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Introduction

CULTURAL NARRATIVES OF ILLEGITIMACY

Demographers and historians refer to the eighteenth century as the “century of illegitimacy,” pointing out that “in every city in England and the continent for which data are available, the upsurge of illegitimacy commenced around 1750 or before.” While they offer a variety of reasons to explain this increase, which remains “unprecedented in the known history of the British population,” they all agree that this phenomenon must have touched everyone who lived at that time and played a crucial role in the economic, social, and cultural life of the Enlightenment.

But if so many families had to deal with the presence of illegitimate daughters, sons, sisters, brothers, and stepchildren, how did it influence the fictional stories that these families wanted, or pointedly did not want, to read? When contemporary writers portrayed bastard children and their parents—or when they carefully edited direct references to bastardy out of their narratives—whose perspective did they espouse, and why? And can we say that the fictional reimaginings of the social practices surrounding illegitimacy had any effect on these practices? For example, did the endless succession of plays and novels featuring lost and found children—the “foundlings”—impact the period’s view of the real-life foundlings, that is, the illegitimate children of serving women liable to be abandoned or even murdered by their mothers? Or, turning to another representational tradition, did the stories portraying sympathetically the “little ones o’both sides” (to adopt Laurence Sterne’s euphemistic phrasing) contribute to the gradual erosion of the official view of the bastard as a social and economic pariah?

To begin to answer these questions, this study brings together research from several different disciplines, such as law, history, and
cultural and literary studies. It pits the official legal views on illegitimacy against the actual everyday practices that frequently circumvented the law. It reconstructs the history of social institutions called upon to regulate illegitimacy, such as the London Foundling Hospital, and it examines a series of foundling narratives written, arguably, in response to the same concerns that underlay the emergence and functioning of such institutions. And throughout, it emphasizes the multiplicity of cultural meanings of bastardy, striving to redefine the “century of illegitimacy” as the “century of illegitimacies.”

**Eighteenth-Century Bastardy:**
**Definition and Categories**

What constituted the eighteenth-century category of bastard? The official view can be summed up by referencing two contemporary authorities. Samuel Johnson’s *Dictionary of the English Language* viewed a bastard as a child “begotten out of wedlock”; William Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England* asserted that an illegitimate child could “inherit nothing, being looked upon as the son of nobody . . . incapable even of a gift from [his] parents” (I:434). In practice, Johnson’s and Blackstone’s definitions were belied by the bewildering variety of legal and informal unions comprising the fabric of eighteenth-century family life as well as by the broad range of attitudes toward bastard children held by people belonging to different social classes and geographic regions. To begin to make sense of this multitude of perspectives, I have grouped the eighteenth-century views of bastardy into the four categories, with a brief note on the relative prominence of each category in the works of fiction:

❖ The bastard could be viewed as the threatening pretender to the legal family’s property, bearing out William Wycherley’s 1676 observation that even though there is a “Law . . . against Bastards, . . . the Custom is against it, and more people get estates by being so, that lose ’em.” In 1735, the *Universal Spectator* published an anguished letter from an illegitimate man who complained that his “liberal education,” charity, and good principles notwithstanding, his relatives viewed him as a pariah, and particularly those on his father’s side considered him as “a Robber who . . . unjustly deprived them of a small Estate [his father] settled upon [him].” Although the relationship between the legitimate and illegitimate siblings could
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develop in many different directions, not always following the trajectory of enmity, the middle-class perspective on a bastard frequently centered on his capacity to disrupt the smooth transfer of property and to poison the emotional well-being of the legal family. Even though I am generally reluctant to use the word middle-class as an umbrella term for the complex internal hierarchies of that elusive and much debated social entity, the term is quite useful for the discussion of illegitimacy because it denotes the middle ground between the extreme “haves” and “have-nots” of the English population. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of eighteenth-century fictional bastards either came from this sprawling social stratum, or, importantly, expressed its views. That is, a character could be presented as a daughter of a baronet, but her own and her family’s perspective of her (presumable) bastardy would unmistakably reflect the concerns of middle-class readers, whose experience of illegitimacy was very different from that of aristocracy (as discussed in detail in the chapter on Burney’s Evelina).

- Illegitimacy had no discernible economic consequences and carried relatively little social stigma for children born to common-law unions among the rural poor of the south and east, especially toward the end of the century. The incidence of such unions increased in times of high prices of food and housing and resulted in a variety of domestic living arrangements. The offspring of common-law marriages were still recorded in parish registers as “bastards,” but because their parents “had no inheritance to pass on” and expected the children to enter the labor market as early as possible, their illegitimate status did not put them at any manifest disadvantage compared to the children born to officially married couples. The practice of cohabitation among agricultural laborers thus effectively demystified the cultural category of “bastard” by demonstrating vividly its dependence on the presence or absence of heritable property. Not surprisingly, there is hardly a mention of this particular type of bastard in the period’s fiction.

- The upper-class attitude toward illegitimacy was also tolerant because, as Ruth McClure has argued, aristocrats were protected by their “great wealth” from any “economic threat, including that posed by bastards.” If the father and the mother both belonged to nobility, their illegitimate offspring could marry well and (if male) could be advanced to high office. We learn from John Habakkuk that
where “the father had legitimate issue, even if it was only female, illegitimate children posed no problem for the succession to the family estate. They were, however, sometimes generously treated, as a sort of younger children.” So when a “virtuous and brave fellow” from Fielding’s Jonathan Wild (1743) complains that after serving for twenty-five years as “the eldest lieutenant [of] the ship,” he was not able to obtain a ship of his own, all the while seeing “several boys, the bastards of noblemen, put over his head” (185; emphasis added), we may remember the fate of the illegitimate son of the tenth Earl of Pembroke, who was “brought up in the family and in due course became an admiral.” Similarly, Habakkuk tells us that “one of the illegitimate daughters of Sir Edward Walpole married successively the second Earl of Waldegrave and the Duke of Gloucester. It was when a landowner had illegitimate male issue and no other children that a problem arose of succession to the estates, as it did in the families of the Duke of Bolton, the Earl of Nottingham, and the last Sheffield Duke of Buckingham.”

Although occasionally referred to in eighteenth-century fiction, well-to-do aristocratic bastards did not figure prominently in it. With its relative lack of conflict, the upper-class legitimacy had as little dramatic potential for writers as did the everyday illegitimacy among rural laborers.

