

University of Southampton Research Repository

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis and, where applicable, any accompanying data are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis and the accompanying data cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s. The content of the thesis and accompanying research data (where applicable) must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder/s.

When referring to this thesis and any accompanying data, full bibliographic details must be given, e.g.

Thesis: Author (Year of Submission) "Full thesis title", University of Southampton, name of the University Faculty or School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.

Data: Author (Year) Title. URI [dataset]

University of Southampton

FACULTY OF LAW, ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
School of History

Mary Carpenter: Her Father's Daughter?

by

Susy Brigden



Mary Carpenter

Frontispiece to *The Life and Work of Mary Carpenter* by J. Estlin Carpenter, 1879.

Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2011

ABSTRACT

This thesis consists of four thematic chapters showing Mary Carpenter (1808-1877) as an example of a Unitarian educational reformer who carved for herself a respectable public life at a time when the emphasis was on separate spheres for women. Mary's significance has recently become more widely broadcast, although her place as a leading pedagogue in educational history still needs to be asserted. As the title suggests, a primary concern will be to examine the influence that Lant Carpenter had on his daughter throughout her life.

The first chapter examines Unitarianism, the life of Lant Carpenter, philanthropy in Bristol and the activities that Mary was involved with during her early life as a school teacher. This chapter also considers the education of middle-class girls together with the relationships between fathers and daughters in the period.

The second chapter investigates the early anti-slavery campaigns in England focusing on the movement in Bristol. Mary's participation in the anti-slavery movement in England and America is examined together with the activities of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-slavery Society.

The third chapter considers juvenile delinquency in England at mid-century, together with Mary's involvement in the formation of reformatory schools for the 'perishing and dangerous classes', as well as her involvement with the drafting of the 'Juvenile Offenders Act of 1854. Mary was the first woman to speak publicly at the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, and this aspect of her life is examined.

The fourth chapter discusses Rammohun Roy's visit to Bristol in 1833 together with Mary's later commitment to help her Indian friends bring education to the women of India. Mary's four visits to India are examined together with her influential book *Six Months in India*, and the formation of the National India Association.

The conclusion considers how the seriousness of her religious beliefs gave Mary the strength to challenge the orthodoxies of the day for females and step out of the prescribed role for women: her career is a cautionary tale underlining the obstacles women faced in their encounters with the Victorian state.

LIST OF CONTENTS

Title page	p.1
Abstract	p.2.
List of Contents	p.3-5
List of Tables and Illustrations	p.6
Declaration of authorship	p.7.
Acknowledgements	p.8
List of Abbreviations	p.8
List of definitions	p.9

Chapter One ‘I have glorified in being the daughter of one who has justly gained the esteem and love of all by his endeavours to promote the happiness and wellbeing of others’.

Mary Carpenter in Carpenter, J. Estlin, (1879) *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, New Jersey, 1974, p.16.

Introduction	p.10
1.1. The Unitarians.	p.22
1.2 Lant Carpenter.	p.30
1.3 The education of middle-class girls.	p.40
1.4 The role of women.	p.44
1.5 Philanthropy in Bristol.	p.47
1.6 Joseph Tuckerman.	p.54

Chapter Two Until ‘all men are free and equal.’

Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 1865, cited in Carpenter, J.E, *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Macmillan & Co, 1879, p.243.

- | | | |
|-----|---|------|
| 2.1 | The early anti-slavery Campaign in England. | p.64 |
| 2.2 | The world anti-slavery convention in London. | p.68 |
| 2.3 | Anti-slavery campaigners in Bristol. | p.71 |
| 2.4 | The Bristol and Clifton Ladies’ Anti-slavery Society. | p.80 |
| 2.5 | Mary Carpenter’s later involvement in anti-slavery. | p.83 |

Chapter Three ‘The only School provided in Great Britain by the State for her children is – the Gaol’.

Mary Carpenter in Carpenter, J.E, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders*, C. Gilpin 1851, p. 261.

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------|
| 3.1 | Juvenile Delinquency and Ragged Schools. | p.91 |
| 3.2 | Mary Carpenter’s <i>Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders: Their Condition and Treatment</i> . | p.100 |
| 3.3 | Mary Carpenter and the Birmingham Conference. | p.109 |
| 3.4 | Kingswood and Red Lodge reformatory schools. | p.113 |
| 3.5 | The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. | p.126 |

Chapter Four ‘India is the brightest jewel in the British Crown’.

Mary Carpenter in Carpenter, Mary *Six Months in India*, 11, Longman, Green & Co, 1868, pp.142-5.

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------|
| 4.1 | Women’s involvement in the campaigns against <i>sati</i> in India and with Rammohun Roy. | p.144 |
| 4.2 | Education for women in India. | p.149 |

4.3	Mary Carpenter and India.	p.154
4.4	<i>Six Months in India.</i>	p.163
4.5	Mary Carpenter, Keshub Chandra Sen and the National Indian Association.	p.167
Conclusion		p.175
Appendices		p.186
Bibliography		p.193

List of Tables and Illustrations

List of Tables

<i>Chart One:</i>	Religious affiliation of women involved in the Bristol and Clifton Working and Visiting Society.	p.80
<i>Chart Two:</i>	Number of children under sixteen committed to Prison 1856-60.	p.97
<i>Chart Three:</i>	Children committed to prison in the period 1856-75.	p.97
<i>Chart Four:</i>	Figures available to Mary Carpenter at the time of writing <i>Reformatory schools for the children of the perishing and dangerous classes and for Juvenile Delinquent - Their Condition and Treatment.</i>	p.103

List of Illustrations

1.	Mary Carpenter: Frontispiece of Carpenter, J.E, (1879) <i>The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter</i> , Montclair, New Jersey, 1974.	p.1
2	Cartoon showing Mary Carpenter in <i>Charivari</i> .	p.159
3.	Memorial to Mary Carpenter in Bristol Cathedral.	p.192

Declaration of authorship

I, Susy Brigden, declare that the thesis entitled *Mary Carpenter: Her Father's Daughter* and the work presented in the thesis are both my own, and have been generated by me as the result of my own research. I confirm that:

This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University.

Where any part of this thesis has been previously submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated.

Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed.

Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is my own work.

I have acknowledged all the main sources of help.

Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself.

None of this work has been published before submission.

July 2011

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the help and support of my family and of my supervisor, Dr Jane McDermid.

I also wish to thank both Examiners as their careful reading of the thesis proved invaluable.

List of Abbreviations

Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society	BCLASS
British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society	BFASS
Bristol Public Library	BL
Bristol Record Office	BRO
Harris Manchester College, Oxford	HMC
National Association of the Promotion of Social Science	NAPSS
Transactions of the National Association of the Promotion of Social Science	TNAPSS

List of definitions

Anti-Corn Law League: formed in 1839 to secure free trade and the abolition of the Corn Laws.

Anti-Trinitarian: opposed to the doctrine of the trinity, that is the union of God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in one Godhead. Unitarians believe that this was added to Christian belief in the centuries after Christ.

Associationism: psychological theory, which postulates that all mental phenomena arise from the association of ideas.

Dissenters: those Protestants who from 1662 rejected the Thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. They included Presbyterians, Congregationalist/Independents, Baptists, Quakers and subsequently Methodists and Unitarians.

Empire: meaning webs of trade, migration, knowledge, military power and political intervention that allowed certain communities to exert their political power and sovereignty over other groups.

Evangelicalism: Protestant movement that stressed the importance of individual salvation and the human soul.

Feminist: is used throughout to describe individuals or groups who recognized and challenged in an explicit way women's inequality and oppression.

Nonconformity: a general term that, by the mid-nineteenth century, was used collectively of the evangelical Dissenting churches and of Methodism and its offshoots.

Non-Sectarian: An education to allow people to think for themselves.

Philanthropy: In this thesis, it will be used with the meaning of personal charitable dealings of the middle-classes with the poor and needy, by entering into a relationship with a recipient in a bid to reform them and to make them respectable by prevailing Victorian standards.

Ragged School: Voluntary elementary schools, often in makeshift accommodation, for vagrants and deprived children.

Raj: the period of British rule in India 1757-1947.

Test and Corporation Acts: Acts of Parliament from the reign of Charles II which excluded from public or municipal office all British people who would not swear oaths of supremacy and allegiance or take the Anglican sacraments.

Introduction

This thesis consists of four thematic chapters showing Mary Carpenter (1808-1877) as an exemplar of a Unitarian social and educational reformer in the nineteenth century. Mary became one of the most well-known women of her day in liberal reforming circles, and this thesis seeks to demonstrate both her uniqueness as well as highlighting how she fitted into broader movements of like-minded people. As the title of the thesis suggests, a primary concern will be to examine Lant Carpenter's patriarchal influence on his daughter Mary.

The first chapter provides an insight into the relationship of Lant Carpenter and his daughter. Mary's relationship with her father suggests a close identification with patriarchy. Indeed, many writers have acknowledged the importance of the relationship between Mary and her father.¹ Deidre David has offered three case studies - Harriet Martineau, Elizabeth Barrett Browning and George Eliot - 'to demonstrate the resistance to and the complicity with hegemonic patriarchy'.² Identification with patriarchal beliefs provided an opportunity for self-definition as well as a chance for authority and limited empowerment. Cominos believes tenderness and respect comes from a daughter's relation to parental authority, yet, in some cases, the deference for the figure of the authoritarian father often caused daughters to form a neurotic attachment to their fathers and this certainly appears to be true in Mary's case.³ At the root of Mary's commitment to reform was her close relationship to her father, Dr Lant Carpenter. He was an anti-slavery activist, educationist and minister of Lewin's Mead chapel in Bristol; indeed, her education in her father's renowned school as well as father's influential writings on education affected his daughter's outlook throughout her life.

Unitarian involvement in reform was not only rooted in the Dissenting tradition but was also natured by the impact of Evangelicism in Britain which encouraged practical Christianity; thus evangelicals were in the vanguard of the movement for social and moral reform. This gave an opportunity for women to develop an interest in philanthropic activities, as the stress on the urgency of bringing about the moral reform of society was combined with an emphasis on middle-class women's role as the guardians of morality.⁴

Lant Carpenter was a progressive teacher and Mary, unlike many girls of the period, had a wide ranging academic education in her father's boys' school. However, because Unitarianism was considered heresy, women such as Mary were considerably hindered in

their activities by a need to act within the bounds of female propriety. Mary's later decision to devote her life to social reform can be traced to limited vocational opportunities open to women. In comparison to her brothers, she lacked access to higher education and was excluded from the colleges which trained her brothers for the Unitarian ministry. Teaching offered one of the few opportunities for middle-class women to work outside the home and there are significant gendered aspects to the way in which Mary used her education and talents within the acceptable bounds of propriety.

Philanthropic works were an area that did not offend against conventional notions of sexual morality; women were doing what was perceived as women's work, but outside of the home. Lewis's *Women in Social Action* is an important study of female social activists in Victorian England which has included a detailed investigation into their religious motivation.⁵ Her study also contributes to understanding why many women, such as Mary, refused initially to commit themselves to the suffrage movement, despite the significant overlap between their concerns and those of the women's movement. Middle-class women, in deploying publicly their 'private' and 'domestic skills', played a crucial role in the construction of a class culture where the domestic was seen as a pivotal site of reform. This division of the public and the private has stimulated empirical as well as theoretical debate and like all dualisms, one category necessitates the other. In the nineteenth century there was a multitude of publics, political and economic as well as religious and philanthropic among others. The ideology of domesticity can also be seen as enabling middle-class women's moral and social influence through the growth of their religious and philanthropic activities.

Historians have attempted to understand how religious faith, belief and practices can function as both empowering and equally oppressive. Janaki Nair has urged historians

To explore the complex ways in which women are, and have been, subjected to systematic subordination within a framework that simultaneously acknowledges new political possibilities for women, drawing on traditions of dissent or resistance while infusing them with new meaning.⁶

While historically the Christian faith has been an exponent of sexual inequality, the belief in the equality of souls before God implied that women should be spiritually equal. While women did not have the same opportunities as men, 'the barriers against their activities were not as inflexible as commonly assumed'.⁷ As Munn has noted, while the bulk of philanthropic work was concerned with the immediate material needs of its clientele, it was motivated by

religious beliefs and teaching.⁸ Throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, religious organised philanthropy remained overwhelmingly popular; contemporary estimates suggests that as many as 500,000 women were active in British charities alone by the 1890s.⁹ Religion can be said to provide its adherents with a purpose, a supportive community. The extension of women's domestic activities, often within a religious framework, through charity work and philanthropy included visiting the poor and sick, teaching in Sunday schools as well as fund-raising. In Mary's case her involvement in philanthropic work brought about a transition from school teacher to campaigner for the fair treatment of juvenile delinquents.

Elliott has raised the question of why charity came to be seen as a natural extension of the domestic sphere for women, a first step out of the house.¹⁰ The ideology of protection for middle-class women worked against charitable activity, at least in the form of direct contact with the poor. While the Judeo-Christian tradition argued that relief of the poor was a religious duty, it also taught that it could be fulfilled through almsgiving rather than direct involvement. Authors such as Prochaska, Davidoff and Hall, Luddy and Lewis have all written on philanthropy in the Victorian period, while studies of individuals such as Octavia Hill and organisations such as the Charity Organisation Society investigate the subject. Philanthropy is also included as a prominent theme in studies of the Victorian middle-classes and of opposition to the Poor Law.¹¹

While middle-class women in the nineteenth century came to adulthood in a society governed by the religious worship of different denominations, Levine believes scholarly debate on the role of religion in the lives of women reformers in Britain mainly focuses on the motivations of leading middle-class activists from Protestant backgrounds.¹² Indeed, Munn believed scant attention has been paid to women's charitable work performed under religious auspices, not because it was performed by women, but because it was religious.¹³ A crucial element of this charitable activity was the sense of purpose it provided to its participants and women's writings of the period demonstrate a tenacity that transcended the everyday and propelled women into philanthropy.¹⁴ Summers set out to rectify what she saw as the underplayed significance of religion in the lives of nineteenth-century women. She attributed this neglect to feminist secularism, church historians' lack of interest in social activism and the focus by social historians on social control rather than religious commitment.¹⁵ Morgan believes that the highly gendered understanding of religiosity in this period, together with the absence of any sustained historical analysis of women's religious and feminist conviction, is striking.¹⁶

Studies such as those by Morgan, of Ellice Hopkins, have shown the importance of religion in women's lives and as Malmgreen has cautioned, 'if feminist historians ignore religion...we will have forfeited our understanding of the substantial majority of women who were believers'.¹⁷

This thesis considers the role of religion in encouraging women's involvement with reform issues and also discusses how religion set gendered limits on female activism. While the struggle for female suffrage did not become unified until the end of the Victorian era, a more widespread recognition of the public function of women was achieved earlier at mid-century. In the main this had been accomplished by women such as Mary Carpenter who were involved in a variety of reform movements. These endeavours were often dominated to a large extent by unmarried women drawn from the middle-classes. While Hall has asserted that the female activist's role has led to a deeper understanding of the gendered role of race and class in the early nineteenth century not all historians agree with this statement.¹⁸ De Vries believes historical studies of the relationship between feminism and religion often stumble over the paradox that religion was both a source of oppressive domestic ideology and a starting point for feminist activism. The numbers of interpretive challenges on feminism and religion have created layers of obfuscation which has hindered historians' ability to understand this dynamic, what can be described as often unpredictable relationships between feminist activism and religious ideas. Indeed, de Vries has noted this includes the current definition of feminism, which has been conceived in primarily secular terms and the historiography of feminism which has not taken religious belief and religiously motivated activism seriously; the exclusive nature of a person's religious experience and the popularity of unorthodox forms of spirituality among feminists that defy easy categorisation.¹⁹

The seminal work of Davidoff and Hall demonstrates the significance of the large part played by evangelical religion in formulating and promoting the ideology of the separate spheres for men and women. In *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850* (2nd ed. 2002) Davidoff and Hall demonstrate the way in which class and gender were mutually constructive, together with the centrality of the domestic, to the formation of the nineteenth-century middle classes. Davidoff and Hall's work, by including the family, focuses on the feminine to yield a paradigm shift in historical analysis. Both Unitarian and evangelical communities provided a gathering space for women and gave them the opportunities to turn their personal convictions into action. Thus women found more than a

polite outlet for their talents in the mission societies, benevolent societies, temperance organisations, Sunday schools and purity groups that attracted their time and attention.²⁰ As Prochaska notes, 'for the great majority of those who imbibed the social gospel of active religion, belief without active benevolence, was inexplicable'.²¹

The tensions within Unitarianism's attitudes towards the status and roles of women have been highlighted in Hall's *White, Male and Middle-class*.²² She observes that in Unitarian congregations across the country women claimed the right to organise activities for their own sex, but these claims were constantly fought over and contested. Unitarian women faced the challenge not only of conventional, conservative thinking about sexual difference, but also increasingly of the doctrine of 'separate spheres'. Indeed, in an imperial or a British context, a common thread in nineteenth-century history was the attention paid to this concept. The origins of 'separate spheres' have been variously attributed to the Enlightenment, Evangelicalism and to political expediency born of the upheavals of the Industrial Revolution. The separate spheres thesis was the dominant historical paradigm for understanding gender relations among the middle classes in the nineteenth century. Separate spheres emphasised how men and women occupied quite distinct arenas: women remained within the home, concerning themselves with reproduction and the moral upbringing of children, while men, as both citizens and heads of the household, occupied the public spheres of politics, business and law. Educational writers from the eighteenth century such as Hannah More and Maria Edgeworth had all emphasized the importance of a mother's role in shaping the world of an infant and small child; with the mother lay the responsibility for the first early direction of moral and religious character.²³

The ideologies of separate spheres and domesticity and the image of 'the angel in the house' have been viewed as fashioned from religious discourse. Female morality was valued as redemptive and decreed women by nature were suited to the role of moral guardian to the nation. As Ware has asserted, gender played a pivotal role in ideas of race and civilisation, and race, class and gender all need to be interrelated in historical enquiry.²⁴ A woman's role was thought to be both biologically and socially determined, and in a period when most people professed a religion, theologians used the scriptures to prove that God willed women's subservience and inferior position in marriage and society.²⁵ However, religion could also provide women with the rationale for participation in the public world, by its insistence on salvation. Many women, inspired by a vision of themselves as 'instruments of God', found

their way around 'separate spheres ideology' by working in a wider community as philanthropists and social reformers.²⁶ This thesis considers how the seriousness of her religious beliefs gave Mary the strength to challenge the orthodoxies of the day for females, and step out of the prescribed role for women.

While the weight of male economic and social power in the nineteenth century is not denied, the separate spheres myth has obscured the realities of Victorian middle-class women's lives; as Bebbington has emphasised, 'the picture can be painted in too monochrome a way'.²⁷

While Davidoff and Hall acknowledge that the concept of separate spheres does not capture the diversity of men and women's lives, nevertheless they view it as the dominant discourse in shaping male and female identity in the nineteenth century. Yet the stereotypes formally thought to characterise Victorian women have proved to be less rigid as nineteenth-century women were not always the passive, submissive creatures of popular idealisations. Indeed, Hilton argues, the nineteenth century public sphere, once presented as clearly distinguishable from the private and almost exclusively masculine, was in fact more nuanced and its gender boundaries more permeable.²⁸

Ground-breaking biographical scholarship on women educators, such as those by Manton on Mary Carpenter (1976) and later by Steedman, and gender sensitive studies by Miller and Martin, among others, has further developed this approach.²⁹ Certainly, the vision of women as instruments of God allowed women to step out of their prescriptive role, and to circumvent the 'separate spheres' ideology by extending their work into the wider community particularly through a focus on a women's mission to women. There are significant gender aspects to the way in which Mary used her education and talents within the acceptable bounds of social propriety. Her subsequent finding of her public voice, together with her reputation as a social and educational reformer, made her a role model for other women.

The second chapter of this thesis discusses Mary's life-long interest in anti-slavery. During the anti-slavery campaigns in the nineteenth century, Mary met many American abolitionists visiting her family in Bristol, and this is the theme of the second chapter. The anti-slavery movement was an important area in which middle-class men could define a new identity, while women, despite their lack of formal power, could influence the campaigns both locally and nationally. Women's participation in the movement received little attention until work by Midgley, among others.³⁰ Anti-slavery campaigns brought to light tensions around aspects of

the superior position of white women in the colonies as well as their oppression in England. During the long fight against slavery, many white women developed a sisterly or maternal concern for colonised women who appeared to need their help. A study of British women's involvement in the anti-slavery campaigns highlights their wish for direct participation in the campaigns of the philanthropic organisations of the period.³¹

There are many personal letters to and from prominent American abolitionists and Mary Carpenter in the Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, including letters from William Lloyd Garrison, Reverend Livermore, Reverend Samuel May, Mrs Eliza Follen and Maria Weston Chapman, all of which demonstrate her long standing interest in anti-slavery matters. Many other letters concerning Mary's views on anti-slavery are reproduced in J. Estlin Carpenter's *The Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*.³² Both Mary and her brother, Russell, were close friends of Frederick Douglass, although none of Mary's letters are reproduced in Douglass' autobiographic *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, and it has been difficult to locate others.³³ While there are 51 letters from Mary Carpenter to Frederick Douglass in the Boston Public library, they are from the American Mary Brown Carpenter. While many papers have been destroyed by the Carpenter family after Mary's death, the many letters between her and American anti-slavery campaigners demonstrate her lifelong involvement in the anti-slavery movement.

Schwan has described Mary Carpenter as the successor of the prison philanthropist Elizabeth Fry (1780-1845) who expanded the Quaker eighteenth-century ideas of sympathy by combining the merging language and concerns of social science, medicine, social work and late-nineteenth-century imperial capitalism.³⁴ Fry, who, unlike Mary, focused exclusively on female prisoners, had advocated the active involvement of middle-class women outside the domestic sphere in the project of reclaiming these prisoners as 'useful' members of society. Fawcett believed that Mary not only built on Fry's agenda but was also her spiritual heir and her successor.³⁵ Mary Carpenter has been hailed as one of the first women to dedicate a professional life to social reform and the study of crime, especially that of juvenile delinquency. Despite Mary's obsessive commitment to female propriety Mary did in later life take on a more public role and Schroder has demonstrated how Mary not only published prolifically on the subject, but 'became one of country's most active platform speakers' who between 1857 and 1876 delivered more than 36 papers at the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, on subjects ranging from the problems of pauper children, the

merits of the Irish prison system to educational and prison reform in India, more than any other woman member of the organisation.³⁶ A central concern of this thesis, and the theme of chapter three, is Mary's role in the schooling of the poor, firstly set within the wider context of the ragged school movement, and secondly with a focus on her pioneering contribution to the treatment of juvenile delinquents together and the influence of her father and Hartleyan associationism on her ideas. Mary's plans for the treatment of juvenile delinquents were published in *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes* (1851). The publication of this book brought her into contact with other reformers and politicians; she was very influential in the drawing up of the Juvenile Offenders Act of 1854, which defined childhood as a period that needed protection by law

The first chapter which explores the actions of British women who opposed *sati* in India offers insights into how middle-class white women in Britain began to see themselves as modern self-governing individuals through setting up the contrasting image of the victimised non-Western women.³⁷ Said's interpretation of 'orientalism' alerted historians to connections of imperialism and how Europeans had constructed a version of an East simultaneously attractive and repellent portrayed as an exotic but inferior 'Other'.³⁸ Subaltern studies attempted to investigate the position of the colonised to explain the complex workings of racial subordination. The mobilisation of *sati* in British colonial discourse has been identified by Spivak as providing a major justification for imperial rule: 'White men saving brown women from brown men'.³⁹ Feminist theory has centred on sexuality and how the hierarchies of gender affected the colonised; the current field of postcolonial studies has brought these strings together.

While Mary did not appear to view herself as a feminist, nevertheless, there is little doubt that middle-class British feminists of the period viewed feminism as an agent of imperial progress, and felt that their capacity to represent Indian women signified their own imperial citizenship. Mary suggested that the treatment of Hindu women as inferior beings 'stood as a grand barrier to the improvement of their race'.⁴⁰ This is a theme common among domestic female reformers at this time as women, by virtue of their domestic functions and their role as 'transmitters of culture' were responsible for 'the uplift and improvement of the body politic' continued to be portrayed.⁴¹ What Walkowitz has called 'the custodial' aspect of female domestic reform was reproduced in Victorian feminist practice yet it is difficult to distinguish what can be described as female domestic reform from what constitutes feminism.⁴² The

extent to which social relations in the Empire were an extension of the social at home is an important point.⁴³ Davidoff, Hall and Poovey have all pointed to the relationships of gender and class construction to national imperial identity.⁴⁴

As Mayhall has shown in the case of British women's suffrage historiography, the segregation of certain historical identities from some historiographical domains has resulted in scholars resolutely fixing a subject like feminism outside the political realm.⁴⁵ While white women's involvement in Empire and the gender politics of imperialism were crucial in the development of imperial attitudes and culture they were neglected in standard histories of the Empire.⁴⁶ Standard histories of British feminism also have had little to say about imperialism while standard histories of imperialism have ignored feminism. Recent attempts to connect the two have been stimulated by contemporary feminist debates concerning the problem of racism in Western feminism.⁴⁷ Watts believes that recent studies on British imperialism and gender have painted a wider picture of British imperialism by including women; these studies contested the traditional view of women in India by 'restoring to the story white women who played an active role, particularly those who believed they were helping their oppressed 'sisters'.⁴⁸ Mary, by labelling British involvement in India in terms of colonial 'duty', disguised the political and economic inequities inherent in a colonial relationship. Rather she saw her own projects of reform in India as an act of or her share of the 'white women's burden'.⁴⁹ Recent feminist research on modern India has focused on the attitudes and motives of Victorian women reformers such as Mary, and on their perspectives of Empire, focusing on what they regarded as the inadequate level of education among Indian women as well as issues surrounding living conditions and legal and customary rights.

Ramusack, Burton and Ware among others, have argued that feminist reformers deliberately stressed colonial difference and the colonial otherness of Indian women, representing them as needy and dependant, while at the same time using their own position as campaigners on behalf of Indian women to bolster their own domestic aspirations and projects.⁵⁰ While white women attempted to work within a framework of imperialism, Burton in *The White Women's Burden* has argued that British feminists collaborated in the construction of an image of helpless Indian womanhood on whom their own emancipation relied.⁵¹ Historians of imperialism have concerns about objectifying Indian women as 'the other' – as victims

passively waiting for white women to help them, believing that British women's intervention was really to prove their worth in 'the masculine enterprise of Empire'.⁵²

Mary had many Indian friends and her Unitarian upbringing had brought her into contact with Indian reformers such as Rammohun Roy and Keshub Chunder Sen. When she finally visited India when in her sixties, her involvement with education as well as penal reform and her subsequent book *Six Months in India*, brought Mary the fame and celebrity status that her previous work had not. Like her relative, Harriet Martineau, Mary wanted to influence public opinion on Indian matters in England and formed the National India Association in 1870, which continued in existence until the First World War.

Watts, Midgley and Burton among others, have written many inspiring articles concerning Mary Carpenter; Watts perhaps has been the most prolific and has published several articles concerning Mary's work with the 'perishing classes' and her work for women's education in India.⁵³ Literature and primary work relating to Mary Carpenter are spread throughout the world; however, there are a considerable number of documents held in Bristol Reference library, Bristol Record Office and the Harris Manchester Unitarian College in Oxford although the state of the handwritten material is at times not legible. An important source of reference to Mary would be the extensive diaries and notes written by Russell Carpenter, yet regretfully these were written in a personal shorthand which has not yet been transcribed. Estlin Carpenter's hagiographic *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter* (1879), focusing on her religious life while glossing over many of the controversies surrounding her, is a prime source of reference for many documents. Manton, a later biographer, in *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets* (1976), reproduces large amounts of Estlin Carpenter's previous work, but contains errors and frequently attributes thoughts and feelings to Mary without reference.

Mary Carpenter was extremely influenced by her father; firstly by the exceptional education she received in his school and secondly by ideas around associationism originating from David Hartley's *Observations of Man, his Frame, his Duty and his Expectations* (1749) which influenced all her work. This thesis, therefore, is based on a rich variety of both primary and secondary sources and addresses the broad scope of her activities and interests. Since so many of these overlapped, it has proved essential to provide the contexts in which she operated and developed her ideas.⁵⁴

- ¹ See for example: Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998; David, Deirdre, *Intellectual Women and Victorian Patriarchy*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1987.
- ² David, *Intellectual Women*, p.24.
- ³ Cominos, Peter, 'Innocent Femina Sensulis in Unconscious Conflict', p.159 in Vicinus, Martha, (ed.) *'Suffer and be Still', Women in the Victorian Age*, Bloomington, Indiana Press, 1972.
- ⁴ Midgely, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform', p.142 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010
- ⁵ Lewis, Jane, *Women and Social Action in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1991.
- ⁶ Cited in Rendall, 'Recovering Lost Political Cultures: British Feminisms, 1869-1900' in Paletschek Sylvia and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker (eds.) *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth-century*, Routledge, 1997.
- ⁷ Gleadle, K. & S. Richardson, (eds.) *Women in British Politics, 1760-1860: The Power of the Petticoat*, Macmillan, 2000, Introduction.
- ⁸ Munn, Susan, 'Women and philanthropic cultures', p.54, in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ⁹ Koven, Seth, *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London*, Princeton University Press, 2004, p.7.
- ¹⁰ Elliott, Dorice Williams, *The Angel out of the House, Philanthropy and Gender in Nineteenth-century England*, Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 2002, p.6.
- ¹¹ Davidoff, Leonore, Catherine Hall, (1987) *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle- Class, 1780-1850*, Hutchinson, 2002; Prochaska, F, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-century England*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980; Prochaska, F, *The Voluntary Impulse- Philanthropy in Modern Britain*, Faber, 1988; Lewis, Jane, *Women and Social Action in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1991; Lewis, Jane, *The Voluntary Sector, the State and Social Work in Britain*, Aldershot, Elgar, 1995; Lewis, Jane, *The voluntary sector, the state and social work in Britain: the Charity Organisation-Family Welfare Association since 1869*, Edward Elgar Publishing, 1995; Luddy, Maria, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth -Century Ireland*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- ¹² Levine, Philippa, *Feminist Lives in Victorian England*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1990, p.31.
- ¹³ Munn, *Women and philanthropic cultures*, p.55.
- ¹⁴ For example, Florence Nightingale in *Suggestions for Thought for Searchers After Truth*, Spottiswoode, 1860; Anna Jameson, *Sisters of Charity, Catholic and Protestant Abroad and at Home*, Longmans, 1855.
- ¹⁵ Summers, Anne, *Female Lives, Moral States*, Newbury, Threshold Press, 2000, pp.290-3.
- ¹⁶ Morgan, Sue, *Women, religion and feminism, in Britain 1750-1990*, Palgrave-Macmillan, 2002.
- ¹⁷ Morgan, Sue, *A Passion for Purity: Ellice Hopkins and the Politics of Gender in the last-Victorian Church*, Bristol, Bristol University Press, 1999; Malmgreen, Gail, (ed.) *Religion in the lives of Englishwomen*, Croom Helm, 2001, p.3.
- ¹⁸ Hall, Catherine, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2002 is a key exploration of these themes and focuses on a period when ideologies were shifting and concentrates on the male activists.
- ¹⁹ DeVries, Jacqueline, 'More than Paradoxes to offer: Feminism, history and religious culture', p.188 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ²⁰ DeVries, *ibid*, p.195.
- ²¹ Prochaska, Frank, *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain. The Disinherited Spirit*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, p.6.
- ²² Hall, Catherine, *White Male and Middle-Class - explorations in feminism and history*, Polity Press, 1992, pp. 190-191.
- ²³ Rendall, Jane, *Women in an Industrializing Society: England 1750-1889*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1990, p.47.
- ²⁴ Ware, Vron, *Beyond the Pale, White Women, Racism and History*, Verso, 1992, pp.37-8.
- ²⁵ Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.18.
- ²⁶ Tyrell, A, 'Women's Mission and Pressure Group Politics in Britain, 1825-60', pp.194-230, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library*, 63, 1990.
- ²⁷ Bebbington, David, *The Dominance of Evangelicalism*, Downers Grove, IL, Intervarsity press, 2005, p.217.
- ²⁸ Hilton, M. & Hirsch, P, *Practical Visionaries: Women, Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Longman, 2000, p.2.
- ²⁹ Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976; Steedman, Carolyn, *Childhood, Culture and Class in Britain: Margaret McMillan 1860-1931*, Virago, 1990; Miller, Jane, *School for Women*, Virago, 1986; Martin, Jane, *Women and the Politics of Schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Leicester University Press, 1999.

- ³⁰ For example, Midgley, Clare, *Women against Slavery: The British Campaigns- 1780-1870*, Routledge, 1982.
- ³¹ Midgley, *ibid*, p.198.
- ³² J. Estlin Carpenter was Mary Carpenter's nephew.
- ³³ Baker, Houston (ed.) *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave*, Penguin Classics, 1982.
- ³⁴ Schwan, Anne, "'Dreadful beyond Description'", Mary Carpenter's prison reform writings and female convicts in Britain and India', p.108, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 14, No.2, 2010.
- ³⁵ Fawcett, Millicent Garrett, *Some Eminent Women of Our Time: Mary Carpenter*, Westminster, National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, 1912, p.5.
- ³⁶ Schroeder, Janice, 'Self Teaching: Mary Carpenter, Public Speech, and the Disciple of Delinquency', p.150, *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 36, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- ³⁷ Spivak, G, 'Three women's tests and a critique of imperialism', *Critical Inquiry*, 1985, vol.12, pp.243-61.
- ³⁸ Said, Edward, *Culture and Imperialism*, Chatto and Windus, 1993.
- ³⁹ Spivak, Gayatri, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in Nelson, C, & L, Grossberg, (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Basingstoke, Macmillan Education, 1988, p. 296.
- ⁴⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 2. Vols, Longmans, 1868, p.75.
- ⁴¹ Burton, Antoinette, *Burdens of Empire: British Feminism, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865- 1915*, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1995, p.12.
- ⁴² Walkowitz, J.R, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class and the State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- ⁴³ Burton, *Burdens of Empire*, p.12.
- ⁴⁴ Davidoff, Leonore, & Catherine Hall, (1987) *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle-Class, 1780-1850*, Hutchinson, 2002; Poovey, Mary, *Making a Social Body: British Cultural Formation, 1830-1864*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- ⁴⁵ Mayhall, Laura E. Nym, 'Reclaiming the Political: women and the social history of the suffrage in Great Britain, France and the United States', p.182-8, *Journal of Women's History*.X11, 1 Spring, 2000.
- ⁴⁶ Watts, R, 'Breaking the boundaries of Victorian Imperialism or extending a reformed paternalism'? Mary Carpenter and India', p. 443, *History of Education*, 2000, Vol. 29, No.5.
- ⁴⁷ For example, Midgley, Clare, 'Anti-slavery and feminism in nineteenth-century Britain', pp.343-62, *Gender and History*, V (1993) 2.
- ⁴⁸ Watts, R, 'Breaking the boundaries', p 44.
- ⁴⁹ Schwan, Anne, "'Dreadful beyond Description'", Mary Carpenter's prison reform writings and female convicts in Britain and India', p.107, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 14, No.2, 2010.
- ⁵⁰ Ramusack, Barbara N, "'Catalysts or Helpers?'" British Feminists, Indian Women's Rights and Indian Independence', pp.109-150 in Gail Minault (ed.) *The Extended Family: Women and Political Participation in India and Pakistan*, Columbia, Mo, South Asia Books, 1981; Burton, Antoinette, *Burdens of Empire: British Feminism, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865- 1915*, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1995; Ware, Vron, *Beyond the Pale, White Women, Racism and History*, Verso, 1992.
- ⁵¹ Burton, Antoinette, 'The White Women's Burden: British Feminists and "The Indian Women"', 1865- 1915', pp.37-158 in Chaudhuri, Nupur & Margaret Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1992.
- ⁵² Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter and India: Enlightened liberalism or condescending imperialism?' p.183, *Paedagogica Historica*, 37, 1, 2002.
- ⁵³ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Educator of children of the "perishing and dangerous classes"', pp.39-51 in Hilton, M. & Hirsch, P, *Practical Visionaries: Women, Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Longman, 2000; Watts, R, *Breaking the boundaries*, p.449; Dresser, Mary, 'Beyond the Pale? Mary Carpenter and the Irish poor in mid-Victorian Bristol', pp.1-6, *History in Focus*, 11 (2006).

CHAPTER ONE

'I have glorified in being the daughter of one who has justly gained the esteem and love of all by his endeavours to promote the happiness and wellbeing of others'.¹

1.1 The Unitarians

In the Victorian period, England was dominated by an established order of aristocracy, gentry and Church who held leading positions at court and in the Church of England as well as having political power. However, beneath this there was a large social, economic and cultural change taking place.² The middle ranks in society, what was to be termed the middle class, including the men who had made money from slave-trading and tobacco as well as the new industrialists who were making their fortunes from coal, iron and cotton, were growing in size and confidence.

In the eighteenth century the Church of England had been awakened from apathy by an evangelical revival. During the period covered by this thesis, Britain's religious cultures underwent dramatic change. While Christianity saturated everyday life, religious allegiances were shifting and new denominations were emerging as others lost ground. They reworked ideas around the sacred and the secular, challenged both public discourse as well as personal belief systems.³ In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the growth of Methodism and the rise of Evangelicalism, which emphasised the importance of individual salvation and the human soul, all affected religious beliefs. The period between 1795 and 1865 has also been labelled the 'Age of Atonement', to signify the immense impact of evangelical religion on British society during this period.⁴

The Victorians lived with religion which was both a personal force and a social organisation; indeed no period outside of the reformation saw such an active, widespread public debate concerning its role. While the Church of England remained the dominant form of Christian worship in Victorian England, its position was eroded by the growth of alternative Christian denominations critical of its practices and doctrine, together with a gradual process of secularisation. The largest of these religious minorities were the Protestant Dissenting Churches and Chapels, the Independents or Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers and Unitarians. The spiritual emotionalism of Evangelical 'new' dissent offered a

challenge to 'old' dissent, i.e. Quakers, General Baptists and Presbyterians. Some Presbyterians were transformed by rationalism and many became Unitarians.⁵ The three people responsible for establishing Unitarianism as a denomination in its own right were Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), Theophilus Lindsey (1723-1808) and Thomas Belsham (1750-1829). During the 1770s Joseph Priestley began to expound the basis of modern Unitarianism in a number of publications and in 1774 the first avowedly Unitarian church was established at Essex Hall, in London. From the 1830s, Unitarianism was influenced by thinkers such as the American Unitarian, William Ellery Channing, and James Martineau; their ideas reinforced the Unitarian commitment to a moral education within an open-ended religion.⁶

Unitarianism was the ideal religion for liberal, independently-minded middle-class men and women, whose deep religious commitment preferred rational ethics to dogma. The Unitarian concept of religion was 'neither creed nor dogma' and Unitarians exalted in their individualism and free thought. Russell Carpenter, Mary's brother, stated 'the name of Unitarian is usually confined to those who deny there is a Trinity ... it does not involve any doctrinal system'.⁷ However, a sect which did not seem to agree among themselves on their beliefs and did not involve a particular doctrinal system confused others. A contemporary preacher, Joseph Barker, was bemused to discover that Unitarians 'differed from one another very much in their views'.⁸ Harriet Martineau was the sister of James Martineau, later Britain's most distinguished Unitarian theologian. Harriet spent fifteen months as a boarder in her aunt's school in Bristol as well as visiting the Rankin and Carpenter families.⁹ While living in Bristol she also received instruction from Lant who made a powerful impression on her and 'she became a devout and devoted Catechumen, living in and for religion, and fiercely fanatical about it'.¹⁰ Yet later in life she was critical of the religion, believing that 'Unitarians retained the right to reject the uncomfortable and retain the comfortable'.¹¹ Indeed, it was this aspect of Unitarianism, the ability to choose for themselves what they believed, that irritated others.

Unitarians had an optimistic belief in the goodness and potential possibilities of humanity, and were allied to an eager anticipation of the unravelling of the laws of nature by reason, experience and experiment.¹² Unitarianism was an optimistic religion in which women and men debated freely on theological issues, and Unitarians had a commitment to individual, civil and religious liberty and social justice.¹³ They challenged traditional views in religion and politics, emphasised social justice and based their progressive ideas on a modern

education, scientific in method and outlook. They often came from the professional middle-classes and many held privileged positions in society as merchants, factory owners, mayors and judges. They took pride in their mercantile, industrial and professional background and were successful in their roles in the manufacturing towns. For example, the first seven mayors of the Reformed Leicester Corporation were from the Great Meeting Unitarian Chapel, the first and a further nine of the first 28 mayors of Manchester were from the Cross Street Chapel and 23 Unitarian mayors presided over Birmingham in 1841 to 1893.¹⁴ While the denomination only crystallised towards the end of the eighteenth century it rapidly emerged as a powerful force in England's intellectual life. Unitarians were a small, highly educated, politically aggressive and articulate denomination who had influence beyond what their number would usually command, although numerically it was never a large denomination. Indeed, the religious census of 1851 recorded only 229 Unitarian congregations in England, most of which were concentrated in the industrial North and the Midlands.¹⁵

A sect that was not based on a particular creed or dogma but rather a wider cultural perspective with a rigorous commitment to public duty, would make Unitarianism very unattractive to many. One reason for the distrust of Unitarianism was a belief among many contemporaries that it would lead to a general disbelief in religion and Unitarianism itself was generally despised as heresy.¹⁶ While penalties against anti-Trinitarianism were finally removed in 1813 there was still harassment of Unitarians. Unitarianism was abhorred theologically by all orthodox Christians, with Unitarian John Relly Beard remarking: 'From the parlour as well as the pulpit the Unitarian is excluded. The very greetings of his orthodox brethren are stiff and cold'.¹⁷ Joseph Priestley, the founder of modern Unitarianism, believed British Unitarians were 'a sect everywhere spoken against'.¹⁸ The Unitarian denial of original sin and the abandonment of some central tenets of traditional Christianity, such as the Trinity and the Virgin Mary, with the constant questioning of the scriptures, and their fondness for scientific discoveries and their passion for social justice, all contributed to this belief.¹⁹ While Unitarians were reviled by many contemporaries as heretical, they were nevertheless distinguished for their influence nationwide. Elizabeth Haldane remarked 'the sect was small but extraordinarily intellectual and efficient, and if born within it, it was impossible not to gaze at the world from a rather superior angle'.²⁰

In the late eighteenth century Unitarians were leaders in promoting religious, social and political change. The Unitarian belief that ‘life experience profoundly affects the individual, rather than innate predisposition’ gave Unitarians a mandate to shape the minds of their fellow beings by improving their material circumstances. Thus Unitarianism became known as a sect dedicated to reforms in education, public health, working conditions, abolition as well as the rights of women.²¹

If Unitarians were divided as to the precise denominational origins of their sect, they were unequivocal in claiming John Locke (1632-1704) as its founding philosopher and were widely influenced by his beliefs. Locke’s belief that the middle-classes had the right to freedom of conscience and rights to property, as well as his own faith in science and his confidence in the goodness of humanity appeared to reflect the Enlightenment viewpoint. Locke, like other eighteenth-century thinkers, hoped that scientific methods using philosophical questions would generate some basic wide-ranging laws which would clear a path through ignorance.²² Locke’s belief that the mind’s structure, organisation and development were derived entirely from interactions with the environment, together with his belief that there was no need for the direct intervention of a Creator nor any need to consider the soul, made his ideas compatible to many dissenters, especially the Unitarians.²³

John Locke and David Hartley had influenced many Dissenting educationalists of the eighteenth century, but Joseph Priestley took their ideas further. Although physiological psychology and evolutionary biology were under development in this period, their findings were not widely disseminated until the 1870s.²⁴ Unitarians had espoused associationist ideas since the late eighteenth century when leading Unitarian theologian Joseph Priestley wrote a condensed version of Hartley’s philosophical work, *Observations of Man* (1749) intended for his Dissenting congregation. As Watts has noted, the result was a full associationist psychology which argued that all complex ideas ‘arise from simple ones, which in turn arise from the impressions made by external objects upon the several parts of our bodies’.²⁵ *Observations* was a seminal text which combined earlier ideas about experience-based learning into a cohesive theory of association and became the cornerstone of Unitarian educational ideas in the eighteenth-and nineteenth-centuries. In Hartley’s theory, a neurological process of association generates ideas or perceptions, concepts and actions and offers a conceptually novel account of how humans learn and perform skilled actions, a dimension of human nature often left unexplored in philosophy. As a work on the spiritual

condition of humanity, Hartley's *Observations* affirms universal salvation and it presents an original model of psychological growth which describes how the self forms and transforms and learns to love both others and God.²⁶ Hartley's ideas were influential and for followers of Priestley, Hartleyan philosophy and Unitarianism became so intertwined 'that acceptance of the former was often a prime factor leading to the conversion of the latter'.²⁷ Richard Allen has noted that commentators have habitually linked Hartley's name with the phrase 'the association of ideas' and have viewed him as the precursor of the school of Associational Psychology. However, Allen believed that the term is misleading to the extent that it suggests that Hartley took ideas to be pre-existing entities which association connects. Rather, the psychological chemistry of association fuses sensory stimuli, emotional responses, cognitive and semantic elements, and physical movements into new compounds. In Hartley's theory a neurological process of association generates 'ideas': that is, perceptions, concepts, and actions.²⁸ Hartley thus offered a psychological account that supported his belief in universal salvation. For some, Hartley was the first to attempt the science of psychology, and certainly his ideas had profound implications for education.

Lant Carpenter, Mary's father, was a close adherent to the associational philosophy of David Hartley and John Locke. In *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1692) Locke posited methods to assure parental authority through non-tyrannical means, and his theory of *tabula rasa* gave recognition to women as the prime educators who supplied the child with its first impressions.²⁹ Locke maintained that humans are born without innate ideas and knowledge is, instead, determined from sense perception and thus favoured the nurture side of the nature/nurture debate, believing that aspects of personality, social and emotional and intelligence could be taught.

Kowaleski-Wallace, pointing to the female child's perception of the father's importance in the domestic setting, argues that a young girl is particularly susceptible to 'impressions when the father turns his attention to her tutelage' as will be demonstrated in the life of Mary Carpenter.³⁰ Any form of rebellion would be impossible in a situation where no overt signs of repression existed, with the child internalising the voice of parental authority. As this thesis will demonstrate, Mary never seems to have disagreed with her father; even after his death, she continued to follow his teachings. Mary absorbed from her father an evangelical fervour usually abhorrent to Unitarians. Strange has described Unitarians like Mary and her father as 'evangelical Unitarians' who shared with orthodox Evangelicals an adoration of Jesus Christ

as well as a concern for all manner of human beings. However, they did not share the Evangelicals' emphasis on the depravity of mankind, their anti-intellectualism, conservatism and their desire to convert all to one unchanging way of religion. Unitarians also did not adhere to feminine virtues stressing humility and obedience, instead wanting women to be educated in order to make their own judgements.³¹ Mary herself described her religious beliefs: 'I believe Evangelical Unitarianism, as my revered and beloved father expressed it, to be the doctrine of gospel, i.e., simple Christianity, and as such I desire its extension'. She continued:

I value the holy truth, and without it I could not do the work that my Heavenly Father has given me to do. But I should not care to convert anyone to it intellectually only, nor do I value it as a living reality which is to be carried with vivifying warmth to bear on every great social evil.³²

It is apparent that Mary inherited an 'almost evangelical type of Unitarianism that focused on the inspiration of Jesus towards active compassion'.³³ Burton has described Mary's adherence to 'a mid-Victorian religious method that emphasised continuous self-sacrifice as the hallmark of the Christian mission to the secular world' and has noted that this 'ethos encouraged female religious enthusiasm that bordered on the ecstatic'.³⁴

Unitarians were also foremost among entrepreneurs of all kinds and tended to be proud of their rational religion, education and liberal tradition. They were staunch campaigners of the rights of minority groups, such as Jews and were instrumental in securing Catholic Emancipation in 1829, as well as being frequently involved in groups to extend the franchise.³⁵ Unitarians were also dedicated to reforms in education, public health, working conditions, temperance, abolition and women's rights. As one Unitarian put it, 'it was hardly possible to find a Unitarian who was not a reformer'.³⁶ Associationism appealed to Unitarians throughout the nineteenth century as it emphasised the influence of the environment in people's development. It also validated the Unitarian emphasis on social reform, believing that life experiences shaped a person rather than an innate predisposition. It can be argued that Unitarians have, in proportion to their numbers and their relatively brief history, made a greater contribution to British culture than all the other Dissenting sects combined. This would be plausible by simply counting numbers and enumerating the distinguished individuals who emerged from among the Unitarians to contribute to the intellectual life of the country. Unfortunately, however, it appears undeniable that Unitarians also appear to have regarded themselves as an intellectual elite and they appear more self-conscious and

haughty than other sects. Indeed, William Taylor described the Unitarian merchant class of Norwich as 'Proud and severe, impatient and authoritative, overbearing and dictatorial. Revered as patrons, they acquired the influence of Lords'.³⁷ Yet despite the disapprobation in which they were held, British Unitarians evolved as a powerful pressure group championing the liberal and progressive causes of the day. Nevertheless, the Unitarian liberal political ideology was thwarted by an understanding that their social and professional standing was not matched by political power in the late eighteenth century.³⁸ While the education, wealth and power of the leading Unitarians placed them among the elite in provincial and industrial life, their religious beliefs, regarded as heresy by many, prevented their involvement with many institutions. For example, Lant Carpenter was keen to be recognized by the British Association for the Advancement of Science and saw his attendance at the meeting in Bristol in 1836 as a chance to be regarded as an equal. He believed that despite all he had done to diffuse science wherever he had lived, and despite entertaining many eminent people, generally his influence and wishes were thwarted, and his motives misinterpreted by people who were prejudiced against his religion.³⁹

As members of a radical sect, Unitarians tended to support each other in an active network and their extraordinary familial networks not only gave cultural but financial support to the liberal causes they believed in. These networks made it possible for the Unitarian elite to realise 'the proper status which their wealth and education merited', thus becoming influential despite the liability of Unitarianism itself.⁴⁰ For middle-class women such as Mary, religious networks provided a pool of socially concerned individuals. As well as a supportive environment and a continual round of visiting, social mixing in domestic and chapel activities cemented the bonds of kinship and friendship out of which the local women's rights campaigners later emerged. While male-dominated church and chapel often inhibited the scope of female reform, informal religious networks, both national and transnational, could provide a supportive web of connection for women seeking to create independent reform networks. Mary was located in a Unitarian network of crucial importance to her as she developed her ideas and activities; this network included men as well as women. Watts has described Mary's Unitarian network, which spanned both Britain and America, as providing crucial 'material, intellectual and moral support'.⁴¹ Mary looked for support from authoritative men such as Matthew Hill, the former Recorder of Birmingham, who was interested in the educational methods of Pestalozzi as well as rights for women. Women supporters appeared to be more helpful in a practical way, providing funds and assisting

Mary in her schools. For example, Lady Noel Byron supported Mary's reformatory school financially and Hill's daughters, the Winkworth sisters, and Frances Power Cobbe were among women who assisted Mary in her schools.⁴² Unitarian women played a large role in forming networks. For example, around Norwich lived the Taylor, Martineau and Aiken families. The Akins knew the Barbould family and the Roscoes in Liverpool, while in London the Aikin and Barbould families were part of a circle which was not exclusively Unitarian but included Maria Edgeworth,⁴³ Henry Crabb Robinson, William Hazlitt and Samuel Rogers.⁴⁴ Unitarian networks were formed on scientific, religious, political or educational propensities, and as in the Lunar Society of Birmingham, while there were different political and religious leanings, the members had a common interest in science.⁴⁵ Another contributing factor to the spread of Unitarian ideas was *The Monthly Repository* which for most of its existence was a Unitarian journal. Other journals included *Jerrold's Weekly Newspaper*, *The Star of the East*, *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* and *Eliza Cook's Journal* which were either run by Unitarians or Unitarians contributed articles to them.

Unitarians were banned from universities due to their heretical ideas and were forced to form their own establishments for further education. Watts has provided an invaluable discussion of the formation of Unitarian networks in *The Unitarian Contribution to the Development of Female Education, 1790 - 1850* by providing a demonstration of how the Warrington Academy was essential for the spread of Unitarian ideas.⁴⁶ The Unitarian interest in science and invention was reflected in the number of Unitarians who became successful manufacturers.⁴⁷ Annan has described Unitarian families who permeated British intellectual life in the second half of the nineteenth century. He has detailed a complex web of the interrelationships between families such as the Wedgewoods, Potters, Rathbones, Roscoes and Smiths.⁴⁸ Another example of how the Unitarians supported each other is demonstrated in the life of Lant Carpenter. Robert Aspland, who was to become a fellow minister and co-author of Lant, continued to try to extend wider education to women. Mrs Mary Hughes of Hanwood, Shropshire, backed Aspland and Lant in establishing a non-sectarian Christian Tract Society and wrote the first tract for them. It was in these ways that Unitarian networks were built-up and women played a vital role.⁴⁹

The next section discusses Lant Carpenter, Mary's father, in more detail.

1.2 Lant Carpenter.

Lant Carpenter (1780-1840), Mary's father, was born in Kidderminster on 2nd September, 1780. Lant was the third son of the nine children of George Carpenter (1748/9-1839) a carpet manufacturer, and his wife, Mary Hooke, an orphan whose guardian was the well-off and childless Nicholas Pearsall. After George Carpenter's business failed he left Kidderminster, but Lant remained with Nicholas Pearsall, who adopted him with the intention of bringing him up to be a Unitarian minister. Pearsall established a Sunday school in Kidderminster where Lant assisted him in teaching. When Lant was around eleven he devised the idea of teaching the Sunday school pupils of his own age writing and arithmetic; this he did for one hour a day, starting at 4am to allow the boys to get to work on time at 6am. He also began to visit the house of the Penn family with his guardian, where he met his future wife, Anna, a teacher.

In 1797, Lant Carpenter entered a Dissenting Academy at Northampton but it closed in 1798. The following year he entered the University of Glasgow, taking the Arts course and also studying chemistry and anatomy, while studying divinity privately, and at one time considered combining the duties of physician and Dissenting minister. Lant did not graduate as his studies were interrupted by attacks of rheumatic fever and depression. However, in 1806 he applied to the University of Glasgow for an award of Master of Arts but to his surprise was awarded a doctorate.⁵⁰ In 1802, seeking more opportunity for private study, he served as a minister to the New Meeting in Birmingham for several months. He accepted the offer of a librarianship at the Liverpool Athenaeum, where he held the position from the end of 1802 until March 1805. Lant also tried to extend higher education to women in Liverpool teaching history, composition, language and philosophy to young women showing how the Unitarian progressive attitudes towards female education, by influence and example, helped pave the way for further educational developments for women.

Lant Carpenter was a correspondent of Catherine Cappe (1744-1821).⁵¹ In contrast to Mary's experience, Cappe's family had discouraged intellectual learning of any kind and she had had to struggle to educate herself. She later turned to social and educational work for the poor. Cappe wrote to Lant in 1803 in what was ultimately an unsuccessful attempt to persuade him to take up the vacant post of assistant tutor at the Unitarian Manchester College in York. Cappe believed that educating future generations of Unitarian ministers was the most

important way of ensuring Unitarian beliefs would be upheld and diffused. A shortage of money was a problem for Lant, as he declined an invitation in 1803 and again 1807 to be tutor in *belles-lettres* at Manchester College, as the salary was to be £130, a drop in income from the £200 per annum that he earned in Liverpool. In 1813 and again in 1823 Lant declined the offers to be co-pastor of John Yates in Liverpool; he also declined offers of positions at Ipswich, Bury St. Edmunds, Ormskirk and Dudley; these offers demonstrate the high esteem Lant Carpenter was held in by the Unitarian community.

In 1805, Lant accepted a position in Exeter, his sister Mary keeping house for him. On Christmas Day he married Anna Penn, (1782?-1856) a teacher.⁵² Anna Penn had previously taught Lant's sister, Mary. It is difficult to discover how long his sister stayed to help Lant and Anna, but in 1815, Mary was in Birmingham to keep house for her eldest brother Philip, who was unmarried and had made a home for his parents and two younger sisters. At Exeter, Lant undertook both an extensive pastorate and the responsibilities of an exclusive boarding school for seven boys. Lant was forced to run a school as well as act as pastor due to continuing financial difficulties and he spoke of how 'inconceivably oppressive' he found the 'double burden' of both teaching and preaching when considering his fragile health.⁵³

Mary Carpenter was born on 3rd April, 1807, in Exeter: two other sisters followed - Anna, in 1808, and Susan in 1811 - and three brothers - William (1813), Russell Lant (1816) and Philip Pearsall (1819). The two younger sons became Unitarian ministers; William also achieved recognition as a naturalist; Russell became his father's memoirist, while Philip was a celebrated conchologist.⁵⁴ Mary was particularly close to her brother, Philip, as during her mother's frequent illnesses, she nursed him 'as a mother and always loved him so'.⁵⁵

Historians have mixed views of the Carpenter family, for example Strange refers to Lant Carpenter's children as the 'motley group' of the Unitarian patriarch, perhaps referring to their very different interests, while describing Mary, William, Philip and Russell as a 'quartet of genius, imagination, creativity and energy for social progress who all devoted their lives to religion and social reform'.⁵⁶ John McLachlan describes the Carpenter children as 'all endowed with above average ability and [who] responded sensitively to the Unitarian tradition in which practical sympathy and religious beliefs went hand in hand with rational analyses'.⁵⁷ Selleck describes the Carpenter family as 'a socially and intellectually exclusive Unitarian family which combined radical political opinions with a fervent almost neurotic religious commitment'.⁵⁸ The use of the word 'neurotic' is I believe very important in

describing the Carpenter family and Mary's later obsessions, with for example Parkhurst prison, demonstrate this tendency.

