

\$3.50



HISTORY OF CHILDHOOD QUARTERLY:

The Journal of Psychohistory

SUMMER 1974 • VOL. 2, NO. 1

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY CHILDHOOD

PSYCHOHISTORY OF WESLEY

BEATING IN SCHOOLS

MATERNAL DEPRIVATION

CHILDHOOD OF BISMARCK

REVIEWS OF PSYCHOHISTORY



HISTORY OF CHILDHOOD QUARTERLY:

The Journal of Psychohistory

2315 Broadway • New York, New York 10024 • 212-873-3331

Editor: LLOYD DEMAUSE

Contributing Editors:

JOHN F. BENTON • RUDOLPH BINION • JOHN DEMOS • PATRICK DUNN • HENRY EBEL • GERALD J. GARGIULO • ARTHUR E. HIPPLER • JOSEPH ILLICK • BOGNA LORENCE • PETER LOEWENBERG • RICHARD LYMAN, JR. • ELIZABETH WIRTH MARVICK • BRUCE MAZLISH • HERBERT MOLLER • STANLEY RENSHON • WILLIAM SAFFADY • EDWARD SAVETH • EDWARD SHORTER • MICHAEL H. STONE • CHARLES STRICKLAND • MELVIN TUCKER • JOHN WALZER • JOHN WATERS

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: U.S. and Canada, and equivalent in foreign currencies: Individuals—\$14.00 one year, \$26.00 two years, \$38.00 three years; Institutions—\$20.00 one year, \$38.00 two years, \$56.00 three years. Available in microform from Xerox University Microfilms. Abstracted in *Psychological Abstracts*, *Sociological Abstracts* and *Child Development Abstracts and Bibliography*. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-646416.

CONTRIBUTIONS: The Journal welcomes contributions of articles on childhood and the family, past and present, psychohistory in its broadest terms, individual or group, applied psychoanalysis except for purely literary studies, political psychology, and the psychology of historical movements. All manuscripts should follow the University of Chicago *Manual of Style* and be double-spaced, including footnotes.

PUBLICATION: *History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory* is published quarterly and copyright © 1974 by Atcom, Inc., 2315 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y. 10024. Statements of fact and opinion are made on the responsibility of the authors alone. Second-class postage paid at New York, New York.



CONTENTS

<i>BOGNA W. LORENCE</i>	1	<i>Parents and Children in Eighteenth-Century Europe</i>
<i>ROBERT L. MOORE</i>	31	<i>Justification Without Joy: Psychohistorical Reflections on John Wesley's Childhood and Conversion</i>
<i>DONALD R. RAICHLE</i>	53	<i>The Abolition of Corporal Punishment in New Jersey Schools</i>
<i>MICHAEL H. STONE AND CLARICE J. KESTENBAUM</i>	79	<i>Maternal Deprivation in Children of the Wealthy: A Paradox in Socioeconomic vs. Psychological Class</i>
<i>CHARLOTTE SEMPELL</i>	107	<i>Bismarck's Childhood: A Psychohistorical Study</i>
REVIEWS:		
<i>FREDERICK F. HARLING</i>	125	<i>Obedience to Authority</i>
<i>BOGNA W. LORENCE</i>	128	<i>Sur La Population Francais au XVIII et au XIX siecles</i>
<i>WILLIAM L. LANGER</i>	129	<i>Further Notes on the History of Infanticide</i>
BOOKS RECEIVED AND NOTED	134	



CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter I	10
Chapter II	20
Chapter III	30
Chapter IV	40
Chapter V	50
Chapter VI	60
Chapter VII	70
Chapter VIII	80
Chapter IX	90
Chapter X	100
Chapter XI	110
Chapter XII	120
Chapter XIII	130
Chapter XIV	140
Chapter XV	150
Chapter XVI	160
Chapter XVII	170
Chapter XVIII	180
Chapter XIX	190
Chapter XX	200
Chapter XXI	210
Chapter XXII	220
Chapter XXIII	230
Chapter XXIV	240
Chapter XXV	250
Chapter XXVI	260
Chapter XXVII	270
Chapter XXVIII	280
Chapter XXIX	290
Chapter XXX	300
Chapter XXXI	310
Chapter XXXII	320
Chapter XXXIII	330
Chapter XXXIV	340
Chapter XXXV	350
Chapter XXXVI	360
Chapter XXXVII	370
Chapter XXXVIII	380
Chapter XXXIX	390
Chapter XL	400
Chapter XLI	410
Chapter XLII	420
Chapter XLIII	430
Chapter XLIV	440
Chapter XLV	450
Chapter XLVI	460
Chapter XLVII	470
Chapter XLVIII	480
Chapter XLIX	490
Chapter L	500
Chapter LI	510
Chapter LII	520
Chapter LIII	530
Chapter LIV	540
Chapter LV	550
Chapter LVI	560
Chapter LVII	570
Chapter LVIII	580
Chapter LIX	590
Chapter LX	600
Chapter LXI	610
Chapter LXII	620
Chapter LXIII	630
Chapter LXIV	640
Chapter LXV	650
Chapter LXVI	660
Chapter LXVII	670
Chapter LXVIII	680
Chapter LXIX	690
Chapter LXX	700
Chapter LXXI	710
Chapter LXXII	720
Chapter LXXIII	730
Chapter LXXIV	740
Chapter LXXV	750
Chapter LXXVI	760
Chapter LXXVII	770
Chapter LXXVIII	780
Chapter LXXIX	790
Chapter LXXX	800
Chapter LXXXI	810
Chapter LXXXII	820
Chapter LXXXIII	830
Chapter LXXXIV	840
Chapter LXXXV	850
Chapter LXXXVI	860
Chapter LXXXVII	870
Chapter LXXXVIII	880
Chapter LXXXIX	890
Chapter LXXXX	900
Chapter LXXXXI	910
Chapter LXXXXII	920
Chapter LXXXXIII	930
Chapter LXXXXIV	940
Chapter LXXXXV	950
Chapter LXXXXVI	960
Chapter LXXXXVII	970
Chapter LXXXXVIII	980
Chapter LXXXXIX	990
Chapter LXXXXX	1000

PARENTS AND CHILDREN IN EIGHTEENTH- CENTURY EUROPE

BOGNA W.
LORENCE

In eighteenth-century Europe the manner of parents and society toward children was typified by two opposing attitudes. One, which can be characterized as an attitude of essential indifference, consisted of minimal contact with children and a modicum of concern about them. Most noticeable among the upper classes, this posture of parents whose lives touched their children peripherally, at its worst consisted solely of an acknowledged legal obligation toward their offspring. Actual upbringing was left to nurses and servants or, for a few fortunate children, to some concerned adult.

At the other end were intrusive parents, who at their most extreme determined to totally mold and supervise their children, often for religious reasons. They were mostly evident in the middle classes.

In addition, there were some individuals, minority voices all, who differed from both indifferent and intrusive parents in that they stressed the mutuality of parent-child relations.

INDIFFERENCE

One blushes to think of loving one's children.¹

Vandermonde, *Essai Sur La Maniere De
Perfectionner L'Espece Humaine*, 1756.

If eighteenth century writers are to be taken at their word, indifference toward children stemmed, in part, from lack of interest in them. In

La Vie de Marianne, (1713) Pierre Marivaux said of his heroine's childhood, "I pass over these years quickly, for I feel that detailed accounts of her early years will bore you."² This indifference toward children, so vivid among the upper classes, was part of a larger, fashionable distaste toward marriage. Men and women of the aristocracy were often ashamed to have children. This "blemish," they felt, rendered both men and women less fit for amorous adventures. The height of bad taste was reached by those who loved their spouses and children, and made a display of it. In commenting on aversion to parenthood, Brillouin in *Le Theophraste Moderne ou Nouveaux Caracteres Sur Les Moeurs*, (1700)³ chidingly contrasted French attitudes to those of Rome where parenthood had been viewed as meritorious. It is this aversion, he said, which made parents demand that children address them as "Monsieur" and "Madame." At mid-century Turgot would write, "one is ashamed of one's children,"⁴ and Vandermonde echoed with "one blushes to think of loving one's children."⁵ Similar attitudes prevailed among the English nobility. Lady Portlington commented on the familiarity of life in Ireland and described how children put their arms around their father's neck and kissed him. She felt that "such behaviour would be thought vulgar in England."⁶ It is a well-known fact that the English gentleman of the period, "had more interest in the diseases of his horses than of his children. England could boast more works on farriery than on pediatrics."⁷ Society was busy with other matters and parents could not spare the time to oversee their children. A French nobleman reminisced,

I was moreover, like all the children of my age and of my station, dressed in the handsomest of clothes to go out, and naked and dying with hunger in the house, and not through unkindness, but through household oversight, dissipation and disorder, attention being given to things elsewhere. One might easily count fathers who, like the Marshal de Belle-Isle, brought up their sons under their own eyes, and themselves attended to their education methodically, strictly, and with tenderness. As to the girls, they were placed in convents; relieved from this care, their parents only enjoy greater freedom. Even when they retain charge of them they are scarcely more of a burden to them. Little Felicite de Saint-Aubin sees her parents only on their waking up and at meal times. Their day is wholly taken up; the mother is making or receiving visits; the father is in his laboratory or engaged in hunting. Up to seven years of age the child passes her time with chambermaids who teach her only a little catechism, with an infinite number of ghost stories.⁸

The aristocratic tradition was such as to interpose a barrier between parent and child; formality and deference characterized their relationship,

the daughter comes 'respectfully' to kiss her mother's hand at her toilet. A caress is rare and seems a favor; children generally when with their parents, are silent, the sentiment that usually animates them being of deferential timidity . . . Monsieur de Talleyrand states that he had never slept under the same roof with his father and mother.⁹

and Susan Sibbald said, "I remember my father but little . . . he was home on Sundays and grand occasions such as birthdays."¹⁰

WET-NURSES. This distancing, both physical and psychological, between parent and offspring, characterized their relationship from birth. It was the rare upper-class mother who nursed her own child, a fact of serious significance in an era when artificial feeding was unsatisfactory, and when the child's physical survival was contingent on the availability of milk.¹¹ The putting out of children to wet-nurses was widespread in the eighteenth century. In 1718 Dionis stated that "to-day not only ladies of the nobility, but yet the rich and the wives of the least of artisans, have lost the custom of nursing their infants."¹² Jean Ganiage calculates that the use of wet-nurses was almost universal in eighteenth-century Paris. Upper-class families brought them into their own households and the lower class of artisans and domestics put their children out to nurses in the Beauvais.¹³ This practice ran counter to prevailing wisdom. In fact, the debate between maternal and wet-nursing had raged for a long time. Moralists and churchmen had long inveighed against the evils of wet-nursing. Prior to the middle of the eighteenth century the main argument used against it was the likelihood that the child might imbibe the nurse's mental and moral characteristics along with the milk. Thomas Phaïre, in the first pediatric manual written by an Englishman, warned in the fifteenth century against red-headed nurses (they were bad-tempered) and Daniel Defoe in *Compleat English Gentleman*, digressed at length on the subject. Guillemeau, the French physician, stated in *De La Norriture et Gouvernement des Enfants*, (1600) that, "there is no difference between a woman who refuses to nurse her own children and one that kills her child as soon as she has conceived,"¹⁴ and William Cadogan, in an essay written in 1748 concurred:

I am quite at a loss to account for the general practice of sending infants out of Doors to be suckled or dry-nursed by another woman, who had not so much understanding nor can have so much Affection for it as the Parents: and how it comes to pass that People of good sense and easy circumstances will not give themselves the Pains to watch over the Health and Welfare of their children: but are so careless as to give them up to the Common Methods, without considering how near it is to an equal Chance that they are destroyed by them. The ancient Custom of exposing

them to wild Beasts or drowning them would certainly be much quicker and more humane way of despatching them.¹⁵

Yet society often viewed maternal nursing with opprobrium. Upper-class French women considered nursing a vulgar, lower-class activity, while as early as the fifteenth century in northern Germany, a woman who had come from a different area and wanted to nurse her own child was,

openly called swinish and filthy by the local women. Her husband threatened he would no longer eat anything she prepared, if she did not give up this disgusting habit.¹⁶

In France the traffic in wet-nurses was so extensive as to be regulated.¹⁷ By 1715 four employment bureaus existed in Paris while in Britain wet-nurses were supplied by lying-in hospitals or by *accoucheurs*, each of whom kept his "nurse-book."¹⁸ Few parents exerted much effort to determine a nurse's fitness and very little was done to ensure the safety of the child. "In England parents put their children out to be nursed in the country by women who were risky or obtained on the slightest recommendation."¹⁹ Nurses returned with their charges to the country where no supervision or control was possible, and unless a nurse lived close to town parents would likely not see their child till it was returned sometime between the age of two and three. Since nurses were mostly illiterate, when one died a child might have been irretrievable. Mistaken identities and substitutions could occur under such circumstances, and the return of a child to the family was not safeguarded.

It seems incomprehensible that parents would gamble so with their children. A partial explanation can be adduced from George Armstrong, an eighteenth century physician who remarked that

Children while in their infancy, especially if the young family is numerous, and the parents in strained circumstances, are not thought of sufficient consequence to be much attended to, unless some sudden, or violent illness happens to give alarm. This Secret has sometimes come out in my hearing, even by persons who are not reckoned poor.²⁰

Actually the carelessness appears to have had little to do with indigence. It is more comprehensible in the poor, but by no means typical only of them. Indifference was manifest across economic lines in the acceptance of high mortality rates and attributed to the "profuse waste of the imperfect workmanship of nature."²¹ The general feeling was that one had several children to keep a few. Gibbon, the English historian, who was succeeded by five brothers and sisters all of whom died in infancy, said that

the death of a new-born child before that of its parents may seem an unnatural but is a strictly probable event; since of any given number the greater part are extinguished before the ninth year, before they possess the faculties of the mind or body. Without accusing the profuse waste of the imperfect workmanship of Nature I shall only observe, that this unfavourable chance was multiplied against my infant existence. So feeble was my constitution so precarious my life, that, in the baptism of each of my brothers, my father's prudence successively repeated my Christian name Edward,²² that, in case of the departure of the eldest son, this patronymic appellation might be still perpetuated in the family.²³

It is impossible to assess whether the death of Gibbon's five siblings was inevitable, or, due to that parental neglect which also made his life precarious. He said of his mother, without condemnation,

To preserve and to rear so frail a being, the most tender assiduity was scarcely sufficient, and my mother's attention was somewhat diverted by an exclusive passion for her husband, and by the dissipation of the world, in which his taste and authority obliged her to mingle.²⁴

Monsieur Nicholas showed similar understanding,

I had the most 'temperamental' woman in the district for wet-nurse (for my mother could not nurse me herself; my father was opposed to it, for good reasons doubtless). Good Lolive, wife of Lemoine, weaned her daughter, Nannette, who was already a sturdy child, when she took me to nurse; but this dear woman could not long refuse herself to her husband, who had already been denied for eighteen months, and it was thought necessary to wean me when I was but six months old. My constitution suffered thereby, but I have no grudge against my nurse.²⁵

Gibbon's survival was due to,

the maternal office which was supplied by my aunt, Mrs. Catherine Portent; at whose name I feel a tear of gratitude trickling down my cheek . . . my weakness excited her pity . . . and if there be any . . . who rejoice that I live, to that dear and excellent woman they must hold themselves indebted . . . I was a puny child, neglected by my mother, starved by my nurse, and of whose being very little care or expectation was entertained; without her (aunt) maternal vigilance I should either have been in my grave, or imperfectly lived a crooked rickety monster, a burden to myself and others.²⁶

Yet Gibbon, himself, shared the assumptions of his age, for he said, "of the various and frequent disorders of my childhood my own recollection is dark; nor do I wish to expatiate on so disgusting a topic."²⁷

There is much to indicate that the "putting out" of children was often a conscious act designed to rid a household of noise, even though parents were aware from doctors' strictures²⁸ that mortality rates were higher for wet-nursed children than for those kept by their mothers. James Nelson said in 1752 in *An Essay on the Government of Children* that,

Parents especially Fathers, who do not love the noise or any other of the inconveniences attending the care of children, have a short way of doing business by sending them at once into the country, and to support the reasonableness of their conduct, readily tell their friends, that those who write about these matters recommend air, and say that children thrive best in it. But surely they have never studied the Duty of Parents, or they must know, that it is always incumbent on them, unless necessity prevent it, to rear their children themselves. But to prove that it is not always a child's good which they seek, so much as their own ease, it is often sent to be nursed even in London, sometimes too in parts much worse than they themselves live in.²⁹

It was common knowledge that some nurses diminished a child's chances of survival! Joseph Hanway, one of the governors of the Foundling Hospital in London wrote, "without the least doubt, there have been nurses in times past who were denominated as "killing nurses" as well they might, if no child ever came out of their hands alive."³⁰ The custom was commonplace enough to be reflected in the literature of the period. An eighteenth century heroine said,

He is very kind! and Billy not being well when he came in, my grief passed off without blame. He had said many tender things to me; but added that if I gave myself so much uneasiness every time the child had anything, he would hire a nurse to overlay him.³¹

Yet parents persistently attributed the loss of children to the mysterious ways of God. Pious resignation toward the high mortality rate, so characteristic of the period, tended to proclaim that

It is a wonderful Part of the Providence of God that so many little creatures seem to be born only to die . . . God, who does nothing in vain has wise ends no doubt, and Purposes worthy of Himself to serve in, by the Birth of Infants who seem born only to die.³²

While it is difficult to substantiate the speculation that eighteenth century parents were suspiciously obtuse concerning the high infant mortality rate, there is little doubt that a puzzling lack of common sense existed in a society which entrusted its children to strangers, often failed to ensure their safe return, all the while realizing that the survival

of infants depended on a steady supply of milk. The belief that character was transmitted through milk was last expressed in the *Art of Nursing*, (1733) but the assumption persisted, as is attested to by the fact that doctors continued to take the trouble to explain that this was not true well into the nineteenth century.³³ Throughout most of the eighteenth century adults assumed that "whenever a child has nothing of either Father or Mother about him 'tis commonly said that the Nurse has chang'd him."³⁴ Also, the very nurses to whom parents entrusted their children, were continuously villified; accused of doing their work for gain, accused of having neither spirit nor delicacy of conscience, and often referred to as depraved,³⁵ yet they were custodians of future generations.

It is puzzling how so many wet nurses were available. Not infrequently, one woman nursed two or three infants successively; or one woman nursed two babies. Ernest Caulfield speculates in *The Infant Welfare Movement in the Eighteenth Century*, that

If over 10,000 children under two years of age died in the year 1741, and a correspondingly large number in other years, the greater part of them must have been nursing babies. The mothers were then available as nurses and a vicious cycle ensued. In some cases infant mortality was the cause of the wet-nurse supply, in other cases the effect. The death of an infant meant the possible addition of one more wet-nurse, who in turn, if unscrupulous, might cause of the death of one more child.³⁶

PEDIATRICS AND GENERAL SOCIAL ATTITUDES. Most physicians showed little interest in the treatment of children. While medicine had undergone a transformation as the result of the Scientific Revolution, pediatrics lagged behind. Contemporaries were aware of such indifference, and as late as 1783, George Armstrong commented in the *Account of the Diseases Most Incident to Children*, that

I know that there are some of the physical tribe who are not fond of practicing among infants, and I have heard an eminent physician say, that he never wished to be called to a young child, because he was really at a loss to know what to offer for it! Nay I am told, there are physicians of note here who make no scruple to assert that there is nothing to be done for children when they are ill.³⁷

The Fellows of the Royal College of Physicians were, in fact, forbidden by their laws to practice midwifery and as a result were ignorant of the diseases of infants and children. The position of the medical community was not unusual, it mirrored the general social attitudes of the period. Indifference and the unawareness of psychological differences between

adults and children, as well as of their varying responsibilities toward each other, were reflected most clearly in legal attitudes. In England and France it was common for beggars to hire out infants and young children whom they would mutilate in order to excite pity. In 1761, at a time when the penalty for petty larceny was death, a woman who gouged out the eyes of children for begging purposes was committed to Newgate "where she is to be imprisoned two years pursuant to the sentence."³⁸ The case of Nari Wotton, a little girl of nine, who in 1735 stole twenty-seven guineas from her mistress, ran away, was caught at a fair, and sentenced to death, illustrates but one of the many instances where the full penalty of the law was applied to young children. Those individuals who sought to ameliorate the lot of children often elicited much hostility from the public. Most of it was of the flavor of one "Porcupinos Pelagios" who in 1750, addressed a poem entitled *Scandalizade*, to Captain Coram, who having long been absent from England, was appalled upon his return in 1739, by the sight of dead and dying infants in the streets of London, and was moved to establish a Foundling Hospital. The public was generally hostile to the project and seemed more concerned with equity than with the welfare of children. Salvos were directed at Coram,

The Hospital Foundling came out of the Brains,
To encourage the progress of vulgar amours,
The breeding of Rogues and the increasing of Whores,
While the children of honest and good husbands and wives,
Stand exposed to oppression and want all their lives.³⁹

Indifference, furthermore, was evident in the legal and public tolerance of cruelty to children. The *Covent Garden Journal*, for March 1752 contained an account of a child who was tortured to death by its stepmother,

A Man and Wife were committed to Malden Gaol for threatening to kill their neighbours for upbraiding them with Cruelty. It seems, the woman used frequently to stick Pins into a Child (to which she was Mother-in-Law) and stir up the Fire with its Feet, so that its toes rotted off; on which the Parish took it from her on the Neighbour's Complaint, and put it in the Workhouse, where it is since dead. But we don't hear that there are any proceedings against her on this score.⁴⁰

In England the infrequency of prosecution in the countless cases of cruelty to children was to continue not merely throughout the eighteenth century, but until the last quarter of the nineteenth when the first Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was passed.

INFANTICIDE. Children of the poor and unmarried felt the greatest impact of indifference. Because contraceptive techniques were far from effective⁴¹ population control was implemented through celibacy, delayed marriages, abortions, infanticide and abandonment. Infanticide was by no means an eighteenth-century phenomenon, it had existed since time immemorial and has continued in diminished proportions to the present. The 1890 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* stated that "the modern crime of infanticide shows no symptom of diminution in the leading nations of Europe. In all of them it is closely connected with illegitimacy."⁴² The Encyclopedia erred in calling infanticide a modern crime. It had existed since antiquity and never ceased.⁴³ William Langer states that

The matter was not publicized because the Christian Churches regarded it with abhorrence, denounced it along with abortion, contraception and other sexual practices, and induced Western governments to declare abortion and infanticide forms of murder punishable by death in a variety of unpleasantly imaginative ways. Nonetheless, and among the poor in particular, babies were often unwelcome and in any case were easy to replace if it was so desired. We can never know how many women were given dangerous drugs to induce abortion or how many babies were murdered in the first days of life. These crimes were easy to commit and difficult to prove. Because the culprits were rarely discovered, even the harshest penalties—such as death by drowning or burial alive—had little deterrent effect.⁴⁴

Whether infanticide increased in the eighteenth century, or simply became apparent to a public which hitherto had ignored the same phenomenon, suffice it to say that there was a growing public concern, if not alarm, over the issue. In 1781 a contest was held in German-speaking Europe for the best essay on how to prevent infanticide. Four hundred essays were received, leading to the observation that "the prize question, how infanticide might be checked, has alarmed so many scholars in all the faculties that one is amazed at the large number of essays submitted."⁴⁵ Executions for infanticide in that period were, to quote a contemporary, "without number."⁴⁶ In England, Addison wrote in the *Gentlemen's Magazine* (1713) "there is scarce an Assizes, where some unhappy wretch is not executed for the murder of a child. And Jonathan Swift in writing *A Modest Proposal* in 1729, justified his scheme for culinary cultivation of children by saying that this would prevent "that horrid practice of women murdering their bastard children, alas! too frequent among us, sacrificing the poor innocent babes . . . more to avoid expense than the shame."⁴⁷

ABANDONMENT. Parents who did not kill their children often abandoned them. Until the end of the eighteenth century, and to a less extent even in the nineteenth, it was common practice to expose unwanted children, either children of unmarried mothers or of those who considered their family too large, in the streets and lanes of cities. Frequently such children died before being discovered. In England, the London Foundling Hospital, established through individual initiative, aimed at stopping the exposure, desertion and murder of infants. The founder, Thomas Coram, together with some ladies of rank, addressed the government in 1739,

No expedient has yet been found for preventing the murder of poor miserable infants at their birth, or suppressing the inhuman custom of exposing newlyborn infants to perish in the streets; or the putting of such unhappy foundlings to wicked and barbarous nurses, who undertake to bring them to starve for want of due sustenance or care, or if permitted to live either turn them into the streets to beg or steal, or hire them out to loose persons by whom they are trained in that infamous way of living and sometimes are blinded or maimed and distorted in their limbs in order to move pity or compassion.⁴⁸

In France, Foundling Hospitals were established long before the eighteenth century, though as in England, they met with public hostility. Many felt, as did Malthus at the end of the century, that the building of Foundling Hospitals was the surest way to increase infant mortality.⁴⁹ The hospitals soon discovered that they were being innundated with children, for although theoretically, the hospitals were obliged to only receive local children, yet children came from all over to the Paris and London Hospitals. Many died on the way, and most were abused during transportation.⁵⁰

The problem of unwanted children was not limited to the illegitimate, for married people also faced the dilemma. In England parents who had large families were allowed, sometimes actually encouraged, to pay ten pounds or some other lump sum to parish officers, who then took the child into their poorhouse where its life was one of short duration.⁵¹ As early as 1676, Jasper Gaunt, writing on *The Natural and Political Observations upon the Bills of Mortality*, stated that "of the 229,250 which have died, we find not above 51 to have been starved to death, except, the helpless children at nurse."⁵² Parliamentary Committees looking into infant mortality for the years 1715 and 1754-65, found that of those received under twelve months old in 1763 and following two years, only seven in a hundred survived. They concluded that, "A great many poor infants . . . are inhumanely suffered to die by the barbarity of the nurses, who are a sort of people void of any commiseration

or religion, hired by the Church Wardens to take the burden from the Parish at the easiest rates they can, and these know the manner of doing it effectually."⁵³ Jonas Hanway reported that

An acquaintance of mine, once solicited a parish officer for two shillings a week for a servant during her lying-in, and nursing her child, alleging that a common parish nurse had at least the sum of two and a half shillings. 'Yes,' says the officer, 'it is very true; but the young woman in question will most probably preserve her child, whereas in the hands of our nurses after five or six weeks we hear no more of them.'⁵⁴

As Ernest Caulfield states in *The Infant Welfare Movement in the Eighteenth Century*,

the most profound and far reaching cause of the Terrific waste of infant life can be summarily described in the word Neglect. Neglected by the profession, neglected by their own mothers, and neglected by the nurses to whom they were abandoned the poor infants must indeed have been endowed with a strong constitution to survive their struggle for existence.⁵⁵

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTANCE. While physical separation and abandonment were obvious manifestations of indifference, the view that children were expendable led to psychological distancing and to frequent treatment of children as playthings. Many parents kept their children at home physically but paid attention to them only for their own gratification. Children were often given fine clothes, expensive toys and retinues of servants. In England, Charles James was the original source of the almost legendary story of the spoilt child, who was allowed to ride to table on a saddle of mutton with his feet splashing in the gravy.⁵⁶ Precocity was admired and encouraged in children. There were some like Doctor Malkin's son who "commence their careers at 3, become expert linguists at 4, profound philosophers at 5, read Fathers at 6, and die of old age at 7."⁵⁷

In *Almeria, or Parental Advice*, a didactic poem printed in England in 1775, Mrs. Cutts rebuked those who

Rank their children, in their earliest years,
Among their cats and dogs, their bulls and bears;
Mere animals whose gambols now and then
May raise a laugh, and turn the rising spleen,
Ere reason dawn'd, or Cunning Learnt disguise.⁵⁸

Such treatment of children implied the lack of impressionability. In fact, *in toto*, the attitudes of indifferent parents lacked any guidelines based on children's needs; it was adult convenience and individual preference which dictated adult behavior toward children. The onus of per-

formance rested upon the children who were expected not to cause their parents too many difficulties. Lady Sarah Lennox wrote to a friend on September 11, 1782, having just given birth to a son,

I am perfectly recovered, all to being a little weak and nervous, but the latter was a complaint which having a brat to provide for (without much hopes of doing it) is not likely to cure, but for the rest I am enchanted with my son. It is a very healthy, strong child, and promises very well to make his way in the world as well as his neighbours, poor little soul; Louisa (child's older step-sister) is doatingly fond of it, which you may guess is a very pleasant circumstance, for as I am not one of those who know how to nurse and make a fuss with a little child, she is always pressing me to attend more to it.⁵⁹

In France, depending on adult mood, an upper-class little girl was likely to be either ignored completely, or bombarded with attention.

The Marquise her mother . . . has a theatre built in the chateau . . . after rehearsing twelve weeks the little girl, with a quiver of arrows and blue wings, plays the part of a Cupid, and the costume is so becoming she is allowed to wear it in common during the entire day for nine months . . . Sent out of the room after dinner, she is brought in again only to play on the harpsichord or to declaim the monologue of Alzire before a numerous assembly . . . in the eyes of the parents there is but one intelligible and rational existence, that of society, even for children, and the attention bestowed on these are solely with the view to introduce them into it, or prepare them for it.⁶⁰

Obviously there existed a tendency to regard children as dolls or playthings, an amusement of the hour, and to make them the object of attitudinizing sentiment, proclaimed for the benefit of observers.⁶¹ The brothers Goncourt in commenting upon eighteenth century French life, described the typical upper-class domestic situation in which,

the little girl comes down to her mother for a moment only, in the morning, at eleven, when, in the vague light of the half-drawn blinds, dogs and dependents are admitted. 'La! What a face! . . . What ails the child? Go put on some rouge . . . no . . . let be . . . you shall not stir from the house to-day!' . . . Then to a visitor, 'I dote on that child. Come kiss me, my sweet. Ah Lud, you are filthy! Go brush your teeth. No I'll not be plagued with questions to-day, no you are a trial child.'—'Ah, Madame, was ever a tender mother!' sighs the visitor. 'I dare say, I dare say,' sighs the mother, 'but I dote on that child.'⁶²

It is evident that one group of parents in the eighteenth century placed inordinate value on social existence; it felt that its duty toward children

lay in preparing them for, and assuring entry into—society. For that reason children were considered uninteresting until they became social creatures.⁶³ Good parenting was demonstrated by assiduous pursuit of opportunities for social advancement. This group considered the display of emotion vulgar and gave its children over to wet-nurses; it was indifferent toward basic physical and psychological needs, and appears to have been unimpressed by evidence which correlated survival with good mothering, yet it frequently condemned the very nurses who served it, by raising its children.⁶⁴

INTRUSIVENESS

Severity is frequently the most certain as well as the most sublime proof of affection; and the want of this power over the feelings, and of that lofty, dignified affection, which makes a good person prefer the future good of the beloved object to a personal gratification, is the reason why so many fond mothers spoil their children, and has made it questionable whether negligence or indulgence be most hurtful; but I am inclined to think that the latter has done more harm.⁶⁵

Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, 1792

There were many parents in the eighteenth century who were concerned with molding and disciplining their children in such a way as to raise a specific kind of individual. They insisted on complete control over their children—they sought to subdue the spirit and harden the body. Implicit in their behavior were two assumptions; that children are impressionable and ought to be shaped from birth, and that parents, or at least these parents, had discovered the right way to rear children—the way that was best for children.

CONTROL. John Wesley's mother, Susannah, claimed that

In order to form the minds of children, the first thing to be done is to conquer the will, and bring them to an obedient temper. To inform the understanding is a work of time, and must with children proceed by slow degrees as they are able to bear it; but the subjecting the will is a thing that must be done at once, and the sooner the better . . . In the esteem of the world they pass for kind and indulgent who I call cruel parents, who permit their children to get habits which they know must be afterwards broken. Nay, some are so stupidly fond as in sport to teach their children to do things which in a while after they have severely beaten them for doing.⁶⁶

Such prescription called for expenditure of time on children and for consistency in order to spare the child confusion and needless chastisement. But above all it concentrated on the subjugation of the will. Methodist memoirs abound in such attitudes. A Sheffield Methodist wrestled to "extirpate self-will and stubbornness in his children by the restraints of authority. None of them after the age of twelve months were suffered to indulge in childish pets."⁶⁷ The great fear seemed to be that the family, or any adult, might through leniency "consign their own children to hell."⁶⁸ Methodists thought it was better to let them die,

I ask as with my parting breath,
To each allotted be,
A Holy life, or early death,
But which, I leave to thee.⁶⁹

The common assumption was that parents had only themselves to blame if children went to hell. "Will it not be a melancholy thought, to reflect, at the close of your days, that you have been prompting the designs of Satan, by bringing up children to be a constant torment to you through life, and then be plunged into everlasting perdition."⁷⁰ The harsh measures advocated by Methodists speak of an intense sense of responsibility for the spiritual welfare of children which arose from the assumption that children are naturally depraved:

Do you love your children, and will you lead them straight to hell and damnation? Do you see your children upon the brink of a terrible fiery furnace, and will you be so cruel as not to warn them of it? Will you not teach them to escape the flames of hell? O parents! Would you be free of your children's blood? Where is your motherly tenderness to the fruit of your womb? Would it not grieve you to hear them crying or to see them frying in hell-fire without relief?⁷¹

Guilt figured prominently in a stance which placed the full burden of action upon parents and made them responsible for the child's eternal fate. The thrust of this child-rearing method indicated that self-indulgent parents, that is parents who avoided their responsibilities because their "natural" inclination was to indulge children, were behaving irresponsibly. Henry Longden, the twentieth child of parents who had already buried nineteen, was spoilt yet determined that his children would not be treated so dangerously, "he had recourse, it is true, to coercive measures, yet always with regret, and not, even when most needful, until he had kneeled down to implore the blessing of God upon the correction he was about to inflict."⁷² Toward the end of the eighteenth century, the Eclectic Society (formed by Evangelical clergymen for the discussion of mutual problems) met to decide, "what are the first and most Prominent Discoveries of Depravity in Children, and the best methods of

counteracting them?"⁷³ All agreed that self-will was the fundamental problem, and some confessed that they were too lenient. While many regretted the need for harshness, there were some like Good who argued that "Passion may be seen even at the breast; and obstinacy too. My child kept me once for two or three hours before its obstinacy would give way; but I conquered and have had no trouble since."⁷⁴ Another statement came in the form of a boast, "I contended once a whole night with a child when seven months old. And it left a permanent effect to this day."⁷⁵ This religious intrusiveness enthralled children to such extent that they sometimes became religious hysterics. Wesley's school, which was devoted to salvation, sent reports which delighted him, of scenes in which boys "screamed in remorse and cried with joy at their salvation."⁷⁶ Children were terrorized in the service of extirpating depravity. The *Evangelical Magazine* advised parents in 1799 to "teach them that they are sinful polluted creatures."⁷⁷ Death appeared prominently as a means of instruction; Isaac Milner was gentle with his child friends, yet took his niece to see a condemned felon and he once wrote to a woman, "present my respects to your son, and tell him that last week I buried three young persons who had died of a malignant fever."⁷⁸

HARDENING. Adults made a concerted effort to restrict, shape, terrorize and expunge self-will in children, but the need to control them, for their own good, was not limited to a particular religious position. John Locke had said "They should be hardened against all suffering, especially of the body, and have no tenderness but what arises from an ingenuous shame and a quick sense of reputation."⁷⁹ Spiritual toughness was matched by prescriptions for emotional and physical stamina. In *An Essay on the Government of Children*, published in 1763, James Nelson said,

Tis wonderful to observe how very early a Wilfulness is discernible in Children; and with what swift Progress it gathers Strength if not immediately and carefully checked. I have seen a Child not above six Months old, obstinately contending for a certain position to be suckled in, and the tender (simply tender) Mother painfully distorting her Limbs, and training her whole frame, in Compliance to it, or it would not suck at all."⁸⁰

Wilfulness, it appears, was the secular version of original sin and propensity to depravity. Like the Methodists, Nelson berated those parents who indulged themselves by laxity, "thus they (the children) are generally suffered to run on to near the Age of Seven, with little or no Variation, except that their Appetites gaining head of their Reason."⁸¹ In support of his position Nelson told the story of a child who in spite of ill-health refused medicine, was not coerced by her mother with the

result that "her Fever would increase, and endanger her life."⁸² Clearly, physical danger was the consequence of overindulgence. Daniel Defoe had said "spare the rod and spoil the child."⁸³ Parents were not only encouraged to strictness but berated for its absence. Susannah Wesley said that her children when they reached the age of one, and sometimes even sooner, "were taught to fear the rod, and to cry softly; by which means they escaped abundance of correction they might otherwise have had, and that most odious noise of the crying of children was rarely heard in the house, but the family lived in as much quietness as if there had not been a child among them."⁸⁴ In Scotland, Lady Elphinstone insisted on having her will obeyed at all times. Once a boy who disliked porridge stayed with her ladyship

She ordained that until he had eaten his share he would have nothing else. The little boy . . . decided that he would rather starve than eat it, and did without either breakfast or dinner. A kind friend, taking pity on him invited him to supper . . . just before the meal Lady Elphinstone's man arrived with the announcement 'Lady Elphinstone's compliments, and this is Master John's Porridge.'⁸⁵

Parents prided themselves on their ability to command their children. "My children from the youngest to the eldest loves me and fears me as sinners dread death. My look is law."⁸⁶ A well-regulated coherent upbringing marked by physical discomfort and sensual austerity was highly recommended.