Illegitimate children of unwed serving women abandoned by their sexual partners (who, as Randolph Trumbach has persuasively demonstrated, mostly came from the same social stratum) fared worst of all. Their mothers were known to attempt to conceal their pregnancies and get rid of their infants to avoid shame, the certain loss of employment (prostitution was often the only remaining option), and, frequently, punishment for burdening their parishes with fatherless charges. Those able to afford a nominal fee could turn to wet nurses, grimly nicknamed “killer-nurses,” who were willing to quietly starve bastard infants left in their custody. (The cost of a nurse who would really take care of the child was “often equivalent to the [woman’s] entire annual wage”). Writing in 1727, Thomas Coram, one of the champions of the English infanticide prevention campaign, complained about the “daily sight of infant corpses thrown on the dust heaps of London.” He was seconded by Thomas Bray, who compared the illegitimate victims of infanticide to “Warts and Wens, and other filthy Excrencencies . . . defacing and weakening . . . the Body Politic” (16), and Bernard Mandeville, who observed that the abandonment of illegitimate children by their indi-
gent mothers was an outrage that should not be tolerated by a “civi-
liz’d Nation” (65). Established in 1739, the London Foundling Hospi-
tal explicitly targeted female servants who had no means of support-
ing illegitimate children on their own and thus could be prevented
from committing the crime of child-murder and reclaimed to virtue
only through the opportune intervention of a public charity. Serving-
class bastardy was routinely depicted in fiction, frequently (though
not exclusively) as a correlative to the middle-class family anxiety
about the encroaching illegitimate children of its philandering
patriarch.

Students of eighteenth-century literature wishing to understand the role
of fiction in the reimagining of bastardy in the Enlightenment may well
find themselves doubting the usefulness of the blanket concept of ille-
gitimacy when applied across social classes and geographic regions.
Being recorded in the parish register as “bastard” must have meant one
thing to an agricultural laborer from Culcheth in South Lancashire,
whose cohabiting parents—like the parents of the majority of his peers—
could not afford to marry, and quite another to Richard Savage, an
ambitious nobody who spent years demanding that the Countess of
Macclesfield acknowledge him as her long-lost “natural” son and
bestow upon him the proper accoutrements of aristocratic wealth and
prestige (she refused). It must have meant yet something else to a
young charge of the London Foundling Hospital, whose early aware-
ness of her humble station in life was to be fostered, among other
things, through learning by heart and singing during public perfor-
manences the following hymn:

Wash off my foul offence,
And cleanse me from my Sin;
For I confess my crime, and see
How great my Guilt has been.

In Guilt each part was form’d
Of all this sinful frame;
In Guilt I was conceiv’d and born
The Heir of Sin and Shame. 19

But if we accept that eighteenth-century writers lived in a world where
the concept of bastardy was anything but monolithic and where the
lack of the parents’ marriage license hardly established any meaningful
common denominator between an illegitimate son of a duke brought up to inherit a portion of his father’s estate and an inmate of the Foundling Hospital, we begin to realize that the period’s fictional treatment of illegitimacy was fitful and selective. Some experiences of illegitimacy were completely obliterated from the literary discourse; others were rewritten so thoroughly that they have so far remained unrecognized as such by students of eighteenth-century culture; still others were presented as normative or universal, masking the remarkable diversity of personal and cultural readings of the phenomenon of “dishonourable birth.”

The project of reconstructing the cultural history of eighteenth-century illegitimacy thus necessarily involves probing textual omissions and strategic silences. This approach is similar to that used by John Boswell, whose seminal study of representations of abandoned children from antiquity to Renaissance was an inspiration for this book. Boswell observed that literature tends to provide “essential information almost in spite of itself—like a witness whose nervousness is more revealing than his testimony—and is a kind of evidence which would rarely if ever occur in purely historical sources.” The eighteenth-century fictional treatment of bastardy was increasingly subject to a system of unspoken cultural conventions, bound up with deeply felt familial concerns of readers and writers; to detect those conventions, however, one has to look not only at the texts openly obsessed with bastardy, such as Laurence Sterne’s Tristram Shandy, Henry Fielding’s Tom Jones, and Mary Robinson’s The Natural Daughter, but also at those that testify “in spite of themselves” by either appearing to have nothing to do with illegitimacy, such as Richard Steele’s The Conscious Lovers, or by treating it only marginally, such as Samuel Richardson’s Clarissa and Sir Charles Grandison.

**Male Bastards and Female Foundlings**

To understand how some bastards managed to enter the polite discourse while others were barred from it, we need to rediscover the complex literary innuendoes of the eighteenth-century term *foundling*. Although in some contexts this word was used interchangeably with *bastard* (e.g., people could refer to any abandoned child as a foundling, and it was widely, though not always correctly, assumed that *all* abandoned children were born outside of marriage), this was rarely so in fiction. Authors aiming at fostering “good breeding” in their audience...
were extremely careful about specifying whether the parents of their lost and found protagonists had been married at the time of their conception, and, as it turns out, the overwhelming majority of temporarily displaced children of the Enlightenment’s belles lettres were conceived within lawful if ill-starred wedlock, as were, for instance, Indiana from Richard Steele’s *The Conscious Lovers*, Fidelia from Edward Moore’s *The Foundling*, Amelia from George Colman’s *The English Merchant*, Evelina from Frances Burney’s eponymous novel, Emmeline from Charlotte Smith’s *Emmeline*, Joanna from Thomas Holcroft’s *The Deserted Daughter*, Rosa and Elinor from Agnes Maria Bennett’s *The Beggar Girl and Her Benefactors*, Virginia from Maria Edgeworth’s *Belinda*, Fanny from the anonymous *Fatherless Fanny*, and others. A typical “foundling” would be raised by strangers, leave her adopted family upon reaching marriageable age, go through numerous ordeals (during which she acquired an eligible suitor while retaining her chastity), and finally discover her true kin, reassert her legitimate status, and reestablish herself as part of her biological family.

Though structurally similar to the real-life bastard as an outsider forcefully inserting herself into the family and social order, the fictional foundling differed in important ways from her money- and status-hungry illegitimate counterpart. Her quest was for moral excellence and true identity,23 and if the revelation of that identity was accompanied by a shower of tears, titles, and estates, this bounty was bestowed by the parent who frequently did not have any other children and was therefore delighted with the reappearance of the long-lost legitimate offspring. One can speak, in other words, about the culturally recognizable literary category of *legally born* foundlings (henceforth referred to simply as “foundlings”) carefully conceptualized as having nothing in common with such people as the illegitimate correspondent of the *Universal Spectator*, perceived as a “robber” by his disgruntled legitimate siblings. As I will argue, however, it is precisely the insistence that the fictional foundling represents no threat to the economic and emotional well-being of her biological family that makes such a character embody most trenchantly the eighteenth-century anxiety about illegitimacy.

But once we place the eighteenth-century fictional foundling into a separate cultural category suggestively related to and yet recognizably different from the category of “bastard,” we are confronted with *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*. The most famous eighteenth-century “foundling” clearly does not fit the paradigm of rediscovered legitimacy. Tom’s bastardy alerts us to a curious pattern in the period’s literary
treatment of children born outside or “almost” outside of wedlock. When eighteenth-century fictional narrative featured an abandoned child, his or her gender served as a largely reliable predictor of whether at the end of the story, he/she would turn out to be a legitimately born foundling or a bastard. Lost male children, such as Tom Jones and Humphrey Clinker, were allowed to stay illegitimate. The majority of their female counterparts, on the other hand, suffered the threat of illegitimacy throughout the story, only to discover at the end that their parents had been married at the time of their conception. If the bastardy of male foundlings could be decried by readers (e.g., Fielding was widely criticized for refusing to “reveal” at the end of his novel that Tom’s parents had been secretly married), the bastardy of female foundlings was not even considered a controversial issue: it barely existed.