Lant Carpenter described the five-year old Mary as having 'a degree of mental and moral regulation ... seldom witnessed in so young a child'.⁵⁹ Lant believed that young children:

Should be early accustomed to consider the education of the poor as an object of delight, of wisdom, and of duty; and should be encouraged to contribute their efforts towards it, with a view to their own moral improvement, as well as to the benefit of their services in the cause of benevolence.⁶⁰

Perhaps it is not surprising that Mary, at age three and half, 'preferred a baby horse cut out of paper to a rocking horse' which she had set her heart on, 'because it cost nothing and Mama would have more money to give to the poor'.⁶¹ Estlin Carpenter writes that Mary, aged three, had said that 'the good God had given her a great deal of love' and this belief bound her afterwards to neglected children.⁶² Piety, an exacting sense of obligation and reforming principles marked the household so it is hardly surprising Mary would grow up focusing on the same issues as her family.⁶³

One of Lant Carpenter's pupils described Anna Penn Carpenter, Mary's mother, as a 'quick, clever, capable person... her wit was ironic, she ridiculed stupidity, in or out of class ... nothing was allowed to disturb the perfection of her management, or to escape her sharp eye ... her husband and her whole household depended on her'.⁶⁴ Mary's brother remarked 'Her rule over her children was strict, only in later life was the tenderness of heart revealed to them'.⁶⁵ Schupf maintains that during the significant part of her childhood, Mary was accustomed to considering herself her father's heir, as it was not until she was seven that her brother William was born, while 'on her father's part the bond between them was sufficiently strong that her brothers did not displace her and she remained her father's principal confidant and principal pupil'.⁶⁶ It certainly seems apparent that Mary's early work, together with her own strong religious beliefs, stemmed from a desire to please her father.

Mary Carpenter's father exercised a considerable influence over his eldest child: indeed, Mary was grateful that she had been educated so thoroughly by her father as she believed she had been trained by him to observe reason and think critically, and this, she considered, was the foundation for all her achievements.⁶⁷ As a consequence of this education Mary was able to integrate into her work a social-scientific language and methods of enquiry unknown to

philanthropists of the previous generation such as Fry. Hutton documents the close relationship Mary had with her father and maintains that 'from her earliest years her father exercised a marked influence on her whole life'.⁶⁸ James Martineau recorded his memories of Mary as a child and of the influence her father held over her: 'as a child, to his daughter Lant was a prophet as well as a parent, and her whole mood and demeanour reflected this'.⁶⁹

Indeed, when Mary was ten years old her future was already mapped out with Lant saying:

The plan to which I look forward as a future resource for my girls and affording me the power of confining myself to the ministry and directly related objects, is a school for girls, in which my elder girls might be directed by their mother, who could also superintend the household affairs until they had experience, and in which I might take some share with the pupils of greater ability or age. This, I have thought would enable me to relinquish my own school.⁷⁰

In August 1807, Lant experienced a temporary loss of his voice, probably caused by stress and overwork, which caused him to propose his resignation to the Exeter congregation. Instead he was offered a year's dispensation from preaching in order to recover and Lant spent his time in founding and managing a public library and returned to preaching again in 1808. That same year, as a member of the Western Unitarian Society, Lant was invited to preach at Lewin's Mead, and the favourable impression he made was so considerable that nine years later he was asked to be the minister.

The influence of Locke and Hartley, and Priestley's psychology's influence on the Unitarians' educational views is most evident in the material their educators produced. Their educational philosophy was influential for progressive educational thinkers like Maria and Richard Edgeworth and Mary Wollstonecraft. Writing in the tradition of manuals like the Edgeworths' well-known *Practical Education* these educators produced various guides for parents, students and teachers. Anna Barbauld's 'Hymns in Prose for Children', the first written for children, was designed to 'impress devotional feelings as early as possible on the infant mind and thus by deep, strong, and permanent associations, to lay the best foundation for practical devotion in the future'.⁷¹

Lant Carpenter did much to widen the theological ethos of his denomination through his writings, and one of his most significant educational publication was *Systematic Education* (1815), written in conjunction with William Shepherd and Jeremiah Joyce. It was a two volume textbook, written for Dissenting academies and as a leaving-home present for Unitarian men, presenting associationism as a foundation for logic and political economy.⁷²

Systematic Education describes the early stages of association in classic Hartleyan terms.⁷³ However, Rylance has noted the texts were vague about the way these chains of association are created [stopping] at the level of abstract description and [resting] on the exchange of nurture/nature statements of principle.⁷⁴ In contrast to a widespread belief that all human beings possess innate mental faculties, or ‘nature’, associationism was an early theory of mind which played a key role in debates over cognition taking place through the century. The belief that ideas and attitudes are developed from an early age through the association of sensations led Unitarians to a preoccupation with education and upbringing.

Lant was a prolific writer and published a total of 38 separate works connected with his Unitarian beliefs.⁷⁵ His stance that cognition, or mental development, occurs through exposure to sensory impressions from the immediate environment was the foundation of *Principles of Education* (1820) for Christian parents. Lant expanded his definition of education to include not only schoolroom instruction but ‘the education of circumstances’, ‘accidental education’ as well as ‘self culture’ or ‘voluntary exertions of the mind’.⁷⁶ In this book he applied Locke’s theories of associationism to children’s physical, moral and intellectual growth together with his theories on education, moral upbringing, and physical activities. Citing Locke, Lant believed children’s reasoning powers should ‘be constantly cultivated with the young taught to think for themselves’.⁷⁷ Lant discussed how these learned traits could be cultivated. For example, he believed affection between parents and children is learned behaviour that affects children’s psychology

By pleasure derived from the care and tenderness of parents, and by privations and pain which the care and tenderness alike may cause, a vast number and variety of impressions are produced, which all uniting and blending together, constitute the filial affection.⁷⁸

As a result of the Unitarians ascribing to the associationist view of learning, they saw education as encompassing much more than the usual rote learning. Rather, education was a matter of understanding students’ inward psychology and many of their educators, as Mary was to do, posited an experienced-based learning in their teaching, focusing on the circumstances of the students rather than the subjects taught.⁷⁹ For example, Lant stated

That it is a most erroneous idea in education, that nothing is done except when children are engaged in the usual rudiments of instruction. A child watching the motions of objects ... is engaged in a work which it should be our aim as much as possible to aid and encourage and from which we may expect very valuable results both on the faculties and furniture of the mind.⁸⁰

While Unitarians might have promoted education for women for their future role as wives and mothers they did not expect women to step outside that domestic role. Lant shared these traditional views on the sexual hierarchy; he put a high status on maternal education, believing that it had 'indisputably the greatest share in the determination of the future character'.⁸¹ Lant in *Principles of Education*, described how girls should be educated:

With a specific view to their afterwards fulfilling some of the most important relations of domestic life, the next race ... it would be a primary object to cultivate their understandings, to give them solidity, accuracy and comprehensiveness of judgement, to fill their minds with correct information, which would in turn enable them to train up their own offspring ... a woman may not be a wife or mother, but she can scarcely fail, if properly prepared for those relations, to be led, in some way or another, to fill situations in life ... on their efforts on the improvement and happiness of others.⁸²

It would appear from this extract that Lant already had in mind future roles for his daughters. While he was prepared to educate his daughters as well as his sons, he followed Unitarian thinking in that education was useful for women as future mothers and wives in the home rather than for any purpose outside it. He 'considered women capable of much, especially the gentleness, cheerful and sacrifice, patience and compassion which made a man's home the dearest place on earth'.⁸³ Lant held that the two sexes were essentially different, and each had its own special work in the world. He had a very high opinion of the value and importance of female capabilities and influence, as he demonstrated in his sermons; his son also noted that all of the Carpenter children were treated with perfect impartiality.⁸⁴ While that might have been the case as children it was certainly not the case later. Despite Lant's attitude to female education, it is apparent that his daughters were expected to serve the needs of the family and to put their brothers first. Both Anna and Mary were expected to teach in their mother's school in order to fund their brothers' education. Susan acted as housekeeper to her younger brother, Philip, who had founded an Industrial School in Warrington in the late 1840s; teaching unemployed male factory workers to read and write and provide them with training in trades such as tailoring, shoemaking or printing. Susan Carpenter also ran the Female Industrial School, where 269 women learned to sew, sing and bind books.⁸⁵

Indeed, as Shoemaker has posited, young women brought up to make sacrifices for the good of the family found themselves adopting the role of pseudo-wife or mother, caring for a sick or widowed parent, or an unmarried or widowed brother. These men seem to have expected that, as a matter of course, unmarried sisters would run their households for them and take care of their children. Yet if the brother remarried, the sister may have found her presence no

longer necessary and at that point she may have been too old for marriage.⁸⁶ Both Susan and Anna Carpenter only married in their late thirties, Anna after Mrs Carpenter finally closed her school and her help was no longer needed.

Both Harriet Martineau and Mary deferred to their mothers until their thirties. Mary lived with her mother until well into her forties and only moved to a house of her own when her mother could live with her married daughter, Anna Thomas. Russell Carpenter notes that after her husband's death, his mother 'devoted herself to aid and encourage every work in which he had been interested'.⁸⁷ With a family background such as this it is hardly surprising that Mary experienced difficulties in stepping out of role of support to her mother that her father had recommended. Daughters were expected to be of service to their families and on Mary's twenty-first birthday she received from her father a copy of Hartley's *Observations of Man* accompanied by a letter recommending her to be her 'mother's comfort and friend'.⁸⁸ It would appear from this gift that Lant was still trying to control both Mary's education and her life. Indeed, Hartley's influence on Mary can be said to be both direct and indirect, through her father's belief in his principles and through Mary's own study.

Lant Carpenter admired the moral writings of Maria Edgeworth (1768-1849), a novelist and educationalist.⁸⁹ As well as Anna Barbauld (1743-1825) he also respected Mary Somerville (1780-1872) as 'she coupled her writings with a meek and modest spirit as well as her domestic duties'.⁹⁰ Anna Barbauld had been taught by her father, John Aikin (1713-80) who had been a classics tutor (including at the new Warrington Academy) and theological scholar; and Anna, like Mary, was strongly influenced by Hartleyan and Priestleyan psychology. In contrast to Mary's later writings, however, the work of Maria, who was not a Unitarian, shows an awareness of the limitations patriarchy had placed on women: for example, in *Letters to a Literary Lady* (1795) Edgeworth refutes the notion that women are irrational or that education is a dangerous force leading to the misuse of power: 'Women have not erred from having knowledge, but from not having experiences; they may have grown vain and presumptuous when they have learned but little, they will be sobered into good sense when they have learnt more'.⁹¹

Yet it would seem that Lant was reluctant to engage with the concept of women having equal rights to men as when the periodical, Fox's *Monthly Repository*, began to mount a relentless and spirited campaign on behalf of the rights of women, many Unitarians,

including Lant Carpenter, were hostile. William Bridges Adams's article *On the Condition of Women in England* avowed: 'Whatever be the rank of our females, whether high or low, with few exceptions, are such slaves as the inmates of a Turkish haram' (sic).⁹² Lant declared the article would 'disgust the pure and reflective spirit' and claimed it would be impossible to read such an article to a female audience. Other Unitarians, such as William Turner and Robert Apsland endorsed Carpenter's sentiments that the periodical 'ceased to possess the confidence of the Unitarian body' and was no longer regarded as a suitable channel for the expression of the Unitarian religious view.⁹³

With the approaching retirement of John Prior Estlin at the wealthy and socially exclusive Lewin's Mead Meeting House, Bristol, Lant Carpenter was invited in August 1816 to be pastor, an offer he accepted. Manton believes Lant Carpenter accepted the invitation to Bristol because of the challenge to his Liberalism; he welcomed the challenge of taking charge of the Lewin's Mead congregation because 'it was in a critical state' and 'Bristol bigotry was notorious and the feuds within their congregations were notorious, to the ribald amusement of the ungodly'.⁹⁴ Yet his son believes he took the position because he wanted to take his children's prospects into account. Lant felt that a more central position in Bristol rather than Exeter would be an advantage for his school or for one he hoped to supersede his own 'a school for young ladies taught by his wife and daughters'.⁹⁵ Lant was also attracted to Bristol on the advice of his friends as 'there were but few Dissenting societies in the country with the wealth and influence of Lewin's Mead'.⁹⁶ Yet Lant's move to Bristol in a way was surprising; his salary was to be £250 per annum and he was forced to take extra pupils into his school to manage financially.⁹⁷ Russell Carpenter refers to the fact that in Bristol 'neither his own congregation nor the public were prepared for [Lant's] practical and enlightened views, which he desired to develop': it would seem Lant had his own agenda in the move, but it is difficult to ascertain exactly his reasons; even his son seems uncertain.⁹⁸

Bristol Dissenters were both rich and powerful; by the mid-nineteenth century they owned some eighty-six chapels and Bristol's religious culture was another stimulus to its voluntary sector. Bristol had a long history of dissent: the 1820 trade directory showed 22 Anglican churches and chapels, and 25 Dissenting, including three Baptist chapels, two Quaker Friends' meeting houses, a Synagogue, eight Methodist chapels, as well as

chapels for French Protestants.⁹⁹ In 1820, one third of the Corporation of Bristol still consisted of Unitarians and other Dissenters, a relic from the previous century when the Lewin's Mead Unitarian congregation included, with one exception, the entire aldermanic bench.¹⁰⁰ The Lewin's Mead congregation of English Presbyterians had evolved towards a more radical Unitarian faith under John Prior Estlin (1770-1817) and the term Unitarian first appeared in the Lewin's Mead records in 1816. The economic implications of religious identity were significant, as membership of a prestigious chapel was a sign of an individual's respectability and also his creditworthiness. Social life for the middle-classes revolved around the church or chapel with middle-class women working all year round making 'comforts' for the poor, and running bazaars, fetes and sales of work.

In 1817, the Carpenter family installed themselves in a large and very imposing house in Great George Street in Clifton, a wealthy area of Bristol, where Lant and his wife ran an expensive school, at £100 guineas a year, for around fifteen boys of wealthy families. Many important men of the Victorian era were educated at Lant's small school; both James Martineau, one of the foremost Unitarians of the period, and Sir John Bowring, politician and Anti-Corn law activist and a member of the peace movement, were impressed with the vividness and practicality of Lant Carpenter's teaching, together with his affection for his pupils.¹⁰¹ Other pupils included Sir John James Potter, three times mayor of Manchester; Thomas Potter, Member of Parliament; James Worsley; James Heywood, university reformer and benefactor and founder of the Manchester Athenaeum as well as a Liberal Member of Parliament; and 'Lord Suffolk and one or two of his brothers'.¹⁰² The pupils from Lant's school were certainly influential as Robert Needham Phillips claimed there were more men from this small school in Parliament than from Rugby'.¹⁰³

Lant was increasingly at home during this period attempting to recover from depression resulting from overwork. In 1826, Mrs Carpenter had asked James Martineau to take charge of the school while her husband was unwell.¹⁰⁴ During the two year period James Martineau was in charge, Sargant maintains that Martineau's influence over Mary was so strong that Mrs Carpenter withdrew her from the school and in 1827 sent her to be governess to two little girls in the Isle of Wight. He believed that there appears to be

little doubt that James Martineau was the object of 'affections' which Mary later asked 'God to subdue'.¹⁰⁵ Lant seems to have felt that Mary and James Martineau should marry: 'perhaps one day it will lead to more'; it would certainly have suited Lant if they married as he later invited James Martineau to enter into partnership with him, and join his household permanently and run the school for him.¹⁰⁶ To his surprise, Martineau refused.

Mary Carpenter wrote, age 25, of the great but unrequited love of her early life, hinted at, but never described in her letters. 'I have been made very unhappy by another branch of the affections. I try to guard against them, for they are a source of nothing but sorrow to me'.¹⁰⁷ Edith Simcox described this early sorrow more plainly: 'she was troubled by inordinate affections, a disposition to set her heart on persons or things with an abandon she knew to be wrong and felt to be painful, for the objects of her affections turned out to have affections of their own, set in quite other directions'.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, James Martineau and Mary remained close friends as letters between them demonstrate, with Mary often visiting James and his wife.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, Yeo believes that Mary closed her mind to marriage after a vision in which a composite of her father and Christ urged her to do social work instead. However, Yeo does not give any reference to what she bases this statement on.¹¹⁰ It would appear that once Mary had given up any secret hope of love or marriage, her father once again became the centre of her emotional life.

Unitarian schools produced some of the most distinguished reformers of the nineteenth century and schools such as those of Lant Carpenter and John Relly Beard were outstanding with a progressive curriculum and an enlightened approach to teaching.¹¹¹ Watts has noted that from Beard's school came Thomas Worthington, Gothic architect; John Ashton Nicholls, philanthropist, and Beard's son, Charles, supporter of popular education and higher education for women as well as William Herford.¹¹² Watts also cites the Reverend Charles Berry of Leicester as educating many professional men and important leaders of commerce and industry, as well as ministering to congregations that produced four members of Parliament and six mayors of Leicester in uninterrupted succession.¹¹³ Unitarians expanded their educational ideas, preaching 'knowledge is power'; they believed that their concept of a liberal education would enable them to fulfil their religious and political aims in the Victorian period.

The next section discusses the education of middle-class girls.

1.3 The education of middle-class girls

Unitarians had very strong views on the importance of education for their children: they advocated a non-sectarian radical education which, in the tradition of Locke and Hartley, taught students to think for themselves in order to understand the world in which humans lived.¹¹⁴ Thus education was a key context in which Unitarians applied associationist principles and they promoted a modernized curriculum.¹¹⁵ Unitarian educators set out to attack what they saw as the exclusive, narrow minded education that prevailed in public and grammar schools and they reduced the traditional classical education in their teaching. This was a complete reform of the usual curriculum, designed to teach children to think and to find evidence for ideas and knowledge rather than just learning by rote. Unitarian children of both genders were taught modern languages and history, English literature, science, geography and political economy. While Unitarians believed that education would bring them power as a group and many did use their education to achieve great influence, the sect's small number qualified this success.

Unitarian educational philosophy was egalitarian, optimistic and humanistic, with children of both sexes receiving a careful education from well-educated teachers who understood the laws of association. Furthermore the Unitarians were often sympathetic to advanced ideas of womanhood and respected women's intellects. Indeed, the Bristol Unitarian minister, John Prior Estlin, had pronounced Unitarianism to be 'the religion of females.'¹¹⁶ As Watts has discussed, 'the stress of associationism led to a belief that inequalities once accepted as physiological and immutable, were, in fact, social and modifiable'.¹¹⁷ Unitarians believed that all people, irrespective of their class and gender, were the product of their education rather than their innate abilities, which led them to educate girls in the same manner as boys. Their insistent coupling of moral and intellectual development meant they argued that the best education available should be given to a woman, both for her own perfection and also as a prerequisite for performing her maternal role properly.¹¹⁸ Some girls, such as Mary and her sisters, received an excellent education and were indebted to Priestley's injunction that women, having the same moral duties, dispositions and passions as men, required a proper education.

Unitarians were not unique in their beliefs and attitudes concerning gender, but as a group they were much in advance of their contemporaries in the early Victorian period. Unitarians tended to agree with George Armstrong, Lant's co-pastor from 1837, that there should be no monopoly on study or subject by either sex, and that 'good wives and mothers should equally be learned and enlightened with vigorous ideas'.¹¹⁹ Thus Unitarians played a significant role in the slow change of attitudes towards women and their education, particularly middle-class women.¹²⁰ Indeed many Unitarians were involved in nation-wide educational reforms including professional requirements for educators, standardisation of secondary education for middle-class girls as well as the creation of institutions of higher education for women.¹²¹ Unitarians also instituted an impressive range of programmes for the lower classes, such as Ragged Schools, Sunday schools, co-educational and infant schools and mechanics' institutes.¹²²

Nevertheless, while organised cultures of religious dissent and evangelicalism both encouraged active female participation in reform, at the same time it sought to set gendered limits on its nature and scope. While the liberalism of Unitarianism made men willing to listen to progressive views on women, the majority tended to gravitate towards more traditional notions of domesticated womanhood. As Gleadle has shown, while Unitarians emphasised women's equal intellectual capabilities they also expected their wives and daughters to be dutiful and respectful. Gleadle believes that 'a vital catalyst in the formation of feminist awareness was that the expectation of personal fulfilment which Unitarians had encouraged in their women was not met'.¹²³ Indeed, it was this paradox within Unitarian ideology that led many Unitarian to join the women's rights movement.

A group of Unitarian feminist thinkers emerged in the reformist atmosphere of the 1830s and 1840s who Gleadle has labelled 'radical Unitarians'. This group emerged from the Unitarian mainstream which adopted a cautious approach to the 'women question', and favoured improved education for women but not female independence. The radicals centred on William Johnson Fox, minister of South Place Chapel in London and promoted their ideas through the magazine, the *Monthly Repository*.¹²⁴ It was these radical Unitarians who established the essential ideologies and networks which were to determine the emerging feminist movements.¹²⁵ While many women were keen to adhere to conventional respectability a disproportionate number of Unitarian women did step

out of their prescribed role and Philippa Levine has estimated that 11 per cent of her sample of 192 leading feminist activists had direct links to Unitarianism. In order to put this figure in perspective the census revealed that Unitarians comprised only two per cent of the population of England and Wales in 1851.¹²⁶

Middle-class girls could become semi-educated, due to the efforts of their mothers and governesses; girls were sometimes allowed to listen in on the activities of the tutors hired for their brothers. Intellectually minded girls could also educate themselves by reading books in the household. Beginning in the early seventeenth century, private boarding schools were established in England, for middle and upper-class girls. The schools were smaller, less numerous and more limited in their aims than schools for boys and offered an education heavily weighted towards fashionable accomplishments, such as lace making, embroidery, drawing, painting, music and deportment 'coaching for success at the game of matrimony'.¹²⁷ Anxious parents viewed this fashionable, genteel preparation for marriage as one based on the upper class whose manners and customs they wanted to emulate.¹²⁸ Yet the earlier Bristol resident, Hannah More (1745- 1833), had echoed Unitarian calls for improving upper and middle-class women's education: instead of being treated as ornaments, she felt that women should be recognized as 'beings, worthy of great respect and education, not least because of the enormous importance of their childbearing responsibilities'.¹²⁹ More regretted that 'I, a girl was educated at random'.¹³⁰ However, this was certainly not the prevailing attitude, and the deficiencies in the education of girls and women in the nineteenth century have been well documented.¹³¹

Parental attitudes towards female education generally determined its quality. Extant records indicate that some clerical fathers took a particular interest in the education of their daughters, even in intellectual fields usually deemed inappropriate for women and it is apparent that from the mid-to-late eighteenth century, some educated women, who became known as 'bluestockings', were encouraged by their fathers. Anna Barbauld illustrated the opportunities Unitarian women could enjoy. She was highly educated by her father, the Reverend Dr John Aikin; through him she became proficient in Latin, Greek French, Italian and English Literature. Her education was enhanced by fifteen years of living at Warrington Academy where, as noted above, her father taught. Barbauld pioneered reputable writing for infants and children. She wrote on education

and controversially for the time published her view on religious and political matters. It was Barbauld's fifty volume series *The British Novelists* (1810) which made her mark on literary history.¹³²

There was little demand for girls to be well educated; the general view was that women were not capable of an intellectual education and would have no use for one either. For example, Jane Austen described Mrs Goddard's school in *Emma* (1815) as a place 'where a reasonable quantity of accomplishments were sold at a reasonable price, and where girls might be sent to be out of the ways, and scramble themselves into a little education, without any danger of coming back prodigies'.¹³³ Reformers such as Erasmus Darwin had argued that girls could benefit from a comprehensive education and efforts were made to raise the level of instruction in the late eighteenth century but this was limited by a shortage of teachers and a parental reluctance to spend money on girls' education.¹³⁴

While many Unitarian girls were educated at home, from the 1800s there were also private schools for girls established by Unitarians: for example, a Unitarian boarding school for girls was opened in 1807 by three sisters, Fanny, Harriet and Sarah Lawrence at Birmingham and later near Liverpool.¹³⁵ Most of the 477 girls they educated in the thirty-one year life of the school came from Unitarian families.¹³⁶ Other girls attended institutions such as those run by Catherine Turner in Nottingham and Rachel Martineau in Liverpool, nevertheless the number of schools for girls was inadequate. Elizabeth Malleon found by 1840 that even in schools with a good reputation, such as that of the Misses Woods' school in Clapham, teaching was poor. 'Learning by rote from poor textbooks was the method employed and there was no explanation, no illustration, [there was] no attempt to awaken the mental facilities'.¹³⁷ It was not until 1846 the Anglican Queen's College was founded, mainly to educate future governesses. It was followed in 1849 by the non-denominational Bedford College.¹³⁸

Unitarians had assisted Phoebe Penn, Mrs Carpenter's half-sister, in partnership with her half-sister, Sarah Bache, who had taught in Joseph Priestley's New Meeting School, to set up a girls' school.¹³⁹ Sarah Bache's mother had run a small school but Sarah herself had been apprenticed to a Mantua maker, and her own education was minimal. Lant

Carpenter advised Sarah and Phoebe on advertisements and a history curriculum, while Mrs Carpenter provided the menus for the schoolgirls' meals. Lant also lent money in 1825 when the school moved to larger premises. This girls' school was typical of the early education for girls; the curriculum included history, needlework, geography, use of the globe and grammar; the cost was 17s 6d a quarter; extra was charged for writing, accounts and ancient geography.¹⁴⁰ This demonstrates how members of the Unitarian network supported each other yet at the same it shows the lack of qualifications considered necessary to become a teacher to girls.

As a group, Unitarians often gave the lead in writing and actions as to what women were capable of, which stemmed from their educational and religious principles. Mary and her siblings were educated rigorously in their father's non-sectarian school: she was taught Latin, English Literature, Greek, Natural History, Mathematics, French, Italian and German: Mary was able to make many useful connections which she would draw upon later in her life. As Mary's experience shows, a girl's education was heavily influenced by the family, and in particular the father. Mary Somerville (1780-1872) who in her adulthood turned to Unitarianism resented 'the injustice of the world in denying those principles of education to my sex which was so lavishly bestowed on men'.¹⁴¹ Florence Nightingale was educated by her Unitarian father in classics, modern languages, history and philosophy.¹⁴² Harriett Martineau's parents provided both sons and daughters with equal opportunities in education as did Elizabeth Rathbone's (1790-1882).¹⁴³ While these women's families had not expected them to become involved in a public role the education they received both motivated and empowered them to do so. The next section discusses the role of women in the early part of the nineteenth century.

1.4 The role of women

In line with the Evangelical revival, which emphasised the moral qualities of women and their duty to others, for women the family was the primary site through which their lives were ordered and contained. In Victorian society, a dependency on men was regarded as the norm, and was seen as a badge of respectability, and both religion and patriotism demanded of women that they marry and raise children. Women's role was considered to be both biologically and socially determined and was underpinned by a series of legal,

economic and social restrictions, which reinforced women's dependence and subordination to husbands, father and male relatives. Liberalism, as articulated in James Mill's writings and the wording of the 1832 Reform Act explicitly denied women political citizenship.¹⁴⁴ Women were expected to marry and bear children although significantly many achieved neither or only one of the aims. Single women were regarded as a social anomaly and usually as an object of pity yet in 1851 there were 20% more unmarried women than men over the age of 40 in England and Wales.¹⁴⁵

Single women who did not live under the protection of a man, be it husband, father or brother, were regarded as a social problem that could be prey to dangers of sexual impropriety or poverty. This is highlighted by the pejorative attitude towards single women who had not fulfilled the expected female destiny of wife and mother. In a world where marriage and bearing children was considered to be women's natural role, single women who didn't marry, were marginalised. During the Victorian period the word 'spinster' came to be used to designate the unmarried state and was largely used pejoratively. Even single women supported by their families faced considerable problems; usually lacking any capital for investment there was no entree into male occupations and they were confined to the narrow range of what was considered women's work.¹⁴⁶ Thus, middle-class women were limited to professions such as teaching, nursing, writing or as companions to the elderly.

Single women had few economic resources and women's roles were defined in terms of their family responsibilities. Indeed, women were expected to be religious with female goodness codified in terms of Christian morality and theologians using the scriptures to prove that God willed women's subservience and position in society. This frequently meant that choices open to single women were reliant on family obligation and opinion and at mid-century virtually all commentators agreed that single women should remain at home throughout their adulthood and fulfil their duties as daughters and sisters.¹⁴⁷ One of the most popular explorations of the life of an unmarried daughter was Charlotte Yonge's *The Daisy Chain: or Aspirations* (1856) which charts the heroine's final acceptance that she must embrace her role as the family's surrogate mother and highlights how women were expected to conform to parental wishes rather than their own inclination.

However, Frances Power Cobbe (1822-1904), an admirer and assistant of Mary Carpenter, questioned the paternal role.¹⁴⁸ At twenty, in a family where evangelical Christianity had to be accepted or rejected in its entirety, she found herself in a religious quagmire and underwent a crisis in religious faith common to Victorian intellectuals. She had read the American Theodore Parker's *The Discourse of Religion*, and embraced his Theist beliefs. After her mother's death in 1846 she expounded her religious beliefs to her father and was banished from home. During her ten months exile, Cobbe received many conciliatory letters from her father, asking her to reject her religious heresies before he would allow her home. As she regarded this as moral bribery, she refused.¹⁴⁹ After her father became ill, Cobbe felt her duty to care for him was paramount despite their differences and she returned home to care for him.¹⁵⁰ This demonstrates how Cobbe's religious crisis became a battlefield for her fight for personal autonomy as a woman against the patriarchal power exercised by her father. In contrast to Mary's relationship to her father, Cobbe was not close to her father and her autobiography makes it clear that he had expressed neither affection nor interest in her.¹⁵¹ Cobbe published anonymously her *Essay on the Theory of Intuitive Morals* (1855), which met criticism from clergy who accused her of stepping outside the bounds of quiescent womanhood; yet her ideas had a considerable influence on Unitarians.

The importance of life in the home was elaborated into a series of tracts, sermons and handbooks to explain to women the importance of their religious and moral duty to family and home. The literature of the early nineteenth century clearly defined the qualities thought to be most desirable in women: a true woman was delicate of body, pure of mind, devoted to religion and the home; she was also expected to be compassionate, nurturing and submissive. In a world increasingly dominated by materialism, competition and individualism, women embodied the old virtues of love, spirituality, harmony and service. The works of authors such as Mrs Sarah Stickney Ellis provided rules for proper feminine behaviour; 'the perfection of the female character is a combination of private and public virtues - of domestic charity, and zeal for the temporal and eternal happiness of the whole race'.¹⁵²

During his adult life Lant Carpenter was subject to periodic melancholia often brought about by overwork: he obviously feared for his health as he wrote a letter in 1825 to his

children to be opened on his death.¹⁵³ In 1839, Lant's health broke under a renewed attack of depression and he took a tour of the continent to recover. He drowned, age 59, on the night of 5-6 April 1840 while travelling on the French Steamer *Sully* from Leghorn to Marseilles. Evidence does not seem to support the suggestion that he committed suicide by jumping overboard, although his depressed mental condition and the wish of the family to prevent any such speculation combine to forbid the absolute exclusion of that possibility.¹⁵⁴ Mary lamented in her diary: 'In outward sorrow, but inward peace, having lost him whom we loved most on earth, yet possessing him in purer love'.¹⁵⁵ After her father's death Carpenter went into a prolonged depression, although she continued to work in the Ragged School.

Her mother noted 'All the poor think of her as her father's representative. She, like him, has all their troubles and sorrows to share, I continually fear for her'.¹⁵⁶ Her mother was wise to worry about Mary; her persistent grieving for her father, somewhat like her obsessive devotion to him from childhood, certainly has a neurotic quality to it. William Carpenter believed that the 'congenial nature of his sister, Mary, was shaped by the influence of her father and penetrated by his spirit'.¹⁵⁷ Lant:

Was to her the earthy type of Heavenly Fatherhood. The feeling of oneness with him, of nearness to him, was not a mere sentiment, but a power that constantly animated and directed her course.¹⁵⁸

With such an intense attachment to her father it is not surprising that she was devastated by his death.

The next section discusses Mary's early activities in philanthropy.

1.5 Philanthropy in Bristol

From the late eighteenth century female support was solicited for a range of issues, initiatives and campaigns, from the abolition of slavery to the support of local philanthropic associations. Perhaps more significantly, women's call to philanthropy was inspired by a perception of duty and an obligation as citizens. The language of 'duty' and 'charity' was an essential part of Victorian vocabulary and the linking of these duties to evangelical religion made them hard to resist. Philanthropy was a central component of the lives of middle-class women, drawing upon a woman's community, social, political,

economic and religious affiliations. Indeed, as Hannah More stated early in the century, 'philanthropy was the profession of a lady'.¹⁵⁹ Charitable works did represent one of the few acceptable bridges to a world beyond the home; moreover, philanthropic activities could also offer friendship and a sense of community to the women involved. For women the work broadened their horizons and gave them serious responsibility beyond the home by doing unpaid but culturally valuable work. The growth of female voluntary involvement through educational and organised philanthropy as well as missionary work began to provide an unprecedented array of new opportunities for women outside the home. Nevertheless it should not be assumed that women in this period were unaware of the implications and ambiguities of their charitable work, and there were power dynamics in charitable interactions that were often reciprocal.

Both religious and social belief dictated that it was the duty of the rich, male or female, to give of themselves, in terms of both time and money. Middle-class women's voluntary philanthropic work was concerned with two social and ideological issues; the appropriate role of women and the relations between the classes. By educating and helping the poor, women's charitable works was thought to ease conflict between the classes and foster social harmony. However, middle-class evangelical women's attempts to reform the poor by imposing their own ideas of domesticity on labouring women did meet with resistance. Lewis believed it was an internal paradox, as it presented a vision of middle-class women as instruments of God for the regeneration of Mankind, while at the same stressing that women should confine themselves to exerting influence from a domestic base.¹⁶⁰ Throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, religiously organised philanthropy remained overwhelmingly popular, with the bulk of the work being focused on the amelioration of the conditions of the poor. The concept that poverty could be eradicated by social reform had little currency among the charitable before the middle of the century, and was only slowly and partially adopted thereafter. Some historians, such as Elliott, are critical of women philanthropists' work, believing that charitable work infantilised and subordinated its recipients.¹⁶¹ While women could be seen by the recipients of their charity as interfering, however, at least the women would have seen for themselves the difficulties that the poor had to contend with.

Philanthropic work by the middle of the nineteenth century was perceived to be both a natural and necessary part of women's role, yet it also became a target for male professionals who needed to define women's work in the social sphere as amateurish rather than professional in order to consolidate their own position.¹⁶² While doctors and clergymen had personal dealings with the poor in the nineteenth century, other men such as politicians, journalists, statisticians and bureaucrats as well as writers such as Dickens and Disraeli, were making careers for themselves by reporting and analysing the conditions of life among the poorer classes. Dickens was not opposed to female philanthropists in general; rather he was critical of them when charitable acts were carried out inappropriately. Dickens' biting satires of women 'philanthropists by trade' in *Bleak House* (1852-3) present these women as unfeminine, even monstrous; while unsubtle but amusing characters or caricatures, his aim was to show that the only people they helped were themselves. For Dickens, visitors of the poor should be empathetic, and respect not violate the poor's privacy. Indeed, Elliot believes these writers reveal how uneasy they were about the challenge that female philanthropy posed to the domestic ideology of separate spheres, not only to accepted gender roles but also to their own positions as experts.¹⁶³ Yet middle-class women, particularly single women, did achieve a more widespread acceptance of the public role of women through their involvement in a variety of reform and charitable work.¹⁶⁴ Mary herself encouraged single women:

Who are mothers in heart, though not by God's gift on earth, to work in juvenile reformatories ... and thereby to bestow their natural love on those wretched moral orphans whose natural sweetness of filial love has been mixed with a deadly poison?¹⁶⁵

Vicinus and others have explored the 'empowering vision of celibacy'. Although this view was not necessarily shared by the majority of middle-class women, it did mean that for women being single might be regarded as a positive option.¹⁶⁶ While Mary was disappointed at the outcome of her relationship with James Martineau, it was Mary's single status that allowed her the time to develop her interest in reform.¹⁶⁷ Providing that single women were financially secure, being single would offer middle-class women the freedom to undertake useful work. Vicinus believes that for many women this freedom was underpinned by a deep religiosity which enabled them to transform the 'passive role into one of active spirituality and passionate social service'.¹⁶⁸ Single women extended the concept of motherhood to fit their celibate state, with social or spiritual motherhood expressed in language, attitudes and behaviour.

By the first quarter of the nineteenth century the inability of the centuries-old parish poor relief system to cope with the degree of poverty, and mass flight to the cities by landless labourers, caused by enclosures and the industrial revolution, was clear. Before 1834 poor relief was administered on a parochial basis; poor rates were levied for the support of workhouses for the unemployed or unemployable. However, the economic dislocations of the Napoleonic wars and the post-war period, falling agricultural prices and a low level of wages brought many parishes, especially those which were rural, to the point of paying outdoor relief to those in badly paid, but regular, employment.

The propertied classes, responsible for paying poor rates felt that employers paid low wages knowing these would be topped up by poor rates. After many years of controversy, the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 was passed. This Act inaugurated the administrative machinery and principles which governed the public provision of assistance for the unemployed, the sick, the mentally ill, the handicapped, orphans and widows. In 1834 a new Poor Law was introduced. Some people welcomed it because they believed it would reduce the cost of looking after the poor, take beggars off the streets and encourage poor people to work hard to support themselves. The new Poor Law ensured that the poor were housed in workhouses, clothed and fed. Children who entered the workhouse would receive some schooling. In return for this care, all workhouse paupers would have to work for several hours each often on menial and depressing work. The poor themselves hated and feared the threat of the workhouse as families were separated yet often the poor had no alternatives. For example, in Bristol in 1833, the Poor Law Guardians, the 'Corporation of the Poor' had some five hundred poor in the workhouse, St. Peter's Hospital, and up to ten times that number on outside relief.¹⁶⁹

Bristol's vigorous religious culture was another stimulus to its voluntary sector, as church and chapel provided organisational foci and different sects tried to address distinct social needs or to identify particular groups to work with. Fallen women, displaced seamen and the increasingly restless working-classes all engaged the attention of the middle-classes.¹⁷⁰ As Mellor in her study of Bristol's governing elite discovered, while religion and voluntary associations provided the moral basis of influence within the city, it did not consider women as integral to the elite.¹⁷¹ Culture dictated that men

would run these voluntary associations while the women were expected to take a subservient role.

The people of Bristol in the nineteenth century maintained that the town 'has long stood at the head of all other cities, for the number, magnitude and diversity of its benevolent institutions'.¹⁷² However, by the 1840s Bristol had lost its position as a leading port for the slave trade, and its slums, most notably the area of St. James' Back, were as bad as any in London. The centre of Bristol was a filthy, noisy and polluted district of factories, sweat shops and smoke stacks, warrens of alleys and dilapidated slum housing. There was no public water supply or sewers and the mortality rate in Bristol was one of the worst in England, with nearly half the children born dying before they reached their fifth year. Cholera and typhoid were endemic, as was tuberculosis.¹⁷³

There were many street children in Bristol and the population census shows that between 1821 and 1871, there was an increase above the national average, of children aged below fifteen in Bristol.¹⁷⁴ Life for these street children was arduous and brutal; the children could occupy a place in society anywhere between pauper and convict and the authorities regarded them as a social nuisance. In the early nineteenth century childhood was a brief and unimportant phase of life for the poor. Children had no rights or independent status; they were vulnerable to all forms of physical and economic exploitation and abuse, with intervention in family life by the state unknown. Thousands of destitute children lived on the streets; they slept under railway arches or in doorways and they lived by begging or stealing. The street children received universal condemnation as their uncontrolled existence challenged the foundations of an ordered society. Dickens describes them in *Household Words*, under the title 'Lambs to be Fed:

Hop about like wild birds; pilfering the crumbs that fall from the table of the nation's wealth ... they certainly have no higher notion of what we could call justice, than blackbirds have of nets, scarecrows or guns.¹⁷⁵

The Bristol riots in 1831 and the cholera outbreak the following year would have impressed on Mary the poverty and ignorance that existed in Bristol. Millicent Fawcett, writing in 1889, maintains that seeing the effect of cholera in 1832 in Bristol encouraged Mary to dedicate herself to her fellow creatures. Mary wrote in her diary: 'these things I have written to be a witness against me, if ever I was to forget what ought to be the object of all my active execration in life'.¹⁷⁶

Unitarians became interested in the concept of non-sectarian Sunday schools after Robert Raikes inspired the movement in the 1780s, and they founded many non-denominational Sunday schools at their chapels.¹⁷⁷ Lant determined to open a Sunday school for the poor of the parish, depending upon his wife and daughters to further his ideas and overcome the initial reservations of the congregation. Many women became involved in teaching in Sunday schools as it was an area of church-related life that was neither private nor public but an intermediate one where women like Mary could rehearse for a life outside the home. This experience influenced Mary's future decision to engage in social reform among the poor children of the chapel. Sunday school teachers were concerned with society as a whole, as many children who came were unconnected with church or chapel. Thus, this was a ministry beyond the chapel to the world, and for some children the only education they would receive. For the teachers it would also develop skills, which could be used in other contexts, such as a more public involvement in charitable work.

Sunday schools, for both sexes, served as an outlet for the reforming energies of the middle-classes as well as attempting to educate children. In particular, teaching could provide one of the few conventional occupations for middle-class women. Many non-conformist women and girls taught in Sunday school at some point in their lives as it was considered a spiritual commitment. In the early nineteenth century the schools occupied most of the Sabbath, from four to six hours, and the teaching included readings from the Bible and other texts, as well as writing and some arithmetic. Many children attended for an average of four years. Mary taught in the Sunday school attached to her father's ministry from the age of twelve and made her first contribution to the organisation of education for the poor, when, in 1831, age twenty-four, she became Superintendent of the Girls' branch of the Sunday school. Mary demonstrated by her work that the poor could not begin to improve their lives without education, but she also saw that the Sunday schools were failing in their original mission. John Latimer states 'that for twenty years Mary gave herself to the young; she was to be found Sunday after Sunday, in the school and at the Superintendent's desk'.¹⁷⁸

Members of leading Unitarian families, including Harriet Martineau and Elizabeth Gaskell, wrote for Travers Madge's *Sunday School Penny Magazine*, supporting Sunday schools. Another Unitarian woman, Sarah Compton, of Birmingham, wrote books to help

the instruction of children and illiterate adults.¹⁷⁹ While evangelicals discouraged teaching working-class children to read, Unitarians viewed Sunday schools as part of a larger liberal project to encourage the working-classes to think and reason for themselves.¹⁸⁰ Many children learnt about the Empire and slavery at Sunday school where stories, hymns and sermons about missionaries demonstrated how Britain was seeking to Christianise 'heathen' people.¹⁸¹

However, even in Unitarian circles it was considered that a different curriculum should be offered to the children of the poor. Most Unitarians shared the common belief of the wealthier classes that the education of the poor should consist of training which would inure them to physical labour, servitude and material hardship.¹⁸² Dick and Laqueur have debated whether some nineteenth-century schools were essentially conservative and patriarchal institutions or an institution central to the religious and recreational life of the working classes, creating a working-class culture of respectability and self-reliance.¹⁸³ Dick believes Unitarian schools exemplified both premises; indeed, Unitarians always acknowledged that knowledge could lead to power and no knowledge should be denied to the working classes.¹⁸⁴ Unitarians slowly and gradually also opened up church committees and especially Sunday school ones to women although men often remained in overall control, particularly of finance, despite Lant Carpenter consistently arguing for female representation in these committees.¹⁸⁵

Sunday schools did present one of the few opportunities for the education of the poor and can be said to have had two major contributions to Victorian culture. Firstly, they served as a means for the middle-classes to investigate conditions among the urban poor. Secondly, they introduced volunteers to the problems of poverty and demonstrated that, in many cases, it was the result of several factors rather than individual weaknesses. For a considerable body of the poor, especially outside London, Sunday schools provided a level of literacy, however minimal. Nevertheless, Sunday schools were below the educational level of the day schools and some failed entirely in their purpose. In spite of this, between 1801 and 1851 the number of Sunday schools and attendance multiplied tenfold, from 2,300 to 23,000 schools and from 200,000 to 2,000,000 children and were often the only education available to children.¹⁸⁶ Yet by enlarging the body of literate, respectable poor, the schools had made all the more conspicuous the state of the illiterate

and unrespectable poor; those who were too ragged, literally and metaphorically, to send their children to school.

Mary was encouraged to take a further interest in pauper children by the visits of the American Unitarian minister Joseph Tuckerman, in 1833 and 1834, to Bristol which is discussed in the next section.

1.6 Joseph Tuckerman

In 1826 the American minister Joseph Tuckerman began a ministry for the poor in Boston, 'The Boston Society for the Prevention of Pauperism'. Tuckerman's vision of non-proselytising domestic missions to the urban poor stressed 'respect for the unique capabilities, needs and value of every individual'.¹⁸⁷ He wanted to encourage specially appointed domestic missionaries to visit, comfort and help the poor, with little or no proselytising intention. Tuckerman had been in correspondence with British Unitarians, including Lant Carpenter, for over a decade and his connection to Unitarians in London, Liverpool and Bristol led to the establishment of domestic missions in England.¹⁸⁸

Tuckerman became ill during a visit to the Carpenter family, and Mary cared for him during his convalescence. His indomitable enthusiasm for his mission left such an impression on 26 year old Mary that it gave impetus for her to form among the ladies of the Lewin's Mead congregation, a Working and Visiting Society; for twenty years she was its secretary and the organising force.¹⁸⁹ Tuckerman's insistence on respect for every individual, including the poorest members of society, was to be the central focus of Mary's future work. His insistence that there was 'no inextinguishable spark that could not be blown into a flame' certainly influenced her belief that all children could be reformed.¹⁹⁰ Mary took on Tuckerman's views, reinforced by her father's approval, and held on to them immutably for the rest of her life. In 1849 she wrote *Joseph Tuckerman* in which she discussed his life and ideas.

In 1836, the Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society had a subscription list of one man and forty-two women alongside Mary Carpenter, who herself took the poorest areas, in visiting the poor from a sense of Christian duty.¹⁹¹ The home visits had a number of aims. One was to encourage children to come to Sunday school, and the Unitarian

respect for other people's religious views encouraged many to use the non-denominational Sunday school attached to Lewin's Mead meeting house. Another aim was the distribution of bread, blankets, or coal as well as the distribution of clothes made by members of the society together with encouraging the poor to help themselves.¹⁹² Mary's awareness of the conditions in which the poor lived, strengthened her conviction of the benefits of helping the poor. A religious imperative encouraged Mary to write in her diary in December, 1836: 'if God sees it well in His own good time it should be so, to devote my life entirely to the blessed employment of aiding the poor and destitute'.¹⁹³ Many evangelical Christians in this period believed that the poverty and distress of the hundreds of thousands of people who lived in industrial cities such as Bristol were attributable to the poor themselves. For many evangelical Christians the idleness, improvidence and licentiousness of the poor were the sole cause of the conditions the poor were forced to live.¹⁹⁴ Evangelical reformers felt that only gospel religion could provide an effectual remedy for the suffering of the destitute as it taught 'foresight, moderation, patience and contentment'.¹⁹⁵ In contrast, Mary believed in a radical environmentalism, based on both her father's and David Hartley's beliefs, and refused to lay the blame for their predicament on the working-classes. She believed that in the case of children any could turn into criminals simply because of society's neglect of them.

If society leaves them in a state of utter degradation in which they are then I think it more absolutely owes them reparation, far more than they could be said to owe reparation to it.¹⁹⁶

Mary disliked the retributive theology of many evangelical Christians which believed all mankind was sinful which caused evangelicals to demand punishment for people who they felt had infringed the moral code they believed in. In contrast, the Unitarians denied the concept of original sin and stressed the desirability of changing the environment rather than severe punishment which might harden the offender.¹⁹⁷

The important voluntary societies created in this period were concerned with activities ranging from poor relief, medical aid and moral reform education to the diffusion of culture and science.¹⁹⁸ The possibility of expanding and redefining the sphere of women's involvement carried the potential for focusing on specifically female issues, in which the concerns of women would aspire to cut across barriers of class and gender.¹⁹⁹ Voluntary societies such as the Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society were often

highly specialised and were concerned with both moral and physical issues in an increasingly urban and industrial environment.

The core income of the Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society was from annual subscriptions, and its income from this source remained constant at a little over £100 per year. As well as a subscription list a substantial amount of donations were also received: for example in 1840-41, around the time of Lant Carpenter's death, donations were particularly generous at £74.17s.²⁰⁰ An interesting point to note is how few of the members of the working parties were actually subscribers to the society, indicating that women were restrained in their philanthropic work by a lack of personal money (*Appendix One*, pp.186-7) All the members were from the Dissenting sects, highlighting how women outside of the Church of England worked together to have their views heard in a sometimes hostile environment. Also noteworthy is that the nucleus of the society later formed the local branch of the Women's suffrage society.²⁰¹

In Bristol, as elsewhere, middle-class women used voluntary associations to carve out for themselves political identities and new professions while at the same time pursuing wider opportunities for women in terms of education, employment and suffrage. Mary's reports for the society show how the ladies had looked at other ways of offering support to the poor, for example by setting up a Provident Institution, such as was provided by the Unitarians in Birmingham.²⁰² The group felt that further help for the poor was needed and Mary led a campaign for a minister who could devote his time exclusively to the poor. Subsequently the Reverend J. Bayley was appointed at a salary of £100 a year funded by the Lewin's Mead Meeting House. While it can be said that the ladies were playing the role of 'lady bountiful', at least the women were attempting to step out of their sphere to investigate the condition of the poor and attempt in a small way to address their problems.

Tuckerman's visit had a tremendous effect on Mary, providing her with another authoritative male figure she could admire and wish to emulate. While Lant believed that Mary's future should be in helping her family in the home, Tuckerman showed Mary that that there was a possibility of a life outside the home. He also encouraged her to believe that she had the authority and ability to help the poor herself. After Tuckerman's death in 1842 Mary wrote that for six years he had been a 'guide and a rest to her soul... He will

live in my thoughts as long as I am here'.²⁰³ Manton believes that all of Mary's work with the poor stems from her devotion to Tuckerman, that he opened her mind to new modes of how she might spend her life.²⁰⁴ Indeed, it is certainly likely that Tuckerman's domestic missions gave a focus to Mary's sympathies for the poor. It was a practical answer as to how she might devote her life in a suitable manner for a Unitarian woman.²⁰⁵

Thus, Mary as a child and a young woman focused her attention on her family and in particular her father, Lant Carpenter, and she can be seen to be complicit in patriarchy. Mary, by teaching in the Lewin's Mead Sunday school as well as schools run by her mother and father, was following her father's wishes that her role should be domestic. Lant Carpenter's priority on the education of the poor was the basis of Mary's early activities in the Sunday school and in the Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society whereas Joseph Tuckerman introduced her to the concept of working with the poor in domestic missions.

The next chapter, which to some extent overlaps chronologically, discusses how Lant Carpenter's interest in abolition inspired Mary's life-long interest.

- ¹ Mary Carpenter in Carpenter, M, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders*, C. Gilpin 1851, p. 261.
- ² Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.14.
- ³ DeVries, Jacqueline, 'More than Paradoxes to offer: Feminism, history and religious culture', p.188 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ⁴ Lewis, J, *Women and Social Action in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1991.
- ⁵ Watts, *Gender*, p.15.
- ⁶ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"', p.40' in M. Hilton & P. Hirsch (eds.) *Practical Visionaries, Women Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Harlow, Pearson Education, 2000.
- ⁷ Carpenter, R.L (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life and Work of Philip Pearsall Carpenter*, C. Kegan Paul, 1851, p.155.
- ⁸ Barker, John Thomas, (ed.) *Life of Joseph Barker. Written by Him*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1880, p.281.
- ⁹ Watts, Ruth, 'The Unitarian Contribution to Female Education, 1790-1850', p.277, *History of Education*, 1980, Vol. 9, No.4.
- ¹⁰ Strange, *British Unitarians*, p.56.
- ¹¹ Chapman, Maria Weston, (ed.) *Harriet Martineau, Autobiography*, Boston, James R. Osgood & Co, 1877, 1,
- ¹² Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children', p. 39.
- ¹³ Watts, Ruth, 'Rational Religion and Feminism: The Challenge of Unitarianism in the Nineteenth-century', p.41 in Morgan, Sue, (ed.) *Women, Religion and Feminism in Britain, 1750-1900*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- ¹⁴ Watts, *Gender*, p.108.
- ¹⁵ Seed, John, 'Theologies of Power: Unitarianism and the Social relations of Religious Discourse, 1800-1850', p.113 in Morris, R.J, (ed.) *Class, Power and Social Structure in British Nineteenth-century Towns*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1986.
- ¹⁶ Watts, 'Rational Religion and feminism', p.40.
- ¹⁷ Watts, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England*, p.105.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid*, p.152.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid*, p.90.
- ²⁰ Davie, Donald, *Essays in Dissent, Church, Chapel and the Unitarian Conspiracy*, Manchester, Carcanet Press Limited, 1995, p.55.
- ²¹ Millard, Kay, 'The Religion of Elizabeth Gaskell', *Gaskell Society Journal*, 15 (2001) pp.1-13.
- ²² Watts, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England*, p.35.
- ²³ Rylance, Rick, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2000, p.56-7.
- ²⁴ Cohen, William, *Embodied- Victorian Literature and the Senses*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2009, p.11.
- ²⁵ Hartley, David, (1749) *Observations on Man*, 2 Vols, New York, 1976, 1, pp. 7-8, 72, 416: Watts, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England*, p.35.
- ²⁶ <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hartley>. Accessed 1/5/2011.
- ²⁷ Watts, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England*, p.41.
- ²⁸ Allen, Richard, 'Hartley, David', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- ²⁹ Locke, John, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 1690.
- ³⁰ Kowaleski-Wallace, Elizabeth, *Their Fathers' Daughters, Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and patriarchal complicity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, p.20.
- ³¹ Strange, Douglas Charles, *British Unitarians against American Slavery 1833-65*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 1984, pp.222-3; Watts, *Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children*, p.40.
- ³² Letter: Mary Carpenter to Reverend Theodore Parker, 12th June, 1859 cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.207.
- ³³ Watts, 'Rational Religion and Feminism', p.46.
- ³⁴ Burton, Antoinette, 'Fearful Bodies into disciplined subjects: pleasure, romance and the family drama of colonial reform in Mary Carpenter's Six Months in India', pp.545-74, *Signs* 20:3, Spring, 1995.
- ³⁵ Carpenter, R.L, (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverent Carpenter*, Bristol, Philip & Evans, 1842, p.380.