The children were always put into a regular mode of living, in such things as they were capable of, from their birth; as in dressing, undressing, changing their linen etc. . . . a regular course of sleeping; which at first was three hours in the morning and three in the afternoon: afterwards two hours, till they needed none at all.

When they turned a year old (and some before) they were taught to fear the rod, and cry softly . . . as soon as they were grown pretty strong, they were confined to three meals a day . . . they were suffered to eat and drink (small beer) as much as they would; but not to call for anything . . . one day was allowed the child wherein to learn its letters; and each of them did in that time know all its letters, great and small, except Molly and Nancy, who were day and a half before they knew them perfectly; for which I thought them very dull . . . rising out of their places, or going out of the room was not permitted unless for good cause; and running into the yard, garden, or street, without leave was always esteemed a capital offence.⁸⁷

Intrusive parents could not "abide contradictions" and felt that the hardship they inflicted on children was for their spiritual and physical good. The eighteenth-century child was restricted from the moment of

its birth. When swaddling clothes were left off it was likely to be thrust into a go-cart up to its arm-pits, and when it began walking, leading-strings were attached to its shoulders. Its body was hardened according to Locke, "as the strength of the body lies chiefly in being able to endure hardships so also does that of the mind."⁸⁸ James Nelson spoke for a large constituency when he said,

The more Water and the colder the Bath the better. At first use only two or three times a Week, afterwards every Day; and continue it (unless other Accidents intervene) 'till every appearance of Weakness be vanished, even though it long, or come on in the coolest Season.⁸⁹

Casualties followed these practices. The poet Southey's sister, Louisa, born in 1779, died of hydrocephalus but Southey was convinced that her death was caused by his parents' practice of "dipping her in a tub of the coldest well water. This was done from an old notion of strengthening her; the shock was dreadful; the poor child's horror of it, every morning, when taken out of bed, still more so. I can not remember having seen it without horror."⁹⁰ Lady Grisell Baillie's daughter spent most of her time in a steel contraption designed to "improve" her figure, and an eighteenth-century lady reminiscing about her childhood said,

It was the fashion then for children to wear iron collars round the neck, with backboards strapped over my shoulders. To one of these I was subjected from my sixth to my thirteenth year. I generally did all my lessons standing in stocks with this same collar round my neck; it was put on in the morning and seldom taken off till late in the evening and it was Latin I had to study . . . At the same time I had the plainest possible food, dry bread and cold milk were my principal food and I never sat in a chair in my mother's presence.⁹¹

It was a common assumption that children, if given free reign would become immoderate in every respect. Conventional wisdom stated that a child is naturally inclined to overeat and must not be allowed to satisfy its hunger. *Anecdotes of Mary or the Good Governess*, written toward the end of the century described a little girl who, for breakfast got dry toast and a bowl of milk and water, followed by dinner at three o'clock, of one helping of meat and no butter or sugar. "When children are suffered to eat as much as they please, they soon become greedy."⁹²

Children tried to please adults; among the religious sects there were numerous "infant prodigies of piety who, in imitation of their seniors, sign 'covenants' and espousals to Christ at the age of 9; who are ripe Christians at the precocious age of 5 . . . children with strong faith and weak lungs."⁹³ Yet while children accepted the reasonableness of their

upbringing, memoirs indicate longing for something more. Lady Ann of the Lindsay family said of her mother,

Had she but accompanied this sometimes with a little of a mother's fondness, what a foundation of tenderness as well as veneration would have been laid in our hearts! But unfortunately for the contents of our nursery, it was not the system of that century (1700) to treat children with gentleness; everything was done by authority and correction. I have been told (by my grandmother) that this was in a still greater degree the case with the former generation, when no child was permitted to speak before or sit down in the company of its parents. This I well remember, that a mother who influenced her children to be right through their affection was at Balcarres reckoned to be unprincipled and careless, accused of a willingness to save herself trouble if she abolished the rod, and of forgetfulness of the laws of nature by allowing her children to look on their parents as their friends and companions.⁹⁴

Intrusive parents were distinguished by their certainty about what children needed, their overwhelming sense of responsibility about parenthood, and their concern to achieve salvation and a good sober life for children. They spent time with their children. In trying to extirpate childishness they propelled children into adulthood, away from the dangers of original sin or Appetite, but unlike indifferent parents whose aim was to assure social success for their children, these parents sought eternal or temporal "salvation" for their children. As indifferent parents found childhood uninteresting these parents found it dangerous, and for those reasons both sets of parents, did not, or could not acknowledge the difference between children and adults, and did all in their power to make adults out of children. Some students of the period claim that the conception of a child of feeling was beyond the imagination of the time. Probably that accounts for the satisfaction so often expressed by those who catapulted children into adulthood.

MINORITY VOICES

My mother sagacious and discrete, rightly judged that I must be governed by reason, or drawn by the cords of affection; and treating me accordingly, experienced no opposition to her will. My father, hasty in his manner, issued his orders imperiously, and my compliance was either reluctant, or wholly withheld. If despot-like, he attempted to punish me, his gentle daughter was converted into a lion. On two or three occasions while he was whipping me, I bit the thigh across which I was laid, and protested against his in-

junctions . . . my father recurred to the remedy of the rod. From that instant all desire of obedience vanished, and I declared that I would not take the medicine at all . . . From that instant my father never laid his hand upon me; nor did he even undertake to reprimand me; but on the contrary, caressed me frequently, taught me to draw, took me out for a walk, and treated me with kindness that rendered him more respectable in my eyes, and insured him my entire submission.

Marie Jeanne Philipon, Madame Roland de la Platiere, *An Autobiographical Sketch*, ca. 1760.⁹⁵

There were some parents, some adults in the eighteenth century, who fulminated against the prevailing indifference and harshness toward children. These were predominantly lonely voices. Such parents delighted in the love of their children and were supported by public voices which advocated gentleness, affection, contact, and stressed the pleasures to be derived from rearing children. They spoke of mutuality. If indifferent parents affirmed the duty of children toward parents, and intrusive adults lingered on the parental burden, minority voices spoke of the benefits which accrued to both children and parents—when they discovered each other.

PUBLIC CONCERN. Richard Steele writing in the *Spectator* of December 13, 1711, said,

I beg of you for the Sake of the many poor Infants, that may and will be saved, by weighing this Case seriously, to exhort the People with the utmost vehemence to let the children suck their own mother, both for the Benefit of mother and child.⁹⁶

A growing number of people spoke about giving children greater freedom and ease. Protests against swaddling appeared in 1741 when Nicolas Andry illustrated the danger of all garments designed to "straighten out" children, and advocated "the customs of Negroes and all other nations which give their children total liberty."⁹⁷ Similar observations were made by Winslow and Hales in 1743, William Cadogan in 1748 and Buffon in 1749. By 1763 most enlightened doctors had rejected swaddling and ridiculed those who clung to the notion.

There is perhaps no country in the world where children are so preposterously swaddled up, and manacled by their clothing as in Holland. A child in arms, trussed up by a Dutch nurse, resembling exactly a Dutch nine-pin except that its head, which ought to have some stay for the security of its neck, is left loose to play about, with every shake, like the niddle-noddle figures from Canton, on a modern chimney-piece . . . As their children grow bigger,

they have a securer way still to keep them warm, and prevent their breaking their bones, or troubling the nurse! This is to imprison them in a kind of close-stool, with a pan of fire placed under their feet; in which situation, if the poor creature is burnt, or is tired of the posture, and expresses its uneasiness by crying, the careful nurse whips in a pan of fresh coals, and if the unfortunate infant still keeps crying, she imputes it to downright peevishness or obstinacy, and lets it take its chance. It is true that numbers of children are killed by this method of showing them kindness, and many others are rendered cripples all their lives; but the members of academies may study philosophy and chop logic a long time, before they will be able to persuade an old woman of the inverse, that it is possible for them to know as much about nursing children, as their great-grandmothers.⁹⁸

Around the second half of the eighteenth century pediatric literature proliferated and infant mortality was receiving wide notice. In England, the *Spectator*, *London Magazine*, and the *Tatler* urged better care of infants. In France in 1761, the king gave official sanction to a bureau of *recomandresses*⁹⁹ and new regulations imposed the use of cribs in order to prevent "overlaying" by nurses and demanded that nurses be certified. A new police regulation in 1762 stated that,

No nurse shall take a nursling unless her last infant had been weaned and is 9 months or unless she has placed it with a nurse. This is to be certified by the cure. She may not take a child if her last *accouchement* is more than two years past. Infant and nurse must be examined by a physician.¹⁰⁰

Growing public consciousness was not necessarily matched by application, for child desertion, especially of the illegitimate, continued, as did infanticide, though by 1808 Malcom wrote that "dropping of children is but little known at present." Evidence indicates that mothers continued to put their children out to wet-nurse well into the second half of the eighteenth century but artificial feeding techniques were much improved after 1774. George Sand in *Histoire de Ma Vie* said that women were intoxicated with Rousseau's *Nouvelle Heloise* and *Emile*, and that "the pretty little puppets after mother read *Emile* were immediately stripped and mother determined to nurse her next child herself."¹⁰¹ It is difficult to assess whether this devotion persisted. Popular sentiment had often enough in the past run to pious cults such as devotion to the Infant Jesus which occurred in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, when Madame Guiyon, who sang the praises of the Little Master, left her three children in order to serve God.¹⁰²

During the course of the century changes in Mortality Bills in England were said to have been revolutionary. For the first fifty years the burials were to baptisms three to two; for the three years from 1740 to 1742

they were two to one; from 1750 the average ratio grew steadily less, though in years of special difficulties, high prices or bad trade, the burials increased and the baptisms declined. In 1790 for the first time christenings exceeded the burials.¹⁰³

In 1766 a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to inquire into the state of the Parish Poor Infants. Its recommendations were incorporated into the act of 1767 whereby all parish children were to be sent out of London to be nursed: those under two at least five miles away, those under six at least three. Nurses were to be paid at least two shillings and sixpence per week and were to have a reward of ten shillings for rearing children sent to them under nine months old. Similar remunerative incentives were instituted in France.¹⁰⁴

Toward the end of the eighteenth century children's clothes became simpler and much more comfortable and by the 1790's children were dressed with a simplicity which gave them almost as much freedom of movement as the modern child. Tastes in general moved toward the simple and natural. A study by Alice Ryerson on the contents of medical advice books in the English language, for the period 1650-1900, indicates that advice about forty different items of child-rearing changed abruptly at some time during the period covered by the study. Of these changes, thirty-three occurred in the middle of the eighteenth century, or shortly thereafter, one took place at the end of the seventeenth century, and the remaining six during the nineteenth.¹⁰⁵

INTIMACY. But it was the attitudes of some parents which were most remarkable. Madame D'Epinay, a French noblewoman, disappointed in her husband's traditionally indifferent attitude toward marriage, "discovered" her children by default, and invested much emotion in them. She said upon the birth of her son in 1746, "My son is with me; I think of nothing but this little creature from morning till evening . . . he has a passion for having me always near him. He cries when I leave him. I sometimes think when he smiles as he looks at me . . . that there is no satisfaction equal to that of making one's fellow creature happy."¹⁰⁶ Later she noted "Since I have been a mother, I have rarely lost sight of my children, and have made it my pleasure to look after them."¹⁰⁷ When her parents scolded her son's boisterousness she exclaimed "The idea of preventing a child from making noise! For myself I allow them entire freedom."¹⁰⁸ Determined to nurse her own child, she was forced by custom to seek permission from her in-laws. Her father-in-law had no objection if her doctor would approve it, and if her husband were willing, while her mother worried that she would make herself ridiculous. She was thwarted by her husband who "would not countenance any departure from the conventional motherhood of the period."¹⁰⁹

As her children grew she hoped to be able to teach them herself. She pleaded with her father-in-law to permit this, saying

Colleges are where children are penned up in herds to be trained and instructed and are comparable to public institutions for the care of sick whose poverty and dire necessity is such that they have no one to turn to in the world. It is all right for those who have no relations, no money, no friends . . . the drawback which strikes one most in public education and which has the most unfortunate results, is the impossibility of acquiring that intimate knowledge of the character of individual children, without which a teacher is not likely to be successful. It is impossible to help one whose needs one does not know. Why hand over to them the care of your children, your children who are your dearest possession and on whose welfare your own future happiness, your comfort and all the joy of life depends.¹¹⁰

Her father-in-law was adamant saying that his sons had gone to college, he and his father, and his grandfather had all gone to college,

'Our fathers never questioned the wisdom of this form of education and we must respect the opinion of our fathers—they were better than we' . . . But I returned (said Madame D'Epinay) 'our fathers believed in witchcraft.' 'My daughter, my daughter, your son will go to college, or I'll wash my hands of him.'¹¹¹

Madame D'Epinay persisted in her efforts and was more successful with her daughter of whom she said "I am teaching her to strive for what is worth having, and only to feel shame when there is something to really be ashamed of."¹¹²

While most parents continued to stress the need for coherency there occurred a growing emphasis on love. As early as the seventeenth century there had been proponents of the gentle method with children,

The Duke de Beauvillier never whipped any of his charges, since he considered 'these sorts of punishments to be by no means proper for children of their rank.' On the contrary, he studies to make them love him, in order to do them the greater service, he treats them with the utmost leniency.¹¹³

In *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters*, (1786) Mary Wollstonecraft urged that parents educate their own children, not only because they must be taught and reasoned with, but because love was essential in their upbringing. The home, according to her recommendation, should be harmonious and happy and the children governed by love rather than constraint or punishment.

It is only in the years of childhood that the happiness of a human being depends on others—and to embitter those years by needless

restrains is cruel. To conciliate the affections, affection should be shown, and a little proof of it ought always to be given . . . punishment should be reserved for serious offenses: violation of the truth, cruelty to animals, inferiors, or those kinds of follies which lead to vice.¹¹⁴

She spoke of the gratifications afforded by childcare,

I go to the nursery, something like maternal fondness fills my bosom. The children cluster about me—one catches a kiss, another lisps my long name—while a sweet little boy who is conscious that he is a favorite, calls himself my Tom. At the sight of their mother they tremble and run to me for protection—this renders them dear to me and, I discover the kind of happiness I was formed to enjoy.¹¹⁵

A few parents commented on the pleasures to be derived from contact with children. "I dined at home to-day *tete-a-tete* with Charles (aged 3) intending to do business; but he has found me pleasanter employment. I grow immoderately fond of him."¹¹⁶ Parents delighted in spending time with their children, "I was going to dine *tete-a-tete* with Charles when I was sent for by the House of Commons. It proved a false alarm, and only prevented my dining with him, but not playing at cricket with him and Peter. He is infinitely engaging, and clever, and pretty."¹¹⁷

In addition, adults expressed concern for the general welfare of children,

I am very sorry to hear of poor dear Thumbs being so bad in his cough. For God's sake have the greatest attention for him. If he is ill, you will see whether my state of affairs make me not forget domestic affection or not. But I pray God no trial of that kind may ever happen to me.¹¹⁸

and apprehension, at the risks undertaken with vaccination,

I wished for the experiment upon the most mature deliberation; but while I trembled with the suspense of its effect, I could not endure to lose a moment from the beloved little object for and with whom I was running such risk . . . The dear child coloured at sight of the blood, and seemed almost petrified with amazement fixing his wondering eyes upon Mr. Ansel with an expression that sought to dive into his purpose, and then upon me, as if enquiring how I could approve of it.¹¹⁹

A child's well-being was more important than its ability to perform according to a preconceived plan. An aunt wrote in 1782,

Her fingers are so sweet . . . I believe she could very soon learn to read was I to keep her to her Book, but as it is time enough I prefer her running about and getting a little more robust to her being a very early Scholar.¹²⁰

In 1753 Lady Wortley Montague commented on her governess in a letter to her daughter,

She took so much pains, from my infancy, to fill my head with superstitious tales and false notions, it was none of her fault I am not this day afraid of witches and hobgoblins, or turned Methodist. Almost all girls are bred in this manner. I believe you are the only woman (or perhaps I might say person) that never was either frightened or cheated into anything by your parents.¹²¹

Both parents, not just the mother, were invoked to care for their children. James Nelson stated that,

I earnestly recommend to both Father and Mother, that their Children suck the Mother's Breast . . . many a tender Mother, has her heart Yearning to suckle her Child, and is prevented by the misplaced Authority of a Husband. Parents upon the whole are to be considered as equally and mutually concerned in the training up their children.¹²²

At the end of the eighteenth century John Witherspoon writing some general works on the education of children said,

The second rule is liberty; All persons, young and old, love liberty, and as far as it does them no harm, it will certainly do them good . . . the best exercises for children is to let them romp and jump about as soon as they are able, according to their own fancy.¹²³

CONCLUSION

Unlike indifferent parents who were unconcerned about children's individual needs, and considered them replaceable and uninteresting until ready to enter society, and intrusive parents who assumed full, burdensome responsibility for shaping their children, viewing the process as a constant battle against parental tendency to indulge, the innovative parents of the eighteenth century sought to discover what children needed. They recognized the difference between adults and children and stressed reciprocity, happiness, pleasure and the satisfaction to be derived from parenting. These parents discovered the child as a love object.

Bogna Lorence is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of California, Berkeley and an instructor of history at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York. She is currently in Poland doing research for her dissertation on eighteenth-century Polish parents and children.

REFERENCES

The author is indebted to Lloyd deMause not only for suggestions and source information for this article, but also for introduction into the field of the history of childhood several years ago.

1. Roger Mercier, *L'enfant dans la Societe du XVIIIe Siecle*, (Dakar: Universite de Dakar, 1961) p. 42.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
6. Rosamond Bayne-Powell, *Eighteenth Century London Life*, (London: John Murray, 1937) p. 59.
7. Ernest Caulfield, *The Infant Welfare Movement in the Eighteenth Century*, (New York: Paul Hoeber Inc., 1931) p. 27.
8. Hippolyte Taine, *The Ancient Regime*, (New York: Peter Smith, 1931) p. 136.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Francis Hett, ed., *The Memoirs of Susan Sibbald, 1783-1812*, p. 16.
11. John Knodel and Etienne Van de Walle in "Breast Feeding, Fertility and Infant Mortality," *Population Studies*, (1967) indicate that at the turn of the century when artificial feeding had become much improved, there was an inverse relationship between breast feeding and infant mortality. A study for the period 1900-1903 shows that out of 5,228 children under the age of 1, 63% were breast-fed, and of those 7.0% died. Of the 19.5% who were never breast-fed, the mortality was 19.9%

Statistics for five French Hospitals for the year 1842 indicate a similar correlation.

Location	% of Mortality
Lyons: children wet-nursed, and soon sent into the country	33
Parthenay: Children wet-nursed. "In this hospital much attention is paid them."	35
Paris: Children artificially fed and soon sent into the country	50
Rheims: Children artificially fed and soon sent into the country	64
Unspecified: No children suckled for fear of giving syphilis to nurses	80

This information from Rendle-Short, *Father of Child Care*, p. 28.

12. T. G. H. Drake, "Infant Welfare Laws in France in the 18th century," *Annals of Medical History*, VII (1935) p. 51.
13. Jean Ganiage, "Nourrissons Parisiens en Beauvais," *Sur La Population Francaise au XVIII et au XIX Siecles*, (Paris: Societe de Demographie Historique, 1973) p. 271-287.
14. Ian Wickes, "A History of Infant Feeding," *Archives of Diseases in Childhood*, XXVIII (1935) p. 232.
15. George Still, *History of Pediatrics*, (London: Dawson of Pall Mall, 1953) p. 382.
16. John Knodel & Etienne Van de Walle, "Breast Feeding, Fertility, and Infant Mortality," *Population Studies*, 21 (1967) p. 120.
17. Drake, *op. cit.*, p. 51. French wet-nurses were highly organized from the twelfth century and subjected to increasing government control. Hiring was usually arranged by the quarter or by the year. A law of 1705 forbade innkeepers from lodging wet-nurses in the city; carriers were required to conduct the nurses to the bureau of *recommandaresses* where they were obliged to lodge. If regulations were broken, fines were collected against the nurse's

husband. Another law forbade the nurse to return an infant to its parents unless they gave her permission. *Meneurs* transported nurses from the country; conditions of transport were often harmful to infants. In 1773 a police regulation stipulated that *Meneurs* must have well-conditioned wagons the bottoms of which were to consist of planks sufficiently covered with clean straw. See Rendle-Short, "Infant Management . . ." p. 113 and Drake pp. 51-52.

By 1780 it was estimated that about 21,000 infants were born each year in Paris, this is according to Drake. Jean Ganiage in the previously cited article indicates that most of these infants were put out to wet-nurses in the Beauvais.

18. *Ibid.*
19. Mercier, *op. cit.*, p. 132.
20. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
21. Edward Gibbon, *The Memoirs and the life of Edward Gibbon, by Himself*, (London: Methuen, Methuen & Co., 1900) p. 29-30. Mortality rate in London for children under 5 is given by Caulfield as:
 66.2% for the period 1730-1779
 37.6% for the period 1780-1829.
22. In many primitive societies, see Nathan Miller's, *The Child in Primitive Society*, (New York: Brentano's, 1928) the child is identified with all that is immature, unfashioned, unripe, weak, negligible, pitiable and incomplete. This is attested to by the vocabulary, whereby the term for child is often synonymous with "come, come!" "nonsense." Basutos in speaking of an older person refer to them as "my father," or "my mother;" when speaking of an equal they say "my brother," and of inferiors they say "my children." In such societies a child is negligible, has no intrinsic value until it has become initiated into the tribe; only then does it become complete. The custom in the eighteenth century, and earlier, of giving the same name to a number of children in the hope that one would survive, indicates a similarity to primitive societies, in that the child assumes importance through its connection with the tribe, or as is the case in Europe, the family.
23. Gibbon, *op. cit.*, p. 29-30.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
25. Restif de la Bretonne, *Mr. Nicolas*, I (London: John Rodkin, 1930) p. 83.
26. Gibbon, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
28. Demographic data for both England and France indicate that infant mortality was high though it varied in France from province to province, and in England was higher in London than in the countryside. Pierre Goubert in "Legitimate Fecundity and Infant Mortality in France during the eighteenth Century: A Comparison," *Daedalus*, Spring 1968, cites the following figures for Brittany, though he feels that these are higher in other parts of the country.

La Guerche	1720-92	285 out of every 1,000
Saint-Meen	1720-92	237 out of every 1,000
Saint Aubin	1749-89	243 out of every 1,000

As a more general statement Louis Henry says that the average infant mortality rate for the period 1750-1789 was 230 per 1,000. "The population of France in the Eighteenth Century," D. V. Glass & Eversley, *Population in History*, (Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1965) p. 447. Also, in *Population Studies*, Thomas McKeown and R. G. Brown in "Medical Evidence in the Eighteenth Century," XXVIII, July 1973, state that the figures for London indicate that in the period 1770-1789, 51.5% of the baptized infants were dead before the age of five, while M. B. Beaver in the same publication, "Population,

Infant Mortality and Milk," quotes T. R. Edwards who wrote "On infant mortality and Infants in England," in *The Lancet* of 1836, and gives the following table.

Childhood Mortality in London 1730-1829

1730-49	74.5	Deaths under 5 years of age as percentages per live births.
1750-69	63.0	
1770-89	51.5	
1790-1809	41.3	
1810-1829	31.8	

Beaver claims that a fall in infant mortality occurred at the end of the eighteenth century in England and Wales.

29. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
30. John and Rowena Rendle-Short, *Father of Child Care: The Life of William Cadogan, 1711-1797*, (Briston: John Wright and Sons Ltd., 1966) p. 26.
31. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 16. "Overlaid" meant that the child had been suffocated by the nurse as she accidentally rolled over in her sleep. It was stated, together with "starved at Nurse" as the cause of the death of some 529 in the London Bills of Mortality for the twenty years ending in 1659, Rendle-Short, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
32. Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, I (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969) p. 301-2.
33. Alice Judson Ryerson, *Medical Advice on Child Rearing, 1650-1900*, unpublished Harvard Thesis, 1960, p. 60.
34. Anonymous, *Some Advice to Governesses and Teachers*, (London: 1729) p. 22.
35. Mercier, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
36. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
37. John Rendle-Short, "Infant Management in the 18th century with special reference to the work of William Cadogan," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, XXXIV, #2 (March-April, 1960) p. 98.
38. Rosamond Bayne-Powell, *The English Child in the Eighteenth Century*, (London: John Murray, 1939) p. 149.
39. Wickes, *op. cit.*, p. 237.
40. Pinchbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 303.
41. Levy & Henry in "Ducs et pairs sous L'Ancien Regime," *Population*, XV, #5, 1960, state that the high society in Paris and Versailles, during the period 1650-1800 entered marriage at a very young age in comparison to the rural population of the rest of Europe. But fecundity, in contrast to the rest of the population was limited. Children were born early in marriage and the age of the average woman with the last child ranged from a low of 28.5 to 29 in the second half of the eighteenth century. The conclusion must be reached that some sort of contraceptive technique, possibly *coitus interruptus*, was prevalent in the high society of that century.
42. David Bakan, *Slaughter of the Innocents*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971) p. 42.
43. See Richard Trexler, "Infanticide in Florence, New Sources, First Results," *History of Childhood Quarterly*, I, 1973, p. 99.
44. William Langer, "Checks on Population Growth, 1750-1850," *Scientific American*, Feb., 1972, p. 96.
45. Bakan, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Jonathan Swift, *A Modest Proposal*, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969) p. 12.
48. Dorothy George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century*, (London: Kegan Paul, 1925) p. 43.

Mercier gives the number of children which were received in the Paris Foundling Hospital, (p. 154)

1690	1,500
1725	2,000
1740	3,000
1755	4,000
1760	5,000
1772	7,676
1779	6,644
1780	5,568

49. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 482. A decree of the King's Council of State, January 10, 1779, stated that every year more than 2,000 infants came to Paris from the provinces. The crown expressly forbade the practice and was concerned for the welfare of infants on such hazardous trips. His majesty is said to have remarked with pain that the number of exposed infants was increasing day by day and that the majority were legitimate births; and that these asylums instituted to prevent the crimes to which the fear and disgrace might induce an erring mother, had become by degrees depots favourable to the criminal indifference of parents, Drake, p. 58.

In the Paris Hospital the number of deaths was 80% in 1770, and 50% in 1820, for infants under 1, and 74% for children under 5. This prompted the cynical inscription over the door: "Ici on fait mourir les enfants," Wickes, p. 238.

50. John Brown, *History and Objects of the Foundling Hospital with a Memory of the Founder*, (London: 1865) p. 14.

Drake states that in France the number of abandoned children under the age of 12 was, (p. 56)

1784	40,000
1798	51,000

51. Bayne-Powell, *Eighteenth Century London Life*, p. 88.
 52. Dorothy Marshall, *The English Poor in the Eighteenth Century*, (London: George Routledge, 1926) p. 98.
 53. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
 54. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
 55. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 100.
 56. Pinchbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 305.
 57. Bayne-Powell, *English Child . . .*, p. 14.
 58. Mrs. Cutts, *Almeria, or Parental Advice. A Didactic Poem* (E. J. R. Rodwell, reputedly printed in 1775) p. 4.
 59. Sarah Lennox, *Life and Letters of Lady Sarah Lennox, 1745-1826*, II (London: John Murray, 1902) p. 24.
 60. Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 136.
 61. Horace Scudder, *Childhood in Literature and Art*, (Boston & N.Y.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1894) p. 188.
 62. Eduard & Jules Goncourt, *The Woman of the Eighteenth Century*, (George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1928) p. 6.
 63. As previously stated, in primitive societies children were considered almost non-existent until formal initiation into the group.
 64. David Hunt in *Parents and Children in History*, (New York: Basic Books, 1970) states on p. 108, "The decision to employ a nurse was as much as anything a sexual triumph for the father" (since intercourse was prohibited during nursing it was the wet-nurse's husband who was deprived) "not only within the family but also in terms of a wider network of social relationships."
 65. Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, (New York:

- Norton & Co., 1967) p. 115.
66. D. N. Horn & Mary Ransome, *English Historical Documents, 1714-1787*, X (Oxford: University Press, 1957) p. 156.
 67. Paul Sangster, *Pity My Simplicity: The Evangelical Revival and the Education of Children, 1738-1800*, (London: Epworth Press, 1963) p. 30.
 68. *Ibid.*, p. 72
 69. *Ibid.*
 70. *Ibid.*
 71. John Willson, *A Mother's Catechism for the Young Child*, (Harrisburg: John Wyeth, 1795) p. iii.
 72. Sangster, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
 73. *Ibid.*
 74. *ibid.*
 75. *Ibid.*
 76. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
 77. *Ibid.*, p. 100.
 78. *Ibid.*
 79. John Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, (New York: Barron's, 1964) p. 145.
 80. James Nelson, *Essay on the Government of Children*, (Dublin: 1763) p. 18.
 81. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
 82. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
 83. Daniel Defoe, *Chickens Feed Capons*, (London: 1731) p. 21.
 84. Horn & Ransome, *op. cit.*, p. 562.
 85. Marjorie Plant, *The Domestic Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century*, (Edinburgh: University Press, 1952) p. 16.
 86. *Ibid.*
 87. Horn & Ransome, p. 561-563.
 88. Locke, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
 89. Nelson, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
 90. Rev. Charles Southey, *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, (New York: Harper, 1855) p. 24.
 91. Bayne-Powell, *English Child . . .*, p. 7.
 92. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
 93. H. Grey Graham, *The Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century*, (London: A. C. Black Ltd., 1937) footnote on p. 345.
 94. Lord Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays: or a Memoir of the houses of Crawford and Balcarres*, II (London: John Murray, 1849) p. 304.
 95. Madame Roland de la Platier, "An autobiographical sketch," *The World's Great Classics*, (New York: The Colonial Press, 1901). The authoress was born in 1754.
 96. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
 97. Mercier, *op. cit.*, p. 110.
 98. Caulfield, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
 99. Apparently the bureau acted as a liaison agency between nurses and parents.
 100. Drake, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
 101. Caulfield, "The Infant Welfare Movement in the 18th century," *Annals of Medical History*, II, 1930, p. 692.
 102. Taine, *op. cit.*, p. 273.
 103. Mercier, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
 104. George, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
 105. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
 106. Ryerson, *op. cit.*, p. 112.
 107. J. H. Freese, ed., *The Memoirs and Correspondence of Madame D'Epinay*, I

- (London: I.H.S. Nicholson Ltd., 1897) p. 106.
108. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
 109. Lincoln McVeach, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Madame D'Epinay*, (New York: Dial Press, 1938) p. 38.
 110. *Ibid.*, p. 64-68.
 111. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
 112. *Ibid.*, p. 176.
 113. James Bossuet, *An Account of the Education of the Dauphine*. (Glasgow: J. T. Phillips, 1743) p. 56-7. In a letter to Pope Innocent XI.
 114. Elinor Flexner, *Mary Wollstonecraft*, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1972) p. 59.
 115. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
 116. George Trevelyan, *History of the Early Life of Charles James Fox*, p. 62.
 117. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
 118. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
 119. Fanny D'Arblay, *Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay*, VI (London: Henry Colburn, 1846) p. 105.
 120. Malcolm Elwin, ed., *The Noels and the Milbanks: Their Letters for Twenty-Five Years. 1767-1792*, (London: MacDonald, 1967) p. 202.
 121. Lady Wortley Montague, *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montague, 1752-1762*, III (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967) p. 26.
 122. Nelson, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
 123. John Witherspoon, *The Works of John Witherspoon, D.B.*, VIII (Edinburgh: Ogee & Aiken, 1805) p. 120.

FROM THE SOURCES

The Striga, Child-eating Witches of Antiquity:

"Big is their head, goggle their eyes, their beaks are formed for rapine, their wings are blotched with grey, their claws fitted with hooks. They fly by night and attack nurseless children, and defile their bodies, snatched from their cradles. They are said to rend the flesh of sucklings with their beaks, and their throats are full of the blood which they have drunk. Screech-owl is their name . . . In the chambers Proca, a child five days old, was a fresh prey for the birds. They sucked his infant breast with greedy tongues, and the poor child squalled and craved help."

Ovid, *Fasti*, (London, 1931),
p. 329.

JUSTIFICATION WITHOUT JOY: PSYCHOHISTORICAL REFLECTIONS ON JOHN WESLEY'S CHILDHOOD AND CONVERSION

ROBERT L.
MOORE

The place of John Wesley in the religious history of the West is a secure one. A major figure in eighteenth century English religion, his career as an evangelist, reformer, and founder of an important religious movement has had an influence reaching far beyond both his century and his country. Few men of the England of his day have received such widespread and continuing interest. Given the current interest in psychohistorical studies and research using personal documents, it should be noted that we have more autobiographical data on John Wesley than on any other major leader in the history of the Christian Church.¹ Beginning as early as 1725 he kept a narrative record of the meaningful events of his life. Add the voluminous, richly autobiographical correspondence and it becomes clear that Wesley is an ideal subject for psychohistorical investigation. Indeed, the historical importance of the figure and the accompanying availability of personal data invite the scholar to undertake a full-length psychohistory of Wesley's life. This essay, however, is a far less ambitious undertaking. In the following discussion we will focus on the question of the relationship between Wesley's experiences as a child in the Epworth parsonage, his Aldersgate conversion of 1738, and his confirmation as an evangelist during the field-preaching at Bristol in 1739.

WESLEY'S EXPERIENCE IN THE FAMILY CIRCLE

An adequate treatment of the impact of John Wesley's family traditions upon his search for selfhood would have to include at the very least an account of the lives of his grandfathers as they interact with the significant religious and political events in the England of their day, along with an even more thorough treatment of the lives of his parents, Samuel and Susanna Wesley. In this essay, however, a brief sketch of Wesley's experience in the Epworth household will have to suffice. On July 24, 1732, Susanna Wesley summarized in a letter the rules which she followed in rearing her children.² This rather comprehensive letter is undoubtedly one of the most valuable documents available for those who seek an insight into the child-rearing practices of eighteenth century England.

She first emphasized the importance of instilling in the child a sense of regularity in living. This principle was to govern the child at all stages of its development. There were definite times for eating, sleeping, and having a change of linen. An early application of a severe discipline was necessary to undergird this rigid regularity.

When turned a year old (and some before), they were taught to fear the rod, and to cry softly; by which means they escaped abundance of correction they might otherwise have had, and that most odious noise of the crying of children was rarely heard in the house, but the family usually lived in as much quietness as if there had not been a child among them.³

They could have as much to eat and drink as they wanted at meal-time, but they were not allowed to "call for any thing." If they wanted to ask for anything, they had to whisper their desire to the maid who took the request to the parent. They were not allowed to eat between meals or to ask the servants for anything at an irregular hour. There was to be no choice on the part of the children as to what they ate.

They were so constantly used to eat and drink what was given them that, when any of them was ill, there was no difficulty in making them take the most unpleasant medicine; for they durst not refuse it, though some of them would presently throw it up. This I mention to show that a person may be taught to take anything, though it be never so much against his stomach.⁴

Underlying all of her method was the desire to inculcate a total obedience to parental authority. Training the child to submit his will to that of the parent was the fundamental foundation and goal of child development.