A closer look reveals that it is not just the fictional *lost and found* children who were coded as legitimate or illegitimate depending on their gender. If the work of eighteenth-century literature featured a pregnant woman who was not married at all or married to a man other than the father of her child, in the majority of cases, her newborn child would turn out to be a boy. Examples include not only Daniel Defoe’s Colonel Jack, Fielding’s Tom Jones, Tobias Smollett’s Humphrey Clinker, and, possibly, Sterne’s Tristram Shandy, but also several boys born to Defoe’s Moll and Roxana; the son of the younger daughter of Monsieur Douxmourie from Eliza Haywood’s *Lasselia*; William Godolphin Jr. from Smith’s *Emmeline*; Peregrine Pickle from Smollett’s eponymous novel; Mr. Macartney from Burney’s *Evelina*; the son of Theodosia Snap from Fielding’s *Jonathan Wild*; the sons of Sir Thomas Grandison and Mrs. Oldham from Samuel Richardson’s *Sir Charles Grandison*; the sons of “Thomasine” and Tom Belton from *Clarissa*; the son of Lovelace and Miss Betterton; the imaginary twins that Lovelace envisions suckling at Clarissa’s breast;24 the son of Miss Burchell in Frances Sheridan’s *The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph*; the son of Kattie Buhunun and Lord Denningcourt from Bennett’s *The Beggar Girl and Her Benefactors*; Mr. Milford from Holcroft’s *The Road to Ruin* and the son of Mr. Elford’s servant, Mary, from Holcroft’s *Hugh Trevor*; Gregory Glen from Robert Bage’s *Hermesprong; or, Man As He Is Not*; the son of William and Hannah from Elizabeth Inchbald’s *Nature and Art*; Frederick, the son of Baron Wildenhaim and Agatha Friburg from August von Kotzebue’s *Love Child*, known to the English audiences as *Lovers’ Vows*, adapted by Inchbald (and almost performed at Mansfield Park); the anonymous victim of infanticide from Mary Hays’s *Memoirs*
of Emma Courtney; two anonymous boys from Amelia Opie’s Adeline Mowbray; and many others.

This list may seem overlong, but its length underscores the casual ubiquity of male bastards in the works of fiction. The comparable list of female bastards would be much shorter, including the daughter of Mr. B and Sally Godfrey from Richardson’s Pamela, a daughter of Mr. Bilson from Sarah Fielding’s The History of the Countess of Dellwyn, the daughters of Solomon Mushroom from Bennett’s The Beggar Girl and Her Benefactors, Louisa from Haywood’s The Fortunate Foundlings, and Eliza and Harriet from Austen’s Sense and Sensibility and Emma, respectively. In other words, the eighteenth-century tendency to allow fictional male foundlings—but not their female counterparts—to remain illegitimate seems to be part of a larger literary tradition of conceptualizing bastardy as a fate reserved predominantly for male characters.

John Shebbeare’s The Marriage Act (1754) is paradigmatic in this respect. A veritable catalogue of illicit couplings, it was written to condemn Lord Hardwicke’s 1753 “An Act for the Better Preventing of Clandestine Marriages” (26 George II, c.33), which introduced mandatory parental consent for marriages of children under the age of twenty-one. The new bill was aimed at deterring penniless opportunists of both sexes from eloping with underage heirs and heiresses by postulating that a priest who weds such a couple without parental permission would be tried and transported, and that the children born to this faux marriage would be considered illegitimate. Those objecting to the Act pointed out that it would serve mainly the interests of aristocrats who could further consolidate their power by arranging marriages within their own class or with the richest segment of population, that it would force young people into marriages of convenience aimed at pleasing their avaricious parents rather than at following their own hearts, and that it would enable unscrupulous men to seduce and abandon naive young women after having allegedly “married” them. Shebbeare’s novel is a passionate two-volume harangue against the Act, which “has given designing people the power of... bastardizing whole families to their utter destruction” (2:181). The author presents one fictional case study after another in which a daughter perishes after being married off to a man chosen by her greedy parents or is ruined by a rake who tricks her into a secret marriage not considered legal under the new law. The novel fleshed out a widely held prediction that the bill would dramatically increase the incidence of bastardy, a prediction that apparently never materialized because although bastardy rates continued to rise, historians do not see it as a consequence of the Marriage Act. Also,
significantly for the present argument, Shebbeare’s concept of illegitimacy is unequivocally gendered.

Thus when one of the least sympathetic victims of the new law, Lady Sapplin, runs off to Paris with her lover, leaving behind her aristocratic husband whom she married on the instigation of her nouveau riche parents hankering after a title, she is treated to the following explanation of how extramarital affairs are looked upon in France: “There is so much suspicion in all husbands that the children are not their own, [one] seldom [sees] any tenderness between the father and son; the first finding no inclination for a child which he suspects is not of his begetting, and the child having but little reverence for a man who very probably is not his father” (2:154). Note the automatic assumption of the gender of the child born to an adulterous French mother, France functioning here and throughout the novel as a sad example that England, newly wrecked by Lord Hardwicke’s Act, is sure to follow soon. Meanwhile, back in England, all bastard children born as a consequence of the Act are also male, as is the son of Lady Sapplin and her hairdresser, Mr. Samuel Waitwell; the son of Lord Sapplin and Lucy Shelton; the son of Miss Standish and Mr. Wright; and the son of Mrs. Lulworth and Mr. Thomas. The uniform gendering of these “true” bastards appears even more striking when we hear the story of one Mr. Sterlin and his three legitimate children, who are retroactively bastardized after the death of their parents by their evil uncle, who wishes to steal their estate and is abetted in his criminal designs by the new law. One of these three children is a girl, “called Patty after her [late] Mamma” (2:222), who was a paragon of virtue and elegance. The little Patty’s gender thus underscores the profound falsity of the uncle’s insinuations that these children are “all bastards” and as such “don’t inherit any estates,” and it reinforces the unspoken convention rendering a bastard heroine a conceptual monstrosity (2:225).

Further eloquent testimony to the force of this convention comes from a novel that all but advertised itself as the story of the female bastard: Mary Robinson’s The Natural Daughter (1799). Midway into the narrative, we learn that its nominal title character, the little Fanny, was conceived in circumstances that drastically palliate her illegitimacy (I emphasize the word nominal because Robinson cultivates her readers’ confusion about who exactly the “natural daughter” of the title is). Traveling through revolutionary France, an English gentlewoman is arrested on the orders of Marat and thrown in prison. She is told that an English gentleman of her acquaintance can procure her freedom if she agrees to marry him. Faced with the imminent execution, she
accepts his offer only to learn, after the marriage is consummated, that her new husband (who swiftly departs for England) deceived her and that the “pretended priest who . . . united [them] was nothing more than the valet de chambre of the infamous Marat” (166). When she does manage to escape the French reign of terror and return to her native country, she first abandons the newborn Fanny but then recovers her and retires to rural Switzerland to raise her. The rhetoric describing the marital status of the woman who sincerely believes herself to be married at the time when her child is conceived is purposively ambiguous. On the one hand, Robinson gets much ideological mileage from condemning heartless self-righteous people who censure unwed but virtuous motherhood. On the other hand, rendering the issue of Fanny’s bastardy and her parents’ unwed state moot, her mother is characterized as “married and deserted,” and mourning “the falsehood of an ungrateful husband” (282; emphasis added).