- ³⁶ Mr Peacock's address to the annual dinner of the Unitarian Congregation, South Place, Finsbury, *Unitarian Chronicle*, No XIV, March 1833, p.84 cited in Gleadle, Kathryn, *The Early Feminists, Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement 1931-51*, Macmillan, 1995, p.11.
- ³⁷ Robberts, 'A Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Late William Taylor', p.40 cited in Gleadle, Kathryn, *The Early Feminists, Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement 1931-51*, Macmillan, 1995, p.22.
- ³⁸ Gleadle, *The Early Feminists, Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement 1931-51*, p.12.
- ³⁹ Watts, *Gender*, p.151-2.
- ⁴⁰ Seed, J, 'Unitarianism, political economy and the antinomies of Liberal culture in Manchester', p.21. *Social History*, Jan. 1983, 7, No.1.
- ⁴¹ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"', p.43 in M. Hilton & P. Hirsch (eds.) *Practical Visionaries, Women Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Harlow, Pearson Education, 2000.
- ⁴² Carpenter, J.E, *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, pp.126-9; p.134, p.137, pp.147-8; p.154; pp.163-4; p.169; pp.173-4; pp.186-7; pp.203-4, p.206.
- ⁴³ Maria Edgeworth was not a Unitarian herself but moved in Unitarian circles.
- ⁴⁴ Watts, *Gender*, p.91.
- ⁴⁵ Watts, 'Rational Religion and Feminism', pp. 39-52.
- ⁴⁶ Watts, 'The Unitarian Contribution to Female Education', pp.273-286.
- ⁴⁷ For example the Courtaulds, Strutts, Wedgewoods and Flowers families became well-known names.
- ⁴⁸ Annan, N.G, "'The Intellectual Aristocracy'" in *Studies in Local History*, edited by J.H. Plumb (1955) pp.241-287 cited in Watts, 'Radical educational networks', p.4.
- ⁴⁹ Watts, *Gender*, p.76.
- ⁵⁰ Carpenter, R.L, *Lant Carpenter*, p.40.
- ⁵¹ *Letters from Catherine Coppe to Lant Carpenter*, 1805; 3rd July 1808; 5th October 1816; 15th October 1816. HMC Ms Lant Carpenter 1,
- ⁵² Mary Carpenter had received a substantial legacy and assisted him in furnishing his house. Carpenter, R.L, *Memoir of the Rev. Lant Carpenter*, Arrowsmith, Bristol 1875, p.40:
- ⁵³ Carpenter, R.W, *Memoir of P.P. Carpenter*, C. Keegan, Paul & Co, 1880, p.40.
- ⁵⁴ Strange, Douglas Charles, *British Unitarians*, p.130.
- ⁵⁵ Carpenter, R.L, *Memoir Philip Pearsall Carpenter*, p.355.
- ⁵⁶ Strange, *British Unitarians*, p.128.
- ⁵⁷ McLachlan, John, *Mary Carpenter. Friend of the Despised and Rejected*, HMC, Miscellaneous Box,
- ⁵⁸ Selleck, Richard, 'Mary Carpenter: A confident and contradictory reformer', p.101, *History of Education* 1985, vol. 14, No 2.
- ⁵⁹ Carpenter, Lant, (1820) *Principles of Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*, Longman & Co, Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1974, pp.187-88.
- ⁶⁰ Carpenter, Lant, *ibid*, p.244.
- ⁶¹ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.22.
- ⁶² Carpenter, J E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.4.
- ⁶³ Saywell, R, J, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, Bristol, Historical Association, 1964, p.2.
- ⁶⁴ Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976, p.22.
- ⁶⁵ Manton, *ibid*, p.23
- ⁶⁶ Schupf, Harriet Warm, 'Single Women and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-century England: The case of Mary Carpenter', *Victorian Studies*, 1974, Vol.17, March, p.304.
- ⁶⁷ Carpenter, Mary, 'On Female Education', *National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*, 1869, (1870) pp.351-2.
- ⁶⁸ Hutton, S, *Bristol and its Famous Associations*, Bristol, J.W. Arrowsmith, 1907, p.394.
- ⁶⁹ *Letter: James Martineau to Estlin Carpenter*, 1877, cited in Carpenter, J. E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.11.
- ⁷⁰ Carpenter, R.L, *Memoirs Philip Pearsall Carpenter*, p.209.
- ⁷¹ Barbauld, Anna Laetitia, *Hymns in Prose for Children*, 1781, p.vi.
- ⁷² Issett, John, *Jeremiah Joyce: Radical Dissenter and Writer*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing, 2006, p.165.
- ⁷³ 'The scent of a rose, the sound from a bell, the taste of an orange, the blow of a stick produce changes in the organ of sense, and these produce sensations in the mind. Sensations soon cease after the exciting cause is withdrawn but if they have been produced with sufficient vividness, the cause remains in the mind.' See Shepherd, William, Jeremiah Joyce & Lant Carpenter, *Systematic Education; On Elementary Instruction in the Various Departments of Literature and Science with Practical Rules for Studying Each Branch of Useful Knowledge* (3rd ed., London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown, 1822), p.266.

- ⁷⁴ Rylance, *Victorian Psychology*, p.57.
- ⁷⁵ For example, *Unitarianism: the Doctrine of the Gospel* (1809), *Errors Respecting Unitarianism Considered* (1808); *Motives and Means for the Dissemination or it Stated* (1808); *An Examination of the Charges made against Unitarians* (1820).
- ⁷⁶ Carpenter, Lant, *Principles of Education*, pp.1-2.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid*, pp.118-20.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p.173.
- ⁷⁹ Dickson, Lori, 'The Culture of Habits and Dispositions', Associationist Psychology and Unitarian Education in Gaskell's *Wives and Daughters*. MA Thesis, *unpublished paper*, p.8.
- ⁸⁰ Carpenter, Lant, *Principles of Education*, pp.27.8.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid*, p.184
- ⁸² *Ibid*, p.184.
- ⁸³ *Ibid*, p.10.
- ⁸⁴ Carpenter, R.L., *Lant Carpenter*, p.180.
- ⁸⁵ Carpenter, R.L., *Memoirs of Philip Pearsall Carpenter*, pp.105-6.
- ⁸⁶ Shoemaker, Robert, *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850-The emergence of separate spheres*, Longman, 1998, p.141.
- ⁸⁷ Carpenter, R.L., *Lant Carpenter*, p.250.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid*, p.115.
- ⁸⁹ Maria was the daughter of Richard Lovell Edgeworth, a well-known author and inventor who encouraged his daughter's career as a writer, but insisted on approving and editing her work. Thus the tales in *The Parent's Assistant* (1796) were approved by her father before he would allow her to read them to her younger siblings.
- ⁹⁰ Carpenter, Lant, *Principles of Education*, p.10.
- ⁹¹ Yeager, Patricia and Beth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Refiguring the Father*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1989, pp.296-311.
- ⁹² Gleadle, Kathryn, *Some Thoughts upon Education*, Basingstoke, Macmillan Press, 1998, p.34.
- ⁹³ Carpenter, R.L., *Memoirs Philip Pearsall Carpenter*, p.155.
- ⁹⁴ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.23
- ⁹⁵ Carpenter, R.L., *Lant Carpenter*, p.46
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid*, p.66.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid*, p.85.
- ⁹⁸ Carpenter, R.L., *ibid*, pp. 80-85.
- ⁹⁹ *Matthews's Annual Bristol Directory and Almanack*, Bristol, 1820, pp.8-12.
- ¹⁰⁰ Bush, Graham, *Bristol and its municipal Government, 1820-1851*, Bristol Record Office, 1976, p.25.
- ¹⁰¹ Bowing, John, *Autobiographical Recollections*, H.S. King, 1877, p.42; *Letter: John Bowing to Lant Carpenter* reproduced in Carpenter, J.E., *Mary Carpenter*, pp.10-11; Carpenter, R.L., *Lant Carpenter*, pp.342-352.
- ¹⁰² *Letter: Lant Carpenter from Sam Worsley*. HMC, Manuscripts, Lant Carpenter, Fol.28.
- ¹⁰³ Carpenter, R.L., *Lant Carpenter*, pp.220-9.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Letters to James Martineau from Mrs Anna Carpenter*: HMC, MS: J. Martineau Fols.53-72.
- ¹⁰⁵ Sargant, N., *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.9.
- ¹⁰⁶ Carpenter, R.L., *Lant Carpenter*, p.497-7
- ¹⁰⁷ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.40, no reference.
- ¹⁰⁸ Simcox, E., 'Ideals of Feminine Usefulness', *Fortnightly Review*, May 1880, cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.40.
- ¹⁰⁹ HMC, *Lant Carpenter manuscripts*; fols 14-29 consists of eight letter to and from Mary Carpenter and James Martineau.
- ¹¹⁰ Yeo, Eileen Janes, 'Protestant feminists and Catholic Saints in Victorian Britain', p.131 in Yeo, Eileen Janes, (ed.) *Radical Femininity: Women's self-representation in the public sphere*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1988.
- ¹¹¹ John Relly Beard educated his daughter Sarah because he wanted her to be independent and to have a career of her own. See Jackson, Mark, *The Borderland of Imbecility: Medicine, Society and the Fabrication of the Feeble Mind in late Victorian and Edwardian England* (Manchester University Press, 2000), p.60 where he writes that Sarah returned to work in her father's school.
- ¹¹² Herford founded a school in 1850 in Lancaster, later pioneered Froebelian education and established a successful co-educational school in Manchester where Beard's granddaughter, Mary Shipman Beard, and Herford's daughter, Caroline, were successive headmistresses.
- ¹¹³ Watts, *Gender*, p.135.

- ¹¹⁴ Watts, Ruth, 'Some Radical educational networks of the late eighteenth century and their influence', p.1 *History of Education*, 1998, Vol.27, No 1.
- ¹¹⁵ Watts, *Gender*, p.38.
- ¹¹⁶ Henderson, 'A memoir of the Late Rev. George Armstrong', p.114 cited in Gleadle, *The Early Feminists*, p.21.
- ¹¹⁷ Watts, 'Unitarian Contribution', p.275.
- ¹¹⁸ Watts, Ruth, 'Unlimited knowledge for all: Unitarians and education, 1800-1860', p.19, *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, 22.1, 1999.
- ¹¹⁹ Watts, *Mary Carpenter: Educator of children*, p. 40.
- ¹²⁰ Harrison, J.F.C, *The Early Victorians 1832-51*, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1971, p.125.
- ¹²¹ See Pedersen, Joyce Senders, *The Reform of Girl's Secondary and Higher Education in Victorian England*, New York, Garland Publishing, 1876; Green, Laura, *Education Women: Cultural Conflict and Victorian Literature*, Athens, Ohio, UP, 2001.
- ¹²² Watts, *Gender*, pp.162-80.
- ¹²³ Gleadle, *The Early Feminists*, p.21.
- ¹²⁴ Midgley, Clare, *Feminism and Empire: Women Activists in Imperial Britain, 1790-1865*, Routledge, 2007, p.24-5.
- ¹²⁵ Gleadle, *Early Feminist*, pp.1-6.
- ¹²⁶ Levine, Phillipa, *Feminist Lives in Victorian England; Private Roles and Public Commitment*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1990, p.32
- ¹²⁷ Lawson, John and Silver, Harold, *A Social History of England*, Methuen, 1973, p.253.
- ¹²⁸ Ferguson, Moira, (ed.), *First Feminists, British Women Writers 1578 -1799*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1985, p.8
- ¹²⁹ Hall, Catherine, 'Early Formation of Domestic Ideology', p.26 cited in Gleadle, Kathryn, *The Early Feminists*, St Martin's Press, 1995.
- ¹³⁰ Stott, Anne, 'A Singular injustice towards women: Hannah More, Evangelism and female Education' p.23 in Morgan, Sue, (ed.) *Woman, Religion and Feminism, 1750-1900*, Palgrave, 2002.
- ¹³¹ For example, Bryant, M, *The Unexpected Revolution: A Study in the History of Education*, Institute of Education, 1979.
- ¹³² For the most recent study of Barbauld, see William McCarthy, *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment*, Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 2009
- ¹³³ Austen, Jane & Fiona Stafford, *Emma*, Penguin Classics, 2003, p.15.
- ¹³⁴ Nardin, Jane, 'Hannah More and the Rhetoric of Educational Reform', p.219, *Women's History Review*, Vol 10, Number 2, 2001.
- ¹³⁵ The Lawrence's great nieces established a school later in the nineteenth-century now known as Roedean.
- ¹³⁶ Watts, *The Unitarian Contribution to Female Education*, p.278.
- ¹³⁷ Malleson, Hope, 'Elizabeth Malleson, 1828-1916, Autobiographical Notes and Letters, 1926', pp.35-6 cited in Gleadle, *The Early Feminists*, p.25.
- ¹³⁸ However, these were secondary schools rather than offering any equivalent of higher education.
- ¹³⁹ Phoebe Penn was the half- sister of Anna Penn Carpenter.
- ¹⁴⁰ Davidoff, Leonore & Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle- Class, 1780-1850*, Hutchinson, 2002, p.297.
- ¹⁴¹ Watts, 'Rational Religion and Feminism', p.95.
- ¹⁴² Florence Nightingale was not allowed to study in the daytime as it was considered unsuitable for young ladies. Watts, *Gender*, p.117.
- ¹⁴³ Watts, *Gender*, pp.89-90.
- ¹⁴⁴ Kent, S.K, *Gender & Power in Britain 1649-1900*, Routledge, 1999, p.180.
- ¹⁴⁵ *Parliamentary Papers: Census of Great Britain, 1851, Part 11(1854) 1*, p.clxv.
- ¹⁴⁶ For example, Watts, *Gender*, p.17-24; Gleadle, Kathryn, *British Women in the Nineteenth century*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2001; Ellis, Sarah Stickney, *The Women of England, Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits*, Fisher, Son & Co, 1839
- ¹⁴⁷ Vicinus, Martha, *Independent Women: Work and Community for Single Women, 1859-1920*, Virago Press, 1985, p.10.
- ¹⁴⁸ Williamson, Lori, *Power and Protest*, Rivers Oram Press, 2005, Williamson notes that Cobbe understood she was questioning both biblical and parental authority.
- ¹⁴⁹ Williamson, *Power and Protest*, p. 28
- ¹⁵⁰ Cobbe, Frances Power, *Life of Frances Power Cobbe*, Vol.1. Richard Bentley and Son, 1894, pp. 94- 5. Williamson believes that Caine does not believe that Cobbe was as happy as she makes out in her

- Autobiography*; she suggests that Cobbe disliked being her father's companion and antagonised him as a means of testing her autonomy.
- ¹⁵¹ Caine, Barbara, 'Feminist Biography and feminist history', p.256 *Women's History Review*, 3:2.
- ¹⁵² Ellis, Sarah Stickney, *The Women of England, Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits*, Fisher, Son and Co, 1839, p.41.
- ¹⁵³ Carpenter, R. L., *Lant Carpenter*, p.114.
- ¹⁵⁴ Schupf, Harriet Warm, 'Single Women and Social Reform in Mid-Nineteenth-century England: The case of Mary Carpenter', pp. 310 in *Victorian Studies*, 1974, Vol.17, March.
- ¹⁵⁵ 31st December 1840, Diary of Mary Carpenter cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.52.
- ¹⁵⁶ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.57.
- ¹⁵⁷ Carpenter, William, B, *Sketch of the Life and Work of Mary Carpenter of Bristol*. Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877, p.3.
- ¹⁵⁸ *Ibid*, p.3.
- ¹⁵⁹ Summers, Anne, 'A Home from Home: Women's philanthropic work in the nineteenth-century', p.37 in Burman, S, (ed.) *Fit Work for Women*, Croom Helm, 1979.
- ¹⁶⁰ Lewis, Susan, *Women's Mission*, 2nd edn. 1839, p.12 cited in Midgely, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform' p.142 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010
- ¹⁶¹ Elliott, D.W, *The Angel Out of the House: Philanthropy and Gender in Nineteenth-century England*, University Press of Virginia, 2002, p.1.
- ¹⁶² *Ibid*, p.112.
- ¹⁶³ *Ibid*, p.5.
- ¹⁶⁴ Morgan, Sue, *Women, religion and feminism in Britain, 1750-1990*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, p.2.
- ¹⁶⁵ Carpenter, Mary, 'Women's Work in the Reformatory Movement', *English Woman's Journal* 1. 1858, pp.219-22
- ¹⁶⁶ Vicinus, *Independent women*, pp.2-20; E.J. Yeo, *The Contest for Social Science: relations and representations of gender and class*, Rivers Oram Press, 1996, p.127; Levine, *Feminist Lives*, p.62; J. Lewis, *Women and Social Action*, p.7.
- ¹⁶⁷ Metcalfe, E, *Memoirs of Rosamund Davenport Hill*, Longman, 1904, p.17; Holton, Sandra, *Quaker women, personal life, memory and radicalism in the lives of women friends*, Routledge, 2007, p.110; Gordon, Eleanor & Gwyneth Nair, *Public lives: women, family and society in Victorian Britain*, Yale, Yale University Press, 2003, pp.167-175.
- ¹⁶⁸ Vicinus, *Independent women*, p.5
- ¹⁶⁹ Bush, *Bristol*, p.10.
- ¹⁷⁰ Gorsky, M, *Patterns of Philanthropy: Charity and Society in Nineteenth-century Bristol*, The Royal Historical Society, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 1999, p.32
- ¹⁷¹ Mellor, H, *Leisure and the Changing City, 1870-1914*, 1976, Routledge & Keegan Paul, pp.772-77.
- ¹⁷² Mathews's *Annual Bristol Directory and Almanack*, Bristol, 1841, p.295.
- ¹⁷³ Fissell, Mary E, *Patients, Power, and the Poor in Eighteenth-century Bristol*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, passim.
- ¹⁷⁴ 'Census of Great Britain' (Population: England and Wales) cited in Wrigley, E.A. & Schofield, R.S. *The Population of England, 541-1871- A Reconstruction*, Cambridge, 1981, p.529.
- ¹⁷⁵ Charles Dickens, 'Lambs to be Fed', *Household Words*, 3, 1851, pp.544-9.
- ¹⁷⁶ Diary: Mary Carpenter 31st March 1832 cited in Fawcett, Millicent Garrett, *Some Eminent Women of Our Time: Mary Carpenter*, Westminster, National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, 1912, p. p.12.
- ¹⁷⁷ Examples of these were at Hanover Square in Newcastle, established by William Turner and Sunday schools at the Old and New Meetings in Birmingham.
- ¹⁷⁸ Latimer, John, *The Annals of Bristol in the Nineteenth-century*, Frome, 1893, p.20.
- ¹⁷⁹ Watts, *Gender*, p.168
- ¹⁸⁰ Gleadle, Kathryn, *British Women in the Nineteenth-century*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2001, p.67.
- ¹⁸¹ Hall, Catherine, 'Missionary Stories: Gender and Ethnicity in England in the 1830s and 1840s', pp.205-54 in Hall, Catherine, (ed.) *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History*, Oxford, Polity Press, 1992.
- ¹⁸² Locke himself had advocated strict and authoritarian schools for poor children where the educative process should be designed to induce humble and subservient behaviour.
- ¹⁸³ Watts, *Gender*, p.169
- ¹⁸⁴ Dick, Malcolm, 'Religion and the origins of mass schooling: the English Sunday school, c1780-1840', *The Churches and Education*, pp.42-6 History of Education Society, Conference papers, December, 1983; Laqueur,

Thomas W., *Sunday Schools and Working-Class Culture, 1780-1850*, New Haven & London, Yale University Press, 1976.

¹⁸⁵ Watts, *Gender*, p.206

¹⁸⁶ Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *The Idea of Poverty: England in the early industrial age*, Faber and Faber, 1984, p.374.

¹⁸⁷ Watts, *Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children*, p.41.

¹⁸⁸ For further information on these missions see 'Liverpool Domestic Mission Society, *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, 6.4. 11838, pp.387-393; Davis, Valentine David, *The London Domestic Mission, 1835-1935*; Haynes, Barry, *Working-class life in Victorian Leicester: The Joseph Dare Reports*, Leicestershire Libraries and Information Service, 1991; Holt, Anne, *A ministry to the poor: being the history of the Liverpool Domestic Mission Society, 1836-1936*, Liverpool, 1936; Packer, Brian, 'The founding of the Liverpool Domestic Mission and its development under the ministry of John Johns', *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, 18.2.1984; Perry, Herbert, *A century of liberal religion and philanthropy in Manchester: being a history of the Manchester Domestic Mission, 1833-1933*, Manchester, H. Rawson & Co, Ltd, 1933.

¹⁸⁹ Carpenter, William B, *Mary Carpenter*, p.6.

¹⁹⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Joseph Tuckerman*, 1849, pp.30-2, 45, 64-5.

¹⁹¹ Mr G. Ames was the sole male subscriber.

¹⁹² Bristol Reference Library B7054: (1836) *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 1st Report*; B7055: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 2nd Report*.

¹⁹³ Extract from Mary Carpenter's diary cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.38.

¹⁹⁴ Hilton, M. & Hirsch, P, *Practical Visionaries: Women, Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Longman, 2000, p.5.

¹⁹⁵ Pope, Norris, 'Dickens and Charity', Basingstoke, 1978 p.6 cited in Hilton & Hirsch, *Practical Visionaries*, p.5.

¹⁹⁶ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.14.

¹⁹⁷ Watts, *Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children*, p.44.

¹⁹⁸ Morris, R.J, 'Voluntary Societies and the Urban Elite 1790-1850: an analysis,' p.96, *The Historical Journal*, 26, No. 1, 1983.

¹⁹⁹ Rendall, Jane, *The Origins of Modern Feminism, Women in Britain, France and the United States*, Macmillan Press, 1985, p.232.

²⁰⁰ BRO7056-7: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society*, 7th Report, p.9-10.

²⁰¹ Gorsky, *Patterns of Philanthropy*, p.153-4.

²⁰² BRO7056: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society*, Third report, p.3.

²⁰³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.56.

CHAPTER TWO

‘Until all men are free and equal’.¹

2.1. The Early Anti-Slavery Campaign in England

In 1787 the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade was formed in England after the realisation that the slave-dependent colonies denied slaves from Africa had failed to develop naturally towards emancipation.² The slave trade was a significant part of British commercial trade, and between 1502 and 1807 British ships were responsible for the transportation of some two to three million African men, women and children to the new world, with many dying en route.³ Large profits could be made from buying African slaves, shipping them to the Caribbean and selling them to plantation owners who, in turn, set them to work producing crops such as sugar in order to meet an increasing demand in England. In 1807 the Abolition of the Slave Trade Act was passed which abolished the slave trade in the British Empire; but not slavery itself. Slavery had been abolished in England by the Somerset case in 1772 but remained legal in most of the British Empire until the Slavery Abolition Act of 1833.⁴

One of the earliest British anti-slavery novels was Aphra Benn’s *Oroonoko* (1688) which was later revived in play form attracting large audiences; from the 1770s, slavery in America prompted criticism in British abolitionists’ writings. Mary Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) followed Enlightenment thought in using the existence of slavery and the oppression of women as a marker of how supposedly civilised societies fell short. Wollstonecraft, by drawing attention to the discriminatory and degrading treatment of both African slaves and European women, aligned the cause of women’s rights with anti-slavery. Women writers felt extremely strongly about the plight of slavery; culture prohibited their public involvement in anti-slavery campaigns and they could only voice their opinions through their writings. Through books and sentimental poems women made a significant contribution to the early abolition campaigns in the late eighteenth century.⁵

Many people in Britain involved in anti-slavery campaigning argued that the only way to end the suffering of slaves was to make slavery illegal, and a new Anti-Slavery Society was

formed in 1823 with many women as members.⁶ Anti-slavery was connected to philanthropy when Susanna Watts (1768-1842) described anti-slavery as an extension of women's religious work in the Bible Society and the Missionary and Sunday schools movements in *The Humming Bird* in 1825. Subsequently the sphere of a religiously inspired philanthropy was established as an acceptable part of a woman's domestic duties.⁷

By highlighting the suffering of colonised women and presenting them as the passive victims of colonial slavery, female British activists played a key role in abolition and paved the way for more active involvement by Victorian women. Nevertheless, the ideology of the period presented difficulties for women wishing to become involved in the anti-slavery movement. Family, political and religious backgrounds, coupled with characteristics of the local anti-slavery societies, played a key role in whether women would become involved in anti-slavery. By the 1820s there were dozens of 'female societies' with overlapping membership, directed by ladies' committees and devoted to evangelical causes.⁸ These groups reflected evangelical prescriptions concerning the motivation and behaviour of women yet Stott believes that far from challenging their formal exclusion from power, these women appeared to idealise their subordinate role.⁹ In contrast, other historians are increasingly recognising that women's anti-slavery societies were not simply passive auxiliaries; rather they were exercising moral and financial pressures on the national movement to abandon gradualism.¹⁰

From 1823 women came to the support of the Anti-Slavery Society when it was organised to bring about the gradual emancipation of slaves in the British colonies, in particular, the West Indies. The support of women to the anti-slavery movement began to be important as they made a substantial financial contribution to anti-slavery societies in their own names. For example, by 1826 the Female Society for Birmingham had an important role in fund raising, demonstrated by an income of £908 compared to the total income of the National Anti-Slavery Society of £2,933. The Birmingham group received subscriptions from some two to three hundred women as well as donations from over 100 more women.¹¹ Moreover, without the leading role other women took in raising money and raising petitions, it was unlikely that the anti-slavery campaign would have been so well supported financially or have so many signatures for its petitions.

From its earliest stages the British anti-slavery movement had two strands; on the one hand, anti-slavery was considered a philanthropic middle-class campaign promoting a Christian mission, and on the other, it was also considered a movement for human rights, based on compassion, sympathy and a humanist belief in the worth of black slaves. Generally, black people, were not viewed as equal even to poor whites; and the pro-slavery stereotype of the savage was the counterpart of the Missionary 'stereotype of childlike innocence'.¹² Female social reformers nevertheless described their colonised counterparts as their 'sisters' and expressed empathy with them, highlighting common bonds of motherhood and forms of oppressions specific to women. Abolitionists attacked the white planters' treatment of black women under slavery including a mother's separation from her children, as well as the flogging and sexual abuse of women.¹³ These concerns formed part of a widespread anxiety regarding the specific sufferings of black women under slavery, with violence against women by male oversees and planters, the flogging of pregnant women and the stripping of women for punishment, showing it was a system of sexual as well as racial exploitation and oppression. There were constant references to the 'degradation' of women by enslavement although codes of respectability dictated women could only make veiled references to black women's rape and sexual exploitation by white men.¹⁴

Female anti-slavery campaigners increasingly adopted the slogan 'Am I not a woman and a sister' in their campaign for the proper treatment of black slaves, which not only echoed the slogan 'Am I not a man and a brother' coined by male campaigners in the 1780s but also highlighted white women's own subordination to white men.¹⁵ At the same time, female abolitionists' adoption of the slogan emphasised white women's superior position as saviours, through the visual image of a chained kneeling black woman appealing to an invisible white audience. Female abolitionists often purchased brooches, pins and bracelets bearing a cameo of a kneeling and enchained male slave signalling their sympathetic identification with the slave. In the early nineteenth century British married women lacked independent legal rights, they did not have the right to look after their own children, their own property and were defenceless against domestic and sexual abuse. For example, at the wedding of the anti-slavery activist, Priscilla Buxton, the toast to the bride was 'that she might long rejoice in the fetters put on that day as well as over those she had assisted to break'.¹⁶

Female anti-slavery campaigners were able to justify their active and public involvement in spite of opposition from conservative male leaders such as Wilberforce by use of the philanthropic mission and the representation of slavery as a religious and moral issue. William Wilberforce had evoked the authority of the Bible in expressing his disapproval of women's involvement, writing in 1826, 'All private exertions for such an object become their character, but for ladies to meet, to publish, to go from house to house stirring up petitions- these appears to me proceedings unsuitable to the female character as delineated in scripture'.¹⁷

In 1824, Elizabeth Heyrick, a Quaker, published *Immediate, Not Gradual Abolition* in which she argued passionately for the immediate emancipation of slaves in the British colonies and launched a frontal attack on the policy of amelioration and gradual abolition which the Anti-Slavery Society had espoused at its inception in 1823.¹⁸ Heyrick's approach assigned women responsibility as purchasers of slave grown products in Britain. Women's societies brushed aside interdictions against their involvement in politics saying that the slavery issue was 'not exclusively a political but, pre-eminently a moral question' and in 1830, the Anti-Slavery Society agreed to the change.¹⁹

Clare Midgley has identified a total of 73 ladies associations active between 1825 and 1833 based in small towns, such as Calne in Wiltshire, to larger industrial cities and by 1831 there were at least 39 ladies' anti-slavery associations. The total membership of ladies' anti-slavery societies probably never exceeded 10,000, and similar to the anti-slavery movement as a whole, consisted largely of the middle-class.²⁰ A cultural climate was created that allowed the reformed Parliament to pass the act to end slavery in the British colonies in 1833. However, the act imposed a period of 'apprenticeship' on slaves until 1838. A national women's petition, carrying 700,000 signatures was organised on behalf of the apprentices and presented to Queen Victoria.²¹ While women were not direct activists they were beginning to step out of their domestic role.

The inclusion of women as subscribers in anti-slavery societies was not only important, both to their recognition by others, but also to their perception of themselves as members of the public whose voluntary activities could advance a philanthropic cause and it also

drew women into a wider public debate. The women's independent petitions signify their increasing determination to have their voices heard and Midgley states that 34 female petitions against slavery were presented to Parliament in 1830-31 and a further 105 in the first half of 1833, when women formed around one third of total signatories.²² In 1833 more than 400,000 women had signed various anti-slavery petitions, using language that reinforced gender relationships and their religious mission, demonstrating their wish to be involved in the anti-slavery movement.²³ While she was becoming interested in the anti-slavery movement at this time, it has been difficult to ascertain whether Mary was a signatory of these petitions. Nevertheless, while women were challenging the exclusion of women from public life and from the anti-slavery movement, they adopted the moral fervour and language of Christian redemption to legitimise their participation. The next section discusses the controversy brought about by the World Anti-slavery Convention held in London.

2.2 The World Anti-slavery Convention

The American anti-slavery campaigner, William Lloyd Garrison, was a radical and his newspaper *The Liberator* denounced not only slavery but also drink, tobacco and the established church as well as advocating women's suffrage. Garrison was extremely unpopular in some circles; he had been dragged through the streets of Boston, wearing a rope around his neck; he later burned a copy of the United States Constitution in public as he believed it linked slave owners to the non-slave-owning states. Garrison and his supporters called for the creation of a new government that prohibited slavery. He contended that the United States Constitution was an illegal document because it denied African Americans their freedom. Garrison believed that if the South would not agree to form a new nation that outlawed slavery he believed the North should secede from the United States. Garrison was extremely critical of the church for its refusal to condemn slavery and his identification of slavery as a sin that implicated all Americans grew out of evangelical cultural perspective that provided a powerful moral and emotional context for abolitionism. Garrison's views were greeted with disagreements in the American Anti-Slavery Society with meetings broken up by shouting and mob violence.²⁴ With radical beliefs such as these it is hardly surprising that many people were suspicious of Garrison as he promoted pacifism and argued that, since both the Church and the state were corrupt, abolitionists should abandon them. To many abolitionists wanting to carry

the struggle against slavery into the centre of political and religious life, Garrison's opinions were unwelcome and counterproductive. The campaign against slavery, which was fought so actively in the nineteenth century, was among the most significant movements of the age in both America and Britain. In practice this meant that abolitionists in both countries could share a common intellectual heritage and formed bonds of friendship which might transcend national boundaries and distinctions. British and American ant-slavery societies were not united and cohesive, but a schismatic, continually and bitterly divided collection of factions who agreed on only one thing - that slavery was a sin and should be abolished.

American women had held their first Anti-Slavery Convention in 1837, when approximately 200 women gathered in New York to discuss their role in the American abolition movement. The dominance of women and the threat to clerical authority, helped to bring about a significant split in the movement in America by 1840. Women asserting the rights of women to be involved with the anti-slavery cause remained with Garrison's organisation.²⁵ It was not until 1840 when the World Anti-Slavery Convention was held in London, that the question of women's equality was brought to the movement's attention. One of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society's first activities was to organize the first international conference in England to celebrate the end of the apprenticeship system and focus attention on the scale of slavery and the slave trade elsewhere, devoted entirely to abolition issues and it attracted delegates from Europe, America and Caribbean countries, as well as delegates from Australia and Ireland. While British and American women were actively involved in anti-slavery campaigns, this did not lead to their inclusion in male organised anti-slavery events. The Garrisonian wing of the anti-slavery movement, however, was staunchly feminist and the Garrison delegation to the convention included women who had made known their interest in other causes such as women's rights. While Garrison had requested the organising committee of the convention that women should be invited, this was not done and there was uproar when the British organisers refused to allow the American female delegates to participate.²⁶

While Amelia Opie, Lady Noel Byron, Elizabeth Pease, Anne Knight and Mary Rawson are seen in the foreground of B.R. Haydon's famous painting of the opening ceremony, the American women were banished to the silent obscurity of the gallery. The male representatives of Garrison's society resigned in protest. Garrison sat with women as a protest at the way they had been treated and consequently was ostracised by the majority

of British abolitionists who had expected him to participate.²⁷ Harriet Martineau noted in a letter to Maria Weston Chapman in July 1840, that 'Garrison was quite right to sit in the gallery at the convention. It has done much for the woman question'.²⁸ The women's male supporters challenged this decision and consequently the first day of the convention was spent in a heated debate over the American women's right to attend.²⁹

The debate was among men only; no women attended as delegates. The British female abolitionists had to watch the debate in silence, as they had only been allowed to attend as non-participants. Ten British men spoke against the acceptance of female delegates and only three men spoke in favour of women. The Radical Unitarian, William Henry Ashurst, stated that 'the anti-slavery cause was under the greatest obligation to the exertions of women, and yet they were going to begin their first Convention by disfranchising their constituency as they did one of creation'.³⁰ George Stacey, speaking on behalf of the Quaker dominated committee of the BFASS, stated they had never contemplated that women should be involved in the convention.³¹ The Society of Friends accepted women's ministry although it did not grant women an equal role within in organisational structure nor approve of public speaking. Several points of disagreement emerged with those opposing the active participation of women citing: firstly, that the custom of the country did not allow such a role for women and that secondly, women already played a central role in anti-slavery without being delegates; thirdly the subject of women's rights was irrelevant to the conference and that as delegates, women would be outside their proper female role.³²

The three supporters of women's involvement were the radicals, Dr John Bowring, a prominent Unitarian politician and a former pupil at Lant Carpenter's school; George Thompson of the Anti-Slavery Society, a leading supporter of Garrison with links to both British and American female abolitionists and Ashurst. The supporters believed that women were already involved in public life and that it was unfair to welcome women's contributions and their funds and then to exclude them from equal participation. Supporters called on the principle of universality and argued that women had as much understanding of anti-slavery principles as men did. This was the first time women's exclusion from national anti-slavery committees and delegate conferences became a matter of debate and for the first time many British women abolitionists began to consider the issues involved.³³

The issue of women's participation contributed to the split between the followers of two American groups: Garrison's Anti-Slavery Society and Lewis Tappan's American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.³⁴ The BFASS had, in refusing to accept female delegates, aligned itself with American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. While the convention had merged the British and American anti-slavery movements into an Anglo-American movement, the rivalry between the Garrisonians and the Tappanites helped to accelerate the pace of activity. This rivalry continued through the 1840s; each group continued to solicit British support and divergent opinions produced a similar split in Great Britain as in America.³⁵

While in the years leading up to the American Civil War, the anti-slavery movement in Britain gained considerable support, it was divided. The most powerful wing was the BFASS founded by the Quaker Joseph Sturge and supported by an older generation of abolitionists such as Thomas Clarkson. This party had close links with its American namesake, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. The three leading male abolitionists who did the most in the 1833-38 period to establish transatlantic links were William Lloyd Garrison, Charles Stuart and George Thompson. They were all promoters of female anti-slavery activism as well as having links to women's societies, and their efforts formed the foundations of the transatlantic sisterhood of women abolitionists which began to flourish in the 1840s and 1850s.³⁶

The next section discusses the anti-slavery campaign in Bristol in more detail.

2.3 Anti-slavery campaigners in Bristol

Bristol had a long history of being involved in slavery, with the slave trade of 'prime importance' to Bristol from as early as 1630.³⁷ By 1713 the mayor of Bristol called it 'one of the great supports of our people'.³⁸ Bristol had been a successful slave port for many years; indeed most of the prosperity of Bristol had been built on wealth connected with slavery. However, in 1788 women in Bristol became involved in the anti-slavery campaign when a public meeting was called at the Guildhall. It was 'well attended with a small coterie of women who were among the original subscribers'.³⁹ In 1823, anti-slavery articles in *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal* began to attract considerable public interest. Although there was a formidable lobby from Bristol's West India Association's management committee who had a financial interest in the continuation of slavery, public meetings were called in Bristol in 1823 to petition Parliament for the gradual abolition of slavery in the British colonies.⁴⁰

Lant Carpenter attended this meeting where, conscious of the distrust of the public of Unitarians, he was both cautious and conciliatory. He agreed to a gradual rather than an immediate emancipation of slaves, 'while attesting to the high character and respectability of many of the planters in England, and having concern with all of those who resided abroad'.⁴¹ By 1824, Lant was responsible for drafting an anti-slavery petition sponsored by the anti-slavery movement, signed by gentlemen, clergy, bankers, merchants and other inhabitants of the city of Bristol and the further four petitions from Bristol, sent between 1826 and 1830, were all drafted by Lant.⁴² Lant had a great deal of difficulty in framing the petition so that it might be acceptable to people in Bristol:

Comprising the timid and the bold; yet [who] were desirous that the hateful yoke should be removed, and those who mistrusted all offers of amelioration, being anxious for speeding emancipation with no compensation to the slave-holder.⁴³

While women were interested in anti-slavery they were certainly not expected to be involved in public meetings. In 1826 an anti-slavery meeting was held in Bristol; only men were reported to have spoken although the published proceedings of the meetings survive and show the Guildhall was 'crowded with a very respectable company ... and the galleries were filled with Ladies'.⁴⁴ Regretfully, the report does not give the names of the ladies watching, but it is likely that Mary Carpenter was among them to hear her father speak, for she regularly accompanied him when he addressed gatherings.⁴⁵

Although women had no direct involvement in organising the 1826 meeting, by 1827 local women, including Hannah More, had established the Bristol and Clifton Auxiliary Anti-Slavery Society. A report from 1829 demonstrates that over 66 women subscribed to the society, drawn from nonconformist and Anglican groups. The formation of this society demonstrates how women in the city were keen to become active participants, rather than just being involved on the periphery, for example by making and selling work bags to raise funds for the movement.⁴⁶ No evidence has been found to show that Mary was involved with this auxiliary society, despite her father's considerable involvement in the campaign. It certainly seems strange that her name is missing from the list of members of the Bristol and Clifton group. It is possible that at age twenty-two she felt she had nothing to contribute; another factor may have been that she had no money of her own and perhaps her parents felt it was unsuitable for her to join possibly as a result of her father's own worries about the distrust in which Unitarians were held, together with Lant's strong views on the role of women.

Links with radical supporters of William Lloyd Garrison in the United States from 1840 into the 1860s were developed and cemented through the strong transatlantic religious networks of Unitarians and Quakers. These networks generated a cosmopolitan outlook and operated at multiple levels; formal organisational links, overseas tours by ministers as well as informal correspondence networks of friends and relations.⁴⁷ Mary became personally involved in the anti-slavery campaign in 1843-4 when she met American campaigners visiting Bristol. Anti-slavery was one of the issues Mary had discussed with Joseph Tuckerman and she was eager to discuss the situation further with the American visitors. Dr S.G. Howe was the first visitor, followed by the Reverend Samuel May of Leicester, Massachusetts, and the Reverend Dr Dewey of New York. Estlin Carpenter believes that 'the interest her father took in the struggle for emancipation gave something of a personal claim upon Mary'.⁴⁸ Samuel May was secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society in America and a supporter of pacifism, temperance and women's rights. His house at Syracuse was a station for the Underground Railroad organisation for escaping slaves, and he himself had taken part in the public rescue of a runaway slave.⁴⁹ Samuel May was responsible for bringing many of the British Unitarians into the anti-slavery field and he maintained a constant correspondence with his British friends.

The friendships that were formed with these visitors enabled Mary to exchange information with her American friends. Letters were accompanied by speeches, biographies and reports on institutions and elementary schooling and Mary's Unitarian network, which spanned Britain and the United States, was crucial in providing 'material, intellectual and moral support' to her development as a social reformer.⁵⁰ Reverend Dr Dewey's emphatic words 'do something' when he visited Bristol, led Mary to ask him what she could do to help. The need for funds for the abolition cause had led to the establishment of an Abolition Fair which was held every Christmas in Boston. Without delay, Mary produced 'some drawings which were highly acceptable and year after year the gifts were renewed'.⁵¹ The Abolition Fair was held in the Faneuil Hall in Boston, organised by a member of Samuel May's anti-slavery committee, Maria Weston Chapman, also editor of Samuel May's anti-slavery paper, *The Liberty Bell*. Maria and Mary became friends by post and instituted the annual 'box', with gifts made by the Carpenter family, friends and, later, pupils at the Ragged School and Red Lodge. Mary wrote to Maria telling her of the indignation felt by her class of ragged boys and girls, who, thinking of the United States as a land of slavery, 'were astonished that it was inhabited by Englishmen'.⁵²

British women's aid to American abolitionists frequently took the form of large donations to anti-slavery bazaars, as well as using the language of sisterhood to call on their American sisters to use their influence to bring about the end of slavery.⁵³ Donations from British supporters enabled the fair in the late 1840s to gross proceeds of US\$3,000-\$4,000 a year.⁵⁴ Bazaars were an area monopolised by women, organising and contributing in a way that was compatible with their duties as homemakers; yet it was also an area which allowed women to be involved in projects outside the home as well as having the opportunity to develop new skills.⁵⁵ In 1844 Mary sent drawings by her sister and herself for the Abolition Fair and 'regrets that there were so many divisions among the abolitionists'.⁵⁶ In 1846 a little sideboard was made by an apprentice and Mary Carpenter told Maria Weston Chapman 'I enclose his note to show you that interest in the object are not just confined to the higher classes'.⁵⁷ In 1847 Mary sent two boxes by different steamers to Boston and told Maria Weston Chapman of the 'little exhibition' held in her drawing room which was visited by more than 200 people.⁵⁸ Their correspondence suggests that Mary can be credited as the organising force behind the boxes sent to America from Bristol to raise funds for the abolition movement as her letters to Maria Weston Chapman demonstrate.⁵⁹ Samuel May wrote to Mary of his delight of the 'most valuable and acceptable box of contributions'.⁶⁰

In Bristol some 300 people, including Mary and Anna Carpenter worked tirelessly for the bazaar. The bazaar was women's principal means of contributing to the American abolitionist campaign as women both made the goods and were the main purchasers. As many as 600 to 700 items were shipped from Bristol alone each year, everything from Mary's drawings to patchwork quilts and knitted socks made by the children of Lewin's Mead Ragged School.⁶¹ On the other hand, while goods sent by British women were gratefully received they also symbolized the international dimensions of anti-slavery and reminded America that the British efforts to abolish slavery had succeeded.⁶² It would appear that at this time of her life Mary was still influenced by her family as to acceptable behaviour for women and found that collecting goods and arranging for their despatch to America was felt to be a suitable way for her to participate in the anti-slavery cause.

The rooms in the Carpenter family's Great George Street home were filled 'for a day or two with the specimens of workmanship which at last amounted to a regular yearly show; and hundreds of visitors poured in to bring some utterance of goodwill'.⁶³ Mary commented 'Our Box is perhaps just arriving in Boston. What a difference, I hope, from those chests of tea'.⁶⁴ In return, the American abolitionists sent sermons, speeches, newspapers and reports. Thus, while the American abolition movement was seen, by necessity, second hand, it played an extremely important part in Mary's nascent political education. Interwoven transatlantic networks of religion and reform were fundamental in encouraging female reformers to radicalise their approach and challenge conventional gender roles; links with radical Garrison abolitionists in the USA from 1840 into the 1870s were developed and cemented through the strong religious networks of Unitarians.

The familial unity of the Bristol Unitarians eased Garrison's task in securing their aid when he visited Bristol in 1846 and this can be illustrated by focusing on Lant Carpenter. His congregation at Lewin's Mead had among its laity Dr Bowring, Dr Estlin and his daughter, Mary, and among its ministers George Armstrong and William James, all prominent Garrisonians. John Estlin, a pioneering ophthalmologist by profession, and family doctor and friend to the Carpenters, was the leading financial supporter and propagandist for the Garrisonians in England. He financed a monthly journal that was published in London called *Anti-Slavery Advocate*. This journal carried the activities of

both political and non-political abolitionists in America and reviewed the publications of both groups while its editorial policy was distinctly Garrisonian.⁶⁵

Mary Carpenter wanted to establish the anti-slavery movement on a broad social basis in Bristol, yet John Estlin felt Mary was too radical in wanting to involve working-class women in the anti-slavery movement. Estlin considered it unladylike for middle-class women to mix with the working classes; a radical move that he felt would undermine respectability, this demonstrates that Unitarian men were censoring the behaviour of women. While the Carpenter siblings were all interested in the reform they all had differing views on anti-slavery issues. William Carpenter had accompanied John Estlin to the Caribbean in 1833 and had strong views on the subject. Perhaps Mary resented the fact that as a woman she was expected to stay at home while her brother Russell, whom she supported by her teaching in her mother's school, was free to travel extensively for a year in the United States in 1858, visiting Samuel May and travelling over 12,000 miles in meeting with anti-slavery groups.⁶⁶

It is difficult to ascertain Mary Carpenter's feelings in relation to the British anti-slavery movement as most of the documentation relates to the trans-Atlantic aspect. Mary told the Reverend Livermore in a letter in 1848 that she felt that 'Slavery is unparalleled, both in its intrinsic wickedness and by its collateral. It is not satisfied with crushing the body, it crushes the soul as much as any human force can do'.⁶⁷ The disagreements over anti-slavery issues among the Carpenter siblings caused Mary to write to Samuel May in 1844 asking him to explain to her the controversy concerning anti-slavery campaigning in America. After discussing the early background to the campaigns he told her that:

The cry was raised against Mr Garrison and his friends that they were infidels - they sought the destruction of the church, the overthrow of Christianity, French Republicanism and Jacobinism were all ascribed to Mr G. and believed all over the country, just as the slanders about Unitarianism and its supporters had been spread all over the land, and by the same men...The prosecutors of the anti-slavery cause perfectly demonstrated that the American churches were the chief supporters of slavery and they openly defended slavery, from reason and from the Bible.⁶⁸

May also stated that he saw no probability of healing the differences existing among the American abolitionists.⁶⁹ While Mary was a staunch supporter of William Lloyd Garrison and respected his sincerity she was alarmed by the violence of his language and actions,

particularly his torrents of invectives against slave-owners. Mary also had concerns that involvement in anti-slavery should not mean other social ills should be ignored. Mary wrote to Garrison telling him that she believed that anti-slavery enthusiasm should not be used, as sometimes has happened in the past, to muffle social injustice at home. She told him 'the Unitarians do not shut the Lord's table against any'.⁷⁰ She also had concerns about the differences of view among the American campaigners, saying to Garrison 'that there are so many divisions among the Abolitionists and especially that this question about the Constitution so interferes with their unanimity'.⁷¹ Manton states that Mary continued to show friendship and hospitality towards all sections of the anti-slavery movement.⁷² Perhaps Mary's ambiguity was the result of the varying differing opinions in the Carpenter household. This would also explain Mary Estlin's criticism of the Carpenter family; she believed that among the defects that Garrisonians saw in Russell Carpenter and in his sister Mary whom they believed he had indoctrinated, was an inability to see Garrisonianism as the most important representative of abolitionism. They tended to see the Carpenter siblings as 'injudicious and intolerant' and 'they loathed [Russell's'] regarding the antislavery movement as [just] one branch of reform and not necessary the [most] important'. Certainly Russell seemed unpopular; he was described as having a 'frigid personality ... and he was disliked as he tended not to be enthusiastic about anything'; John Estlin described him as a 'wet blanket'.⁷³

While Samuel May had published, anonymously, Mary's article on the British working-classes, Mary's sense of propriety was outraged when Garrison attempted to print her private letters of sympathy to him in *The Liberator*. She would only agree to extracts appearing over the signature 'an English Lady'.⁷⁴ Later she wrote to Maria Weston Chapman saying how displeased she was about the situation.⁷⁵ Estlin Carpenter noted:

Mary Carpenter has at this time a peculiar horror of publicity, and had been sorely troubled at the appearance in print of some of her antislavery poems, and passages from her letter to Mr Garrison and others, with her signature.⁷⁶

Mary offered her name to the anti-slavery cause saying 'Do not imagine that we shrink from avowing your cause: far otherwise, we glory in it as far as is consistent with our notions of female propriety here in England'.⁷⁷ Mary, despite her compelling reformist talents and cultural networks, was stifled by the Unitarian conventions of female propriety.

After Garrison's visit to England in 1846, Mary wrote to Maria Weston Chapman linking the visit of Garrison with the American reformer, Joseph Tuckerman. While approving of Garrison she felt:

Though we may feel as we do with regard to Mr Garrison, some will be repelled from the subject by his visit and a very large number, which hating slavery, will have been repelled from the Abolitionists by his language on many occasions, and by his entering on subjects which they think quite foreign to slavery, and on which they consider that he holds very injurious views.⁷⁸

Mary certainly admired Garrison and although she also certainly had reservations about his radical tactics, she developed a close friendship with him. Mary and William Garrison became lifelong friends and she considered it a 'great privilege', even though she did not always agree with his methods.⁷⁹ Once again it seems that Mary has been attracted to a strong male figure, particularly after her father's death.

Mary established close relationships with a number of other leading American abolitionists, including Maria Weston Chapman, Frederick Douglass,⁸⁰ the Reverend Samuel May⁸¹ and Eliza Follen.⁸² Importantly the extensive correspondence between Mary and the American abolitionists also demonstrates a discourse of political, not simply moral expression. The link between Mary's religious beliefs and abolition is demonstrated in *Morning and Evening Meditations*, published anonymously in 1845 for private circulation. The book can be described as a collection of guided meditations, usually scripture based, designed to be used privately or within a family group; in her journal, she dedicated the book to her father's memory:

My father, I have this day made thee a little offering; perhaps in another world I may be permitted to tell thee how I rejoiced to have associated with thee my humble efforts to help others in their morning and evening thoughts of the spiritual.⁸³

The dedication within the book read 'A First Offering of Love and Gratitude to the Memory of a Revered Father'. In this book, and her later book *Spirit Voices and Spirit Pictures*, published posthumously, Mary included prayers such as *Prayer to my Father*, which further demonstrate her devotion to her father.⁸⁴

Although still unknown in England, Mary became a recognized figure in American liberal circles when Samuel May arranged the publication of *Morning and Evening Meditations* in Boston. The first edition sold out in months, was reprinted in Britain and

America and ran to a total of six editions.⁸⁵ Mary's later books, detailing her ideas for education, reformatory schools and prison reform, were also well received in America. Despite being dependent on her mother financially, Mary donated the proceeds of the book to Reverend May, thanking him for:

All the trouble you have taken with my little volume. I am glad that my name does not, after all, appear, much as I rejoice in it, both Christian and surname ... I wished that you would devote the proceeds to some good cause, probably the Antislavery, or the Ministry at Large.⁸⁶

While Mary Carpenter was unable to travel to America herself, Harriet Martineau, a school friend and relative of Mary, travelled extensively in America; she attended an anti-slavery meeting in Boston as well as witnessing slavery. The efforts of women anti-slavery campaigners in America gained greater publicity when Martineau wrote at length about American abolitionism. On her return to England, Martineau published *Theory and Practice of Society in America* (1837) highlighting the contradiction between the principles of the American Declaration of Independence and the practice of excluding both black people and women.⁸⁷ Martineau also aligned herself with the Garrisonian wing of American abolitionism and, despite contradictory politics, managed to balance patriarchal attitudes with active feminism. She did this through her alignment of women's conventional domestic acquiescence with a 'female ratification' of male ideas.⁸⁸

While the link between the anti-slavery campaign and the movement for women's rights both in Britain and America has been noted, in the United States women looked to the radical wing of the abolitionist movement for support. It united the rights of enslaved women with American women's assertion of their own rights to speak at meetings.⁸⁹ In contrast, women campaigners in Britain, with a few exceptions, proved reluctant to raise the issue of their own rights within the movement and tried to avoid linking together abolition and feminism. Rather, their rhetoric was based on assertions of their own privileges as women, and the desire to extend these privileges to others. While American women were linking anti-slavery with rights for women, in Britain middle-class women, even the most radical, sought to keep anti-slavery as a single issue campaign. Thus the separation of slavery and women's rights contradicted the abolitionist-feminist discourse developed by women in the United States, not only because of the differing political cultures but also because of the differing dynamics of race, class and gender in the two nations. However, while many women

sympathised with demands for female emancipation this was not universal and for many, including Mary, their first loyalty was to the anti-slavery cause. Despite their different agendas as British and American women worked together in their concerns over slavery. Indeed, links with Unitarian supporters of William Lloyd Garrison in America encouraged some British women, including the ladies of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-slavery Society (BCLASS), to question the conservatism of the male national leadership of BFASS which will be discussed in the next section.

2.4 The Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-slavery Society

The formation of groups such as the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-slavery Society marked a change from abolition as an individual commitment, to anti-slavery as a collective female endeavour. BCLASS was founded at the Temperance Hotel, Bath Street, Bristol, on 17th September 1840, as an auxiliary of the Quaker-run British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (BFASS). BCLASS intended to 'conduct a religious, moral and pacific campaign' and Mary was the secretary for its duration.⁹⁰ The women were supported by a short-lived radical paper, the *Bristol Examiner* which also supported adult suffrage, women's rights, and temperance among other causes.⁹¹ The group held meetings in members' homes to raise funds for the parent society and most of its members were from Dissenting religious groups, as highlighted in *Chart One*.

Chart One
Religious affiliation of the members of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society members.⁹²

Congregational	11
Quakers	13
Unitarian	4
Baptist	2
Unknown	5

Like Mary, many of the women in the group were involved in other local philanthropic work. Seven of this group were the wives of Baptist or Congregationalists ministers; there were two

Dorcus Society members; three women were collectors for the Bristol City Mission Ladies Association; another woman was a member of Mary's Visiting and Working Society while another lady sat on the General Hospital Ladies' Committee.⁹³

In its early years the society seemed to work quietly, raising small amounts of money in support of schools for freed slaves, making articles for the Massachusetts Female Emancipation Society annual Boston bazaar and petitioning against the return of freed slaves. The society also aided emancipated slaves in the West Indies, fugitives in Canada as well as American anti-slavery organisations approved by the parent society, BFASS.⁹⁴ In September 1846 Mary heard William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass, a former slave, address an anti-slavery meeting in Bristol; the presence in Britain of these men reinforced the position of pro-Garrisonian women abolitionists. Frederick Douglass was a man of striking looks, a fiery orator, intelligent and educated and he made a particularly favourable impression on women in England and Ireland on his anti-slavery lecture tours.⁹⁵ Mary noted the effect Douglass had on the Bristol ladies attending his lectures, telling Maria Chapman Weston 'we saw one or two who seemed rather absurd in their over attention'.⁹⁶

However, John Estlin had some ambivalent ideas: instead of approving of Frederick Douglass for encouraging more British women to become involved in the anti-slavery cause, Estlin remarked 'My fear is that often associating so much with white women of education and refined taste, he [Douglass] will fill a 'craving void' when he returns to his own family'.⁹⁷ Estlin implied that any interracial contact between the sexes held dangers of impropriety for women.⁹⁸ John Estlin obviously had not considered the effect that an attractive black man would have on the Bristol ladies; perhaps he felt that escaped slaves in England should be considered working-class and therefore of no interest to white middle-class women. Estlin's male jealousy underlines his belief that the concept of black men associating with white women was improper and had the possibility of disrupting gender, race and class.

Garrisonism and feminism remained distinct minority positions within the British anti-slavery movement but continued to create tensions, sometimes together and also as separate issues.⁹⁹ After William Lloyd Garrison's visit to Bristol, BCLASS began to show a greater independence from the parent society. The group shifted towards Garrisonism and

dissatisfaction with BFASS in 1851. This more active stance can be traced to male and female members of the Estlin and Carpenter families with Mary Estlin joining the committee in 1851.¹⁰⁰ An address from British Unitarians to American Unitarians to persuade them to oppose slavery more strongly was signed only by the adult male member of each congregation demonstrating again how women were excluded.¹⁰¹ Henceforth the independent society was the base for Mary Estlin's emergence as a national advocate of Garrisonism in England.¹⁰² BCLASS began a period of distributing pamphlets written in defence of Garrison to local anti-slavery associations who still supported the BFASS propaganda.¹⁰³ One of the BCLASS first undertakings was to publish in 1852 *Statements respecting the American Abolitionists; by their Opponents and Their Friends: Indicating the Present Struggle between Slavery and Freedom in the United States of America*, compiled by Mary as secretary. This document urged ministers of all denominations attending the annual anti-slavery conference in London not to offer access to their pulpits to any visiting American clergy who had refused to condemn the Fugitive Slave Act.¹⁰⁴ The BCLASS pamphlet was distributed to more than 250 nonconformist ministers and religious associations in England, as well as to 53 associations and 300 other individuals.¹⁰⁵ As a result a number of religious organisations, as well as ladies' anti-slavery societies agreed to take up the issue. The decision of the parent society, BFASS, to act was partly in response to the women's prompting, and during BCLASS's existence it was instrumental in changing official policy towards the Fugitive Slave Act.¹⁰⁶ Mary Carpenter had written to Samuel May after the passing of the Fugitive Slave Law, saying:

I feel obliged to put a strong curb on myself when speaking on the subject, so awful an offence does it appear to me is being committed by your nation against humanity, against itself, against God ... May you, Mr Garrison, and all others who are true to their trust, have divine grace to fight this battle in the spirit of the Lord.¹⁰⁷

BCLASS had become frustrated owing to the failure of the BFASS to make practical suggestions for action and a clear statement of its policy towards the American Societies.¹⁰⁸ Other groups of Dissenting women such as Quakers Anne Knight of Chelmsford, Elizabeth Pease of Darlington and Elizabeth Wigham of Edinburgh, had also become critical of the BFASS and became supporters of Garrison. Anne Knight and her friends, including Mary Estlin, began to question women's subordinate role in British anti-slavery organisations and to make links between anti-slavery, peace and Chartists. These developments alarmed the main-stream evangelicals who dominated the

transatlantic anti-slavery societies, and they sought to discredit their opponents by branding them as religious infidels. Relations between the BCLASS and the national organisation deteriorated, the crisis coinciding with the visit of Maria Weston Chapman and her family. These women convinced their Bristol sisters that concentrated on marginal aspects of abolitionism and ignored the important work of American Garrisonians.