In order to form the minds of the children, the first thing to be done is to conquer their will, and bring them to an obedient tem-

per. To inform the understanding is a work of time; and must with children proceed by slow degrees, as they are able to bear it; but the subjecting the will is a thing that must be done at once, and the sooner the better.⁵

For Susanna, the neglect of careful and constant correction could only lead to an increase of stubbornness and obstinacy in the child. She considered leniency in discipline to be a mistake which could only lead to more severe confrontations and punishment at a later date. Thus the indulgence of supposedly kind and gentle parents seemed to her to be the essence of parental stupidity and cruelty.

Whenever a child is corrected, it must be conquered; and this will be no hard matter to do if it be not grown headstrong by too much indulgence. And when the will of a child is totally subdued, and it is brought to revere and stand in awe of the parents, then a great many childish follies and inadvertances may be passed by.⁶

Although some innocuous misbehavior could be overlooked or only mildly challenged, any obviously willful transgressions of parental authority were not to be forgiven without punishment. Such transgressions were dangerous, not only to the order of the household, but to the spiritual well-being of the child.

I insist upon conquering the will of children betimes, because this is the only strong and rational foundation of a religious education, without which both precept and example will be ineffectual. But when this is thoroughly done, then a child is capable of being governed by the reason and piety of its parents, till its own understanding comes to maturity, and the principles of religion have taken root in the mind.⁷

It is clear from her account that for her the importance of this breaking of the will can hardly be overemphasized. Since self-will lies at the foundation of all sin and misery, anyone who encourages its expression in children is leading them into a life of wretchedness and irreligion.

This is still more evident if we farther consider that religion is nothing else than the doing the will of God, and not our own; that, the one grand impediment to our temporal and eternal happiness being this self-will, no indulgences of it can be trivial, no denial unprofitable. Heaven or hell depends on this alone.⁸

Her convictions as to the importance of early childhood education for the personal and spiritual well-being of the child in later life led her to undertake a systematic and comprehensive program of instruction. She taught them the basics of religious observance, including the Lord's Prayer and other devotional materials. They had to distinguish Sunday from the other days of the week, and learned to be equally careful in

their utterance of the name of God. When talking among themselves, the children were to manifest the appropriate religious decorum by prefixing proper names with "Brother" or "Sister."

With regard to other learning, she was equally as systematic in her instruction as she was in the more overtly "spiritual" areas. She organized their waking hours into an austere educational process. Lessons were given in the morning from nine o'clock to twelve, and in the afternoon from two to five. During their instruction they were not allowed any distractions or time for play.

There was no such thing as loud talking or playing allowed of, but every one was kept close to their business, for the six hours of school . . . Rising out of their places, or going out of the room, was not permitted unless for good cause; and running into the yard, garden, or street, without leave was always esteemed a capital offense.⁹

Mrs. Wesley also noted a number of "by-laws" which were observed by her, several of which are of interest to us here. First, to prevent lying a law was made that if a child would confess his transgression of a rule and promise "to amend" he would not be beaten.

This rule prevented a great deal of lying, and would have done more, if one in the family would have observed it. But he could not be prevailed on, and therefore was often imposed on by false colours and equivocations; which none would have used (except one), had they been kindly dealt with.¹⁰

Apparently the father of the household was not altogether in sympathy with the moral order which Susanna had established in the nursery, and often punished the children in spite of, and perhaps because of, their confessions.

Second, no "sinful action" would ever remain unpunished. Third, no child would ever be scolded or beaten twice for the same fault, and, if they did not continue the error, they were not to be upbraided regarding the transgression later. Fourth, every act of obedience would be praised and often rewarded according to the merits of the particular case. And fifth, if a child did anything with the intention to please or obey, even if the act lacked success in its intentions, the obedience and intention should be noted and the child helped in order to do better in the future.

If Susanna was conscientious to a fault in her efforts with all of the children, the following event led her to be even more conscientious with John Wesley. On the night of February the ninth, in the year 1709, the Epworth parsonage was on fire.¹¹ It was unclear whether the cause was arson by angry parishioners or simply carelessness on the part of Samuel Wesley. Nevertheless, the fire was not discovered in time, and the en-

tire family came close to losing their lives in the holocaust. The fire spread so rapidly and the heat was so intense that no real attempt was made to rescue young "Jacky" from his bedroom—although his father did kneel and commit the child's soul to God. Thanks to the efforts of a friendly parishioner, however, young John was spotted at his bedroom window and pulled to safety. His mother, overwhelmed with thankfulness at his "miraculous rescue," thereafter referred to him as the "brand plucked from the burning," and when she was alone made pious vows on his behalf: "I do intend to be more especially careful of the soul of this child."¹²

And careful she was. It should be helpful at this point to reflect on the special meaning that John was coming to have for his mother. Her dreams about having her own Samuel follow in the illustrious footsteps of her famous father, Samuel Annesley, as a prominent divine, had undoubtedly been cruelly broken by the time of John's miraculous rescue. Samuel Wesley, it seemed, was condemned to spend the rest of his life as a priest of the backwater parish of Epworth. Nevertheless, the competition among the daughters of Samuel Annesley continued in the form of a search for a man-child who would—and could—follow in the footsteps of the patriarch.¹³ In this "divine intervention" Susanna believed she had a sign—a portent of John's future stature as a man of God. If she had not been able with all of her ability and commitment to enable Samuel Wesley to carve out a place of importance for himself, it had been because of weaknesses in his character. With care, she might be able to form a character in John without those debilitating weaknesses which had so plagued his father.

Samuel Wesley, however, was impatient with his wife's rigorous and consistent method of child-rearing, and the subject was one of many areas of conflict between them. Elsie Harrison has characterized his response to the personality traits which that method was creating in John:

... the star pupil, John Wesley himself, had an uncomfortable time with his father, for he got both beaten and laughed at for observing the rules too well. His mother had taught him to reason out everything, with the result that he debated every step of the way forward and made a man like his father very angry. A poet cannot be expected to tolerate too much reason. He would thunder at the child, 'You think to carry everything by dint of argument,' and turning to his mother he followed up his advantage in that trying strain of crude banter: 'I protest, sweetheart. I think our Jack would not attend to the most pressing necessities of nature unless he could give a reason for it.'¹⁴

No doubt this early experience of the conflict between the intrusive maternal authority and the ambivalent paternal authority formed the basis for an internalized psychic conflict which would prove very diffi-

cult to resolve. During his experience under the heavy but consistent hand of his mother John Wesley had learned his lessons well. His personal style as a "Methodist," compulsive, over-organized, perfectionistic in his attempts to obey authorities which he believed to be legitimate, just, and consistent was determined at an early age by this relationship. His sense of having an extraordinary destiny, some special mission in religious leadership was also fostered by his mother, and led to his strong belief in the providential element in his personal history.¹⁵

Yet we do not want to minimize here, as many biographers have done, the importance of Samuel Wesley in his son's developmental economy. The scholarly, poetic, volatile, unorganized and imminently unpredictable figure of his father must have elicited a response from young John that had elements of both *mysterium tremendum* and *mysterium fascinans*. If it was impossible for John to have an unambiguously positive response to Samuel, neither was the response totally negative. Though all of the children suffered under the capricious and often heavy hand of the father's authority, neither they nor their mother were willing to deny the formal legitimacy of that authority and its claim upon them. If not an effective head of the household, he was a powerful presence for the children emotionally and had to be dealt with in their struggle to develop appropriate and autonomous ego-identities. We shall see below how John Wesley approached the task of integrating into his mature identity the claims of the maternal authority while neutralizing the problematic potency of the capricious father.

GEORGIA: THE FAILURE OF AN EXPERIMENT

In the heat of intense marital conflict Susanna Wesley had learned to limit the destructive effects of her husband's caprice and impulsiveness through the careful use of reason and argument from a coherent religious perspective.¹⁶ John Wesley chose very early in life to cast his lot with the carefully reasoned and "logical" moral order which Susanna had created in the nursery. From a psychohistorical perspective we suggest that in formulating his unique style of ego-synthesis and adaptation Wesley committed himself to carrying the principles of that microcosmic moral order to their logical conclusions in the world beyond. This chosen adaptive style was to have far-reaching ramifications that figure in his mature self-image as a religious leader and in his fully-formed understanding of the soteriological economy. At this point, however, we are still contemplating a young John Wesley who has not yet laid the potency of the paternal authority to rest. We will now turn to the last and most significant conflict with that authority.

By 1733 the health of Samuel Wesley was failing, and, concerned about the continuing welfare of his family in the event of his death, he began to seek a successor from his sons to take over the Epworth living. He first asked Samuel Jr., but he declined since he had just taken a position as headmaster of a school. Charles was not yet ordained, and therefore an attempt was made to enlist John as his successor. With this request a struggle was engaged between Wesley and his father which was to extend until his father's death in 1735, and which had results extending to the Aldersgate experience and beyond.¹⁷

John was at first not totally resistant to the idea, and seemed to be considering the appointment. But gradually his resolve to stay at Oxford strengthened, and he resisted his father's intensive pressure until the appointment had already been promised to another. The question of the basis for Wesley's refusal to succeed his father is an important one, and we must consider what the request must have meant to him at this important juncture in his personal and professional development. For the psychohistorian two factors stand out here as important contributing factors: Wesley's own sense of a special destiny and the shared family assumption that their father had abilities and potential which were frustrated by the effectual exile of Epworth.¹⁸

With regard to Wesley's prodigious sense of a special destiny, the psychohistorian must agree with his subject who once told his friend Adam Clarke, "If I were to write my own life I should begin it before I was born."¹⁹ First of all, most biographers have missed the reason that Wesley, contrary to all of the other children, was given a middle name. That middle name, Benjamin, was the name of a sibling who had died three years before John's birth. In fact, his name was a combination of that of infant John who died in 1699 and that of the aforementioned Benjamin who had died in 1700.²⁰ This uniqueness of naming indicates that our subject in effect had to live for three persons and thereby at a very early age came to have a heightened significance for his mother.²¹ When this significant naming is combined with his experience of being a "brand plucked from the burning," one can discern the major factors which led to his sense of a special destiny. He was convinced that he had been saved by God and set aside for some providential role. It should be clear at this point that if Epworth had frustrated his father's ambitions, it would certainly not be an adequate position for one destined to greatness.

The decision to reject the Epworth living, however, was a costly one for Wesley since he had never taken lightly any overt conflicts with his father. Even in those circumstances when he believed his father guilty of irresponsible conduct toward a family member John's rebellion, however minute in its dimensions, led in a seemingly irrevocable manner to his doing penance through working on one of his father's pet projects.²²

Now Wesley had, in rejecting the appointment, not only effectually raised a question regarding the worth of his father's life-long labor at Epworth, but also in so doing had cast himself in the role of the insensitive and irresponsible family member. Such a transgression of the will of his father would no doubt require an act of penance and that no amount of transcribing on a literary work could ever satisfy. His father's death in 1735 prevented any reconciliation or direct attempt at penance, but John soon found an opportunity to do penance on a grand scale. His father had often spoken of a desire to become a missionary to the "heathen" in foreign lands and had followed the plans for a new colony in Georgia with interest.²³ In spite of his previous resistance to leaving Oxford, when Wesley was offered a position as pastor to Savannah and missionary to the Indians he accepted it. Here was an opportunity to assuage his guilt by working on a project which was far more dear to his father's heart than any literary work.

Georgia also promised relief on another developmental front which was troubling the young clergyman: his own sexuality. His childhood had been one of continual interaction with a small group of sensitive and religious female companions. He learned to prefer the company of women and to thrive upon it.²⁴ At this point there seemed to be no conflict between religious purity and commitment and intimate relationships with the other sex. With the onset of adolescence, however, the bliss of a conflict-free relationship with female peers was to come to an end.²⁵ A recurrent fear in the period prior to the Georgia episode is summarized by the question Wesley put to himself, "Have I loved women or company more than God?"²⁶ In his fantasies, Georgia would have no women to tempt him and threaten him with a "burning" of a different kind.²⁷

If John Wesley had hopes of working out his own salvation in Georgia he was soon to find himself frustrated on every front. The very conflicts which the Georgia experiment was to have put to rest began to manifest themselves again, and the entire experience proved to be a disastrous failure. First and most important, the mission to the natives which had promised to serve so well as a grand act of penance never materialized. The head of the colony, General Oglethorpe, had never really intended for him to occupy himself with the natives. Wesley was pressured more and more into the role of the parish priest of Savannah and the nearby settlement of Frederica. This left him in a role which he had already rejected actively and which he now rejected passively through failure. If he failed as a parish priest, he chose to do so in the style of his heavy-handed father and could appeal to his "good intentions" in the face of that failure.²⁸ Secondly, his discovery of attractive young women in the colony had been experienced as a "sweet threat" to his religious mission.²⁹ He found his desire for psychosexual intimacy reawakened by

Sophy Hopkey, the eighteen-year-old niece of the magistrate of Savannah.³⁰ His resolutions to live a celibate life were based in large part on his mother's tendency to draw an identity between "carnality" and self-will. But these resolutions underwent a severe buffeting, and he found himself dangerously close to a proposal of marriage.³¹ When he had realized the intensity of his feelings he became frightened and bewildered at this surge of carnality, and began to pray for divine assistance in resisting this temptation. After a long struggle he achieved a measure of "resignation" and managed to frustrate the young woman until she consented to marry another suitor.³² The maternal prohibitions had proved too powerful for him to break and he had succumbed to obedience.

The Georgia excursion had, of course, been an experiment, and, as with many experiments, an unexpected outcome can prove as useful as one that had been anticipated. Georgia had come to mean, not a locus for a special ministry isolated from the temptations of the world, but the wilderness of temptation itself, a trial by fire during which he was "purified" of his illusions about his own capacity to prove himself worthy and his tendencies toward self-will.

It is appropriate at this point to analyze briefly the ways in which the Georgia fiasco seemed to turn on the issue of will. At the outset, of course, we should remember that it was the aftermath of a mighty struggle of wills between himself and his father that eventually led Wesley to undertake the Georgia mission. Indeed, in Eriksonian terminology the unifying theme for the Georgia experience might well be understood as initiative vs. guilt.³³ It was, in a way, a kind of precocious *spiritual initiative* which formed one of his main reasons for wanting to stay at Oxford, and which formed the basis for his *stated* reason for undertaking the mission to the Indians.³⁴ At the outset of the journey he had little sense of the self-will and pride which he later came to believe lay at the root of his desire to save his own soul. On leaving Georgia things looked quite different. The most glaring expression of initiative and accompanying guilt during his stay in Georgia was, of course, his passion for and involvement with Sophy. Gradually he had come to view his will, even when it manifested itself in the form of spiritual initiative, as hopelessly flawed.³⁵ Increasingly it began to dawn on him that his own initiative had to die, that it could not be trusted, that his only hope lay in resignation to the will and initiative of God.

He had sought to work out his own salvation in fear and trembling, and it was that very fear which made him begin to question the adequacy of his faith. Even as early as the voyage to Georgia on board the *Simmonds* he had been impressed with the fearlessness of the Moravians.³⁶ The uneasy feeling that he lacked something that the Germans had led him to become very close to them throughout the time of his stay in

the colony. His conversion with Spangenberg on his arrival in Georgia had posed the question which occupied him during his ministry there and which now, on leaving it, obsessed him: "Does the Spirit of God bear witness with your spirit that you are a child of God?"³⁷ He continued his soul-searching, and was not at all happy with what he found there. His lament was perhaps best expressed in his sorrowful realization, "I went to America, to convert the Indians; but oh, who shall convert me?"³⁸

On February 1, 1738, Wesley landed again on English soil. At this point, though he later questioned these thoughts, he was convinced that he had never been converted. In an account of his reasoning on the matter he takes note of his scholarly accomplishments in the area of divinity, his good works, his sacrifices and concludes that he is still a child of wrath. He was convinced that his whole heart was "altogether corrupt and abominable" and that he had no hope except that of being justified, not by any claim of righteousness on his own part, but "that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."³⁹

Wesley went on to describe the kind of faith which he longed for and which he lacked:

The faith I want (the faith of a *son*) is 'a sure trust and confidence in God, that, through the merits of Christ, my sins are forgiven, and I reconciled to the favour of God.' I want that faith which St. Paul recommends to all the world, especially in his Epistle to the Romans: that faith which enables every one that hath it to cry out, 'I live not; but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me.'⁴⁰

The trials of Georgia had finalized the process which Susanna Wesley had initiated and facilitated in the Epworth parsonage, the breaking down of John's self-will. The fires of passion and even of spiritual initiative had burned him out, and he now felt himself to be a cold, dead cinder, a *resigned self* waiting for the Spirit of God to move in him and to warm his heart.

JUSTIFICATION WITHOUT JOY: THE ALDERSGATE CONVERSION

On his arrival back in England Wesley did not allow his intensive self-analysis to interfere with his continued work as a minister. He read prayers and counseled with travelers in the inns where he stayed during his journey to London. Though he had some wistful hopes of returning

to Georgia, he was soon to become convinced that England provided "heathen" enough without returning to the colony, and that an extraordinary ministry did not have to focus entirely on foreign missions. At this point, however, Wesley was too depressed and disoriented by his recent failures and his new realizations about himself to be much concerned with any grand designs.

He was gratified to find a warm welcome from numerous old friends, but it was the making of a new friend in the person of the Moravian Peter Bohler which was to prove most important in his continuing personal and theological development.⁴¹ Bohler and several of his friends had just arrived in London from Germany and, since they knew no one in England, Wesley assisted them in finding lodging for their stay. What Spangenberg had been to Wesley in Georgia, Bohler was to pick up and carry further in England.

It was quite natural that Bohler and Wesley immediately seemed to have an affinity for each other, since Bohler was on his way to a ministry in Georgia.⁴² The attraction on Wesley's part, however, went much deeper than that. He had continued to ruminate on the rocklike trust and assurance which appeared to be available to the Moravians he had met previously and which seemed to elude his grasp. Now he had an opportunity to continue his inquiries under the tutelage of Bohler. He told the Moravian of his experiences with the German community in Georgia and of his intention to visit Herrnhut the following summer. He lost no time in engaging this new spiritual advisor in extensive discussions of the nature of the soteriological economy. Bohler, after having had time to locate Wesley's particular stage of spiritual and theological development, proved himself to be a formidable judge of the remnants of Wesley's propensity to seek security through his own reason or righteousness. In Bohler Wesley had found for the first time a spiritual guide who rivaled his mother in intrusiveness. The German, like Susanna, presented a claim of total submission and obedience to the will of God. But in Bohler the demands were prefaced by a gentleness and warm acceptance which he had known, if at all, in the Epworth parsonage only *after* his "repentance."

Wesley was becoming more open to Bohler's message of "salvation by grace through faith," but still on the level of the abstract.⁴³ With regard to his own practice, he seemed to be convinced that when his preaching or spiritual counseling proved less than effective it was due to his own lack of discipline rather than anything more basic. Wesley's punitive conscience was still very much at work and the screws of repression remained as tight as ever. Nevertheless, Bohler's continual hammering at the necessity of saving faith, a present personal relationship with Christ through which one would *know* pardon and assurance and not merely speculate about it, had taken its toll on him. On Sunday,

March 5, 1738, John was finally totally and irrevocably convinced that he did not have the faith which was necessary for salvation. He had already realized this intellectually, but now it struck him with renewed force.

Immediately it struck into my mind, 'Leave off preaching. How can you preach to others, who have not faith yourself?' I asked Bohler whether he thought I should leave it off or not. He answered, 'By no means.' I asked, 'But what can I preach?' He said, 'Preach faith *till* you have it; and then, *because* you have it, you *will* preach faith.'⁴⁴

Here again Bohler was striking at the heart of Wesley's religious egoism. For the Moravian the power of God's word of grace had an objective reality and efficacious power that did not depend on the subjective condition of the preacher. Wesley was experiencing a great deal of resistance to this idea that God might use him without his own spiritual house being in obsessive and compulsive order. Nevertheless, he continued preaching in spite of his feelings of unworthiness.

Within a month Wesley had been convinced that Bohler's understanding of faith was fundamentally correct.⁴⁵ He had tested the Moravian's position by delving deeply into his own Greek New Testament and had found much evidence to support the new emphases. Bohler was directing him toward that kind of faith which he had said that he wanted, the faith of a *son*, and his objections were becoming fewer in number with each passing day. Yet he still had one principal problem with Bohler's point of view: he simply could not stomach the idea of "instantaneous" conversion.⁴⁶ Again he searched the scriptures and, to his amazement, he found a great deal of evidence for the existence of such conversions in the early Church. Bohler had backed him into a corner and John found that he had no defense left.⁴⁷ He was now clear about what he lacked and very depressed about his condition as he now understood it. He told his brother Charles about his new insights and found him still very resistant to the Moravian's point of view. Bohler, on the other hand, had not given up on the younger brother, and took his advocacy into combat with Charles' doubts. Again the intrusive German was not to be resisted and the reluctant Charles soon capitulated.⁴⁸

Bohler now felt that he had done all that was humanly possible to prepare the way for God's action in the lives of the Wesleys. He had stripped away their defenses with all the skill of a tender surgeon, and, from his point of view, they now stood naked awaiting a move only God could make. With his work with them complete, he left London to depart for his work in the new world.

The Moravian had done his work well, and Charles was the first to experience the results of his long and tedious teaching. The younger Wesley had been having periodic bouts of ill health, and was still bed-fast from one of his attacks when he experienced his conversion to a "saving faith."⁴⁹ John, however, was still without such an experience, and his depression continued without any relief. He continued his preaching, and continued to find that wherever he preached from his new understanding the pulpits were closed to him. Having achieved a state of resignation and submission, he now awaited *divine* initiative.

On May 24, 1738, he found the experience which he had been seeking. In the evening of that day he went without enthusiasm to a small group meeting which was located on Aldersgate Street. One of the members of the group was reading from Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans. When he came to the section which discusses the death of the old self and the fruits of the divinely-initiated faith in the life of the believer, Wesley took the message as a personal word from God.

About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death.⁵⁰

His temptations had not ended, however, and almost immediately he wondered why he was not experiencing *joy*.⁵¹ He was taught at that time that though joy usually accompanies the beginning of faith, it does not always do so. This eased his concern somewhat, but after returning home his fears continued. Now, rather than allowing himself to sink into a deep depression, he prayed for grace to assist him and found some solace.

And herein I found the difference between this and my former state chiefly consisted. I was striving, yea, fighting with all my might under the law, as well as under grace. But then I was sometimes, if not often, conquered; now, I was always conqueror.⁵²

A close reading of the journal, as we shall see below, raises real doubts as to whether Wesley was now "always conqueror." Still, there is little doubt that the experience was in fact an important one for Wesley. Popular Wesley biography has taken this event and interpreted it as *the* decisive event in Wesley's personal and spiritual development.⁵³ Wesley himself evidently wanted to present the experience as the occasion of a most significant upturn in his psychic and spiritual condition. We must inquire as to the nature of the change which had occurred.

From a psychohistorical perspective, this intense experience of the grace of God following so closely upon the failure of an important experiment and "grand act of penance" raises the question of the pos-

sible relationship between the failure and the forgiveness. Two failures of real magnitude to John had occurred in Georgia. He had failed to carry out his extraordinary ministry to the heathen, thus aborting his project of penance to the paternal authority. Maternal expectations of an extraordinary role for him had also been thwarted by this contingency, and, in addition, his unexpected struggle with the carnal was a head-on conflict with maternal prohibitions. We have noted above that Susanna was satisfied with a child's obedience of her rules, and granted approval even of a failure when good intentions were manifest. Samuel, on the other hand, was mysteriously ambivalent and often made fun of John precisely *because* he kept the rules and obeyed so well. Samuel took no note whatever of "good intentions," and even a successful carrying out of an act of penance could not be depended upon to effect a reconciliation with the capricious father. Samuel simply did not have the charity, as John had put it, which was due even to "wicked persons."⁵⁴

It is significant that the qualities which Samuel lacked were precisely those which Wesley had come to attribute to the heavenly father. At an early age he had formulated an understanding that justification is made possible solely through the merits of Christ. But his understanding of faith was conceived of as an intellectual assent rather than as a personal relationship of trust. The emphasis was put on the fundamental necessity of the subjugation of the will, purity of intention, and fulfilling the law. He had committed himself to seek total devotion and obedience and to prove himself worthy of receiving the benefits of the sacrifice of Christ. But just as he had difficulty knowing where he stood with his earthly father—even when he had done his very best—he continued to be possessed by fear that he had not yet pleased his heavenly father either.

Georgia had intensified his feelings of inadequacy and his fear that all of his works and feigned righteousness would meet only with God's wrath. He had found his will far more infected with carnality than he had previously believed, and now his hope that he might find favor with God was greatly weakened. It was not until he had continued his learning from the Moravians under the tutelage of Bohler that his image of God began to change. Now a different kind of faith seemed to become a possibility, that of a *son* rather than a servant. We should remember in this context that reconciliation with Samuel had always required John's serving him as a scribe, or working on some other task which the father assigned. The new image of God, facilitated by Bohler and actualized in the Aldersgate experience, was of a heavenly father who was not only trustworthy, but whose love reached out to man, even in his imperfection, and made man *want* to obey him. After Aldersgate Wesley was no longer inhibited by a capricious, unloving, unreasonable father. He now

had a heavenly father who was not only just, but loving and gracious. The demand of the drudgeries of constantly proving oneself, and doing penance after having failed, seemed to have been replaced by an opportunity for joyous obedience.

From the psychohistorical perspective it is clear that one can discern in the superstructures of the new soteriological economy elements of the moral order of Susanna's nursery. For if the potency of the capricious paternal authority had finally been laid to rest, that of the maternal authority not only continued in the form of a search for a providential role, but also was transformed and elevated into the demanding, yet gracious, image of the heavenly father.⁵⁵ The issue of initiative vs. guilt had been resolved, not through rebellion against authority, but in submission to it and identification with it. The "face" or image of authority was altered so that it *deserved* obedience. There was now no *good* reason to resist it. The intrusive authority had been welcomed into his being to replace his "perverted" will. Whereas before good works were a burden which might or might not elicit an expression of approval and favor from the divine authority, now the expression of encouragement and favor preceded the works and his initiative was far less inhibited by feelings of fear and acute uncertainty. His self-will and perverted initiative had led to failure in Georgia. Yet in a manner reminiscent of the Epworth nursery, when his good intentions and repentance were presented to the relevant authority he found pardon, and in that pardon he had concrete evidence that he was a son and not just a servant.

CONFIRMATION

The absence of joy in Wesley's experience after Aldersgate is an indication of dynamics left unchanged by the "conversion." His obsessive-compulsive over-controlling style with regard to what he considered as being permissible expressions of will, including feelings, remained intact. He continued to be suspicious of taking pleasure in anything which was not completely innocuous. For him the adjudication of what qualified under this rubric was determined by the question of whether the enjoyment was directly related to his religious mission. In this sense, then, the law—both psychological and theological—was still functional, and rigorous obedience was seen as a natural outgrowth of an experience of justification by grace through faith. It is not surprising that Wesley had little room in his heart for the joy which he wanted so much to experience. For him real religious commitment issued in a radical seriousness, and Wesley continued to be suspicious of anyone who manifested the least lightheartedness.⁵⁶ Now he felt he had "peace with

God," but "the enemy injected a fear, 'If thou dost believe, why is there not a more sensible change?' "⁵⁷ As the days passed he became more and more concerned about his lack of a continuing experience of joy. Was something wrong? Bohler had taught him that justification would bring with it a full experience of assurance and accompanying joy. He finally decided that he would embark on his planned trip to Herrnhut to see if he could find some answers there.

Through a visit with Count Zinzendorf at Marienborn and a number of the Moravian brethren at Herrnhut he found a rationale under which he could accept his continuing lack of joy without questioning his experience of justification. They assured him that a weak faith was still faith, and that the experience of the full fruits of that new trust in God might take a while to develop.⁵⁸ Now he was confident that he had an adequate theological explanation for what he experienced during the doldrums which followed Aldersgate.

In spite of his new intellectual rationale, however, he continued to be troubled by his lack of joy and a felt love for God. Although on his return to England he had continued preaching the "glad tidings of salvation," he was agonizing in private.⁵⁹ He still felt that he had been truly pardoned and saw evidence that in spite of what he lacked on the experiential level, the grace of God was present and seemed to use him more than ever. On September 30th he had had the surprising and encouraging experience of helping a man to face the depths of his wickedness and to receive pardon.⁶⁰ The man had shown evidence of a total change in the orientation of his life, and, probably more important to John, had begun to experience the joy of his newfound trust in God. A little more than a week later Wesley read a book which no doubt magnified in his mind the significance of the conversion which he had helped to bring about. As Wesley put it in his journal entry, "In walking I read the truly surprising narrative of the conversions lately wrought in and about the town of Northampton, in New England. Surely 'this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.' "⁶¹ He took an abstract from this account by Jonathan Edwards and included it in a letter to a friend. The friend's response initiated another crisis of self-doubt in Wesley that rivaled any that he had had before in severity. Following St. Paul's directive to "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith," Wesley asked himself once more the ways in which he was "a new creature" and found himself lacking.⁶² Although he had some of the "fruit of the Spirit," he could not find the presence of other important qualities, among them the love of God and joy.

He was stuck in a spiritual rut. Bohler's formula had not worked. Assurance and confirmation that his ministry was truly of God would have to come from some other source than his internal state. At this point we should remember that from an Eriksonian perspective it is not

enough for a young man to find an integrating ideology. He must find an institution, a role through which his embryonic identity can find social sanction and support. We have seen above that for Wesley the providential role had long been an object of first priority in his search for selfhood. The account of the exciting events in New England suggested a possible role for him, but his continuing spiritual crisis raised a serious question as to whether or not one with his shortcomings could be used by God in such a wondrous way. It was not until George Whitefield's return from America that the opportunity to test his role as the leader of a revival would present itself.

Whitefield was convinced that the time had come for the revival to begin in England, and had initiated a series of services among the Bristol colliers. When it became necessary for him to leave the Bristol area, he pressed Wesley to take his place in the field-preaching. Wesley was highly resistant to the idea. The practice was very irregular, and particularly repugnant to the more conservative principles of his brother Charles.⁶³ His brother sought to keep him from accepting the invitation, and John's reaction to this pressure was a revealing one. He entered into his journal at that point the letter which he had previously written to his father to explain his decision to reject the Epworth living. In that letter he had contrasted the relative claims of the authority of a parent with those of a call of Providence.⁶⁴ The entry was a clear indication that the opportunity for an extraordinary role would take precedence over any authority which was of man. In one of his letters written from Herrnhut he had affirmed that he would call no man master in faith, practice, or discipline.⁶⁵ This affirmation in truth covered his father, Count Zinzendorf, his brothers, and later, the bishops of the Anglican Church. He had had, in fact, only one earthly master—Susanna—and he had by now so thoroughly internalized the structures, values, and intentions of her authority that he was soon to become her spiritual parent, and, more important, that of thousands of his fellow Englishmen.

Finally, after having convinced his colleagues at London that he should accept Whitefield's invitation, he departed for Bristol. Arriving there on March 31, 1739, he found himself still a little troubled at the prospect of field-preaching. In the evening of the following day he led a society in an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. In a revealing comment he noted that these passages would serve as a "remarkable precedent" for field-preaching.⁶⁶ Earlier in his pilgrimage he had identified with Paul the Apostle.⁶⁷ Now he was identifying with the person and ministry of Jesus. The beginning of the following important entry indicates with little room for doubt that in his resignation and submission he had been clearing the way for his exaltation into a most extraordinary ministry:

Mon. 2—At four in the afternoon I submitted to be more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation, speaking from a little eminence in a ground adjoining to the city, to about three thousand people. The scripture on which I spoke was this (is it possible any one should be ignorant that it is fulfilled in every true minister of Christ?), 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor. He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted; to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovery of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.'⁶⁸

His identification with Jesus had not begun and would not end here. He had had his temptation in the wilderness, had been claimed as a son, and now preached his own sermon on a mount. His need to enter the comment regarding the fulfillment of the scripture in the life of every true minister probably indicates that he had an uneasy awareness of the degree of his identification. When John the Baptist had inquired of Jesus whether or not he was the expected one, the scriptural account in Matthew 11:2-5 portrays Jesus as pointing to the concrete manifestations of his ministry as proof that it had been confirmed by God. In the following month Wesley too was to have his evidence. Great crowds were coming to hear him preach. He was treated like a saint and even acknowledged as a prophet. But more than that, many persons were convicted of their sins, repented, and found peace and joy through their new faith.⁶⁹ In a letter to his brother Samuel written on May 10th his new conviction that his work had been found favorable in God's sight is evident.

I am one of many witnesses of this matter of fact, that God does now make good His promise daily, very frequently during a representation (how made I know not, but not to the outward eye) of Christ either hanging on the cross or standing on the right hand of God. And this I know to be of God, because from that hour the person so affected is a new creature both as to his inward tempers and outward life.⁷⁰

He goes on to relate the conversion of John Haydon who, like many others, had found both joy and love through his ministry. Haydon had been converted by simply *reading* one of Wesley's sermons. The reviving impact of these events upon Wesley is evident in the closing paragraph of the letter. John states that his health, which had bothered him a good deal in earlier years, was now as good as it had been at any time in his memory. The revival had begun, and Wesley himself had been revived in a remarkable way. Bohler had told him that he should preach faith until he had it, but he had failed in this. Now he had preached faith until *others* had it, and the assurance which he could not gain through a

sensible change in himself he now gleaned from that which his ministry was facilitating in the lives of others.

It is evident that here at Bristol Wesley had found the long-sought "providential role" and the necessary confirmation of the extraordinary personal and professional identity which had been his life-long goal. Let us examine some of the factors which made this role seem so acceptable to him. If Aldersgate had marked the end of the inhibiting effects of the paternal authority, it did not do away with the necessity of dealing with parental identifications. It is perhaps significant to note that his father had also engaged in fantasies of becoming a traveling evangelist in the British Indies.⁷¹ His paternal grandfather had in fact been an itinerant preacher who engaged in an irregular ministry and came into conflict with ecclesiastical authority. By engaging in field-preaching, Wesley was able to claim a role which represented a positive identification with his father and which, in its "irregular" style, reenacted the life and style of religious leadership of his paternal grandfather. The role, given its similarity to traditional dissent, was, in effect, an affirmation not only of the negative identity of the father (who converted from dissent), but also of those tendencies of Susanna toward irregular behavior in the dissenting mode.⁷²

Therefore Wesley had found a role which enabled him to integrate identifications gleaned from two generations of his family, which manifested his sense of being different and "special," and which challenged him to use the skills of leadership which had long been cultivated by him.

The enthusiastic responses of the masses had convinced him that he had finally found God's will for him, and, in Eriksonian terms, had *confirmed* him in his new social role.⁷³ Not only had *he* come to view himself as an evangelist, but the fact that others responded to his leadership provided concrete evidence that he was correct in viewing himself in this way. His resignation and submission to the internalized maternal authority had enabled him to be exalted, and his initiative, self-will, and desire for love and intimacy were so sublimated into his religious work that he could find at least partial gratification of these previously conflict-inducing needs. If he still could not "take fire into his bosom and not be burnt," at least he could kindle it in the hearts of others and warm his own hands and heart vicariously through proximity to and participation in their newfound love and joy.

In conclusion we might ask why Wesley's message seemed to strike such a responsive chord in the hearts of thousands of his countrymen. If some had had the same type of over-controlling, close-binding mother that Susanna represented, the answer would seem obvious: that Wesley's message seemed congruent with their own experience and hence was easily accepted by them. Yet many, indeed most of his responses during the early years of his ministry came from the ranks of the lower classes.⁷⁴

His journal entries and letters written during this period are replete with accounts, for example, of tears of joy rolling down the coal-blackened cheeks of hardened miners. These "colliers" were widely considered to be the savages of the English society of the time, and it is very doubtful that the intrusive style of child-rearing was prevalent among them.⁷⁵ It seems more likely that the bulk of his audiences had known the terror and uncertainty of childhoods spent with not only harsh and distant, but capricious and ambivalent parental authority. If this were the case, then Wesley's choice of the intrusive, yet fair and consistent order offered by Susanna may be significant in another way. Perhaps the moral order of the Epworth nursery writ-large in Wesley's theology and preaching offered the masses an experience with parental authority (albeit divine rather than human) which they in fact had *never had*, and which, given the frightening experiences of their own childhoods, indeed seemed to be almost unbelievably good news.