Moreover, Robinson’s readers cannot help applying the novel’s title not just to Fanny, a secondary character, but also to its main protagonist, the unquestionably legitimate Martha Morley. Martha’s kindness and attention to her family members render her the true—that is, “natural”—daughter, as opposed to her clearly “unnatural” sister, spoiled, sensual, and deceitful Julia, whose acts of selfishness include ostracizing the upright and suffering Martha and locking her own mother in a madhouse. Robinson’s editor, Sharon Setzer, sees the contrast between Martha and Julia as complicating “the easy equation between ‘natural’ and ‘illegitimate.’” One effect of such complication is further attenuation of our perception of Fanny as bastard and thus “the” natural child of the novel.

Predictably, the indisputably illegitimate child figuring in The Natural Daughter is a boy, the infant son of the hypocritical Mr. Morley and Julia, who augments “her catalogue of crimes” (281) by neglecting and destroying her newborn. Robinson’s fancy footwork around the issue of female but not male illegitimacy—the story of Fanny’s “revolutionary” conception presents a striking contrast to the chronicle of shameless fornication leading to the birth of the male bastard—is particularly remarkable given what we know about the possible origins of her novel. Setzer considers the earlier critical tradition of tracing The Natural Daughter to Robinson’s plan to write “a fictional expose of Susan Priscilla Bertie, the natural daughter of the Duke of Ancaster and the recent bride” of Robinson’s lover, Banastre Tarleton, and she counters it with a different explanation, pointing to Robinson’s “sympathetic identification with women like Mary Wollstonecraft, the mother of
another illegitimate Frances conceived in revolutionary France.”

That the textual genesis of *The Natural Daughter* can be traced not to just one but two different female bastards makes even more poignant the novel’s endeavor to represent Fanny as not really illegitimate or, in any case, less illegitimate than her male counterpart.

How far back can we trace the literary genealogy of the eighteenth-century correlation of legitimacy with gender? In her study of illegitimacy in Renaissance drama, Alison Findlay observes that the overwhelming majority of the period’s fictional bastards were male. To explain such demographic uniformity, she suggests that female bastardy simply did not present the playwright with much dramatic potential: “legal illegitimacy affected one’s rights to inheritance, succession, and the exercise of authority, advantages usually enjoyed by men. [As] under patriarchal law, women were normally excluded from the inheritance of estate, position, or power . . . bastardy merely reinforced their already marginal status.” Since Findlay does not make a distinction between foundlings and bastards, referring to all abandoned children as bastards, she does not acknowledge that in the rare cases in which Renaissance writers did portray abandoned female children (e.g., Shakespeare’s Perdita and Marina), they were born to married parents. The legitimate status of such heroines makes a crucial difference, however, for the present argument because the figure of the abandoned female child, relatively rare in Renaissance drama, becomes so omnipresent in eighteenth-century belles lettres.

The sharp increase in the general number of female protagonists in the fiction of the Enlightenment is a well-discussed phenomenon in eighteenth-century studies. So it would be only logical to suggest that the Enlightenment’s tendency to use a woman as the “vehicle for testing the possibilities of an individualist ethic” manifested itself in the growing numbers of female foundlings. We can argue, furthermore, that whereas both Renaissance and eighteenth-century writers were extremely reluctant to leave their foundling heroines illegitimate, the shifting gender ratio of the protagonists in the latter period finally allows us to recognize the obligatory legitimacy of the female foundling as a significant literary phenomenon.

To take this argument further, one may suggest that the tendency to monitor the legitimacy of the female protagonist more vigilantly than that of her male counterpart could be traced to the novel of antiquity (e.g., Heliodorus is careful to show that his Charicleia was born within a legal union) and to the Old Testament precept that prohibited priests from marrying women whose mothers had been born out of
wedlock. If we consider that a patriarchal culture would tend to seize
on any correlation that seems to render female sexual behavior less
threateningly unpredictable to the surrounding males, the tradition of
predicting the young woman’s sexual virtue through the known chastity
of her female ancestor(s), could account, at least in part, for the vitality
of the literary trope of the legitimate female protagonist, including
the female foundling.

Readers thus must not have been too surprised to learn that the
illegitimate daughters of Sir Solomon Mushroom from Bennett’s The
Beggar Girl and Her Benefactors (1797), though brought up as heiresses of
a rich Member of Parliament with no knowledge of their bastardy, still
possess “innate vulgarity” (4:28), which renders their style of clothing
a “satire on decency” (4:2) and their conduct lacking in either “sense
or principles” (4:37). Predictably, these fruits of cohabitation later dis-
tinguish themselves by their own sexual misdemeanors: the elder
cheats her husband with the uncouth Jacob Lowder; the younger sleeps
with her fiancé before marriage and impudently defends her actions
with a speech that glibly mixes the rhetoric of “honour” and “keeping”
(the term often used to refer to the practice of keeping mistresses):
“Lord Delworth and I have been as good as man and wife ever since I
have been in the country. . . . My honour and my heart are in my own
keeping; I have pledged the one, and yielded the other, [and] I shall
keep to my engagement” (5:236–37). To emphasize that whereas the
sisters’ vulgarity could be explained by the modest origins of their par-
ents, their lack of chastity is the direct consequence of their illegitimacy,
Bennett contrasts their behavior with that of Elinor Bawsky, one of
the novel’s numerous foundlings. The legitimate child of a serving-class
couple, Elinor is mistakenly thought to be the daughter of a countess
and taken into her presumed mother’s mansion, from which she later
elopess with the low-born Jackie Croak. Whereas her embarrassing
infatuation with Jackie, who at one point hires himself out as a footman,
betrays her own inconspicuous origins, her legitimacy guarantees that
she will not “yield” her “heart” in the manner of Charlotte Mushroom
before officially marrying her “dearest love” (5:203). In other words,
blood (class) will out, but female bastardy will out even surer.

But, apart from the old literary convention of “guaranteeing” the
chastity of fictional heroines via the chastity of their mothers, can the
requisite legitimacy of the female protagonist be traced to certain real-
life social practices? Did female bastards indeed fare worse in the
eighteenth-century marriage market than their male counterparts? I
have found no consistent evidence of such discrimination and have to
conclude that the money and social connections, or lack thereof, of the bastard typically trumped the consideration of gender. In the cases where bastardy of a prospective bride had indeed been used as a pretext for rejecting her, financial problems had also been conspicuously present. Thus, as I show in the next chapter, the lack of adequate funds might have played a key role in the rejection of Steele’s own natural daughter by Richard Savage, even though her illegitimacy was used as an excuse (illegitimacy, one should add, that did not prevent her from soon marrying another man, and one who must have made a much better husband than the unstable Savage ever could). In other words, the emphasis on the legitimacy of the fictional female protagonist emerges as a complex compensatory fantasy that responded to a gamut of readers’ personal anxieties, ranging from the desire to control and predict young women’s reproductive behavior to the acute awareness of the particularly weak bargaining position of that female bastard who could command no financial and social support from her family.