Mary Estlin persuaded the group to take a more aggressive stance and give further support to the Garrisonians. She persuaded BCLASS to sever its connection with BFASS in November 1851 because of the latter's anti-radical stance, and it then became an independent body.¹⁰⁹ It was the first and only auxiliary of the BFASS to take this step.¹¹⁰ Members of the society also produced a Special Report explaining their course of action; it was widely circulated to local anti-slavery associations and newspaper editors.¹¹¹ After splitting from the BFASS the BCLASS remained formally independent of both wings of the anti-slavery movement and decided its own policy on anti-slavery rather than looking to America for guidance. Mary Estlin explained to American Garrisonians that they must be content with a 'co-alition (sic) and not a union'.¹¹² Yet the BCLASS feared it was becoming an 'isolated clique', viewed with suspicion by many evangelicals and orthodox Quakers.¹¹³ At the end of 1853 the illness of John Estlin, Mary Estlin's father, brought much of their work to a halt because they could find no other 'gentleman' to assist them in organising public meetings and other events 'beyond the scope of a ladies' society'.¹¹⁴

Estlin Carpenter noted in 1847 that Mary had found a 'new ardour' and was more and more occupied with her growing interest in the Lewin's Mead Ragged School. He noted:

That the bondage of the soul in which she found the wild youths of Lewin's Mead entangled, appeared to her to be not less but rather more terrible than positive slavery; and though she did not admit the analogy when it was urged by those who were but lukewarm in the cause of Abolition, she was not unwilling to use it in justification of her own devotion to the cause.¹¹⁵

While Mary became more interested in her educational projects the Ragged School she had a lifetime interest in anti-slavery which is discussed in the next section.

2.5 Mary Carpenter's later involvement in anti-slavery issues

The emerging feminist movement, which provided a new vehicle for feminist reform, can be identified as an important element in the ferment of political and social reform in Britain. For many British women abolitionists, feminism became the new focus of their political energies and a concern for the suffering of enslaved and freed black women abroad was displaced by growing awareness of the subordinate position of women within British society. Thus the anti-slavery movement was not transformed into a lasting mass campaign nor did it continue to offer either practical aid or political support for emancipated slaves.¹¹⁶ While Mary was not yet openly advocating women's rights, other Unitarian women were linking anti-slavery with women's rights, for example, for Elizabeth Reid (1789-1866) and Mary Howitt (1799-1888) anti-slavery and women's rights were two of a range of radical reforms they supported.¹¹⁷

A more serious threat to the balance between British and American anti-slavery groups was the American Civil War. The close ties between the two meant that British abolitionists could understand the complexities of the war and consequently found it difficult to adopt a clear cut policy. Mary found the American Civil War 'both bewilderment and a grief' seeing each month of the Civil War increasing hatred between North and South, 'strengthening the worst passions in both'.¹¹⁸ She wrote to her friends in Boston; 'I much regret that there are so many divisions among the Abolitionists and especially this question about the Constitution so interferes with their unanimity'.¹¹⁹ Mary told Samuel May 'Until all men are free and equal in the United States, they will not be entitled to the respect of a free nation ... we are working zealously in Bristol for the Freedmen'.¹²⁰ As more and more slaves were freed, between the implementation of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation in January 1863 and the end of the American Civil War in 1865, British abolitionists became increasingly concerned with providing the freed slaves with practical aid and education. The Freedmen's Aid Society was formed in 1863 as a continuance of the fight against slavery and involved many families with a history of anti-slavery campaigning. The same year women in Bristol issued an appeal 'to the friends of abolition', urging them to contribute money towards the education and clothing of freed slaves through a network of female collectors in England, Scotland and Ireland.¹²¹ When the American Civil War was over, Mary sent an annual subscription of five pounds towards teachers for freed-men and women, 'wishing it could have more, the

work is not done as long as the equal rights of man, irrespective of colour, are not acknowledged and protected'.¹²² Mary continued her interest in anti-slavery throughout her life; in 1865 she was busy preparing articles and drawings for the Freeman's Aid Association when she visited by Dr W.S. Gannett. He was a prominent abolitionist and she told him 'My anti-slavery interest is half a century old and cannot die out while anything can be done'.¹²³

In 1873 Mary set out to visit the American friends she had made through the Unitarian network. Watts states that Mary was astonished and impressed to discover that women were successfully 'holding position of trust in the treasury at Washington, in all levels of education, in printing offices and hospitals', based on a thoroughly good education equal to that received by boys. She hoped that this would be emulated in England.¹²⁴ She spent three weeks in Boston, where Unitarians were not the small minority they were in Britain; Harriet Beecher Stowe observed 'All the literary men of Massachusetts were Unitarians. All the elite of wealth and fashion crowded Unitarian churches; the judges in the bench were Unitarian'.¹²⁵

Mary, as an acknowledged expert, gave addresses on India, education and reformatories. Old friends gathered around her, with William Lloyd Garrison at their head, with affection and interest. In this environment, Mary found to her genuine bewilderment that she was a heroine; everybody wanted to meet her and hear her speak. Manton believed that Mary felt she was being honoured as her father's child.¹²⁶ Mary expounded Lant Carpenter's *Harmony of the Gospel* to a puzzled audience, saying 'the life of Christ was so associated in my mind with my father, that I can no more disbelieve one than the other'.¹²⁷ At the age of 64, Mary was still using her father's words, seemingly unable to accept that she was being feted for her own reforming work.

Mary Carpenter visited William Lloyd Garrison who, after the end of the Civil War, had closed *The Liberator* and retired. In memory of their long friendship Mary requested that he send her his photograph; 'I hope you will'.¹²⁸ From Boston, Mary left for New York to visit its prisons where she was asked to deliver an address on prison reform. Having only one day available, a Sunday, she lectured on prison reform from the pulpit of the largest church in Hartford, before travelling to Virginia and Washington to meet Frederick Douglass. 'Her eloquence' in her speech on prison reform, it was reported in

one of the papers the next day, was the eloquence of a ‘consecrated conviction, and of perfect familiarity with her theme, which gave all she said, the highest interest’.¹²⁹ A public lecture from a church pulpit demonstrates Mary’s acceptance of her public role as a world authority and is in marked difference to 1851 when she had her papers read at the Birmingham Conference on Reformatory Schools. The acclaim that greeted Mary in America was in contrast to the resentment she had felt earlier in her life when she saw her brother visiting America while she had been left to teach in her mother’s school. Mary also visited the South to see some of the colleges for freed men and women to which she subscribed and travelled to Virginia to see the ‘scene of some frightful struggles and know the slaves are free’.¹³⁰

Later Mary travelled to Montreal, to visit her brother Philip and his wife, where in ten days she addressed ‘seven meetings and visited ten prisons amazing all by her stamina’.¹³¹ She reported that ‘the state of the City Prison was the worst I have ever seen’; after giving her reports to the Mayor and City Council, she wrote to Lord Dufferin, at Government House, Ottawa, demanding the matter to be addressed. On 27th July 1873, Mary wrote ‘I am thankful to believe that my coming here has been of greater use than I expected’.¹³²

While the role of women in anti-slavery campaigns had become more prominent after the world anti-slavery convention in London, women’s role was still constrained. Mary had become initially interested in anti-slavery issues following the lead of her father and her life-long correspondence with campaigners testifies to her life-long commitment. Yet circumstances prevented Mary becoming more involved in the Bristol and Clifton Anti-Slavery Society due to her increasing role in education for the poor children she saw around her in Lewin’s Mead which will be discussed in the next chapter.

- ¹ Mary Carpenter to Samuel May 1865, cited in Carpenter, J.E, *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Macmillan & Co, 1879, p.243.
- ² Midgley, Clare, 'Anti-Slavery Campaigning in Britain' in Grant, Joan, *Women, Migration and Empire*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books, 1996, p.75.
- ³ Walvin, James, *Britain's Slave Empire*, Stroud, Tempus, 2000, Introduction.
- ⁴ This act gave all slaves in the British Empire their freedom.
- ⁵ Midgley, Clare, *Women against Slavery: The British Campaigns- 1780-1870*, Routledge, 1982, p.58
- ⁶ Members included Thomas Clarkson, William Wilberforce, Thomas Fowell Buxton, Elizabeth Heyrick, Mary Lloyd, Elizabeth Pease and Anne Knight
- ⁷ 'Address to the Ladies of Great Britain', *The Humming Bird*, Vol.1, No 7, June 1825.
- ⁸ Billington, Louis and Rosamund, 'A Burning Zeal for Righteousness': Women in the British Anti-Slavery Movement, 1820-1860', pp.83 in Jane Rendall (ed.) *Equal or Different*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- ⁹ Stott, Anne, *Hannah More: The First Victorian*, Oxford University Press, 2003, p.21.
- ¹⁰ Billington, *Burning Zeal*, p.90
- ¹¹ 'The First, Second, Third and Fifth Reports of the Female Society for Birmingham, West Bromwich, Wednesbury and their Respective Neighbourhoods, for the Relief of the British Negro Slave', Birmingham, B. Hudson, 1826-1828, 1830' cited in Midgley, *Anti-Slavery Campaigning*, p.77.
- ¹² Midgley, *Anti-Slavery Campaigning*, p.192
- ¹³ Midgley, Clare, (ed.) *Gender and Imperialism*, Manchester University Press, 1988, p.164.
- ¹⁴ Young, R.J.C, *Colonial Desire, Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, Routledge, 1995.
- ¹⁵ Midgley, *Women against Slavery*, p.204
- ¹⁶ 'Extract from the journal of Anna Gurney and Sarah Buxton', Buxton Papers, Vol,XII, pp.111-13, MSS British Empire, S.444, Rhodes House Library, Oxford.
- ¹⁷ Cited in Midgley, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform' p.143 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ¹⁸ Midgley, *Women against slavery*, p.103.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid*, p.110.
- ²⁰ *Ibid*, p.83.
- ²¹ *Ibid*, p.67.
- ²² *Ibid*, p.67.
- ²³ Stott, Anne, 'Women and Religion,' p.113 in Barker, H. and Chalus, E. *Women's History, Britain, 1700-1850*, Routledge, 1995.
- ²⁴ Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Street*, Heinemann, 1976, p.77.
- ²⁵ Rendall, Jane, *The Origins of Modern Feminism, Women in Britain, France and the United States*, Macmillan, 1985, p.252.
- ²⁶ Gleadle, Kathryn, *British Women in the Nineteenth-century*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2001, p.74.
- ²⁷ Ware, V, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* Longmans, 1998, p.85.
- ²⁸ Chapman, Maria Weston & Harriet Martineau (ed.) *Harriet Martineau Autobiography*, Vol.1. Boston, James R. Osgood & Co, 1877, p.58.
- ²⁹ *Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention Called by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and Held in London, From Friday, June 12th Tuesday 23rd, 1840*, John and Barrett, 1841.
- ³⁰ *The Liberator*, 24th July, 1840, p.119.
- ³¹ Midgley, *Women against slavery*, p.159.
- ³² *Ibid*, p.159.
- ³³ *Ibid*, pp.159-60.
- ³⁴ Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists*, p.2-3.
- ³⁵ Fladeland, Betty, *Men and Brothers: Anglo American Antislavery Cooperation*, Chicago and London, University of Illinois Press, 1972, p.273.
- ³⁶ Midgley, *Women against Slavery*, p.129. Stuart and Thompson were the leadings agents of the Universal Abolition Society which was founded with the aim of aiding American abolitionists and campaigning against foreign involvement in the slave trade.
- ³⁷ MacInnes, C.M, 'Bristol and Overseas Expansion', p.227, in MacInnes C.M. & W.F. Whittard, *Bristol and its Adjoining Counties*, Bristol, British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1955.
- ³⁸ Hunt, William, *Bristol*, Longmans, Green & Co, 1887, pp.214.
- ³⁹ BRO 17562, Papers and Prints collected by John Bishop Estlin, together with miscellaneous documents.
- ⁴⁰ Carpenter, Russell Lant, (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverend Carpenter* Bristol, Philip & Evans, 1842, p.271.
- ⁴¹ *Bristol Auxiliary Anti-Slavery Society; Reports of Proceedings from the Formation of the Institution to the 31st December, 1830*, Bristol, 1831, pp.6-16.

- ⁴² MacInnes, C.M, *Bristol: A Gateway of Empire*, Newton Abbott, David and Charles, 1968, pp.350-51.
- ⁴³ Carpenter, Russell Lant, (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverend Carpenter* Bristol, Philip & Evans, 1842, p.272-3.
- ⁴⁴ For the most recent study of Barbauld, see William McCarthy, *Anna Letitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment*, Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- ⁴⁵ BRL B3128 *Bristol Auxiliary Anti-Slavery Society, Report of proceedings from the formations of the institution to 1830*. Bristol, T.D. Clark; MacInnes, *Bristol*, pp.350-51.
- ⁴⁶ BRL B3218 Mrs, Towell, Mrs Foote, Mrs Bonville Mrs M. Wright, Miss F. Wright and Miss L Wright, *Bristol Auxiliary meeting; Report of the proceedings from the formation of the institution to 31st December 1830*, Bristol, 1830.
- ⁴⁷ Midgley, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform' p.145 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ⁴⁸ Carpenter, J. E., (1879) *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, New Jersey, 1974, p.69, p.76..
- ⁴⁹ The rescued slave was a Mr Jerry McHenry. Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter*, p.76.
- ⁵⁰ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"', p.43 in Hilton, M., & P. Hirsch (eds.) *Practical Visionaries, Women Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Harlow, Pearson Education, 2000.
- ⁵¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.70.
- ⁵² Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomydearmr00carp10>.
- ⁵³ Midgely, *Women against Slavery*, p.132.
- ⁵⁴ Taylor, Clare, *British and American Abolitionists. An Episode in Transatlantic Understanding*, Edinburgh University Press, 1974, p.86.
- ⁵⁵ Prochaska, F, *The voluntary Impulse- Philanthropy in Modern Britain*, Faber, 1988, p.57.
- ⁵⁶ <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomrschapm00carp>,
- ⁵⁷ <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomydearmr00carp>
- ⁵⁸ <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomrschapm00carp10>
- ⁵⁹ Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, <http://www.archive.org/details/lettertomrschapm00carp9>, <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomydearmr00carp11> <http://www.archive.org/details/lettertomrschapm00carp2>, <http://www.archive.org/details/lettertomrschapm00carp12> <http://www.archive.org/details/lettertomrschapm00carp>,
- ⁶⁰ Letter: Samuel May to Carpenter; December 1845, *The May Papers*, Ms.B.1.6. Vol 3 1849-1849.
- ⁶¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.9: One of Mary Carpenter's drawings at the Abolition Fair was bought by Theodore Parker. Mary instructed her brother Russell, a correspondent of Parker, to tell him 'how much delighted I am that he looks with pleasure of my drawing of Gethsemane. I am much pleased that my pencil should give any interesting thoughts'. Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.74.
- ⁶² Letter: Mary Kenney to William Lloyd Garrison, May 1st 1841. SFAS Records, EPI cited in Jeffrey, Julie Roy, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism*, Chapel Hill, the University of North Carolina Press, 1998, p.123.
- ⁶³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.70.
- ⁶⁴ Letter: *Mary Carpenter to Maria Chapman*: Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library: MS A.9.2, Vol. 23, No 170.
- ⁶⁵ Fladeland, Betty, *Men and Brothers: Anglo American Antislavery Co-operation*, Chicago and London, University of Illinois Press, 1972, p.359.
- ⁶⁶ Carpenter, Russell, *Observations on American Slavery after a year's tour in the United States*, Edward T. Whitfield, 1852.
- ⁶⁷ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.90.
- ⁶⁸ Letter: Samuel May to Mary Carpenter, 28th October 1844: MS.B.1.6 *The May Papers*, No .6.
- ⁶⁹ Letter: *ibid*, MS.B.1.6 *The May Papers*, No .6.
- ⁷⁰ Letter: Carpenter to William Lloyd Garrison, no date, cited in Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter*, p.78
- ⁷¹ Cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.77.
- ⁷² Cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.78.
- ⁷³ Strange, Douglas Charles, *British Unitarians against American Slavery 1833-65*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 1984, p.127.
- ⁷⁴ Letter: Samuel May to Mary Carpenter, December, 1845, MS.B 1.6 Vol.3 1845-1849, *The May papers*, No.7.
- ⁷⁵ Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomydearmr00carp6>,
- ⁷⁶ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.96.

- ⁷⁷ Letter: *Carpenter to William Lloyd Garrison*, Boston Public Library, MS A.9.2, Vol.23, No.17
- ⁷⁸ Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, <http://www.archive.org/details/lettertomrschapm00carp5>.
- ⁷⁹ Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, <http://www.archive.org/details/letterstomydearmr00carp2>.
- ⁸⁰ Letter: *Mary Carpenter to Frederick Douglass*. Rhodes House Library: Anti-slavery papers C.128/112-3.
- ⁸¹ For example, Letters: *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, October 13, 1844; *Mary Carpenter, to Samuel May*, 15th January, 1845; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 15th February 1846; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 16th June, 1847; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 12th June 1848; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 6th April, 1850; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 5th October, 1850; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 5th October, 1850; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 29th May, 1852; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 16th April, 1864; *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, 5th June, 1865 cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.71-2; p.73; p.96-7; pp.99-100, pp.102-4; p.p.238-9; p.243. Samuel May's diary and papers are held at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- ⁸² Cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp. 71, 72, 73-4, 94-5, 100, 157.
- ⁸³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.66
- ⁸⁴ Carpenter, Mary, 'Prayer to my Father', *Spirit Voices and Spirit Pictures*, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877.
- ⁸⁵ First published anonymously in 1845 as *Meditations and Prayers*, but afterwards the title was changed to *Morning and Evening Meditations* and her name appended
- ⁸⁶ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.96.
- ⁸⁷ Martineau's articles in the *Westminster Review* (1837) brought the matter of the struggle for abolition of the slave trade in America.
- ⁸⁸ David, Deidre, *Intellectual Women and Victorian Patriarchy*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1987, p.227.
- ⁸⁹ Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists*, p.4.
- ⁹⁰ BCLASS, 12th September, 1840, cited in Gorsky, M, *Patterns of Philanthropy: Charity and Society in Nineteenth-century Bristol*, The Royal Historical Society, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 1999, p.173.
- ⁹¹ *Bristol Examiner*, January 1850, August and September 1951,
- ⁹² Gorsky, M, *Patterns of Philanthropy: Charity and Society in Nineteenth-century Bristol*, The Royal Historical Society, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1999 pp.174-5.
- ⁹³ B7065/B7060: *Lewin's Mead Domestic Mission Society*.
- ⁹⁴ Billington, *A Burning Zeal for Righteousness*, p.101.
- ⁹⁵ Baker, *The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass*, p.268. Frederick Douglass (1817?-1895) was born a slave in Maryland and for several years he had delivered passionate speeches for anti-slavery organisations in American and in 1845 his autobiography, *Narrative of the Life of Fredrick Douglass*, was published and became an immediate success. In 1847, Hugh Auld formally registered a bill of manumission for Frederick Bailey, otherwise called Frederick Douglass. However, many staunch anti-slavery advocates believed Douglass should not have allowed himself to be purchased from his owner, thus tacitly acknowledging the right of one man to buy another. In 1847 Douglass was finally able to take passage back to the United States to visit his family and continue his efforts on behalf of the United States anti-slavery movement.
- ⁹⁶ Letter: *Mary Carpenter to Maria Weston Chapman* Vo.23, No.17, Boston Public Library, Ms.A.9.2.
- ⁹⁷ Midgley, *Women against slavery*, p.141.
- ⁹⁸ *Anti-Slavery Report*, 3rd Series, Vol.1. August 1853 pp.175-76 cited in Lorimer, Douglas A, *Colour, Class and the Victorians: English Attitudes to the Negro in the Mid-Nineteenth-century*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1978, p.58.
- ⁹⁹ Billington, *A Burning Zeal*, p.101.
- ¹⁰⁰ BLASS. 10th September, 1846, cited in Gorsky, *Patterns of Philanthropy*, p.173.
- ¹⁰¹ Strange, *British Unitarians*, p.102.
- ¹⁰² Mary Estlin was influential in founding the Leeds Anti-Slavery Association, a largely Unitarian group.
- ¹⁰³ Letter: *Mary Estlin to Maria Weston Chapman* Bristol, 26th February 1852, MS A.7.3 p.43, *Minute Book of the BCLASS* 19th February and May 1852; Bristol & Clifton Anti-Slavery Society: *Statements Respecting the American Abolitionists; by the Opponents and their Friends: Indicating the Present Struggle Between Slavery and Freedom in the U.S.A.* Dublin, Webb & Chapman, 1852.
- ¹⁰⁴ Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-slavery Society, *Statements respecting the American Abolitionists: by their opponents and friends*, Dublin, Webb & Chapman, 1852.
- ¹⁰⁵ Midgley, *Women against slavery*, p.135
- ¹⁰⁶ The Fugitive Slave Act stated that captured runaway slaves had to be returned to their owner.
- ¹⁰⁷ Letter: *Mary Carpenter to Samuel May*, Bristol, May 29th, 1851 cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.102.
- ¹⁰⁸ Midgley, *Women against Slavery*, p.133.

- ¹⁰⁹ Mary Estlin compiled a list of eight charges against the BFASS and set about drawing attention of all other groups associated with the BFASS to inform them of the reasons their separation.
- ¹¹⁰ Midgley, *Women against slavery*, p.134.
- ¹¹¹ 'Special Report of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society', *Minute Book of BLASS*, 16th September, 1852.
- ¹¹² Letter: Mary Estlin to Caroline Weston, 21st March, 1852, M.S, A.9.2. Vol 26, No19, Boston Public Library.
- ¹¹³ *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, June 1854 cited in Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists*, p.414.
- ¹¹⁴ Anne Tribe to L.A. Chamerovzow, Kingsdown, Bristol, 5th December 1853, Anti-Slavery Collection, Rhodes House, Oxford.
- ¹¹⁵ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.94
- ¹¹⁶ Midgley, *Women against Slavery*, p.196.
- ¹¹⁷ Mary Howitt was friends with both Garrison and Frederick Douglass and in 1856 she demonstrated her feminist commitment by becoming secretary of the committee for a petition for a Married Woman's Property Act.
- ¹¹⁸ Boston Public Library, MS a2, Vol 34, p.94, no further details cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.186.
- ¹¹⁹ Probably written to Maria Weston Chapman but no reference given in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.77.
- ¹²⁰ Letter: Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, June 5th 1865, Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.243.
- ¹²¹ A sewing circle, of around eighty to ninety Unitarian women, was set up by Frances Armstrong and Mary Estlin to make clothes for the Freedmen. Midgley, *Women against slavery*, p.188; 'The emancipated American slaves'. Bristol, Ackland, 1863 cited in Midgley, *Women against Slavery*, p.187.
- ¹²² Letter: Mary Carpenter to Samuel May: Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, MS A.2.
- ¹²³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.244.
- ¹²⁴ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"' p.48 in Hilton, M. & Hirsch, P, *Practical Visionaries: Women, Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Longman, 2000. .
- ¹²⁵ Wilbur, 'A History of Unitarianism', p.436 cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.220.
- ¹²⁶ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.220.
- ¹²⁷ Manton, *ibid*, p.220.
- ¹²⁸ Letter: Mary Carpenter to William Lloyd Garrison, Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, MS A2 Vol.37, p.83.
- ¹²⁹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.332.
- ¹³⁰ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.221, no reference.
- ¹³¹ Carpenter, R.L, *Memoir of Phillip Pearsall Carpenter*, London, C. Kegan & Paul, 1880, p.278; p.321.
- ¹³² The results of her observations of Montreal and her suggestions for reform were embodied in a report to Dr, Harris of the Prison Association of New York as well as in a paper communicated to the Prison Congress held in St. Louis in 1874.

CHAPTER THREE

‘The only School provided in Great Britain by the State for her children is - the Gaol’.¹

3.1 Juvenile Delinquency and Ragged Schools

As the work of individual philanthropists developed, unsuccessful attempts were made between 1820 and 1840 to persuade the Government to take positive action towards juvenile delinquency.² The issue of imprisonment had been on the Government’s agenda for some time as prison inspectors were aware of the miserable conditions that drove boys to crime, but warned that separate prisons for juveniles would be ineffective unless they were harsh.³ In spite of the work of John Howard, Elizabeth Fry and others, there was a growing perception that despite increasing prosperity, crime was rising rapidly among the young. This was confirmed by the number of prison convictions for child criminals under the age of twenty, which rose from 6,803 in 1805 to 11,348 in 1834.⁴ Juvenile crime in the early nineteenth century appeared to be a new and intractable problem for contemporaries and became defined as ‘juvenile delinquency’; a social problem that could be treated and cured.

Juvenile delinquency has been explained in terms of population growth and a consequent increase in the number of young people in an inherently unstable economy, eroding patterns of domicile, labour and apprenticeship for the young.⁵ Life for children living on the streets was arduous and brutal, and children, perceived as small people rather than children, received universal condemnation and were seen as feral criminals. Their uncontrolled existence embraced all the symptoms of social disorganisation which, it was felt, challenged the foundations of an ordered society. Although Unitarians began to establish non-proselytizing domestic missions for the poor, open to all, missionaries working with the poor found it difficult to counteract the effects of poverty and hardship. Watts confirms that missionaries’ factual reports all discredited the assumption of the middle-classes that ‘prudence, temperance and moral reform would be sufficient to assuage the pauperism’ they saw around them.⁶

Lant Carpenter had encouraged Mary's early work in establishing a Visiting and Working Society to help the poor in Bristol. Although this can be seen as a furtherance of her domestic role, it was certainly this experience which further brought the plight of the ragged children that surrounded Lewin's Mead to her attention. Other people had already been involved in working with ragged children. For example, in 1780, Robert Raikes had opened the first Sunday school for ragged and outcast children, while Sheriff William Watson had started industrial feeding schools in Aberdeen.⁷ It was felt that by giving children an education they would be enabled to lead a better life; they would be able to find work to support themselves and therefore not have to steal to survive. Many schools were started by churches and were staffed by volunteers; yet because of the growing number of children involved, it soon became necessary to employ paid members of staff and many petitions were made to Parliament asking for grants.⁸

Lant Carpenter's death in 1840 had impacted on Mary's wish to devote her life to the needs of the poor because of the necessity of working in her mother's school. In her diary she had noted that it was 'the desire of my heart for these twelve years' to work for the poor.⁹ It was not until Mary was 39 that she finally overcame her mother's opposition and persuaded the wealthy, 700-strong congregation of the Lewin's Mead chapel, together with family friends such as John Estlin, to back her financially in opening a Ragged School for the poor. Mary opened the school, with a Mr Phelps as schoolmaster, on the 1st August, 1846, in a room in a tenement that was 'then notorious for the degraded character of its inhabitants offering free instruction to the waifs that would attend'.¹⁰ Despite her many years teaching in her mother's middle-class school Mary had no experience in teaching pauper children so she adopted the motto *Dum Doceo Disco* - While I teach, I learn.¹¹

Mary, in a letter to a friend in December 1846, gives credit to Joseph Tuckerman for inspiring the school, saying:

It has been the one earnest wish of my heart, since I took a walk through these wretched streets with our beloved Dr Tuckerman, more than twelve years ago, and he spoke of the duty of following these unhappy children to their homes and endeavouring to exert a moral influence over them.¹²

The school was opened on the anniversary of the abolition of slavery in the British dominions, linking Mary's views on slavery with her mission on behalf of the poor children of Bristol. Mary wrote to William Lloyd Garrison in Boston, modestly giving all the credit to

Our much loved Dr Tuckerman. I went into a school we have lately commenced here for children deep in misery. It is called in the press a Ragged School, but we call it a free school.¹³

Mary Carpenter, by not only opening a Ragged School but working in it herself, brushed aside conventions held for middle-class women, let alone a single woman. There were considerable gender implications in her actions; her family, an intellectual and serious group, would have found both her behaviour and her intentions extraordinary. Mary had felt obligated to defer to her father's plans for her and it was not until 6 years after his death that she felt able to begin the work she had wanted to do for so long. Referring to her father's wish that she had spent nearly 20 years working in his, and later her mother's schools to support her brothers in education, Mary said:

I feel as if I had within me the powers, which never had leisure to expand themselves. A desire to work out my own individuality and to be free from the shackles, which I have always felt in various ways, to be imposed on me.¹⁴

Although Unitarian education was for both sexes, adult education and the most prestigious institutions were reserved for men. Perhaps these frustrations contributed to the earnest and determined way Mary went about her various reforms; she may have felt she had wasted much of her life conforming to the expected role of Victorian womanhood as a dutiful daughter.

Despite her initial reservations, Mrs Carpenter described the opening of the Ragged School in a letter to a friend: an illustration of the pitiful condition of the ragged children:

The seven that Mr Phelps had collected brought a dozen more in the afternoon which showed that they liked it; but, beginning to be tired in the afternoon, one of them said 'Now let us fight' and in an instant they were all fighting ... It is indeed a 'ragged school'; none have shoes or stockings, some have no shirt, and no home, sleeping in casks on the quay, or on the steps ... and living, I suppose, by petty depredations; but all appear to be better fed than the children of the decent poor are.¹⁵

The central focus of the Ragged School, in line with Ragged Schools started by other evangelicals, was on teaching their pupils to read the Bible and so the scriptures formed the

principal texts. There was never any intention to offer a first rate education, rather to instil in children discipline, steady habits and a moral and religious outlook. Mary, in line with the associationist psychology she had been educated in herself, believed that all were innately equal. Echoing Locke and Hartley's theories, she believed that if children were treated respectfully and with love, they would gain self-respect. Mary, following her father's belief in the benefits of 'imagination', managed to keep the children's interest through imaginative storytelling as well as introducing ideas of natural science.¹⁶ Mary, influenced by Hartley and Priestley as well as her father, felt that all studies should be adapted to the age and capacity of the child and to introduce the children to science she brought instruments into the schoolroom for them to examine:

I showed them the orrery, which greatly delighted them, and they seemed to quite understand it, and to enter into the idea of the inclination of the earth's axis producing a change of seasons.¹⁷

She later described her experiences as a teacher saying she 'endeavoured to carry out those principles which my revered father laid down, and which had proved so successful in his own school for young gentlemen'.¹⁸ John Latimer reports that there was so much interest in attending the school that a night school was soon added, bringing in a 'swarm of young men and women whose habits and character almost caused the stout heart of Mary to quail'.¹⁹

The Ragged School was so popular that it soon moved to bigger premises where it was in operation for 25 years. In 1850, when Mary was able to buy the court in which the school was situated, she improved the dwellings by adding a wash-house, baths, waterworks and a playground. This follows Lant Carpenter's belief that children should be brought up and educated in a comfortable environment, since children are influenced by their surroundings, to facilitate their learning.²⁰ William Carpenter believed that the school 'speedily became a marked success and had a beneficial influence on the neighbourhood'.²¹ It is interesting to note how Mary's family seemed to be changing their views; as Mary's work gained creditability they too became more positive about it, perhaps finding that there was not the amount of criticism of her behaviour that they had expected. While teaching these poor children Mary became aware of issues around pauperism and juvenile delinquency and her work in the Ragged School became the basis for the still more difficult issues she was yet to become involved with.

At the end of 1848, the Ragged School was visited by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, Joseph Fletcher, who was to become a close friend of Mary. Fletcher's praise encouraged Mary and he urged her to write more fully about the school, and to apply for an annual grant. He declared flatteringly: 'He did not know of any other Ragged School where there was so large an amount of intellect and well directed effort exerted to raise the school, to train up self-acting beings'.²² Fletcher was one of Mary's early supporters and Mary admitted 'I owe more [to him] than almost to any other'.²³ Mary became involved in garnering publicity for the concept of Ragged Schools and subsequently a series of articles she had written on Ragged Schools stressing education, not delinquency were published in the Unitarian paper, *The Inquirer*. This collection of articles was subsequently published as *Ragged Schools: their Principles and Modes of Operation by a Worker*, in 1850. Mary's views on the proper place for women in public life led her to ascribe her work simply to 'a worker'.²⁴

Mary believed that circumstances or education in a wide sense formed children; she also believed that all children, whatever their background, were capable of a greater intellectual ability than was commonly assumed. In *Ragged Schools* Mary describes the pitiful state of destitute children and asserted that these children were of a completely different class from those attending the ordinary national and British schools. Again echoing Hartley, Mary also rehearsed her ideas of how the powerful reformatory effect of a liberal and loving education for the most degraded and criminally inclined children would bring about change. A most inspiring factor of the book was how she wrote from the child's point of view, as until this time children had been seen as small adults and were expected to behave as such. This is highlighted in her words when she makes the point:

Knowledge must therefore be made attractive to them by the aid of pictures and illustrations; and after a time occasional lessons on the works of nature will be interesting and instructive.²⁵

This is an extraordinary statement for the period and clearly shows the influence her father and his theories of education had on her.

Yet many people disapproved of Ragged Schools, and the issue was given more publicity by a series of articles written by Henry Mayhew in *The Chronicle* in March and April,

1850. Mayhew believed that Ragged Schools could not reform children who were un-reformable; they could only corrupt them still more, and corrupt everyone who came into contact with them. He complained in *The Chronicle* that if the education obtained in the Ragged Schools did not have the perverse effect of increasing crime, then the Ragged Schools themselves did, because innocent children were thrown together with the youngsters who had the most 'vicious propensities and depraved habits'.²⁶ In contrast, Charles Dickens supported the schools and approved of their general effect while objecting to what he saw as an excessive religious orientation.²⁷ Mary's Ragged School was one which did not have this religious orientation and she upheld her principles of education against strong opposition such as that of Thomas Lloyd-Baker of Hardwicke Reformatory who believed that children in reformatory schools should work for profit. She achieved this by organising conferences, such as one she organised in Birmingham in 1851, by lobbying officials and politicians, and by publicising her own views through her extensive writings.

Mary Carpenter was aware that many of the children who attended her Ragged School survived by begging and stealing; the children were often incarcerated in prison for short sentences before returning to the Ragged School. The children were frequently whipped in prison and after a specified number of convictions the boys were automatically sent for transportation. Repeated imprisonment had failed to effect any reformation and Mary was aware of the inadequacy of the Ragged School to cope with the desperate physical and mental needs of the vagrant children. She had studied the *Report of the Select Committee of 1847* on prisons and discovered that 1,274 children under 12 were in prison. By 1856, the figures had increased to 1,990 of the same age group in prison, where they mixed freely with older prisoners.²⁸ There were few legal distinctions drawn between the offence and modes of trial and punishment, and as many as 114 children less than 14 years of age received capital sentences at the Old Bailey between 1801 and 1846; all were commuted to transportation or imprisonment.²⁹ Between the ages of seven and 14, children were presumed innocent unless it could be proved that an ability to 'discern between good and evil' was present. While these provisions were usually observed, children were sentenced to the same retributive punishments as adults with sentences being given for conviction, transportation and imprisonment. In 1847, the Summary Jurisdiction Act was passed making it possible for certain offences to be tried

quickly in magistrates’ courts. This was thought to be beneficial for children and reformatories were started for the reception and education of juveniles already convicted or those in criminal surroundings, although this act did not actually result in a decrease in numbers of children in prison. *Chart Two* highlights the number of children under sixteen sent to prison.

Chart Two

Number of children under sixteen committed to prison 1856-60

Year	1856	1857	1858	1859	1860
Number of Children	13,981	12,501	10,329	8,913	8,029

Source: ‘Judicial Statistics of England and Wales’, *Parliamentary Papers* (1857-76): Abstract of Criminal Returns, 1854-60 cited in Duckworth, Jeanne, *Fagin’s Children, Criminal Children in Victorian England*, Hambledon, 2002.

Chart Three below shows that although the figures of children sent to prison rose in the period 1866-70, numbers did decrease during the period 1856 to 1875. Yet children were being still being sent to prison, with the proportion of boys sent being considerably greater than the number of girls.

Chart Three

Children committed to prison in the period 1856-75

Year	Number of children in prison	Boys	Girls
1856-60	53,752	45,814	7,938
1861-65	44,106	37,547	6,559
1866-70	49,378	42,661	6,717
1871-75	43,854	38,142	5,712
Totals	191,090	164,164	26,926

Source: ‘Judicial Statistics of England and Wales’, *Parliamentary Papers* (1857-76) and Census on England and Wales, 1851, 1861, 1871 and 1881 cited in Stack, John, ‘Reformatory and Industrial Schools and the Decline of Children Imprisonment in mid-Victorian England’, *History of Education*, Vol.23, 1994, No.60.

Mary was shocked to find that nothing had been done about these children, nor any action contemplated. She decided that there was no other way but to write a book on the subject in order to bring the subject to public attention, and to dispute the theory that Ragged Schools corrupted children rather than helping them.

Despite the developing concept of the environmental causes of juvenile crime, it was still believed that religion alone was the most powerful engine of regeneration that could be applied to the young mind. Mary was horrified to hear not just opponents of her schemes, but also men she considered her friends declare that a crime involved sin, which must be punished deliberately before reformation could begin. Even the prison chaplain in Preston, the Reverend John Clay, was a strong believer in the softening effect of solitary confinement. In a firm memorandum to him Mary argued:

The only ends of punishment are the prevention of crime, and the reformation of the offender. No vindictive element must have a place in it ... Crime is a moral disease. The young criminals placed in the schools must be treated as moral patients, for whose cure we should, as Christians, apply the best remedies in the wisest way.³⁰

Around this period the plight of children working long hours in unregulated factories and mines began to come to the attention of the British public. It culminated in the Factory Act of 1833, brought by Lord Shaftesbury to regulate the number of hours children could work. The Earl of Shaftesbury, who also was Chairman of the Ragged School Union and was to become a close friend of Mary, was instrumental in gaining publicity for Ragged Schools and the reformatory movement. The Ragged School Union was a voluntary group dependant on the help of wealthy philanthropists to found and fund schools. However, there were two factions in the movement: a more humanitarian one led by Mary, Matthew Davenport Hill, and the Reverend W.C. Osborne, chaplain of Bath jail and a pamphlet writer for the Association for Advocating the Non-Imprisonment of Children; and a more hard line opinion voiced by Thomas Lloyd- Baker of the Hardwick Reformatory school, Sydney Turner of the Philanthropic Society and Jelinger Symons, a school inspector, proprietor and editor of the *Law Magazine* and author of numerous articles on statistics, education and crime.³¹

Mary and her allies believed that imprisonment was unjust because most child offenders had acted without discernment and consequently should not be held responsible for their acts. Prison was injurious as it could result in children being corrupted by a more experienced child or adult prisoners; it also stigmatised child offenders. Mary felt that children in prison

were 'exposed to the contaminating influence of old experienced felons' and prisons were nothing more than 'Schools of Vice' which were almost impossible for anyone to enter without 'being ruined for life'.³² The hardliners disagreed with the humanitarians about four aspects of the child imprisonment. Firstly, whether the child had known what he or she was doing and therefore deserved punishment; secondly, whether in fact these children should be sent to prison; thirdly, whether or not preliminary imprisonment was necessary before the child was sent to a reformatory school; and fourthly, whether reformatory schools should restrict their admission only to the leaders of child delinquency.

Two major strands that of punishment and reformation ran through the debate about the punishment of juveniles. It was felt that a punitive regime should not be totally abandoned, rather the issue was the degree of application.³³ Options for punishment of juveniles included transportation, corporal punishment, classification and separation, solitary confinement, occupational and educational strategies, and agricultural training.³⁴ It had become clear that custodial sentences for the young, without any training or occupation, would only compound juvenile offending, and it was recognized that some form of incentive had to be offered. Generally, this was in the form of some form of training and subsequently colonial immigration. However, to maintain these incentives and not at the same time to risk encouraging children to offend, since imprisonment might seem an attractive option to the poor, was seen as a major problem. Thus on one level the debate was between punishment and reformation while on another it examined to what extent the two strands could co-exist.

For 18 months Mary studied Parliamentary Blue Books, prison inspectors' and chaplains' reports, together with Joseph Fletcher's *Statistical Tables of Convictions*, as well as a growing number of pamphlets and articles arguing for legislative reform. She wrote endless letters of enquiry and carefully noted facts and figures; she undertook an analytical approach to her investigations. In 1851 Mary published *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes* which brought Mary the respect of male officialdom. It effectively certified her claim to expertise in the area of juvenile delinquents, which will be discussed more fully in the next section. Selleck has argued that calling the very poor 'the perishing and dangerous classes' is a slippage into contemporary fears and prejudices; proposing education for combating social ills is also assuming some lack in those to be educated and contradicts Mary's more usual enlightened educational plans.³⁵ In this day and age, Mary's choice of title seems inappropriate, although the term was in popular use during

her life. Indeed, Watts believes that by the use of these terms, Unitarians contributed to the concept of a 'residuum in society which others depicted as irredeemable'.³⁶

The next section discusses how Mary's influential book changed how children were perceived in Britain.

3.2 *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offender: Their Condition and Treatment*

Mary's educational philosophy can be seen in her work in Ragged, Industrial and Reformatory schools as well as in her didactic writings.³⁷ Her reform discourse drew on Unitarian models on nineteenth-century science, and her approach aimed at the construction of scientific knowledge of the so-called 'criminal classes'. Mary's book *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offender: Their Condition and Treatment* demonstrated a religious ethos with new ideas of therapeutic discipline, seeking to mould young criminals into 'docile bodies'.³⁸ Reformatory Schools and her later books made her a national authority although her compassionate arguments for education, rather than punishment were by no means accepted. In her work with the poor Mary believed that a life of happiness and achievement was largely based on having received a good education and that vice and crime were related to educational deficiencies. With no general educational policy in place in Britain, Mary believed that all children needed education. In *Reformatory Schools* Mary discussed the need for schools for different grades of destitution, vagrancy and criminality, which she felt should be state funded, under voluntary management and inspected by the Government.

Firstly, Mary believed that ordinary fee paying day schools run by the National and British societies which would cater for the majority of working-class children were necessary. Mary had seen that children of the poorest classes were not wanted in the ordinary fee-paying day schools because the children were unsuitably dressed, and perceived as possibly dangerous and aggressive. Secondly, for the destitute child, without proper clothing, who did not attend elementary schools, she proposed Free Day Schools, an improved version of Ragged Schools aided by a parliamentary grant for the 'perishing classes', which can be described as children who, through poverty or neglect, were on the boundaries of committing crime. For neglected children, wandering the streets and likely to become involved in crime, she wanted Industrial Schools which would offer elementary education, a free meal as well as some form of

industrial education which would prepare children for employment. Finally, for offenders who had been convicted in court, she wanted Reformatory Schools to be established, emphasising reform not punishment. Mary did not mention the pauper schools attached to some workhouses or the factory schools maintained by the Factory Act, perhaps as she considered them unsatisfactory and wanted the schools abolished.³⁹ Mary believed that success with children, however degraded or deprived, was only possible if they were given love, respect and care in line with associationist psychology. Here, Lant Carpenter's influence on his daughter is clearly seen.

The *Edinburgh Review* referred to *Reformatory Schools* as the first book to treat the subject adequately and Dickens referred to the work of 'the good and wise lady ... of personal interest to every citizen'.⁴⁰ The *Bristol Daily Post* referred to Mary as a 'gaol philanthropist' and 'the most earnest since the days of Mrs Fry'.⁴¹ Yet others were critical: Jelinger Symons, at the Royal Society of Arts in 1855, attacked her belief 'that juvenile offenders are errant little angels who required little else than fondling'.⁴² Mr Elliot attacked the 'effeminate and debased sentimentality' of the reformatory movement arguing that 'juvenile offenders should be treated as all other offenders ... they must be hurt so that the idea of pain might be instantly associated with crime in the minds of all evildoers'.⁴³ Certainly Mary's approach to juvenile delinquency was completely at odds with evangelical doctrine, where the reform of young sinners was punishment, instruction in Christian doctrine and admonitions.

In *Reformatory Schools* Mary discussed how the prevailing prison system operated in reference to juvenile offenders and her writings showed an optimistic Enlightenment belief that all children could be saved by education.⁴⁴ Disagreeing with current ideas on punishment, Mary pleaded for no degrading or revengeful punishments and no prison sentences for children, and she suggested practical alternatives. She concluded that if children were to be reformed, they must be treated with affection and every effort should be made to give the child a form of family life. She wrote for the first time of the juvenile offender as a child, believed that reform was brought about 'by individual action on the minds of particular children', and felt that government institutions, which were usually large and impersonal and governed by a desire for bureaucratic uniformity, should be opposed.⁴⁵ *Reformatory Schools* demonstrated how she had mastered the complex discipline of presenting empirical evidence such as statistical tables and first-hand reports within a feminine discourse of sentimental power and sympathy. She encouraged her readers to consider the plight of the young juvenile

delinquents saying 'The mass of society are better acquainted with the actual conditions of remote savage nations, than with real life and the actions of these children'.⁴⁶ Mary justified her liberal approach to children in order to shift the attention of the evangelical authoritarian project, which centred on children as sinful objects needing repentance, to a radical consideration of children as subjects with their own peculiar God given powers. Mary's ideas for reform disputed previous concepts of reform for juvenile delinquency; Watts rightly believes that this was revolutionary doctrine and that it was not surprising that Mary faced strong opposition to her views, and wonders how she was listened to at all.⁴⁷

Mary Carpenter suggested La Colonie Agricole at Mettray, France, the Raus Haus in Hamburg, and to a lesser extent, Redhill in Surrey as examples of successful reformatory schools. Mettray was founded in 1839 and was an agricultural reform school run on Pestalozzian principles of cottage homes where children worked in farm industry rather than sitting in workhouse idleness. Mary compared Mettray with Parkhurst prison on the Isle of Wight and argued that what was needed were legally approved reformatories rather than prisons. Parkhurst Juvenile Penitentiary had received its first prisoners in 1838 and its regime and aims combined both custodial reformatory strategies including moral, religious and industrial training and colonial emigration. However, by the late 1840s it became a prison for young convicts who had committed serious crimes; the reformatory experiment in the shape of Parkhurst had failed.⁴⁸ The failure of Parkhurst was described by Mary:

Such a system must fail: for the boy whose heart has never been purified and softened by any good home influence, which has always done what is right in his own eyes ... he regards with profound suspicion the appointed agents of his reformation.⁴⁹

Mary Carpenter had refused to visit Parkhurst as she considered it more of a state-run prison than a reformatory. Mary had included in *Reformatory Schools* a bitter attack on Parkhurst prison for boys, based on 1849 statistics, insisting that 'it is utterly vain to look for any real reformation where the heart is not touched' and that 'this cannot possibly be done for children in the mechanical and military discipline of Parkhurst'.⁵⁰ Mary also used evidence from Whitworth Russell and the experience of Wakefield gaol, where the system of solitary confinement and silence had been discontinued, as 'juveniles' debility and contraction of the joints; premonitory symptoms of sluggishness and feeble-mindedness appeared, and there was danger to their minds.'⁵¹ Mary explained her reasons for attacking the juvenile prison system by saying that as many people regarded it as a model institution it was necessary to point out the radical defects of the system. She described Parkhurst prison school as:

The only school provided in Great British by the state for her children is THE GAOL. It would seem that the walls of this school-house are rather unnecessarily thick and massive to confine the tender limbs of a little child; - that the keys used to lock him in are somewhat ponderous; - that the stern military governor and the strong rough-looking turnkeys are rather strange attendants on a creature almost a nursling.⁵²

It was a searing condemnation of the existing jail system with regard to young offenders and this criticism of Parkhurst greatly irritated Joshua Jedd, the Director of Prisons; he wrote to Mary saying that by her statement she given support to people who did not believe in the necessity of reformatory or industrial school. He also justifiably complained that her statements about the boy inmates of Parkhurst would ensure that:

They will have little or no chance of obtaining employment after release and by necessity will be driven into a criminal career 'which first brought them within the grasp of the law.'⁵³

Jedd was certainly right to reprimand Mary about condemning Parkhurst boys; she herself had complained that a prison sentence condemned a child to a life of crime. Mary had used facts in her book that supported her arguments while ignoring the context in which they were provided, attacking both ideas and people she disliked which became characteristic of all of her subsequent writings. Carlebach points out that the figures she quoted were highly selective.⁵⁴ For example, she stressed the number of whippings that had taken place in 1844 without mentioning that previous and following years there had been none.

Chart Four
Figures available to Mary Carpenter at the time of writing *Reformatory Schools*.
Parkhurst Prison

Year	Number of Boys	Recorded escapes.	Recorded whippings.
1842	375	6	-
1843	423	4	-
1844	645	-	165
1845	648	10	-
1848	620	20	-

Source: Carlebach, Julius, *Caring for Children in Trouble*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970, p.49. Mary tended to manipulate facts and figures to suit her purpose. Another example of this inclination was in 1861 when a parliamentary committee was looking into questions

concerning the Poor Law; among the subjects discussed was the condition of the workhouse schools. When Mary was involved in the Ragged School movement she had visited Stapleton House, the Bristol workhouse. To gain entry required considerable courage and determination as the managers and superintendents of the workhouse were often reluctant to expose conditions of life inside to outside observers. They wanted no interference with practices which were frequently inefficient, often inhumane and sometimes corrupt.⁵⁵ Mary had not continued her visits, but her long experience among the very poor had bought her into constant contact with the system of the administration of relief and she concluded that the system of pauper education contained grave and ineradicable defects.⁵⁶ During an earlier visit Mary had objected fiercely to the punishment given to badly behaved boys: many boys, for example, were forced to eat their dinner from a trough like pigs. She also objected to little girls in thin cotton frocks being turned out from draughty wards into a high-walled sunless yard for exercise. However, Mary, with crusading fervour, had failed to add that this had taken place ten years previously.⁵⁷

Mary informed the Committee that it should be made unlawful to take children into the workhouses as she felt that the management of pauper children should be placed in the hands of a school committee. The school committee was to be chosen annually from the ratepayers, and the schools should be certified as fit and proper by the Secretary of State. Mary was hoping to avoid the depressing influences of pauperism, and to provide a domestic setting instead of the machinery of a large institution. Naturally, the present workhouse officials resented her criticisms, and severe resolutions of condemnation were passed. The Guardians responsible for the workhouse tendered rebutting evidence to the committee, whereupon Mary also offered to appear again and justify her statements. The Bristol newspapers made much of the dispute and in an effort to make her views clear Mary published a pamphlet containing her paper on *What shall we do with our Pauper Children?* It also included a 'Letter on the charges of the Bristol Guardians', in which she vindicated her statement, and an angry exchange of pamphlets and letters broke out.⁵⁸ Manton states even Mary's family were surprised at the intense and lasting resentment with which she pursued the luckless Bristol Guardians but she gives no evidence of this.⁵⁹ The Bristol Board of Governors had a rebuttal printed in the local press; they certainly did not approve of her involvement.

Mary's suggestions in *Reformatory Schools* were by no way made for the first time, nor did Mary claim any novelty for them. In various forms they had been before various Committees

of the Lords in 1847 and the Committee of the Commons in 1850. Nevertheless, the book brought into focus the evidence needed to bring about changes in the law relating to juvenile delinquents; Mary had arranged the various aspects of the book to lead the reader to conclude that reformatory schools were necessary. It was to her merit that Mary presented facts and figures into a compact body of reasoned truths and pointed out the lines of action to be followed.⁶⁰ Mary, due to her associationist perspective, redefined the scope of education needed for delinquents and juxtaposed the problems in the traditional system of education with principles of Unitarian psychology. She presented her ideas as an alternative way to envision learning.

Mary Carpenter's theories of how to reform wayward children through education were based on the ideas of John Locke, David Hartley and her father. They stressed that all humans were originally good, but children behave badly through bad upbringing and the influence of these men can be seen in her ideas for reform. Mary, while she had earlier stressed 'the holy duties of the parent', felt that the best place for a child was to be with its parents, but only if the parents exercised proper parental authority. When they did not, or where parents might themselves corrupt the child, she felt that society should act in the parents' place.⁶¹ Mary believed, once again echoing her father, that in this way a sense of trust, affection and the sense of security that a child could expect in a normal family would be brought to the surface.⁶²

Following the example of the Raus House in Hamburg, Mary felt that a reformatory should be close in size to a family unit so that individuals' needs could be met, and an appropriate environment for reform created. Lant Carpenter believed that a family unit would provide the 'care and tenderness' that is necessary to a child's upbringing to encourage children to 'feel duty, gratitude and respect' and thus feel 'a desire to please'.⁶³ Unlike the Raus House, which kept children for a fixed time of four to five years, Mary did not stipulate a fixed period, feeling each case should be dealt with on its merits, decided by the school managers and Government inspectors. Recreation was as important as work as children, girls as well as boys, needed physical activities such as sport. This was not in line with the evangelical means of reforming children, which believed in punishment, not recreation for pleasure or health. This aspect of Mary's ideas is based on Lant Carpenter's theories of the merits of physical education, which he advocated in *Principles of Education* to give children 'the

greatest probability for being vigorous, healthy and happy, active in their bodily powers to lay the best foundation for intellectual and moral excellence'.⁶⁴

Corporal punishment was to be reduced to a minimum and Mary highlighted the story of Anselm; Anselm visited a monastery where the Abbott consulted him about the incorrigibility of the boys there. The Abbott continually beat the boys but still their behaviour grew worse. Anselm replied:

Yet surely if you give the young trees in your garden no freedom they would become crooked and useless. So it is with boys, as they do not observe any love or kindness in your dealings with them, they think you have no other motives in your discipline than envy and hatred ... they will grow up full of hatred and suspicion.⁶⁵

This demonstrates Mary's belief that kindness and respect would enable the children in reformatories to flourish. Mary felt 'there should be that degree of confidence shown to children that will make them feel they are workers together with the teachers'.⁶⁶ These ideas were certainly revolutionary in a period when schools were often ruled by the cane. Mary's methods were largely educational, yet to her no education or training was conceivable unless it was founded on Christianity and she intended for un-sectarian Christian and moral education to accompany the teaching of a trade. In *Reformatory Schools* Mary had to deconstruct both popular evangelical theory and refute utilitarian arguments of the political economists concerned with the workhouse principle of 'less eligibility'. This was the belief 'that money expended on convicted children should not exceed in liberality of comfort due to the poor labourer's child outside the reformatory or prison' and she was soon forced to oppose leading political economists on the question of poverty.⁶⁷

Reformatory Schools brought public acceptance to Mary's work and she was drawn into correspondence with leading thinkers and workers for reform. From provincial obscurity, she emerged as an almost unrecognisable figure, a national expert who was also a woman.⁶⁸ It is apparent that at this time Mary was extremely conscious of the problems connected with being female in a male environment. William Carpenter, in the introduction to Mary's second religious book, *Voices of the Spirit and Spirit Pictures*, written shortly before she died and published posthumously, stated that his sister was a force to be noted, 'due to her considerable power of inducing Public Men to take her views and give effort to them'.⁶⁹ Whether Mary, due to her upbringing, was looking for strong male support such as her father, Joseph Tuckerman and Samuel May, Russell Scott Jr. and Lord Shaftesbury, among others,

had provided, or that she felt her views would be more readily accepted if presented by men is difficult to determine. Indeed, masculine support was essential for the realisation of her plans. It was a measure of Mary's powers of persuasive reasoning that she and her supporters were able to gain state aid in reformatory and later, industrial schools.⁷⁰

In 1853 Mary Carpenter published *Juvenile Delinquents - their Condition and Treatment*; she believed she had to write another book because 'of the many objections by those who saw the subject in a different light' and 'of the scepticism as to the possibility of really reforming children'.⁷¹ All of Mary's bêtes noire were included in the book: the workhouses, prisons, prison schools and once again Parkhurst. Unfortunately, her attacks on Parkhurst, based on what a visitor had told her, had not been well received and was disputed by Jedd, Governor of Prisons. He accused her of misleading the public, reiterating again the effect her words would have on the public perception of Parkhurst boys:

The boys will rue for themselves and their descendants after the anathema you have pronounced on them. It is altogether unfair, and what is worse, being based upon single facts, wholly inapplicable as argument, it conveys an absolutely false impression. Such impressions being made, however, is productive of the same result as if it was true.⁷²

Mary was extremely upset by Jedd's letter as she felt that he had challenged her conviction that she was doing the work God had intended for her. In her adolescence she had confessed to her diary her 'unwieldiness to own herself in the wrong or allow herself to be considered in the wrong'.⁷³ Jedd's appeal to her 'to have some regard for the poor boys' seemed to undermine the purpose of her existence, which she regarded as being devoted to the care of children.⁷⁴ Mary appeared to feel that her work with children was driven by God and she failed to understand why other people did not see it as such.