Robert L. Moore is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies at Western Illinois University in Macomb, Illinois, and is presently working on a full-length psychohistory of John Wesley.

REFERENCES

1. Albert Outler (ed.), *John Wesley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964) p. 37.
2. Nehemiah Curnock (ed.), *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (London: Robert Culley, 1909), Vol. III, pp. 34-39. (Hereafter cited as *Journal* with acc. notation of volume).
3. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
11. Adam Clarke, *Memoirs of the Wesley Family, Collected from Original Documents* (London: J. Kershaw, 1823), Vol. I, p. 282.
12. Quoted in Rebecca Lamar Harmon, *Susanna: Mother of the Wesleys* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), p. 53.
13. Cf. the similar dynamics discussed in Richard Bushman, "Jonathan Edwards as Great Man: Identity, Conversion, and Leadership in the Great Awakening," *Soundings*, 52 (Spring, 1969), 15-44.
14. G. Elsie Harrison, *Son to Susanna* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1938), p. 35.
15. V. H. H. Green, *The Young Mr. Wesley* (London: Edward Arnold, 1961), p. 54.
16. See her tactics in handling Samuel as manifest in her letter to him written on February 6, 1712, and quoted in Clarke, *op. cit.*, pp. 328-332.

17. See the account of this struggle in Green, *op. cit.*, pp. 241-247.
18. Maldwyn Edwards, *Family Circle: A Study of the Epworth Household in Relation to John and Charles Wesley* (London: The Epworth Press, 1949), pp. 50-52.
19. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
20. See the chart listing the births and deaths of the nineteen Wesley children in Harmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.
21. Cf. the similar dynamics discussed in Albert J. Lubin, *Stranger on the Earth: A Psychological Biography of Vincent Van Gogh* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972), pp. 88-90. The theme of the significance of the deceased sibling is an important thread in Lubin's interpretive narrative.
22. See, for example, the struggle between John and Samuel which centered on the father's "uncharitable" treatment of Wesley's sister Hetty in Green, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-111.
23. Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
24. Green, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
26. Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
27. John Telford (ed.), *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (London: The Epworth Press, 1931), Vol. I, p. 189. (Hereafter cited as *Letters* with acc. notation of volume).
28. John Wesley's strict application of ecclesiastical discipline in the primitive setting of Georgia is reminiscent of the behavior of his father in the Epworth parish.
29. *Letters*, I, p. 199.
30. *Journal*, I, pp. 291-294.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 290.
32. See the summary of the relationship with Sophy in Martin Schmidt, *John Wesley: A Theological Biography*, Vol. I (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), pp. 195-209.
33. Erik H. Erikson, *Identity and the Life Cycle* (New York: International Universities Press, 1959), pp. 74-82.
34. *Journal*, I, p. 109.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 422-423.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 143.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 418.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 423-424.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 424.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 436.
42. *Ibid.*
43. *Ibid.*, p. 440.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 442.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 454.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 454-455.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 459.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 464.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 475-476.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 476.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 477.
53. Outler, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
54. During the dispute with his father concerning the latter's harsh treatment of Hetty, John had preached a pointed sermon from his father's pulpit which

- was entitled: "Universal Charity or the Charity due to Wicked Persons." See Edwards, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-160.
55. Cf. the similar issues discussed in James E. Dittes' article, "Continuities Between the Life and Thought of Augustine," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 5 (Fall, 1965), 130-141.
 56. *Letters*, I, p. 258.
 57. *Journal*, I, p. 478.
 58. *Journal*, II, pp. 13-63.
 59. *Ibid.*, pp. 89-91.
 60. *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.
 61. *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.
 62. *Ibid.*, p. 89.
 63. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
 64. *Ibid.*, pp. 159-166.
 65. *Letters*, I, p. 252.
 66. *Journal*, II, p. 168.
 67. This identification with Paul the Apostle is particularly noticeable in the two letters written from Herrnhut on August 4, 1738. See *Letters*, I, pp. 252-254.
 68. *Journal*, II, pp. 172-173.
 69. *Ibid.*, p. 173-192.
 70. *Letters*, I, pp. 308-310.
 71. Samuel Wesley was continually trying to formulate plans for "mission work" through which he could escape his exile at Epworth. See the discussion in Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
 72. Some of Susanna's activities at Epworth had earned her criticism for leaning toward irregular ecclesiastical practices. See Clarke, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-332.
 73. See the discussion of identity formation in Erikson, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.
 74. Bernard Semmel, *The Methodist Revolution* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 9.
 75. See the discussion of eighteenth-century childhood by Bogna W. Lorence in this issue of *History of Childhood Quarterly*. The terms "ambivalent" and "intrusive" for major modes of child-rearing are from Lloyd deMause, "The Evolution of Childhood," in Lloyd deMause, editor, *The History of Childhood* (New York: The Psychohistory Press, 1974).

FROM THE SOURCES

The Child in the Cradle:

"... is wayward and full of affections, which though his body be small, yet he hath a great heart, and is altogether inclined to evil: and the more he waxeth in reason by years, the more he groweth proud, forward, willful, unruly and disobedient. If this spark be suffered to increase, it will rage over and burn down the whole house."

Robert Cleaver, *A godlie forme of householde government* . . . (London, 1598), p. 294.

THE ABOLITION OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN NEW JERSEY SCHOOLS

DONALD R.
RAICHLE

In 1867 New Jersey became the first state to abolish corporal punishment in its schools by statute and remained the *only* state to do so for more than a hundred years. Not until 1972 when Massachusetts passed equivalent legislation was she emulated by any sister state.¹ The unique statutory restraint in New Jersey appeared as a relatively minor element of a wide-reaching law which sought to strengthen a school system that had not yet attained development comparable to that of other states. Not that the legislature went very far, for even in 1867 the law neither compelled the establishment of schools nor children to attend them. Still, the additional funds provided, state-wide coordination, and more sophisticated administration showed that New Jersey had embarked on its most ambitious state school project up to that time. New Jersey's reluctance to provide the educational system sought by the schoolmen was pointed up in the addition of the ban on corporal punishment to the then new school law. It was no coincidence that the statutory ban came exclusively in New Jersey; it illustrated the gap between the schoolmen on the one hand and the citizens and legislators on the other. For, however popular the ban may have been among parents it found virtually no support among educators.

Of course, the mitigation of corporal punishment *per se* was nothing new as the nineteenth century progressed. Throughout the country schools increasingly found themselves circumscribed in the time-hon-

ored use of the rod. The unique feature in New Jersey was the prohibition by statute rather than the more familiar state or local school board regulation. Whatever the method, Americans grew increasingly reluctant to wreak physical pain routinely on their children. Lloyd deMause, arguing a progressive improvement in child care through two thousand years of Western history,² is certainly borne out in the United States experience. In colonial Connecticut and Massachusetts, the penalty for disobedience of the parent could reach as far as capital punishment.³ Family and state united in grim refusal to tolerate rebellion from the young. That American settlement coincided with the development of the Enlightenment induced progressive distaste for disciplining children by inflicting physical pain. DeMause finds that of over two hundred statements of advice on child-rearing prior to the eighteenth century, most approved beating children severely, while only three forbade beating altogether. The earliest lives of children who may never have been beaten, he puts in the period 1690-1750.⁴ America swung away from the corporal tradition much more than did England as the experience of the two peoples widened.

THE AMERICAN HOME

From the first, the American experience corroded forms brought from the European past. The "patriarchal" family apparently was not nearly so extensive in kinship group as earlier had been thought, yet it contained within it, for the most part, the educational functions later assumed by the school. Elementary socialization as well as vocational education had been the responsibility of the colonial family and, as Bernard Bailyn shows, the education of children extended to family, church, and community in a continuous web until the American Revolution.

With the disruption of the old order, the movement of the child from the family out into society becomes sharper, losing the earlier ease and naturalness⁵ and inviting, particularly in an increasingly mobile society, anxiety on part of both child and parent. By the early Jacksonian period this break was best illustrated by the child's entry into school.

The patriarch himself, of course, had begun to disappear. Tocqueville observes that "the family in the Roman and aristocratic signification of the word, does not exist" in the United States and that as the psychological distance between family members lessens, so, too, with parental authority at the same time that the father develops more intimate and affectionate relations with his children.⁶ No wonder Frances Grund, Marryat, Dickens and Sir Charles Lyell, along with other British travelers found in American schools an air of permissiveness which they

put down to "republican spirit", a term they equate with hostility to authority.⁷ Arthur W. Calhoun made the nineteenth century a revolution in the status of the child with increasing valuation of him, leading to the "reign of youth" and the "century of the child."⁸ The most repeated consensus of British travelers was that the American character itself was the character of the child.⁹

John F. Walzer has shown the eighteenth century in America to be a period of ambivalence in the development of the child¹⁰ and although the nineteenth century was different in many ways, ambivalence continues and, of course, reaches to our own times. There is not one but rather a range of patterns. Still if crusty John Adams, as vice president of the United States, could be prevailed upon by his grandson to draw him about in a chair for a half-hour, to the delight of grandfather and the derangement of Abigail Adams' carpet, one can more readily appreciate Tocqueville's comment that in early America even those of the most conservative persuasion invited from their children addresses of easy, colloquial familiarity.¹¹ The trend was clear in the age of Jackson, even to the point that the concept of the "developmental" child as the sociologist sees him today had begun to supplant the "traditional" concept of childhood. The "traditional" child as seen in the twentieth century keeps clean and neat, obeys, pleases, and respects adults, respects property and so on. The "developmental" child is healthy, co-operative, happy, contented, loves and confides in his parents, "grows as a person" and so on.¹² Now although the study setting forth this dichotomy was made about the time of World War II, some of these same elements in the concept of childhood were vying with one another in Jacksonian America. "Kisses, hugs, and frequent embraces were recommended [by the popular writers on child nurture of the time] and the mother's kisses were given magical power over the child's destiny." To be sure, the substitution of love and example for authority and precept in the early period aimed essentially at producing a child who would obey, respect, and please adults, but it also contained wider objectives. The child was expected to love back and "confide" and, Bernard Wishy notes, to develop his own free individualism. Fundamentally, those travelers to America who spoke of "the republican spirit" in American childhood were observing the beginnings of the developmental child. America in the nineteenth century wrestled with the conflict of attempting to pass on its heritage of Christian morality and faith in democratic ideals in much the same form it knew them both while at the same time to allow for the contradictory development of the free individual, eager to carve his own destiny in his own way.¹³ In homes where the old orthodoxies like infant depravity came to be replaced by an image of the child set off with almost limitless expectations, the need to flog the future rested on shakier and shakier philosophical ground.

The child appeared with less sin and the parents with more hope. So corporal punishment began to play a smaller, but still significant role in the American home. Even Bronson Alcott, philosophically as well as temperamentally opposed to physical punishment, spanked his growing daughters as "a last resort".¹⁴ Where the gentle Alcott fell back on the traditional methods, we may be sure that few of his contemporaries showed greater restraint. On the other hand, a new emphasis on alternatives after Beccaria and Bentham appear: "isolation, maintenance of physical decencies, reflection on the crime, change of heart, return to society."¹⁵

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL

The classic notion of the place of corporal punishment in the nineteenth century American school is summed up in the opening page of Edward Eggleston's *The Hoosier School-Master* published in 1871. The local trustee issued the young, slightly-built teacher aspirant a stern warning.

Want to become a school-master, do you? You? Well, what would *you* do in the Flat Creek deestrick, *I'd* like to know? Why, the boys have driv off the last two, and licked the one afore them like blazes. . . . They'd pitch you out of doors, sonny, neck and heels, afore Christmas.¹⁶

The great thing about this for the boys was that it was often a heads-I-win, tails-you-lose for them. If one bested the teacher, he was immortal but even if he took a beating, he was a kind of hero simply because he had engaged the enemy. But the free, mutual exchange of blows could be engaged in, obviously, only by the older boys. More typically, the teacher was schoolmaster of the physical encounter quite as much, or even more than he was master of the knowledge he engaged to teach. Nathan Hedges, the dean of teachers of the state at the time New Jersey legislated an end to corporal punishment, was as famed for his ability with the rod as for his teaching. One source, crediting him with having taught "most of the men in Newark who were in active business" at the close of the century, adds that they "doubtless held him in awe to the latest moment of his life."¹⁷ Hedges himself had felt the rod cruelly when, in 1799 as a boy of seven in a school outside Morristown, he studied under a master known as "Clubber Blair." In 1865 Hedges recalled the barbarities of the classroom he had known.

I well remember that when I could not multiply by even one figure, he would give me a sum in multiplication, with four figures for a multiplier, and from day to day would pound my bare feet with his hickory club for not doing the sum correctly. He furnished no help, no instruction, no kind encouragement to a beginner, but relied entirely on the severity of his punishment. Children in those days were not allowed to complain to parents of the unreasonable severity of teachers.¹⁸

No "Clubber Blair" himself, Hedges developed his own, ruthlessly playful style. He ordered the pupil to be chastised to line up his toes on a crack in the floor, to bend over, to touch another crack with his fingers and then, whack! Remembered by a former pupil, such an exercise was "fun" for the veterans in the class but an abomination for him who was being baptized into the rite. The aura of "fun" that Hedges infused into this punishment appears in a variation, cheerfully known as "Going to London." The victim was forced to crawl, on hands and knees, under the legs of the schoolmaster who stood like the Colossus of Rhodes, feet wide apart to permit the passage, meanwhile rewarding the victim with a shower of blows. Nor was there any escape in an attempt to scoot through in a hurry; the burst of speed merely caused the schoolmaster's legs to close and pin the victim while the punishment proceeded at leisure. On one occasion a particularly muscular lad, held fast by the schoolmaster's legs, simply stood up and toppled Colossus in what was surely the high point of delight in the school careers of those students present. Hedges must have been a very considerable man merely to live down the story. However little the redoubtable Hedges amused his victims with his lighthearted approach, he seems infinitely less menacing than another Newark teacher, the physician William P. P. Sanford, who simply smiled grimly as he brought down the rattan.¹⁹

No one speaks of any restraint on the part of Hedges; his students remembered the dramatic and told stories for effect. His remark that in his boyhood pupils could not complain of undue severity suggests that by mid-century they could and did. But they probably did not have to complain about him; he knew and felt affection for his pupils as his speech at Elizabeth in 1847 shows.²⁰ His overriding reputation, in the profession and outside it, the reputation that brought the sons of his former pupils to his private school, argues that the man had more good sense than muscle. It argues, too, that Hedges could do what many schoolteachers could not. To explain why Americans have been and are less willing than their English cousins to expose their children to school whipping, M. A. Eckstein has written that the English have more confidence in the competence of their teachers, which may well provide more sanction for corporal punishment than in America where "the

teacher's status is subject, not superior or independent, not professional." As Edgar W. Knight put it, "the American school-teacher as a type has a shady past."²¹ Knight referred to early nineteenth century schoolmasters who were often shiftless, lazy and even inebriate. Moreover, in England the traditional independence of the school as an authority for the proper ways of educating the young is entrenched as it has not been in the American experience. There is also in the English tradition a rather clear mutual understanding of the procedures used. Exceptions notwithstanding, a proper caning is a proper caning wherein a familiar, however formidable, weapon is applied to the buttocks. Americans, more individualist, used a larger variety of weapons in a variety of ways, thereby increasing the anxieties of the equally individualist parent. At least one Teachers Institute sought to set forth some ground rules, forbidding such practices as blows to the head, pulling the ear or hair, etc.²² In addition to these considerations, there are the somewhat different perceptions of the English and the Americans as to just who it is they discipline. A more class structured society the more easily accepted the role of the "master" in the authority role.

In nineteenth century America, the Calvinist view of man as corrupt continuously gave ground to the Enlightenment view of human perfectability. Horace Mann, defending his advice to minimize the use of corporal punishment, shrewdly seized upon his opponent's belief in infant depravity to discredit him. Mann knew how to appeal to his constituency, by citing infant depravity he could put down his opponent by tying him to a discredited concept.²³ The Enlightenment view directly fed into the schools Rousseau's doctrines of "natural goodness" through Pestalozzi and his followers. By the end of the century, the "child study" movement had clearly projected an image of a child to be loved, not beaten. And, of course, it was those American parents who were least likely to use corporal punishment at home who pushed the fight against it in the schools. As a former president of the Newark Board of Education noted in 1893, not only do parents not rebuke their children, they do not wish them rebuked. "We have homes," he said, "in every part of the city where the children have no home government whatever but where the slightest interference of the liberty of the child at school is resented."²⁴

Bronson Alcott, beginning his teaching in a Connecticut district school in 1823, stepped completely out of the role of the ferule-bearing schoolmaster and anticipated Charles Silberman by establishing a classroom that was not without joy. Remembering that his ungraded classroom contained about eighty children of varying ages, his achievement was no mean one. Unhappily for both children and Alcott he was premature; the community wanted no such school and Alcott was dismissed.²⁵

As the nineteenth century progressed, the trauma of the child stepping from the nuclear family to the outer community seemed to increase with the development of the school system. Less and less was the American prepared to surrender *carte blanche* his parental rights to the school no matter what the common law might hold. Increasing development of the schools by no means increased the confidence of parents that the same love and warmth that he sought to provide in his home flourished in the schoolroom. Two years after the close of the Civil War, the new edition of the popular textbook on school teaching by David Page still alluded to the fact that corporal punishment in the schools was "debated with great zeal and warmth in almost every educational meeting that is held." An ex-principal of the Albany State Normal School, Page was no doubt the veteran of many such meetings and he exemplifies the most common approach of the educational community—the teachers and the administrators—to corporal punishment.

First, there must be qualifications: in Page's case he cautioned against ever using corporal punishment harshly, never in the heat of passion, always in public in order that the pupil may not later misrepresent the incident to the detriment of the teacher (addressing himself to teachers, Page is at least as much concerned with the protection of the teacher as he is of the child), delay the punishment so that there can be no doubt that anger has subsided and use the proper instrument—a light ruler for the hand, a rod for the back and lower extremities. Second, there are no suitable alternatives. Confinement (isolation) is not possible, for example, in a one-room schoolhouse, and expulsion only deprives the child who most needs it from the school which is the means to provide him with correction. Page admits that there are better ways, but none so promising that corporal punishment can be abandoned entirely for the child must be brought to obey.²⁶ On the primal need for obedience—the community insistence on the preservation of the heritage—there was little dissent. But if obedience was elemental, so too, was the heritage of freedom. Foes of corporal punishment argued that it could not develop the moral character consistent with liberty. Lyman Cobb's book attacking corporal punishment is full of this argument but Morrill Wyman sums it up best. "American youth for the reason that they are born to an inheritance of unparalleled individual freedom, stand in peculiar need of the early acquisition of a reverence for law and its administrators."²⁷

Lyman Cobb who wrote what Bernard Wishy has called an "influential book" on "the evil tendencies of capital punishment" illustrates the foe of corporal punishment. Typically, he called for its diminution, not its extinction. Repelled by the harshness and the routine nature of whipping both in homes and schools, Cobb devoted half of his book to pointing out the shortcomings of whipping and attempting to forestall

his opponents, the other half to alternative methods. Cobb accepted corporal punishment as "a last resort."²⁸ Aimed at the home, Cobb's approach had a great deal of merit; parents could be introduced to alternatives that, left to their own devices, might not have occurred to most of them. Less effective was the thrust at the school where, not only was the policeman, judge, jury, and executioner all the same person, but no blood relation to the accused. Where such authority was being routinely abused, Cobb and others had their work cut out to stop it. One attempt to balance the scales, however ineffectual, was the requirement to record each instance of whipping in order to allow some oversight.²⁹

Opponents of corporal punishment made what they could of sex differences—both of teacher and pupil. Cobb cited a New York superintendent of schools who would not subject "delicate females" (teachers) to the unpleasant task and trial of physical strength.³⁰ A minority report of the Massachusetts Education Committee in 1867 thought women teachers, being "more excitable", would be protected from wrong by a ban on corporal punishment.³¹ But the stronger case, of course, rested on the prohibition of the whipping of girl students, more apt to suffer injustice, it was argued, from unwise teachers, as girls were "more sensitive, more excitable, more subject to change and diseased actions during their school life."³² Indeed, why flog a creature who "instinctively knows that upon the good impression she makes on others is based her hopes for the future"?³³

The extent to which the daily clash of egos entered into school whippings is illustrated in the case of a girl in a Massachusetts school who whispered and, as she was thought to be defiant, sent by her teacher, a woman, to the recitation room to be whipped. The teacher could not hold her so the principal instructed her to get another woman teacher to help. This made the whipping possible but the girl screamed and brought an angered principal to the scene in person. He proceeded to whip the girl until she stopped screaming after which he left in triumph but the teacher told the girl she had "submitted" to the principal and now she would have to "submit" to the two women. So a third beating ensued. An investigating committee, looking into corporal punishment, found, in this instance, no "improper" motive.³⁴ As one of the contemporary reformers pointed out, a young woman could receive punishment by a man in the public schools of Massachusetts which could not legally be inflicted in a state penitentiary or, if inflicted by a husband on his wife, would be cause for divorce.³⁵

No doubt one of the factors checking corporal punishment was the feminization of the teaching profession. Early nineteenth century schools employed men during the winter terms, but in the summer when the older children were busy with farm chores, women served to teach

the younger ones. The call for increasing numbers of teachers with the rise of the public schools revolutionized the system. School systems quickly learned that the same low salaries that attracted few capable young men brought large numbers of quite capable young women. By no means excluding corporal punishment entirely, women probably tended to emphasize it less, partly because they encountered grave disadvantage in physical confrontation with adolescent boys, but also because it was considered less seemly in their sex. This is not to say women were inferior to men as disciplinarians or even thought so by school officials. In the mid-nineteenth century, the state superintendent of schools surveyed the New Jersey school officials to find men only "slightly" preferred to women as disciplinarians. Successive city superintendents in Newark staffed its schools for incorrigibles with women exclusively.³⁶ Sometimes, women abandoned flogging but were nonetheless corporal as was Marion Patton, a teacher in Camden, who in 1892 disciplined an occasional unruly youngster by popping a handful of pepper in his mouth. Her defense at the hands of her principal significantly illustrates the great quality of loyalty within professions. He explained that she used neither red pepper nor ginger, only black pepper, and by the handful, never a whole pot, and added that by the practice some of his "wildest boys had been tamed into obedience."³⁷

Testimony of the recipients of the beatings reveals interesting, if predictable, patterns. Sado-masochism emerges in John Griscom, an associate high school principal from New York, who wrote Lyman Cobb that he remembered as a child "having, after a well-merited flagellation from my father, felt a glow of regard for him, far beyond what I had enjoyed while in a state of rebellious feeling. . . ." As a teacher, Griscom had seen the same phenomenon in pupils.³⁸ One father beat his son with such severity that the family physician had to intercede.³⁹ Cobb reported a little girl who had never before either been whipped nor seen anyone whipped develop a "frightful and alarming tremor" terrifying both her teacher and the other pupils.⁴⁰ Apparently not unusual was the lad who shrugged that it was worth a licking to go fishing.⁴¹ Another reported that he was completely paralyzed by the threat of flogging and, although he knew his lessons, could never say them and so he was flogged daily. There was no relief for him until he was transferred to another school.⁴² Toward the close of the century, one school observer reported a story illustrating the most complete flight to fantasy. A boy described a schoolmate, Harry Custer, the son of a cowboy, a fourth-grader who owned a revolver and shot and killed another boy. When the teacher threatened to whip Harry he held her off with his revolver. Harry Custer, of course, was wholly a figment of the boy's imagination.⁴³

Richard Henry Dana exemplifies the "battered child" that resulted from the unrestrained use of force on schoolchildren.⁴⁴ At the age of

seven Richard was provoked by another boy to laughter as he was reciting. Rebuked, he could not control himself and had his ear pulled. Twice more his tormenter succeeded in making him laugh and each time the enraged teacher spent more force on the ear, the last time tearing the skin connecting it to the head. Richard's father later succeeded in bringing an end to ear pulling in the school, leaving discipline to be handled by the ferule. But young Richard some years later experienced an even more harrowing episode which he recorded himself.

Mr. W. kept [school] but a fortnight. He was very unfortunate in all his plans and notions. He also inflicted some violent corporal punishments. One inflicted upon myself was the cause of his being turned out of office.

He (the schoolmaster) had placed me in the middle of the floor for some offence or other, and my station being near the stove, and the room very hot, I became faint and asked to be allowed to go out and gave my reason, but to no purpose. In a few minutes we had our usual recess of a quarter of an hour, and I went out. Here I came very near fainting again, looked very pale, and asked leave to go home. This was refused. As I was really sick, at the suggestion of the boys, I went home, which was but a few minutes' walk, to get a written excuse. My father saw that I was ill and kept me at home, and sent me the next morning with a written excuse for my non-appearance, alleging faintness and sickness. Mr. W. was mortified and angry at this and said that the excuse only covered my not returning, while the chief offence was my going home without leave, which he could not excuse, and calling me out, took his ferule and ordered me to put out my left hand. (He also intimated that my sickness was all a sham.) Upon this hand he inflicted six blows with all his strength, and then six upon the right hand. I was in such a frenzy of indignation at his injustice and his insulting insinuations that I could not have uttered a word for my life. I was too small and slender to resist, and could show my spirit only by fortitude. He called for my right hand again, and gave six more blows in the same manner and then six more upon the left. My hands were swollen and in acute pain, but I did not flinch or show a sign of suffering. He was determined to conquer and gave six more blows upon each hand, with full force. Still there was no sign from me of pain or submission. I could have gone to the stake for what I considered my honor. The school was in an uproar of hissing and scraping and groaning, and the master turned his attention to the other boys and left me alone. He said not another word to me through the day. If he had I could not have answered, for my whole soul was in my throat and not a word could get out . . . I went in the afternoon to the trustees of the school, stated my case, produced my evidence and had an examination made. The next morning but four boys went to school, and the day following the career of Mr. W. ended.⁴⁵

Thomas Wentworth Higginson recalled in his *Cheerful Yesterdays* some not so cheerful schooldays, described by his classmate in later years simply as "My dears, it was hell." While Higginson chose not to express himself so bluntly, he found his school in which the schoolmaster constantly carried a rattan "degrading to boyish nature."⁴⁶

Cobb remembered one boy whose genius for mischief resulted in frequent and severe beatings and whose family concluded that he was mentally deficient. When Cobb knew the boy some years later the beatings had stopped and in his judgment the boy had more talent than anyone else in the family.

Almost an American version of "Dotheboys Hall" apparently flourished for a time in Girard College if even part of the sickening record is true that included

pupils showing purple welts and the marks of cruel stripes upon their persons; boys incarcerated under lock and key, for weeks upon weeks, in midwinter, in the topmost rooms of the college building, where no heat was allowed them, no light permitted when evening came, no books given them to read; stripped of their clothes, in some instances partially, and in others almost entirely; obliged to answer all the calls of nature in these rooms, and fed upon bread and water; children condemned to the House of Refuge, on the application of the President, without knowledge of their mothers or friends, and without any opportunity of appeal; new and ingenious modes of punishment, which were but the synonym of torture; utter want of sympathy for the mute appeals of orphanage; and disregard for the feeling and rights of mothers, as shown in the denial of their most innocent requests.⁴⁷

There is little doubt, then of the excesses. Moving in humanitarian directions in such areas as prison reform, care for the mentally ill, treatment of labor, America had responded to appeals like those of Herman Melville in *White Jacket* and abolished corporal punishment on shipboard in 1853. (The strong pull of tradition is underlined in Richard Henry Dana's refusal, despite his long history as a victim of the excesses of corporal punishment, to advocate its ban on shipboard in his classic *Two Years Before the Mast*.) By 1890, Richard Humphreys could point not only to the New Jersey ban but also to school board prohibitions on corporal punishment in both New York and Chicago as he sought to convince Boston to follow those examples.⁴⁸ There was to be no final or complete victory; ambivalence still reigns in the United States. As far as one can generalize, the home still wars with the school. Parents, or large numbers of them, wish to retain the exclusive rights to whip or not to whip their children's bodies. The schoolmen claim, almost invariably as "a last resort", that they must share the right as a necessary

consequence of their vocation. The mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts debate underscores the division between home and school on the subject.⁴⁹

THE NEW JERSEY BAN

Exceptions to the general schoolteachers' attitude include that of Professor David Cole of the New Jersey State Normal School who argued that "God never intended pain to be connected with the acquisition of knowledge, but only moral delinquency." Cole, one of the most outstanding educators in New Jersey at mid-century, unfortunately, could gush on occasion with sentimentality. One can understand that a teacher might, as Cole said he did, "sicken at the thought of imposing restraint on the joyous little children."⁵⁰ But, of course, Cole at the Normal School taught not children but fairly adult students and, as every parent knows, no one imposes restraint on "the joyous"; it is the mischievous who provoke irritation and the rebellious who invite retaliation.

Cole had a good case but did not make it and, in any event, did not speak for the profession. Throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century schoolmen as a body continued to articulate their faith in the desirability of corporal punishment.⁵¹ Herbert Falk found during World War II that a small sample of faculty members of graduate schools of education divided about equally on the necessity for the use of corporal punishment in the schools. On the other hand, Rotarians and school administrators favored its use much more.⁵² For, however permissive Americans might have been as compared with the English, they were by no means entirely so, neither at school nor at home. Frederick W. Ricord, New Jersey State Superintendent of Schools during the Civil War, pointed out that corporal punishment cast a pall of fear over the classroom that interfered with children's education, particularly as he found it to be the custom for parents to warn their children that if they were whipped in school they would be whipped even harder when they came home, a practice which dated back to colonial times. But Ricord did not ask for the abolition of corporal punishment, objecting to it only when "injudiciously administered."⁵³ This was long received doctrine with New Jersey teachers, as with teachers elsewhere. The New Jersey Society of Teachers in 1845 had passed a resolution "to dispense with physical force as far as is consistent with the maintenance of wholesome discipline" which is to say that they would never use it unless they thought they should.⁵⁴

George B. Sears, City Superintendent of Schools in Newark from 1859 to 1877, took a similar view although early in his tenure as super-

intendent he sought to reduce school floggings. Group singing, he thought, should be practiced more in the schools for its therapeutic effect inasmuch as it "calms, quiets and gladdens the heart, subdues the passions", and prepares the way for "kindly suggestions." "I should not," he wrote, "expect to find a prosperous Primary School where there was no singing." The mood produced, he maintained, was precisely the opposite of that produced by corporal punishment which "only exasperates and sours unless administered by a master hand." Note the escape clause which virtually always accompanies the schoolman's criticism of corporal punishment. The evidence that these exponents of the rod had the best of motives is overwhelming. By their lights, the public school was a moral crusade which would preserve the State, mold the good citizen and honor God. Moreover, they were humanitarian in the sense that they sought to mitigate, if not to abolish, the use of force. When they were faced with the choice of whipping a child or suspending him from school, they whipped him in the firm conviction that suspension, driving the child into the streets, would destroy him as well as imperil the state.⁵⁵ In this they had distinguished precedent: Horace Mann defended corporal punishment as a lesser evil than to turn out thousands of children "to be marauders and freebooters on society 'free' from all salutary restraints."⁵⁶

In response to public criticism the Newark Board of Education recorded its disapproval of "any corporal punishment whereby wounds or other marks of violence are inflicted." That was enough for Superintendent Sears. Newark classrooms in the middle of the nineteenth century routinely numbered between seventy-five to a hundred students. Those numbers called for strong deterrents to high spirits and Sears had no mind to ban the rod although he conceded that if classes should be reduced to 25 to 30 and "proper houses of correction for the incorrigible" provided he might alter his view.⁵⁷

Sears, moreover, accommodated himself to constant violation of Board of Education regulations which specified that only principals could administer corporal punishment. Classroom teachers ignored the regulations and wielded the rod on their own, a practice which eventually called forth a rebuke from the President of the Board. The Superintendent officially put himself on record not as determined to enforce Board regulations, but as in favor of recording each instance of corporal punishment *by whomsoever inflicted* as a means of moderating its use. This flouting of the law by school teachers with the cooperation of the Superintendent continued under Sears' successor, William N. Barringer. In 1881 Barringer told his principals to pass word on to the classroom teachers that "frequent" resort to floggings was no credit to the school. By 1888, under pressure from parents, he finally told his principals that the violations must stop.⁵⁸

Flogging in Newark schools during Sears' tenure was quite common. Complaints sometimes appear in Board minutes of beatings of undue severity. Terms such as "brutal whipping", or "indications on the person of the child of excessive severity" indicate that passion often accompanied punishment. In 1876, the Board became sufficiently exercised to instruct the Superintendent to report the number of cases of corporal punishment in each school. Sears reported that teachers recorded a total of 9,408 beatings in Newark schools in the year ending 30 June 1876. In that year there were 10,153 students in average daily attendance in the city schools (not counting the high school which is not mentioned in Sears' report) so that there was an average of almost one whipping a year for each child in the system.⁵⁹ Not much in comparison to English public schools, where Dean Keate, headmaster of Eton, flogged eighty boys in a single evening, but that was in 1832, a particularly boisterous period of school life in England. Not long before, George III, on meeting some Eton boys at Windsor, had been prompted to ask, "Have you had any mutinies lately, eh, eh?"⁶⁰ The Newark figures, however, roughly compare with Boston, which in 1866 recorded 20,000 whippings.⁶¹ The population of Boston in 1870 was roughly a quarter of a million compared to Newark's which was slightly over a hundred thousand. It must be remembered that these are *recorded* beatings and about as accurate as the police blotter for crime statistics. In Boston, for example, substitute teachers did not record their exploits and contemporary observers report even experienced teachers omitted to record severe floggings.⁶² However Newark floggings compare with exploits elsewhere, it remains true that in that city the threat of the rod was the major means of maintaining order. Nor did schoolmen elsewhere in the state take a stand against corporal punishment. In the first place, most schools outside the cities were ungraded and in a one-room school such as that in the Hilton section of South Orange (now a part of Irvington) 70 to 80 pupils ranging from four to twenty years of age could keep a teacher in such a state of siege that little, if any, learning took place. Only a master with the skill of Frank H. Morrell, who later became superintendent of schools in Irvington, or his brother William marked a regime given to study. Lesser men found themselves locked in the outhouse, held on the pot-bellied stove, or assaulted by a barrage of ink bottles. Under such conditions, it was unthinkable to abandon corporal punishment. As a "reserve force", it could be used quite legally or not, as the schoolmaster determined, so long as school boards and legislatures left it alone.⁶³

School board regulations rather than statute, became the usual basis for restraints on the practice of corporal punishment. In this regard Newark early exemplified what came to be national practice. When, in 1855, a public school system was established in that city, the Board pre-

scribed that only the principal could legally administer such punishment and then only for offenses of willful neglect or insubordination. Protests against this system were frequent but sporadic and quite unorganized. Indeed, nowhere in the state appeared any concerted movement or public debate against corporal punishment nor does it seem that New Jersey abused corporal punishment more than other states. Unfortunately for the New Jersey public school teachers in the nineteenth century, they were notoriously ineffectual politically and almost powerless to counter legislative moves they opposed. When, quite casually, the ban was introduced, schoolmen were caught surprised and impotent. The occasion was the consideration by the legislature of a general school law in 1867. On 14 March, Assemblyman A. O. Evans of Hudson County arose to amend the law to prohibit corporal punishment absolutely in all of the schools of the state, private as well as public. Evans' amendment might have been provoked by an incident in a Hudson County public school a day or so earlier where a mother came and asked to see her child's teacher. When the teacher presented herself, the mother gave her what the newspaper called a sound "cowhiding." The principal, hearing the row, rushed to the rescue but apparently the irate mother was a match for teacher and principal together and she thrashed him as well. Her child, she felt, had been punished too severely and she took matters firmly into her own hands.⁶⁴

Assemblyman Evans, however strongly he may have felt about the incident, if indeed he was influenced by it at all, led no crusade and certainly did not consult with school officials about his amendment. He did argue at some length that there were better ways to get along with children and his proposal found spontaneous support in the legislature. Representatives from all parts of the state spoke in favor of it while the opposition proved wavering. Elias M. White of Morris County threw in the obvious quotation about sparing the rod and spoiling the child—invariably, someone had to—but the heart of the opposition centered really in the fear that the people would not sustain the action and such fear did not loom large enough to prevent passage.⁶⁵

On 21 March the bill came before the Senate for final action. Senator August G. Richey of Mercer spoke the last word for the lost cause, arguing that corporal punishment was "often necessary for the well being of the scholars." Senator Alexander Wurtz of Hunterdon answered with the viewpoint that carried the day. Many teachers are "perfect brutes", he held, adding that nothing so irritated parents as having their children beaten and the best course lay in prohibiting such punishment in the schools. Should some pupils prove incorrigible, he proposed that they be sent home with the responsibility shifted to parents who were the proper persons to inflict the punishment.⁶⁶ Therein lay one of the bones of contention between schoolman and layman. The schoolman wanted the child off the streets and in school and therefore (what he considered

to be) adequate scope to deal with him.⁶⁷ When Senator Wurtz suggested sending the child home he ignored the fact that many of these children were "incorrigible" because of parental neglect. To send them home might well mean to turn them into the streets which was precisely what the schoolman sought to avoid.