Resisting Symbolism: Property, Social Personality, and the Foundling Narrative

As a persistent feature of the eighteenth-century literary endeavor, the foundling motif has generated a fair share of critical discussions in the last thirty years. These discussions, however, focus primarily on the rich symbolic potential of the foundling trope and, to a lesser degree, on its indebtedness to the literature of antiquity, and as such they do not require any principled differentiation between bastards and legitimately born foundlings. The bastard, the foundling, and the orphan all merge into one fuzzy category, and it is the fascinating literary genealogy of such a character, on the one hand, and her titillatingly fluid kin and class affiliation, on the other, that pique scholars’ interest.

A paradigmatic example of the “genealogical” perspective is Margaret Anne Doody’s analysis of the relationship between the eighteenth-century foundling and the protagonist of such ancient novels as Heliodorus’s An Ethiopian Romance (c. 250–380 A.D.). Drawing in particular on the striking similarities between the journeys of self-discovery of Heliodorus’s Charicleia and Burney’s Evelina, Doody develops her argument about the “community of literature,” that is, the strong tradition of continuity between the ancient romance and the early modern novel.
Using a different approach, scholars such as Lynn Hunt and Michael McKeon explore the ontological uncertainty central to the image of the foundling, which renders her a fit symbol of broader social changes. Commenting on the popularity of representations of abandoned children around the time of the French Revolution, Hunt demonstrates that such representations were co-opted to serve a wide variety of political agendas; what remained invariable, however (and connected the French foundling novel to its English counterpart), was the tendency to use the figure of a seemingly free-floating child as a symbol of the “shifting world.” McKeon sees the eighteenth-century fictional bastard as a hero used to convey an “implicit criticism of aristocratic ideology . . . within the context of progressive ideology.” Illegitimate characters, in this view, are representative of the larger class of “progressive protagonists who possess ‘true’ as distinct from inherited, gentility, especially in narratives that progressively insist . . . that their heroes are capable ‘of acquiring Honour’ even in the total absence of ancestry.” It is significant that neither Hunt nor McKeon differentiates explicitly between fictional bastards and foundlings. Hunt, in fact, refers instead to a broad category of “children . . . almost always without fathers . . . illegitimate, foundlings, orphans, or . . . virtually so.” The illegitimacy of characters thus matters only so far as it frees them from an allegiance to a specific family or social class and allows them to embody the promise of expanded social and economic possibilities of the Age of Enlightenment.

Two recent rearticulations of this view are offered by Wolfram Schmidgen and Ala A. Alryyes. Schmidgen argues that as “a creature of the threshold,” existing “both inside and outside society,” the bastard can “cross hierarchical divisions and . . . enact a radicalized social mobility,” even though his or her mobility remains compromised: “curiously disembodied, simultaneously traversing and leaving inviolate the boundaries of an uneven social space.” Note that in his compelling analysis of the illegitimate protagonist’s “placelessness,” Schmidgen does not differentiate between bastards and foundlings either, calling both Fidelia from Moore’s *The Foundling* and Evelina from Burney’s eponymous novel “bastards,” even though both Moore and Burney went to some lengths to present their heroines as legitimate foundlings.

Alryyes takes as his starting point Lauren Berlant’s “theory of infantile citizenship,” with its focus on “a young person” as a “stand-in for a complicated and contradictory set of anxieties about national
identity,"39 to argue that the “sufferings of the homeless child” become “a central element in nationalist narratives” of eighteenth-century England.40 Alryyes does touch on the differences in the status of children who “leave home, such as Robinson Crusoe, or children who have no homes, such as the bastard Colonel Jacque, the kidnapped Captain Singleton, or the abandoned Moll Flanders.”41 On the whole, however, his study is dedicated to investigating the possible “nationalist” meaning of the fictional protagonists’ “natural” or self-imposed orphan state, and as such is not invested in differentiating between legitimate and illegitimate characters. Tellingly, he observes that “central” as “the orphan’s story” has been to the nineteenth-century British novel, its origins can be found in Tom Jones, for “like the orphans of the nineteenth-century novel, Fielding’s foundling’s loose parentage allows him a freedom not granted the other child heroes.”42

Among the scholars who did comment on the difference between bastards and foundlings, Marthe Robert and Christine van Boheemen offer a Freudian interpretation of this difference that pointedly transcends specific historical circumstances. Having argued that the classical romance was at times instantiated as a story of the murderous Bastard—thus reflecting the complex Freudian dynamics of the child’s fantasy about his family—Robert has read the “bastardy” of such a protagonist as a reflection of his dark impulses rather than his actual illegitimacy. Consequently, she refers to Oedipus, who was actually legitimate, as a “Bastard . . . never done with killing his father in order to take his place, imitate him or surpass him.”43 Similarly, van Boheemen locates the bastardy of Tom Jones in the context of “Lacan’s revision of Freudian psychoanalysis,” suggesting that Tom’s illegitimacy transforms the search for an “actual father . . . into the quest for the name-of-the-father, for a symbol in language representing the law of patriarchal transmission of power, property, and identity.”44

The explorations of the symbolic potential of the foundling figure as well as of the “genetic inheritance” of the eighteenth-century foundling narrative constitute an important background for this study, even though my approach differs significantly from those outlined above. I assume that illegitimacy profoundly impacted the production and the reception of the eighteenth-century foundling narrative.45 Moreover, I consider the British Enlightenment as invested in downplaying a connection between its fictional foundlings and its real-life bastards, an investment that still haunts eighteenth-century studies today as scholars continue to treat their period’s obsession with the foundling motif as separate from the vexed issue of illegitimacy.
Although it may not always be possible or even necessary to resist a symbolic interpretation of eighteenth-century foundling stories, we ought to remember that for the readers of that time any possible symbolic meaning of such stories was impacted by their everyday dealing with practical repercussions of illegitimacy.

The claim that a personal involvement with the issue of illegitimacy affected both the authors and the readers of the eighteenth-century foundling narrative can be easily interpreted as an invitation to inquire into the private circumstances of the authors of foundling fictions. This approach is neither new (Richardson, after all, insisted that Tom Jones was “made a natural child” because Fielding’s first wife, Charlotte Cradock, “was such”) nor, by itself, particularly illuminating. The acknowledgment that the writer could indeed use the foundling motif with all its traditional classical trappings to express in a sublimated form his worries about the fate of his own bastard child is simply a first step in historicizing the eighteenth-century foundling narrative. The next step is to ask what factors set eighteenth-century England apart from other societies practicing illegitimacy, thus lending a recognizable common meaning to the various fictional expressions of private anxieties about “natural” children. One crucial factor to consider here is the eighteenth-century view of property as the catalyst of social personality.