In 1864 Mary published the two-volume *Our Convicts* which provided a comprehensive introduction to her thinking on reformatory discipline as well as her social agenda. While her earlier books had focused on the education of the 'children of the perishing and dangerous classes' and juvenile offenders, *Our Convicts* offered a boldly critical examination of the condition and treatment of adult criminals: she repeatedly demanded changes in the prison system which she felt has totally 'failed' and therefore must be 'radically wrong'.⁷⁵ She wrote that 'reluctantly are we compelled to give special notice to Female Convicts not least because the treatment of females is in fact more perplexing than that of males'.⁷⁶ Mary's strenuous

criticism of the Government of the day was thus reflected in repeated and outspoken demands for radical changes in a convict system which she believed to be a complete failure.⁷⁷ Mary, beginning to take an interest in the rights of women, also believed that there was a poor understanding of female offenders' specific needs. She also noted that 'few observations are usually made respecting the women in the general Reports' and she noted they were poorly represented in official documents.⁷⁸ Mary believed that prison reform had completely stalled by the 1860s with 'the Commissioners find[ing] themselves unable to offer any suggestions' and 'no prospect of any attempt of change in those adobes of vice'.⁷⁹ Manton believes that Mary was disliked in official circles as her ideas regarding the state's and society's responsibilities towards juvenile and adult offenders, which favoured structured reform and education, 'ran directly counter to some of the most cherished beliefs of the age with its insistence in individual responsibility and self-help'.⁸⁰ *Our Convicts* was well received in England, however, and received 'warm commendation from jurists in France, in Germany and in America'.⁸¹ Mary, in *Our Convicts*, referenced the writer Frederick William Robinson's very successful prison narratives, published under the anonym of 'A Prison matron' in order to back up her arguments concerning female prisoners. Though Mary believed, as did most of her contemporaries that they offered an authentic account by a prison officer, they were in fact fiction.⁸²

For Mary, the treatment of convicts went beyond her personal sympathy and she expressed the moral and religious implications that lay at the heart of earlier philanthropic interventions. It had crucial implications for the welfare of society, with Victorian society seen as part of the Empire.⁸³ Mary wrote:

Our Convicts! They are part of our society! They belong to ourselves! They are not only subjects with us of the same great British Empire on which the sun never sets, but they belong to the same British Isles, the same small centre of civilisation, the same heart of the world's life, the same island, small in geographical extent, infinitely great in its influence on other nations, - whence must go forth laws, principles, examples, which will guide for better or worse the whole world.⁸⁴

Our Convicts sold enough copies to finance Mary's subsequent travels to India as well as her adopted daughter's education.⁸⁵ Harriet Martineau, discussing the book in the *Edinburgh Review*, commended Mary for being the first author to provide 'the material needed to qualify us to understand the conditions of a life altogether unlike our own' and 'for disclosing to us the entire natural history of the lawless classes'.⁸⁶

Mary believed that it was necessary to involve a greater number of people in the juvenile delinquency debate and she was anxious to make the facts about juvenile delinquency known to as many people as possible. She proved herself to be a pioneer at a new means of publicity, conferences to discuss juvenile delinquency.

3.3 Mary Carpenter and the Birmingham Conference

Mary Carpenter's writings and discussions with other reformers, most notably the jurist Matthew Hill,⁸⁷ resulted in a conference in Birmingham, in December, 1851, for the purpose of considering *The Condition and Treatment of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes of Children and Juvenile Offenders and the Remedies their Condition Demanded*.⁸⁸ Matthew Hill's public stance as Recorder of Birmingham had provided him with a public platform from which he could air his views, particularly on matters of penal and criminal law reform and he became a mentor to Mary.⁸⁹ Matthew Hill wrote to his sister:

I have an admirable coadjutor in Mary Carpenter. We are going to hold a conference in Birmingham to obtain legislative powers of coercion over criminal children and for enforcing pecuniary responsibility on the parent.⁹⁰

Mary went in search of supporters for the conference, staying with her extended family whenever possible. She went from members of Parliament, to magistrates to prison chaplains, asking them to come to the conference to discuss what should be done to help delinquent children. She was involved in writing the invitations and in making practical arrangements. She wrote to her friend and former pupil, Lucy Stanford, saying:

It is a curious feeling to me when I think about it to give out my opinions with a certain degree of confidence and have it received as worthy of consideration. As I have written a book, it seems to be supposed that I know something about the matter.⁹¹

It is apparent that her authorship, rather than her experiences in her Ragged School, was what was giving her creditability.

At the first conference on the evening of the 9th December, 1851, the attendance was small, about 50 people, but the attendees were influential; the conference was chaired by Mr Hill with Lord Lyttleton as President. Lady Noel Byron was a supporter of the reformatory movement and offered a prize of £200 for the best essay on the 'dangerous and perishing classes'.⁹² Reluctant to be seen as an advocate of women's rights Mary did not speak at the

gathering but was active behind the scenes lobbying for reform; she believed that 'to have lifted up her voice in an assembly of gentlemen would have been tantamount to unsexing herself'.⁹³ Mary was instrumental in drawing up the final resolutions of the conference demanding:

That for those Children who are not attending any School and have subjected themselves to police interference, by vagrancy, mendacity, or petty infringement of the law, legislative enactments are urgently required, in order to aid or establish an Industrial Feeding School, at which the attendance of such Children shall be enforced by Magistrates.

Those legislative enactments are also required in order to establish Correctional and Reformatory Schools for those Children who have been convicted of felony, or such misdemeanours as involve dishonesty; and to confer upon magistrates the power to commit Juvenile Offender to such Schools instead of Prison.⁹⁴

Mary Carpenter and her colleagues had kept Parliament and the press focused on the need for reformatories for juvenile delinquents but had not managed to overcome long held beliefs in the efficacy of the deterrent of prison sentences. Sir George Grey, the Secretary of State, believed there was not sufficient public interest to warrant legislation, saying 'the time is not yet ripe'.⁹⁵ He did, however, agree to appoint a Commission of Enquiry, which sat in 1852 and 1853 to which Mary was called to give evidence: this was her first public appearance as a woman who was an expert on juvenile delinquency.

Mary's attitude to punishment was examined by the Select Committee on Criminal and Destitute Juveniles in May, 1852, when she was one of the first witnesses. The prevailing view was made clear: the punishment of crime was morally and theologically justified and a deterrent to future offences. In Mary's testimony she explained she had visited industrial schools in Liverpool and Manchester as well as prisons at Bath, Bristol, Liverpool, Preston and London. She had 'minutely enquired into the principle of institutions for young offenders in France, Germany and America'.⁹⁶ In answer to a member of the Select Committee who asked 'you would entirely abolish punishment in case of juvenile offenders?' Mary replied:

The term punishment is used in many different ways by different persons. I would say in the case of a child merely refer to the spirit of the English law, that a child is to be treated as a child. We ought in the first place to consider the position of these children in regard to society. I consider society owes retribution to them, just as much as they owe it to society.⁹⁷

In 1851, this was a revolutionary statement, particularly from a single woman. Unfortunately, once again, Mary was also very critical of Parkhurst Prison and her testimony on this was discredited as she had not visited the prison in person.

The feminist monthly, *English Woman's Journal*, called Mary's appearance before the Select Committee, an 'epoch in history', and discussed how difficult it must have been for her to answer the summons to testify:

Crossing the lobby of the House of Commons, confronting the chairman, answering methodically the interrogatories of the honourable gentlemen who undertook to undertake the inquiry, and withstanding the shock of a cross-examination by members on the 'other side', may have been received with a feeling more or less akin to a natural feminine shrinking from the obligation of occupying a too conspicuous position.⁹⁸

It was certainly significant for a woman to give evidence to a Commission in the first place; of even more significance was an unmarried woman, a Unitarian, disagreeing publicly with a commissioner. Certainly, if Mary had previously equated women's public speech with a loss of femininity, by the early 1850s she needed to reconcile the previously male privilege of public speech to her determination to appeal to people whose support she wanted to enlist. Mary herself resolved the problem of the public professional woman in her article for the *English Women's Journal*, when she advised her readers that publicity for the sake of reform work was not a contradiction of Christian femininity, but rather a God-given test of it:

Nor let women fear the difficulties to be contended with in this work, the apparent publicity to which it may expose them, or the unwillingness of the other sex to allow them to work. A true woman will surmount all obstacles by the God-sent strength of her very weakness; - while apparently placed in a public position, she will know to keep the privacy of her individual nature guarded by an invisible but impenetrable shield - and so, going forth with no desire for worldly glory, no attempt to intrude on the peculiar duties of the other sex, she will not be hindered by them, but aided and encouraged.⁹⁹

This statement is a pertinent example of the methods by which Mary persuaded men to adopt her ideas; by deferring to men and giving the impression that she was merely a woman with a motherly interest in children, Mary managed to encourage many men to back her ideas. Despite her dubious use of figures to suit her own arguments, Mary played a leading role in promoting legislation and submitted evidence to various Royal Commissions on reformatory and industrial schools, as well as on juvenile delinquency. It was a measure of Mary's powers

of persuasive reasoning that, as noted above, she and her supporters were able to gain state support for reformatory and later, industrial schools.¹⁰⁰

It is apparent that Mary was extremely conscious of propriety at this time as well as problems connected with being female in a male environment. Mrs Carpenter wrote to Philip Carpenter saying Mary:

Has been invited to the meeting of the Committee on Tuesday, held to settle the draft of the Act to be presented to Parliament, but she declined. She knows how jealous the lords of creation are of the interference of women and thought it wisest to be of real use by looking over the rough drafts of the Bill, all of which had been submitted to her for inspection and by corresponding with the leading members of the committee.¹⁰¹

Mrs Carpenter appears to be happier with Mary's prominent role now she had become acclaimed. Selleck maintains that the recommendations of the conference and the Draft Bill it produced were so similar to Mary's suggestions in *Reformatory Schools* that it was not difficult to see her hand in drafting it.¹⁰²

The reformatory movement's principles were finally given statutory recognition in the Youthful Offenders Act of 1854 and were identical to those which had failed to gain support in the 1820s.¹⁰³ The Act empowered Magistrates to send juveniles to reformatories on summary conviction for a period of years and parents could be obliged to make contributions towards their children's upkeep: the schools would be under voluntary management, with Government grants and inspections, as Mary had suggested. The Youthful Offenders Act, although imperfectly enforced, represented a major change in penal policy and established a pattern of relations between statutory and voluntary bodies that would serve as a model for the future; it also gave legal sanction to Kingswood reformatory. Yet for Mary, the act still contained the obnoxious principle of retribution, by insisting that every child must spend 14 days in prison before he or she could be transferred to a reformatory.¹⁰⁴ Mary's many letters to Sir Stafford Northcote, Lord Lyttleton, concerning the Juvenile Offenders Bill, demonstrate her influence on governmental policy.¹⁰⁵

To test her theories of reformation Mary determined to open a reformatory school at Kingswood, near Bristol which is discussed in the next section.

3.4 Kingswood and Red Lodge Reformatory School

Mary Carpenter's connection with the Unitarian network provided much needed financial support. In September 1852, Mary, together with Mr Russell Scott started a reformatory school at Kingswood for both girls and boys, in a building that Wesley had originally erected for a college, some miles outside Bristol. Patronage was necessary as the school was privately funded and because Kingswood had no fixed income Mary was forced to write letters asking for subscriptions and some £300 was collected by July 1852.¹⁰⁶ Initially, at Kingswood there were ten boys and five girls, aged 8 to 14: most had come from Bristol and all were sent by permission of their parents or guardians as magistrates had no legal power to commit them before the 1854 Youthful Offenders Act.¹⁰⁷ Later there were a total of 16 boys and 13 girls living at Kingswood. As noted above, Mary felt 'there should be that degree of confidence shown to children that will make them feel they are workers together with the teachers'.¹⁰⁸ These ideas were revolutionary in a period when normally schools were ruled by the cane.

The Kingswood Agricultural Reformatory school was to be based on a Christian and moral education which accompanied the teaching of a trade. Furniture for Kingswood came from a school in Ealing, founded by Lady Noel Byron, who after her move to Bristol in 1854 became a close friend and supporter of Mary.¹⁰⁹ These inter-relationships again demonstrate how Unitarians strove to help each other and the closeness of the Unitarian network: as the many letters between Mary and Lady Byron reveal, their friendship was profound. Lady Byron and Mary had very similar views on education and she continually encouraged Mary in her reformatory schools.¹¹⁰ Lady Bryon can be described as Mary's closest female friend after her sisters, as Mary, due to her educational opportunities, had more intellectually in common with men.¹¹¹ These women offered Mary what she seemed to need most; consistent support and an affirmation that what she was doing was right and justified. Mary often had difficult relationships with other women, for example with Frances Power Cobbe who was critical of her management of Red Lodge. Mary had also had continual disagreements with Harriett Martineau, a very close friend of her brother Philip: Estlin Carpenter devotes several pages to these disputes.¹¹² It would appear that Mary had problems with some women intellectuals like herself who themselves had strong views. Jane Rendall believes the choice of female friendship meant resistance to enforced social expectations and could be the basis of a wider pattern of association among women with a political purpose - this can certainly be seen in the friendship between Lady Byron and Mary.¹¹³

Mary's work with the delinquent poor was certainly not supported by her family in this period; she thought of living at Kingswood, but this scheme was given up in deference to her mother's wishes. Mary had no income of her own, only a small allowance from her mother, and she was still teaching in the Ragged School. It appears her mother, who by this time was quite well off, did not intend to support her daughter's projects financially. It also demonstrates both how Mary wanted to defer to her mother's wishes yet was also determined to be involved with Kingswood. She walked everywhere in order to save money to spend on her activities for the poor. Mrs Carpenter wrote to Philip Carpenter complaining:

Mary goes on her usual course. Yesterday, after writing all morning, she got her dinner at half-past twelve, and set off to walk to Kingswood, four miles there and busied herself there between three and four hours and then walked back.¹¹⁴

Mary Carpenter also seemed to be disillusioned with the lack of support from her family in this period; she had tried to involve her brother Philip, but he told her 'he had not the head to master the subject she desired'.¹¹⁵ Mary later urged him to take charge of the reformatory but he replied that 'he shrunk from responsibility and harassment', although he was the author of the Sixth Report of Red Lodge Reformatory.¹¹⁶ Whether Mary felt she should offer the management of Red Lodge to her brother because of family obligations or whether she herself was tired of the problems of managing reformatory schools is difficult to discover.

Mary Carpenter's ideas on how to reform young criminals ran into problems as the children would run away, the girls going into Bristol to meet their boyfriends and pimps. A committee was appointed in 1854 to run Kingswood, according to her biographer 'to relieve her of part of her burden', and they refused to keep the rowdy and rebellious girls when they behaved badly.¹¹⁷ Mary wanted to keep the wayward girls in her own home but agreed that she could not house them with her frail and aged mother. The appointment of a committee, presumably suggested by her backers, implies that there were problems connected with her management of Kingswood. Mary appears not only to have had problems with the children at Kingswood but also with her assistants as she felt they had an imperfect grasp of what she regarded as her fundamental principles.¹¹⁸ Estlin Carpenter refers to her having more and more demands put onto her at Kingswood; new staff was appointed at Kingswood but Mary was far from happy and 'from the thick of the conflict she turned to the Ragged School with a sense of rest'.¹¹⁹ There were certainly differences of opinion between her and the committee responsible for running Kingswood in connection with the committee's plan to make the children work for profit. She wrote in her diary on May 23rd 1853:

I am insufficient for the work Thou has given me to do, my strength ... is continually torn and wounded by the distrust, by the misconceptions, of those around me; the instruments I have to guide in this work are inadequate to their undertaking.¹²⁰

Mary recorded in the same diary entry in 1853 what could be called an out of body experience saying:

It seemed to me that my spirit reposed in Him with a sort of intensity of nearness, of satisfied loving union, which words cannot describe. Those few moments were heaven.¹²¹

From this statement, it appears Mary placed at the centre of her life the heavenly Father God and she did not appear to doubt that she had the possibility of instant access to his presence. Her view of things was not wholly idiosyncratic. Much of it was central to the Unitarianism of the day, and it was to be found, with minor variations throughout various sections of nonconformity. While it is obvious that Mary believed her work with destitute children was inspired by God, Kingswood at this time can be considered a failure and it would seem that the disciplinary disasters of her 'family-model' regime could only be resolved in a separate school for boys and girls. Mary wrote in her journal on 19th October, 1854, the day the Youthful Offenders Act was passed, of her determination to continue her work.

I had not the warm hopes and vivid spirits when entering Kingswood on September 11th, 1852. Two years on unwearied labour, severe disappointment, harassing trials of various kinds, have quenched the pleasurable excitement at the anticipated principles in which I had perfect confidence; yet they have not in any way cooled my ardent devotion to the work, but given me increased confidence in the principles and a degree of experience which could only have been gained in no other way.¹²²

There were further problems at Kingswood in 1862 as the committee, in line with a common trend at the time, purchased a steam press for brick making hoping that this would put the institution on a sound financial footing. Soon, the boys at Kingswood were producing 4,000 bricks a day. Sydney Turner, now a Reformatory Inspector, warned that the boys would be too tired after a day's brick making to be taught in the evenings and their general education would suffer. The committee pleaded economic necessity and continued.¹²³ Mary disagreed with this policy and showed her displeasure by not visiting Kingswood; it was some two years before she returned to read to the boys again. It is likely that this was the basis of the disagreements in 1863 when Mary believed she was 'regarded with suspicion instead of the confidence she felt she had a right to expect and her share in establishment of the school was doubted'; she 'felt she was needed there no more and resigned her connection'.¹²⁴

Mary certainly became unhappy when her belief that she knew better than others on how to run a reformatory was thwarted. Her biographer believes that her leaving Kingswood made her ill. He reports 'mental suffering always reacted on her physical frame [and she] sometimes lacked the power to sustain the violent conflicts that went on within'.¹²⁵ It is interesting to note how often Mary became ill when things did not appear to go her way. Not only did she become ill when she was no longer involved in Kingswood but she also suffered another attack of her childhood illness, rheumatic fever, in 1854 shortly before Red Lodge Reformatory School for girls was opened. Bailin believes that 'the sick room can be said to provide the 'sole access to a hallowed space of connection, of repletion and of liberty' and perhaps this was what Mary needed.¹²⁶ As discussed earlier the Carpenter family had a tendency to become unwell when their life became difficult. Mary's mother herself was unwell when Mary was a child, forcing Mary to care for her younger brother Philip for a considerable period. Bailin believes that invalidism permitted the inversion of the sentence imposed on her gender and class by permitting a woman to sequester and immobilize herself. The rhetoric of 'inside' versus 'outside' structures are reminiscent of the mid-Victorian endorsement of separate spheres - with the sanctity, peace and moral rectitude of home life versus the competitive struggles and ethical ambiguities of the public world.¹²⁷

Despite Mary's problems at Kingswood she still had active support from the Unitarian network. Matthew Hill's daughters became part of Mary's reforming circle; Florence assisted Mary in her reformatories, Rosamund helped to manage the St James's Back Ragged School, and later, with Mary, started an Industrial School for girls, while Joanna became the secretary of a local visiting association. They were joined in 1862 by Catherine and Susanna Winkworth (1820-1884) who had already taken an interest in women's rights in Manchester and campaigned for the higher education of women. These women were part of a large reforming circle including Octavia Hill, Helen Taylor Mill, and Frances Power Cobbe among others. Indeed, Mary inspired many men such as Russell Scott and the Reverend Carter of Liverpool as well as other women to take up work on reform issues. Many of these women, together with Mary Estlin, later became involved in the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act and the campaign for women's rights.¹²⁸

While Mary accepted that male and females were created for totally different spheres, she believed that both sexes should appreciate the different gifts of the other and have equal

opportunities. She believed that boys and girls should have different training to match their differing physical nature and their future social positions. Watts believes that Mary did see women first as domestic creatures, and this indeed affected how she treated girls in her reformatory schools.¹²⁹ Mary wanted to open a reformatory school just for girls with Government funding, as she felt girls would be easier to manage in a single-sex reformatory school. Mary had noted earlier that ‘daughters especially have to be looked after lest they enter careers in which they might work yet greater evil than the delinquent boy[s]’.¹³⁰ In line with the dominant Victorian morality of the period that saw women as the perfect embodiment of virtue and passiveness, Mary believed: ‘that the very susceptibility and tenderness of woman’s nature render her more completely diseased in her whole nature when this is perverted to evil’.¹³¹ Thus, as Zedner asserts, criminal girls and women ‘represented the very negation of the ideal of femininity’.¹³² Mary felt that girls were more difficult to reclaim than boys.¹³³ Quoting Reverend Baxter, Chaplain of East Prison, Aberdeen, she stated:

Once young girls have been seduced and degraded, they are more difficult to rescue than boys ... Indeed, to them the prison is a kind of necessary and wholesome retreat...their enfeebled powers renovated, and then return like dogs to his vomit, of the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.¹³⁴

After the Reformatory Act of 1854 gave legal power to reformatory schools, Mary opened Red Lodge Reformatory Schools for Girls. The Elizabethan Red Lodge, in Colston Street, Bristol, once the prospect house of a Carmelite Priory and suitable for a school of 50 to 60 girls, became available in 1854. Lady Noel Byron bought the premises and gave it into the sole charge of Mary, who was superintendent from its certification until her death in 1877.¹³⁵ Red Lodge opened with 10 girls, the numbers increasing to 52 by the end of 1856, and Red Lodge had around 60 girls annually.¹³⁶ A plaque in Red Lodge confirms Mary’s belief of her importance to her father as well as highlighting the fact that she felt her work was divinely inspired: ‘Where my blessed father beckons me to come’.

The position of Red Lodge Reformatory School was somewhat peculiar. By taking on the sole management of Red Lodge, Mary cut herself off from the co-operation of members of other churches, such as the people who made up the committee at Kingswood; whether this was due to the difficulties she had encountered previously with the committee is difficult to ascertain. Estlin Carpenter believes that to other people she appeared to be:

The holder of an unorthodox creed, whose teaching was distrusted and whose influence must be kept in check, paragraphs were circulated about the religion of the foundress and the manager of the school; together with no evidence of the religious instruction provided or evidence of the girls attending any church not of the satisfaction of the Inspector of school.¹³⁷

Indeed, the Somersetshire Magistrates at the Quarter Session at Wells in 1856 went as far as refusing to recognize Red Lodge because of the religious beliefs of the foundress, highlighting again the difficulties that Unitarians experienced.¹³⁸

In 1855 Mary began drafting the *Principles, Rules and Regulations of Red Lodge*. Girls were to receive a vigorous and all-prevailing religious instruction in which sectarian teaching was forbidden, they were to be taught to read and write, as well as arithmetic and geography, industrial training was to consist of washing, cooking, ironing and needlework. The rules of Red Lodge¹³⁹ were read to each new girl on her arrival and included ground breaking concepts far ahead of their time, such as:

1. Every new girl on entering the school is to begin with a new character;
2. Girls must as far as possible forget their old life;
3. There was to be no outward sign that Red Lodge was not an ordinary boarding school;
4. Girls were not to go out, or receive money or letters without permission;
5. Books were to be read out loud during meals and sewing;
6. Irreverent use of God's name or language was forbidden;
7. Diligence, neatness, politeness and kind consideration to companions was required.

Mary's view on a reformatory regime, characterised by surveillance and 'a strict and vigilant discipline', a reward scheme and 'intellectual improvement' illustrate Foucault's theories on a nineteenth-century shift from harsh punishment to subtler modes of control.¹⁴⁰

However, Sydney Turner, now a Reformatory School Inspector, noted in his first report, made three years after the establishment of Red Lodge, 'that discipline errs perhaps on the side of kindness and indulgence. Miss Carpenter has not been as successful as she wished in engaging really efficient assistants'.¹⁴¹ Turner's report refers as well to problems with discipline and the unsuitability of the girls, some of whom had to be sent away as

unmanageable. The *Red Lodge Journals*, Mary's private record, reveal her as harassed and overcome with everyday problems and she wrote anxiously of the difficulties encountered with various girls.¹⁴² One of the first entrants, Annie Woodhouse, was sent to America after a short time; she had become too 'audacious' to be borne with'.¹⁴³ *The Second Report of Reformatory Schools* reported:

The gross misconduct of some very vicious girls who were in the first instance committed to prison for desecration and insubordination and afterwards discharged ... a more efficient school mistress has been engaged and a stricter discipline enforced to the manifest advantage of the girls ... Comparing the school with other female reformatories, I feel satisfied that the great desire is a really able matron'.¹⁴⁴

Mary's most serious problems at Red Lodge concerned the older girls, who were even 'beyond her father's most hallowed principles and who, as she herself eventually admitted, might need a school conducted on a somewhat stricter plan'.¹⁴⁵ The girls at Red Lodge tended to be more hardened, as girls were only sent to reformatory schools when all else had failed. Mary believed that only by providing a sympathetic, homely environment could these girls learn self-discipline, receive an education and internalise a desire for reform that would allow Christian women to take them as servants.¹⁴⁶

Mary had become the leading expert on reformatory schools, an extraordinary position for a woman; to publicise further the work of reformatory schools Mary was often away from Red Lodge and during her absences the girls tended to behave more badly. The school had also been seriously disturbed by the insubordination of some girls towards the matron and there continued to be further trouble among the children. Mary reported: 'One lost, others ran away, but all were captured. Crawford very outrageous, when brought back, put in cellar'.¹⁴⁷ To punish them, the girls were placed in one of the four tiny cells in the cellar of Red Lodge with no windows and bars on the doors. The nearby walls still show the children's handprints where they tried to avoid the punishment; this indicates that that Red Lodge staff did not stand by Mary's principles that 'music should be used in tranquillising and subduing the wild spirits we have to deal with'.¹⁴⁸ Mary had believed that the very existence of the cells would be enough to check their use and sat with the girls for 24 hours trying to convince them to behave but finally called the police and the girls were sent to prison for 3 months.¹⁴⁹

Disciplinary problems continued at Red Lodge, which Mary blamed on the teachers as she had at Kingswood, saying 'there is a great want of moral force in the staff'.¹⁵⁰ Responsibility

for these unfortunate incidents was not seen to rest directly with Mary, as she was then absent.¹⁵¹ On 9th July 1859, Mary wrote: 'perfectly awful, the rebellious girls in the gallery. The satisfaction they received was nothing in comparison with that they had unavoidably brought upon themselves'.¹⁵² Once again, Mary became ill, prostrated with disappointment at the failure of her methods of reform.

Mary Carpenter did not appear to understand how to manage a residential school for troubled girls or to be able to inspire her assistants who were required to do their poorly paid work with little apparent appreciation. Whether it was distrust or, more likely, that she believed she knew how to run the reformatory better than anyone, it was certainly not surprising that she had trouble in finding suitable people to work at Red Lodge. Mary's attitude to her staff was all too human. Like many people she wanted two contradictory things at once. She wanted her untrained and probably badly educated employees to be totally subservient to her as superintendent; she expected them to conform to methods drawn up by her yet at the same time, she expected them to exercise a strong personal influence over the character of the girls. Mary did not employ women who would oppose her; consequently those she employed were timid and could not discipline the girls. Mary was extremely inflexible and would not tolerate any interference with her views by her staff; she decided in future to part with any individual who interfered with her own authority.¹⁵³ In 1851, speaking in reference to the Ragged School, Estlin Carpenter refers to how Mary continued to expect more from her helpers feeling that everyone should show the same devotion to the reformatory cause as she did herself.

The confiding and ardent nature with which Mary welcomed each newcomer to the work; the occasional discovery of aims less lofty than her own, the preference of other plans than her own: indeed, the least hint of jealousy of her superior influence, excited her with undue agitation, and renewed within her the conflicts she had suffered so much.¹⁵⁴

Not surprisingly, working with Mary at Red Lodge presented difficulties as she expected her staff to work under her constant scrutiny. Miss Swanbourne left as her health was suffering under the stress of the regime and the rebellious nature of the students, and Miss Stuart was also reported to be in bad health. In 1856 the second matron to be employed at Red Lodge was described as a 'baneful influence': 'I have discovered' wrote Mary, a supporter of temperance:

That she certainly drank both porter and brandy, I clearly see her great object was to secure herself a comfortable home by getting rid of the persons who could not be made her tools and blinding me by flattery.¹⁵⁵

Of another teacher, Mary commented: 'I knew her to be inefficient as a teacher, but believed her faithful to duty and persevering, in fact inefficiency prevailed'.¹⁵⁶

It seems that Mary's problems stemmed both from her lack of trust in her staff and from her wish to be in control of any situation she was involved in. It was not Mary's nature to surrender authority gracefully and she did not hand over the reins of Red Lodge easily. She wrote in her diary, 'that Mrs J. recklessly alters arrangements ... she boasted of her strong moral influence, claiming that the results show the superiority of her plans'.¹⁵⁷ Sydney Turner's relationship with Mary became strained after he had taken the side of the matron, Mrs Johnson, against her. Mary then threatened to resign the certificate of Red Lodge and wrote in her diary: 'He spoke to me in an overbearing way which I am sure he would not have done to a gentleman'.¹⁵⁸ It was not until 1859 that a suitable matron was found who was capable of taking charge during Mary's absences.

One of Mary's helpers was Elizabeth Sturge who provides a picture of the life of the inmates at Red Lodge. She recalls a:

Vivid picture of her [Mary Carpenter] before my mind's eye as, seated in the 'oak room'. Mary addressed the assembled school on some festive occasion. Leaning forward (I only knew her when she was old) she spoke to the girls in her earnest, almost awe-inspiring tones, and distributed little rewards to those who had earned them by good conduct. The girls were often pitiable, for that children so young as many of them were when admitted, should have fallen into crime and been sent to prison was deplorable, especially when one knew that they had no chance at all in such homes as they came from.¹⁵⁹

Mary Carpenter did not want the girls at Red Lodge to engage in industry for profit as the boys at Kingswood did, and so the only alternative was to keep living expenses at Red Lodge as low as possible. Red Lodge was the cheapest reformatory in England at £14.5s. per head against a national average of £18.16s.5p per head.¹⁶⁰ Mary had noted in the *Red Lodge Journals* details of the *Home Office Statistical Returns* for September, 1858 when 55 girls were at Red Lodge (*Appendix Two*: p.188). The figures, although incomplete, show that Mary received £286.11s.4d for keeping 55 girls, an average of just over £5 per head per annum, and was expected to make up any shortfall from voluntary donations.

The figures also demonstrate that many people contributed towards dress material, intended to provide the children with suitable clothes. Red Lodge and Kingswood children were sent for emigration to Australia where they were met by Mrs Caroline Chisholm, and to the Children's Aid Society in America, while children travelling to Canada were accompanied by an accredited agent.¹⁶¹ The American Civil War had suspended supplies of cotton and the cotton famine caused unemployment and poverty among the Lancashire cotton workers. Philip Carpenter was actively engaged in promoting emigration. Mary agreed with him, saying the only thing anyone can do 'is to encourage emigration' for the children in her homes.¹⁶² Estlin Carpenter briefly refers to Mary taking three boys and two girls to Gravesend for emigration in 1854 but there is no actual indication of how many of the children from Kingswood and Red Lodge reformatory schools were sent for emigration.¹⁶³ Yet Mary was obviously unhappy about having to send the children for emigration, in 1864 she appointed a full-time Children's Agent in Bristol to find work and lodgings for newly discharged children and to visit them regularly. Mary felt that every large city should have a children's officer, a forerunner of today's social services.¹⁶⁴

Single women had extended the concept of motherhood to fit their celibate state, but social or spiritual motherhood was expressed in diverse attitude, language and behaviour. Work with children appealed to many single women and some, including Mary, not only worked in child welfare but adopted a child of their own. Mary had adopted Rosanna Powell in 1858. This was an unusual step for an unmarried woman and Mary's delight in the child is apparent:

Just think of me with a little girl of my own, readymade to my hand and nicely trained, without the trouble of marrying, etc., a darling little thing, an orphan. I already feel a *mere de famille*, happy in buying little hats and socks and a little bed to stand in my own room, out of my own money. It is a wonderful feeling.¹⁶⁵

In this case, a missionary called Foxton and his wife had been asked to look after the child and when the payment ceased she was placed in the workhouse. In 1858, Foxton applied for her to be admitted to the Muller Orphanage in Bristol, but the orphanage refused to accept her as Foxton could not prove that the child's missionary parents had been married. Mary agreed to keep the child in Red Lodge and she became so attached to her that she regarded her as a daughter, although there does not appear to have been a formal adoption process. This situation later caused a minor scandal when Foxton was accused of having stolen the child

from her mother and he was immediately retired, though the natural mother agreed to let Rosanna continue to live with Mary.¹⁶⁶

Mary Carpenter's maternalism made it possible for her to define herself as a motherly woman despite her status as a single woman. Her vision of social motherhood also allowed her to reconcile her deeply rooted nonconformist distrust of the state with the expansion of the state's role in regulating and financing juvenile reformatories. It seems that later in her life Mary, despite her single status, emerged as a mother figure, not only to Rosanna but to all the children in her care. Indeed, when later in her life she went to India she was given the title of 'old mother' and was clearly proud of that.¹⁶⁷

When Mary needed help in Red Lodge, Lady Byron suggested Frances Power Cobbe, an Irish Theist. In November 1858, Cobbe travelled to Bristol to live with Mary at her home, Red Lodge House. Cobbe's first impression was recorded:

'The first glimpse in the doorway set my mind to rest' wrote Frances enthusiastically, 'the plain and careworn face, the figure which at fifty-two was angular and stooping, were yet all-alive with feeling and power'.¹⁶⁸

She described Mary as 'clever enough, well read, and full of innocent merriment' and looked forward to sharing a 'happy life ... busy all day long'.¹⁶⁹ Frances Power Cobbe had an independent income; she paid Mary 36 shillings a week for board and lodgings and was continually entreating Mary to spend more time over meals and to enjoy a greater variety of food than bread and salt.¹⁷⁰ Cobbe described her time at Red Lodge:

Our days were much alike, we assembled for prayers early every morning; and breakfast, during the winter months, was got over before daylight. After this there were classes at the different schools, endless arrangements and organisations, the looking up of little truants from the Ragged School, and a great deal of business in the way of writing reports and so on. Altogether, nearly every hour of the day and week was pretty well mapped out, leaving only space for brief dinner and tea; and at nine or ten o'clock, when we met at last, Miss Carpenter was often so exhausted that I have seen her fall asleep with the spoon halfway between her mouth and the bowl of gruel she ate for supper.¹⁷¹

Burton believed that Mary experienced a tension between the sense of pleasure and satisfaction that she gained from her 'blessed work' in reform, and her belief that a self-denying Christian mission would be a mark of true piety which drove her into the ascetic lifestyle and punishing work schedule she undertook.¹⁷² Cobbe was also critical of Mary,

saying her absorption in her work always blinded her to the fact that others might be bored of hearing about it constantly:

Had she confined her conversation on the subject of her fellow workers it would be excusable, but it was with great difficulty that she could ever be moved by anybody out of her groove, or induced to talk on literature, or art, or general subjects.¹⁷³

Cobbe believed Mary 'was an ingrained stoic, to whom all the minor comforts of life are simply indifferent, and who can scarcely even recognize the fact that other people have need of them'.¹⁷⁴ Manton argues that Cobbe's work at Red Lodge was doomed from her arrival, that she wanted to convert Mary to Theism, and even that she wanted to become her lover.¹⁷⁵ This is pure speculation as Manton provides no evidence for her statement. Williamson points out that there is no proof that Cobbe harboured such an agenda, or that she expected Mary to renounce Unitarianism. The charge of lesbianism, Williamson believes, while titillating, cannot be substantiated.¹⁷⁶

Moreover, there does not appear to have been any reason why Cobbe and Mary should not become compatible co-workers, and perhaps friends. The two women appeared to share a warm relationship based on similar spiritual beliefs and mutual respect. Both women considered it their duty to become a part of God's philanthropic army to care for unfortunate children. They saw each other and themselves as the moral guides of the Red Lodge girls and in the early days of Cobbe's stay, their religious compatibility made for a harmonious atmosphere. Cobbe approved of Mary's approach to redeeming Bristol's wayward children, as, like Mary, she associated moral purity with practical action.¹⁷⁷ Nevertheless, Cobbe had trouble in adapting to Bristol's slums; Lewin's Mead was a derelict area lit by gas lamps, and full of criminals and drunks; even the police avoided it. Cobbe disliked the filthy run-down alley where the Ragged School was situated, next to a tripe and trotter shop, where the smell permeated the atmosphere. Cobbe was also expected to teach a 'class of very wild city Arabs'.¹⁷⁸ Cobbe and Mary's relationship is another example of the difficulties Mary experienced in working with women. Cobbe left Red Lodge to the summer of 1859 to regain her energy and to recover from an attack of rheumatism. Mary wrote to her, saying 'Dear Friend, Be sure that I am more grateful for your love than for any external help you can give me. I only desire to do the work given me by the loving Father'.¹⁷⁹ Mary can be credited with introducing Cobbe to issues concerned with providing homes for workhouse girls, workhouse epileptics and for discharged female prisoners.

The 1860 *Report of Reformatory Schools* showed that 'of the 33 girls discharged from Red Lodge, six had been discharged prematurely as 'incorrigible', eleven were doing well, nine were doubtful and seven had been reconvicted'.¹⁸⁰ Some success had been noted: for example, several members of the public had employed Red Lodge girls and several were satisfactory in domestic service. It seems, however, that Red Lodge was not successful in reforming the girls in its care, with only one third of its girls doing well, while two thirds had either re-offended, often discharged as unmanageable, and the success of nine was doubtful. With such failures it is hardly surprised that Red Lodge received criticism. That same year Lady Byron died, but although Mary lost one of her closest supporters she received a legacy sufficient for the outright purchase of Red Lodge, including a cottage in the grounds where suitable girls could be trained for domestic service.

In 1862, however, a management committee was formed at Red Lodge that excluded Mary from active involvement. Estlin Carpenter believes Mary was very bitter about this but formed a new interest in prison reform after Sir Walter Crofton visited Red Lodge in 1862 and later published on the Irish method of prison reform.¹⁸¹ Perhaps after her difficult correspondence with Sir Joshua Jedd and difficult scenes with Turner, the Reformatory Schools Inspector, Mary was looking for a new supporter. Yet during her life people were most reluctant to criticise Mary's management of Red Lodge, perhaps in fear of some form of retaliation by her formidable pen. Whenever Turner had cause to comment on an unsatisfactory point he went out of his way to exonerate Mary herself. For example: 'I think the school has suffered in the last two or three years by the employment of a lady superintendent to whom Miss Mary has entrusted a great deal of the supervision'.¹⁸² When Mary died in 1877, Turner eulogised her, but then criticised the school in a way he had not dared to do before: 'I was totally dissatisfied not only with the education provided but also with the spirit and behaviour of the girls ... I find nothing in the condition of the school to give me satisfaction'.¹⁸³

Although Mary refuted all criticism of her work at Red Lodge, in fact she had withdrawn from active management around 1860 and having completed *Our Convicts* in 1864, Mary was 'beginning to feel a strong wish for change'.¹⁸⁴ The Empire was providing new opportunities, which gave Mary 'a new impulse' and allowed her to escape the social and political limitations of Britain.¹⁸⁵ At the same time Mary became heavily involved with the

National Association for the Promotion of Social Science which gave her a public platform for gaining support for her reform ideas which is discussed in the next section.

3.5 The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science

The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (NAPSS), established in 1857, had evolved from the National Reformatory Union and the Law Amendment Society, who had shared members.¹⁸⁶ The first feminist campaign in Britain for protection of a wife's property after marriage had played a part in the creation of the NAPSS and had bought it female adherents from the onset. The original Married Women's Property Committee developed into the so-called Langham Place circle of women activists led by Bessie Raynor Parkes and Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon.¹⁸⁷ George Hastings, secretary of the NAPSS, helped the group establish the first feminist periodical in Britain, the *Englishwoman's Journal*, in 1858.¹⁸⁸

The NAPSS annual conferences attracted many participants interested in liberal causes. One of the important features of the NAPSS was the presence of 15 women at the opening conference, including Mary, which according to John Stuart Mill was 'a great step in admitting women in theory and in practice, to take part equally with the men, both in administration and in its proceedings'.¹⁸⁹ Rendall has suggested that within NAPSS certain themes in relation to philanthropy were emerging which were to be a significant part of the feminist cause of the 1850s. Women's influence - defined by them - was to be felt both in working-class homes through an appeal to working-class women and in new state institutions; thus middle-class women had to organise, to speak in public and to write for the press.¹⁹⁰ There was also a relationship between this need for women's influence to be broadcast with the desire of women for more varied occupations and employments.

The Englishwoman's Journal had encouraged its readers to give papers in person: Mary, who did not speak at the Birmingham reformatory conference she had helped organize in 1851, six years later read her own paper on 'Female Reformatories' at the inaugural Birmingham meeting of the NAPSS.¹⁹¹ The first public speech by a woman was such a curiosity that a large crowd gathered to hear her and the meeting had to be moved to the larger Theatre of the Midland Institute. Bessie Parkes recalled when 'Mary Carpenter spoke Hearers poured in from the other sections and sat, not only in every available corner, but

also on steps, or on anything they could find upon the floor'.¹⁹² Her brother noted that she sat 'surrounded by the first men of England, Brougham, Russell and Stanley among the number, raised her own voice, and was listened to with equal veneration'.¹⁹³ This public lecture, together with her work with children and her published works, made Mary both a role model and an inspiration especially but not only to other middle-class women. However, the vote of thanks to Mary was accepted by her brother on her behalf 'as to speak in public was one thing but to acknowledge applause would have infringed feminine modesty'.¹⁹⁴ At the earliest meetings of the NAPSS women's papers were read by men on their behalf. Florence Nightingale contributed seven papers in this manner.¹⁹⁵ An exception to this was Mary whose increasing self-confidence enabled her to read her own papers each year and argue passionately for educational and social reform based on the associationist principles of her father and David Hartley. In the first 20 years of the association's life she gave 36 papers (*appendix three*, p.189) the largest contribution of any member. Mary also took part in the discussions afterwards, basing her arguments on detailed analysis as well as her own considerable experience.

The NAPSS laid claim to be the first public platform for middle-class women in British history where women were involved as participants. Indeed, the NAPSS provided Mary with her most important platform throughout her career. In claiming a space in public assembly rooms by the simple use of their voices, Unitarian women reformers such as Mary, Bessie Parkes and Barbara Bodichon can be said to have challenged the male privilege of public address and changed the visual, oral and aural culture of Victorian reform movements.¹⁹⁶

There are connections between family life and the public life, or sisterhood, of women like Mary Carpenter, Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon and Bessie Raynor Parkes who were all forced to live by rules set by their fathers. While Mary had a close relationship with her father, Leigh Smith Bodichon and Rayner Parkes had difficult relationships with theirs. Unlike Mary, who had no income of her own, Bodichon was the daughter of wealthy nonconformists and she received an income of £300 a year and the deeds to Westminster school when she turned 21.¹⁹⁷ Rendall has recently shown the way in which Bodichon and Parkes came to see the need to fight women's oppression.¹⁹⁸ Despite their evident ability they were both denied access either to the field of political and social reform in which their fathers were engaged or to any form of paid employment.¹⁹⁹ While Bodichon lived with a family who were sympathetic to her interests the opposite was true of Parkes's family. Rendall

believes both women experienced a constant sense of emptiness and lack of purpose until they became closely involved in the women's movement and found it a fulfilling activity. 'The awakening of self-consciousness and of different kinds of feminist activity ... has to be related to personal histories and the network of friendship which underlay the slow growth of the women's movement'.²⁰⁰ Like Mary, Parkes was constrained by patriarchal authority until her father's death. Yet in the case of Parkes it would seem that it was the strength of her friendship with Bodichon that was important, while in Mary's case it was the strength of her relationship with her father and other male authority figures. Mary did have many female supporters and admirers who helped her in her schools, but unlike Lady Byron and her sisters, it is difficult to describe them as friends.

Due to the opprobrium Unitarians faced for their religious views they appear to have been very concerned to adhere to a conventional etiquette with Unitarian women themselves mediating notions of female propriety.²⁰¹ It is possible that the conflict Mary was experiencing between public speaking and the expectation of feminine modesty lay behind her attempts to reconcile her work with the traditional expectations of her family. Unitarian women, such as Mary, Florence Nightingale and Octavia Hill experienced increasing problems as to how they might fulfil their work, without transgressing traditional bounds of propriety. The origins of this conflict lay deeper than feminine reticence. As a member of a religious society which had 'always compensated for its rashness in thought by its social conventions', Mary may have been trying to reconcile her work with the traditional expectations of friends and family.²⁰² Anxieties concerning the politics of public speaking demonstrate the problems women faced when entering the public sphere. Cobbe's paper *Social Science Congresses and Women's Part in Them* discussed the multiple anxieties concerning the politics of public speaking; matters concerning women's decorum and appearance all pointed to the dilemmas women faced when entering the public spheres.²⁰³

It is not surprising that Mary, with a keen desire for respectability and aware that Unitarianism was perceived with suspicion, as well as the limitations of the period towards gender and class, would be worried about speaking in public. Henrietta Busk, for example, was mindful of her aunt's injunction that: 'Women of our family do not speak on public platforms. Remember!'²⁰⁴ Yet three years after her first public appearance at the NAPSS, Mary became the first woman to address the British Association for the Advancement of

Science, from which she had been debarred in 1836.²⁰⁵ *The Times* noted ‘her voice, low and gentle, but full of authority’.²⁰⁶

Mary Carpenter certainly had an influence on her audiences at the NAPSS; one explanation for this could be her gender. Audiences may have responded more readily to a female advocate of children, as protection of the weak was understood to be a natural component of femininity; she could speak on India because she had travelled there herself. The absence of sensation in her public presence probably served her well, as it would have protected her from accusations of self-promotion, frowned on by her liberal feminist contemporaries. Mary’s reputation as a speaker, together with the sheer number of her contributions and the ‘reasoned’ and ‘gentle’ tone of her public demeanour, ‘inoffensively reconciled a male-oriented professional expertise with a feminine propriety lined with care and moral sympathy’, helped normalise and legitimise women’s platform presence.²⁰⁷ Whereas speakers such as Parkes and Cobbe routinely received a mixture of moral censure and ridicule, Mary appears to have escaped criticism and was continually held up as a shining example, by both feminists and non-feminists, of proper womanly behaviour in official public settings.

As discussed, women, particularly those who were single, entering the public domain risked exposing themselves to ridicule from those who saw it as their duty to police the boundaries of female respectability. As a result great care had to be taken in the way their actions were perceived, both by themselves and others. Respectable women could be seen to enter the public arena only for higher moral or patriotic duties, and not for praise. Nevertheless, Mary, by defining spinsterhood as having a social and motherly vocation, was able to counterbalance anxieties about spinsters as dangerous and redundant burdens on the family and society. She did this within the context of both the religious imperative surrounding the notion of women’s domestic mission, and the development of the organised women’s movement. Mary’s careful rejection of the personal in her public identity allowed her to forge a new sense of self, of personhood, one that inoffensively reconciled a male-oriented professional expertise with a feminine propriety of care and moral sympathy.²⁰⁸

More commonly, women’s activities were portrayed as a natural extension of their domestic responsibilities with the emphasis on selflessness and care for others.²⁰⁹ It would be wrong to characterise the reception women speakers received at the NAPSS as entirely negative, for example *The Times* had guarded approval for speakers such as Bessie Raynor Parkes, even

going so far as to reproduce one of her speeches. Watts believes that while Mary was an outstanding example of the Unitarian emphasis on an intellectual education for girls her later public career was held back by 'a typical anxiety to conform to contemporary modes of respectability'.²¹⁰ Certainly Unitarian women, because of radical beliefs they held, had to behave in a very circumspect manner and Mary, throughout her life, had an obsessive concern over the propriety of her behaviour.

In 1859 women came forward in greater numbers to speak for themselves, and by 1870 women's contributions were routine. 163 women gave papers at Congresses, contributing 269 papers out of more than 3,000 printed in *Transactions of the National Association of the Promotion of Social Science*.²¹¹ Approximately 100 papers given by women were concerned with the 'woman question', including married women's property, as well as 'several dozen' papers contributed by men on women's issue.²¹² As Dorothy Thompson has stated, although often taken to be synonymous with votes for women, the 'woman question' in nineteenth-century Britain was as much about the moral authority of women as any battle over women's political rights and this aspect is highlighted in the association.²¹³ Mary was not interested in women's rights when first associated with the NAPSS but she came around to that viewpoint in her later years. It is apparent that the NAPSS also changed perceptions on the issues of women's employment as *The Times*, in 1862, noted that this 'crochet' had 'attracted the notice of grave and sensible men and won its way to public favour' was 'chiefly owing to the ventilation secured for it in the Social Economy Department of these Congresses'.²¹⁴

Nevertheless, individual women members of the Association were few in number, although many more women attended the Congresses by purchasing special Ladies' Tickets. In 1865/6, only 22 women were members out of a membership of 1,064 while in 1870 it remained the same figure, 22 out of a total membership of 956 and in 1874/5 it had fallen to 15 out of a membership of 1,173.²¹⁵ While more women were presenting papers and increasing their public profile no woman was ever a member of the Association's governing council. This mirrors the anti-slavery societies of earlier in the century, when men were on the committees and women were the 'foot soldiers'. Perhaps in order to encourage more women to become members, Mary chaired, in 1869, a Ladies Conference at the NAPSS and around 150 women gathered for the first conference in Bristol.²¹⁶

Mary explained the rationale behind separate meetings for women and men. She felt women could consider 'peculiarly women's business which was unworthy to take up the time of the general body of the association and it would be easier for ladies to quietly speak out'.²¹⁷ Nevertheless, a more intense division arose among the participants over a wider issue; should they concentrate on women's issues and philanthropy; or on political campaigns to remove the inequalities to which women were subjected? Mary told the Congress that:

They would keep clear of politics or political subjects, and of what were called women's rights. Or their fancied wrongs ... ladies should work modestly and quietly, and not seek any more publicity than is necessary to obtain their object.²¹⁸

She continued that she hoped that they would 'avoid political or religious discussions, women's suffrage or rights... they were much safer in keeping to women's work'.²¹⁹ Despite her role as a public speaker in the NAPSS, even in the company of women Mary still felt it necessary to adhere to rigid codes of propriety. Nevertheless, it would appear that the ladies involved did not wish to keep to women's work and when the Ladies Conference met again the next day under the presidency of Lady Bowring, it again debated its *raison d'être*.²²⁰ Mary's wishes were ignored as the majority favoured a political option. The following year, Mary did not attend the Ladies Conference, seemingly annoyed that her wishes had been overturned and the 1870 conference was the last held for women. The forming of a separate association for women, while possibly Mary's idea as she was chairwoman, would seem to defeat the NAPSS objectives. The abrupt termination of the Ladies' Association was understandable as the Social Science Association already brought women into the public domain and facilitated alliances with sympathetic men, and to hold separate discussions lost both these advantages.²²¹ While women's contribution to the earliest congresses had been exclusively about women's issues, over time women had come to contribute on all the questions before the Association; hence separation limited the impact they could have made beyond their sphere.²²²

While Mary was not a feminist, her views on the Women's Movement changed over the years and, well aware of the problems of prostitution by the behaviour of the girls at Red Lodge, saw that women needed to stand together in each other's defence. Mary publicly supported the Women's Movement to obtain better education and thereby employment for middle-class girls, arguing for the establishment of training school for girls and women to be trained as teachers, as well as advocating training schools for Indian women to be educated as teachers. To this campaign women brought the same concern for moral principle that had

characterised Garrisonian abolitionists in particular with 'social purity' being seen by many women as the new abolition movement.²²³ Like many reforming women of her generation she was appalled by the sexual double standard of the Contagious Diseases Acts, which the Government had passed in the 1860s to reduce venereal disease in the armed forces. Mary felt:

The question is whether the two sexes are entitled to equal rights, or whether one is created for the use of the other. This, once settled, the rest follows easily. Granting the medical necessity for stamping out disease, then any law to this effect must affect both sexes equally.²²⁴

Mary publicly supported the campaign to repeal the Contagious Diseases Acts, and was vice president of Josephine Butler's Ladies' National Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Disease Act, formed in 1869. Butler had been approached to lead the agitation against the Contagious Disease Act, and felt that it might be 'the very work, the very mission I longed for years ago and saw, coming afar off, like a bright star'.²²⁵ Butler, in a similar way to Mary earlier in the century, was looking for a way to devote her life to the poor. Butler was devoted to a powerful father whose religious beliefs and public works she tried to extend or complement. However, 'she also had to negotiate with a masculine tradition and to establish that she had been specially chosen to undertake a public role' and in a similar way to Mary, Butler believed she had a personal God-given responsibility to undertake social work.²²⁶ Butler offers another example of a woman who had an adolescent religious crisis and, however vague, her account makes it clear that crisis was unlike those of Cobbe, George Eliot or other Victorian intellectuals whose spiritual agony centred on their inability to believe in the God of revealed religions. Butler was apparently never in doubt about this fundamental truth; rather, what concerned her was how to make sense of human injustice and to accept she had a particular God-given responsibility to fight it.²²⁷ Butler's crisis was similar to those of Mary Carpenter and Catherine Beecher in that it centred on how to face the implications of having been chosen by God to dedicate one's life to His service.²²⁸ Catherine and Mary were likewise devoted to powerful fathers committed to their religion and public service which they too sought to emulate. All three women had to negotiate with the patriarchal tradition to establish that they had been specially selected to dedicate themselves to a public role.²²⁹ Yet while both Mary and Josephine drew inspiration from fathers who linked religious belief to a reforming passion, their approach to social and moral reform was different. This reflected a wider distinction between the Unitarian tradition, which

had an emphasis on individual education so people found their own answers to religious truths, and Butler's mainstream evangelism, with its stress on salvation and conversion.²³⁰

Bristol was an important centre for women's groups in the South West, and members came from Quaker and Unitarian families. These groups were some of the first in the country to fight the Contagious Diseases Act, to campaign for female suffrage, organise the municipal vote and form political associations.²³¹ Single women were particularly active in the Bristol branch of the Ladies' National Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts and in 1870 they made up 40% of the membership.²³² Members of this society in Bristol included Mary Estlin, Agnes Beddoe, Mary Priestman, Mary's sister Mrs Charles Thomas, Margaret Tanner²³³ and Liliash Ashworth. These were women who had been involved in the Lewin's Mead Visiting and Working Society, the Bristol campaign against anti-slavery or who had assisted Mary in her various schools in Bristol. Mary demonstrated to her contemporaries the possibilities that were available to women in the area of social work and, by her own example, showed it was possible for women to bring about significant changes in social policy.

The suffrage campaign employed and developed strategies used previously in the anti-slavery campaigns by appealing to Parliament. John Stuart Mill moved for an amendment to the 1867 Reform Bill, calling for the inclusion of women on the same terms as men and although his bid was unsuccessful, women started to set up societies to campaign for female enfranchisement. Feminists began to highlight British women's potential role as social reformers of the Empire as a way of claiming that they had a legitimate place in a Parliament responsible for policy making on imperial as well as domestic issues. While Mary had not been initially a supporter of female suffrage, John Stuart Mill encouraged her to put any doubts she had about campaigning to one side. In 1867 Mill wrote to her requesting support (*appendix four*: p.190) but Mary replied that she had to devote her time and energy to her schools, saying:

Withholding the franchise is of course simple injustice ... [I am] bound to give my heart and soul and strength, influence that my name may have, to work on which I am embarked.²³⁴

Estlin Carpenter notes that Mary would evade questions on her views on women's rights saying 'I don't talk about my rights, I take them' or she would declare 'that she had all the rights which she wanted, given to her'.²³⁵ While Mary did not wish for her educational work

to be side-tracked by the women's suffrage campaign, she gradually came around to the view that women needed to be organised politically to defend their interests. Mary played an important role in stimulating interest in Indian women among British women suffrage campaigners in the 1860s, and has been described by Burton as 'a role model of feminist imperial activism'.²³⁶ While Mary had links to organised feminism, she, like many active public women such as Florence Nightingale, kept her distance from the movement, lending support to certain causes and inspiring feminists through example rather than direct involvement. Both Nightingale and Mary felt it was necessary to separate issues from suffrage for tactical reasons, and for Mary 'this was as true in Bristol as anywhere else'.²³⁷ Mary's reluctance to lend her name to women's suffrage in the late 1860s was informed by a dichotomy; she felt that by doing the work she herself had chosen, she was quietly going about gaining rights that other women were merely talking about.