But the striking thing is the casual approach to the ban. It had been before the legislature only a week. Apparently no one thought to ask the State Superintendent of Schools, Ellis A. Apgar, or any other expert on the matter if, indeed, the legislature thought there *were* any experts on a subject like the public schools that we all know so much about. To be sure, the nineteenth century produced fewer specialized experts than the twentieth and, hence, never became quite so habituated to consult them. Even taking this into account, all the evidence shows the law to be a careless gesture: a vote for the sanctity of the Home and against the Teacher with his disreputable past, to use Knight's term. There was no attempt to spell out anything more than the widest blanket prohibition which even the legislature must have known would be flouted in private schools. There was no provision even to define what corporal punishment was. For example, corporal punishment has been variously defined to mean punishment *of* the body such as imprisonment, as well as punishment *on* the body such as whipping. What of popping pepper in the pupil's mouth? Was that corporal? The New Jersey refusal to set forth a definition is in sharp contrast to the minority report of the Massachusetts education committee which in 1868 clearly made it "any punishment which produces physical pain."⁶⁸

But the nineteenth century New Jersey legislature had learned to show more interest in its own image than in reality. Seven years later, when it made school attendance compulsory it carefully avoided any machinery for enforcement.⁶⁹ In the face of inadequate facilities statewide, the law was impossible to enforce. Yet to the casual observer it gave the impression of a legislature that brooked no nonsense about education. So, in banning corporal punishment, we need not assume that the legislative purpose was really to eliminate the beating of children.

Nor does the record show litigation to enforce the law until the twentieth century when the ban was construed rather favorably to school disciplinarians. For example, a Commissioner of Education held in 1913 that a teacher who pulled a pupil's hair had violated the law but found himself overruled by a Board of Education who maintained that this was not corporal punishment but only a way of attracting the pupil's attention.⁷⁰ Nor did a janitor violate the law who, catching some lads in an act of misconduct, slapped each of them "on the behind" as they ran out of the building.⁷¹ But these were twentieth century cases; the nineteenth century proved less litigious. Despite an increasing sensitivity to humanitarianism, the abolition of corporal punishment in New

Jersey sprang from no intensive effort of an organized movement, nor was it a response, in any direct sense, to the industrialization or urbanization that had begun to change the face of New Jersey. Rather, it was the compound of New Jersey apathy toward the public schools and low esteem for teachers together with a shrewd political judgment that the ban on corporal punishment would have some superficial popularity while it antagonized no group with enough political power to worry about. The schoolmen objected, of course, only to demonstrate again the little political power at their command. After the law had been enacted, Superintendent Apgar recorded his grave reservations, articulating the received position of the educators. Conceding that some county superintendents had reported improved discipline since the ban, he noted that others reported "disorder and insubordination." Despite his hope that the time would come when corporal punishment could be eliminated altogether, he doubted that the schools were ready then for prohibitory legislation. However, the first step had been taken; "it may be well to let the section remain." But on one point he was adamant; "there certainly should be no exceptions in favor of the cities", to make them is to create "inconsistent legislation."⁷²

THE NEW JERSEY BAN AND THE CITIES

His point was well taken. New Jersey's absolute ban on corporal punishment had not lasted a month. On 12 April the legislature approved a joint resolution which nullified the effect of the ban on those cities already empowered by the legislature to make regulations for the government of their schools.⁷³ (The nearly 10,000 beatings in the city of Newark in 1876 were all quite legal.) Not a single dissenting voice in the legislature decried the slipping back into the corporal tradition.⁷⁴ What more eloquent testimony to the irresolution of a legislature and the careless drafting of legislation than the short, sweet life of the absolute ban in the cities? To be sure, by its ban on corporal punishment the legislature had circumscribed the powers it had earlier granted the cities of New Brunswick, Newark and Elizabeth.⁷⁵ But, in logic, if the ban were justified for the rest of the state, then that made the case for the necessity of taking back to the state a part of the powers it had earlier granted the cities. Superintendent Apgar was right; the legislators had written "inconsistent legislation" and beyond that, had passed legislation which they had not only not thought through; they were perfectly willing to abandon unanimously their high ground with the first breath of political opposition against it. Only in the cities was there sufficient organization to rise against the law and, once it did, legislative resolution collapsed with neither bang nor whimper. No hero of humanitarianism immortalized himself with a vote of dissent.

The ban on corporal punishment in New Jersey produced some grumbling a year later. Apgar polled the county superintendents to get their view of the 1867 law establishing a statewide school system. Only one complaint of the law emerged in the poll: apprehension about the prohibition of corporal punishment expressed by six of the twenty-one county superintendents. Not a single one approved the ban. Superintendent Ralph Willis of Middlesex commented revealingly that an absolute prohibition covering all cases and all places must be modified or it would be violated. The prohibition, if not disregarded, he pointed out, was "overruled" by the impossibility of repressing disorder and maintaining the authority of the teacher by any other means than the use or fear of the rod.⁷⁶ The state had been put on notice that in some schools the law would be observed more in the breach than the observance; for apparently Newark was not alone in its cavalier attitude toward obeying the law. Here, by the way, we are considering only public schools and public school officials; parochial school teachers continued to swing the ferule far into the twentieth century in imperious disdain of secular dicta on classroom discipline.

Beatings, then, continued in the cities under color of the law. A writer for the *Newark News* remembered early in the twentieth century that each Newark principal kept a long, black walnut ruler within ready reach, to be applied to the outstretched hand of the hapless child, and, should maximum punishment be indicated, the hand first dipped in a basin of water and the principal bending back the fingers to make a taut surface.⁷⁷ No doubt some principals practiced this particular device but by no means all. A janitor gave J. Wilmer Kennedy, Principal of Miller Street School in 1892, a piece of rattan from an old chair. Kennedy, who later became a Newark Assistant Superintendent of Schools, used the rattan on a boy named James Cork six or eight times on the hand and across the back of the leg for having thrown a wad of paper at a girl, striking her in the eye and inflaming it. Charged by the boy's father with "unjust and severe punishment", Kennedy faced a hearing by a subcommittee of members of the Board of Education. Although young James bore at least one mark on his leg, the committee and the Board of education exonerated Kennedy. It is interesting that in a hearing that stretched over three sessions and entailed lengthy questioning, no one asked whether Kennedy thought the boy had displayed willful insubordination, the only offense that permitted corporal punishment under Newark regulations.⁷⁸

But the hearing merely punctuated the ending of the old order. The following year, in 1893, the legislature extended the statutory prohibition on corporal punishment to include even the city schools.⁷⁹ Uneasiness stirred in the Newark school system. City Superintendent of Schools William N. Barringer reported that one of the Newark principals

remarked, "Well, corporal punishment is abolished. What shall we do now? What shall be done with the defiant and persistently disobedient? We must obey the law of the state."

"Certainly," replied Barringer, "you must obey the law. You say corporal punishment is forbidden, but punishment for wrongdoing is not prohibited. Have you no other means of correction but the rod?" One cannot help reading this conversation as a question from principal to superintendent, asking if the law need be obeyed. The answer was emphatic and must be understood to represent as well the City Superintendent's official warning that no violator of the law might look to him for defense irrespective of earlier practice. The principal at once proposed that the ban would lead both principal and teacher to examine other approaches to the problem and he went on to point out that at least one result of the law would be that more study would enlighten "the whole subject of punishments as related to the reformation, training, and education of the young."⁸⁰ Had the law done nothing else than to stimulate this kind of thinking in the schools, its justification might well be established.

In December 1894 the Board directed Barringer to survey the schools to determine the effects on discipline after a year of the latest statutory restraint on the schoolmen's power. At the February 1895 meeting of the Board, Barringer presented his report. He had asked the thirty-eight principals of the Newark system four questions. First, what had been the experience of discipline in your school since the abolition of corporal punishment? Thirteen noted no change. Twenty had encountered difficulty with parents; that is, they had had to spend too much time meeting with parents settling paltry differences. This was the most universal complaint. The second question asked the principals what their experience had been prior to the ban. No consensus developed; the principals significantly did not wish to illustrate the experiences of the past golden age. Barringer also wanted to know their opinion of corporal punishment. Of the thirty-eight, twenty-two found it necessary while fourteen opposed it. Two responded that some other provision should be made. The final question asked what measures the principal would recommend for improvement. Various suggestions followed but a clear majority opted for an ungraded school for "incorrigibles" which certainly did not antagonize Barringer. He and his predecessor had been trying to persuade the Board to provide one for twenty years.

Barringer, who in the past year had gathered data on wayward children from sixty cities throughout the country, swept aside the silly objection that too much time had to be spent with parents. As for Barringer, he knew no better way for principals to spend their time. Then he returned to the refrain that his predecessor, Sears, had raised twenty years earlier. The large size of classes continued. In this context,

there remained three ways of dealing with the "incorrigible." A return to corporal punishment "under rigid limitations" apparently looked to possible modification of the state statute. Alternatively, the Board might expel or suspend the recalcitrant but it should understand that, in effect this was to turn the child into the street and meant, for Barringer, the destruction of the pupil. Finally, he reiterated the recommendation of the establishment of a reformatory school with suitably equipped shops and staffed with a "strict" faculty.⁸¹

A last voice spoke for the continuation of the use of corporal punishment. Citing United States Commissioner of Education, William Torrey Harris, "one of the two or three foremost educators of the country", the *Newark Sunday Call* reminded its readers that corporal punishment had wide support among educators. The *Call* argued, too, that the twenty principals who favored use of corporal punishment were conceded to be at the head of their profession in the city. (These, it will be remembered, were the principals who found too much of their time wasted talking to parents.) Barringer's report, the *Call* held, ought to open the eyes of "the anti-rod shouters"; either there must be a return to corporal punishment or face the burden of maintaining a costly school for "incorrigibles." That is what it came down to in the end. Spare the purse but not the rod.

Probably the extension of the statute to the cities was better enforced than Newark Board regulations had been in the past. In the fifteen years after the ban reached Newark, extant records disclose only three cases touching corporal punishment. One constituted a scuffle between teacher and pupil in which the teacher seems to have emerged second best. The second resulted in the censure and subsequent transfer of a teacher who used corporal punishment. Officials dismissed a third charge, probably with justification, although the standards of evidence sought by the superintendent seemed to embrace only the most severe encounter. Had the witness "ever seen a child with clothing torn, or nose bleeding, or otherwise showing *signs* of corporal punishment?" Nonetheless, the censure and transfer of the only teacher on record as breaking the law suggests a hostility to corporal punishment and a resolve to enforce the law not characteristic of the past.⁸²

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that in nineteenth century New Jersey—even in Newark—restraint marked the use of corporal punishment in the school system. Compare the regulations in Newark with twentieth century Dallas and Newark does not fare badly. Dallas instituted its program after consultation with B. F. Skinner, investing it with the most recent

psychological thought in a way that Newark could not equal. But Newark gave authority of the rod—without power to delegate—solely to the principal. Dallas not only empowered the principal to delegate his authority to the assistant principal, but in addition it opened the door for any teacher to do his or her own flogging if the "Pupil Personnel Committee" so determined. After such determination, a teacher may administer the corporal punishment only in the presence of an adult after written consent from the parent. But in giving the teacher *any* powers and in permitting the principal to delegate his, twentieth century Dallas went further than did nineteenth century Newark. To which, unhappily, must be added the observation that neither nineteenth century Newark nor twentieth century Dallas respected its own rules.⁸³

On the other hand, the sheer numbers dwindle. Dallas chalked up 5,358 cases in 1971;⁸⁴ a century earlier Newark, a city only a sixth as large, had nearly twice as many. The City Superintendent of Newark claimed a need for flogging because of large classes, but as the nineteenth century closed, the argument shifted to where it lies basically today: flogging as a last resort and for the unusual case.⁸⁵

A question lingers about the educator's perception of the child as he decides whether or not to flog. In nineteenth century Newark, that perception was at least in part of "the influx of a foreign element . . . so great that it is impossible to bring it at once under the higher and better influences. Many of these children have very little idea of obedience to authority of any kind." So said Superintendent Barringer who further believed that the time had "fully come when this large and lawless class of children should be taught obedience to righteous authority." To be sure, corporal punishment was to be used only "in very, very rare instances."⁸⁶ The "foreign element" further complicates the image of him to be beaten. While nineteenth century America increasingly turned away from corporal punishment of its own children, it was rather more certain that other people's children needed a good hiding, particularly if they were of another race, ethnic group or class.⁸⁷ In this sense the flood of immigration to industrializing America nurtured traditional belief in corporal punishment. Happily, not always. Reconstruction Freedmen's Schools in the South on occasion could lead the country in abandoning the rod. Reverend J. F. Ware of Maryland reported that "in dealing with a degraded race we took at once a stand *against the rod*" and it worked.⁸⁸

The Newark argument for continued use of corporal punishment was badly flawed. If the case rested on the need to teach obedience to constituted authority, then both Barringer and his predecessor, Sears, might have begun with good example, obeying the regulations of the Board by enforcing the ban on classroom teachers. Moreover, no evidence appears that the ban on corporal punishment subverted discipline in New

Jersey schools, but on the contrary, despite the gloomy forebodings of the educators, they came to admit that discipline did not suffer. After the first full year that the statutory ban applied to the cities, Barringer reported to the State Superintendent that "*discipline and government of the schools throughout all classes and grades have decidedly improved.*"⁸⁹ Charles B. Gilbert, the able City Superintendent who succeeded Barringer in 1896 had no taste for corporal punishment in education and Addison B. Poland who followed in the same post in 1901 found that the segregation of the "incurables" in ungraded schools—the substitute for corporal punishment proposed since 1874—reduced disobedience to authority to a minimum in Newark schools.⁹⁰

For the historian, the significance of the use of corporal punishment may be in the way it emphasizes the monumental difficulties in the establishment of the public schools in the first place. Why should teachers traditionally have associated the whip as the *sine qua non* of their profession? Does not corporal punishment forever establish the psychic insecurity of the schoolman and his own anxiety about the monotony, the irrelevance, and the haunting inhumanity of so many of the things he taught and the way he taught them? To be sure, America had to be literate and progressively larger numbers learned for the achievement not only of a democracy, but an industrialized society, and also for the appreciation of the deeper meanings of the religious heritage. The values in so rich a bequest filled the educator with such a crusading spirit that the public school became a value in itself and woe to him, either outsider or recalcitrant child, who did not accept it and accord with it.

But the realization of the public school dream fell short of its aspiration and none sensed this better than the children. For the school in the end also had to serve in Morrill Wyman's phrase, "an inheritance of unparalleled individual freedom", that is, that the end and purpose was neither government, economy, or church, but the child himself. Sometimes the truth of things is seen by the children first as the Reverend Bradford Frazie wrote Lyman Cobb in 1847.⁹¹ They knew something was wrong, not just in the use of corporal punishment, but the essential operation of the school as institution which fell short, so lamentably short, of achieving the reconciliation of individual freedom and the transmission of the heritage. Perhaps the goal itself was unreal, expectations beyond the hope of realization. To the extent that the schoolmen swung the rod, energetically dedicated to keeping order, doing what they could as best they could in what Thoreau saw as "lives of quiet desperation" and without investing the children with the sense of mutual respect and affection, the goal was missed.

In the New Jersey experience the schools withstood the statute banning corporal punishment which has remained essentially unchanged down to the present. Unconsulted by the legislature, the schoolmen

had no recourse but to swallow their medicine only to find it had quite different results than they had expected. They did not need the ancient power of the rod that had been wrested from them and they found themselves better examples of the obedience to authority, the ideal that they sought to instill in the young. The law is an ironic example of educational reform. Born of a political gesture as much as a humanitarian's dream, it remains in the second century of its establishment in far better repute than so many more earnestly felt and more carefully reasoned reforms that have characterized American schools.

Donald R. Raichle teaches American intellectual history at Kean College of New Jersey, and is currently working on a history of his college.

REFERENCES

I am indebted to Lloyd deMause, Robert J. Fridlington and my wife, Elaine, for comments on this article.

1. Massachusetts *Annotated Laws*, Ch. 71, Sect. 37G.
2. Lloyd deMause, "The Evolution of Childhood", *History of Childhood Quarterly* 1 (Spring, 1974):504-575, 542-543.
3. Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study*, (New York: W. W. Norton, 1960) p. 23.
4. DeMause, "The Evolution of Childhood", p. 544.
5. John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970) pp. 62-81; Bailyn, *Education*, pp. 15-29.
6. Demos, *Little Commonwealth*, p. 100; Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2 vols., (New York: The Century Company, 1898) 2:233-239
7. Lawrence Cremin, *The American Common School: An Historic Conception*, (New York: Teachers College, 1951) p. 217.
8. Arthur W. Calhoun, *A Social History of the American Family*, 3 vols., (Cleveland: A. H. Clark, 1915-1918, reprinted New York, Barnes and Noble: 1960) 2:51, 56, 77.
9. Richard L. Rapson, "The American Child as Seen by British Travelers, 1845-1935," *American Quarterly* 17 (Fall, 1965): 520-534.
10. John F. Walzer, "A Period of Ambivalence: Eighteenth Century American Childhood", in Lloyd deMause, ed., *The History of Childhood*, (New York: The Psychohistory Press, 1974) pp. 351-382.
11. Calhoun, *American Family*, 2:54; Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2:237.
12. Evelyn Millis Duvall, "Conceptions of Parenthood", *American Journal of Sociology* 52 (1946) 193-203 cited in Ruth Shonle Cavan, *The American Family* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1958) pp. 511-513.
13. Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic: The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture* (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968) p. 10.
14. Charles Strickland, "A Transcendentalist Father: The Child Rearing Practices of Bronson Alcott", *History of Childhood Quarterly* 1 (Summer, 1973) 4-51.
15. Wishy, *The Child*, p. 46, but see Wishy's whole chapter "Spare the Rod and Save the Child", pp. 42-49.
16. Edward Eggleston, *The Hoosier School-master*, (New York: Grosset and Dun-

- lap, 1889) p. 37.
17. Frederick W. Ricord, ed., *Biographical and Genealogical History of the City of Newark and Essex County*, 2 vols., (New York and Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1898) 1:492-3.
18. Hedges to editor of the *American Journal of Education* 16 (1866):738.
19. *Newark Sentinel*, 2 September 1890.
20. Excerpts are in Lyman Cobb, *The Evil Tendencies of Corporal Punishment as a Means of Moral Discipline in Families and Schools, Examined and Discussed*, (New York: Mark H. Newman & Company, 1847), pp. 129-130n, 161n.
21. Cited in Herbert Falk, *Corporal Punishment: A Social Interpretation of its Theory and Practice in the Schools of the United States*, (New York: Teachers College, 1941) p. 65.
22. M. A. Eckstein, "Ultimate Deterrents: Punishment and Control in English and American Schools", *Comparative Education Review* 10 (October, 1966): 433-41; *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 1 June 1889.
23. Horace Mann, *Sequel to the So-Called Correspondence between the Reverend M. H. Smith and Horace Mann Surreptitiously Published by Mr. Smith; Containing a letter from Mr. Mann, Suppressed by Mr. Smith with the Reply Therein Promised*, (Boston: William B. Fowler, 1847) pp. 27-28.
24. "Hearings on Franklin Street School", 20 February 1893, reported in a manuscript book in the office of the Superintendent of Schools in Newark. I am indebted to Dr. John Anderson of Edison High School for bringing this document to my attention and to Mr. Bernard J. Reilly, Jr. of the Superintendent's office for assistance in locating it.
25. Maxine Green, *The Public School and the Private Vision: A Search for America in Education and Literature* (New York: Random House, 1965) pp. 42-43.
26. David Page, *Theory and Practice of Teaching or the Motives and Methods of Good Schoolkeeping* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 90th ed., 1867) pp. 194-215.
27. Dr. Morrill Wyman, *Progress in School Discipline. Remarks of Dr. Morrill Wyman, of Cambridge, in support of the resolution to abolish the corporal punishment of girls in the public schools of the city made in the Republican caucus, November 16, 1866* (Cambridge: James Cox, 1866) p. 5.
28. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, Appendix.
29. Falk, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 79.
30. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 260.
31. Massachusetts Education Committee, *Reports on the Abolition of Corporal Punishment in the Public Schools*, House Document 335 (Boston: Wright and Potter, 1868) p. 15.
32. Massachusetts Education Committee, *Reports*, p. 14.
33. Wyman, *Progress in School Discipline*, p. 6.
34. Wyman, *Progress in School Discipline*, p. 5.
35. Wyman, *Progress in School Discipline*, p. 40.
36. New Jersey State Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1861, p. 18; Newark Board of Education, *Annual Reports*, 1901, p. 59; 1910, p. 75.
37. *Newark Evening News*, 25 March 1892.
38. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 225.
39. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 61.
40. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 30.
41. Richard C. Humphreys, *Corporal Punishment: Reply to the Majority Report of Committee on Rules and Regulations of Boston School Board*, (Boston: George H. Ellis, 1890) p. 14.
42. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 71.
43. J. P. Gordy, *Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1891) p. 83.

44. For a discussion of "battered children", see deMause, "The Evolution of Childhood", p. 543ff.
45. Cited from Charles Francis Adams, *Richard Henry Dana* in Falk, *Corporal Punishment*, pp. 57-58.
46. Falk, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 59.
47. Massachusetts Education Committee, *Reports*, pp. 26-27n.
48. Humphreys, *Corporal Punishment*, pp. 15, 19.
49. Massachusetts Education Committee, *Reports*, p. 45; Wyman, *Progress in School Discipline*, p. 4, citing the *Massachusetts Teacher*.
50. "Address at the State Normal School" *American Journal of Education* 5 (July, 1867):835.
51. See the poll in *National Education Association Journal* 50 (May, 1961):13 in which 71.6% of teachers favored corporal punishment; a poll in *Nation's Schools* 87 (May, 1971):39 showed an increase from 25% to 74% in five years in schools using corporal punishment. 64% of teachers approved. A shocking development in collective bargaining is the "negotiation" of the right to beat children's bodies. 7.3% of teacher's contracts had corporal punishment clauses, *National Education Association Bulletin* 47 (May, 1969):59.
52. Falk, *Corporal Punishment*, pp. 36-7.
53. Alice Morse Earle, *Child Life in Colonial Days*, (New York: MacMillan Company, 1899) p. 197; New Jersey State Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1863, pp. 10, 15.
54. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 253n.
55. Newark Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1860, p. 16, Lyman Cobb preceded Sears as a believer in singing as a corrective for the need for corporal punishment, *Corporal Punishment*, pp. 148-151; for a colonial precedent of the same type see Alice Morse Earle, *Child Life in Colonial Days*, p. 202; *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 1 June 1889; *Newark Evening News*, 25 May 1890.
56. Mann, *Sequel*, p. 26.
57. Newark Board of Education, "Minutes" 31 May 1861; *Annual Report*, 1874, pp. 54-6; 1876, p. 58.
58. Newark Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1864, p. 41; "Minutes" principal's meeting, 2 March 1881, 7 March 1888.
59. Newark Board of Education, "Minutes" 27 October 1876; *Annual Report*, 1876, p. 19.
60. James McLachlan, *American Boarding Schools: A Historical Study* (New York: Scribner, 1970) p. 152; Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (New York: Random House, 1962) p. 319.
61. Wyman, *Progress in School Discipline*, p. 25.
62. Humphreys, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 12. For figures in the 1880's for Boston, see Falk, *Corporal Punishment*, p. 93.
63. *Newark Sunday Call*, 28 September 1909; the common law makes the teacher *in loco parentis*; the parent in the act of sending the child to school delegates parental power of such correction as may be necessary to accomplish the purpose of education; Michael Arthur Travis, "New Jersey School Law as Applied to Classroom Teachers and Teacher Relationship", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1943, p. 107.
64. *Trenton Daily True American*, 18 March 1867.
65. *Trenton Daily True American*, 16 March 1867.
66. *Trenton Daily True American*, 21 March 1867.
67. The view survives in John A. R. Wilson, "Sometimes Teachers Should Spank Students", *Educational Forum* 24 (January, 1960): pp. 217-19.
68. Massachusetts Education Committee, *Reports*, p. 4.
69. *Trenton Daily True American*, 27 March 1874.

70. *School Law Decisions of Commissioner of Education and (New Jersey) State Board of Education*, (Trenton: McCrellish and Quigley, 1938) pp. 585, 586, 588.
71. Carl Graydon Leech, *The Constitutional and Legal Basis of Education in New Jersey*, (Philadelphia, privately printed, 1932) pp. 419-420.
72. New Jersey State Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1867, p. 665.
73. New Jersey Acts, 1867, Joint Resolution No. 12, p. 1028.
74. *Trenton Daily True American*, 12 April 1867.
75. New Jersey Laws, 1855, Ch. LXX, Sect. 3, p. 160; 1857, Ch. LII, Sect. 61, p. 147; 1860, Ch. CXXIV, Sect. 62, p. 314, for New Brunswick, Newark, and Elizabeth, respectively.
76. New Jersey State Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1868, pp. 755-783.
77. *Newark Evening News*, "Neighborhood Editorial Corner" 30 May 1913.
78. "Hearings", 24 February to 8 March 1892; *Newark Evening News*, 26 March 1892.
79. New Jersey Laws, 1893, Ch. 109, pp. 194-5.
80. Newark Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1894, "Corporal Punishment", pp. 98-103, p. 100.
81. *Newark Evening News*, 26 January 1894, 18 February 1895; *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 28 February 1895.
82. Newark Board of Education, Committee on Teachers, "Minutes", 28 January 1898, 30 November 1900; my italics, Committee on Instruction and Educational Supplies, "Minutes", 13 September 1909.
83. *Ware v. Estes* 328 F. Supp. 657 (1971) at 658. Incidentally, the opinion of the court that teachers in Dallas abused the practice of corporal punishment did not lead it to declare the practice including such abuse a violation of any constitutional rights. The Supreme Court, 20 November 1972, upheld the opinion, denying certiorari.
84. *Time* 99 (12 June 1972): 37-38.
85. L. C. Hickman, "Corporal Punishment: Relegated to Last Resort Discipline, Survey Shows" *Nation's Schools* 76 (1965):48-50; see also Francis Keppel and others cited for the same view in *National Education Association Journal* 52 (September, 1963): 19-20.
86. Newark Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1895, p. 101.
87. Earl Barnes, "Corporal Punishment as a Means of Social Control", 13 (March 1898) *Education*, 387-395.
88. Massachusetts Education Committee, *Reports*, p. 29.
89. New Jersey State Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1894, Appendix A, p. 115, my italics.
90. Gilbert to G. M. Brant, 1897 in Letterbooks, Office of the Newark Superintendent of Schools; Newark Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1911, p. 115.
91. Cobb, *Corporal Punishment*, pp. 240-241.

MICHAEL H.
STONE
AND
CLARICE J.
KESTENBAUM

MATERNAL DEPRIVATION IN CHILDREN OF THE WEALTHY: A PARADOX IN SOCIOECONOMIC VS. PSYCHOLOGICAL CLASS

A sizeable proportion of patients now referred for psychoanalysis or for analytically-oriented psychotherapy come from families where considerable wealth has been present for a number of generations. Certain problems this group often poses for psychotherapy have already been outlined (Stone, 1972).

Many of these families are extremely conscious of "form" and "tradition." In some instances this very emphasis upon tradition tends to fix parental attitudes along lines more befitting an earlier time, and rather out of step with what would be most suitable in the here and now. We may speak then of a "cultural lag" in parental norms. To be sure some degree of "lag" is common in parental behavior at all socioeconomic levels, but may be quite glaring in certain highly placed families, such as those depicted in this paper. The influence of tradition upon current methods of raising children is being extensively investigated by deMause (1974) and Robertson (1973). Meanwhile, thanks in part to the influence of Erikson and Benedek, parenthood itself has in recent years come to be regarded not as a mere biological accident, but

as an important maturational step in the life-cycle, worthy of intensive study in its own right: The Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (1973) has recently published a monograph on the subject.

To the extent that the quality of mothering in some upper class families is severely compromised for reasons that appear related to wealth and tradition, we find ourselves obligated to make a distinction between socioeconomic class and "psychological" class. By the latter we refer to a term used by deMause (*op. cit.*) in describing levels of psychological maturity. He grades culturally predominant modes of parental behavior along a spectrum ranging from the most primitive ("infanticidal," "abandoning") to the most "evolved" ("socializing," "helping"). The last two deMause feels, are only found in the 19th and 20th centuries (*op. cit.*, p. 53), and he amasses much evidence to show that harsh and insensitive treatment of children was very much the "norm" up until the late 18th century. While it is clear to the casual observer that the "empathic" (as we prefer to call it) mode has by no means supplanted its predecessors even in our day, one must be cautious in condemning our ancestors too roundly: much of the material regarding earlier examples of parent-child interaction come to us by way of written accounts from necessarily literate, therefore the upper or, at least, educated classes.

Before modern times the majority of mankind was illiterate and so unable to pass on a clear account of its daily life to future generations. Necessity may have forced some people of lesser means into more adequate forms of parenthood: the extensive use of wet-nurses, and of fostering infants into the care of strangers up until age 5 or 8 (cf. chap. I in Brander's book (1973)), was doubtless, because of the expense, much commoner amongst the privileged. It is easy to see that a daughter "farmed out" till 8, only to return a comparative stranger to her own parents, would lack a template for normal, integrated mothering. With no adequate role-model to fall back on, such a girl, when it became her turn to have a family, would be quite vulnerable, even with the best of intentions, to visit the harshness of her own past upon her children. Contemporary upper class families who continue to follow some of the old customs, especially if leading a life very separate from the children (v. *infra*, case 4), and if preserving Calvinistic rigors amidst our more tolerant society, may give evidence of severe maternal deprivation involving successive generations (v. *infra*, case 15).

Many of the families in our series exemplify the middle range of deMause's evolutionary modes: the abandoning and socializing as well as the "ambivalent" or the "intrusive" (modes that were especially widespread in Western culture between 1500 and 1900). Stierlin (1974), using a somewhat different classification, refers to these homes as "punitive" (cf. also Walzer, 1974, for a description of parental ambivalence in eighteenth-century America). He contrasts such families with

those where the children themselves are "parentified" to fulfil certain needs of the parents; this "parentifying" he sees as less pathogenic than the "punitive" style, but not as healthy as the "empathic."

Presumably parents will exhibit varying degrees of most or all of these modes at various times throughout the course of their long interaction with their children. Ideally, the more "primitive" modes remain mostly submerged and surface, when they do, only briefly.

To better appraise the *balance* amongst these coexisting modes of parental behavior in our patient population, we are currently attempting to assess the families of a number of ambulatory and hospitalized patients according to anchored rating scales based on deMause's and Stierlin's taxonomies.

Our assumption is that in the evolution of any contemporary family, the "ancestral" modes will indeed appear, often in a temporal sequence, and in a manner analogous to the tendency of the individual to live through certain primitive modes of relatedness (cannibalistic, sadistic, phallic-aggressive . . .) as he matures. Ontogeny may recapitulate phylogeny at the family level as well as at the level of the individual. The "empathic" mode of familial relatedness would correspond to the Freudian end-stage of "*genitality*" which most of us approach asymptotically but never quite reach. One could carry the analogy to individual psychodynamics still further and speak of the mothers of our patients, for example, as not wholly lacking in empathy, but rather "fixated" at one of the earlier, less adaptive modes, particularly the "abandoning," and "punitive." Children reared under these circumstances would then experience their mothers as basically *depriving*.

In the past 10 years the authors have collected over a dozen cases (ranging from children to young adults) from wealthy and aristocratic families, where maternal deprivation has been a major factor underlying the psychopathology. As such it becomes an important factor influencing treatment, sometimes rendering a more classically analytic stance unfeasible, sometimes necessitating special interventions in order to overcome the tenuousness of the therapeutic alliance. Our patients include several with a pronounced narcissistic character structure or other deformations of personality, exaggerated by wealth, and of a kind that foster fragility and impoverishment in object-relations.

The frequency with which the psychoanalytic psychiatrist may encounter such patients, seems, if anything, to be growing. We hoped this paper might serve to alert others to this deprivation factor; we hoped in addition that some of our experiences in treating this group might be applicable in our colleagues' cases, and thus redound to the benefit of similar patients elsewhere.

Table 1 contains some relevant demographic data. In it we have also attempted to assess the quality of motivation for therapy, in some instances notably wanting, as well as the degree of maternal deprivation.

TABLE 1

<i>Name & Age</i>	<i>MHSR†</i>	<i>Sex</i>	<i>Relig.</i>	<i>Ethn. Orig.</i>	<i>Motivat.*</i>	<i>Depriv.**</i>	<i>Diagnosis</i>
1. Jane V. 19	52	F	Prot.	Engl.	2	2	borderline character, bulimia, abuse of psychotomimetic drugs.
2. Elinor M. 18	80	F	Prot.	Engl.	3	1	depressive reaction (mild), anorexia nervosa.
3. Alice T. 19	75	F	Prot.	Engl.	2	2	narcissistic character, depressive reaction.
4. Sybil E. 25	50	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	3	manic-depressive illness (unipolar).
5. Amanda G. 8		F	Jewish	Russ.	4	3	adjustment reaction of childhood; mild sociopathic behavior.
6. Linda F. 17	40	F	Prot.	Engl.	3	3	psychotic depressive reaction.
7. Marie S. 17	28	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	3	schizophrenia; schizo-affective type; narcissistic character.
8. Andrea C. 16	26	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	3	psychotic depressive reaction with suicidal gestures; homosexuality.
9. Carlos R. 15	25	M	Cath.	Span.	3	3	explosive personality; minimal brain damage; mild depressive reaction
10. Faith H. 30	45	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	3	chronic undifferentiated schizophrenia.
11. Cynthia L. 18	30	F	Prot.	Engl.	3	3	schizophrenia; schizo-affective type, with multiple phobias.
12. Wilma B. 25	68	F	Pr./Cath.	Engl./Irish	4	3	obsessive-compulsive personality.
13. Peter W. 17	80	M	Pr./Cath.	Engl./French	1	2	narcissistic character.
14. Sandra N. 16	75	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	2	adjustment reaction of adolescence.
15. Lucy F. 28	70	F	Pr./Cath.	Engl./Irish	4	2	borderline character; mixed hysterical and obsessive features.
16. Mary N. 22	65	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	2	psychoneurosis with phobias.
17. Gail V. 25	65	F	Prot.	Engl.	4	3	borderline character; depressive-masochistic personality.

†Menninger Score when first seen.

*(Motivation for Therapy) scaled 1 to 4.

**(Degree of Maternal Deprivation) scaled 1 (moderate) to 3 (severe).

We recorded the latter as "1" if it were characterized by prolonged separations from an otherwise adequate mother, or by chronic maternal aloofness. A "2" signified mothers who were available for only very brief periods of time, or who were subtly rejecting of the patient. A "3" was assigned mothers who were seriously ill-prepared for the task of motherhood, who were characterologically obsessive and cold, available only rarely to their children, or who were consistently rejecting and overtly hostile.

The patients' overall level of functioning when first seen was evaluated (in retrospect) according to the Spitzer and Endicott (1974) modification of the Menninger Health-Sickness Rating Scale (Luborsky, 1962). The four patients whose initial ratings were 30 or less were first seen in a hospital setting.

The section that follows is devoted to the clinical profiles of representative cases selected from different age brackets.