The notion that property functions as “both an extension and a prerequisite of personality” and that “different modes of property [generate] different modes of personality” constituted an important tenet of Western tradition inherited by the English Enlightenment. Whereas the seminal study that follows the crisis of this view in late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, J. G. A. Pocock’s *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, is not concerned with the epistemologies of illegitimacy, it provides a useful starting point for our discussion of eighteenth-century representations of bastardy. Pocock posits the “fascinating and elusive relationship between the notions of right and ownership, and . . . that world of language in which ‘property’—that which you owned—and ‘propriety’—that which pertained or was proper to a person or situation—were interchangeable terms.” The evolution of the early modern views of bastardy could then be understood within the context of the broader crisis of the ideological system engendered by the old feudal mode of production, according to which property and propriety were indeed interchangeable terms.

Thus, as long as the heritable, preferably landed, property remained the only source of livelihood and a guarantee of what Pocock
calls the “moral personality . . . and the opportunity of virtue,” the illegitimate offspring could be viewed as “improper” because “unpropertied”—that is, threatening, socially subversive, and amoral. Hence the emphasis was on representing illegitimate characters as outsiders in the Renaissance. Bastards figured largely in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature, mostly as villains associated with treachery, promiscuity, atheism, disintegration of community, and death (e.g., Shakespeare’s Edmund, Caliban, and Don John; John Kirke’s Suckabus; Gervase Markham and William Sampson’s Antipater), or—in rare cases—as benevolent if zany aliens, often endowed with a poetic or prophetic gift (e.g., Springlove from Richard Brome’s 1641 A Jovial Crew). Sometimes historical figures were retroactively bastardized in order to provide a psychosocial legitimation for inauspicious turns in a community’s political past. The 1591 anonymous The Life and Death of Jack Straw, for example, depicted the peasant revolt of 1381, headed by a character whose bastardy was invented by the author of the play. The 1607 anonymous Claudius Tiberius Nero featured an emperor whose illegitimacy was also an invention, a fitting symbol of the “illegitimate nature” of his political regime.

Pocock argues that England’s financial revolution of the 1690s strengthened the developing moral opposition between the “landed interests” and “monied interests” and thus precipitated a crisis in the traditional association of landed property with propriety: “property moved from being the object of ownership and right to being the subject of production and exchange, and . . . the effect of this on the proposition that property was the basis of social personality was to make personality itself explicable in terms of a material and historical process of diversification, refinement and perhaps ultimate decay and renewal.”

The challenge of defining—and accepting—social personality in relation to volatile property demanded a new conceptual flexibility and could allow, among other things, for a more “enlightened” perspective on the social position of bastards, whose relationship to property had been paradigmatically troubling.

The relationship between the socioeconomic history of England and the cultural view of bastards could be thus described as follows: The further along we are in the “long, slow, cumulative process culminating in the industrial revolution,” the more ambiguous the fictional representations of bastards seem to become. The reason for this representational adjustment is the slowly developing awareness on the part of the middle-class population (i.e., the population most sensitive to the
economic threat represented by bastardy) that, at least up to a point, inheritance did not define in absolute terms the person’s financial destiny, and that the loss of some part of one’s heritable property to an illegitimate sibling could in principle be recouped by future economic entrepreneurship. To put it starkly, the Enlightenment could in principle afford a slightly more enlightened attitude toward “sons of nobody” because their legitimate brothers felt increasingly empowered by the economic possibilities of venture capitalism.

This new feeling of empowerment by no means translated into the legally sponsored embrace of bastards as fully enfranchised members of the economic order. (In fact, the British laws postulating the socioeconomic exclusion of illegitimate children had been remarkably resilient; as late as 1978, the House of Commons rejected “A Bill to remove the legal disabilities of children born out of wedlock.”53) A tentative development of a relatively more tolerant attitude toward bastards manifested itself rather in the increasingly vocal articulation of the view that the “unhappy innocents” (Richardson, Sir Charles Grandison, I:366) should not be made to pay for their parents’ sins. The opening of the London Foundling Hospital in 1739, dedicated to saving the lives of illegitimate children of the poor, was one palpable manifestation of that view, a manifestation by no means unambiguous, however, since this public charity was sometimes described as shouldering the burden that might have otherwise been borne by the legitimate children of the father of the bastard.

When it came to fictional representations of illegitimacy, the situation was equally complicated. To begin with, the figure of the dripping-with-venom bastard—venomous because of his bastardy—disappears from eighteenth-century belles lettres or moves so radically to the back of the stage that we hardly notice his skulking presence. This excision of the vile bastard as a nearly ubiquitous literary type is accompanied by the introduction of the similarly ubiquitous virtuous foundling. Furthermore, whereas the overwhelming majority of sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century literary texts featuring illegitimate characters conclude with the triumphant expulsion of the malevolent bastard from the community,54 most of the eighteenth-century supposed bastards (particularly the females) turn out to be legally born foundlings who wind up reintegrated into the social order. One way of reading this crowding out of one literary type/social destiny by another is to suggest that the ascendance of the benevolent foundling exemplified the Enlightenment’s readiness to assume a more humane attitude toward
illlegitimate children—a belles lettres equivalent of the fact that the charitable public institution designed to shelter bastards was called the Foundling Hospital.

At the same time, the literary rewriting of bastards as foundlings fit to be claimed by their long-lost families was crucially implicated with the self-perpetuation of the socioeconomic system privileging legitimate children. A cultural potential for a more enlightened perspective on the plight of bastards notwithstanding, the transfer of property to the hands of the legal heir remained the key concern of the eighteenth-century foundling narrative.

The emphasis on the psychosocial function of property thus qualifies the current critical view of the eighteenth-century generic foundling/bastard/orphan character as a paradigmatic progressive protagonist embodying “an implicit criticism of aristocratic ideology.” On the one hand, there is a certain intuitive appeal to considering such a character representing what John Richetti describes as the eighteenth-century fictional narrative’s “progressive, even at times utopian, conviction that things should be different from the way that they have always been and that the new order is full of opportunity for the hardworking and the meritorious.” On the other hand, the traditional exegetical model that collapses foundlings, bastards, and orphans into one broad category of “progressive” protagonists seems less persuasive once we notice how many of the Enlightenment’s fictional foundlings depend on the acquisition of inherited property (preferably landed property) and how sensitive a subject the correlation between the acquisition of that property and the establishment of the exact marital status of the protagonist’s parents is. Our tendency to look for an overarching narrative of progress emerging from the eighteenth-century foundling fictions is thus checked by our realization that those fictions were fueled, to a significant degree, by the very real presence of a large class of people—illegitimate daughters, sons, sisters, brothers, and stepchildren—who were officially denied social personality by being denied the right to inherit property and whose attempts to acquire such personality—via inheriting property—were read with an uneasy mixture of opprobrium and compassion.