The theme of sisterhoods is a recurring one, both in the *English Woman's Journal* and in the work of writers such as Louisa Twining. It is apparent that there was a cohesion and a sense of cooperation between women working together - a sisterhood - between reformers of this period, particularly among single women. While Mary herself seems to have more in common with men intellectually, she was a member of this sisterhood as well as having the support of the Unitarian network. These women included Harriet Martineau, Mary Estlin, Lady Noel Byron, Bessie Raynor Parkes, Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon, Josephine Butler, Mary Howitt, Agnes Beddoe, the Winkworth sisters, Florence Nightingale, the Hill sisters and Frances Power Cobbe. Despite differences in age, religious persuasion and politics, there was also a large degree of unity within Bristol's female philanthropic elite; a sisterhood which found expression in friendships and associations. A sense of solidarity was encouraged by linkages of female action and extensive kinship networks such as those the Unitarians shared shaped the collective and individual identities of single women.²³⁸ The work of these women, among others, brought together the themes of education and training, of the need for employment, of the ever expanding sphere of women's lives away from their domestic role.²³⁹ Hill has stressed the growth of religious sisterhoods in mid-nineteenth century Britain should not be viewed in theological terms but rather for the 'transitional' functions they performed before the state and the 'caring' professional absorbed their work.²⁴⁰ Jane Rendall believes that suffragists in this period were concerned with exploring the meaning of citizenship and in doing so had to engage with contemporary liberal ideas and the tradition of radical politics. Women demanded the vote as a right and also because they wished to carry

out their duties as socially responsible citizens, believing that women had a feminine perspective to bring to politics.²⁴¹

A professional approach to charitable and political engagement was integral to the empowering ideal of a single life as one of service and influence. Certainly through their day-to-day involvement with charitable work, single women were able to develop a sense of citizenship and to influence the ideology and practice of urban politics. Influence and encouragement worked across horizontal lines of kinship, i.e. the Carpenter siblings, and vertically between generations, as the Estlins and Hill families demonstrate. For example, when the Bristol Women's Suffrage Society met in 1868, it had male parental backing but at the same time it also highlights the difficulty women had in acting as independent agents. The invitation, in a circular from Professor Newman, stated that:

Mr Commissioner Hill permits his daughter to invite, as many as his drawing room will hold to meet there on 24th January, 1868, at 3.p.m. for a friendly consultation on this public question, although from the narrowness of the space the meeting cannot be public.²⁴²

Agnes Beddoe, a member of the first committee, explained:

I found a large part of the fashionable part of the community present. It was explained to us that the society was unlike most others, for it required neither time nor money, it was so evidently fair and just too, that it only required to be brought before Parliament to be granted.²⁴³

While Mary herself did not wish to be distracted from what she considered was her God-given work in educational reform, she did come to see the need for women to have political rights if the world was to be reformed. In 1868 Mary believed:

I feel that I have as good a right to the vote as any man, but I have not signed any petition and decline to give my name to it. I wish these things to be left, for they will surely come about in the gradual order of change.²⁴⁴

In 1871, the Bristol and West of England branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage joined with five others to organise a conference in London to assist the progress of the latest Suffrage Bill and to send a deputation to Gladstone.²⁴⁵ Here we see that middle-class women influenced by women such as Mary gained the courage to express their views in a public meeting. By 1872, the Bristol and West of England Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage members included Mary, her nephew, the Reverend J. Estlin Carpenter, Charles and Herbert Thomas,²⁴⁶ Helen Bright Clark, Catherine Winkworth, Emily

Sturge and Dr Eliza Walker, Bristol's first female doctor. While men were involved in the society it was the women who came forward to carry out the day-to-day organisation and to undertake public speaking. Bristol activists persuaded newspaper proprietors to report their meetings as fully as possible as well as seeking the support of local Members of Parliament and gathered signatures for petitions to be presented to Parliament. In March 1877 Mary spoke at a crowded meeting of the Bristol and West of England Society for Women's Suffrage where she and Frances Power Cobbe took turns to propose or second the resolutions on women's suffrage.²⁴⁷

While Mary's associationist principles were not as successful as she had hoped in her management of Kingwood Agricultural School and Red Lodge Reformatory School for Girls later in her life she saw the necessity to take on a more public role to bring an awareness to a wider public of the problems of delinquency and the care of children and prisoners. For this purpose she became an active member of the NAPSS, finally overcoming her father's viewpoint on the role of women and what can be described as her obsession with suitable womanly behaviour for a Unitarian woman, to talk publicly on her concerns to bring them to a wider audience. Not only did she present more papers than any other speaker at NAPSS her words were also published in *the Transactions of The National Association for the Promotion of Social Science* bringing her words to a wider audience. While initially inspired by her father, Mary was becoming her own woman.

The next chapter discusses Mary Carpenter's role in bringing education to Indian women.

- ¹ Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders*, C. Gilpin 1851, p.261.
- ² Selleck, R.J.W, 'Mary Carpenter: a confident and contradictory reformer', *History of Education*, Vol.14, No 2 p.106.
- ³ Young, A.E, & Ashton, E.T, *British Social Work in the Nineteenth-century*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956, p.164.
- ⁴ May, M, 'Innocence and experience of the concept of juvenile delinquency in the mid-nineteenth-century', p.16, *Victorian Studies*, (1973), September, VXII, No.1.
- ⁵ Weiner, Martin J, *Reconstructing the Criminal, Culture, Law and Policy in England, 1830-1914*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990, p.17.
- ⁶ Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1769-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.179.
- ⁷ The schools were given this name because the children who attended had only ragged clothes to wear and they rarely had shoes.
- ⁸ For example: *Ragged School Association: petition for continuance of the grant in aid*, Issue 143 of Parliamentary Paper, publisher Thomas Strut, 1889.
- ⁹ Mary Carpenter, Diary, 31st December 1846 cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p83.
- ¹⁰ Latimer, John, *The Annals of Bristol in the Nineteenth Century*, Bristol, W. & F. Morgan, 1887, p.6.
- ¹¹ Fawcett, Millicent Garrett, *Some Eminent Women of Our Time: Mary Carpenter*, Westminster, National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, 1912, p.5.
- ¹² Carpenter, J. E, (1879) *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, New Jersey, 1974, p.95.
- ¹³ Letter: *Mary Carpenter to William Lloyd Garrison* Boston Public Library, MS, A.9.2.Vol.16, p.8.
- ¹⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.135.
- ¹⁵ Letter: *Mrs Carpenter to Mrs Timothy Smith*, Bristol, August 7th, 1846 cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.82.
- ¹⁶ Carpenter, Lant, *ibid*, p.70.
- ¹⁷ Extract from the teaching journal of Mary Carpenter, c.1856 quoted in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.112.
- ¹⁸ Carpenter, Mary, 'Address on female Education by Miss Carpenter at Bombay', *Bombay Gazette*, March 14th, p.66.
- ¹⁹ Latimer, John, *Annals of Bristol in the Nineteenth-century*, Bristol, W & F. Morgan, 1887, p. 207.
- ²⁰ Carpenter, Lant, *Principles of Education*, pp.193-197, pp.200-201.
- ²¹ Carpenter, William, *Life and Sketch of Mary Carpenter* Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877, p.7.
- ²² Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.88.
- ²³ Carpenter, J.E, *ibid*, p.138.
- ²⁴ The biblical quotation she placed on the title page: 'We speak that we do know, testify that we have seen' was both an affirmation of her independence of statistical evidence as well as confirmation that she wrote from her personal experiences. .
- ²⁵ Carpenter, Mary, *Ragged schools, Their Principles and Modes of Operation, by a Worker*, London, 1850, pp.47-8.
- ²⁶ Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *The Idea of Poverty: England in the early industrial age*, Faber and Faber, 1984, pp.36-8.
- ²⁷ Dickens parodies a Ragged School in *Our mutual Friend* (1864-5) and published mildly critical but approving articles in *Household Work* (1850-9).
- ²⁸ Cited in Young Agnes Frieda and Aston, E.T, *British Social Work in the Nineteenth-century*, Routledge, 1956, p.164.
- ²⁹ Knell, B.E.F, 'Capital Punishment: Its Administration in relation to Juvenile Offenders in the Nineteenth-century and Its Possible Administration in the Eighteenth Century', pp.109-207, *British Journal of Criminology, Delinquency and Deviancy & Social Behaviour* V.
- ³⁰ Cited in Hilton, Mary, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young: Education and Public Doctrine in Britain 1750-1850*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2007, p.199.
- ³¹ Thomas Barwick Lloyd- Baker presented a paper on Reformatory schools in September 1854 at the British Association Meeting cited in Stack, John A, 'Reformatory and Industrial Schools and the Decline of Child Imprisonment in mid-Victorian England and Wales', p.645, *History of Education*, vol. 23, 1994, No 1, March; This report was published as *Report of the Hardwicke Reformatory for 1856 and 1857*, Gloucester, 1858. Jelinger Symons had written *Tactics for the Times: As Regards the Condition and Treatment of the Dangerous Classes* in 1849.
- ³² Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Delinquents- Their Condition and Treatment*, G. Cash, 1851, pp.262-3.
- ³³ King, Peter & Shore, Heather, *Artful Dodgers: Youth and Crime in Early Nineteenth-Century London*, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 1999, p.94.

- ³⁴ King & Shore, *ibid*, p.94-5.
- ³⁵ Selleck, Richard, 'Mary Carpenter: A confident and contradictory reformer', pp.101-15, *History of Education*, 1985, Vol.14, No.2, pp.107-8; Watts, Ruth, 'Education, Empire and social change in nineteenth-century England', p.778, *Paedagogica Historica*, Vol.45, No.6. December, 2009; Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter and India: enlightened liberalism or condescending imperialism? p.194, *Paedagogica Historica*, 37.1. 2002.
- ³⁶ Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.178.
- ³⁷ Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory schools for the children of the perishing and dangerous classes and for Juvenile Delinquents- Their Condition and Treatment*, G. Cash, 1851, p.14.
- ³⁸ Foucault, Michael, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prisons*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1977, p.138.
- ³⁹ Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *The Idea of Poverty: England in the early industrial age*, Faber and Faber, 1984, p.379.
- ⁴⁰ Dickens, Charles, 'Lambs to be Fed', p.544-9 cited in Hilton, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young*, p.193.
- ⁴¹ BRO 12693/23: *Bristol Daily Post*, 24th May, 1857.
- ⁴² Hilton, Mary, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young*, p.198.
- ⁴³ Hilton, *ibid*, p.198.
- ⁴⁴ Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory schools*, p.40.
- ⁴⁵ 'Report from the Select Committee and Destitute Juveniles,' pp. 105-7 cited in Selleck, R.J, 'Mary Carpenter: A confident and contradictory reformer', p.11, *History of Education*, 1985, Vol 14, No 2.
- ⁴⁶ Carpenter, *Reformatory schools*, preface.
- ⁴⁷ Watts, *Gender*, p.176.
- ⁴⁸ King, & Shore, *Artful Dodger*, p.113. The establishment and regime of Parkhurst prison has been dealt with extensively in: Carlebach, Julius, *Caring for Children in Trouble*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, pp.25-46; Radzinowicz, Leon, Sir, *A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration from 1750, The Emergence of Penal Policy in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Clarendon Press, 1990.
- ⁴⁹ Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory Schools*, p.321-2.
- ⁵⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *ibid*, p.321-2.
- ⁵¹ Carpenter, Mary, *ibid*, p.298.
- ⁵² Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory Schools*, pp. 261-2, emphasis in the original.
- ⁵³ Box 11 in a collection of letter and MS of Sir J. Jebb in the Library of the London School of Economics cited in Carlebach, Julius, *Caring for Children in Trouble*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, p.51-2.
- ⁵⁴ Carlebach, *ibid*, p.48.
- ⁵⁵ Parker, Julia, *Women and Welfare*, Basingstoke, Macmillan Press, 1980, p.28.
- ⁵⁶ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.226.
- ⁵⁷ Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976, p.161.
- ⁵⁸ *Miscellaneous papers* containing Newspaper cuttings and pamphlets relating to Mary Carpenter, including *Reply to the Guardians*, Pamphlet, Longman Brown, Bristol, n.d. BRO 12693/2.
- ⁵⁹ Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976, p.161.
- ⁶⁰ Carpenter, J. E., *Mary Carpenter*, p.130.
- ⁶¹ Mary Carpenter believed 'that it is not so much the poverty which fills our prisons with young criminals, as the vicious conduct and culpable neglect of parents'. Carpenter, Mary (1853) *Juvenile Delinquents, their condition and treatment*, Nabu Press, 2010, p.299; p.152.
- ⁶² Carpenter, Lant, (1820) *Principles of Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*, Longman & Co, Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1974, pp.93-5.
- ⁶³ Carpenter, Lant, *Principles of Education*, p.94.
- ⁶⁴ Carpenter, Lant, *Principles of Education*, p.184; p.222.
- ⁶⁵ Carpenter, Mary (1853) *Juvenile Delinquents, their condition and treatment*, Nabu Press, 2010, p.316.
- ⁶⁶ Saywell, Ruby, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, Bristol, Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1964, p.7.
- ⁶⁷ Hilton, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young*, p.200.
- ⁶⁸ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.103.
- ⁶⁹ Carpenter, Mary, *Voices of the Spirit and Spirit Pictures*, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877, Introduction.
- ⁷⁰ Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.177.
- ⁷¹ Carpenter, Mary, (1853) *Juvenile Delinquents, their condition and treatment*, Nabu Press, 2010, p.14.
- ⁷² Box 1 in a collection of letter and MSS. of Sir J. Jebb in the Library of the London School of Economics cited in Carlebach, Julius, *Caring for Children in Trouble*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969, pp. 51-2.
- ⁷³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.12.
- ⁷⁴ Selleck, Richard, 'Mary Carpenter: A confident and contradictory reformer', pp.107-8, *History of Education*, 1985, Vol.14, No.2.

- ⁷⁵ Carpenter, Mary, *Our Convicts*, 2 vols. (1864) Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1969, 1, p.218.
- ⁷⁶ Carpenter, *ibid*, 1, p.31.
- ⁷⁷ Carpenter, Mary, *Our Convicts*, 1, p.217.
- ⁷⁸ Carpenter, Mary, *ibid*, 1, p.224.
- ⁷⁹ Carpenter, Mary, *Our Convicts*, 1, p.287.
- ⁸⁰ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.13.
- ⁸¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.306.
- ⁸² Robertson, Frederick William. *Female Life in Prison* (1862). *Memoir of Jane Cameron, Female Convict* (1863) and *Prison Characters Drawn from Life with Suggestions for Prison Government* (1866).
- ⁸³ Schwan, Anne, "'Dreadful beyond Description'", Mary Carpenter's prison reform writings and female convicts in Britain and India', p.111, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 14, No.2, 2010.
- ⁸⁴ Carpenter, Mary, *Our Convicts*, 2 vols, (1864) Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1969,1. p.1
- ⁸⁵ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.191.
- ⁸⁶ Martineau, Harriet, 'Life in the Criminal Classes', *Edinburgh Review* cited in Schwan, *Dreadful beyond Description*, p.110.
- ⁸⁷ A radical Unitarian who had many connections with the radical Unitarian cohort who had recently returned to Bristol to live, he was a long standing friend of the Carpenter family and a founding member of the Law Amendment Society.
- ⁸⁸ Mary Carpenter, Miscellaneous Papers 'The Invitation to the 1853 Conference, Juvenile Delinquency, Preventive and Reformatory Industrial Schools'. BRO12693/23.
- ⁸⁹ Many of Hill's views were published as *Suggestions for the Repression of Crime* in 1857 which established his reputation as a criminologist and reformer
- ⁹⁰ Davenport Hill, Rosamund & Florence, *A Memoir of Matthew Hill*, Macmillan & Co, 1878, p.161.
- ⁹¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.122.
- ⁹² Davenport Hill, R, and F.D, *The Recorder of Birmingham: a memoir of Matthew Davenport Hill with a Selection from his correspondence*, 1878, p.172.
- ⁹³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.126.
- ⁹⁴ *Report of the proceedings of a conference of the subject of preventive and reformatory schools, held at Birmingham, on 9th and 10th December*, London, 1851.
- ⁹⁵ 'Report of the Proceedings of the Second Conference on Preventive and Reformatory Schools, 1854' cited in Carlebach, *Caring for Children*, p.49.
- ⁹⁶ 'Report of the Select Committee on criminal and Destitute Child', *Parliamentary Papers*, 1852 (515) V11 iff cited in Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976, p.107.
- ⁹⁷ Hilton, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young*, p.174.
- ⁹⁸ 'The Ladies Evidence- Poor Relief.' *English Women's Journal*, 7 (1861), p.406 cited in Schroeder, Janice, 'Self Teaching: Mary Carpenter, Public Speech, and the Disciple of Delinquency', p.153, *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 36, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- ⁹⁹ Carpenter, Mary, 'Women's Work in the Reformatory Movement', *English Women's Journal*, 1, (1858), pp.189-95.
- ¹⁰⁰ Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.177.
- ¹⁰¹ Mrs Carpenter to Philip Carpenter, February 4th, 1852, cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.129.
- ¹⁰² Selleck, *Mary Carpenter*, p.110.
- ¹⁰³ Wingburger, Barbara, 'The children of the perishing and dangerous classes: Industrial and reformatory schools and the elementary education system, Childhood, Youth and Education in the Late Nineteenth-century', p.65, *History of Education Series*, 1980.
- ¹⁰⁴ It was not until 1899 that prior imprisonment was abolished.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Letters: Mary Carpenter to Sir Stafford Northcote* in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.191; p.193; p.205; p.210; p.213-4; p.284.
- ¹⁰⁶ Russell Scott (1801-1880) had assisted in the formation of one of the first large stock banks in London. He was a member of the finance sub-committee, together with Dr Russell Carpenter, to fund the building of a new chapel for the Hampstead Meeting. He left business at age 36 having achieved what he considered a competence. He purchased both the site and the buildings at Kingswood. Scott also supported the London Domestic Mission from its foundation. Carpenter's brother, Russell Lant, was the honorary organist at the Hampstead Chapel and introduced him to Mary Carpenter.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Bristol Mercury*, 14th February, 1852.
- ¹⁰⁸ Saywell, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, p.7.
- ¹⁰⁹ In 1843, Lady Noel Byron had wanted a tutor for her daughter Ada's two children and offered the post to William Carpenter.

- ¹¹⁰ Annabella, Lady Noel Byron (1792-1860) had studied the methods of the continental reformer, Johann Pestalozzi, and she was also a prominent publicist of the Swiss reformer, Phillip von Fellenberg who believed that education should be a holistic experience, to ensure the happiness of mankind.
- ¹¹¹ *Letters: Mary Carpenter to Annabella Byron* cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.120, 130, and 147.
- ¹¹² Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.168-171.
- ¹¹³ Rendall, Jane, 'Friendship and Politics: Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon (1827-91) and Bessie Raynor Parkes (1829-1925)' p.137, in Mendes, Susan & Jane Rendall (eds.) *Sexuality and Subordination*, Routledge, 1989.
- ¹¹⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.139.
- ¹¹⁵ Carpenter, Russell Lant, *Memoirs of the Life and Work of Phillip Pearsall Carpenter*, C. Kegan Paul & Co, 1880, pp.132-3: BRO12693/53: Carpenter, Philip, *The Sixth Report of the Red Lodge Girls' Reformatory Schools*, Oberin Press, 1861.
- ¹¹⁶ Carpenter, Russell Lant, *Memoirs of the Life and Work of Phillip Pearsall Carpenter*, C. Kegan Paul & Co, 1880, pp.132-3: BRO12693/53: Carpenter, Philip, *The Sixth Report of the Red Lodge Girls' Reformatory Schools*, Oberin Press, 1861.
- ¹¹⁷ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.156.
- ¹¹⁸ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.152.
- ¹¹⁹ Unfortunately no further details are given of the conflicts at Kingswood. Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.156.
- ¹²⁰ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.153.
- ¹²¹ Carpenter, J.E, *ibid*, p.153.
- ¹²² Carpenter's diary cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.165.
- ¹²³ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.167, no references.
- ¹²⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.234
- ¹²⁵ Carpenter, J.E, *ibid*, p.234.
- ¹²⁶ Bailin, Miriam, *The Sickroom in Victorian Fiction: The Art of Being Ill*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p.7.
- ¹²⁷ Bailin, *Sickroom*, p.19.
- ¹²⁸ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p. 148.
- ¹²⁹ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"' pp.46-7 in Hilton, M, & P. Hirsch (eds.) *Practical Visionaries, Women Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Harlow, Pearson Education, 2000.
- ¹³⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Reformatory Schools*, p.81.
- ¹³¹ Carpenter, Mary, *Our Convicts*, p.31-2.
- ¹³² Zedner, Lucia, *Women, Crime and Custody in Victorian England*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1991, p.19.
- ¹³³ Carpenter, *Reformatory Schools*, p.84-5.
- ¹³⁴ Carpenter, *Reformatory Schools*, p.110. Emphasis in original.
- ¹³⁵ Lord Palmerston, as Secretary of State, signed the Certificate of Red Lodge, on the 9th December 1854.
- ¹³⁶ Carpenter, William, *Sketch of the Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877, p.11.
- ¹³⁷ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.177.
- ¹³⁸ *Ibid*, p.177.
- ¹³⁹ Carpenter, Mary, *Principles, Rules and Regulations of Red Lodge*, 1855: BRO 12693C.
- ¹⁴⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Our Convicts*, p.210; p.253.
- ¹⁴¹ *1st Report Reformatory Schools, 1858*, p.24 cited in Carlebach, *Caring for Children*, p.457.
- ¹⁴² *Red Lodge Journals, 1855-1857*: BRO12693/1/2.
- ¹⁴³ Saywell, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, p.10; 'audacious' appears to be the term used for promiscuous.
- ¹⁴⁴ *2nd Report of Reformatory Schools, 1869*, cited in Carlebach, *Caring for Children*, p.57.
- ¹⁴⁵ Sargant, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.31.
- ¹⁴⁶ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"' in M. Hilton & P. Hirsch (eds.) *Practical Visionaries, Women Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Harlow, Pearson Education, 2000, p.47.
- ¹⁴⁷ BRO12693/1/2: *Red Lodge Journals, 1855-1857*, 9th February, 1858.
- ¹⁴⁸ *Ragged Schools, their principles and modes of operation by a Worker*, Partridge and Oakley, 1850, pp. 47-8.
- ¹⁴⁹ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.133.
- ¹⁵⁰ Saywell, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, p.13.
- ¹⁵¹ *14th Report Reformatory and Industrial Schools*, p.51-2
- ¹⁵² Carpenter, Mary, *Red Lodge Journal*, Vol, 2, 9th July, 1859.
- ¹⁵³ Saywell, Ruby J, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, Bristol, Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1964, p.11.
- ¹⁵⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.121.
- ¹⁵⁵ BRO 12693: *Journal of Red Lodge and Girls' Reformatory*, May 1859, p.86; July, 1859, p.99.

- ¹⁵⁶ Saywell, *Mary Carpenter*, p.13.
- ¹⁵⁷ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.143.
- ¹⁵⁸ Manton, *ibid.*, no reference, p.143.
- ¹⁵⁹ Sturge, Elizabeth, *Reminiscences of my Life*, J. Arrowsmith Ltd, 1928, p, .31.
- ¹⁶⁰ Manton, *Mary, Carpenter*, p.169.
- ¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p.173.
- ¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p.186.
- ¹⁶³ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.156
- ¹⁶⁴ Carpenter, Mary, 'Supplementary Measures for Reformatories' cited in Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.174.
- ¹⁶⁵ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.198-9.
- ¹⁶⁶ BRO12693/23; *Album of press cuttings*.
- ¹⁶⁷ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.383, 396.
- ¹⁶⁸ Cobbe, Frances Power, *Life of Frances Power Cobbe*, Vol.1. Richard Bentley and Son, 1894, p.276.
- ¹⁶⁹ Letter: *Frances Power Cobbe to Miss Goddard*, 27th November, 1857, Boston Public Library, MS.AM.1456 (15).
- ¹⁷⁰ Williamson L, *Power and Protest: Frances Power Cobbe and Victorian Society*, Rivers Oram Press, 2005, p.48.
- ¹⁷¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.200.
- ¹⁷² Burton, Antoinette, 'Fearful Bodies into disciplined subjects: pleasure, romance and the family drama of colonial reform in Mary Carpenter's Six Months in India', pp.545-74, *Signs* 20:3, Spring, 1995.
- ¹⁷³ HMC, Miscellaneous Box, Frances Power Cobbe, *Personal Recollections of Mary Carpenter*, p.209.
- ¹⁷⁴ Cobbe, *Life*, I, p. 277
- ¹⁷⁵ Manton, *Mary Carpenter*, p.148
- ¹⁷⁶ Williamson, *Power and Protest*, p.48.
- ¹⁷⁷ Cobbe, *Life*, I, p.266.
- ¹⁷⁸ Minor Deposits, 1311A, National Library of Wales, cited in Williamson, *Power & Protest*, p .50.
- ¹⁷⁹ Mary Carpenter to Frances Power Cobbe, 17th March 1859. Frances Power Cobbe Collection, CB cited in Williamson, *Power and Protest*, p.257.
- ¹⁸⁰ *3rd Report Reformatory School*, 1860, p.34.
- ¹⁸¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.232
- ¹⁸² Carlebach, *Caring for Children*, p.55.
- ¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp.55-6.
- ¹⁸⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.309.
- ¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p.309.
- ¹⁸⁶ The National Reformatory Union had, since 1846, been engaged in a reassessment of the theories of punishment. This resulted in Mathew Hill's important and influential *Draft Report on the Principles of Punishment*, intended to be a guide for reform and to shape thinking on the reformatory movement.
- ¹⁸⁷ The middle-class feminists of the Lanham Place Circle campaigned to improve the position of women within British society by petitioning for married women's property rights as well as campaigning for improvement in women's educational and employment opportunities.
- ¹⁸⁸ Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.115.
- ¹⁸⁹ *Letters: J.S. Mill to Helen Taylor, 21 Feb, 1860 and T.B. Potter, 17 March 1864* in Mineka, F.E. & D.N. Lindley, *The Later Letters of John Stuart Mill in Collected Works of J.S. Mill*, Toronto, 1972 XV, 683, 925 cited in Goldman, Lawrence, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain: the Social Science Association, 1857-1886*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p.46.
- ¹⁹⁰ Rendall, Jane, *The Origins of Modern Feminism*, Macmillan Education, 1985, p.269.
- ¹⁹¹ *Englishwoman's Journal*, 2 October 1857, p.124 cited in Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.115.
- ¹⁹² Belloc, *A Passing Wind*, p.16-17. Goldman states that it is not clear whether this statement specially refers to the 1857 paper or her addresses in general. Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.115.
- ¹⁹³ Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.115.
- ¹⁹⁴ Schroeder, Janice, 'Self Teaching: Carpenter, Public Speech, and the Disciple of Delinquency', p.149, *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 65, Cambridge University Press, 2008 Schroeder, *Mary Carpenter*, p.2.
- ¹⁹⁵ Nightingale, Florence, 'Notes on the Sanitary Condition of Hospitals, *Transactions of the TAPSS*, 1858, p.462-8.
- ¹⁹⁶ Schroeder, 'Self Teaching', p.149.
- ¹⁹⁷ Caine, Barbara, 'Feminist Biography and feminist history', *Women's History Review*, 3:2, p.254.
- ¹⁹⁸ Rendall, Jane, 'Friendship and Politics: Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon (1827-91) and Bessie Rayner Parkes (1828-1925)' in Mendus, Susan & Jane Rendall (eds.) *Sexuality and Subordination: interdisciplinary studies of gender in the nineteenth century*, Routledge, 1989.

- ¹⁹⁹ Caine, *Feminist Biography*, p.255.
- ²⁰⁰ Rendall, 'Friendship and Politics', p.163.
- ²⁰¹ Gleadle, Kathryn, *The Early Feminists, Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement 1931-51*, Macmillan, 1995, p.30.
- ²⁰² Gray, B.K., 'History of English Philanthropy, 1905, pp.307-308 cited in Schupf, Harriet Warm, 'Single Women and Social Reform in mid-Nineteenth-century England: The Case of Mary Carpenter', p.310, *Victorian Studies*, Vol.17, No.3 March 1974.
- ²⁰³ Cobbe, Frances Power 'Social Science Congresses and Women's Part in Them', *Macmillan's Magazine*, December, 1861, p.93.
- ²⁰⁴ Young, Ruth, *The Life of an Educational Worker: Henrietta Busk*, (1934) cited in Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.212.
- ²⁰⁵ Radzinowicz and Roger Hood, *A History of English Criminal Law And Its Administration from 1750, Vol.5, The Emergence of Penal Policy*, Clarendon Press, 1986, p.164.
- ²⁰⁶ *The Times*, 28th June, 1870.
- ²⁰⁷ Schroeder, *Self Teaching*, p.154.
- ²⁰⁸ *Ibid*, pp.149-61.
- ²⁰⁹ Morgan, Simon, 'Seen but not heard? Women's Platforms, Respectability, and Female Publics in the Mid-Nineteenth-century', p. 51, *Nineteenth-century Prose*, 2002.
- ²¹⁰ Watts, Ruth, 'Breaking the Boundaries of Victorian Imperialism or extending a reformed paternalism? Mary Carpenter and India', p.448, *History of Education*, 2000, Vol.29. No.5.
- ²¹¹ Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.117.
- ²¹² Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.117-120/
- ²¹³ Thompson, Dorothy, 'Women, Work and Politics in the Nineteenth-century England: The Problem of Authority' pp.57-8 in Rendall, Jane, (ed.) *Equal or Different., Women's Politics, 1800-1914*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- ²¹⁴ Goldman, *Science, Reform*, p.120
- ²¹⁵ *Ibid*, p.118.
- ²¹⁶ *Ibid*, p.137.
- ²¹⁷ *Ibid*, p.137-8.
- ²¹⁸ *Ibid*.
- ²¹⁹ *Ibid*.
- ²²⁰ *Ibid*, pp-116-8.
- ²²¹ *Ibid*, p.137-8.
- ²²² *Englishwoman's Review*, 15th October, 1880, p.461.
- ²²³ Billingtons, *A Burning Zeal*, p.109.
- ²²⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.337.
- ²²⁵ Butler, J.E, *An Autographical Memoir*, E.D. G. & L. Johnson, Bristol 1909 p.91 cited in Caine, Barbara, *Victorian Feminists*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, p163.
- ²²⁶ Butler, *ibid*, p.162.
- ²²⁷ Caine, Barbara, 'Feminist Biography and feminist history', *Women's History Review*, 3:2, p.257.
- ²²⁸ Caine, *ibid*, p.257
- ²²⁹ Sklar, Kathryn Kish, *Catherine Beecher: a study in American Domesticity*, W.W. Norton & Co, 2007.
- ²³⁰ Midgley, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform' 148-9 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ²³¹ Malos, E, 'Bristol Women in Action, 1839-1919: The right to vote and the need to earn a living' p.97 in Bild, I, (ed.) *Bristol's Other History*, Bristol, Bristol BroadSides, 1983.
- ²³² Martin, Moira, 'Single Women and Philanthropy: a case of women's associational life in Bristol, 1880-1914', p.399, *Women's History Review*, 17:3: Josephine Butler refers to the Bristol women 'I refer especially to the sisters Priestman and Margaret Tanner, with Miss Estlin and others closely associated with them who have been to me personally, through this long struggle... a kind of bodyguard, a 'corps d'elite' on whose prompt aid, singleness of purpose, prudence and unwearied industry I could and can rely on at all times'. Butler, Josephine, *Personal Reminiscences of a Great Crusade*, Horace Marshall, 1896, p.104-5.
- ²³³ A neighbour of the Carpenter family.
- ²³⁴ *Letter: Carpenter to J.S. Mill*, 11th August 1867, British Library of Political and Economic Science. Mill-Taylor Collection, Vol.1.103:
- ²³⁵ A Reminiscence of Mrs Jones, of Seneca Falls cited in Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.338.
- ²³⁶ Burton, *Burdens of Empire*, pp.111-13, 122-3.
- ²³⁷ Malos, *Bristol Women in Action*, p.109.

- ²³⁸ Martin, Moira, 'Single Women and Philanthropy: a case of women's associational life in Bristol, 1880-1914', p.412, *Women's History Review*, 17:3.
- ²³⁹ Rendall, Jane, *The Origin of Modern Feminism*, Macmillan 1985, p.316.
- ²⁴⁰ Hill, M, 'The Religious Order- A study of virtuosio religion and its legitimation in the nineteenth century Church of England', 1973, p.10 cited in Rendall, *Modern Feminism*, p.316.
- ²⁴¹ Rendall, Jane, 'Citizenship, Culture and Civilisation: The Language of British Suffragists, 1866-1874', pp. 127- 50 in Daley, C, & Nolan, M, (eds.) *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminine Perspectives*, New York University Press, 1994.
- ²⁴² Tanner, S. J, *How the Women's Suffrage Movement began in Bristol Fifty Years Ago*, 1918, Carlyle Press, p.6.
- ²⁴³ Beddoe, Agnes, *The Early Years of the Women's Suffrage Movement*, Bradford on Avon, 1911.
- ²⁴⁴ *Western Daily Press*, 18th June, 1868.
- ²⁴⁵ Hannam, J, ' "An enlarged sphere of usefulness": The Bristol's Women's Movement', p.190 in Dresser, M., And Ollerenshaw, Phillip, *The Making of Modern Bristol*, Tiverton, Redcliffe Press, 1996.
- ²⁴⁶ Herbert Thomas was Mary's brother-in-law.
- ²⁴⁷ HMC: Miscellaneous Box, Frances Power Cobbe, *Personal Recollections of Mary Carpenter*, no date or provenance, p.299-300.

CHAPTER FOUR

India is the brightest jewel in the British Crown.¹

4.1 Women's involvement in the campaigns against *sati* in India and with Rammohun Roy

The visit of Rammohun Roy to Britain in 1831-1833 was an early example of interfaith dialogue; an illustration of British views on India and the Indian response to Christianity. Unitarians had become interested in the work of Rammohun Roy (1772-1833) when he had mobilised public opinion against *sati*, the burning of Hindu women on their husbands' funeral pyre. Roy had appealed for support in England, bringing considerable pressure to bear on Indian policy through the House of Commons.² The Unitarians' broad political and social impact in nineteenth-century Britain ensured Rammohun Roy's ideas were widely circulated. The Unitarian reform agendas were similar to that of Rammohun Roy in wanting freedom of the press: Unitarians had founded the *Manchester Guardian* and Rammohun Roy had helped to establish several newspapers in Calcutta. Both Unitarians and Rammohun Roy were interested in the education of women, as well as the promotion of welfare in this life rather than in the afterlife. Rammohun Roy, like the Unitarians, believed that there was a universal truth underlying all religions that could be apprehended by reason.³ Rammohun Roy's deist views, his struggle with Hindu orthodoxy and debate with Baptist missionaries over the doctrine of the Trinity and the nature of Christ, and the fact that his family was said to have disowned him for his views, all resonated strongly with the Unitarians of the 1820s and 1830s.⁴ They had themselves faced persecution by the authorities, legal disputes over chapels and endowments, as well as public objections to their involvement in politics and campaigning.

Rammohun Roy, along with a number of Indians and Europeans, was involved in the formation of a short-lived Unitarian Committee in 1821 in Calcutta, which paved the way for his progressive, rationalist organisation, the Brahmo Samaj.⁵ This organisation broke away from centuries old traditions in a rigid Indian society by proclaiming equality on the basis of universality and rationality, and the group received a great deal of hostility from Hindus steeped in the old ways. Missionary criticism around the subject of Indian women, together with concerns voiced by liberals and radicals in England, had encouraged many Indians to take up issues around social reform. A key motivator was a belief that for a 'national

awaking' to take place in India some reform and modernising was necessary.⁶ Reformers felt that without substantially changing women's status, regeneration in India appeared to be doomed to failure. However, while they wanted changes in the way women were treated they did not want it to happen through reliance on Western leadership or continuous discourse about the evils of Hinduism by European missionaries. Zastoupil believes that by successfully leading a public campaign to rescue women from ritual death, establishing schools and literacy societies for the advancement of knowledge, and founding newspapers and a printing press, Rammohun Roy was, in many respects, the image of those Unitarians who were reshaping provincial urban life in Britain.⁷

Rammohun Roy also campaigned against female infanticide and polygamy and he was an important and influential advocate of education for Indian women. Rammohun Roy was the first Indian figure to publicly undertake critical examination of the Indian heritage and he not only took a stand against *sati*, grounding his argument in scripture, but he also attempted to reformulate Hinduism. As a result Rammohun Roy emerged as one of the first Hindu exponents of social reform and is often known as the 'father of modern India'.⁸ Rammohun Roy was both a linguist and a social reformer; he was selected by the Mogul Emperor Abunassar Muinuddin Akbar as his unofficial emissary, and given the title of Rajah.⁹ In 1829, after much debate, the British Government outlawed *sati*; however, this was challenged by orthodox Hindus and placed before the Privy Council to make a final decision. Rammohun Roy was called to give evidence in this case and he arrived in England in April 1831 and was welcomed and extensively acclaimed in reform circles in Britain

Mani, in contrast, argues that *sati* was marginal to the debate over India. She believes the controversy was over definitions of Hindu tradition, the place of ritual worship, the civilising missions of colonialism and evangelism, as the well as the proper role of the colonial state. Nevertheless, the prohibition on *sati* was heralded as a key step forward for women's emancipation in modern India. It was also highly significant in the history of British imperialism because it came to be used as a major justification for Imperial rule over India through positioning British men as the protector of non-Western women. By assigning to British men the credit for the abolition of *sati*, both British government discourses as well as Christian missionaries presented Indian women as passive victims and Indian men as their violent abusers.¹⁰

Imperial concerns featured prominently in the evangelical reform agenda between the 1790s and the 1830s. Midgley believes that it was cross currents of influence, between religiously motivated reform movements in Britain and the United States, that were important in stimulating the almost simultaneous entry of women into petitioning in both nations in the 1820s and 1830s. Yet it was only by presenting the issue of *sati* and slavery as a moral rather than a political issue, that female petitioning became acceptable.¹¹ Indeed, after the eradication of British involvement in the slave trade, colonial slavery became a key campaigning priority. A second preoccupation viewed as equal, or of even greater, importance, was to bring Christianity to the people of Britain's expanding empire in the Indian subcontinent.

Women in the missionary movement campaigning against *sati* in England used petitions to call on Parliament to abolish it and between February 1829 and March 1830 a total of 14 separate petitions were sent to Parliament.¹² These petitions also drew women into the first co-ordinated attempt to provide Christian education for Indian girls.¹³ While female anti-slavery activists highlighted the oppression of black women by white men under the system of colonial slavery, the female anti-*sati* campaigners highlighted Hindu women's oppression by Hindu men. Both campaigning groups stressed the importance of combining legislative intervention with direct social action; 'while the former stressed the need to reform the coloniser, the latter stressed the need to reform the colonised'.¹⁴ The campaigns against *sati* were part of a broader campaign which was linked to garnering female support for the foreign mission movement, yet Midgely believes that historians have largely overlooked this extra-Parliamentary campaign, probably because it was overshadowed by the contemporary anti-slavery campaign.¹⁵ British women campaigners, by contrasting their own position with Indian women - similarly to anti-slavery campaigners whose campaigning overlapped chronologically - signalled their acceptance of their existing social role by stressing their own privileges in a civilised and Christian country.¹⁶ However, there is no documentary evidence that Mary, despite her father's involvement with Rammohun Roy, was herself actually involved in campaigning. Perhaps at this period, Mary was still heavily influenced by her father as to the proper role of women, since as noted above it was only after his death that Mary became more confident of her abilities.

Rammohun Roy's visit to England generated enormous publicity in both India and England. In Manchester 'the great unwashed' joined crowds to see 'the King of Indee [sic]'.¹⁷ Midgley

believes that Rammohun Roy was particularly popular with Unitarian women as they saw him 'as representing an ideal new man, deeply concerned with improving the position of women' and demonstrating that Indian men could be supporters of women's rights; they also believed his religious beliefs were similar to their own¹⁸ At the same time Roy also bolstered British women's sense of superiority to Indian women, as well as a belief that British imperialism was a good influence in India. British women were keen to meet him as they appeared to believe that he was on the verge of converting to Christianity. Religion provided a respectable cover for social relations with an Indian that would have been otherwise unacceptable. Rammohun Roy was a very attractive figure, dressed as a Rajah, stately, eloquent and high-class, so it is not surprising that women found him interesting. He could also be described as middle or upper-class another important factor in his popularity. A contemporary who left an account of Rammohun Roy's visit to England described him 'in the prime of manhood his figure was beyond common height, and was stout and muscular in proportion'.¹⁹ Lucy Aikin described Rammohun Roy in glowing terms:

I have seen the excellent Rammohun Roy. He is indeed a glorious being - a true sage - with genuine humility... and more fervour, more sensibility. A more engaging tenderness of heart than any *class* of character can justly claim.²⁰

Catherine Castle, Lant Carpenter's ward, was another woman impressed by Rammohun Roy; she had his picture painted, which today hangs in Bristol City Art Gallery. Middle-class women, by their interaction with Rammohun Roy, were also able to feel part of a British civilising mission.²¹ 'Who knows', wrote one of Mary's correspondents to her, 'this man may be one of the instruments by which, God, in his mysterious providence, may accomplish the overthrow of idolatry'.²² While Rammohun Roy was supported by a wide network of influential women he was not without criticism. Indeed, there were certainly concerns about his popularity with women as Lant Carpenter was forced to counter the rumours about Rammohun Roy's popularity with the British ladies:

I had myself repeated opportunities of observing with earnest respect how he appreciated the true delicacy in the female character and I learn that, while he always maintained his habitual politeness to the sex, and may have therefore misled the superficial observer, he manifested a very prompt and clear discrimination as to individuals, and even disgust, where they seemed to him to depart from that true modesty which is essential to its excellence.²³

Soon after his arrival in London, Rammohun Roy had written to Lant Carpenter, expressing his wish to visit Bristol and make his acquaintance.²⁴ The two met in May 1831 and Lant conducted him to a meeting of the Unitarian Association in the Strand, where they met with

Joseph Tuckerman. It was not until August 1833 that Rammohun Roy visited the Carpenter family in Bristol and worshipped at Lewin's Mead Meeting House, where the congregation eight years previously had contributed to the setting up of a Unitarian mission in India that he had connections with.²⁵ Mary first became interested in India when she met Rammohun Roy when he visited her father in Bristol and had many conversations with him concerning educational prospects for women in India. Rammohun Roy also encouraged women such as Mary to believe that they themselves had the power to bring about positive changes in the lives of Indian women. It is not surprising, with the adulation surrounding Roy, that Mary was deeply impressed; another factor that would have attracted Mary was her father's approval of him. Estlin Carpenter records that Rammohun Roy 'filled her with an intense and enduring interest in the regeneration of India'.²⁶

Rammohun Roy was staying at Beach House, Stapleton Grove, Bristol, at the home of Catherine Castle and her Aunt Ann Kiddell, both members of the Unitarian community, when he became ill.²⁷ Dr Estlin was called and recognised that Rammohun Roy was suffering from meningitis; he died some ten days later on 27th September, 1833. Mary was among those who attended his silent funeral conducted by her father who read aloud several of her sonnets in commemoration of Rammohun Roy.²⁸ Medhurst believes these sonnets are highly revealing of the beliefs of Unitarians at the time, and of the attitude of Westerners, even progressive liberal one, to the East. Mary regarded India as 'pagan' with 'wandering children' and referred to 'India's darkening shore' with Indian women 'trembling midst the dismal night of pagan horrors' and contrasted this with Rammohun Roy's vision of 'the day-star of approaching morn, an Unitarianism that would persuade India to accept Christ's message'.²⁹ Rammohun Roy's body was eventually laid to rest in Arnos Vale Cemetery, Bristol. Mary later expanded her feelings more fully saying:

When he died she had the melancholy duty of following his body to the grave; a very strong impression of that circumstance remained on her mind, and she resolved to do all she could to benefit that good man's country.³⁰

After his death Rammohun Roy was the focus of widespread memorialisation by Unitarians, while the on-going commemoration of Roy throughout the nineteenth century contributed to a continuing communication between Unitarians and Brahmo reformers. The next section discusses education for women in India.

4.2. Education for women in India

One of the first battles fought by Evangelicals in Britain was to modify the Charter of the East India Company so that India could be opened up to missionary activity. The setting up of missionary schools was motivated by the belief that intellectual enlightenment could lead to a rejection of Hindu idolatry, conversion to Christianity and the subsequent moral reform of society.³¹ While British mission organisations were never formally aligned with the institutional apparatus of Empire, both domestic and colonial governments supported religious activity where it buttressed their authority.³² Missionaries in India recognised as early as 1820 that female education was vital to achieving their aim of reforming society from a familial base, and that British women could potentially play a leading role in promoting this.³³ Missionary literature regularly presented reports and provided illustrations of the 'degraded condition of women in heathen countries', and felt that education was crucial to their success.³⁴ When missionary activities expanded after 1813, missionary societies became increasingly reliant on the networks of ladies associations for funds, and *sati* was the focus of appeals to draw women into the missionary movement.³⁵

From the period when the British first began to settle in India, the practice of *sati* was commonly represented as a product of a pagan religious system, which had produced all 'manner of strange and backward social practices, not least the caste system, and had aroused interest in the way Hindu women were treated by men'.³⁶ Female supporters of missions couched their opposition to *sati* in the terms of an Indian widow's duty as a mother, which accorded with Evangelical idealisations of motherhood; it also linked support for missions in India to their preoccupations in the domestic philanthropic area with work among working-class women and children. Thus, the ambitious project for the conversion and moral reform of India was placed in women's hands and women were encouraged to imagine that they had the power, under the auspices of the British Empire to extend their own privileges as white women to other women.

As British women were already demonstrating their philanthropic concern for their own sex it was not surprising that missionary appeals to women in England focused on the ill-treatment of women in India, and more graphically of the horror of *sati*. *Sati* prompted the first recorded group of female petitions in 1829, one year before women's first mass petition for the abolition of colonial slavery. The *sati* petitions set a precedent for female intervention in

colonial policy and were at the forefront of later feminist intervention on the condition of Indian women from 1865. Between 13 February and 29 March 1830, a total of fifteen separate groups of women from around England sent petitions to Parliament calling on it to ban *sati*, which they described as ‘the practice in India of burning widows on the funeral piles of their husband’.³⁷ Female petitioners against *sati*, together with the female petitioners against colonial slavery who followed them, were anxious to present petitioning as a respectable female activity that lay within their womanly sphere. By presenting petitions as pleas to powerful men to extend their paternal protection to Indian women, British women attempted to defuse criticisms of usurping a male role. This feminine context was first used in the anti-*sati* campaigns then replicated in the campaign against slavery. Thus the campaign by women with connections in the missionary movement directly preceded the more extensive petitioning by women against colonial slavery, between 1830 and 1833. Although the eradication of the slave trade was the most pressing concern to the British in the early part of the nineteenth century, at the same time there was an effort through the missionary movement to bring Christianity to the people of Britain’s empire in India.

Mary Carpenter had heard about the educational difficulties that beset women in India both from her friends in Government and from Indian students who came to visit her in Bristol. Whereas India had remained a shadowy concern for the three decades while Mary was involved in her career as a social reformer, she often invited educated Bengalis to Bristol, perhaps assuming that Christian influence on the Indian elite would pave the way to the spread of Christianity. Jogut Chunder Gangooley came to Bristol from the United States, recommended to Mary by her friend the Rev. A. Livermore.³⁸ While Indians were eligible to work for the Indian Government under the Indian Civil Services Act of 1861, almost all higher appointments were by competitive examinations held in London. Indian candidates for the Indian Civil Service came to England for their special two-year courses at British universities. Many of these young Bengalis were members of the Brahmo Samaj, formed by Rammohun Roy, and visited the elaborate mausoleum in Bristol where Rammohun Roy lay entombed; and some also visited Mary Carpenter’s reformatories.³⁹

At Christmas 1865, Mary invited three Hindu students to join her in Bristol and their discussions revived her interest in India. Mary learnt from her Indian visitors that they wanted the Indian girls who were to become, or already were, their wives and mothers of their children, to have similar educational advantages to those that British females received.⁴⁰

For example, one Indian reformer believed that India would be measured as a civilised country by 'the social conditions' of its women.⁴¹ Mary also learnt from her Indian visitors of the 'extreme prejudice against Christian converts and the orthodox missionaries, male or female in general'.⁴² Other visitors included Mr S.N. Tagore and Mr M. Ghose and they led Mary to resolve in secret to devote herself to the elevation of women in India.⁴³

Gangooly's preaching to Unitarians in Bristol inspired Mary to try to help him; she wrote to the Reverend Livermore in September 1860, saying that his 'simplicity, unaffected manner, and genuine devotion to the cause of his master, inspired us all with very warm interest and a desire to help him'.⁴⁴ Mary noted in her diary her promise to Gangooly that she hoped 'to go to India, and do all I can to help him and his wife in their work for the native women and girls; if possible establishing the reformatory principle in Calcutta'.⁴⁵ Burton believes that Estlin Carpenter suspected that she had romantic feelings towards him as he refers to him as 'Mr G'. Burton continues that the cultural taboos working against any kind of union between a Victorian Englishwoman and an Indian man must be adduced by the fact that he was the only Indian visitor who Estlin Carpenter does not name in his account of Mary's life.⁴⁶ However, at the time Mary was fifty-three and Gangooly in his twenties so it was more likely she thought of him as a surrogate son; he was only one of several Indian men, of whom Rammohun Roy was the first, whom Mary met who promoted her interest in India and revived her thoughts about extending her father's reform work to India.

British and European missionaries in nineteenth-century India were keen to bring the message of the Christian gospel to the Indian masses; they were especially interested in young, educated and English speaking upper caste Indians whose conversion to Christianity could pave the way for conversion of the masses through the Indian continent. While the Empire offered many opportunities for men in government, religion, trade and military exploits, for women this was more limited. An area woman could become involved in and gain authority and position was through education. Missionary activities, long regarded as the province of the male, fostered the growth of female educators once the idea took hold that Christianity, especially in India, depended on the conversion of wives and mothers.⁴⁷ While the main foreign missionary societies did not directly employ women until the second part of the nineteenth century, women did play a crucial role overseas as missionaries' wives, while single women were employed by women-run societies to undertake the Christian education of native females. One of the earliest was the Society for Promoting Education in the East, in

1834, followed by the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society in 1852.⁴⁸ Societies such as these demonstrate how the Victorian missionary imagination defined civilization and women's role in imperialism.

Missionary schools, while playing a vital role in education in the first phase of the women's educational movement, had several distinct features. Firstly, they were open for Indians of all classes; secondly, the language of instruction was Bengali; and thirdly, the lesson on the tenets of Christianity was a compulsory part of their curriculum. The schools therefore did not attract girls from the respectable class and alienated middle-class Indians who felt that missionary education did not meet the needs of some Hindus, Muslims and Parsis who wanted education for their daughters to be within the tradition of their own faith and not within the lines laid down by the mission schools, which included teaching of the Bible. It was this aspect of Indian mission schooling that caused most concern and was disliked by Indian nationals.⁴⁹

In England women's missionary societies were founded with the limited goal of supporting female mission teachers for girl's schools.⁵⁰ Midgley reports that by May 1821 a total of £521.9s had been collected by the Ladies Committee of the British and Foreign School Society to fund sending a woman teacher to Calcutta.⁵¹ Under the patronage of Radhakanta Deb, of the Calcutta Female Society (formed in 1819) and the Baptist Christian Missionary Society, Mary Anne Cooke (1795-1861) travelled to Calcutta in 1821 and was very successful in setting up a network of schools in the Calcutta district. Cooke was not only supported by funding from Britain, she was also aided by prominent local Hindu reformers in Bengal who were supportive of girls' education, despite their distrust of the missionaries' agenda. Cooke was the forerunner of a group of single female missionaries who found in India a new sphere of opportunity which contrasted with their constricted lives in Britain. Nevertheless, as will be seen, Mary's plans to introduce different methods of schooling caused much disapproval among missionaries.⁵² It is apparent that aspects of life in India that British women were agitating against reflected their own positions in relation to suffrage; in addition, the petitions against *sati* by women, as well as increasing support for the foreign missionary enterprise, can be said to be linked to part of a larger campaign to extend the female realm.

In 1865 it seems that the Governmental understanding of the educational situation in both Calcutta and London remained sketchy. This permitted official policy to waver unsystematically between girls' schooling and female teacher training for the next 30 years without much awareness of the differences between them and how they might be interconnected in the future.⁵³ While Government reports continued to carry favourable reports of mission schools, the schools themselves had a history of poor management and tensions with the Government over educational philosophy. In 1859 the missions accounted for 4.6% of children attending Government schools and by 1875/6 this had only grown to 9.2%.⁵⁴ Yet though inadequate and disliked by Indian nationals, mission schools were the first attempt to bring education to the masses, even if their real aim was conversion to Christianity. The threat of Christian missionaries converting Muslim or Hindu girls was removed when in the 1850s Indians began to open schools for girls themselves. Mathur states that in 1854 there were approximately 626 girls' schools in India, including 288 in Bengal, 256 in Madras and 65 in Bombay. While these schools were minuscule in relation to the total population, a shift in attitude towards female education had taken place.⁵⁵ From only 95 girls' schools with an attendance of 2,500 in 1863, the figures went up to 2,238 schools in 1890 to more than 80,000 students.⁵⁶

In 1857, shortly after the 'mutiny' in India, Harriet Martineau, who had not actually visited India, published a lengthy historical narrative history of the British involvement in India, *British Rule in India* (1857) in which she suggested that the British public knew hardly anything about the subcontinent. Her book *Suggestions on the Future Government of India* (1858) was a discussion on the nature and desirability of colonialism. Martineau's interests were not specifically focused on the emancipation of Indian women but rather on colonial reform, politics and the Indian people in general. Nevertheless, Martineau's description of India as 'an imagined community' demonstrated that the book was written for an audience unfamiliar with the concept of the British Parliament governing a land so 'strange and far away'; thus she domesticated imperialism for the British palate.⁵⁷ The wealth of material written on India was due to a number of factors. Firstly it was a field of political controversy in which intellectual and educated women could contribute to the debate; secondly, it was also a potential field of employment; and thirdly, and perhaps more importantly, it was a new area where women could undertake social reform and participate in the imperial enterprise.

Many British women such as Josephine Butler, Millicent Fawcett and Dorothea Beale, while never visiting India themselves, regarded the emancipation of Indian women as an extension of their own domestic campaigns. Their writings contrast with those of Mary Carpenter, Annie Besant, Flora Annie Steel and Annette Ackroyd Beveridge who visited, or lived and worked in India. In 1866, Mary edited *The Last Days in England by Rajah Rammohun Roy* and included a biographical sketch for which she used extracts from her father's book, *Review of the Labour, Opinion and Character of Rajah Rammohun Roy* (1833). In this book Mary discussed her assessment of the religious harmony between the Unitarians and the Brahmo Samaj movement in India. By using extracts from her father's works, Mary again demonstrated how his beliefs permeated her writings. Mary's religious beliefs are clearly mixed with her plans for reforms and it is apparent that she saw herself as successor to both her father and to Roy. Mary had been impressed with Roy's view of Indian women, but she was not immune to projecting Western values onto the Indian way of life. She noted in her diary:

O Father, my heart is fixed, in the deep recess of my heart I feel Thee leading and guiding me to go to carry Christian sympathy and help to Thy distant children in India, especially those of my sex.⁵⁸

Many women of the Raj such as Mary crossed boundaries of accepted race, gender and class positions to find friends among Indian reformers, and the next section discusses Mary's first trip to India to stay with her Indian friends.

4.3 Mary Carpenter and India

In 1866, aged nearly 60, Mary determined to sail to India to visit her Indian friends. She stressed her initial ignorance about India and stated that she only went there 'because Indian gentlemen most earnestly entreated that British women would try to do something for their ladies'.⁵⁹ Schwan believes the British Empire ultimately offered Mary perhaps the 'most significant platform for intervention and a social tactic aiming to construct female authority and expand women's influence in the domestic public sphere'.⁶⁰ Schupf believes Mary clearly felt the visit was 'both a duty and also an escape from the darkening vista of her career in philanthropy in Britain'.⁶¹ While Red Lodge and Kingswood were being overtaken by Government officialdom perhaps Mary felt she could now devote her time to her own interests. Mary's plans for educational reform in India were based on her Unitarian beliefs that education was the foundation of any change in society. Beyond these personal

considerations there was also an inner core of a political viewpoint; she contended that Indians, by the fact that they were British subjects, should receive the same kind of assistance she had given to the needy in England. In her correspondence with British officials she conveys this point of view as a moralistic judgement.⁶² Mary wanted to help the Indian men who sought to change social conditions for women of their own class in India, yet Barbara Ramusack states, and I concur with this analysis, that Mary ‘implicitly accepted the ethnocentric views of British officials and Christian missionaries, that the “degraded” position of Indian women was a major indication that Indian civilisation ranked below that of an enlightened Britain’.⁶³ Indeed, Mary, although she professed to be religiously neutral, in many of her words and actions believed that Indians should be educated as they would then move towards Christianity.

Lord Dalhousie, Governor General of India from 1848 to 1856, had stated that no single change was likely to produce more important and beneficial consequences in India than female education.⁶⁴ In spite of Dalhousie’s call for the education of women, no action had been taken for the training of women teachers by the Indian Government, and women’s education remained neglected, as indeed did any plans for vernacular primary education for the Indian people.⁶⁵ Moreover, Geraldine Forbes believes that Indian norms and social customs made the British method of schooling difficult, if not impossible. Deeply ingrained notions of sex segregation, and in some homes complete seclusion, meant that girls had to have female teachers and study separately from boys.⁶⁶ In 1854, Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India, issued from the India Office in London an *Educational Despatch* which signalled a more general governmental attempt to bring education to what it called ‘the masses’ across India. The *Despatch* gave rise to the bureaucratic integration of existing governmental schooling efforts and a more formulaic commitment to education across India. It introduced a grant-in-aid regulation that applied to mission schools as well as a formula for linking college and district schools, college and university education by scholarships, school inspections and building grants. Unfortunately, the new alignment between the Indian civil service and the state also resulted in the marginalisation of the thousands of languages and region-specific indigenous schools in the 1850s and 1860s, with education subject to tightly controlled protocols of government reporting.⁶⁷

Mary, told by her Indian friends of the terrible conditions in Bombay and Madras hospitals, had visited Florence Nightingale in 1864 in an attempt to persuade her to send nurses to

India, but Florence was reluctant to involve herself in anything that lacked Government authorization.⁶⁸ Mary later asked Florence Nightingale for an introduction to John Lawrence, then Viceroy of India. However, Lawrence was not very enthusiastic about her arrival:

If Miss comes my way ... I will look after her and take care of her. I much fear she will find that, she cannot do much good. How anybody, in a brief visit, without any knowledge of the people, or of their language [could achieve any reforms] passes my comprehension.⁶⁹

Nevertheless, the British Government demonstrated its agreement to her promoting her views by giving her credentials, 'which opened to her every public institution in India, and secured her a cordial reception by the authorities in three Presidencies'.⁷⁰ Mary also had letters of introduction from Lord Stanley, Sir George Grey, as well as her friend Lord Cranborne, formally Lord Shaftsbury, Secretary for India. He wrote on her behalf from the India Office to Sir John Lawrence: 'That Miss Mary's Carpenter's opinion has for many years past been sought and listened to by legislators and administrators of all shades of political opinion in England and his Excellency in Council looks forward to her visit to Bombay as likely to be of great public interest'.⁷¹ Shortly after her arrival Mary received an official letter from the Secretary to the Governor dated 6th September 1866, containing an order from His Excellency the Governor in Council, Sir Bartle Frere, to the Inspector of Prisons, and gentlemen in charge of various institutions, to afford her every facility for studying them, with a view of her afterwards conferring with the Government on the subject.⁷²

While Mary's main reason for going to India was the education of women, her credentials as the author of books on reformatory schools as well as her later books on convicts and the Irish Prison System, made the government aware that her visit could be of some use to them.⁷³ While Mary stayed with her Indian friends where possible, she was also invited to stay with the Viceroy at Government House: thus it can be argued that Mary was actually visiting India in a semi-official capacity.