Case 1

Jane V.'s history and treatment illustrate many points of the syndrome under discussion. She was nineteen when first seen in psychotherapy. Jane's presenting symptoms were bulimia accompanied by forced vomiting, mild depression and apathy. She was the third of four children, the rest boys, born to a family of immense wealth and some social prominence. At the time she sought help, she had been experiencing a growing disenchantment with the college she had just entered: she had so little sense of purpose and so little discipline she was at a competitive disadvantage with many classmates who had less native intelligence than she.

Shortly before entering college she had "rebelled" against the values of her home, and had taken up a "hippie" existence, wandering about the country in the company of more genuine "hippies," whose needs and habits were for the most part subsidized by her. For a time she had become moderately anorectic, recalling later that "I felt being skinny would help me compete with the (even more) beautiful girls I grew up around."

She indulged rather heavily for over a year in marijuana, hashish, LSD, and mescaline. Just before beginning treatment she began limiting herself to occasional marijuana. As the drug-use trailed off, however, she resorted more to alcohol, getting "almost high" on wine every day.

Her expression was often vague, her speech slow and unspontaneous—as though she had to ransack her brain for answers to the simplest questions. All this tempted one to make a borderline-schizophrenic diagnosis at first, though much of this symptomatology was probably better

characterized as manifestations of her recent drug-abuse. In this respect she would probably fit in the first of three categories of syndromes connected with psychotomimetic drugs outlined by Glass (1973).

Jane's earliest memories involved mortal danger in the absence of helping figures:

"I recall at 4 a hurricane in my hometown; I went outside and had to hold onto a car door lest I be blown away."

and at five:

"I almost drowned at the shore. I tried to scream but couldn't. There was no one to hear me anyway, because my parents were not there. Eventually I thrashed back to safe ground."

Her parents were noticeably absent from her early recollections. All she could recall of her father, from about her eighth or ninth year, was his emerging occasionally from his study to ball her out for playing her flute.

Her early school years were almost as bleak: the exclusive private school for girls which she attended was intolerant of anyone who, like herself, "wasn't a little angel." Her classmates tended to come from families that had less money but more aristocratic lineage than hers, and she was not accepted by them.

There were two nurses at home but neither "stuck up" for Jane, nor was she allowed to "bother" her parents. She would instead seek refuge in a small "cave" at the edge of the family property, in which she would burrow herself, there to read comics with a flashlight and to guzzle soda-pop.

The table was rather spartan within the home—though only for the children: their mother was "very fussy about food, very interested in nutrition, and very emphatic about the virtues of slenderness." The father, by contrast, was obese. Jane saw her mother as "beautiful but sexless," lacking in spontaneity, and orderly to the extreme, whereas her father was "lusty, adventuresome, irritable, and a gourmet." He was the more human figure, though not available to her in any meaningful way till shortly before his death when she was in high school.

It was difficult for Jane to take advantage of the privilege in psychotherapy to say anything one feels like without fear of reproach. She had been reared in an atmosphere of repression, where one simply knew not to discuss religion, politics, sex, money, or, worst of all, personal feelings. The invitation to discuss all these matters she found bewildering and threatening. After so many years of suppressing her feelings, her whole emotional vocabulary was undeveloped and imprecise. Her dreams proved helpful, because there, certain emotions were clearly recognizable to me, and eventually to her also.

The work soon focused on her eating disturbance, particularly on the relationship of her symptom to the theme of loneliness and maternal deprivation. It should be mentioned that appearance was never severely affected by her over-eating; because of her most serious symptom, self-induced vomiting, she was never more than five pounds overweight. The following dream was representative:

"I have a passionate encounter with an older woman in a strange town. I make a big pile of food for us in a little store; all my favorite things."

This woman she described as "very motherly," someone who "made me forget I was new in the town (where the school was) because she was so warm and friendly." One aspect of her bulimia that came to light at this time was her preference for driving to small villages or towns where she knew no one, there to "buy out" the contents of the local grocery store. When I inquired about her predilection of unknown communities she replied, "For me all the warmth in human relations came from people outside the family! Strangers are warmer than relatives." The homosexual conflict, the longing for her own mother, seemed too far from consciousness at this time, and were dealt with later in her treatment.

She was next able to verbalize her feeling of having been an unwanted child, especially by her mother. This was heralded by a dream in which:

"The widow of our old chauffeur invited me to her house and showed me photographs of the family. There were pictures of everyone except me!"

With this she began to recount feelings of being a "lemon": an unnoticed, unwanted child "unworthy" to be prized by her parents or by anyone. Later she recalled how, when she went off to college, her mother had her room redecorated into a guest room, within weeks of her leaving home. When she found out she cried at mother's being a "goddam insensitive bitch." "I felt," she said, "as though I'd been scratched from the family album."

She now began to work tentatively on feelings concerning women, as exemplified by this dream:

"I see Martha and Denise in bed together exploring each other's bodies. They ask me to come to bed with them, but I decline and leave the room. I went instead to fetch my little brother who was nearby."

Female homosexuality was much discussed and indulged in at the school she had been attending. She had sometimes felt tempted, was both excited and frightened by the idea. In the ensuing months she be-

gan to identify more and more with the "square" or "establishment" world represented by her fiance and his friends.

She eventually married and moved to a different city, interrupting her therapy. By this time her eating disturbance had for the most part subsided. During the first phase of its improvement she became able to curb her overeating when in the presence of her fiance, still tending to gorge herself when alone for any length of time. Eventually she developed a fairly good capacity to withstand even the hours she was not with him, without resorting to the symptom.

Jane's attitude toward treatment was always a curious admixture of enthusiasm (verbalized) and apprehension (not verbalized). Her motivation, not of the most intense order to begin with, flagged as symptoms waned, especially as marriage approached. The deepest layers of conflicts surrounding the mother relationship were left untouched; toward the end she did begin to express some admiration for her mother's stoicism and ability to run an orderly household. She no longer had to be the "opposite" of her mother's image, in order to retain a comfortable sense of self, but would choose a middle position: she adopted some of her mother's sense of style and elegance, but retained a kind of spontaneity and sensuality quite foreign to her mother.

Case 4

Sybil E. was seen when she was twenty-five because of frequent crying spells, and ruminations about suicide. She saw herself as "worthless," and felt all her school efforts were "pointless," since, as she was convinced, she would never amount to anything anyway. "Amounting to something" in her view meant accomplishing a singular feat in some creative field such as music or fine arts. Such a feat could entitle her, according to her values, to some crumbs of recognition and affection from those around her. In time even the meagre prospect of winning such acclaim ceased to buoy her spirits, inasmuch as "after the earth spins around the sun a few more times most of us will become forgotten specks of dust; after a few more spins, even Beethoven will be forgotten."

She came by this incapacitating sense of ennui and existential isolation in the following manner: She was a "middle child" with an older brother and a younger sister. Her parents were from southern "aristocracy," held large tracts of land, and lived off ample trusts, although the father worked in addition as a capable executive. He and his wife took frequent extended trips, sometimes as much as six months at a time, away from the children. The household help who looked after the children were a stable group who remained with the family until the youngest child was grown, but they were punitive and unempathic. The

parents were called "mater" and "pater" by all three children, who rarely saw either of them, and never ate at the same table until adulthood. Her mother was rejecting and aloof, such that Sybil could recollect few shared moments with her, except to be ordered to do a few unpleasant household chores (of a kind the servants would have done in any case) in a halfhearted attempt to teach her daughter "responsibility."

Sybil's most frequent dream centers around seeing herself as a scullery-maid, much like in the Cinderella fable, attached to a wealthy home, whose exalted inhabitants she was privileged to witness only from afar.

In Sybil there seemed to be a close connection between her conviction that "nothing really mattered" and the peculiar variety of maternal deprivation she experienced. To a much greater extent than was true for the other patients described here, she was denied opportunities to do tasks (whether modelling clay, going over music lessons, or sharing in the completion of a school assignment) with, and in relation to her mother. She did almost nothing in direct relation to either parent, still less did she have repeated experiences of her efforts, thoughts, impressions "mattering" to her parents.

Since she had no way of knowing what it was like to have incorporated into one's self the quality of "mattering" greatly to a parent, she took her own feeling of insignificance to be an unchallengeable truism.

Eventually she could accept in a limited way that her own feelings of isolation and unimportance, which periodically engulfed her, were more properly to be understood as symptoms of her early deprivation, and not as eternal verities. "But what," she then poignantly inquired, "am I to substitute for all that I didn't get? There still seems to be only the 'void'; if I didn't have a mother to whom I could feel like I counted, *who will I have, then?*"

One answer of course is the therapist. But "mattering-to-the-therapist" can be thin gruel compared to "mattering-to-mother."

Case 5 (C.J.K.)

Amanda G. was an eight-year-old girl referred by a male psychiatrist for "treatment with a woman," with whom she could "identify." Her overt reported symptoms were behavioral: masturbation and stealing from classmates. The school was concerned only about the anti-social behavior, while her mother was totally preoccupied with the sex play. She spied on Amanda in her bedroom, in the bath, and in fact frequently examined her genitals "to see if Amanda's clitoris was growing too big."

The family history was difficult to follow. Mrs. G., a beautiful but highly narcissistic ex-actress, spent much of the time talking about herself. Amanda, it emerged, was her daughter by her first marriage. But by the time the girl was 5, her mother had divorced and remarried three times. The mother-child relationship was pathologically symbiotic until the "terrible twos," at which time Amanda was entrusted entirely to nannies. There were several prolonged separations from mother because of the latter's hospitalizations (for suicide attempts) or vacations abroad.

As Amanda grew older, she had no close friend and was considered "a spoiled, rotten rich kid" by classmates and teachers. She had frequent episodes of bronchitis and mild asthmatic attacks which kept her out of school during part of each winter term.

Amanda came for therapy twice weekly. She responded very favorably to play-therapy: she immediately selected appropriate dolls to reenact family fights, "bad" children who stole, and "good" fairy-godmothers who protect babies and never go on vacations. She soon revealed that she masturbated to relieve tension—that she was frightened of the dark and was preoccupied by fears of burglars who would steal her away. Several of her stories involved abandoned children who were left alone in the woods. At no time did she speak openly of any disappointment in her own mother, nor did she express the slightest criticism, even if her mother was found quite by chance listening at the door of the office-playroom. Mrs. G. was meantime becoming increasingly jealous of her daughter's attachment to the doctor. All the best efforts to explain the importance of the therapeutic alliance which was forming failed and Mrs. G. removed Amanda from treatment after 10 months.

A year later the mother allowed Amanda to resume treatment, following a reexacerbation of her original symptoms.

The spontaneous doll-play again revolved around scenes of maternal abandonment: A "ten-year-old girl" was taking care of a "two-year-old;" the mother was "childish"—she "couldn't do anything by herself" and besides she was "always going away." Occasionally Amanda brought her own dolls to the office. At no time did she discuss her disappointment with her mother and she remained resistant to any such interpretation, calling the analyst names and saying she hated her and would rather talk to the maid. Her stories continued to act out scenes of orphaned children adapting to life without a mother.

Ambivalence toward her mother began to manifest itself in the transference. Amanda began stealing bits of play-food from the doll house and told the analyst, "I hate you—I hope you leave forever." During the period two major events colored her everyday life: she began to attend a prestigious parochial school, and she met her "real" father, Richard, who was involved in a court case with the mother over

child support. Her school work and relationships in general improved materially at this time in spite of the disappointment she experienced in meeting her father, who actually never had any real interest in her.

Case 7

Marie S. was 17 when first admitted to the New York State Psychiatric Hospital. Her presenting symptoms consisted of depression with suicide-gestures, and a rather incapacitating "globus hystericus."

She had become involved shortly before her graduation from high school in a number of chaotic sexual affairs, mostly with sadistic and rejecting men, though there were also two sexual encounters with young women.

Marie was the only child of a couple, each of whom came from old aristocratic Virginia families, and who divorced when she was four. She then lived with her mother, but, because of a chronic illness that rendered her mother an invalid for the next two years, she had to be cared for almost exclusively by nurses. Upon the mother's recovery, the nurses played less of a role in her upbringing; what developed instead was a "hostile symbiotic" relationship between mother and daughter. The mother was immensely autocratic, domineering and competitive, and was in addition a remarkably selfish woman, who encouraged certain skills in Marie only insofar as they might redound to the credit of the mother.

Marie was left to play by herself at home for much of the time, while her mother pursued her various "interests." She socialized very little, always felt estranged from her schoolmates, and was literally "at sea" whenever she had to leave the peculiar but familiar world of her home, and enter the ordinary world. She was so supercilious and arrogant that she made no real friends from amongst her many acquaintances.

The negative side of her markedly ambivalent feelings toward her mother was poignantly summarized in a dream she reported during the sixth month of her hospitalization:

"I am a baby lying in a crib or a baby carriage. Mother is standing nearby, naked, and with a very long penis which was curved around back to where she could put it in her mouth and suck on it."

The most relevant aspect of the dream for our purposes is that of her mother's failure to feed her baby, whom she stands tantalizingly near, while "feeding" *herself*.

The same selfishness Marie accused her mother of was present in herself as well. This trait comprised one of many egocentric attributes of which her narcissistic character structure was composed.

Yet, from the standpoint of therapy the most vexing problem initially was the "as-if" quality to her personality (the over-all level was consistent with a borderline-schizophrenic disorder). She had two therapists, for example, during her two and a half years in the hospital. Her seemingly strong attachment to the first doctor all but vanished the day the second doctor took charge of her case. The same kind of instantaneous detachment and reattachment could be seen in her relationships with everyone, especially with boyfriends. In treating her, one had to exercise the greatest caution in making an interpretation, unless Marie was herself just on the verge of making a similar connection. Otherwise she would snap up the doctor's words at one swallow, spewing them out the next day as a "new truth" she'd hit upon, uttering it of course without the slightest conviction.

Marie resembled in a number of ways the first patient Helene Deutsch (1942) described in her famous paper on the "as if" personality:

"One of these patients, a woman, and the only child of one of the oldest noble families in Europe, had been brought up in an unusual atmosphere. With the excuse of official duties, and quite in accordance with tradition, the parents delegated the care and training of their child to strangers. . . . The patient was drilled in love, honor, and obedience . . . without ever feeling these emotions directly or realistically. . . . For our patient there was never a warm, living, emotional relationship to the parents or to anyone else." (pp. 305-309)

Case 9

Carlos R. was admitted to the New York State Psychiatric Institute when he was 15 because of suicidal gestures, and withdrawal alternating with episodic outbursts of violence. He was from a family of wealthy Spanish landowners.

Early life was attended with many severe traumata. His delivery had been difficult (mother had fallen shortly before; delivery was breech). He showed slowing of his "milestones" (sat at 8 months, walked at 2½).

Carlos' mother was considered a "vain jet-setter," who neglected his care to a marked degree, attempting to compensate for her indifference to some extent through lavish gift-giving. Carlos was cared for almost entirely by servants until 9 when he went to boarding school. After the age of six his attendants were for the most part male; some of them apparently engaged in homosexual practices with Carlos, enticing him into performing fellatio.

By nine, Carlos was noted to be "accident-prone," burning himself on several occasions. He adjusted poorly at the Swiss school to which he was sent, and was alleged to have endured a homosexual "rape" his first year away.

When he was twelve, his parents divorced, and Carlos was sent to live with an uncle. Other forms of erratic behavior made their appearance now: impulsive striking of several teachers, and placing his hands on the crotch-areas of some male employees of his relatives' households.

At 14 he was sent to a boarding school in America. His mother had by now remarried, and was, if anything, less involved with Carlos' care and welfare than before. He engaged in a number of self-destructive acts at the school, such as swallowing tacks and smashing his fists against jagged rocks. He reported at times hallucinating men of "larger than life size."

In the 2½ years of his stay at the Institute his mother never visited. There were calls from her every other month from abroad, but these were tense and full of strained silences. It became a predictable event on the ward that within hours after these calls Carlos would erupt in violent behavior, either lashing out at those around him, or doing something injurious to himself.

Case 11

Cynthia L. was first referred for psychiatric treatment when she was twelve, shortly after the divorce of her parents. She was an only child. She had gone to live with her mother after the separation, but soon became unable to concentrate on her schoolwork. Although she retained most of her friends, she grew more isolated from them, preferring to contact them by phone rather than leaving home to visit them. Within a few months a full-fledged "school phobia" developed. Mrs. L. sought consultation with a psychiatrist, who recommended transfer to a sheltered school in a neighboring state that specialized in emotionally disturbed children.

Her mother was a very orderly, obsessional and detached woman who had not been eager to have a family at all. She entrusted Cynthia's care to a nurse, until shortly before the divorce, while she worked full-time as a legal secretary. She took little interest in her daughter, and maintained an attitude that was neither cordial nor yet punitive. Rather she let Cynthia "go her own way," such that her daughter would be "free" to wander about the house alone on the nurse's day off. Many of Cynthia's early recollections center around her terror at being left alone at 7 or 8, worrying lest the house be invaded by "monsters" or "burglars."

Cynthia spent five years at the special boarding school. When she was allowed home visits the last three years there, she chose to spend the time with her father, with whom she felt wanted. Her mother had remarried, and she did not feel accepted by either her mother or her stepfather. Though she completed her studies satisfactorily, she was still intensely phobic about many things at the end of the five years, most especially about all forms of transportation. She was also unable to enter an elevator.

She was transferred, because of her continuing inability to function outside a sheltered setting, to the New York State Psychiatric Institute when she was 17. Her hospitalization spanned some twenty months, the first 15 of which were spent languishing in her dormitory cubicle.

She was seen twice weekly in analytically-oriented psychotherapy, remaining, until the last five months, unproductive and negativistic almost to the point of mutism. When the therapist began to share with her his own irritation and frustration at all this silence, she suddenly perked up. She, too, had felt inhibited about venting her anger at the way the therapy had been stagnating. The therapist was himself "freed up" to become more open with her following a remark by a supervisor, who said, reacting to the case being presented to him in such a way he felt unable to comment constructively, "perhaps you cherish her the way she is!"

From that moment she made rapid strides. She was able to talk without any difficulty, and related how she and her father used to rock in their respective rocking-chairs on the porch of her father's house, neither saying much to the other, while her father would glower at her in silent disapproval. Her feeling was that if she defied him and left, "lightning" would strike her. Once she got up the courage to expose these apprehensions, she grew more assertive, and the intensity of her phobias diminished.

The therapeutic work throughout the final, productive five-month period remained centered around conflicts involving her father. As these conflicts got resolved, she made such progress that she became engaged to the boyfriend she had had for several years, and made plans to marry.

The deeper layers of conflict, those centering around her mother, remained unresolved. She was sufficiently content with the gains she had made to "settle" for the life she now had. She was marrying an appropriate man, she was able to work and had found a job. She made it plain she had no stomach for the potentially more painful work of analyzing her relationship with her mother. Earlier she had said, in attempting to summarize what she understood of her conflicts, "My father loved me so much, he couldn't let go of me; my mother loved me so little, she wouldn't have me around. I guess I can forgive Dad a lot easier."

Case 13

Peter W. was first seen in consultation when he was seventeen. He was the middle child of a concert pianist and his heiress-wife. Though his father was Roumanian and his mother was from the United States, he grew up in Switzerland where his family had moved, out of convenience to the father's career. The patient was referred because of frequent absences from school and unruliness (disrespectful attitudes toward his teachers, primarily) when he did show up. The school catered to young people talented in the arts and tended to look the other way with regard to poor academic performance, or else Peter would have been in more serious scholastic trouble. Except in his violin lessons, where he showed considerable promise, his performance was less than mediocre. He was living alone in the city as he had done since being expelled from an American private school for boys some two years before. Although he did spend summers with his family, the only time they visited him here was in connection with the expulsion. His parents made it plain through their correspondence that they were happy to have an ocean between Peter and them, because his behavior was so disruptive at home. His mother did interact with him to some extent, as well as with the two other children, when she was home, usually in an exhortatory manner regarding their behavior. At times she was also capable of some warmth. She could sometimes shield the children against the ire of their father, who could be kindly when his children were behaving well, but icy and aloof when, as had so long been the case with Peter, they were not. Much of the time, however, both parents were away from home, the mother tending to accompany her husband on tours wherever he might go. Other family members with whom the therapist was in contact confided that the mother, though still a striking beauty in her own right, was very jealous of her husband, and felt it necessary to be with him at all times lest he actualize what she imagined to be his extramarital interests. As a result, she "belonged," by her own contrivance, overwhelmingly much more to her husband than to her children.

Peter came to his sessions faithfully, though always with a begrudging air, assuring me he was coming only to satisfy the whims of his teachers, since he was himself, by his own admission, quite "normal." I was granted very few glimpses into unconscious material; Peter, instead, spent the hours recounting his exploits, complaining about the incompetence of his music-teachers, and humming tunes of pieces he was working on. At first I would try to nudge him into revealing "dynamic" material, but soon allowed myself to be guided by the pace he was setting and by the kinds of topics he was willing to chat with me about.

Toward the end of many sessions he would get up, rummage around my desk, and after perfunctorily asking my permission, help himself to generous quantities of envelopes, stationery, notepads, and ball-point pens. I tended to wink at all this genteel larceny, partly because I felt it constituted a kind of symbolic compensation for all the maternal deprivation he had experienced. After 3 months I was pleasantly surprised to learn from the authorities at his school, that Peter was a "changed boy." He was respectful to his teachers, calmer, and more disciplined in the performance of his assignments. (With me he was still rude and arrogant).

In retrospect one would have to call the treatment a success, though I would hesitate even to dignify it as a "transference cure" (Kolb 1959). It seems nearer the truth to consider it a "relationship-therapy," where I offered him access to an available and noncritical adult (something he had not encountered before), who in addition was willing to serve as a lightning rod for the bursts of irritation at his mother and at unifying authority in general.

Case 15

Lucy F. was 28 years old when first seen. She was referred for psychoanalysis because of difficulties raising her 2 small boys, consisting of squeamishness about handling their "messiness," and extreme impatience with them, occasionally punctuated by outbursts of rage.

Lucy was herself the middle of 3 children from a home where the father was an industrialist, and the mother (a strict and obsessional woman) a department-store heiress. Their marriage had become strained following the birth of Lucy's younger brother: The father began to "step out," while mother would remain home, growing more and more resentful and jealous. Their mother would lock herself in her quarters for hours on end, absorbed in prayer (she was a devout Catholic; the father a Protestant) whilst the children were relegated to the servants. Earlier in Lucy's life conditions were not much better; her mother avoided any substantive involvement with her not because of her father's infidelity but because of Lucy's "messiness". Cuddling the children, changing diapers, seeing them through toilet-training, kissing them good-night all seemed repugnant chores to the older woman. Lucy, when it became her turn to be a mother, experienced the same set of feelings. She was enormously guilty about sex, and imagined that her one episode of intercourse before marriage, even though it was with her future husband, had condemned her to the mental anguish that now beset her.

Her dreams were at first strikingly "primitive" and filled with themes of witches beating her with whips made of rosaries, of being torn limb

from limb by crocodiles, of having her family die in car crashes. During the first year of treatment two central themes emerges: (1) her rage at her mother for being constantly away (on trips with the father) or else preoccupied and unavailable to her, and (2) her guilt-tinged attachment to her irascible but, to her at least, seductive and attentive father.

My vacations were particularly upsetting to her, and touched off dreams in which she was tearfully waving goodbye to her parents, who sail away, as they so often did during her childhood, for months at a time to Europe.

In the latter 2 years of treatment, the major themes were (1) rage at being subjected to separations (when she could finally verbalize this in the transference-situation, the panicky calls ceased) and (2) erotically-tinged longing for her mother. After much work on this homosexual conflict, she became sexually responsive, began to feel both more womanly and more motherly, such that she was much less often angry at her children.

DISCUSSION

This series of patients represents all relevant cases seen by either author, who were treated for at least six months. Of the 17 who were included, 15 were female. This preponderance may be without statistical significance in a relatively small series, although there are a number of factors that could predispose to a one-sidedness of this type. In the cultural background from which most of the patients came, academic excellence is seldom required of the daughters to anywhere near the same extent as it is of the sons. The same is true for occupational performance. Many of these girls felt undervalued compared to their brothers, as though little else was expected of them in life than to look pretty, and make a lovely home. Unlike their brothers, they received in many instances no guidance about managing money matters. Like their mothers before them, they were not expected to go further academically than high-school.

The kinds of mental discipline required for adequate adaptation to life as a single adult living apart from the family were less well inculcated into the daughters of these households, as compared to the sons. The daughters were in this respect more vulnerable to breakdown when subjected to the various stresses attendant upon leaving the family.

There were many examples of mothers who were exaggeratedly preoccupied with their husbands to the relative neglect, or even exclusion, of their children. These mothers were often very needy themselves, and tended to seek maternal "supplies" (about which they felt so short-changed by *their* mothers) from their husbands. They were overly concerned about their appearance, jealous of other attractive women, and

competitive, rather than supportive, toward their daughters, as the latter began to blossom into attractive young women during adolescence. Sons, of course, would be much less threatening in this regard, hence again, the daughters in such an environment, would be at greater risk.

Freudenberger (1969) described the effects of maternal deprivation he observed over a wide range of clinical material. His patients come from all segments of the socio-economic spectrum and included survivors of war-torn Europe who had suffered separation or loss of their mothers.

He enumerated several features in many such patients; taken together these features may be said to constitute a deprivation "syndrome." Included were (1) a chronic low-grade depression; (2) a sense of abandonment; (3) feelings of emptiness; (4) deep dependency needs; (5) inability to maintain intimate human relations; (6) psychotic-like rage attacks; and (7) a tendency toward projective defenses, giving a paranoid coloration to their character.

Using Freudenberger's criteria, the most notable abnormalities in our series were encountered in the areas of "chronic depression" and "feelings of emptiness." All but one of the female patients complained of a pervasive and long-lasting sense of sadness, ennui and discouragement about the future. This along with a heightened readiness to tears constituted their chronic depression. This feeling-state was noted in one of the two male patients (#9). Likewise feelings of "emptiness" were noted in most of the female patients (all except #2 and #5), though not in the male patients.

In addition, half our patients exhibited prominent eating disturbances, ranging from anorexia nervosa (#2), or overeating under stress (#1, #11, and #16), to extreme finickiness and hypochondriacal concern with bowel-function (#4, #6) or globus hystericus (#7).

Feelings of worthlessness, impaired self-esteem, devalued body-image, and a weak sense of personal or sexual identity are other factors commonly seen in these patients. Freudenberger makes only a passing reference to families of the wealthy, stating that nurses often have an important role in childrearing in these families, where, e.g., a warm, maternal nurse may mitigate the effects of distant mothering, while an aloof, harsh, or critical nurse may reinforce the bad effects of such mothering. Case #1 illustrates the former effect; case #4, the latter.

Writing about clinical syndromes at the reverse end of the spectrum, David Levy (1943) mentions a variety of maternal *overprotection* in which a mother would become overprotective in relation to her husband's (suspected or real) infidelity or to his waning attentions. Levy saw this as a compensatory mechanism, the mother now showering on her offspring affectionate interest originally intended for her husband.

We noted in a third of our series examples of a quite opposite phenomenon: mothers whose emotional life centered almost exclusively

around their husbands. This helped create a family constellation reminiscent of many upper class English homes described by Gathorne-Hardy (1973) where the children had only a few minutes contact each day with their actual mothers (the remainder of the time being spent with "Nanny" or the governess). One facet of this development, in at least five of our cases, involved the mother's parentification of her husband, as a means of making up for the mother's own maternal deprivation. A third of our patients could, for example, recall hearing their mothers' complaints about the aloofness and superciliousness of their maternal grandmothers. They also knew their grandmothers and experienced them all as "cold" or "stiff" or "uncomfortable to be around."

In five of our patients, the effects of maternal deprivation were mitigated by the extra measures of attention shown them by their fathers. The salutary effect of this attention upon their daughters' emotional growth may have rendered an otherwise hopeless situation salvageable. But these fathers could in no way totally eradicate the scar that must inevitably develop where mothering-from-mother is so largely absent.

The series of female patients whose mothers and maternal grandmothers were significantly "unmotherly", either continuously or during prolonged periods of the patients' lives, highlights a special aspect of the maternal-deprivation syndrome. Women deprived of adequate mothering, for whatever reasons, almost predictably exhibit great difficulties in becoming adequate mothers themselves. Under optimal circumstances a paradigm of good mothering is offered to a young girl as she grows up through the person of her own, in Winnicott's term (1965), p. 145), "good-enough" mother. Our patients did not have such a model with which to identify, and in many instances neither had their mothers before them.

Their mothers, reared in homes where physical contact and demonstrativeness of any kind were often strongly discouraged, were ill-at-ease having to kiss their children goodnight, standoffish about hugging them, and so on. They transmitted the notion that such behavior was sinful or dirty. By identification with their mothers, a number of our patients fell into the same pattern (Andrea, Wilma, Sandra); still others, because of their more than ordinary longing for contact, displayed excessive grooming and, later, promiscuity (Alice and Marie).

Another manifestation of the restless search for human contact, that in some instances had led to promiscuity, was the tendency to wander from doctor to doctor. This behavior was noted in only one of our younger patients (Marie), although it has been observed rather often in adult patients from this class (Stone, 1972). When present, this pattern is very difficult to correct, because the patient avoids making a deep enough or lasting enough relationship with the therapist to allow for its

resolution. This situation has been described in maternally-deprived persons in general by Bowlby (1966), who spoke of their "inaccessibility" which was so "exasperating to those trying to help" (p. 31).

Dramatic examples of maternal deprivation in homes of the very poor are more familiar to clinicians; that such deprivation can occur in the most affluent homes as well seems ironic, and raises the whole question of the disparity of socioeconomic class and psychological class. How are we to explain the frequency of this disparity in the children of the wealthy?

A number of explanations for this paradox come to mind, some probable, some more speculative. *Probable* factors include:

a) Unavoidable separations from the children because of the highly important nature of one or both parents' work. Obviously a man with a critical government post, who happens also to enjoy great wealth, may have to absent himself from his family for reasons of overriding importance to the nation of families which he serves. Multiple and unexpected absences may be the rule, and may require the presence of his wife on many occasions. In such a setting children might be subjected to a kind of maternal deprivation even where their mother may be in no way rejecting or inept at motherhood.

b) Avoidable separations from home, by parents who do find the tasks of parenthood burdensome and unpleasant, and who have ample means to circumvent these tasks in a "decent" fashion: arranging prolonged visits abroad, etc., whilst their children remain for many months at a time with no adult figures in their midst except the household help. One would anticipate in such homes a poorer quality of mothering also when mother was physically present. This phenomenon was noted in a third of our patients. More extensive comment on the subject will be found in Bowlby's recent monograph on separation (1973, Chapter 3).

c) Institutionalization within the subculture of enhanced separation of parents from children, through the offices of specialized servants. The custom of having a nanny for routine child care and a governess for early education has never been as widespread or highly developed in America, as compared to England or continental Europe. Mothers in wealthy homes here assume correspondingly more of a role in their children's upbringing. Hence in those rather few homes where the older tradition still prevails children may regard themselves as relatively disadvantaged, in the amount of contact with mother, compared to their schoolmates. The most striking example of this that we encountered was in the case of Sybil. She was not only kept in a separate wing of her parents' house with a "classic" British nanny (who happened to be punitive and austere), but she was also reared in "splendid isolation" from the surrounding community. She was actually 12 before she was allowed to set foot outside the 1000-acre estate of the family. In this

respect her experience recalls that of Freud's famous patient, the Wolfman (1971).

Speculative factors include:

a) A tendency amongst some young men of inherited wealth to marry women more outstanding for beauty and "sophistication" than for their psychological maturity, let alone potential for maternal effectiveness. Some of these women are effete and highly narcissistic. The mothers of our cases #1, #3, #9, and #13 exemplify this tendency.

b) A tendency for extreme affluence to foster espousal of what Kahn and Wiener (1967, p. 39) call "sensate" (appealing to the senses, to the wish for pleasure; epicurean) values as contrasted with "idealistic" values (emphasis on long-term goals, puritanism, stoicism, self-abnegation in the service of some higher goal). This again would favor the creation of marriages where the partners are more devoted to immediate gratification of the senses than to long-range goals involving hard work, self-denial, or child rearing. The marriage-bond itself may be weakened in the process.

c) A special instance affecting female offspring only is the greater preference in families of the very wealthy, especially those with aristocratic pretensions, to favor male children, who will carry the family name, over the daughters, who will not. This factor appeared to be at work in cases #7, #14, and #17.

One recurring feature in the psychotherapy of our patients (noted in two-thirds of the cases) was the greater ease with which transference issues stemming from the father-relationship could be broached and resolved, in comparison to issues stemming from the mother-relationship. One of the authors (M.H.S.) grew uncertain for a time about the significance of this observation, inasmuch as it could easily be argued that it might be more natural for patients with a male therapist to display transference material involving male figures, first, before endowing him with attributes deriving from the important females of their earlier life. The female co-author noted, however, that her (female) patients, from amongst this maternally-deprived group, likewise began the therapeutic work with problems relating to their fathers.

Most of the patients in the series were female, and for them discussion of the deeper layers of conflict centering around their mothers was tinged with homosexual implications: erotization of dependency conflicts had taken place in all but the youngest (#5).

Several of the mothers, from their side, had significant unresolved problems in the same area, most notably the mothers of Marie (#7), Andrea (#8), and Wilma (#12). This appeared to serve as another factor operating to keep their daughters at arms' length, i.e., repudiation of their own unconscious and erotized longings for union or intimacy with their growing daughters. In another instance a mother who was herself

severely starved of adequate mothering rejected her daughter (Faith, #10), until the latter grew older and mature enough to provide some of the maternal supplies her mother had been lacking. Faith's mother shifted in her attitude from aloofness to clinging dependence, a transition also noted in the relationships between Marie and her mother.

Strong homosexual conflicts are noted in the male patients as well. In case #9 these were acted upon intermittently during latency and early adolescence. Freud (1905), incidentally, was aware of this kind of situation occurring in upper-class families occasionally, as he noted in his essays on sexuality:

"The education of boys by male persons . . . seems to encourage homosexuality. The frequency of inversion among the present day aristocracy is made somewhat more intelligible by their employment of menservants, as well as by the fact that their mothers give less personal care to their children." (p. 230)

Maternal deprivation in the offspring of the very well-to-do appears to be a common feature in *those who seek psychiatric help*. We are not prepared to say that deprivation of a clinically significant degree would be found more often in homes of the wealthy, than in middle-class homes, though this is certainly a possibility.

There are some important implications to this issue for psychoanalysis as it is currently practiced. It has already been demonstrated by Aronson and Weintraub (1968) that nineteen out of twenty patients receiving psychoanalysis come from the first two of Hollingshead's classes (which represent 11% of the population). Seventy-three percent, in fact, came from "Class I" homes, representing 3½% of the population. The patients of our series were for the most part younger when first seen than are patients who might be accepted for classical psychoanalysis. Many adult patients, however, referred for psychoanalysis to us and to our colleagues in recent years come from similar homes. They show many aspects of the maternal deprivation syndrome, just as in our younger patients. This entire group of patients, taking the children, adolescents, and adults together, come from a much more rarified socioeconomic stratum than that represented by Class "I" of Hollingshead, and may come from a class of families that comprises only ½ to 1% of the population.

If one considers that psychoanalytic treatment, in the strict sense of the term, typically involves three to five sessions per week, at fees ranging from \$30.00 to \$60.00 per session, one realizes that the yearly cost would nowadays range from about \$4,300 to about \$14,500. The average cost would be close to \$9,000 per year. There are few who can now afford psychoanalytic treatment who do not come from the narrow band of the socioeconomic spectrum that we have been describing.

It would seem that psychiatrists practicing psychoanalysis or psychoanalytically-oriented psychotherapy will encounter in increasing

numbers maternally deprived patients similar to those who form the subject of this paper. Ironically, we have noted that it is in this very group of unusually wealthy patients that one finds surprisingly few genuinely analyzable patients. In some instances one encounters poor motivation coupled with tenuous object-relations and a narcissistic character disorder of such a kind as to slow down or defeat altogether the formation of a therapeutic alliance. The brittleness of character and impoverishment of interpersonal relations are often themselves manifestations related to maternal deprivation. In other instances one encounters highly motivated patients who are capable of forming the necessary alliance, only who are so fragile, again partly because of intense maternal deprivation, that classical analysis becomes risky.

In the section that follows we turn our attention to some of the attitudes and manoeuvres we have found useful in treating patients of this kind.