A Brief Outline of This Book

Each following chapter focuses on one or two “canonical” plays and novels (such as The Conscious Lovers, The Foundling, Tom Jones, and Emma)
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and a constellation of lesser-known works (such as Hays’s *The Victim of Prejudice*, Haywood’s *The Fortunate Foundlings*, and Bennett’s *The Beggar Girl*), considering them in the context of everyday practical dilemmas posed by illegitimacy. The first and second chapters, respectively, analyze Steele’s play *The Conscious Lovers* (1722) and Defoe’s *Moll Flanders* (also 1722) in relation to the early-eighteenth-century concern about the widespread practice of infanticide and the campaign to establish the English “House of Orphans,” a foundling hospital similar to those existing by that time in many European countries. The third chapter offers a bifurcated analysis of Edward Moore’s play *The Foundling* (1747) and Samuel Richardson’s *Clarissa* (1747–48), highlighting the difference between the representational challenges faced by the playwrights and novelists responding to the eighteenth-century preoccupation with the issue of bastardy. The fourth chapter compares the bastard-foundling hero of Fielding’s *Tom Jones* (1749) with other illegitimate heroes of eighteenth-century fiction, such as Savage’s “Bastard” (1728), Haywood’s Horatio (*The Fortunate Foundlings*, 1744), and Smollett’s Peregrine Pickle (1751) and Humphrey Clinker (1771), problematizing the accepted critical view of Tom Jones as a paradigmatic progressive protagonist of eighteenth-century belles lettres.

The fifth chapter returns to the history of the London Foundling Hospital, reading Richardson’s last novel, *Sir Charles Grandison* (1753–54), as offering an ambivalent emotional justification for the presumably self-imposed exclusion of women of quality from public participation in the affairs of the Foundling Hospital at mid-century. The sixth chapter uses Charles Burney’s attempt, in 1774, to turn the Hospital into the first national public school of music—a project in which he was assisted by Frances Burney—as an important background for the treatment of the theme of illegitimacy in *Evelina* (1778). The concluding chapter focuses on the story of Harriet Smith, the bastard protégé of Emma Woodhouse in Jane Austen’s *Emma* (1816), arguing that Austen capitalized on the cultural iconography of the Hospital to offer a corrective to the rule of configuring the legitimacy of the fictional foundling as a function of her gender.

The larger goal of the insistent cross-referencing between the historical and the literary that drives the argument of this book is to put illegitimacy on the map of eighteenth-century studies as a crucial fixture of the period’s imaginative landscape. Whereas I cannot claim that the reconstruction of the dialogue between the foundling fictions and the concern about bastardy somehow covers or exhausts the complex topic of the cultural meanings of illegitimacy in the “long” eighteenth
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century, I am convinced that by listening to the many voices of that hitherto unnoticed dialogue, we come closer to recognizing illegitimacy as an important, far-reaching, and immensely complex sociopolitical institution of the British Enlightenment.
Although the tradition of the obligatory transformation of female bastards into foundlings may have ebbed by the 1810s, representations informed by that tradition still resonate with us today in unexpected and subtle ways. Consider the flashback at the end of the BBC 1998 production of *Tom Jones*, which shows Tom’s late parents, Miss Bridget Allworthy and Mr. Summer, smiling at each other and very much in love. The next shot is a mercifully brief close-up of Mr. Summer’s face disfigured by disease as he lies dead in the parish church with Bridget crying over his body. We learn from a voice-over supplied by Tom’s presumed mother, Jenny Jones, that on the very day Mr. Summer was to ask for Bridget’s hand from her brother, Mr. Allworthy, “he was taken with a small-pox and passed away by the following morning,” leaving Miss Allworthy pregnant with his child and terrified at the impending loss of her reputation.

The revelation that Tom’s parents would have married had it not been for Mr. Summer’s untimely death is the invention of this particular movie. In the book, Bridget is not at all inclined to wed her lover, who is handsome and genteel but poor. As the thunderstruck Allworthy reminisces at the end of the story, “I confess I recollect some passages relating to that Summer, which have formerly gave me a Conceit that my Sister had some Liking to him. I mentioned it to her: For I had such a regard for the young Man, as well on his own account, as on his Father’s, that I should willingly have consented to a Match between them; but she expressed the highest Disdain of my unkind Suspicion, as she called it, so that I never spoke more on the Subject” (833).

Postscript

BBC REWRITES TOM JONES’S ILLEGITIMACY
Henry Fielding’s Bridget, vehemently disclaiming any tenderness for an indigent son of a clergyman, is very different from the BBC Bridget, crying over Mr. Summer’s body on the very day when he would have revealed their mutual attraction to Mr. Allworthy. More is at stake here, however, than simply transforming a hypocritical stick-up character into a sympathetic suffering one. What Fielding has emphatically refused to do and the movie sheepishly does is mitigate Tom’s illegitimacy and his mother’s sexual trespass by implying that his parents were almost as good as married because they planned to get married. In fact, sociologists studying early modern illegitimacy put such “courtship pregnancies” in a class by themselves, implying that the charge of promiscuity could not be leveled against a couple whose marriage plans were disrupted through no fault of their own.¹

The introduction of the “courtship pregnancy” motif into the narrative can lead to certain misunderstandings. The picture closes with a moving tribute to Fielding, which includes the mention of a “scandal” surrounding the first publication of Tom Jones. Based on what they have just seen, some viewers account for that controversial reception by the sexual explicitness of the novel, amplified by several nude scenes in the BBC production.² In reality, however, the scandal was precipitated not only by the characters’ sexual escapades but also by Fielding’s audacity in leaving his hero a bastard. Jacobite critics claimed “that an earthquake that threatened London and other cosmic disorders were God’s punishment for this indecency,” and, generally, the offended first readers of the novel wished that Fielding had “revealed a secret marriage between Bridget and her illicit lover, who had died anyway.”³ The BBC producers’ tampering with Tom’s irredeemable illegitimacy caves in to that old wish, but the only apparent benefit of this “improvement” is that Bridget comes off as more virtuous—a curious instance of prudishness on the BBC’s part. Why not leave the foundling hero a bastard, since Fielding himself did?

It seems that removed as we are from the anxieties surrounding the issue of illegitimacy in the days of Fielding, we could still be made to respond to representations engendered by those anxieties. It mattered then whether Tom was legally conceived or not, and, judging by the movie’s tiptoeing around the issue, it may still matter now. The twentieth- and twenty-first-century audiences may be unaware of the socio-economic conditions (i.e., the importance of inheritance for one’s economic survival and the grave threat represented by a bastard sibling’s claim on that inheritance) that fueled the demonization of bastards for

¹ Zunshine

² Postscript

³ Zunshine
many centuries, but the echoes of that demonization still haunt our cultural imagination. Tom’s considerable personal charms apparently acquire a different slant if he is perceived as a bit less of a “bastard” and a bit more of a love child deprived by a fluke of fate of a loving two-parent family.

The final scene of the movie amplifies the stakes of this tacit shift in perception. We see Tom riding up to his house in a carriage together with Allworthy, the older man snuggly dozing off now and then, the younger man gazing at him with tenderness. The carriage stops, and Tom’s family—Sophia and their two children, Tom and Bridget—joyfully welcome him at the door. Amidst their happy domestics, there is another married couple, Honour and Partridge, and as they turn around to enter the house behind their masters, we see their hands sliding quietly toward each other’s bottoms. Tom is thus firmly ensconced in his role as paterfamilias; Allworthy does not have to keep an eye on him and can afford to nod off; Bridget Allworthy’s memory is sanctified by her grandchild being named after her (note that the novel itself does not specify the name of Tom’s daughter); and sex, particularly of a playful, non-procreative kind, is displaced onto the comic couple of a lower social standing.