Mary Carpenter was invited to India by her Indian visitors to work with them, rather than dictate to them, and in this she did indeed differ from missionaries and colonists: it was not her intention to impose British culture and religion on India. Yet Mary did not seem to understand that reform could only proceed gradually in India and it is apparent she did not see Indian women as equal 'sisters', or even fully understand what the male reformers she worked with were hoping to achieve. She also does not seem to have questioned the

underlying patriarchal assumptions of her own culture, although in her own battles for reform and her increasing interest in women's rights, perhaps she should have queried this more.

When Mary arrived in India in 1866, she appeared initially to win popularity among the Indian reformers. Firstly, she was known to have powerful connections and friends in British Government which she demonstrated by letters of introduction to the most important men in Indian Government; secondly, she had Indian contacts through having met Bengalis visiting Rammohun Roy's tomb which allowed her access to Indian families and their friends; and thirdly, as a woman she had access to the zenana. It was certainly surprising that an unmarried woman should be greeted so warmly and with respect in India, and perhaps her age and her continual interest in the plight of children and women contributed to this; she was called 'the old mother' in India and was clearly proud of the title although perhaps 'maternal imperialist' is a better description.⁷⁴

Mary Carpenter reached Calcutta in November, 1866, where her first visitor was Keshub Chunder Sen, the successor to Rammohun Roy in the Brahmo Samaj. Sen had first lectured on the importance of female education in 1861 and the following year organised a society for males who supported reforms for women. In 1865 the Brahmo Samaj sponsored the first organisation where women met for religious instruction, sewing lessons and discussions of social issues.⁷⁵ The topic of education for females led to a split in the Brahmo Samaj in 1866, and it was Keshub Sen's small breakaway group, Navadbidhan, which welcomed Mary to Calcutta. Sen believed that widows in particular would benefit from teaching as an occupation, but at the time there were no women equipped to train them as teachers hence his interest in Mary plan's for education.

Mary Carpenter was aware of the secular rivalry between the Unitarian and Christian missionaries established in Calcutta; yet one unifying factor between the sects, including the American Unitarians in India, was that they all disliked her and were reluctant to support her plans for education. Mary Carpenter's visit to India was very controversial, with the Indian Press, as well as Christian and American Unitarian missionaries such as Reverend Dall, critical of what they saw as her interference. Dall commented bluntly to the American Unitarian Association in December 1869, saying that 'she walks roughshod over everybody and meets her best advisors with rebuke, saying "she knows better"... if only she but begin

to see how little she knows of India'.⁷⁶ Dall also wrote for the Indian newspaper, *The Englishman* complaining that Mary had done little for India:

Being thoroughly persuaded that her position of prime patroness of female education in India is a ludicrous mistake of hers. I can only say what I know and compelled by facts to believe, namely, that her coming to India to accomplish a great reform in a few weeks was simply absurd.⁷⁷

Mary wrote to her sister, Anna:

Numbers of people have called on me, both natives and English. One of the first was a native Free Church of Scotland Missionary, the editor of a *Friday Review*, who had written an abusive, bigoted article against me in preparation for my visit.

Scarcely any (English) ladies have come near me ... chiefly probably because they were afraid of my heterodoxy. I hear that a whole sermon was preached against me in one of the churches.⁷⁸

While the Brahmo Samaj had already broken Hindu custom by allowing men and women to dine together, when Mary hosted the first tea party in Calcutta, held at her friend Mr Chuckerbutty's house, at which both British and Indian men and their wives attended, the party evoked much criticism in the Indian press.⁷⁹ As it was not the custom for wives to leave their homes to attend public functions the furore in the local press indicated how far the reformers had strayed from traditional Indian values.⁸⁰ Mary's cultural assumptions meant she only gradually realised how revolutionary some of her hopes for Indian women were.⁸¹ It is difficult to assess whether Mary had arranged this tea party on purpose, or purely because this was how things were done in England, or just from ignorance of Indian life; a more charitable reason was that it was perhaps at the request of her Indian male guests who wanted to bring their wives out of the home sphere into society, yet it was certainly extraordinary that she held this type of party when she was surely aware of the censure it would bring.

Disapproval of Mary plan's for education continued. During her visit in 1875 a cartoon was published showing how some sections of the Indian press regarded what they saw as Mary's interference.



Charivari, 5th March, 1875

The cartoon is of Mary Carpenter playing a flute marked education and is using the traditional iconography of the God Krishna showing him seducing women by playing the magic tune 'education'.

The caption explained: 'Brother Ramdoss was delighted at the prospect of another visit from the philanthropist Miss Carpenter to find out about female education which amounts to nothing, But Ramdoss had other hopes. She was so interested in Indian women he hoped she would take an interest in Hindu men. So he offered himself to be taken for better or worse. The cartoonist hoped he would succeed, for Miss Carpenter would then be confined once and for all to a zenana instead of meddling in other people's business.'⁸²

Despite criticism from many sections of people, however, Mary had a rapport with other supporters of female education in India. Her friendships with influential Indians would have given her encouragement to persevere. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Indians Mary met were among the more socially privileged of their compatriots and her contacts all tended to be Hindus. However, these men were not always popular with some of the increasing number of Indian nationalists who on principle disliked any plans to westernise India.

Mary Carpenter's first visit to India persuaded her that one of the first measures necessary for successful education for women was the formation of a Normal Female school, a teacher

training school for women run by the Government. As with the non-sectarian Red Lodge in England she also insisted that there was to be no attempt to convert the Indian pupils to Christianity. With higher class Indian women being confined to the inner world of the home, the zenana, Mary found the 'ignorance' of Hindu women of a suitable age to train as teachers was 'one great impediment, and the difficulty of finding many, except widows, who would be able and willing to train for teachers, is another'.⁸³ As was usual with all Mary's reforms she described her ideas for reforming female education in India with clarity and outlined in detail the measures that would be necessary; she even included details of suitable housing, accommodation and salaries.⁸⁴

However, Mary does not seem to have considered how a seemingly insurmountable problem was the idea of professionalism for Indian girls. This would entail leaving the protection of the family home and earning money in the form of a regular salary. Reforms in Indian women's education, such as Mary was suggesting, would simply replace one patriarchal system with another, as well as demonstrating the privileged place white women occupied in the Empire.⁸⁵ Mary, despite her own lengthy campaigns to obtain legislative reform for juvenile offenders and prison reform, seemed to expect immediate results in India and failed to consider that any of the problems in India were brought about by colonialism. Mary was certainly trying to inculcate what she considered 'enlightened' thoughts to Indians as she had to the poor in England.⁸⁶ She was concerned not only with female education in India but was also concerned with the state of the prisons and she visited hospitals, dispensaries and lunatic asylums in Ahmadabad, Bombay, Poona, Calcutta and Madras to try to add to her understanding of the educational and prison situations in India. Mary was particularly concerned about women prisoners saying:

I felt grieved and shocked that in any part of the British dominion, women who were rendered helpless by being deprived of liberty, and thus fell under our special responsibility, should be so utterly uncared for as to be left under the supervision of male warders and without any means to improve it.⁸⁷

Twenty years of experience had fixed in Mary's mind firm ideas on how prison discipline should be maintained. Sir Walter Crofton believes that she:

Had been so accustomed to throw her whole mind into the consideration of a subject in which she was interested that I was not surprised at how rapidly she could form her opinion as to the tone of even a large prison, before she had exchanged a word either with the prisoners or the staff.⁸⁸

No wonder that Mary was unpopular with officialdom. Before leaving India, Mary presented her suggestions and evidence to the Viceroy at Government House in Calcutta, who placed it before his Council at Simla, on 20th July 1867.⁸⁹ Sir John Lawrence ruled:

There are many reasons why it would be inexpedient for the Government to assume entire responsibility ... An earnest and genuine effort by the native community must be insisted upon ... if Indians would subscribe half the money the Government would make a grant-in-aid for the Presidency Provinces.⁹⁰

Lord Napier told Mary:

I doubt that the money will be got ... the truth is the community is lukewarm if not adverse and not disposed to be generous ... Personally, I think it was a mistake to demand Native co-operation at all. The Government might have done it but I was overruled.⁹¹

The culminations of Mary's visit to India were two separate resolutions of the Governor-General in Council: one to aid female Normal Schools in Bombay presidency and the other to establish them in three presidency towns.⁹² Between 1868, and 1872 the Raj established expensive teacher training colleges, one in each major province, and set about importing a European female teacher as an exemplar of European best practice to head these new institutions.⁹³ *The Indian Female Evangelist* complained saying: 'Even Lord Lawrence, when Viceroy of India, was so much impressed by her enthusiasm, that he was induced to subsidise three normal secular schools in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay'.⁹⁴ It is difficult to understand exactly why Mary was so influential in this period in India, although she had made many connections in Government during the drafting of the Young Offenders Act of 1854, including as noted above Sir Stafford Northcote and Lord Cranborne. Mary's influence in Government circles in England meant that much of the meagre Governmental funding for female education was diverted to her teacher training schools, all of which contributed to the dislike she was held in by other groups attempting to bring education to India.

During Mary's first visit to India she had met the Reverend J. Long (1814-1887). Long had visited England where he attended the NAPSS. Long wanted the elite of Bengal to understand the value of such voluntary associations, the changes they could bring, the pressure they could exert, and he wanted to establish a similar society in Calcutta. He needed the active co-operation and the membership of a group of people, both British and Indian, to set up the Bengal Social Science Association. Long could not set up the society, as the initiative should be seen to come from a person who would be above the local politics of the time; Long had also been associated with the Indian Revolt and had been fined and

imprisoned.⁹⁵ Thus, although the idea of forming a Social Science Association in India came from Long, Mary stole the limelight.⁹⁶ It is apparent that Mary became involved with the Bengal Social Science Association because she saw it as a means to stimulate public opinion on matters in which she had an interest.

The birth of the Bengal Social Science Association went smoothly and with the blessing of the Governor-General it was established in January 1867 in Calcutta. Mary's voice at the opening ceremony was described 'as entirely audible, though subdued and with a directness, simplicity, and perspicuity of statement extremely characteristic, and only obtained by years of familiarity with the subject', an extraordinary role for a woman in India.⁹⁷ In 1869, two years after its formation, three honorary members were elected at the Annual Meeting of the Association. They were Mary, J.B. Phear, the ex-president of the Association, and Florence Nightingale. Nevertheless, Goldman believes the Bengal Social Science Association functioned purely as a focus for the anglophile Bengali elite: Indians who embraced western modes of thought and culture. Although the Association's ends were practical, he believes there is no evidence that it actually achieved anything or that it exerted any influence over the colonial administration.⁹⁸ However, one achievement that has been overlooked is how the association acted as a vehicle for the dissemination of Mary's ideas among the elite of colonial India. For example, the association introduced the concept of providing education for women as well as highlighting the terrible condition of Indian prisons and hospitals to its members in India.

When Mary returned to England she had discussed with her contacts her proposals for reforming both the educational and prison systems in India, as well as her thoughts on other aspects of Indian life under colonial rule. Mary presented a more detailed plan to Sir Stafford Northcote, Secretary of State for India, dated 8th October 1867, saying that she felt that Indian reformers had done as much as they could and that now the duty fell on the British Government.⁹⁹ Northcote wrote to General Grey, the private secretary to Queen Victoria, asking him to ask the Queen to take notice of Mary saying:

She has long been distinguished for her efforts in the cause of education and reformation of prisoners, has just returned from India where she has been enquiring into the state of female education and the condition of the prisons; and she has brought home some very useful information and suggestions. She certainly well deserves some mark of approbation for few ladies have spent a more useful life than she has done.¹⁰⁰

Thus in 1868, Mary was invited to Windsor to give an account of her observations in India to Queen Victoria; Mary took the opportunity to present the Queen with a copy of her book, *Our Convicts*. Queen Victoria wrote in her journal:

After luncheon I saw in the corridor Miss Carpenter, who has done a great deal for schools and education in India, and was most earnest and energetic in this work. She is past 60, but full of life and vigour.¹⁰¹

As Mary was leaving, the Queen presented to her a copy of her book, *Leaves of a Journal from our Life in the Highlands*. Mary submitted an article on this visit to the *Daily Press* expressing her appreciation:

That so noble a woman as she certainly is ... sympathetic in this work, and I believe that the knowledge of the interview will have an effect ... so I am thankful for this added talent.¹⁰²

4.4 Six Months in India

After her return to England, Mary published her thoughts on the social and educational situation in India, together with a collection of speeches she had made in India, in *Six months in India* (1868). The book was dedicated to Rajah Rammohun Roy 'who first excited in the author's mind a desire to benefit his country'.¹⁰³ The first volume was a narrative and the second volume propaganda for women's education, prison discipline and reformatory schools in India, together with an appendix in which various speeches and addresses connected with her trip were included. Mary emphasised her own initial unfamiliarity with the 'dreamland' about which the British were 'almost entirely ignorant'. She stated she had visited and seen for herself how 'India is the brightest jewel in the British Crown, yet surely we have not done so much as we ought for the two hundred million Indian subjects of our beloved Queen'.¹⁰⁴ This comment demonstrates, once again, Mary's firm belief, based on the teachings of her father, that all people, regardless of gender, race or colour could achieve education as the basis of a liberal society. It shows how Mary valued the potential and needs of every individual.

The book is a traveller's account of great detail, colour and sensitivity to the wishes of her Indian friends; with the purpose to persuade people in England that the proper response to the 'romance that was India' should not be sentiment, but rather sober reform action. Mary stated that she strove to achieve an interpretation of what Indian reformers desired, together with her own ideas based on her experiences in England. She described her visits to prisons,

asylums and girls' schools and quoted extensively from Indians on the urgent need to release Indian women from female serfdom. Mary wrote of her belief that only by establishing a formal network of women professional teachers was there any hope of improving female education in India; she felt initially women teachers should be sent from England to train Indian women. In her conclusion to *Six Months in India* Mary proposed a scheme devised to enable the native population to:

Obtain the help of educated Englishwomen in the elevation of their wives and daughters, without dread of inference with their religion or social customs; we may thus prepare them to help themselves, which at present they are unable to do.¹⁰⁵

Mary did not see her educational programme as an exclusively public project, stating: 'There is ... work to do for every [British] lady in India who employs native women in her service in India, and one need not remove her from her home'.¹⁰⁶ By insisting on the appointment of British women in the field of education and in the reform of the Indian prison system, Mary was implicitly encouraging the employment of British women. Mary's suggestions regarding both education and prison reform in India constituted her contribution to what she considered 'India's elevation to a high position among the nations' - explicitly a strategy to consolidate the British Empire as well as a tactic of empowerment for British women.¹⁰⁷

Nevertheless, while deploring the neglect of the poor by higher-class Indians, Mary seems to have shown little understanding of the economic plight of poor Indian women, stripped of their former role in agriculture and domestic industry which had been caused by the colonisation of India by the British.¹⁰⁸ Burton has referred to *Six Months in India* as essentially an account of a secular reform pilgrimage which functioned as a kind of 'revealed text'.¹⁰⁹ It could be read simultaneously as a white woman's romance with India and also as a serious programme for colonial reform, encouraging women readers to consider taking on responsibilities in the empire as she puts it 'beyond the indulgences of an armchair romance'.¹¹⁰ Despite the considerable work Mary had done for education and reform for juvenile delinquency in England, it was *Six Months in India* that brought Mary fame and celebrity.

Concerned by what she felt was apparent apathy towards India among members of the British Government, Mary accepted invitations from Indian friends to return to India in November 1868. Within days of her arrival, Mary had offered her services free of charge to the Government as a Lady Superintendent of a training college, persuaded a rich Hindu to lend

her a house, and begun to collect pupils. She unveiled her plans for education for girls at the Cowasjee Institute in Bombay, and she offered to run a Normal school for potential teachers. Lord Napier, with whom Mary had stayed in India, told her in February 1869:

The Government has respectfully declined your generous offer to take the management of a Normal Training School ... I am of the opinion that you could do more for female education by *staying at home and* supporting those who are interested in it.¹¹¹

Unfortunately, the school Mary eventually set up, using subscriptions from Unitarians, only remained open for three years, during which time only nine children attended. The Bengali Government closed down the school in 1872 saying:

On a general review of the whole subject, it is clear after three years' experiment the Female Normal School has unquestionably failed ... the Lieutenant Governor is himself not inclined to think that there is much in the view taken by the ladies most experienced in these matters, viz, that it may be very dangerous to give women education and a certain freedom of action without the sanction of some religion... The Female Normal School will, therefore, be closed after the 31st of January 1872.¹¹²

Certainly the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society was jubilant over the closure of Mary's school in 1872. Lahari quotes from the *Indian Female Evangelist*, published by the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society, recording the 'Abolition of the Government Female School Normal School by the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, and the reasons assigned for it':

At a time when Education with or without religion may truly to be said to be the question of the day, and when through a similar combination of party interests and influences, a non-religious or anti-religious secularism is contending for the ascendancy, we recommend the following remarkable extracts from the Indian newspapers to the special attention of our readers'.¹¹³

This was followed by quotes from leading Indian newspapers, such as the *Times of India*, *The Bombay Guardian*, and the *Bengal Christian Herald*, who pointed to the reasons for the closure of Mary's school. Their conclusion was that Miss Carpenter's secular system 'had been tried and failed'.¹¹⁴

Despite support from Sir Stafford Northcote who had advised her that change in India would be slow, Mary felt she was unappreciated and became ill.¹¹⁵ Mary wrote to her sister telling her that her third visit to India in 1869/70 had 'convinced her that she would have more opportunity to promote the cause of female education in England rather than by the establishment of institutions in India'.¹¹⁶ Unfortunately, this visit, accompanied by her

adopted daughter Rosanna, was unsuccessful through difficulties with staff, her temporary alliance with the Government ceased, her health failed in February, and she had to return to England in April.¹¹⁷

Although the school Mary had set up in Bombay only remained for a short time, with few students, Mary had undertaken an important pioneering effort. Mary's proposals appear to have been doomed to failure because her plans for establishing teacher training colleges for Indian women were received with mixed feelings by different sections of people. While the government initially supported the scheme, as Mary's letters to Lord Cranborne, the Marquis of Salisbury, demonstrate, and there was some support and assistance initially from progressive Bengalis, the Brahmo Samaj vacillated, and missionaries were firmly against her ideas as they believed Mary's ideas on non-secular schooling would reduce the number of Indians converted to Christianity. Although the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, William Gray, supported Mary, many members of the Raj did not and a committee was formed to oppose her influence.¹¹⁸

Mary Carpenter made her last and fourth visit to India in 1875, when, aged 68, she made a report to the Marquis of Salisbury on education and prison reform.¹¹⁹ Mary was by now established as an authority on India so her updated report detailing again her ideas for reform was published as a Parliamentary paper.¹²⁰ However, members of the British government were still unhappy at what they saw as her interference. Mary had suggested to John Bright, the Secretary of State for India, in 1876, the need for children of five years and upwards to be protected from long hours of labour and unsuitable working conditions and suggested the enforcement of rules in the Factory Act in England. Bright brushed her comments aside and his reply, both abrupt and unsympathetic, demonstrates a typical comment by the minister of a laissez-faire Administration on any suggestions on regulating the industrial practices in India (*appendix five*: p.191). Mary published *Discipline and the Necessity for a Factory Act in India: Being a report of her fourth journey to India in 1875-76*, in 1877 to make her viewpoint known. Shortly after Mary's death the Factory Act was passed.

Practically, however, it seems Mary achieved little at the time and it is debatable how far she could actually understand the Indian situation, or how far as a British woman her liberalism was touched by cultural imperialism and class attitude. No unified policy for education had been formulated in India and education was firmly in the hands of men whose prejudices and

attitudes determined Mary's failures. She moved from one leading male to another looking for co-operation. With opposition on all fronts it is not surprising that Mary's plans for education were thwarted.

The next section discusses how Mary Carpenter set up the National India Association in England.

4.5 Mary Carpenter, Keshub Chandra Sen and the National Indian Association

Aside from her four trips to India, Mary had been involved in the setting up of the National India Association in England. Keshub Chandra Sen (1838-1884) visited Britain several times to gain support for social reform in India and delivered more than fifty lectures, speeches and sermons mostly to British Unitarians.¹²¹ Sen had met Mary in India and visited her in Bristol in June 1870. Sen stayed at Red Lodge and Mary arranged for him to present a lecture on the Brahmo Samaj and Christianity. Sargent notes that Mary was greatly impressed by the candour, spirituality and religious feeling of Keshub Chunder Sen 'so that he became her friend and guru and the spiritual successor of Rammohun Roy'.¹²²

Yet while Mary welcomed Sen to her home, she upset him by 'incessant directions about the usages and the etiquette of British society'.¹²³ Sen's attendant Majumdar explained: 'We are afraid Miss Carpenter found Sen an intractable pupil and in the end something like coolness sprung up between them, but Keshub bravely pulled through the crisis at Red Lodge'.¹²⁴ Once again, Mary felt she knew better than anyone else on how to behave and did not seem to have taken Sen's feelings into consideration. Susanna Winkworth, after hearing of Sen's irritation with Mary, blamed Mary's behaviour on 'Miss Carpenter's usual tiresome little ways of ordering everyone's movements' which hid 'her real goodness and warmth and sympathy and faith'.¹²⁵

Sen was lionised by women and Burton believes that Sen's popularity among the British 'bordered on obsession'.¹²⁶ Frances Power Cobbe, who had written on the Brahmo Samaj, described him as 'the ideal of a great teacher... a tall and manly figure ... a very handsome square face'.¹²⁷ This was a similar situation to the adoration with which Rammohun Roy was received and again duplicates the tensions between white women and black or Indian men.¹²⁸ It is clear that there is a linkage between Rammohun Roy and his successor Keshub Chunder

Sen, both were charismatic figures who influenced a generation of feminists. Sen encouraged women such as Harriet Martineau and Annette Ackroyd Beveridge to think in culturally sympathetic terms about the education of Indian women. Mary Carpenter went to India because she was inspired by Rammohun Roy and Annette Ackroyd Beveridge went to India to teach Indian girls because she was inspired by Sen.¹²⁹

The experience of her visits to India had shown Mary that some of the greatest obstacles to social progress in India were grounded in British ignorance of its needs and difficulties. In September 1870, with the second visit of Keshub Sen to Bristol and the interest in Indian female education that his tour of the British Isles stimulated, Mary, assisted by Susanna Winkworth, decided:

That this was a good time to form the British Indian Association in Aid of Social Progress and Education in India ... promote by voluntary effort the enlightenment and improvement of their countrymen; to extend our knowledge of India, and interest in her throughout our country; to cooperate with enlightened natives of India in their efforts for Improvement of their countrymen; to obtain any action where necessary; to show kind attention to young natives of India who were in Great Britain for their education.¹³⁰

Mary had hoped that Keshub Chunder Sen would form a branch of the National Indian Association in Calcutta as he had promised, but instead he established a separate body called the Indian Reform Association, perhaps because the relationship between the two had become strained, together with her continual criticism of him. Mary wanted to keep the need for education in India in the public eye, and the association was initially called the Indian National Association for the Promotion of Indian Female Education.¹³¹ The National Indian Association established many branches in India and sponsored schools which:

Fulfilled a need for the Indians who wanted education for their daughters to be within the traditions and faiths of their fathers, and not those laid down by the mission institutions, who were the pioneers of female education in India.¹³²

By focusing on Indian nationals setting up schools by the National India Association Mary had found an alternative way to bring education to Indian females. In the late 1870s, the National India Association in both Britain and India financed scholarships for teacher training colleges. Mary's contribution to education in India was noted in a series of educational books named for her: 'The Carpenter Series' for use in zenana teaching in India.

While the *English Woman's Journal* and its successor, the *Englishwoman's Review* had published regular information on Indian affairs, and closely monitored the activities of

reformers such as Mary to further promote knowledge of Indian affairs in Britain, Mary founded, and was editor of the *Indian Magazine and Review* in 1870. The magazine consistently published information on political and public events concerned with India and about half the contents were devoted to women's issues; the magazine was supported by a wide range of both Indian and British men and women.¹³³ *The Indian Magazine and Review*, like Mary's book, *Six months in India*, appealed to a wide range of feminist women in Victorian Britain, and was an important legacy of Mary's work in India.¹³⁴

Mary Carpenter, after four trips to India was a model of feminist imperial activism; she was involved in both British and colonial affairs and Fawcett believed she was 'a true empire builder in the best sense of the word'.¹³⁵ Mary continued to work steadily in England, publicising the necessity of the reforms she advocated in India and had the satisfaction of witnessing the preparation of a Bill for the establishment of Reformatory and Industrial Schools, to be brought before the Indian council. In 1876 a bill was passed which sent convicted Indian children to reformatories rather than prison.

Mary's passion for India was prevented from translating itself directly into the institutional changes she wanted, partly because the colonial Government preferred the traditions of paternalism that viewed Mary, as well as Florence Nightingale, as busybodies. Another reason her demands were received with a lack of interest was her alliance with an increasingly well organised cohort of Indian reformers who had their own plans for education. Indeed, the exercise of any form of maternal authority was not tolerated by the bureaucrats at the Indian office.

Mary Carpenter's liberal humanitarianism was certainly tinged with a comfortable assumption of British superiority, yet her work in India forced the Government to recognise at least some of their responsibilities towards female education. Jayawardena believes that Mary's aims were influenced by her Indian friends, who had their own agenda for India's regeneration. For them she was:

More enlightened than the British rulers, more radical than missionaries ... more daring and persistent than her male compatriots in exposing the evils of the patriarchal social structure of both Britain and India.¹³⁶

Jayawardena has placed Mary among the western reformers who legitimised imperial authority by agitating on issues affecting women in order to 'achieve a righteous British

empire where social justice prevailed.¹³⁷ Certainly it was not until the early 1900s that Fawcett appealed to Parliament asking again for education for women in India. Lasting evidence of Mary's connection with India can be seen at the Brahmo Samaj Girls' School in Calcutta where a hall is dedicated to her.¹³⁸

- ¹ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 11, Longman, Green & Co, 1868, pp.142-5.
- ² Oddie, G.A, *Social Protest in India*. New Delhi, Manoharm Publications, 1978, p.2.
- ³ Medhurst, P, *Rammohun Roy and 'The day-star of approaching morn'*; The Essex Hall Lecture, 1992, The Unitarian Information Department, p.9.
- ⁴ www.BristolUnitarians.co.uk/Rammohun Roy, accessed 15/6/2011.
- ⁵ The Brahmo Samaj was a religious group that aimed for 'pure' monotheistic worship with no idolatry or sacrifice and the group sympathised with Christianity. The Lewin's Mead chapel contributed £70 and then £25 annually. Carpenter, Russell (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverent Carpenter*, Bristol, Philip & Evans, 1842, p.112.
- ⁶ Jayawardena, Kumari, *The White Women's Other Burden*, Routledge, 1995, p.66.
- ⁷ Zastoupil, L, 'Defining Christians, making Britons: Rammohun Rajah and the Unitarians', p.227, *Victorian Studies*, 44:2, 2002.
- ⁸ Midgley, Clare, 'Remembering Rammohun Roy: gender, commemoration and cross-cultural community in an imperial age', *Women's History Network*, 18th Annual Conference, St. Hilda's College, Oxford, 11-13 September, 2009, unpublished paper.
- ⁹ Rohit Barot believes that Roy had three reasons for visiting Britain: firstly, the charter of the East India Company was due for renewal and Roy wanted to influence this; secondly, orthodox Hindus opposed the law banning suttee and their appeal against this ruling was due to be heard before the Privy Council; and thirdly, the Mogul Emperor Abu-nasar Muinuddin Akbar, wanted Roy to press for an increase in his annual allowance from the British government. Barot, Rohit, *Bristol and its Independence Movement*, Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1988, pp.4-5.
- ¹⁰ Mani, Lata, *Contentious Traditions-the debate on Sati in Colonial India*, University of California Press, 1998, passim..
- ¹¹ Midgley, *Feminism & Empire*, p.85.
- ¹² Midgley, Clare, 'Female Emancipation in an Imperial Empire: English women and the campaign against *sati* (widow burning) in India, 813-30', p.106, *Women's History Review*, Volume 9, Number 1, 2000..
- ¹³ Midgley, *ibid*, p.94-5.
- ¹⁴ Midgley, *Female Emancipation in an Imperial Empire*, p.65.
- ¹⁵ Midgley, *ibid*, p.106.
- ¹⁶ Midgley, *Feminism & Empire*, p.89.
- ¹⁷ Visram, Rozina, *Ayaks, Lascars and Princes: Indians in Britain 1700-1947*, Pluto Press, 1986, p.35, no reference for quotes given.
- ¹⁸ Midgley, *Remembering Rammohun Roy*, Unpublished paper.
- ¹⁹ Brajendra Nath Banerji, 'Sutherland's Reminiscences of Rammohun Roy' p.70 cited in Burton, Antoinette, *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late Victorian England*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1999, p.36.
- ²⁰ Midgley, Clare, *Women against Slavery: The British Campaigns- 1780-1870*, Routledge, 1982, p.105.
- ²¹ Burton, Antoinette, *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late Victorian England*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1999, p.36.
- ²² Carpenter, Mary (1866) *The Last days in England of Rammohun Roy*, 1989, Delhi, S.S. Publishers, p.21.
- ²³ Carpenter, Lant, *Review of the Labours, Opinions and Character of Rajah Rammohun Roy*, London, 1833, p.119.
- ²⁴ Letter: *Rammohun Roy to Lant Carpenter*, Manchester College, MS Lant Carpenter fols 259-62.
- ²⁵ Lant Carpenter wrote of the support the Unitarian chapel had given Roy saying: 'His services in the cause of philanthropy and religion were, in a special manner brought forward to this congregation; when an appeal was made to it, answered with more that its wonted liberality to assist in the establishment of Unitarian worship in the capital of British India'. Carpenter, Lant, 'A Reviews of Labours' cited in Norman, C, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Hibbert Trust, p.5. The Lewin's Mead Unitarian Chapel had supported Unitarian missionaries in Bengal for many years.
- ²⁶ Carpenter, J.E, *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, N.J. Patterson Smith, 1974, p.31.
- ²⁷ Catherine Castle's father had been a prominent Unitarian merchant and a former Lord Mayor.
- ²⁸ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.32.
- ²⁹ Medhurst, *Rammohun Roy*, pp. 9-17.
- ³⁰ 'An Address on Female Education by Miss Carpenter, at Madras', *Madras Times*, January 1867.
- ³¹ Laird, M.A, *Missionaries and Education in Bengal, 1793-1837*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972, p.xii.
- ³² Semple, Rhonda A, Women, mission and the cultures of empire, p.119 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ³³ Midgley, Clare, *Female emancipation in an Imperial Empire*, p.111.

- ³⁴ Billington, L. & R., "'A Burning Zeal for Righteousness': Women in the British Anti-Slavery Movement, 1820-1860", p.83 in Rendall, Jane (ed.) *Equal or Different, Women's Politics 1800-1914*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- ³⁵ Prochaska, Frank, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-century England*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1980, pp.23-9.
- ³⁶ Ware, Vron, *Beyond the Pale, White Women, Racism and History*, Longmans, 1998, p.128.
- ³⁷ Midgley, Clare, *Feminism and Empire: Women Activists in Imperial Britain, 1790-1865*, Routledge, 2007, p.65.
- ³⁸ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.217.
- ³⁹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.236.
- ⁴⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, Vol.1. Longman, Green & Co, 1868, p.80.
- ⁴¹ Sargent, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.10.
- ⁴² Bhattacharya, Bijoy, 'Women and their Education' p.142 in Sharma, Usha and B.M. Sharma, *Women Education in India*, New Delhi, Commonwealth Publishers, 1995.
- ⁴³ Gangooly had met the American Unitarian Dr C.H.A. Dall, a Missionary of the American Unitarian Association in Calcutta, and had been converted; he had been ordained in Boston in June 1860 by American Unitarians.
- ⁴⁴ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.217-8. The Reverend Livermore and Mary Carpenter were frequent correspondents. See Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.74-6, 97-9, 101-2, 217-218.
- ⁴⁵ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.221.
- ⁴⁶ Burton, Antoinette, 'Fearful Bodies into disciplined subjects: pleasure, romance and the family drama of colonial reform in Mary Carpenter's *Six Months in India*', p.553, *Signs* 20:3, Spring, 1995.
- ⁴⁷ Watts, Ruth, 'Education, Empire and social change in nineteenth-century England', p.779, *Paedagogica Historica*, Vol.45, No.6, December, 2009.
- ⁴⁸ *Records of the Society for Promoting Education in the East*, University of Birmingham, Special Collections GB 0150 FES: *The Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society*, Suter and Alexander, 1853.
- ⁴⁹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, pp.255-6.
- ⁵⁰ For example; in 1819, the Female Juvenile Society was formed by Baptist missionaries in Calcutta and in 1821, Miss Cook was sent by the London British and Foreign School Society and she stayed in India until 1845. The Bengal Ladies' Society and the Calcutta Ladies' Association were set up in 1824 and 1825 respectively. By 1827 the number of schools for girls in India had increased to twenty and the number of students to 400. These early societies for female education were followed the Society for Promoting Education in the East, in 1834, followed by the Indian Female Normal School and the Instruction Society in 1852.
- ⁵¹ Midgley, *Feminism and Empire*, p.76.
- ⁵² 'Result of Educational Returns of the Punjab for the Years 1859-6' cited in Allender, *Ruling through Education*, New Dawn Press Inc., p.210.
- ⁵³ Allender, Tim, 'Instructing the Women: Changing State Agenda in Colonial India, 1854-1924', p.4, 16th Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia in Wollongong, 26-29 June, 2006.
- ⁵⁴ 'Result of Educational Returns of the Punjab for the Years 1859-6' cited in Allender, Tim, *Ruling through Education: The Politics of Schooling in the Colonial Punjab*, Slough, New Dawn Press, 2006, p.210.
- ⁵⁵ Mathur, Y.B, *Women's Education in India 1813-1966*, Delhi, Asia Publishing House, 1973, p.26.
- ⁵⁶ Chatterjee, Partha, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: a derivative discourse?* Zen Books, 1986, p.3.
- ⁵⁷ Ray, Sangeeta, *En-Gendering India, Woman and Nation in Colonial and Postcolonial Narrative*, Duke University Press, 2000, pp.53-54.
- ⁵⁸ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.310.
- ⁵⁹ Carpenter, Mary, 'On Female Education in India', *TNAPSS* 1868, p.405.
- ⁶⁰ Schwan, Anne, "'Dreadful beyond Description': Mary Carpenter's prison reform writings and female convicts in Britain and India", p.108, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 14, No.2, 2010.
- ⁶¹ Schupf, Harriet, 'Single Women and Social Reform in Mid-Victorian England: The Case of Mary Carpenter', p.313, *Victorian Studies*, Vol xviii, No.3, March, 1974.
- ⁶² Lahiri, Krishna, 'Mary Carpenter and the Early Crisis in Teacher Training for Women in Calcutta', p.21 in Richard L. Park, (ed.) *Patterns of Change in Modern Bengal*, East Lansing, Asian Studies Centre, Michigan State University, 1979.
- ⁶³ Ramusack, Barbara N, 'Cultural missionaries, material imperialists, feminist allies: British women activists in India, 1865-1945', p.120 in Chaudhuri, Nupur, Strobel, Margaret, (ed.) *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*, Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press, 1992.
- ⁶⁴ Mathur, *Women's Education in India*, p.25.

- ⁶⁵ Bhattacharya, Tithi, *The sentinels of culture, education and the colonial intellectual in Bengal*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, p.145.
- ⁶⁶ Forbes, Geraldine, *The New Cambridge History of India, IV2, Women in Modern India*, Cambridge, University of Cambridge, 1996, p.41.
- ⁶⁷ Allender, Tim, 'Learning abroad: the colonial educational experiment in India, 1813-1919', pp.727-735. *Paedagogica Historica*, 45, 6. .
- ⁶⁸ Bostridge, Mark, *Florence Nightingale, The women and the legend*, Viking Penguin, 2008, p.403.
- ⁶⁹ Sir John Lawrence to Florence Nightingale, 1st August 1866, BL OIOC, Mss Eur A.110 cited in Jharna Gourlay, *Florence Nightingale and the Health of the Raj*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003, p.95.
- ⁷⁰ Carpenter, William B, *Sketch of the Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877, p.18.
- ⁷¹ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.254
- ⁷² Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.253.
- ⁷³ For example: *Our Convicts*, 2 vols, (1864) Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1969; *Reformatory Prison Discipline as developed by Sir Walter Crofton in the Irish Convicts Prisons*, Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1872.
- ⁷⁴ Ramusack, *Cultural Missionaries* p.133; Carpenter, J. E, *Mary Carpenter*, p. 383; p.396.
- ⁷⁵ Borthwick, Meredith, *The Changing Role of Women in Bengal, 1849-1905*, Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1984, p.291
- ⁷⁶ Ramusack, Barbara N, 'Cultural missionaries, material imperialists, feminist allies: British women activists in India, 1865-1945', pp.309-20, *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol.XI 11, No 4, 1990.
- ⁷⁷ Letter: Dall to American Unitarians Association, Letter Book September 30, 1870, & March 22, 1868 cited in Lahiri, Krishna, 'Mary Carpenter and the Early Crisis in Teacher Training for Women in Calcutta', p.37 in Richard L. Park, (ed.) *Patterns of Change in Modern Bengal*, East Lansing, Asian Studies Centre, Michigan State University, 1979.
- ⁷⁸ Letter: Dall to the American Unitarians Association, in Letter books, December 22, 1866, *ibid*.
- ⁷⁹ Jayawardena, K, *The White Women's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia during British Rule*, Routledge, 1995, p.71.
- ⁸⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 1, p.129-30.
- ⁸¹ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter and India: Enlightened liberalism or condescending imperialism? *Paedagogica Historica*, Volume 37, No.1.2001, p.209.
- ⁸² Mitter, Partha, *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp.146-47.
- ⁸³ Carpenter, Mary, 'On Female Education in India', TNAPSS, 1868, p.144.
- ⁸⁴ Burton, *Fearful bodies*, p.566.
- ⁸⁵ Ramusack, *Cultural missionaries*, pp.309-20.
- ⁸⁶ Watts, *Mary Carpenter and India*, p.207.
- ⁸⁷ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 1, pp.48-51.
- ⁸⁸ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.258.
- ⁸⁹ 'Proceedings of the Government of India. Home Department, Education', 1867 and 1868 cited in Sargant, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.75.
- ⁹⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 1, p.154.
- ⁹¹ Letter from Lord Napier to Mary Carpenter. BRO 12693/16.
- ⁹² 'Proceedings of the Government of India. Home department, Education', 1867 and 1868 cited in Sargant, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.75.
- ⁹³ Allender, 'Instructing the Women', p.5.
- ⁹⁴ *The Indian Female Evangelist*, October 1, 1872, p.287.
- ⁹⁵ Gourlay, Jharna, *Florence Nightingale and the Health of the Raj*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003, p.92.
- ⁹⁶ Mary Carpenter herself admitted that the idea was Long's. Carpenter, Mary. *Six Months in India*, 1868. Vol .1, p.218.
- ⁹⁷ *The Englishman*, Calcutta, December, 1866
- ⁹⁸ Goldman, Lawrence, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain: the Social Science Association, 1857-1886*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p.324.
- ⁹⁹ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 1, pp.154-65.
- ¹⁰⁰ Royal Archives, B23/63 cited in Sargant, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.72-3.
- ¹⁰¹ *Queen Victoria's Journal*, 1968, cited in Sargant, N. *Mary Carpenter in India*, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.82
- ¹⁰² *Daily Press*, Bristol, Vol XX, No 3177, 28th May, 1868.
- ¹⁰³ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, in 2 vols. Longman, Green & Co, 1868, preface.
- ¹⁰⁴ The full text of this address is published in *Six Months in India*, 11, pp.142-5.

- ¹⁰⁵ Carpenter, Mary, *Six Months in India*, 1, p.216.
- ¹⁰⁶ Carpenter, Mary, *ibid*, 1, p.83.
- ¹⁰⁷ Schwan, 'Dreadful beyond Description', p.116.
- ¹⁰⁸ Watts, R, 'Breaking the boundaries of Victorian Imperialism or extending a reformed paternalism'? Mary Carpenter and India', p.455, *History of Education*, 2000, Vol. 29, No.5.
- ¹⁰⁹ Burton, Antoinette, 'Fearful Bodies into disciplined subjects: pleasure, romance and the family drama of colonial reform in Mary Carpenter's *Six Months in India*', p.560, *Signs* 20:3, Spring, 1995.
- ¹¹⁰ Burton, *ibid*, p.560.
- ¹¹¹ Letter: Lord Napier to Mary Carpenter; emphasis in original. BRO: 12693/16.
- ¹¹² H. Woodrow, Inspector of Schools, Central Division, to the Director of Public Instruction. Education Consultation, March 1871, No.13' pp.43-56 cited in Lahari, Krishna, 'Mary Carpenter and the Early Crisis in Teacher Training for Women in Calcutta' p.28 in Richard L. Park, (ed.) *Patterns of Change in Modern Bengal*, Michigan, Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1979.
- ¹¹³ 'Origin and Progress of the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society', *The Indian Female Evangelist*, April, 1879, p.40 cited in Lahari, Krishna, 'Mary Carpenter and the Early Crisis in Teacher Training for Women in Calcutta' pp.19-48 in Richard L. Park, (ed.) *Patterns of Change in Modern Bengal*, Michigan, Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1979.
- ¹¹⁴ *The Indian Female Evangelist*, 1st October, 1872.
- ¹¹⁵ Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.290.
- ¹¹⁶ Letter: Mary Carpenter to Mrs Herbert Thomas, February, 1870; Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p. 294.
- ¹¹⁷ Letter: Mary Carpenter to Lord Cranborne, Marquis of Salisbury, Carpenter, J.E, *Mary Carpenter*, p.270; p.351; pp.361-2; pp.367-8.
- ¹¹⁸ Lahari, *Mary Carpenter*, p.29.
- ¹¹⁹ BRO36298: Copy of the Report to Marquis of Salisbury by Miss Carpenter on Prison Discipline, and on Female Education in India, 24th April 1977.
- ¹²⁰ Carpenter, Mary, *Letters to the Rt. Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury on Female Education in India, Prison Discipline and the necessity for a Factory Act in India: Being a report of her fourth journey to India in 1875-7*.
- ¹²¹ His speeches were later published a new Brahmo supporter, the Unitarian, Sophia Dodson Collett (1822-1894) *Keshub Chunder Sen's English Visit*.
- ¹²² Sargent, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987, p.55.
- ¹²³ Sargent, *ibid*, p.101.
- ¹²⁴ Majumdar, P.C, 'Life and Teachings', p.144-5 cited in Burton, Antoinette, *Burdens of Empire: British Feminism, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865- 1915*, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1995, p.40
- ¹²⁵ Sargent, *Mary Carpenter in India*, p.102.
- ¹²⁶ Burton, *At the Heart of the Empire*, p.39.
- ¹²⁷ Cobbe, Frances Power, *Life of Frances Power Cobbe*, 2 vols. Richard Bentley and Son, 1894, p.451.
- ¹²⁸ Burton, *At the Heart of the Empire*, p.39.
- ¹²⁹ Tuson, Penelope, (ed.) *The Queen's Daughters*, Ithaca Press, n.d, p.12.
- ¹³⁰ One of its main objects to collect information on all questions of Indian social improvement, with special reference to the education of the people, the education of women and the improvement of their position, sanitary improvements, and the improvements of prison discipline and the establishment of juvenile reformatories. An important function of the association was the help it gave young Indians, from Keshub Chunder Sen to Mohandas K. Ghandi to find lodgings, tuition and connections in England. Prem Sunder Basu, *Keshub Chunder Sen in England*, Calcutta, 1871, p.8.
- ¹³¹ The long list of supporters was headed by Princess Alice; H.R.H. Grand Duchess of Hess, with Mary Carpenter as secretary.
- ¹³² Sargent, Norman Carr, 'Mary Carpenter of Bristol (1807-1877) and her connection with India through Ram Mohan Roy, K.C. Sen and the National India Association', *Indian Church History Review* vol. x11, No, 1978, p.131.
- ¹³³ Tuson, *The Queen's Daughters*, p.8.
- ¹³⁴ Saywell, Ruby J, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, Bristol, Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1964, p.17.
- ¹³⁵ Burton, Antoinette, *Burdens of Empire British Feminism, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865- 1915*, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1995, p.122.
- ¹³⁶ Jayawardena, *White Women's Other Burden*, p.71.
- ¹³⁷ Jayawardena, *ibid*, p.71.
- ¹³⁸ The committee of the school was also able to purchase a house for a school from a donation from the Carpenter Memorial fund.

CONCLUSION

In *Reformatory Schools for the Dangerous and Perishing Classes* Mary wrote:

I have glorified in being the daughter of one who has justly gained
Esteem and love of all by his endeavours to promote the happiness and wellbeing
of others.¹

Indeed, it is apparent that throughout her life Mary was proud of being her father's daughter and in what she did she tried to emulate him. Like her father, Mary had a compulsion to set the world to rights; she was heavily influenced by the example of her father whose commitment to religion and reform were intertwined. In this she was her father's daughter, but Mary found a way to forge her own path as a female reformer drawing strength and inspiration from her own deeply held religious beliefs as well as believing in the inherent goodness of mankind. Mary, following the wishes of her father, was involved in the education of the very poor from the 1820s: as a teacher she served a form of apprenticeship in her father's school as well as a governess to two small girls in the Isle of Wight. Later, Mary, following her father's wishes became superintendent of the girls section of the Lewin's Mead Meeting House Sunday school, and influenced by Joseph Tuckerman, set up the Lewin's Mead Visiting Society, as well as working in the Carpenter family's schools.

During Lant Carpenter's lifetime Mary's focus was on carrying out his wishes which allowed her father to concentrate on his ministerial duties and writing. Mary continued to adhere to her father's views, as well as her mother's view on what Lant Carpenter would have wished, as she developed a philanthropic career in a field in which she was a pioneer. It was not until Mary was in her late thirties she had the time to further develop her interest in the education of the poor. Mary, in setting up her Ragged School in 1846, emerged for the first time as an adult and demonstrated her wish to step out of the expected role for a single woman; this caused her many problems with her family, her mother in particular, as they saw her as extending Lant Carpenter's principles in ways he might not have considered.

Lant Carpenter can be said to have influenced much of Mary's work, even if not directly, while other men can be said to have influenced Mary's participation in particular reform issues that Lant Carpenter had been interested in. While Mary herself might believe she was carrying out her father's wishes, and the wishes of the alternative father figures 'adopted' by Mary, men who had satisfied Mary's twin needs for a father figure and a secure intellectual foundation,

such as Joseph Tuckerman, Joseph Fletcher, Rammohun Roy or Mathew Hill, it is apparent that she had gone beyond their influences and had formulated her own views. Mary can certainly be described as complicit in patriarchy, notably in her relations with both her father and other male mentors; but at the same time she also carved a role for herself and served as an example to other women in her position. Arguably, Mary's method of deferring to patriarchal authority even as she developed and put into practice her own ideas allowed her to achieve much more than if she had been assertively feminist. In addition, Mary did not defer to patriarchy in general, but to her own chosen patriarchs; Mary appealed above all to the authority of her long-dead father to justify what she said, wrote and did. Mary was an intellectual with strongly held views yet she avoided being depicted as a 'bluestocking', or a de-sexed woman by presenting herself as a pupil being guided by her father. While Mary seems more complicit than resistant to patriarchy she did in fact resist many male authorities who were critical of her ideas and what they saw as her interference in reforms in education and prison management. Mary's continual reference to her father and his ideas throughout her life appears to be a way of obscuring the originality of her thinking, and her apparent daughterly devotion ensured that her ideas and plans were acceptable to the men she worked with. Perhaps where Mary Carpenter differs from Deirdre David's case studies is that she was not only a writer but she also tried to put her theories into practice.

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century progressive educationalists, from John Locke, David Hartley, through Joseph Priestley to the Unitarians, saw science as an integral part of the modern education they promoted. Indeed, Mary's most pressing interest, educational reform for poor and pauper children, can be said to be based initially on her father's ideas, encouragement and example as well as a Unitarian form of evangelicalism. Throughout her life Mary based all of her work on her belief that every person, white or black, could be educated in independent thought and understanding through the principles of intellectual, physical and moral understanding. Mary was clearly an advocate of the principles of associationism, but in her reforming works on poor and destitute children she rejected the substantial differences that Locke had first set out between bourgeois individuals who should be educated to become rational and genial citizens, and members of the poor classes who should simply be trained to a life of servitude and labour.² In her writings she based her arguments on broad assumptions about the role of nurture and environment in an individual's mental development. Punishment was anathema to Mary and she believed that if children were being treated

respectfully and with love and if they were to gain self-respect, they would become useful members of society. Mary, in all the schools she set up, applied the Hartleyan/Unitarian principle of changing the environment to achieve an education which cultivated rational moral principles rather than teaching religious doctrine. Indeed, throughout her life Mary had a Unitarian approach to social reform which combined deep religious motivation with a scrupulous non-interference in the religious beliefs of those whose lives she sought to improve. Mary, during a life working for the poor and juvenile delinquents in Bristol, was responsible for the Ragged School in St James' Back which later became a Feeding Industrial Day School, Kingwood Agricultural School, and Red Lodge as well as a Certified Industrial Schools for Boys in Park Row in 1858, Bristol and it was at her instigation that a Girls Certified Industrial School for girls was set up in 1865.³ Mary was not always successful, of course, but, like Florence Nightingale, Mary Carpenter became a very influential figure, recognised even by the male establishment as an expert in her chosen fields.

There were certainly contradictions in Mary's work. While a life devoted to the poor and deprived children of society brought her to the public gaze, it was coupled with an assumption that she knew what was best for people brought up in different circumstances than herself, for example in the slums of Bristol or in India. Mary had a paternalistic attitude and believed she was more qualified than other people on matters concerning education and, delinquency; indeed she herself recorded that people spoke of 'her pride as her great enemy'.⁴ Mary's writings were overlaid with 'contemporary jargon insinuating class superiority' which Selleck has also noted that calling the poor 'the perishing and dangerous classes' showed Victorian fears and prejudices, that contradicted Mary's enlightened educational philosophy, although these terms were in use at the time.⁵

Schupf has argued that Mary not only adopted Lant Carpenter's values and priorities but also identified herself with her father so closely that 'on one level it approximated a continuing struggle towards duplication: albeit with a congregation of the neglected and delinquent'.⁶ While some aspects of this statement are true, in time Mary did change her attitudes, particularly in respect of the rights of women. Yet while Mary did adjust her ideas in the light of her experiences in her schools unfortunately she also felt that her expertise and experience gave her the right to dictate to people less fortunate than her,

how to manage their lives. As both John Seed and Ruth Watts have stated, she allowed contemporary stereotypical notions of political economy to infiltrate her work implying her superior class morality.⁷ On the other hand, while Mary had faults and was often high-handed, she did endeavour to help, and to empower, the unfortunates whom she felt needed her help.

The anti-slavery movement drew upon ideas and beliefs of a wider liberal humanitarianism as well as religious evangelicalism, but also upon the more radical ideas held by numbers of Nonconformists, Quakers and Unitarians, concerning the perfectibility of individuals and social institutions. Within this radical milieu, parallels were drawn between the un-free blacks and other oppressed groups, including women.⁸ While some women in the anti-slavery movement expressed explicitly feminist views concerning their roles with the movement, others such as Mary believed that women had an important moral and practical role within the movement but one that did not overstep the bounds of the private and domestic. Perhaps initially Mary had developed an interest in abolitionism because of her devotion to her father; yet Mary's letters to the leader of the controversial anti-slavery campaigner, William Lloyd Garrison, demonstrate her close relationship with him, although she had many reservations concerning his radical tactics. It was certainly familial restraints that did not allow Mary to take a more public role in anti-slavery campaigning and it was the setting up of her Ragged School in Lewin's Mead the same year that BCLASS was formed that necessitated Mary taking the role of secretary rather than as a more active participant. However, Mary was the organizing force behind the many boxes sent to the Abolitionist Fairs held in Boston to raise funds for the anti-slavery campaign. Prochaska, in his entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* does not refer at all to Mary's interest in anti-slavery, although he notes she did not wish to be side-tracked from her educational work. Indeed, Estlin Carpenter believed it was apparent she was more interested in anti-slavery before she opened her Ragged School and had less time to devote to the anti-slavery cause. Throughout her life she did take an immense interest as the many private letters to and from American abolitionists have demonstrated.⁹

Mary Carpenter's work among the poor in Bristol was strongly influenced by a distinctive Unitarian approach to social reform as developed by Joseph Tuckerman. Single women defined themselves as members of civic society in terms of their contribution to social progress. In addressing specific problems, women such as Mary developed a network of philanthropic activities and delineated a space for themselves in which they felt safe to

explore new ways of being. Acting as members of charitable organisations and other associations, single women were able to traverse the boundaries of class and gender without any loss of social status. Supported by like-minded people, such as those in the Lewin's Mead Visiting and Working Society, women were able to develop initiatives in response to particular social ills; including being emboldened to enter the streets and homes where the poor lived and traversing the boundaries of class and gender.

Mary Carpenter was the leading female advocate of poor and delinquent children in mid-century England: she was also one of the first philanthropists to demand special facilities for their care. In 1851, with the publication of *Reformatory Schools for the Perishing and Dangerous Classes*, Mary forged her own vision of social progress: using her considerable powers of organisation, analysis, writing and persuasion to Parliamentary level she emerged as an active agent of social and educational reform.¹⁰ The application of Mary's principles as outlined in her book would require not only the establishment of special residential institutions for young offenders, but also a shift in the official policy towards juvenile delinquency. Although Mary was wary of what she saw as interference by Government, she envisaged in the institutional model a partnership between charitable and public authorities, which she hoped would provide some form of supervision as well as financial assistance.

In the early 1850s Mary preferred her words to be spoken by men, and throughout her life, was extremely sensitive to issues around the propriety of her behaviour. Mary later gained the confidence and conviction to read her papers herself, and was the first woman to speak publicly at NAPSS; she read 36 papers based on her associationist theories of reform, more than any other person, male or female; she also participated fully in the discussions afterwards, demonstrating that women could make reasoned arguments in order to promote her views and she became an increasingly influential figure. Mary was finally able to reconcile her class-based ideas of female gentility with her own reluctant engagement in public life.¹¹ Mary became a celebrated public figure, a woman who felt compelled to speak out for what she saw as injustice. She had a pivotal role in a network of social and educational reformers and became a prominent figure among reformers around the world. It is remarkable how well Mary's papers at NAPSS were received, the content of her lectures was reported on at a time when most newspapers and magazines

criticised, even ridiculed, ladies for publicly expressing an opinion, portraying them as unfeminine, and even unnatural. In contrast, Mary's words were reported, not merely her demeanour, and she was recognized as an expert in her field. Mary had become aware of the necessity of women gaining greater rights and her visit to America in 1873 demonstrated to her what women could achieve through education. She also latterly saw the need for women to have a voice and she became an active supporter of female suffrage and was vice-president of the Ladies Association for the Repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act, although her other commitments did not allow her to prioritise these campaigns.

Mary was aware of the early sexual activity of poor girls at Red Lodge reformatory school, and in her later work with Josephine Butler she would have been aware of the abuse and the sexual trade in children. In her reformatories Mary sought to rescue and protect children, and in this she acted like other Victorian philanthropists, but she went further than most. She wanted to nurture these marginalised children, having a belief in their value as human beings; she saw worth in individual paupers, not just the respectable poor. Mary recognised the importance of trying to understand and to empathise with those in her charge. While it is true that there were problems with her management of the girls in her reformatories, at the same time she recognised that these were not just related to the girls' previous experiences but to the way they felt about themselves. These included feelings of anger and perhaps despair over their life prospects which were so limited, especially for criminal or 'fallen' girls. Mary showed a strong sense of social engagement based on a moral agenda, as well as understanding the link between immorality and social breakdown; but she was not moralistic. While Mary was wrong in some of her facts about Parkhurst prison, she was very bravely speaking out (and today would be seen as a 'whistle-blower') about brutal abuse which had happened in the past and was widespread in prisons, when so many others preferred to remain silent about the treatment of paupers and criminals. Indeed, her actions and writings may be seen as laying the foundations of what is now called the 'best practice' of social work.