The presence, during early life, of some nourishing figure has been considered almost essential for a successful psychoanalytic—or psychoanalytically oriented treatment in later life. Freudenberger emphasized this point (*op. cit.*), and also cited a 1909 paper by Freud in which the importance of the mother-child relationship as paradigm for all future relationships was underlined.

Clinically, there is something about having had a mother who was 70% “there” for one, that allows him to face, during intensive psychotherapy, the re-emergence of feelings—the pain, the longing, the disappointment—associated with the 30% she was not “there”. So far we can speak of an “analyzable” situation. But those for whom mother seemed to be “not there” 90%, often experience, in an inchoate and scarcely verbalizable way, that the “good” 10% is too meager a buttress against the tumultuous feelings that would be unleashed were the full perception of their deprivation to ever register upon their consciousness. Patients of this sort with healthier ego-structures, functioning at a “neurotic” level, may exhibit extreme brittleness of character, or a tendency to “somaticize” certain complaints. In the women, especially, one may see a tendency to identify with mother, or with mother-as-she-ought-to-have-been. The latter group often make successful adaptations in the nurturing professions, while still preserving a large storehouse of scarcely analyzable bitterness and sorrow over the mothering they *didn't* get.

Patients with more fragile ego-structure tend to encase maternal deprivation, especially if the latter has been severe, behind the wall of denial. This is so even when the patients' over-all function is good enough to keep them out of the borderline-schizophrenic category.

In our series only three patients were schizophrenic, as were only two of the patients' mothers (#10 and #12). Yet the severe degree of maternal deprivation in most seemed to leave them with a core of untappable, unanalyzable conflict.

These patients seemed to require, instead of insight, long exposure in psychotherapy to a supportive, reliable, nurturing figure. In many instances the therapist was the first person who showed any genuine interest or delight in the patient's emerging self. The degree to which the therapist served as a model for identification surpassed in its healing qualities the efficacy of the more traditional features of the treatment-situation. The nonverbal aspects often overshadowed the verbal.

Sybil E., for example, had never shared a meal with her parents. She was in the habit of bringing tea and cakes into the session to share with her doctor. Initially there was an attempt to discourage this behavior, and to analyze its roots. Sybil showed great resistance to any such efforts; she became tearful, or uncomprehending, or abusive, depending on her mood. Usually she would look incredibly hurt. After some months her doctor took the cue and abandoned his effort to bring this bit of behavior into the analysis, giving in, as it were, to her longing, after so many years, for a simple meal shared with someone she cared about. The "4 o'clock tea" became a regular feature of her sessions, and she herself began to "flourish": she completed some unfinished schoolwork, got a job, and even grew bold enough to vent some of her hostility at her mother's indifference. All this in a setting of not much analyzed acceptance, mutually enjoyed conversations about her coursework, and so on. Treatment resembled the kind of work Augusta Alpert (1959) recommended for dealing with maternally-deprived children, via her technic of "corrective object relations" ("C.O.R.").

Alpert's study was an outgrowth of the resurgence of interest in maternal deprivation stimulated by the work of Bowlby (*op. cit.*) and Spitz (1946), both of whom had been concerned in part with institutionalized children who had been orphaned during World War II.

Her corrective-object-relations technic had as its first step the establishment of an "exclusive, need-satisfying relationship" between such a child and, in the case of her study, the special nursery-school teacher. This might then lead to the child's regression to the point of traumatic fixation, and to the teacher-therapist's coming to acquire a better understanding of the quality of mothering before the trauma or separation took place. The teacher was then to follow and encourage the child's regression by gratifying the phase-specific needs (oral, most often). The treatment method aimed in some instances in "preparing otherwise unready children for later psychoanalysis."

If one transposes these recommendations into the arena of intensive therapy by psychoanalytically-trained psychiatrists, adjusting also for an older age-group, they are seen to correspond well to the kind of treatment we have found useful for the maternally-deprived patients of our own series. In cases #5 and #15, for example, treatment occurred

in two phases, an initial need-gratifying phase, followed several years later by psychoanalysis.

There were nevertheless a number of cases (#1, #3, #4, #6, and #11) where the preparatory phase of being a "real person" for the patient was not followed by the patient's developing a capacity to confront more fully and work through the deprivation-oriented psychopathology. Usually the patients left at this point, grateful for modest gains already made, but devoid of any eagerness to push further. Jane and Cynthia are two examples of such patients: they both quit treatment after making rather fortunate choices of marital partners. Both men were gentle, sensitive individuals who preferred, like the patients, to avoid the social scene and live in a comfortable twosome with their spouses. No doubt this arrangement made up in some measure the lack of adequate mothering suffered by both girls. It has been our experience that one often has to settle, in this group of patients, for half-treatments of this sort, adequate in many respects, yet not as solid as one would have liked to achieve.

A healthy sense of self-worth is, in Freudenberger's words (*op. cit.*) "built up through the interest parents show, by telling their child stories, listening to its conversation . . . or by just listening to him. . . . These activities are neglected by the . . . preoccupied or uninterested mother." Many of our female patients, having been reared in the virtual absence of this kind of maternal attentiveness, lacked not only a healthy sense of self-worth, but also the discipline with which to apply themselves later on to any pursuit (psychotherapy included) that might prove rewarding or helpful.

The authors consider it an important task in treatment to foster an appropriate sense of self-discipline where this has been lacking.

As Sybil and Linda began to resume their college studies, for example, many sessions were devoted to poring over catalogs and making up schedules. Neither was yet capable of integrating the fact that a person should be able to derive enjoyment from his favorite activities even when there was no one else in their life to do them *for* or *with*. It was cold comfort to them to hear such statements, even if backed up by the relevant dynamic interpretations. With Sybil and Amanda, it took five years to get "enough" from their therapists—to incorporate sufficiently, that is, the therapist's genuine interest in their personal development—before this capacity to *do* and to *be* alone emerged.

This process is akin to what Winnicott (1958a) speaks of, concerning the capacity to be alone:

"Gradually the ego-supportive environment is introjected and built into the individual's personality, so that there comes about a

capacity actually to be alone. Even so, theoretically there is always someone present, someone who is equated ultimately and unconsciously with the mother, the person who, in the early days and weeks was temporarily identified with her infant, and for the time being was interested in nothing else but the care of her own infant." (p. 420)

Only with our patients it was not always sufficient to become equated with more (mere replacement); one had literally, and seemingly for the first time, to *be* mother.

Of our 17 patients, five left treatment within a year, and of those, three left prematurely (Jane, Alice, Linda). The remaining patients have had from five to ten years of continuous therapy (though not always with the same therapist).

Time is an important factor in undoing the effects of maternal deprivation, which had often rendered the patients as severely disturbed, from a characterological point of view, as are most schizophrenic patients from an ego-integrative point of view. Both groups of patients seem to require, for optimal therapeutic results, a prolonged basking in symbiotic, mutually pleasurable "oneness" with the therapist.

Searles (1958), spoke of this time element in connection with schizophrenic patients and their mothers:

"The time-span involved in the (transference) evolution . . . may be great indeed. . . . It seems to me that one of the great reasons for this long time-span . . . is that the 'good mother' transference-relatedness has a basically symbiotic quality which is anxiety-provoking to both patient and therapist and therefore arouses great resistance in each of them, which takes many months to resolve." (p. 578)

While Searles' remarks appear equally valid for our patients, who for the most part were not schizophrenic, we believe one should also add this comment: even if the anxiety-provoking aspects of the necessary therapist-patient intimacy could be overcome in a month, tremendous periods of time would still be necessary for treatment to have its full effects. There are a number of essential organs in the anatomy of normal character structure which need in our patients not to be simply improved or redesigned; they must in the more severe cases be created anew out of the matrix of the therapeutic relationship. Here we are speaking of the capacity to trust the "other," the development of self-discipline, the capacity to pursue and sustain a creative or occupational endeavor, the capacity to endure separation and to endure disappointment in the inevitable "break-ups" that occur along the way in choosing an appropriate marital partner. The introjective and identificatory processes out of which these "organs" develop would under the best of circumstances require years, not months.

Michael H. Stone, M.D. is Associate Director, General Clinical Service, New York State Psychiatric Institute; Clarice J. Kestenbaum, M.D. is Director, Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, St. Luke's Hospital, New York City.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alpert, Augusta (1959): Reversibility of pathological fixations associated with maternal deprivation in infancy. *Psychoan. Study of the Child*. 14:169-185.
- Aronson, H. and Weintraub, W. (1968): Social background of the patient in classical psychoanalysis. *J. Nerv. and Ment. Dis.* 146:91-98.
- Brander, Michael (1973): *The Georgian Gentleman*, Glasgow: MacLehose and Co.
- Bowlby, John (1966): *Maternal Care and Mental Health*. New York: Schocken Books.
- (1973): *Separation: Anxiety and Anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- deMause, Lloyd (1974): The Evolution of Childhood, in *The History of Childhood* (L. deMause, ed.) New York: The Psychohistory Press.
- Deutsch, Helene (1942): Some forms of emotional disturbance and their relationship to schizophrenia. *Psychoan. Quart.* 11:301-321.
- Freud, S. (1905): Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, S.E. vol. VII.
- Freudenberger, H. and Overby A. (1969): Patients from an emotionally deprived environment. *Psychoan. Rev.* 56:299-312.
- Gathorne-Hardy, J. (1973): *The Unnatural History of the Nanny*. New York: The Dial Press.
- Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (1973): *The Joys and Sorrows of Parenthood*. Vol. 8, report #84.
- Hollingshead, A. B. and Redlich, F. C. (1958): *Social Class and Mental Illness*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kahn, Herman and Wiener, Anthony, J. (1967): *The Year 2000*. New York: The MacMillan Co.
- Kolb, L. C. and Montgomery, J. (1959): An explanation for transference cure. *Progress in Psychotherapy* 4:66-75, 1959.
- Levy, David M. (1943): *Maternal Overprotection*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Luborsky, L. (1962): Clinicians' judgments of mental health. *Arch. Gen. Psych.* 7:407-416.
- Robertson, Priscilla (1974): Home as a Nest: Middle Class Childhood in the 19th Century in Europe. *The History of Childhood* (Lloyd deMause, ed.) New York: The Psychohistory Press.
- Searles, Harold F. (1958): Positive feelings in the relationship between the schizophrenic and his mother. *Internat'l. J. of Psychoanal.* 39:569-585.
- (1960): *The Non-Human Environment*. New York: International Univ. Press.
- Spitz, Rene (1946): Anaclitic Depression. *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*. Vol. II, pp. 313-342.
- Spitzer, R. L. and Endicott, J. (1974): Psychiatric Rating Scales in the Evaluation of Psychiatric Treatment. *Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*. (Freedman and Kaplan, eds.). (In press)
- Stierlin, Helm (1974): Comments on "The Evolution of Childhood," *History of Childhood Quarterly: The Journal of Psychohistory* 4:582-4.
- Stone, Michael H. (1972): Treating the wealthy and their children. *Int. J. of Child Psychother.* 1:15-46.

- (1973): The history of child psychiatry before the 20th Century. *Internat'l J. of Child Psychotherapy*. 2:264-308.
- Walzer, John F. (1974): A Period of Ambivalence: Eighteenth-Century American Childhood. In *The History of Childhood* (L. deMause, ed.). New York: The Psychohistory Press.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1958a): The capacity to be alone. *Internat'l J. of Psychoanal.* 39:416-420.
- (1958b): Metapsychological and Clinical Aspects of Regression within the Psychoanalytic Setup. *Collected Papers*. New York: Basic Books.
- (1965): *The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment*. New York: International Univ. Press.
- Wolf-Man (1971): *The Wolf Man: the double story of Freud's most famous case*. New York: Basic Books.

FROM THE SOURCES

Sexual Molesting of Children in the Eighteenth Century:

"... nothing is so dangerous for morals and perhaps for health as to leave children too long under the care of chambermaids, or even of young ladies brought up in the chateaux. I will add that the best among them are not always the least dangerous. They dare with a child that which they would be ashamed to risk with a young man. I had need of all the sentiments of piety which my mother implanted in my soul to preserve my youth from great corruption."

Francois Joachim de Pierre de Bernis,
Memoirs and Letters (Boston, 1901),
Vol. I, p. 90.

BISMARCK'S CHILDHOOD: A PSYCHOHISTORICAL STUDY

CHARLOTTE
SEMPELL

Scant attention has been paid to Bismarck's childhood. Whenever biographers mention it they do so in terms of disparate heritage, the Bismarcks, a Junker family, on the one hand, the bourgeois high civil servant Menckens on the other. Inheritance is of course a given, and there can be little doubt that Otto von Bismarck got his intellectual gifts from his mother, and not only by inheritance. The only detailed story of his childhood and youth was given by Erick Marcks¹ in the first volume of a never-completed biography. Its basic approach was time-bound to such an extent that the author could not continue the work after the first World War. Although dated, the book is indispensable as a source. In his recent article *Toward a Psychoanalytic Interpretation of Bismarck* Otto Pflanze gave a bare outline of the oedipal situation of the child.²

In the following I attempt a psychohistorical investigation of Bismarck's childhood. As a theoretical framework I used the writings of Anna Freud, Erik Erikson, and articles in the *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*.³ It should be borne in mind that I will deal only with the emotional development of the child Otto von Bismarck. Attention to the interconnected maturational processes and cognitive growth would require a different theoretical basis. Not all the facts we would like to have are available. To name only one, we do not know whether his mother or a wet-nurse breastfed him. Occasionally I have used infor-

mation contained in the earliest biography of Bismarck by George Hesekiel⁴ which gives no sources and must have been based on oral tradition. Information coming from Bismarck's conversations has to be evaluated with regard to time and the person with whom he talked. Conversations with Robert von Keudell⁵ have greater value than those with Moritz Busch⁶ because the former was a personal friend, whereas the latter was his press agent who sometimes caught him in an unguarded moment. Psychologically most valuable are Bismarck's letters to his wife-to-be, Johanna von Puttkamer,⁷ during the early months of their engagement before he entered the political scene. The close connection of his engagement with his so-called conversion experience after the death of Marie von Blankenburg was reflected in an attitude of honest self-searching which is otherwise foreign to Bismarck. Lastly I have used the letters Bismarck's parents wrote to their older son, Bernhard,⁸ as a direct evidence for their relationship to their sons. Sometimes, due to lack of specific information, I have had recourse to treatises on child raising and to contemporary autobiographies, as well as to the basic tenet of psychoanalysis that certain attitudes of the adult reveal the impact of childhood events.

After Bismarck had been dismissed from office his old friend Alexander von Keyserling visited him. He advised him to use his remaining years to become harmonious. Bismarck asked: "Why should I be harmonious?"⁹ The story of his childhood will show why this was indeed impossible.

The early nineteenth century is a time of change for child-raising practices. Under the influence of Rousseau, childhood began to be considered as something special. "As mankind has its place in the world, so childhood has its place in human life."¹⁰ Still, centuries of Christian teaching about original sin had left their imprint, and the recognition of the importance of the first year of life spelled a heavy responsibility for early moral training, lest evil get the upper hand. Even Rousseau warned: "The first tears of children are requests, if we are not careful they will become commands; they begin by begging for our help, they end by making us their slaves."¹¹ The century-old fear of the infant was still there. One did not trust the nature of the child. Georg Friedrich Most, who wrote a German handbook in 1839 on child raising, explained that "to raise according to nature" meant "that we eliminate everything that hinders the nourishment and conservation of the body and that we increase the skill of the child by daily exercises . . . that we strengthen the will of the child, stimulate his courage and strength in dangers, his patience in misfortune."¹²

Upper-class families included servants who lived in and to whom a good part of the physical care of children was entrusted. The question

of whether or not a mother should nurse her child was much debated. The Prussian law required that a healthy mother should nurse her child.¹³ The social reality was different. The medical profession, while extolling the virtues of mother milk, thought it impractical for higher-class women to nurse as it would interfere with their social obligations, or they were assumed to be of too delicate health.¹⁴ Johanna von Schopenhauer reported that her mother nursed her against the custom of the time and against the advice of her physician.¹⁵ It was necessary to choose the wet-nurse carefully not only for health reasons but also because the child imbibed the character traits with the milk.¹⁶ After the child was weaned, the wet-nurse would be dismissed and the child was "orphaned and rejected".¹⁷ The weaning itself should take eight weeks during which time new food was to be introduced consisting of rusks softened in milk and somewhat later white bread at least a day old. In the second year a very thin bouillon and weak beer, vegetables like carrots and young beans, fruit cooked and raw could be added. Potatoes were considered unhealthy. In order to find out how much a given child needs, one should observe how much it takes of simple unsweetened food.¹⁸ The very insistence on simple and sparse food had its causes not only in the fear of diarrhea, but was a remnant of the older fear of the devouring infant.

Other physical care of the infant included a sunny room, heated at night only during the first year of life, just as warm baths were confined to that period; later cold rooms and cold water were recommended.¹⁹ If swaddling seems to have been on the way out, one still used leading strings to teach children how to walk, though no less a person than Kant remarked: "It is remarkable that one wants to teach children how to walk, as if anybody would not be able to walk for want of such instruction."²⁰ Toilet training does not appear in the literature as a special problem except that at least one author demands it to start in the first year of life. All the more stress is put on early moral education and in this context servants are rejected because they give in to the child or worse play with his genitals which leads to vice and an early death.²¹ The strictest moral training is necessary, and the recollections of many persons attest to harsh treatment, usually beatings, by parents whenever a moral lapse is even suspected. To cite only one example, Johann Gottfried Seume tells how his father, who usually did not beat his children, gave him a thorough hiding because he suspected him, wrongly, of lying. When it turned out that he was innocent his father "sought to compensate with many a secret tenderness, for publicly his authority could not suffer."²² The only beatings Bismarck, who was a grievance collector, ever mentioned were those by tutors at school, thus it cannot have been part of his upbringing. He was left to the care of his

mother's personal maid as long as he stayed at home. This might indicate some personal involvement of his mother. On the whole, even if left to the care of servants, German children had more contact with their parents than the English nursery provided.

Otto von Bismarck was born April 1, 1815 at Schoenhausen. He was the second surviving son of Ferdinand and Wilhelmine von Bismarck; of three older children only Bernhard, born 1810, was still living and, like Bismarck himself reached old age. The family belonged to the petty Prussian nobility known as Junkers. Ferdinand, whose mother died when he was an infant, had been raised by his father who was a man of the Enlightenment, yet sent all his sons into the army. Ferdinand, the youngest of four brothers who unlike them, left the army at age twenty-three against the wishes of his king who withheld his promotion and the right to wear the uniform, both later granted. He never served again not even during the wars against Napoleon though Bismarck once said that he did.²³ Ferdinand spent his life managing his estates, first Schoenhausen then three Pomeranian estates he had inherited from an uncle. His wife urged him to introduce such changes as sheep raising instead of the less profitable grain production, an innovation advocated by agriculturalists like Albrecht Thaer. However, there were too many experiments for the good of the productivity of the estates. Ferdinand followed her initiative with little discrimination, disregarding what his own good sense would have counselled. He was easy-going, friendly, with a crude sense of humor and a common sense that was evident in his advice to Bernhard, not to lend money to friends because he would make an enemy when he wanted it back.²⁴ His one outstanding trait was his devotion to his wife whose every wish he seems to have fulfilled. He married her when he was thirty-five years old. The lateness of the marriage was due to an earlier unhappy love affair. He had fallen in love with the beautiful young wife of his brother Ernst. He fainted upon first seeing her. The love was reciprocated, a divorce only averted by the early death of the young woman. Ferdinand then took his brother into his own household.²⁵ Wilhelmine Mencken, seventeen at the time of her marriage, had first been courted by Ferdinand's brother Friedrich who remained a bachelor. He had been the most successful of the Bismarck brothers attaining the rank of lieutenant-general.

Wilhelmine was the daughter of a high-ranking bourgeois, Ludwig Anasthasius Mencken, who had made a career under Frederick the Great, becoming a member of his cabinet. He continued to serve under his two successors, with the exception of a short time when he was in disgrace as a "jacobin." Baron Carl von Stein counted him among the forerunners of reformers like himself. Wilhelmine seems to have been her father's favorite but he died when she was twelve years old. She had

received a good education and, living in the royal residence of Potsdam, had been the playmate of the Hohenzollern princes, who were permitted to visit her father's house as their only contact with the bourgeoisie. Her marriage to a nobleman, though permissible by law, was unusual at a time when the French Revolution threatened aristocratic privileges. The era of reform in Prussia following the defeat, as well as the reactionary period after the victory over Napoleon stiffened the prejudices of the aristocracy in different ways. Hesekei mentions that Wilhelmine was snubbed by Pomeranian Junkers.²⁶ What moved the beautiful and intellectual Wilhelmine to marry the rather primitive Ferdinand? As she was half his age at the time of their marriage, we assume that she was looking for a father substitute, who, however, had to be sufficiently unlike her own father to ward off incest guilt. She had rejected the more congenial Friedrich.

Ferdinand and Wilhelmine were ill matched. His life centered around the estate, the hunt, the woolmarket, whereas she was a city child and had been raised in the shadow of the court. Yet, she could not accompany her husband to court because her bourgeois birth barred her from the royal presence. She took a lively interest in politics. During the July revolution in France, she sent Otto to fetch the newest French newspapers. She followed modern ideas like Mesmerism,²⁷ a then much-discussed medical treatment by magnetism. She read Justinus Kerner's *Seeress of Prevorst* and subscribed to his periodical where somnambulist phenomena were described. Swedenborg also fascinated her. At one time, she claimed to be clairvoyant herself, although her husband remarked that she had failed to foresee the fall of the wool prices toward the end of the wool market.²⁸ These tendencies were counterbalanced by her regular reading of *Zschokken's Almanac*, a publication closer to enlightenment than to romanticism. Most of her life she was suffering from ailments which might have been psychosomatic and finally undermined her health. She died at fifty of cancer. Her husband suffered a stroke after her death but recovered and lived to be seventy-four.

The contrasting personalities of his parents must have created difficulties for Otto von Bismarck. Not only was the mother and not the father the leading personality in the family, but this anomaly resulted in the additional one of a socially inferior person proving to be superior in intelligence and will power. Great contrasts between father and mother are not necessarily psychologically damaging, while they create problems they also offer a wider scope of possibilities for solving them. In Bismarck's case, he never mentioned the bourgeois origin of his mother, and from an early age he posed as a Junker. Repressed facts hint, of course, at psychological conflicts.

Otto von Bismarck spent the early years of his childhood at Kniephof in Pomerania. The family moved there when he was a year old.

He remembered fondly the time spent at home on the estate. He once said:

until my sixth year I was at Kniephof nearly always outside in the fresh air or in the stables. The old cowherd once warned me not to be so trusting with the cows. The cow, he said, can hit you in the eye with her hoof. The cow doesn't notice anything and continues to feed but your eye is then phuit.²⁹

Another time he said that the old cowherd had been an important person in his childhood, and that he had died when he was five or six. "When I think of him," he added "it feels like heather and wild flowers."³⁰

Other memories of his earliest years were of a different nature. He remembered the parties which his parents attended or gave. Once, when he was still wearing girl's clothes, as was customary for little boys at the time, he overheard some guests speculating in French whether he was a boy or a girl. "C'est un fils, monsieur"³¹ he said. This would mean that he had learned French very early—we know that his sister, born 1827, did—but later his mother reproached both her sons because she had heard that they had been dumb like fishes when French was spoken.³² The little story otherwise indicates that he attended parties as a child, or maybe was called in to be presented. During the French campaign he twice spoke of his mother and how she was dressed when she went to a ball. He put the memory into the year 1821 or 1822.

She wore long gloves, until here—pointing to his upper arms—a dress with a short waist, loose curls at both sides (of her face) and on her head an ostrich feather.

Busch added "he did not continue the story if there was supposed to be one."³³ On the second occasion Bismarck repeated the description that it was one of his earliest memories. Later we will see another example of his being impressed by the elegance of his mother. Here I only want to point out the contrasting elements which dominated his early childhood; on the one hand the simplicity of the country and his attachment to the old cowherd, on the other the life of the society of the capital with its glittering elegance personified by his mother. He found the same fashionable world at watering places when he accompanied his parents on their summer trips. His mother appeared even in his memory as an object of admiration rather than the person who took care of him. Bismarck once complained that she did not much trouble about him.³⁴ The personal maid of his mother looked after him as long as he was home. His father too was somewhat remote, he addressed the child in the third person singular.³⁵ Yet the child was generally liked and may have been somewhat spoiled.

1819 when Otto was four years old, a younger brother, Franz, was born. At the time Bernhard was already away at school. We have no account of Otto's reactions to the birth of a rival for the attention of his mother and of the maid who cared for him at an age where oedipal conflicts develop. A number of favorable comments about him a year later sound as if he had had a difficult time. In 1820 his mother reported that *now* he was no longer afraid of the cold and played outside a lot, that he climbed trees with the grandson of the cowherd, exercised at parallel bars, wore Bernhard's grey smock, and in the spring tended Bernhard's garden.³⁶ During the summer he travelled again with his parents and "he saw much and liked it everywhere."³⁷ Thus he had successfully mastered the birth of a rival by adopting the role of big brother, molding himself on the real but absent and thus not threatening big brother.³⁸ He was now the big boy who could play outside and travel with his parents. His further development pleased his parents, and he started to learn reading and writing. This favorable personal growth was rudely cut off when he was sent away to boarding school when he was still six years old, in January 1822.

It was an unusual step. Most upper-class children received their early schooling at home from their parents, sometimes beginning as early as four years old. When Latin was required, they passed on to the local clergyman or tutors were taken into the house, richer families asking the sons of the less wealthy to participate. Almost nobody was sent to school before he was twelve.³⁹ Bismarck blamed the early exile on his mother. She was moved partly by the conviction that the irregular life of the family was not conducive to a good education.⁴⁰ The alternative would have meant a more sedentary life which entailed her giving up water cures and social distraction in the capital in winter. One thinks of the neighboring family of Adolf von Thadden, whose life revolved around the estate and the church and whose sons remained at home until the upper grades of the gymnasium.⁴¹ The chosen school, Plamann's Institute, had a good reputation. The director, Johann Ernst Plamann, had founded it in 1805 in the spirit of Pestalozzi, whom he had visited and about whose method he had written.⁴² Friedrich Ludwig Jahn had been a teacher at the school and went from there to found the German *Turner* movement. Some of his egalitarian tendencies as well as regular physical exercises became part of the school. Jahn had stressed the importance of human community; "hermits are human crustaceans" he claimed.⁴³ Plamann considered the thirty boarders one large family. The days were strictly regulated. One was awakened at six in the morning, a simple breakfast of milk and bread and a short prayer meeting followed before the lessons started at seven. At ten they were interrupted by a second breakfast of bread and salt with fruit added during the summer. The main meal was taken at midday as customary in

Germany. Everybody gathered in the dining room. Mrs. Plamann and her daughter measured out the portions, a servant handed them around. One could ask for seconds, but whoever did not finish his plate was sent to the terrace and forced to remain there until he had eaten all. There were more lessons from two to four, interrupted by an afternoon snack of bread and salt; lessons then continued until seven. The evening meal consisted of a soup or of sandwiches. What time was left was spent doing homework or playing in the garden. Two of the lesson hours were daily devoted to physical exercise (*turnen*).⁴⁴ The reason for Plamann's sparse food was not economy, but because simple nourishment was considered wholesome. Coffee, tea, chocolate, wine, strong beer and spices were forbidden, because they would stimulate the *physis* and lead to masturbation.⁴⁵ By the time Bismarck entered the school, *turnen* had been outlawed and the public places for this exercise were closed. In 1824, Jahn was condemned to two years in the fortress and, though pardoned a year later, he was refused permission to live in any town with a university or a gymnasium.⁴⁶ Under these circumstances, it seems dubious whether this particular form of exercise was still part of Plamann's curriculum. We know that he continued to take his pupils on hikes and that they had little plots in the garden which they cultivated.⁴⁷

Life at this school contrasted sharply with Bismarck's free and easy-going home at Kniephof, the spartan simplicity with the elegance of the Berlin society life of his parents which he saw every winter when they took an apartment in the capital. One of the consequences was that never again, after leaving this school, would Bismarck submit to any kind of discipline imposed from without. Wilhelmine von Bismarck believed in the perfectibility of man through education. In that respect she was influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment. She thought that her sons needed better training than the home could provide. She accompanied their progress through school with many letters admonishing them to learn well. Ferdinand was more easily satisfied and boasted among friends when their report cards were good. The mother seldom praised, she saw it as her duty to point out every fault. Her oldest son, Bernhard, disappointed her deeply and as he grew older her pressure became almost hysterical. Her ideal of a man was described in the following words:

Look around and examine the judgement of the world about a solid education (*gediegene Bildung*) and you will admit that much is lacking for you to lay claim to the title of a well-educated man, however, this aspiration remains an ordinary one, and it would degrade you in the eyes of the world, if you would not live up to it in your position and after the upbringing you received. One will count you among the very ordinary people, nay, among the common mass if you continue to move more and more only in the narrow circle of a sensual life, avoiding every intellectual effort.⁴⁸

One cannot help remarking how little her husband lived up to these ideals. In fact, Bernhard was very much like his father. Thus Wilhelmine must have been disappointed and consequently discontented, as was attested to by her ill health. Hedwig von Bismarck remembered that she heard the word "nervous" first in connection with this aunt.⁴⁹ In order not to despair she projected the fulfillment of her wishes—on the unconscious level to regain the lost father—into the future, demanding from her son what her husband did not give her, intellectual stimulation and a career like the one of her father. She expressed it in a poignant letter after she had given up hope to see Bernhard live up to her demands.

I thought it the greatest good fortune I could achieve to have a grown-up son who, after having been educated under my eyes, would share my ideas, but who, as a man, would have been able to penetrate further into the realm of ideas than it was given to me as a woman. I looked forward to the exchange of ideas, to the mutual stimulation an intellectual life provides, and to the satisfaction of finding such delights in the intercourse with my son who was closest to me by nature, and who would become even closer through spiritual kinship. The time is here when such expectations should be fulfilled, but they have disappeared and—I must say—regretfully—forever.⁵⁰

She ended the letter with "I went into the garden and cried." All through Bernhard's school years her letters drove him relentlessly toward an achievement he evaded more and more. Her letters to Otto no longer exist. Her pressure on him may have been somewhat less, in any case he was the better student finishing the gymnasium only two and a half years after his five year older brother. If Bernhard evaded his mother by passive resistance, as an adolescent hardly talking to her,⁵¹ Otto's relationship with her was more complicated, though consciously he rejected her.

All his life he complained about having been sent to school and blamed it on his mother. He felt rejected by her.

I was not properly educated. My mother was fond of society and did not trouble much about me. Afterwards I was sent to an educational establishment, where too severe a system prevailed, insufficient and poor food, plenty of hardening, thin jackets in winter, too much compulsion and routine, and unnatural training.⁵²

This remark stemmed from the year 1877 when earlier, more positive feelings had been repressed. But about the school itself he was always bitter. In 1864 he told Keudell:

My childhood was ruined in the Plamann Institute which seemed like a penitentiary to me.

But he also talked about being homesick:

Plamann's school was located so that one could see the open fields at one side. When I saw a pair of oxen plowing a furrow, I had to cry out of homesickness for Kniephof.⁵³

Or to Johanna describing his solitary return to Schoenhausen after their engagement:

I was close to tears just as I was when I saw the towers of Berlin from the mail coach after the vacations.⁵⁴

The separation from home and parents was aggravated by the fact that it undid his previous successful mastering of the birth of a sibling. At Plamann he was once more the younger brother of Bernhard and the little rival had won after all, possessing the mother for himself. During the first summer vacation the boys could not even return home, as the parents were at Ems where their mother took the cure. Ferdinand wrote to his sons:

How much would I like to have you here, my good children, but it is impossible to arrange. To have you travel by mail coach is too risky and too strenuous as it goes day and night.

Then he tried to amuse them:

All excursions into the countryside here are made on donkeys; fifty or sixty are always ready waiting saddled in a large shed, half of them with side saddles. You would laugh if you could see your tall papa on a donkey. It is admirable how such a small animal carries me up the steepest hills.⁵⁵

The boys spent their vacation on the estate of their uncle Friedrich near Berlin. In the following years the same situation arose and once they went on a walking tour with Plamann. During all this time they saw their parents in winter when the latter took an apartment in Berlin. Furthermore, they maintained a close contact with their mother through letters and diaries which she made them write for her.⁵⁶

During Bismarck's first year at school his little brother died in September 1822. He choked on something he put in his mouth. The mother after praising him wrote:

Long since it was his only fault to put something into his mouth that was forbidden, and it cost him his life.⁵⁷

She could not resist to use this tragic event for educational purposes, pointing out the dire consequences of disobedience. At the same time she denied her own responsibility. Nothing is known about Otto's reaction to the news. A psychoanalytic study about children's reactions to the death of a sibling found a great variety of possibilities determined by the personality of the individual child. Mentioned are:

depressive withdrawal, accident prone behavior, punishment seeking, constant provocative testing, exhibitionist use of grief and guilt, massive projection of superego accusations and many forms of acting out.⁵⁸

A report by Plamann for the year 1825 called Otto von Bismarck hasty in his work and thinking even in handicrafts and sport, adding that for a long time he seemed almost absent minded.

He has to watch that his natural exuberance does not again deteriorate into flightiness, and that everything has its right place, seriousness at work and fun at play.⁵⁹

The cautious words of Plamann indicated a lack of attention and loss of impulse control. The former was a temporary regression and caused as much by the separation from parents as by the death, the latter remained a problem all his life. "I am all nerves so much that self control has always been the greatest task in my life,"⁶⁰ Bismarck said of himself. Furthermore, as Chancellor, Bismarck was unduly suspicious and vindictive against any younger man whom he suspected, rightly or wrongly, to want to replace him. The most notorious case was his treatment of Harry von Arnim, who did harbor such ambitions, and who had disregarded instructions, but who certainly had done nothing to deserve criminal prosecution. The excessive reaction to a largely imagined threat—there was little danger that he would be replaced during the lifetime of William I—lets us suspect that he once had felt keenly the rivalry of the little brother, that he must have wished him dead, a very normal wish for children.⁶¹ To see it fulfilled was a fearful triumph. The child had to defend himself against the guilt aroused by his own seemingly unlimited power—by regressing to the time when the birth of the sibling had been experienced as a threat and thus justifying his own aggression. As the event fell into the early latency period where the superego is particularly harsh, the defense had to be drastic.⁶² In the Arnim affair a hint of sibling rivalry appeared in a letter to William I.

I cannot conceal that (my strength) would be used up quickly, if I were to suffer under the painful feeling that I have to fight with a man like Count Arnim for Your Majesty's confidence.⁶³

If the death of the brother represented a wish fulfillment for Otto, it was not really successful because it did not regain him the privileged position near his mother. He remained in school and became now definitely the younger brother. This position was not altered when in 1827 a sister was born.

It is extremely difficult if not impossible to distinguish between Otto's reaction to the death of a sibling and those evoked by the separation from his parents. In his own utterances only the latter is ever mentioned. One of the results of the separation was the difficulty of

dealing with his natural ambivalence toward his parents. As Anna Freud explained:

The distress experienced at separation from mother, parents, or home (is) due to an excessive ambivalence toward them. The conflict between the love and hate of parents can be tolerated by the child only in their reassuring presence.⁶⁴

Bismarck's description of his parents to his bride Johanna von Puttkamer, when he was over thirty and both parents no longer living, showed that he had not been able to come to terms with his childhood ambivalence. In connection with his mother he produced the memory of an event, her birthday. The day always remained significant for him, he expected to die on that date. There is no such concrete scene connected with the explanation of his relation to his father.