Mary, while unsentimental in her writings about children, was devoted to their welfare and was determined to improve their lives. While Cobbe criticised what she saw as Mary's obsession with her work, there is strong evidence that Mary considered her work in terms of a religious vocation and she took great strength from her religious beliefs, imbibed as a child from her father. Indeed, when Cobbe asked Mary about her religious beliefs she replied they

could be found in her *Meditations and Prayers* (1845) and her father's writings.¹² Unlike her brothers, the path of the church was closed to her but in her correspondence with Cobbe she continually refers to a sense of mission, a phrase that suggests ministerial duties.¹³ The seriousness of her religious beliefs gave Mary the strength to challenge the orthodoxies of the day for females and step out of the prescribed role for women. Despite Mary's often difficult relationship with other women apart from her close family and Lady Bryon, she became a role model for other women. *The Spectator* criticised Mary for her behaviour but it can also be described as an indication of how women were expected to behave.

The concentration of her purpose and the tenacity of her just self-confidence concealed from the eyes of the world a depth of sentiment, which if it had been visible as her social aims, would have given her greater charm.¹⁴

Mary Carpenter is a very complex figure and it is not easy to do justice to the ambivalences in her writings. She was passionately committed to bringing about reform where she felt it was necessary. While she demanded that Government improved conditions in various institutions she was far from being a political radical. Mary, as well as others like Fry, Cobbe, Nightingale and Butler, acted as 'pioneers of statutory welfare arrangements' and 'early social workers'.¹⁵ Unlike Butler or Bodichon, Mary did not promote the professionalism of women explicitly but she did leave a distinctive legacy in those areas.¹⁶ Mary, like many middle-class female reformers, anxiously negotiated the contradictions between a public life and her commitment to representing herself as a respectably behaved Unitarian woman. Her involvement in reform called into play her considerable talents for organisation, raising public awareness and writing. Seth Koven quite rightly refers to her career 'as a cautionary tale underlining the obstacles women faced in their encounters with the mid-Victorian state'.¹⁷

In British India, the provision of western education and campaigns against *sati*, demonstrate how religious and moral reform was increasingly measured according to a western definition of the well-being of women.¹⁸ Hutton maintains that Mary was 'One of the noblest women of the nineteenth century, whose life and work are imperishably associated with Bristol'.¹⁹ Yet he should also have included in his assessment her contribution to reform on a national and, to an extent, international basis. Mary's move in 1860 to promote secular girls' education in India was the result of long-standing links between Bristol Unitarians and members of the Brahmo Samaj, an organisation which placed emphasis on improving the position of Indian women. Indeed, Midgley believes that it was Mary's place at the hub of networks such as this that led her to become an international figure among social and educational reformers in India,

the USA and Europe.²⁰ Articles by Mary on India featuring her plans for Indian education, either in book reviews or excerpts from *Six Months in India* published in the *Englishwoman's Review*, encouraged imperial activism. Her visits to India in late 1860s and early 1870s were thought to have 'opened up' India to feminist attention. Mary was 'someone feminists could be especially proud of' because she was a pioneer in educational reform in England who did not limit her feminist vision to issues in England.²¹

Mary was an exceedingly courageous woman. This is reflected not just in her social work but also in her travels to India and America in her sixties, driven by her belief that her experiences in England would enable her to help Indian women become educated. Many middle-class feminists, as well as other women of the period 1865-1915, identified themselves with the cause of Indian women, yet very few had visited India. It is apparent that there were many obstacles to the transfer of British ideas concerning gender and the appropriate education for colonial women, due to the vast differences of race and culture. Importantly *Six Months in India* was influential in imparting to Victorian women in particular knowledge of India and how women lived. What was distinctive about Mary's writings was that she combined a Christian ethic of female reformatory care in English and Indian prisons in order to justify British women's authority in the face of resistance by male officials. Mary, in order to justify British women's authority, demonstrated that female criminality in the colonies, and in domestic prisons as metaphorical colonies, came under female authority. The large number of papers presented by Mary at the NAPSS on India also brought information on the country to a new audience. It also demonstrated that British women accepted an active role in the Imperial enterprise and were willing to assume responsibility for Britain's female colonial subjects.

Mary's work in promoting girls' secular education in India can be labelled a religiously inspired mission of Unitarian secular social reform. It demonstrates how later in her life she was moving away from the influence of her father to a more feminist viewpoint. Mary's approach to female education, with its emphasis on non-sectarian education, contrasted with the evangelical mainstream and not surprisingly was distrusted by Evangelicals. Her work for women offered a different sense of women's mission which does not fit easily within the interpretative frame of 'missionary Imperialism'.²² Mary's work in India, while unsuccessful at first sight, did force the Government in both Britain and India to recognize their responsibilities towards female education. This also allowed her to circumvent limited opportunities for social and political influence in Britain. The reports she presented to the Marquis of Salisbury on

education and the state of Indian prisons brought attention to aspects of life in India which had not merited attention earlier. Perhaps Mary's attempts would have been more successful if she had continued to use her original tactics of appealing to men to help her with her plans rather than, as in India, presenting detailed reports of what she felt officials were doing wrong.

The Education Act of 1870, the 'Forster Act' to which Mary had contributed, marked a watershed in the history of Victorian state, and with its passage England finally joined the other major European states in their adoption of public elementary schooling for all children. Mary Carpenter recognised that the Forster Act was 'beginning a new era in the educational condition of our country'.²³ Mary wrote to an old friend, Mrs Richards, concluding 'I have after thirty years, got the Government to tend to the miserable children'.²⁴

Mary Carpenter died in 1877 leaving a network of institutions for the reform of young criminals and the prevention of crime. A meeting of Unitarians was held in the Guildhall, Bristol, four months after her death, where it was proposed to perpetuate her memory by the promotion and extension of the work she was especially interested in. Two houses were opened bearing her name, a home for working boys and one for working women. They also decided to place a monument to her in the Cathedral: donations of £2,700 were received demonstrating how highly she was regarded (*appendix six*: p.191).²⁵

It is clear that Mary's career as the architect of a national system of juvenile reformatories was emblematic of women's power to initiate social welfare policies that were later subsidised or absorbed by the state. Her involvement called into play her considerable talents for organisation, raising public awareness and writing. Mary's work laid a basis for education for all as the 'basis of a modern liberal society'.²⁶ Mary helped alter perceptions of social responsibilities towards the children of the poor: she identified the modern category of juvenile delinquents, a liminal figure who was neither child nor adult, criminal nor innocent. This was a project which required a radical rethinking not only of the ways in which poor and abandoned children would be 'managed' but also of childhood itself.

While the concern of this thesis has been with patriarchy Mary Carpenter's own legacy is still continuing. While Mary Carpenter had always credited her father's influence it was her own writings, especially on the education and treatment of poor and delinquent children, which were enlightened enough to have continuing relevance. In August 2010, Camila

Batmanghelidjh of Kid's Company nominated Mary on a Radio Four programme in the 'Great Lives Series', presented by Mathew Parris, as a woman of great influence. Batmanghelidjh commented that Mary's teaching philosophy and the continuing relevance of her ideas on how children should be cared for, was being used in her work with children today and cited her as the inspiration behind her organisation, which focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable children in Britain. Mary's influence has indeed been wide-ranging.

- ¹ Mary Carpenter in Carpenter, M, *Reformatory Schools for the Children of the Perishing and Dangerous Classes and for Juvenile Offenders*, C. Gilpin 1851, p. 261.
- ² Hilton, Mary, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young: Education and Public Doctrine in Britain 1750-1850*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2007, p.194.
- ³ The Industrial Schools for boys was in in house purchased for Mary by a supporter, Mr Frederick Chapple of Liverpool
- ⁴ Carpenter, J. Estlin, *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, New Jersey, 1974, p.25.
- ⁵ Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998, p.6, pp.8-12: Selleck, Richard, 'Mary Carpenter: A confident and contradictory reformer', pp.107-8 *History of Education*, 1985, Vo.14, No.2.
- ⁶ Schupf, Harriet Warm, 'Single Women and Social Reform in mid-Nineteenth-century England: The Case of Mary Carpenter', p.303, *Victorian Studies*, Vol.17, No.3 March 1974.
- ⁷ Seed, J, 'Unitarianism, Political Economy and the Antinomies of Liberal Culture in Manchester', pp.1-25, *Social History*, Jan. 1983, 7, No.1, Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998.
- ⁸ Billington, L. & R, "'A Burning Zeal for Righteousness': Women in the British Anti-Slavery Movement, 1820-1860, p.110 in Rendall, Jane (ed.) *Equal or Different, Women's Politics 1800-1914*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- ⁹ Carpenter, J. Estlin, (1879) *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, New Jersey, 1974, p.82.
- ¹⁰ Watts, Ruth, 'Rational Religion and Feminism: The Challenge of Unitarianism in the Nineteenth century', p.39 in Morgan, Sue (ed.) *Women, Religion and Feminism in Britain, 1750-1900*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- ¹¹ Koven, Seth, 'Borderlands: Women, voluntary Action, and Child Welfare in Britain, 1840-1914', p.126 in Koven S, and S, Michel, (eds.) *Mothers of a New World: Materialist Politics and the Origin of Welfare States*, Routledge, 1993.
- ¹² www.oxforddnd.com/articles. Frank Prochaska, *Mary Carpenter*, accessed 1/12/2010
- ¹³ Cobbe, Frances Power, *Life of Frances Power Cobbe*, 2 vols. Richard Bentley and Son, 1894, p.209-10.
- ¹⁴ Cited in Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976, p.245.
- ¹⁵ Parker, Julia, *Women and Welfare*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1988, p.1.
- ¹⁶ Schwan, Anne, "'Dreadful beyond Description': Mary Carpenter's prison reform writings and female convicts in Britain and India', p.116, *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 14, No.2, 2010.
- ¹⁷ Koven, *Borderlands*, p.97.
- ¹⁸ Semple, Rhonda A, 'Women, mission and the cultures of empire', p.121 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ¹⁹ Hutton, S, *Bristol and Its Famous Associations*, Bristol, J.W. Arrowsmith, 1907, p.304.
- ²⁰ Midgley, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform' p.146 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- ²¹ Burton, Antoinette, *Burdens of Empire: British Feminism, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865- 1915*, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1995, p.109.
- ²² Midgley, *Women, religion and reform*, p.149.
- ²³ 'Proceedings of the NAPSS: Industrial Schools and School Boards, 1871', cited in Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Street*, Heinemann, 1976, p.223.
- ²⁴ Saywell, Ruby J, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, Bristol, Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1964, p.18.
- ²⁵ Latimer, J, *Annals of Bristol*, W. & F. Morgan, 1887, Bristol, p.295-6.
- ²⁶ Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter and India: enlightened liberalism or condescending imperialism? p.195, *Paedagogica Historica*, 37.1. 2002.

Appendices

Appendix One

List of Subscribers to the Lewin's Mead

Working and Visiting Society, 1840

	£	s	d
Mr G. Ames		10	6
Miss F.Acland		5	0
Miss L. Acland		5	0
Miss Armstrong		5	0
Mrs Benson		5	0
Mrs Bromhead		5	0
Mr Browne		5	0
Mrs Browne		5	0
Mrs Bryant		5	0
Mrs Bunny		5	0
Miss Benton		5	0
Mrs Carpenter		5	0
Miss M. Carpenter		5	0
Misses A. and S. Carpenter		5	0
Miss Castle		5	0
Mrs Coates		5	0
Miss Coates		5	0
Miss Cundell		5	0
Mrs Dowling		5	0
Mr Estlin		10	6
Mrs Estlin		5	0
Mrs S. Evans		5	0
Miss Edwards		5	0
Mrs Fripp		5	0
Miss Fry		5	0
Mrs Gillett		5	0
Miss Glascodine		5	0
Mrs Green		5	0
Misses Grosvenor		10	0
Miss Hall		5	0
Mrs Harley		5	0
Miss Hilles	£1	0	0
Mrs Hodgetts		5	0
Miss A.M. Hodgetts		5	0
Mrs Kentish		5	0
Mrs Lang		5	0
Misses P. and E.Lang		5	0
Mr Lang		5	0
Mrs T. Lang		5	0
Miss Lowe		5	0

Members of the Working Party, 1841

Members of the Working Party who were not subscribers in italics.

Miss L. Acland.
Miss Armstrong, Mrs Armstrong
<i>Mrs Bayley</i>
Miss Browne
Miss M. Browne
Mary Carpenter
Mrs William B. Carpenter
Miss Coates
<i>Misses A and R. Dunsford</i>
<i>Miss Edwards</i>
Miss Estlin
Mrs S. Evans
Miss Glascodine
Mrs Green
<i>Mrs Jenkins</i>
<i>Mrs Jennings</i>
Mrs Kentish
Misses P. And E. Lang
Mrs T. Lang
Miss Lowe

Mr Morgan	10	0
Miss Morgan	10	0
Mrs Marshall	10	0
Mr Milford	£1 1	0
Mrs Palmer	5	0
Mrs Philp	5	0
Mrs Prowse	5	0
Miss Prowse	5	0
Mr H.A. Palmer	10	0
Mrs Reid	5	0
Miss Rickards	5	0
Miss E. Rickards	5	0
Miss Ricketts	5	0
Miss E. Rowe	5	0
Mrs Selby	5	0
Miss Shepperd	5	0
Mrs Swain	5	0
Mrs Stock	5	0
Miss Somerton	5	0
Ditto from last year	5	0
Mrs Taylor	5	0
Miss Thomas	5	0
Miss S. Thomas	5	0
Miss Watts	2	6
Mrs Watts	2	6
Mrs J. Wreford	5	0
Mrs W. Wreford	5	0
Mrs Worsley	5	0
A friend by Miss Edwards	5	0

Miss Parnell

Mrs and Miss Philp

Miss Prowse and Miss M. Prowse

Mrs Reid

Miss Rickards

Miss E. Rickards

Miss Ricketts

Miss Stone and Miss E. Stone

Mrs Selby

Mrs Shute

Miss Staples

Miss Stock

Miss Stark

Mrs Stockwell

Mrs Swain

Miss Thomas

Miss S. Thomas

Miss E. Williams

Miss M.A. Williams

Mrs W. Wreford

Appendix Two

Extract from Home Office Statistical Return for Red Lodge for the year ending September 1858

Number of Girls at commence of year.	55
Total committed during the year.	10
Discharged on the order of the Secretary of State.	13
Discharged on competition of term.	4
Removed to other reformatories	1
Number remaining under detention	55
Donations including general subscriptions	£ 76.14s.6d.
Donations towards emigration	£ 24. 5s
Donations towards dress material	£ 6. 15s
Payment for keeping girls	£ 286.2s 11 ½d
Total Income	£ 594.2s 11 ½d

Outgoings

Rent to Lady Byron	£ 30.
Clothes and shoes	£ 31.10s1d
Outfits for emigration	£ 29.17. 2½d
Staff Salaries	£ 108.14s 3d

Appendix Three

List of papers presented by Carpenter at the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science.

- The relation of Ragged Schools to the Educational movement, 1857.
Reformatories for Convicted Girls, 1857.
On the relation of Ragged and Industrial Schools to the Parliamentary Grant, 1858.
On the disposal of Girls from Reformatory School, 1858.
On Certified Industrial Schools, their principles and Actual Operation, with a Consideration of the Act by which they are established 1859.
On the Principles of Education, 1859.
On the supplementary measures needed for reformatories for the diminution of juvenile crime, 1860.
On the connection of voluntary effort with Government aid, 1860.
The application of the principles of education to schools of the lower classes of society, 1861.
What shall we do with our Paper Children? 1861.
On the essential principles of the reformatory movement, 1862.
On the Education of Pauper Girls, 1862.
National Education and the Revised Code, 1862.
On the treatment of female convicts, 1863.
Refuges for female convicts, 1863.
On the non-imprisonment of children, 1864.
The duty of Government to aid in the education of children of the perishing and on the treatment of female prisoners, 1864.
On the Consolidation of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools' Acts, 1865.
Our neglected and Destitute Children. Are they to be Educated? 1865.
On the nature of the educational aid required for the destitute, 1866.
On female Education in India, 1867
On Prison Discipline in India, 1867
The Goals of India, from Official Reports, 1868.
On the inefficiency of pauper schools, 1868.
Result of the Industrial Schools and Reformatory Schools Act, 1869.
Children's agents, 1869,
How the education of Neglected Children may be best provided, 1871.
Certified Industrial Schools and their Relation to School Boards, 1871.
On Day Industrial Schools for neglected and destitute children, 1872.
How can Education be brought to bear on the hitherto Untouched Portions of the Population? 1872.
The treatment of Life-Sentenced Prisoners, 1873.
How Far is it Desirable that the Industrial Schools Act should be extended to Day Industrial Feeding Schools? 1874.
On Reformatory and Industrial Schools in India, 1874.
Female Education in India, 1876.

Appendix Four

Extract from a letter from Mr J.S. Mill to Carpenter on Women's Suffrage 29th December 1867

If you think that to give your name in aid of the movement for the political enfranchisement of women might be in any degree injurious to the work you have chosen, I cordially agree that those who are working in another department than your own for the public good have no claim upon you. Whether giving your name to our Society would have any such mischievous effect, you are full better qualified to judge than I am, and I will not therefore venture an opinion. I will content myself with thanking you for the pleasure with which I learn from your letter that you are with us in principle, and with expressing the hope that the time may not be very far distant when the progress of events and of public opinion may remove the obstacles, which prevent you from joining us.

There are, however, one or two points in your letter in which I cannot agree with you. To take the most important first- most important, because it is a point of moral obligation, you say you do not desire a vote for yourself. I have too great a respect for you not to venture to say, that in my opinion this is a dereliction of duty you owe to your fellow-creatures. If your vote could affect only yourself, that is to say, if you could be the sufferer, materially speaking, from allowing yourself to be governed by others, it would still be a question whether, unless those others govern you with perfect justice, you are morally entitled to forego the right and power which a vote would give you to force them to do justice.

Appendix Five

Letter from John Bright to Carpenter

16th May, 1876, Rochdale,

Dear Madam,

I shall not be Town before Thursday evening and I am not able at present to make an appointment with you- as I may have to be away for a few days almost immediately.

As to a Factory Act in India. It seems to me not a subject for the House of Commons but for the Indian Govt. And I should be disposed to object to its being discussed in the House of Commons.

Factory acts are measures which tell upon industry as the tariffs of Foreign Countries do- and if pushed much further will cripple and perhaps destroy it. I hope we may keep our hands from meddling with such delicate matter in India- and be content to leave them to the Govt. of India.

I am very resp. yours,

John Bright

HMC: Miscellaneous Box, *Letter from Mr John Bright to Carpenter*, 16th May 1876.

Carpenter, Mary, *Discipline and the necessity for a Factory Act in India: Being a report of her fourth journey to India in 1875-76*, Bristol, 1877.

Memorial to Carpenter in Bristol Cathedral



SACRED TO THE MEMORY OF
MARY CARPENTER

FOREMOST AMONG THE FOUNDERS OF REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS IN THIS CITY AND REALM.

NEITHER THE CLAIMS OF PRIVATE DUTY NOR THE TASTES OF A CULTURED MIND
COULD WITHDRAW HER COMPASSIONATE EYE FROM THE UNCARED FOR CHILDREN OF THE STREETS.
LOVING THEM WHILE YET UNLOVELY,

SHE SO FORMED THEM TO THE FAIR AND GOOD AS TO INSPIRE OTHERS WITH HER FAITH AND HOPE,
AND THUS LED THE WAY TO A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF MORAL RESCUE AND PREVENTIVE DISCIPLINE.

TAKING ALSO TO HEART THE GRIEVOUS LOT OF ORIENTAL WOMEN,
IN THE LAST DECADE OF HER LIFE SHE FOUR TIMES WENT TO INDIA,
AND AWAKENED AN ACTIVE INTEREST IN THEIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR SERIOUS DUTIES.

NO HUMAN ILL ESCAPED HER PITY NOR CAST DOWN HER TRUST:
WITH TRUE SELF SACRIFICE SHE FOLLOWED IN THE TRAIN OF CHRIST,
TO SEEK AND TO SAVE THAT WHICH WAS LOST AND BRING IT HOME TO THE FATHER IN HEAVEN.

DESIRING TO EXTEND HER WORK OF PIETY AND LOVE,
MANY WHO HONOURED HER HAVE INSTITUTED IN HER NAME SOME HOMES FOR THE HOUSELESS YOUNG,
AND NOW COMPLETE THEIR TRIBUTE OF AFFECTION BY ERECTING THIS MEMORIAL.

BORN AT EXETER, APRIL 3, 1807.

DIED AT BRISTOL, JUNE 15, 1877.

192

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Place of publication London, unless otherwise stated.

Primary Sources

Selected published books, pamphlets and articles by Mary Carpenter

- Morning and Evening Meditations and Prayers, for every day in a month*, Longman Green, 1845.
- Life of Tuckerman*, 1849.
- Ragged Schools, their principles and modes of operation by a Worker*, Partridge and Oakley, 1850.
- Reformatory schools for the children of the perishing and dangerous classes and for Juvenile Delinquents- Their Condition and Treatment*, G. Cash, 1851.
- Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society. *Statements respecting the American Abolitionists; by their Opponents and Their Friends: Indicating the Present Struggle between Slavery and Freedom in the United States of America*, Dublin, Webb and Chapman, 1852.
- Carpenter, Mary (1853) *Juvenile Delinquents, their condition and treatment*, Nabu Press, 2010.
- Mary Carpenter and Russell Scott, *First Report of Kingswood Agricultural Reformatory School*, Bristol, H.C. Evans, 1854.
- Grants from the Committee of Council of Education solicited for the preventive and reformatory schools*, Bristol, Isaac Arrowsmith, 1856.
- 'Food, Labour and Rest in Reformatories for Boys' and Girls', *The Philanthropist*, 1857.
- 'Women's Work in the Reformatory Movement', pp.289-95, *The English Woman's Journal*, vol.1, July 1, 1858, No 5.
- The Claims of Ragged Schools to Pecuniary Educational Aid*, 1859.
- On the principle of Education*, Emily Faithfull & Co, 1860.
- An address read at the Conference on Ragged Schools held at Birmingham*, Birmingham, Benjamin Hall, 1861.
- What shall we do with our pauper children? Together with a letter on the charges of the Bristol Guardians addressed to the editors of Bristol Daily Press and of the Western Daily Press*, Longmans, 1861.
- On the Education of Pauper Girls*, Bristol, 1862.
- A day at Red Lodge*, Bristol, 1864.
- Suggestions on the Management of Reformatories and Certified Industrial Schools*, 1864.
- Our Convicts*, 2 vols, (1864) Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1969.
- The management of Reformatories*, 1864, Bristol.
- The Last days in England of Rammohun Roy*, 1866, Delhi, S.S. Publishers.
- An account of visits to prisons in southern India*, 1867.
- Address to the Hindoos, delivered in India*, Longman, Green and Co, 1867.
- Report of Miss Carpenter's address at Bethune Society, Calcutta: The reformatory school system and its influences on the female mind*, Calcutta, I.C. Base & Co, 1867.
- Six Months in India*, in 2 vols. Longman, Green & Co, 1868.
- Reformatory Prison Discipline as developed by Sir Walter Crofton in the Irish Convicts Prisons*, Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1872.

Day Industrial Feeding Schools for Children beyond the reach of School Boards, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1874.

An address on prison discipline and juvenile reformatories, Address at a special meeting of the Bengal Social Science Association, December 18th, 1875, W. Jones, 1876.

Red Lodge Girls' Reformatory School Bristol, Its History, Principles and Working, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1875.

Voices of the Spirit and Spirit Pictures, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1879.

Books and articles prior to 1921.

Bristol Auxiliary Anti-Slavery Society; Reports of Proceedings from the Formation of the Institution to the 31st December, 1830, Bristol, 1831.

Butler, Josephine, *Personal Reminiscences of a Great Crusade*, Horace Marshall, 1896.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, (1879) *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, Montclair, New Jersey, 1974.

Carpenter, Lant, (1820) *Principles of Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*, Longman & Co, Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1974.

Carpenter, Lant, *Review of the Labours, Opinions and Character of Rajah Rammohun Roy*, London, 1833.

Carpenter, Russell (ed.) *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverent Carpenter*, Bristol, Philip & Evans, 1842.

Carpenter, Russell, *Observations on American Slavery after a year's tour in the United States*, Edward T. Whitfield, 1852

Carpenter, R.L, *Memoir of Philip Pearsall Carpenter*, C. Kegan & Paul, 1880.

Carpenter, William, *Sketch of the Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1877.

Chapman, Maria Weston & Harriet Martineau (ed.) *Harriet Martineau Autobiography*, 2 vols. Boston, James R. Osgood & Co, 1877.

Cobbe, Frances Power, *Life of Frances Power Cobbe*, 2 vols. Richard Bentley and Son, 1894.

Collet, Sophia Dodson, *Life and Letters of Rajah Rammohun Roy*, 1900.

Davenport- Hill, R, and F.D, *The Recorder of Birmingham: a memoir of Matthew Davenport Hill with a Selection from his correspondence*, 1878.

De la Beche, Sir H.T, and Dr Lyon Playfair, *Report on the sanatory (sic) condition of Bristol, Bristol*, 1845

Ellis, Sarah Stickney, *The Women of England, Their Social Duties and Domestic Habits*, Fisher, Son & Co, 1839.

Fawcett, Millicent Garrett, *Some Eminent Women of Our Time: Mary Carpenter*, Westminster, National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, 1912.

Hartley, David, (1749) *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty and His Expectations*, 2 Vols, New York, Garland Publishing, Inc., 1971.

Hill, M.D, Mettray, *The Exemplar of Reformatory Schools*, 1855.

Hutton, Stanley, *Bristol and its Famous Associations*, Bristol, J.W. Arrowsmith, 1907.

Latimer, John, *Annals of Bristol in the Nineteenth century*, Bristol, W & F. Morgan, 1887.

Lloyd-Baker, Thomas Barwick, *Report of the Hardwicke Reformatory for 1856 and 1857*, Gloucester, 1858.

More, J.S, *Report of the Proceedings of a Conference on the Subject of the Prevention and Reformatory Schools, held in Birmingham on 9th & 10 December, 1851*.

Prem, Sunder Basu, *Keshub Chunder Sen in England*, Calcutta, 1871.

Proceedings of the General Anti-Slavery Convention Called by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and Held in London, From Friday, June 12th Tuesday 23rd, 1840, John and Barrett, 1841.

Shepherd, William, Jeremiah Joyce and Lant Carpenter, *Systematic Education, Or Elementary Instruction in the Various Departments of Literature and Science with Practical Rules for Studying each branch of Useful Knowledge*, 3rd edition, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822.

Simcox, Edith, 'Ideals of Feminine Usefulness', pp.656-671, *Fortnightly Review*, Vol.27, 1880.

ARCHIVES

Bristol Record Office

BRO 31127: *Letters: Mrs Carpenter from Joseph Tuckerman.*

BRO12693/1/2: *Red Lodge Journals*, 1855-1857.

BRO12693/3: *Principles, rules and regulations of the school*, 1854.

BRO12693/6: *Account Book, No.31*, 1854-1884.

BRO 12693/13/14: *Certificates of Red Lodge Reformatory*, signed by Lord Palmerston, as Secretary of State, 9th December, 1854.

BRO12693/18a: *Interview with the Queen*: Manuscript account by Mary Carpenter.

BRO12693/20: *Carpenter's Poetical Book March 1836 to July 1876* containing extracts by a number of prominent reformers.

BRO12693/23: *Miscellaneous papers and containing newspaper cuttings and pamphlets relating to Mary Carpenter.*

BRO Mary Carpenter, *Miscellaneous papers 'The Invitation to the 1853 Conference, Juvenile Delinquency, Preventive and Reformatory Industrial Schools'*.

BRO12693/24: *Records of India 1866*, Vol. 1.

BRO12693/30: *Suggestions on the Management of Reformatories and Certified Industrial Schools.*

BRO12693/35: *Report of Miss Carpenter Address at the Bethune Society, Calcutta.*

BRO 12693/36: *Suggestions on Prison Discipline and Female Education in India*, Bristol, Arrowsmith, 1867. .

BRO12693/43: *Mary Carpenter born 1787 died 1877.*

BRO12693/46: *The Carpenter Mary Memorial Working Girl's Home, Bristol Street, Bristol, Annual Report.*

BRO12693/53: *Red Lodge*, Bristol.

BRO12693/53: Carpenter, Phillip, *The sixth report of the Red Lodge Girls' Reformatory Schools*, Oberin Press, 1861.

BRO40589/1: *Letters: Mary Carpenter from Florence Nightingale.*

BRO40578/1: *Letter: Mary Carpenter from James Martineau.*

BRO40781/1: *Letter: Mary Carpenter from John Stuart Mill.*

BRO40589/16: *Letters: Mary Carpenter from Lord Stanley. Lord Shaftesbury and other government ministers.*

BRO39461-5, a, b, c, *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, Annual Reports. 1935-1884.*

BRO12693/23: *Invitation to the 1853 Conference, 'Juvenile Delinquency, Preventive and Reformatory & Industrial Schools.*

BRO36298: *Copy of the Report to Marquis of Salisbury by Miss Carpenter on Prison Discipline, and on Female Education in India, 24th April 1877.*

Bristol Reference Library

- B3217: *Proceedings of the Anti-Slavery Meeting, held at the Guildford, Bristol, on Thursday February 2nd 1826, Bristol, John Bonner, 1826.*
- B3218: *Bristol Auxiliary Anti-Slavery meeting Report of the proceedings from the formation of the institution to 31st December 1830, Bristol, 1830.*
- B7054: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 1st Report.*
- B7055: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 2nd Report.*
- B7056: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 3rd Report.*
- B7057: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 4th Report.*
- B7058: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 5th Report.*
- B7059: *Lewin's Mead Working and Visiting Society, 6th Report.*
- B7060- 8: *Lewin's Mead Domestic Mission Society annual reports, Bristol 1841-58.*
- B7065/ B7060: *Lewin's Mead Domestic Mission Society, 11th report.*
- B28776: *Visitors' book and official inspection of Kingsmead and reformatory controversies.*
- B29760: *National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Bristol meeting, 1869*
- B34965: 'Anti-Slavery Meeting, 1851', recorded in the *Bristol Mirror*, 12th April 1851. .
- B31078: *Letter: Lant Carpenter from Rammohun Roy.*
- B31078: *Letter from Rammohun Roy to Lant Carpenter, 7th May, 1831.*
- B16093: *The Red Lodge, Bristol.*
- Matthews's Annual Bristol Directory and Almanack, Bristol, 1820.*
- Matthews's Annual Bristol Directory and Almanack, Bristol, 1841.*

British Library of Political and Economic Science.

Letter from Mary Carpenter to John Stuart Mill, 11th August 1867, Mill-Taylor Collection, Vol 1, 103.

Harris Manchester College, Oxford

- Carpenter, Mary, 'On the non-imprisonment of children' *Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Science*, 1864 meeting (1865).
- MS Lant Carpenter, fols 256-278 *On the Interment of the Rajah Rammohun Roy*
- MS Lant Carpenter, fols. 279-288, *Present at Interment 1833*, MS Lant Carpenter, and fols 279-88, dated 23rd July 1831.
- MS Lant Carpenter, fols. 279-288, *Letter: Lant Carpenter to Mr Marshall, MP, concerning Rammohun Roy, 23rd July 1831.*
- MS Lant Carpenter, fols. 279-288, 85 *Letters: James Martineau to members of Carpenter family, including Mary, 1821-1880.*
- MS Lant Carpenter 2, Letterbox D. *Album of letters from or to Mary Carpenter, Florence Nightingale, Joseph Tuckerman, J.S. Mill, Charles Dickens, Lady Byron, Harriet Martineau.*
- Miscellaneous Box, Frances Power Cobbe, *Personal Recollections of Mary Carpenter*; no date or provenance.
- Miscellaneous Box, *Letter from Mr John Bright to Mary Carpenter, 16th May 1876.*
- MS *James Martineau*, fols, 1-51; 53-72.

Rhodes House Library, Oxford.

Letter: Mary Carpenter to Frederick Douglass Anti-slavery papers C.128/112-3.
Anne Tribe to L.A. Chamerovzow, Kingsdown, Bristol, 5th December 1953 in Anti-Slavery Collection, Rhodes House, Oxford.

University of Birmingham.

Records of the Society for Promoting Education in the East, University of Birmingham, Special Collections GB 0150 FES.

Boston Public Library: Antislavery Collection, Dept. of Manuscripts:

Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston, Samuel May to Mary Carpenter, December 1845. *The May Papers*, Ms.B.1.6. Vol 3 1849-1849: MS.B 1.6 Vol.3 1845-1849., No, 7 Samuel May to Mary Carpenter, December, 1845.
Further letter between Samuel May and Mary Carpenter cited in Carpenter, J.E, *The Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*, (1879) Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1974 including Letters, Carpenter to Samuel May, October 13, 1844; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 15th January, 1845; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 15th February 1846; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 16th June, 1847; Carpenter to Samuel May 12th June 1848; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 6th April, 850; Carpenter to Samuel May 5th October, 1850; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 5th October, 1850; Carpenter to Samuel May, 29th May, 1952; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 16th April, 1864; Mary Carpenter to Samuel May, 5th June, 1865; cited in Carpenter, J.E, *The Life and Works of Mary Carpenter*, pp.71-2; p.73; p.96-7; pp.99-100, pp.102-4; pp.238-9; p.243.
Maria Weston Chapman Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston,
<http://www.archive.org/details/lettertomrschapm00carp.1-12>

Newspapers

Anti-Slavery Advocate
Birmingham Daily Press.
Bristol Advertiser.
Bristol Daily Post.
Bristol Mercury.
Christian Examiner.
Daily Press, Bristol.
Edinburgh Evening Courant.
English Women's Journal.
Humming Bird
Macmillan's Magazine.
Madras Times.
Manchester Mercury.

New York Times.
The Athenaeum.
The Anti-Slavery Advocate,
The Athenaeum.
The Beehive.
The British Emancipator.
The Christian Reformer.
The Edinburgh Review.
The Englishman.
The Examiner.
The Indian Female Evangelist
The Indian Zenana Evangelist
The Inquirer.
The Liberator.
The Philanthropist
The Times.
Unitarian Review.
Western Daily Press.

Secondary Resources

Books

- Allender, Tim, *Ruling through Education: The Politics of Schooling in the Colonial Punjab*, Slough, New Dawn Press, 2006.
- Amey, G, *City under Fire: The Bristol Riots and aftermath*, Lutterworth Press, 1979.
- Bailin, Miriam, *The Sickroom in Victorian Fiction: The Art of Being Ill*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Bebbington, D.W, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*, Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Billington, Louis and Rosamund, ‘“A Burning Zeal for Righteousness”: Women in the British Anti-Slavery Movement 1820-1860’, pp.82-111 in Jane Rendall (ed.) *Equal or Different*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Bolt, Christine, *The Anti-Slavery Movement and Reconstruction: A Study in Anglo-American Cooperation*, Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Bolt, Christine, and Drescher, Seymour, (eds.) *Anti-Slavery, Religion and Reform, Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey*, Folkestone, Dawson, 1980.
- Borthwick, Meredith, *The changing role of women in Bengal, 1849-1905*, Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Bostridge, Mark, *Florence Nightingale, The women and the legend*, Viking Penguin, 2008.
- Bradley, Ian, *Call to Seriousness: The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians*, J. Cape, 1976.
- Burton, Antoinette, ‘The White Women’s Burden: British Feminists and “The Indian Women”, 1865- 1915’, pp.37-158 in Chaudhuri, Nupur and Margaret Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1992.
- Burton, Antoinette, *Burdens of Empire: British Feminism, Indian Women and Imperial Culture 1865- 1915*, Bloomington, Indiana, University Press, 1995.
- Burton, Antoinette, *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late Victorian England*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1999.
- Bush, Graham, *Bristol and its Municipal Government, 1820-1851*, Bristol Record Office, 1976.
- Butcher, E.E, (ed.) *Bristol Corporation of the Poor: Selected Records, 1696-1834*, Bristol, Bristol Record Society, 1932.
- Caine, Barbara, *Victorian Feminists*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Carlebach, Julius, *Caring for Children in Trouble*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Corfield, K, ‘Elizabeth Heyrick: Radical Quaker’, pp.31-67 in G. Malgreen (ed.) *Religion in the Lives of English Women 1760-1930*, Croom Helm, 1986.
- Davidoff, Leonore, Catherine Hall, (1987) *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle-Class, 1780-1850*, Hutchinson, 2002.
- David, Deirdre, *Intellectual Women and Victorian Patriarchy*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1987.
- DeVries, Jacqueline, ‘More than Paradoxes to offer: Feminism, history and religious culture’, p.188-210 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.
- Dresser, Madge, ‘Protestants, Catholics and Jews: Religious Difference and Political Status in Bristol, 1750-1850’, pp.129-60 in Dresser, M, and Ollerenshaw, P, *The Making of Modern Bristol*, Bristol, Redcliffe Press, 1996.

- Dresser, M, *Slavery Obscured: The Social History of the Slave Trade in an English Provincial Port*, Continuum, 2001.
- Duckworth, Jeanne, *Fagin's Children, Criminal Children in Victorian England*, Hambledon, 2002.
- Eger, Elizabeth, Charlotte Grant; Cliona O'Gallchoir and Penny Warburton, *Women's Writing and the Public Sphere 1700-1830*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Elliott, D.W, *The Angel Out of the House: Philanthropy and Gender in Nineteenth-century England*, University Press of Virginia, 2002.
- Ferguson, Moira (ed.), *First Feminists', British Women Writers 1578-1799*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Fissell, Mary E, *Patients, Power, and the Poor in Eighteenth-century Bristol* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Fladeland, Betty, *Men and Brothers: Anglo American Antislavery Co-operation*, Chicago and London, University of Illinois Press, 1972.
- Forbes, Geraldine, *The New Cambridge History of India, Women in Modern India*, Cambridge, University of Cambridge, 1996.
- Foucault, Michael, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prisons*, Harmondsworth
- Gleadle, Kathryn, *Radical Writings on Women, 1800-1850: An Anthology*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 1992.
- Gleadle, Kathryn, *The Early Feminists, Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement 1831-51*, Macmillan, 1995.
- Gleadle, K, Richardson, S. (eds.) *Women in British Politics, 1760-1860: The Power of the Petticoat*, Macmillan, 2000.
- Gleadle, Kathryn, *British Women in the Nineteenth century*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2001.
- Gleadle, Kathryn, 'British Women and Radical Politics in the Nonconformist Enlightenment c1780- 1830', pp.121-151 in Vickery, A. (ed.) *Women, Privilege, and Power: British Politics 1750 to present*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Goldman, Lawrence, *Science, reform, and politics in Victorian Britain: the Social Science Association, 1857-1886*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Gordon, Eleanor; Nair, Gwyneth, *Public lives: women, family and society in Victorian Britain*, Yale, Yale University Press, 2003.
- Gorsky, M, *Patterns of Philanthropy: Charity and Society in Nineteenth-century Bristol*, The Royal Historical Society, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, 1999.
- Gourlay, Jharna, *Florence Nightingale and the Health of the Raj*, Alderhot, Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003.
- Hall, Catherine, 'The early Formation of Victorian Domestic Ideology', pp.15-32 in Burman, Sandra, (ed.) *Fit Work for Women*, Croom Helm, 1979.
- Hall, Catherine, *White, Male and Middle-class: Explorations in Feminism and History*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2002.
- Hall, Catherine, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867*, Oxford, Polity Press, 2002.
- Hall, Catherine, 'Of Gender and Empire: Reflections on the Nineteenth century', pp.46-76 in Levine, Phillipa (ed.) *Gender and Empire*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hall, Catherine, and Sonya O. Rose, (eds.) *At Home with the Empire*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Hannam, J, "'An enlarged sphere of usefulness": The Bristol's Women's Movement', pp.184-209, in Dresser, M, & Ollerenshaw, Phillip, *The Making of Modern Bristol*, Tiverton, Redcliffe Press, 1996.
- Hilton, M. & Hirsch, P, *Practical Visionaries: Women, Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Longman, 2000.

- Hilton, Mary, *Women and the Shaping of the Nation's Young: Education and Public Doctrine in Britain 1750-1850*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2007.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *The Idea of Poverty: England in the early industrial age*, Faber and Faber, 1984.
- Holton, Sandra, *Quaker women, personal life, memory and radicalism in the lives of women friends*, Routledge, 2007.
- Jayawardena, K., *The White Women's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia during British Rule*, Routledge, 1995.
- Jeffrey, Julie Roy, *The Great Silent Army of Abolitionism*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Kent, S.K., *Gender and Power in Britain, 1649-1990*, Routledge, 1999.
- King, Peter and Heather Shore, *Artful Dodgers: Youth and Crime in Early Nineteenth century*, Royal Historical Society, 1999.
- Koft, David, *The Brahma Samaj and the Shaping of the Modern Indian Mind*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Koven, Seth, 'Borderlands: Women, Voluntary Action, and Child Welfare in Britain, 1840-1914' in Koven S, and S, Michel, (eds.) *Mothers of a New World: Materialist Politics and the Origin of Welfare States*, Routledge, 1993
- Kowaleski-Wallace, Elizabeth, *Their Fathers' Daughters, Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and patriarchal complicity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Krueger, Christine, *Functions of Victorian Culture at the Present Time*, Ohio, Ohio University Press, 2002.
- Lahiri, Krishna, 'Mary Carpenter and the Early Crisis in Teacher Training for Women in Calcutta', pp.19-48 in Richard L. Park, (ed.) *Patterns of Change in Modern Bengal*, East Lansing, Asian Studies Centre, Michigan State University, 1979.
- Laqueur, T.W., *Religion and Respectability: Sunday Schools and Working-Class Culture, 1780- 1850*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1976.
- Large, David, *Bristol and the New Poor Law*, Bristol, The Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1995.
- Levine, Phillipa, *Gender and Empire*, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lewis, Jane, *Women and Social Action in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1991.
- Lewis, Jane, *The Voluntary Sector, the State and Social Work in Britain*, Aldershot, Elgar, 1995.
- Logan, Anne, (ed.) *The collected letters of Harriet Martineau*, Vol.1-5, Pickering and Chatto, 2007.
- Lorimer, Douglas A, *Colour, Class and the Victorians: English Attitudes to the Negro in the Mid-Nineteenth century*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1978.
- MacInnes, C.M, *Bristol: A Gateway of Empire*, Newton Abbott, David and Charles, 1968.
- Malos, E., 'Bristol Women in Action, 1839-1919: the right to vote and the need to earn a living', pp.97-128 in Bild, I. *Bristol's Other History*, Bristol, Bristol Broadsides, 1983.
- Malmgreen, Gail, (ed.) *Religion in the Lives of English Women*, Bloomington, University of Indiana Press, 1986.
- Mani, Lata, *Contentious Traditions: the Debate on Sati in Colonial India*, University of California Press, 1998.
- Manton, Jo, *Mary Carpenter and the Children of the Streets*, Heinemann, 1976.
- Marshall, P, (1975) *Bristol and the Abolition of Slavery: The Politics of Emancipation*, Bristol, Bristol Historical Association, 1998.

Martin, M, 'Managing the Poor: The Administration of Poor Relief in Bristol in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', pp.97-128 in Dresser, M, & Ollerenshaw, P, *The Making of Modern Bristol*, Tiverton, Redcliffe Press, 1996.

Mathur, Y.B, *Women's Education in India 1813-1966*, Delhi, Asia Publishing House, 1973.

Mayne, Ethel, *The Life and Letters of Anna Isabella, Lady Noel Byron*, Constable & Co Ltd, 1929.

McColgan, Daniel T, *Joseph Tuckerman Pioneer in American Social Work*, Washington, Catholic University of America, 1940.

Medhurst, P, *Rammohun Roy and 'The day-star of approaching morn'*, The Essex Hall Lecture, 1992, The Unitarian Information Department.

Mellor, H.E, *Leisure and the Changing City, 1870-1914*, Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1976.

Melman, Billie, *Women's' Orients: English Women and the Middle East, 1718-1918, Sexuality, Religion and Work*, Michigan University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Midgley, Clare, *Women against Slavery: The British Campaigns- 1780-1870*, Routledge, 1982.

Midgley, Clare, (ed.) *Gender and Imperialism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1988.

Midgley, Clare, 'From Supporting Missions to Petitioning Parliament: British Women and the Evangelical Campaign against Sati in India', 1814-1830', pp.74-92 in Gleadle, Kathryn & Sarah Richardson, *Women in British Politics, 1760-1860, The Power of the Petticoat*, Basingstoke, Macmillan Press Ltd, 2000.

Midgley, Clare, *Feminism and Empire: Women Activists in Imperial Britain, 1790-1865*, Routledge, 2007.

Midgley, Clare, 'Women, religion and reform' pp.138-158 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.

Mitter, Partha, *Art and nationalism in colonial India, 1850-1922*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Morgan, Simon, *Victorian Woman's Place: Public Culture in the Nineteenth century*, Tauris Academic Studies, 2007.

Morgan, Sue, *A Passion for Purity: Ellice Hopkins and the Politics of Gender in the last-Victorian Church*, Bristol, Bristol University Press, 1999.

Morgan Sue, *Women, Religion and Feminism, in Britain 1750-1990*, Palgrave-Macmillan, 2002.

Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.

Munn, Susan, 'Women and philanthropic cultures' pp.54-71 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline de Vries (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.

Nair, Janaki, 'Uncovering the Zenana: Visions of Indian Womanhood in Englishwomen's Writings, 1813-1940', pp.245-246 in Hall, Catherine (ed.) *Cultures of Empire*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2000.

Oldfield, J.R, *Popular Politics and British Anti-Slavery: The Mobilisation of the Public against the Slave Trade, 1787-1807*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1995.

Pierson, Ruth Roach and Napur Chaudhuri, (eds.) *Nation, Empire, Colony: Historising Gender and Race*, Bloomington, In. Indiana University Press, 1998.

Poovey, Mary, *Making a Social Body: British Cultural Formation, 1830-1864*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Porter, Andrew, *Religion versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1800-1914*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2004.

Porter, Roy, *English Society in the eighteenth century*, Penguin Press, 1990.

Prochaska, F, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-century England*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980.

Prochaska, F, *The voluntary Impulse- Philanthropy in Modern Britain*, Faber, 1988.

Prochaska, Frank, *Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain. The Disinherited Spirit*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006.

Procida, Mary, *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics and Imperialism in India, 1833-1947*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2002.

Radzinowicz, Leon, Sir, *A History of English Criminal Law and Its Administration from 1750*, Vol.5, *The Emergence of Penal Policy in Victorian and Edwardian England*, Clarendon Press, 1990.

Raman, S.A, *Getting Girls to School: Social Reform in the Tamil Districts, 1870-1930*, Calcutta, Stree, 1996.

Ramusack, Barbara N, “‘Catalysts or Helpers?’ British Feminists, Indian Women’s Rights and Indian Independence”, pp.109-150 in Gail Minault (ed.) *The Extended Family: Women and Political Participation in India and Pakistan*, Columbia, Mo, South Asia Books, 1981.

Ray, Sangeeta, *En-Gendering India, Woman and Nation in Colonial and Postcolonial Narrative*, Duke University Press, 2000.

Rendall, Jane, *The Origins of Modern Feminism, Women in Britain, France and the United States*, Macmillan Education, 1985.

Rendall, Jane, ‘Friendship and Politics: Barbara Leigh Smith Bodichon (1827-91) and Bessie Rayner Parkes (1828-1925)’ in Mendus, Susan & Jane Rendall (eds.) *Sexuality and Subordination: Interdisciplinary Studies of Gender in the Nineteenth century*, Routledge, 1989.

Rylance, Rick, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880*, New York Oxford University Press, 2000.

Said, Edward, *Culture and Imperialism*, Chatto and Windus, 1993.

Sargant, N, *Mary Carpenter in India*, Bristol, Hibbert Trust, 1987.

Saywell, Ruby J, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*, Bristol, Bristol Branch of the Historical Association, 1964.

Seed J, ‘Theologies of power: Unitarians and the social relations of religious discourse, 1800-1850’ in Morris, R.J, (ed.) *Class, Power and Social Structures in Nineteenth-century Towns*, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1986.

Semple, Rhonda A, ‘Women, mission and the cultures of empire’, pp.117-137 in Morgan, Sue & Jacqueline deVries, (eds.) *Women, Gender and Religious Cultures in Britain, 1800-1940*, Routledge, 2010.

Sharma, Usha and B.M. Sharma (eds.) *Women’s education in British India*, New Delhi, Commonwealth Publishers, 1995.

Shoemaker, R.B, *Gender in English Society 1650 –1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres*, Longman, 1998.

Sklar, Kathryn Kish and James Brewer Stewart (eds.) *Women’s Rights and Transatlantic Antislavery in the Era of Emancipation*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2007.

Spivak, Gayatri, ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, *Marxism and Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana and Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Strange, Douglas Charles, *British Unitarians against American Slavery 1833-65*, Basingstoke, Palgrave, 1984.

Sturge, Elizabeth, *Reminiscences of My Life*, J. Arrowsmith Ltd, 1928.

Summers, Anne, *Female Lives, Moral States: Women, Religion and Public Life in Britain, 1800-1930*, Newbury, Threshold Press, 2000.

- Summers, Anne, 'A Home from Home: Women's philanthropic work in the nineteenth century', pp.33-63 in Burman, S., (ed.) *Fit Work for Women*, Croom Helm, 1979.
- Taylor, Clare, *British and American Abolitionists. An Episode in Transatlantic Understanding*, Edinburgh University Press, 1974.
- Thompson, F.M.L. (ed.) *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1960 Volume 3: Social Agencies and Institutions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Tuson, Penelope, (ed.) *The Queen's Daughters*, Reading, Ithaca Press, no date.
- Van der Veer, Peter, *Imperial Encounters: Religion and Modernity in India and Britain*, Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Vicinus, Martha, (ed.) '*Suffer and be Still*', *Women in the Victorian Age*, Bloomington, Indiana Press, 1972.
- Walkowitz, J.R, *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class and the State*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Walvin, James, *Britain's Slave Empire*, Stroud, Tempus, 2000.
- Ware, V, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* Longmans, 1998.
- Watts, Ruth, *Gender, Power and the Unitarians in England, 1760-1860*, Longman, 1998.
- Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter: Education of the Children of the "Perishing and Dangerous Classes"' in M. Hilton & P. Hirsch (eds.) *Practical Visionaries, Women Education and Social Progress, 1790-1930*, Harlow, Pearson Education, 2000.
- Watts, Ruth, 'Rational Religion and Feminism: The Challenge of Unitarianism in the Nineteenth century', pp. 39-52 in Morgan, Sue (ed.) *Women, Religion and Feminism in Britain, 1750-1900*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Williamson, L, *Power and Protest: Frances Power Cobbe and Victorian Society*, Rivers Oram Press, 2005.
- Yeager, Patricia and Beth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Refiguring the Father*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.
- Yeo, Eileen Janes, 'Protestant feminists and Catholic saints in Victorian Britain, in Yeo, Eileen Janes, (ed.) *Radical Femininity: Women's self-representation in the public sphere*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Young, Agnes Frieda and Aston, E.T, *British Social Work in the Nineteenth century*, Routledge Keen, 1956.
- Young, R.J.C, *Colonial Desire, Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, Routledge, 1995.
- Zedner, Lucia, *Women, Crime and Custody in Victorian England*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1991.

Articles in Periodicals

- Allender, Tim, *Instructing the Women: Changing State Agenda in Colonial India, 1854-1924*, pp.1-11, 16th Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia in Wollongong, 26-29 June, 2006.
- Allender, Tim, 'Learning abroad: the colonial educational experiment in India, 1813-1919', pp.727-731, *Paedagogica Historica*, 45, 6.
- Burton, Antoinette, 'Fearful Bodies into disciplined subjects: pleasure, romance and the family drama of colonial reform in Mary Carpenter's *Six Months in India*', pp.545-74, *Signs* 20:3, Spring, 1995.
- Burton, Antoinette, 'Thinking beyond the Boundaries: Empire, Feminism and the Domains of History', pp.60-71, *Social History*, 26.1. January 2001.
- Caine, Barbara, 'Feminist Biography and feminist history', *Women's History Review*, 3:2, pp.247-261.
- Dick, Malcolm, 'Religion and the origins of mass schooling: The English Sunday School, c.1780-1840', pp.42-6, *The Churches and Education, History of Education Conference Papers*, December, 1983.
- Dresser, Mary, 'Beyond the Pale? Carpenter and the Irish poor in mid-Victorian Bristol', pp.1-6, *History in Focus*, 11 (2006).
- Malos, E, 'An Enlarged Sphere of Usefulness', in Dresser, M, & Ollerenshaw, P, *The Making of Modern Bristol*, Bristol, Redcliffe Press, 1996.
- Martin, Moira, 'Single Women and Philanthropy: a case of women's associational life in Bristol, 1880-1914', *Women's History Review*, 17:3, pp.395-417
- May, M, 'Innocence and experience of the concept of juvenile delinquency in the mid-nineteenth century', pp.7-29, *Victorian Studies*, 17.1 (1973).
- McLachlan, John, 'John Bright to Mary Carpenter', pp.178-9, *Transactions of the Unitarian Society* 1981, vol. 17, No 3.
- Medhurst, P, *Rammohun Roy and 'The day-star of approaching morn'; The Essex Hall Lecture*, 1992, The Unitarian Information Department.
- Midgley, C, 'Female Emancipation in an Imperial France: English Women and the campaign against sati (widow burning) in India 1813-30', pp.95-122, *Women's History Review*, 9.1. 2000.
- Millard, Kay, 'The Religion of Elizabeth Gaskell', *Gaskell Society Journal*, 15, 2001, p.1-13.
- Nardin, Jane, 'Hannah More and the Rhetoric of Educational Reform', p.211, *Women's History Review*, Vol 10, Number 2, 2001.
- Ramusack, Barbara N, 'Cultural missionaries, material imperialists, feminist allies: British women activists in India, 1865-1945', pp.309-20, *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol.XIII, No 4, 1990.
- Rendall, Jane, 'Citizenship, Culture and Civilisation: The Language of British Suffragists, 1866-1874', pp. 127- 50 in Daley, C, & Nolan, M, (eds.) *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminine Perspectives*, New York University Press, 1994.
- Sargant, N, 'Mary Carpenter of Bristol (1807-1877) and her connection with India through Rammohun Roy, K.C. Sen and the National India Association', *Indian Church History Review*, Vol. XII, 1978.
- Schroeder, Janice, 'Self Teaching: Carpenter, Public Speech, and the Disciple of Delinquency', p.149, p.61 *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 65, Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Schupf, Harriet Warm, 'Single Women and Social Reform in mid-Nineteenth-century England: The Case of Mary Carpenter', pp.301-317, *Victorian Studies*, Vol.17, No.3 March 1974.

Schwan, Anne, "'Dreadful beyond Description'", Mary Carpenter's prison reform writings and female convicts in Britain and India', *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 14, No.2, 2010 pp.107-120.

Seed, J, 'Unitarianism, political economy and the antinomies of Liberal culture in Manchester', pp.1-25, *Social History*, Jan. 1983, 7, No.1.

Selleck, Richard, 'Mary Carpenter: A confident and contradictory reformer', pp.101-15, *History of Education*, 1985, Vol.14, No.2.

Watts, Ruth, 'The Unitarian Contribution to Female Education, 1790-1850', pp.273-286, *History of Education*, 1980, Vol. 9, No.4.

Watts, Ruth, 'Some Radical educational networks of the late eighteenth century and their influence', pp.1-14, *History of Education*, 1998, Vol.27, No 1.

Watts, Ruth, 'Unlimited knowledge for All: Unitarians and Education 1800-1860', pp.18-36, *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, 22, 1999.

Watts, R, 'Breaking the boundaries of Victorian Imperialism or extending a reformed paternalism'? Mary Carpenter and India', pp. 443-457, *History of Education*, 2000, Vol. 29, No.5.

Watts, Ruth, 'Mary Carpenter and India: enlightened liberalism or condescending imperialism? pp.183-210, *Paedagogica Historica*, 37.1. 2002.

Watts, Ruth, 'Education, Empire and social change in nineteenth-century England', pp.773-786, *Paedagogica Historica*, Vol.45, No.6, December, 2009.

Yeo, Eileen Janes, 'Protestant feminists and Catholic saints in Victorian Britain' in Yeo, Eileen Janes, (ed.) *Radical Femininity: Women's self-representation in the public sphere*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1998.

Unpublished Conference Papers.

Allender, Tim, 'Instructing the Women: Changing State Agenda in Colonial India, 1854-1924', 16th Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia in Wollongong, 26-29 June, 2006.

Midgley, Clare, 'Remembering Rammohun Roy: gender, commemoration and cross-cultural community in an imperial age', Women's History Network, 18th Annual Conference, St. Hilda's College, Oxford, 11-13 September, 2009.

Unpublished Papers.

Dickson, Lori, 'The Culture of Habits and Dispositions', Associationist Psychology and Unitarian Education in Gaskell's *Wives and Daughters*. MA Thesis, 2009