Today was the birthday of my late mother. How clearly do I remember the room of my mother from the time when my parents lived at the Opera Place near the Catholic church in Berlin when a huntsman fetched me from boarding school in the morning. I found her rooms adorned with lilies of the valley which she loved above all, with dresses which were gifts, with books, and interesting knicknacks. There followed a gala dinner attended by many young officers who are now aging majors, and by much decorated, gourmandizing, old gentlemen, now eaten by worms. When I was sent from table as having had enough, my mother's personal maid received me in order to stuff me with caviar and baisers she had put aside until I was sick. What did not these domestics steal. My mother was a beautiful woman who loved external elegance, had a bright and lively intellect but little of what Berliners call *Gemueth*. She wanted that I should learn much and amount to much, and appeared often cold and hard toward me. As a little child I hated her, later I deceived her successfully with falsehood.⁶⁵

We see the boy brought into the presence of his mother from the austere simple school. He was deeply impressed by the luxury surrounding her, and by the splendor of the birthday dinner which formed such a stark contrast to the meals at Plamann's where dry bread was a major component. The child was longing to grow up and become part of such a world. He wrote of Plamann's garden as

the birthplace of ruined castles in the air and the blue haze of distant mountains which lay on the other side of the fence . . . the whole colorful world as it existed for me then with its forests and castles and all experiences which waited for me in it.⁶⁶

The future was colored by his mother's world, the castles and forests memories of his early trips with her. But the birthday scene like real life ended in disappointment. He was sent away and became sick overeating.

All his life he stuffed himself indiscriminately, treating food as substitute for mother love. The little scene was symbolic of his relationship with his mother. It is notable that neither father nor brother, who certainly attended the birthday dinner, were mentioned; only Otto, his mother, and strangers representing the glamorous world appeared. In the end the boy was relegated to the nether regions of the servants. The same maid who had taken care of him at Kniephof received him and stuffed him, and he put the blame on her, implying that she was not a good mother substitute. After the description he characterized his mother with a curious selection of contradictory adjectives. She was "beautiful," "loved elegance," "had a bright and lively intellect" but she was "cold and hard" toward him. When he concluded by saying that he hated her, he indicated a reversal of feelings as well as his impotent rage. Then he salvaged his self-esteem by claiming to have deceived her successfully. In the same vein, he later wrote to his brother that "the court of Kniephof is more amenable to diplomatic ruse and lies than to a rude soldierly tone."⁶⁷ One cannot help concluding that he learned diplomacy at his mother's knee. Even the description of his attitude toward his father shows the influence of his mother.

I truly loved my father, when I was not with him I felt repentance about my behavior toward him, made resolutions which had little solidity; for how often did I not return his truly boundless, disinterested, good-natured tenderness for me with coldness and moroseness, and, many times, made a show of love out of my reluctance to violate what appeared to me to be good manners, when in reality I was hard and without love on account of his apparent weaknesses, which I had no right to judge, and which angered me only when they were coupled with a violation of good manners. Still I can't retract the statement that I loved him at the bottom of my soul.⁶⁸

The first impression is that he protested his love too much. He wished to love his father, but was unable to do so because he could not respect him. He judged him according to his mother's values and questioned only the right of the child to pass judgement not the measure he applied. He thus betrayed the unconscious introjection of his mother's values. However, the longing for a father that could be respected and obeyed became a decisive force in his life. It led to his so-called conversion experience by an act of will. "I recalled the vanguard of my doubt which had advanced too far,"⁶⁹ he said to his friend Keyserling. Later, he found in the person of William I a father figure whom he could serve while imposing his own will. His policy of strengthening the institution of the monarchy in spite of the trends of the time toward parliamentarianism must also be connected with this syndrome. Finally, the will to submit to a father held his personal ambition in bounds.

If the child Bismarck had difficulties accepting his father as a model, he did not express anger against him. The anger was directed against his mother, as the child felt rejected by her. This in turn produced a feeling of worthlessness against which he defended himself by rejecting her in turn. "Mother does not love me becomes I hate mother."⁷⁰ But a feeling of worthlessness persisted into adulthood as a dream he reported to Johanna showed.

I dreamt that you pushed me into the rolling sea from the plank I had grabbed when shipwrecked. It would not hold both of us, and you turned away, and I was poorer of a hope.⁷¹

The prophecies of the old man, that the Reich, his work, would not last were also connected with this unconscious self-evaluation.

Whenever Bismarck mentioned his unhappiness at school, he depicted himself as homesick for Kniephof, not for mother and father. His longing for the countryside grew as he got older. In touch with nature he recaptured the bliss of early childhood. His years at Kniephof lent it plausibility, but the depth and exclusiveness of his attachment to trees and the woods point toward an attachment to the preoedipal mother. The preoedipal attachment of the male child

is . . . determined . . . by the need to have everything and to feel everything the almighty mother has, can do, and feels . . . When the conflict between the wish to have a child as a manifestation of maternal power and the impossibility to realize this wish is insufficiently resolved, this preoedipal identification is continued into a later stage . . . In (this stage) exists an additional identification with the mother in the passive feminine sphere . . . the defense against the passive feminine attitude increases the regression to the active feminine preoedipal identification.⁷²

Bismarck's lifelong yearning for the solitary peace of Kniephof, Varzin, or Friedrichsruh, while he did everything to obtain and retain power and influence, his alternation between periods of intense work and almost total negligence suggest a character formation resulting from an unresolved preoedipal identification with mother. The experience that successful individuation as manifested in his adaptation to the birth of a sibling was useless, worked in the same direction of regression. However one should not overlook that his periodic retreats to his estates always restored him. They functioned as temporary regressions in the service of the ego,⁷³ in the same way in which we all are restored by that temporary return into a symbolic womb, sleep. Bismarck's well-known insomnia was a symptom of his struggle against his attachment to his mother.⁷⁴

After he left the Plamann Institute in 1827 when he was twelve "life became more bearable."⁷⁵ That age can also be considered as the end of

the latency period and mark the beginning of preadolescence which sets the stage for the resurgence of childhood conflicts in adolescence. We must reserve the discussion of this period for another article. Here something needs to be said about the latency period. It has not yet attracted much attention from psychoanalytic investigators, yet one can by no means assume that nothing much happens then. Erikson subsumes it under the heading of industry. Another writer Robert W. White introduced what he called the "model of competence"⁷⁶ wherein it becomes the task of latency to acquire competence in the outside world. Anna Freud regarded it as a period of "socialization," Peter Blos set the task as one where "object love becomes identification" and secondary process thinking is developed.⁷⁷ Berta Bornstein distinguished between two phases of latency, a first period which is introduced by the establishment of a super ego and a concomittant regressive pull against which defenses are established.⁷⁸ This period especially in cases like Otto v. Bismarck where there existed a certain regression due to the separation trauma becomes a prolongation of earlier conflicts. Important is what kind of defenses are adopted because "there is no antithesis between development and defense, since the strengthening of the ego and its defensive organization is itself an essential part of the child's growth."⁷⁹ During the second part of latency, the world of contemporaries becomes more important than the family,⁸⁰ yet, we know of no childhood friend of Bismarck. As nobody claimed such a status once he had become famous, we can be sure that there had been none. His earliest intimate friends date from his years as a student at the university. This somewhat unusual state of affairs may be due to the fact that from his entrance into school until the age of fourteen his brother Bernhard shared his life, first at Plamann, then in a common apartment under the supervision of a tutor.⁸¹ Even before that time Otto had imitated him, choosing the older brother as a model. For most of his later life he maintained a close relationship to his brother. All of this points toward a somewhat unusual sibling relationship where the normal rivalry is largely absent. Bernhard was the only member of the family who shared his latency years and may even have served as a substitute for the parents. He was five years older. The close relationship Otto maintained with him precluded his making other personal friends. When he later said that at age sixteen he already played the role of a university student,⁸² he again imitated his older brother who was then studying law. The rivalry which one would expect when considering such a statement by Bismarck, that he could not stand not to be the first in any company,⁸³ was displaced later onto the political scene. His attitude toward Austria at the *Bundestag* showed the marks of rivalry, acceptable because projected into a different context where it was useful. This does not mean that the affective component of his policy was the most

important; only that, just as in the other instances mentioned, it contributed to giving Bismarck's politics their particular and unusual turn.

Charlotte Sempell is professor of history at Brooklyn College of The City University of New York, where she teaches modern European history. Her book, Otto von Bismarck, one of Twayne Publishers Rulers and Statesmen of the World series, has just been published. She is currently examining the German branches of the grandchildren of Queen Victoria.

REFERENCES

1. *Bismarcks Jugend*, (Stuttgart 1909).
2. *The American Historical Review*, 77 (1972).
3. *Normality and Pathology in Childhood* (New York 1965). *Psychoanalysis for Teachers and Parents* (Boston 1969). Erikson, *Childhood and Society* (New York 1950). *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, yearly, ed. Ruth S. Eissler et al.
4. *Das Buch vom Grafen Bismarck*, (Bielefeld 1869).
5. *Fuerst und Fuerstin Bismarck*, (Berlin 1901).
6. *Tagebuchblaetter*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1899).
7. *Gesammelte Werke* vol. XIV, ed. by Wolfgang Windelband and Werner Frauendienst, (Berlin 1933) quoted as *Werke*. Charlotte Sempell, *Unbekannte Briefstellen Bismarcks*, *Historische Zeitschrift* 207, (1968) quoted as 1968.
8. Charlotte Sempell, *Briefe der Eltern Bismarcks an seinen Bruder Bernhard*. *Historische Zeitschrift*, 214 (1972) quoted as 1972.
9. Alexander Graf Keyserling, *Ein Lebensbild in Briefen und Tagebuchblaettern*. ed. by Helene von Taube. Berlin 1902 vol. 2, p. 588.
10. Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*. Book 1.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Der Mensch in den ersten sieben Lebensjahren*. Leipzig 1839. p. 19.
13. *Allgemeines Preussisches Landrecht*. 1794 Teil 2 Titel 2.
14. Albrecht Peiper, *Chronik der Kinderheilkunde*. Leipzig 1966. p. 436.
15. Rudolf k. Goldschmitt-Jenner, *Die Jugend Grosser Deutscher*. Wiesbaden 1958. p. 93. The book does not give the sources.
16. Most, p. 51.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 156.
19. Bertha Meyer, *Von der Wiege bis zur Schule*. Berlin no date, p. 54.
20. Peiper, p. 336.
21. Most, *op. cit.*, pp. 106-7.
22. Goldschmitt-Jenner, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.
23. Busch II, p. 30.
24. Marcks, p. 45.
25. Hedwig von Bismarck, *Erinnerungen einer 95 jaehrigen*. (Halle 1913), p. 28.
26. Hesekei, p. 81.
27. Henri K. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious*, (New York 1970) 77. The author puts German Mesmerism into the context of the romantic philosophy of nature.
28. Marcks, 43.
29. Keudell, p. 160.

30. Busch I, p. 547.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 414.
32. Sempell 1972, p. 569.
33. Busch I, 486. II, p. 75.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 425.
35. *Ibid.*, I, p. 560.
36. Marcks, p. 42.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
38. Anna Freud, *Normality and Pathology in Childhood*, p. 137.
39. For home teaching see the accounts of contemporaries in Goldschmitt-Jenner. A later coworker of the chancellor Rudolph von Delbrueck was sent to school at age twelve though he lived in a town and it was a day school. *Lebenserinnerungen*. vol. 1 Leipzig 1905, p. 28. Leopold von Ranke living in the country entered boarding school at the same age. Werner von Siemens was sent to school at eleven but taken out and tutored at twelve. Goldschmitt-Jenner 167, p. 242.
40. Hans Kramer, *Bismarcks Schuljahre*. 1895, p. 3.
41. *Letters of Marie von Thadden*. Manuscript in the possession of Reinold von Thadden, Fulda.
42. Robert Ulich, *A Sequence of Educational Influences*. Cambridge 1935, p. 4.
43. Otto Friedrich Bollnow, *Die Paedagogik der Deutschen Romantik*. Stuttgart 1952, p. 95.
44. Kramer, *ibid.*
45. Most, p. 157.
46. Peiper, p. 356.
47. Marcks, p. 54.
48. Sempell, 1972, 576.
49. H. von Bismarck, 30.
50. Sempell, 1972, p. 578.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 579 where Wilhelmine complains that he hardly answers yes or no.
52. Busch, II, p. 425.
53. Keudell, p. 160.
54. Werke, p. 51.
55. Sempell, 1972, p. 560.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 570.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 562
58. A. Cain, J. Fast, and M. Erickson; *Disturbed Reactions to the Death of a Sibling*. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 34, 743.
59. Marcks, 58.
60. A. J. P. Taylor, *Bismarck* (London 1955) 12.
61. A. Freud, *Psychoanalysis for Teachers and Parents*, p. 31.
62. Berta Bornstein, *On Latency, Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* VI, p. 280.
63. George O. Kent, *Arnim and Bismarck*. (Oxford 1968) p. 114.
64. A. Freud, *Normality*, 113.
65. Werke, p. 67f and Sempell 1968, p. 610.
66. Werke, p. 195.
67. Hans Rothfels ed., *Bismarckbriefe*. (Goettingen 1955) p. 23.
68. Sempell 1968, pp. 611, 612.
69. Keyserling, p. 125.
70. A. E. Scharl, *Regression and Restitution of Object Loss. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XVI, 472.
71. Werke, 69.
72. P. J. Van der Leeuw, *The Preoedipal Phase of the Male. Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, XIII, p. 367.

73. A. Freud, *Normality*, p. 105, "Ego regressions are useful answers to the strain of a given moment" . . .
74. Georg Groddeck, *The Book of the It*. (N.Y. 1961) pp. 77. 78.
75. Keudell, 161.
76. Robert W. White, *Competence and the Psychosexual Stages of Development*, In *Perspectives on Personality*. ed. by Salvatore R. Maddi (Boston 1971) 272-306.
77. Bloss, 57.
78. Berta Bornstein, 280.
79. A. Freud, *Normality*, 177.
80. White, 298.
81. Marcks, 59.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
83. Werke, p. 16.

FROM THE SOURCES

The Kindergarten as Punishment (1897):

"This question of punishment will forever exercise parents, and there will never be discovered a just and equitable set of punishments if we search forever. My experience has been that right here the kindergarten comes to our rescue. If it were possible for each child to be daily separated for a certain number of hours from the mother, even at the age of two, and put in a little world of children his own age, he would learn the sharing, the obedience and yielding to 'must' . . ."

Andrea H. Proudfoot, *A Mother's Ideals: A Kindergarten Mother's Conception of Family Life* (Chicago, 1897), p. 122.

BOOK



REVIEWS

Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

Reviewed by Frederick F. Harling,
Westfield State College

Stanley Milgram has thrust us into a challenging, integrative, and humbling study of obedience to authority. The challenge stems from the convincing, empirical results of his experiments. They indicate that man's worst inhumanity to man originates from his earliest conditioning to obey authority. This early conditioning is reinforced by all other social institutions as the individual develops in all modern societies. The author's theoretical approach is integrative, combining experimental and Freudian concepts of personality theory into an inclusive framework of social psychology. The humbling aspect of this study is the degree to which most of us may well be pervasively conditioned to obey authority, no matter how destructive the results may be in human terms. Milgram's quote of C. P. Snow on page 2 is an accurate prognostication of the entire study of obedience to authority. "When you think of the long and gloomy history of man, you will find more hideous crimes have been committed in the name of obedience than have ever been committed in the name of rebellion." This states the basic findings of the author's experiments that are consistently, but not uncritically pursued.

At the outset, it is fundamental to have an understanding of the inventive but effective experimental model that Milgram has created to probe human responses to authority *per se*. It requires a "teacher" and a "learner" to take part in an experiment allegedly designed to test the effects of punishment upon learning. The procedure is explained by the experimenter who then conducts "teacher" and "learner" into the experimental context. The "learner" is seated in a chair with his arms

strapped down and an electrode strapped to his wrist. He is told he is to learn a group of word pairs, and when he fails to remember a pair, he is given a shock of increasing intensity by the "teacher." The "teacher" is seated before an impressive shock generator marked in 15 volt increments from 15 to 450 volts. The generator is also verbally marked from "slight shock" to "danger-severe shock." The "learner" grunts when a 75 volt shock is applied. At 120 volts, he verbally complains. At 150 volts, he demands that the experiment be terminated; and at 285 volts, he cries out in agonizing screams. Actually, the "learner" receives no shocks, but is in reality an actor. The experimenter dispassionately urges the "teacher" to keep administering the shocks of greater intensity. Obviously, the real focus of this experiment is the "teacher" who must decide whether to follow the dictates of his conscience (super-ego) that oppose inflicting pain upon another person or to be obedient to the experimenter. The results of 18 variations of this model compose the main body of the book.

In conjunction with the foregoing experiment, groups of people including psychiatrists, graduate students, faculty, and middle class people were asked how they felt the "teacher" would respond to the discomfort and the pain that he believed he was inflicting upon the "learner." They predicted that virtually all of the subjects would refuse to obey the experimenter. Soberingly, Milgram's experimental responses contradict the expected behavior. The psychiatrists' predictions, page 30, Figure 5, dramatize this point. The experiments as a whole, not only indicate a general obedience to authority, but also show a far greater obedience to authority than the experimenters had dreamed of!

Beyond this, there were some findings about the nature and functioning of authority by the observation of the many variations of the fundamental experiment. For instance, when the victim of the inflicted pain is brought physically closer to the "teacher" who inflicts pain, the power of the authority is cut in half. Furthermore, authority systems must be based upon people arranged in a hierarchy and the question of control is determined by who is specifically in control of whom, not by who stands in the absolutely highest position in the hierarchy. Any confusion in the structure of the hierarchy tends to compromise the power of the authority. This power of authority also may be reduced by the formation of groups challenging it. The ramifications of these ideas are informative to show just how societies function. Since all societies require some control of immediate gratification, the complete autonomy of every individual is of necessity shifted to some degree to become an agency of someone else's authority. It begins with the parents and family, thence to social institutions. Milgram calls this the agentic shift. Once this agentic state occurs the individual becomes generally obedient to the wishes of someone else and is no longer in contact with his own professed values (super-ego). The individual turns away from his own self-image and looks towards others to confirm his worth.

After the experiments were concluded, the "teachers" were asked why they continued to administer the painful shocks. They replied that

they wanted to carry out the experiment the way it was intended to be done by its designers and implementors. They were following instructions and doing their job. Milgram draws the obvious comparison to this testimony and that given at Nuremburg and Mylai. The defendants at war crime trials repeat that they were only faithfully carrying out the instructions of their duly authorized superiors. Most of the defenders emerge as very human, obedient bureaucrats rather than sadistic fiends. Evidently, man's most cruel and inhuman travesties stem not from some personal, innate aggressive instincts, but rather from obedience, learned first in the family and later reinforced by other social experiences. There is no question that Milgram has stirred furor among professional psychologists. This is reflected in Appendix I, "The Problems of Ethics in Research." When professionals engage in controversy about ethics, it usually indicates that different attitudes are being established towards fundamental issues.

Although Milgram's results seem to place men in a predestined straight-jacket of obedience without significant access to human values or free will, the conclusions of these experiments are not merely dispassionately reported in a scientific vacuum. He is not about to give passive assent to a dogmatic behaviorism. He is concerned with why some people defy authority. He has designed a responsibility clock, Appendix II, page 204, to investigate why certain individuals rebel against authority. It was found that defiant subjects attribute primary responsibility for their acts of cruelty against others to themselves. People who do not rebel place the responsibility for their cruel acts more upon their immediate authority figure and their victim. It is true that the results of Milgram's experiments appear to be grim portents for the future of mankind, but not because man is primarily evil or murderous. Far more dangerous is "man's capacity to merge his unique personality into larger institutional structures." Milgram continues on page 188, "This is the fatal flaw nature has designed into us, which in the long run gives our species only a modest chance of survival." This raises the rhetorical question, why does a Stanley Milgram become so concerned to carefully research and objectify about the problem of authority and obedience? Is it not that he is as concerned with human values as he is with scientific inquiry? A quote from the final page of the book may help to place this question in perspective. "I am certain that there is a complex personality basis to obedience and disobedience. But I know we have not found it." This sounds more like a call to further bold and innovative investigation, rather than an affirmation of social determinism.

This book has profound implications for research into personality development. It has established the crucial significance of human obedience as both a causative and limiting factor in human behavior. Perhaps though, the social implications are equally as important. Scholars researching the possibility of peace on this planet will be deficient unless they understand the wide ranging ramifications of *Obedience to Authority*.

Sur La Population Francais au XVIII et au XIX siecles. Paris: Societe de Demographie Historique. 597 pages.

Reviewed by Bogna W. Lorence,
Hobart and William Smith Colleges.

This collection of thirty-seven articles by prominent demographers such as Goubert, Henry and de Walle deals mainly with the topics of population, marriage and children.

It is the articles on children which readers of this journal will find most useful. They consist of: abandonment in late eighteenth-century Rouen, wet-nursing 1740-1840 in the small town of Thoissey-en-Dombes, infant mortality during the Consulate and Empire, foundlings and illegitimates in seventeenth and eighteenth century Languedoc, and infants at wet-nurse in Beauvais. The article on Beauvais caught my interest. Apparently the area lying within a sixty-mile radius of Paris had long served the needs of Paris infants by providing the necessary wet-nurses. The author, Jean Ganiage, calculates that during the eighteenth century the average infant stayed in Beauvais until the age of two or three, though many remained for another year or so. Mortality was fairly constant from one year to the next.

By going through the Parisian parish registers, Ganiage has ascertained that infants came from all sections of the city and were of a diversified parental economic background, though preponderantly of artisan parents, some 45% in fact; the others coming from workers in commerce, transportation and domestic service. There were no noble children or those of high bourgeoisie since these families, according to Ganiage, kept wet-nurses in their own homes. The practice of sending children out was widespread, few households were exempt.

FROM THE SOURCES

On Avoiding "Cockering" of Children:

"For as with the Ape doth with too much embracings well neer kill her young whelpes: so likewise some indiscrete parents, through immoderate love and over-much pampering and cherishing do utterly despoil and mar their children. Therefore, if parents would have their children live, they must take heed that they love them not too much."

Robert Cleaver, *A godlie forme of household government* . . . (London, 1598), p. 296.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF INFANTICIDE

by William L. Langer

These notes are intended to supplement the author's article: "Infanticide: A Historical Survey", published in The History of Childhood Quarterly, I, No. 3, 1974, 353-365.

Despite the ever-growing literature on the status of women and the sexual behavior of the ancient Greeks and Romans, it can hardly be said that these important aspects of ancient civilization have been fully illuminated. Of the more recent literature may be mentioned the authoritative treatment of Johannes Leipoldt: *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Ur-Christentum*, Berlin, 1962; the brilliant little essay by Erich Burck: *Die Frau in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Munich, 1969; the lavishly illustrated volume by Verena Zinserling: *Die Frau in Hellas und Rom*, Stuttgart, 1970; and the excellent survey in K. J. Dover: "Classical Greek Attitudes to Sexual Behavior" (*Arethusa*, VI, 1973, 59-74).

On account of the comprehensive and unlimited authority of the father over all members of his household, it was his decision alone that determined whether a new-born babe should be permitted to live. Under these circumstances there could be no crime such as infanticide. Judging from the smallness of Roman as well as Greek families, it seems likely that many female babies were promptly disposed of after birth, frequently without consultation with the mother. The offspring of the father's concubines and slaves were almost certainly exterminated.

In general Roman women enjoyed somewhat greater freedom than their Greek sisters, who were rarely permitted to leave the house or to meet strangers. In Greece boys and girls were reared in complete separation, and throughout the Greco-Roman world girls were ordinarily married off at some early age such as fourteen. They rarely if ever met or even saw their bridegroom before the day of the wedding. The entire transaction was in the hands of the father, who not uncommonly avoided consultation with either his wife or his daughter. All in all, Greek and Roman men held their wives in low regard and respected them merely as the managers of the household and the mothers of their legitimate children. For their sexual satisfaction they turned to the brothels, which were numerous and generally accepted, staffed mostly by slave women. The hetaerae, so frequently mentioned in classical literature, were women of superior charm and beauty, frequently women of high estate captured in war, who were highly esteemed for their education and provided men of the cultured classes with stimulating company. (On the *patria potestas* or paternal authority see the excel-

lent analysis of H. F. Jolowicz: *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law* (2 ed., Cambridge, 1952, 118 ff.)

Of considerable interest in connection with the punishment of women for the crime of infanticide in the Middle Ages is the fact that the method of execution derived from Roman law and practice, though in the case of the Romans it was applied to cases of parricide, a crime the exact character of which is still obscure. It meant in the first instance the murder of a parent, becoming extended later to members of the entire family or even tribe. (Earlier analyses of the term *parricide* have now been superseded by the analyses of James L. Strachan-Davidson: *Problems of the Roman Law* (Oxford, 1912, 21) and by Jolowicz: *op. cit.*, 328.)

The method of execution in question may best be named "sacking", and seems to have originated in hazy antiquity. Again I am indebted to my colleague, Mason Hammon, for guidance to helpful literature. Theodor Mommsen, in his *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig, 1899, 921 ff.) describes the Roman practice in minute detail: the victim was first flogged and then sewn into a leather sack, together with a dog, a cat, a cock and sometimes a snake. The whole miserable bundle was then thrown into the water for a last struggle for life. Cicero also discussed it in his *Pro Roscio Amerino* and it was included in the Justinian code. One can readily understand that it found its way thence into the medieval codes, first as a penalty for parricide and more and more usually as the penalty for infanticide. Jacob Grimm, in his *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, 3 ed., Göttingen, 1881, 691 ff.) traced it to the laws of several German states, even as late as the eighteenth century.

Burial or entombment alive was another medieval practice that derived from the Romans. The six Vestal Virgins, chosen from the most prominent families, were regarded as the daughters of the entire community and enjoyed privileges denied to other women. But unchastity on their part was looked upon as the equivalent of incest. The guilty woman was first flogged and then entombed alive in an underground cell designed for the purpose. Supplied with a small lamp and a modicum of food she was left to suffer a lingering death. Roman records show that in the reign of Domitian (c. 90 A.D.) no fewer than four Vestal Virgins suffered this penalty (George W. Mooney, Ed.: *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum*, Libri vii and viii, London, 1930, 547-548; Roger F. Gebhart: *C. Suetoni Tranquilli: Vita Domitiani*, Philadelphia, 1922, 59). Throughout the Middle Ages women convicted of infanticide were frequently buried alive, with a stake driven through the heart and a crown of thorns impressed upon the body (Grimm: *op. cit.*, 691-694).

During the nineteenth century female infanticide in China and other parts of Asia was always spoken of in the West in terms of horror. Ac-

tually nothing much is known of the practice in China prior to the seventeenth century and Europeans learned of it only late in the eighteenth. In 1777 P. Amyot and in 1793 John Barrow both reported seeing in Peking wagons making regular scheduled rounds in the early morning hours to collect the corpses of female infants, which they conveyed to a special burial ground outside the city. The practice seems to have been more prevalent in South China than in the North and was motivated chiefly by economic considerations, most parents feeling that two sons and one daughter was all they could afford and that destruction of girl babies was a legitimate way of maintaining a minimal standard of living. Officials of the government denounced the practice in the harshest terms and scholars repeatedly stressed the inhumanity of the system. They even opened hospices for the reception of unwanted babies, but all to no avail or very little. In the privacy of the woman's quarter girl babies were at their birth suffocated at once in the covered night-stool or in a bucket of water or milk. According to a Chinese source the mothers would close their eyes and turn their backs, but continued to hold the babe immersed until it was safely dead. The men refused to become involved, holding the entire problem to be one for the women. How general was the practice of female infanticide is indicated by the Chinese as well as by Western sources. In Shensi in 1829 there were 156.4 males to 100 females, and in much of China the ratio was 110 or 130. Small wonder that unmarried men abounded almost everywhere.

The most important Western treatment of the problem was that of the Jesuit missionary P. Palâtre: *L'infanticide et l'oeuvre de la Sainte-Enfance en Chine*, (Shanghai, 1878). It was a mine of information, government decrees, posters and other illustrative material. Protestant missionaries like their Catholic confreres held the book in high regard. Of considerable interest was also the inquiry conducted in the 1880's by the Royal Asiatic Society, which collected seventeen statements from competent persons and published them in the *Journal* of the North China Branch of the Society (Vol. XX, 1885, 25-50). Material on the Chinese side has always been rare, but has recently been supplied by Ping-ti Ho: *Studies in the Population of China, 1368-1953* (Cambridge, Mass. 1959, 58-65). There is nothing in Ho's account, which is based on local histories and other specialized sources, that contradicts what Western observers reported, but he does not attempt to explain how or why the practice had all but died out by the middle of the twentieth century.

Population data for the earlier centuries of Japanese history are so scant and scrappy as to make even an educated estimate impossible. The islands seem to have been always densely populated and the peasantry, working with limited areas of arable land, was undoubtedly obliged to resort to family limitation by abortion and infanticide from

earliest times. Only with the coming of the Tokugawa Shogunate in 1603 does calculation make possible firmer notions. The end of internal disorders and the restoration of authority probably encouraged some increase of the population for a century or so, but ever since the pioneer study by Garrett Droppers: "The Population of Japan in the Tokugawa Period" (*Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, XXI, 1894, 253-284) both Japanese and Western students have agreed that from about 1732 to 1846 the population remained essentially stable, numbering roughly thirty million. The lack of growth was due in part to several severe famines and epidemics, but in the opinion of competent demographers the explanation for the stagnation is to be sought primarily in the spread of abortion and infanticide. The isolation of the country, the strict feudal order, which obliged the peasantry to support a couple of million idle military men, and the exhaustion of the soil reduced the peasantry to the basic level of subsistence, marked frequently by starvation and death. Under the circumstances it was natural that every effort should be made to forestall further population increase. Even the upper classes held down the number of their children by resort to abortion, while the peasantry everywhere practiced infanticide. As in China, the first male baby was welcomed and reared so as to ensure the continuance of ancestor worship. Beyond that a second boy might be spared, but girls were generally disposed of immediately on birth either by suffocation or drowning. Efforts of officials to check the practice proved quite ineffectual, for the peasants and to a certain extent the townspeople regarded the raising of more than three children at the very most as utterly irresponsible. An eighteenth century author claimed that in a village of ten houses, more than two babies were killed every year, while another observer reported that in the two provinces of Dewa and Oshu from 16,000 to 17,000 babies were sacrificed every year: "But no one is startled by this deplorable custom," he added. In all parts of the country the farmers spoke freely of infanticide as *mabiki*, or the "thinning out", as of plants in the garden bed. Even after the imperial restoration in 1868 it took at least thirty years and a greatly improved economic situation to effect a reduction if not a complete suppression of the practice.

Japanese scholars have for years been studying abortion and infanticide in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with great intensity, and their findings have been fully exploited by Japanese and Western writers using Western languages. One of the most outstanding authorities, Eijiro Honjo, has summarized his research in an article "The Population and its Problems in the Tokugawa Era" (*Bulletin de l'Institut International de Statistique*, XXV (2) 1931, 60-82). Other important treatises are those of Ryoichi Ishii: *Population Pressure and Economic Life in Japan* (London, 1937); Ayanori Okasaki: *Histoire du Japon:*

l'Economie et la Population (Paris, 1958); and the splendid analysis in Irene B. Taeuber: *The Population of Japan* (Princeton, 1958), especially pp. 30 ff.

It is reasonable to suppose that in India, as in China and Japan, infanticide was commonly practiced by the impoverished peasantry who could not afford large families, who were interested primarily in producing a male child to carry on the ancestral worship, and who regarded the eventual marriage of a daughter as an unwarranted and unacceptable expense. Naturally information as to the habits and customs of the lower classes is all but impossible to obtain. But in India, especially among some of the more arrogant and warlike tribes of the North and Northwest, female infanticide was resorted to by the highest castes. In view of the rigorous seclusion of Indian family life, it was only in 1789 that British officials learned through a native informer that among the proud Jharejas of the Benares region girl babies were destroyed without exception on the plea that daughters of the tribe might never marry below their station and that it was therefore all but impossible as well as extremely expensive to find suitable husbands for them. Before long it was learned that even the princes and chiefs of other Rajput tribes, especially on the Kutch and Kattiawar peninsulas adhered to the same practice, allowing their own young men to purchase brides among lower, inferior tribes.

The officials of the British East India Company were naturally appalled by what they learned, but for some time their authority and control was too limited to do more than use influence, persuasion, promises and threats to induce the chiefs to forbid female infanticide for the future. Only after 1840 were they in a position to impose more drastic measures. An Infanticide Fund was set up to reward those who engaged to abolish the practice. A report on the Jhareja population of Kattiawar recorded that in the 1840's there were only 1370 females in a total population of 5760. Somewhat later, in 1855, an investigation of 332 villages reported that infanticide was accepted practice in 308. In sixty-two of these villages not a single girl was to be found under the age of six.

Like the Chinese, Indian women disposed of their female offspring by plunging the new-borns into a pail of water or milk, but an even more popular procedure was to rub opium on the nipples of the mother, which produced quick and painless results.

It may well be that even today infanticide is still practiced in the overcrowded and impoverished villages. But by 1885 the British authorities had induced or obliged the ruling classes to abandon the custom after which, officially at least, this appalling procedure was brought to an end.

The subject of female infanticide in India has produced a substantial literature, much of it based on official records and concerned primarily

with the varied and often complicated maneuvers employed by the authorities to suppress the practice. Basic still is the book by Edward Moor: *Hindu Infanticide* (London, 1811), followed by the missionary account of John Wilson: *History of the Suppression of Infanticide in Western India* (Bombay, 1855). A number of other narratives and specialized studies have now been superseded by the scholarly work of Lalita Panigrahi: *British Social Policy and Female Infanticide in India* (New Delhi, 1972).

BOOKS RECEIVED AND NOTED

- Anton, Ferdinand, *Woman In Pre-Columbian America*. New York: Abner Schram, 1974. 200 pages, \$20.00.
- Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis, *The Annual of Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 1, 1973. New York: Quadrangle, 1973. 395 pages, \$15.00.
- Conklin, Henry, *Through "Poverty's Vale": A Hardscrabble Boyhood in Upstate New York, 1832-1862*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974. 263 pages, \$8.50.
- Crowe, Brenda, *The Playgroup Movement*. New York: Schocken Books, 1973. 205 pages, \$8.50.
- Farson, Richard. *Birthrights*. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1974. 248 pages, \$6.95.
- Freehill, Maurice F., editor, *Disturbed and Troubled Children*. New York: Spectrum Publications, 1973.
- Holt, John, *Escape From Childhood*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1974. 287 pages, \$7.95.
- Muncy, Raymond Lee, *Sex and Marriage in Utopian Communities: 19th Century America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973. \$10.00
- Rothman, David J. and Sheila Rothman, editors, *The Colonial American Family: Collected Essays*. New York: The Arno Press, 1972. \$18.00.
- Reich, Wilhelm, *Sex-Pol. Essays 1929-1934*. New York: Vintage Books, 1972. Paperback, 378 pages, \$2.45.
- Soman, Shirley Camper, *Let's Stop Destroying Our Children*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1974. 273 pages, \$7.95.
- Young, Michael and Peter Willmott, *The Symmetrical Family*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1973. \$10.00.



THE PSYCHOHISTORY PRESS

A Division of Atcom, Inc., Publishers

2315 Broadway • New York, New York 10024 • 212-873-3331

The Psychohistory Press proudly announces the publication of the much-discussed new book

THE HISTORY OF CHILDHOOD

Lloyd deMause, *Editor*

CONTENTS:

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. The Evolution of Childhood | <i>Lloyd deMause</i> |
| 2. Barbarism and Religion: Late Roman and Early Medieval Childhood | <i>Richard B. Lyman, Jr.</i> |
| 3. Survivors and Surrogates: Children and Parents from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Centuries | <i>Mary Martin McLaughlin</i> |
| 4. The Middle-Class Child in Urban Italy, Fourteenth to Early Sixteenth Century | <i>James Bruce Ross</i> |
| 5. The Child as Beginning and End: Fifteenth and Sixteenth Century English Childhood | <i>M. J. Tucker</i> |
| 6. Nature Versus Nurture: Patterns and Trends in Seventeenth-Century French Child-Rearing | <i>Elizabeth Wirth Marvick</i> |
| 7. Childhood in Seventeenth-Century England and America | <i>Joseph E. Illick</i> |
| 8. A Period of Ambivalence: Eighteenth-Century American Childhood | <i>John F. Walzer</i> |
| 9. "That Enemy Is the Baby": Childhood in Imperial Russia | <i>Patrick P. Dunn</i> |
| 10. Home As a Nest: Middle Class Childhood in Nineteenth-Century Europe | <i>Priscilla Robertson</i> |

To obtain your own personal copy of *The History of Childhood*, send your check for \$12.50 (postage paid, N.Y. state residents add applicable sales tax) to: The Psychohistory Press, 2315 Broadway, N.Y., N.Y. 10024.

ISBN 0-914434-00-4

LC 74-75787