Tom, the movie implies, has shaken off rakishness (and some of his libido?) together with his bastardy, or is it that his former rakishness was an expression of his bastardy? BBC’s Tom Jones seems to be implicitly playing off the old association of bastardy with unruly sexual appetite, which is deeply ironic because this is an association that Fielding himself sought to subvert by populating his novel with numerous bastards and refusing to see their bastardy as a meaningful common denominator explaining their behavior. The BBC’s Tom is the virtuous son of the virtuous mother, his new respectability guaranteed through the use of the same representational strategy that the eighteenth-century writers relied on to guarantee the respectability of their female protagonists. The old transformation of female bastards into foundlings becomes an equal opportunity endeavor.

The “rewriting” of early modern bastardy thus goes on, even in a culture that has lost most, if not all, of the former socioeconomic incentives for monitoring the legitimacy of its citizens. To me it indicates that one of the key endeavors of my study—to uncover the mundane and thus poignant existence of eighteenth-century illegitimate men and women from under the agglomeration of cultural fantasies about “bastards” and “foundlings”—remains a project in progress. Although we
may never be able—and, in fact, would not even want—to postulate a certain cutoff point at which the “real” experience of bastardy ends and its cultural reimagining begins, we should at least be aware of our enduring tendency to ignore the former and to overprivilege the latter in our ongoing reconstruction of early modern cultural history.
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54. Shakespeare’s King John and Brome’s A Jovial Crew constitute notable exceptions to this rule.
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13. As H. Grant Sampson points out, Terence’s plays were “universally taught” throughout the eighteenth century (“Terence, Comic Patterns, and the Augustan Stage,” 90). See also Malcolm Kelsall on Terence’s status as one of the most important classical dramatists “shaping neo-classic theory and sensibility” (“Terence and Steele,” 11).
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16. Jumping one hundred years ahead, we hear a curious if unintended echo of Echard’s reasoning in Elizabeth Inchbald’s explanation of why “no person of talents and literary knowledge” had undertaken translating August von Kotzebue’s Das Kind der Liebe [Love Child] into English before she did, in 1798. The potential translators, wrote Inchbald, must have been deterred “by the consideration of [the play’s] original unfitness for an English stage, and the difficulty of making it otherwise” (von Kotzebue, Lovers’ Vows, A play, In five acts. Performing at the Theatre Royal, Covent-Garden, ii–iii). It is interesting that Inchbald lists among the reasons for the play’s “unfitness” the “indelicately blunt” (iii) behavior of the young aristocratic woman who proposes marriage to the man she loves, as well as the “dangerous insignificance” (ii) of one of the secondary characters; but she does not mention as objectionable the play’s frank discussion of bastardy even though she significantly modifies that discussion in her translation, thus making us suspect that she herself considered that aspect of the play quite risqué. Not only is the play now called Lovers’ Vows instead of a more forthright Love Child, but also the original’s discussion of an army career as the only one open to the bastards is dropped altogether from the end of act 4. Furthermore, unlike Stephen Porter, Inchbald never uses the word bastard in her translation. Inchbald was wrong, of course, in claiming that no other translators had undertaken the play. Stephen Porter’s version appeared the same year, is much more faithful to the original, and contains a vitriolic preface, in which Porter asserts that he “was engaged” on translating the play “before she was” and wonders at Inchbald’s “very invidious advertisement” (von Kotzebue, Lovers’ Vows, or, the Child of Love. A Play, in Five Acts. Translated from the German of Augustus von Kotzebue, i).

17. See Petty, An Essay Concerning the Multiplication of Mankind. For a discussion of Petty’s proposal, see Andrew, Philanthropy and Police, 58.

18. Scholars disagree on whether infanticide had actually increased by the early decades of the eighteenth century. Some have argued that “in eighteenth-century England the incidence of infanticide was lower than it had been in the mid-sixteenth century” and that its frequent denunciations by writers (such as
Defoe), painters (such as Hogarth), and other public figures was the “result of increased social conscience rather than . . . the reflection of an increase in crime.” This view is supported primarily by the scant number of cases prosecuted at the court of law. Others have pointed out that abandonment of infants should count as infanticide because the abandoned child had practically no chances for survival, and they assert that “it is undoubtedly true that there was an enormous rise in the number of children abandoned, all over Europe, in the eighteenth-century” (Viazzo, 176).

19. England, of course, was not the only European country afflicted by infanticide and abandonment. For discussion, see Boswell, 15–16.


21. Adair suggests that “there may possibly . . . have been semi-institutionalized networks of infanticidal wet-nurses, although it is difficult to distinguish neglect from deliberate killing” (44).


23. Recent examinations of fictional depictions of victimized children and their deviant parents in conjunction with transformations in political, economic, aesthetic, and reproductive landscapes of early modern Europe range from Thomas Laqueur’s radical assertion of an ontological linkage between eighteenth-century forensic descriptions of dead infants and the developing British novel (176–204) to Deborah A. Symonds’s analysis of a careful repositioning of the figure of the “unnatural” (murderous) mother in fictional and legal discourses of the time (Weep Not for Me, especially 191–210). For a response to Laqueur’s argument and a useful overview of publications on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century infanticide, see Thorn, “Introduction.” Among other recent explorations of the theme of infanticide in early modern literature, see Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars*; Travitsky, “Child Murder in English Renaissance Life and Drama”; Bowers, *The Politics of Motherhood*; and Findlay, *Illegitimate Power*. Dolan extends her analysis of depictions of domestic crime in England, 1550–1700, to include some of the seventeenth-century pamphlets describing infanticidal parents and stepparents, and she examines the infanticide-through-exposure motif in Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*. Travitsky explores the unsympathetic portrayal of infanticidal mothers in Renaissance drama. Bowers considers infanticide an important constituent of an Augustan “mythology that at once exploits and denies explicitly maternal agencies and subjectivities” (4). Within early modern cultural studies, infanticide studies thus pursue an important double project of uncovering the historical emergence of the “accepted” cultural readings of dead infant—and silenced maternal—bodies and of showing how these readings informed the early modern “construction and containment of maternity” and female agency (Francus, “Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies,” 135).
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28. I wish I could sound less tentative on this issue, although I am also reminded of Hume’s recent observation that when it comes to historical scholarship, literary critics are seldom “prepared simply to say that the evidence . . . will justify only a very tentative hypothesis” (“The Aims and Limits of Historical Scholarship,” 418). Hume insists that “the scholar must understand (and make clear to others) exactly what is being claimed, and where those claims slide across the boundary between fact and speculative interpretation” (415). Although any aspiration to a distinction between the “matters of fact” and “speculative analysis” (403) may appear particularly suspect in a study dealing with representations of illegitimacy, I have endeavored, whenever possible, to retain some critical distance from my historical explications and to alert my readers to the differing degrees of certainty with which I myself treat different claims that I make.
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37. Savage, An Author To be Lett, A3, A4. As Lawrence Lipking observes, An Author To be Lett is “remarkably vicious . . . even by the standard of the War of the Dunces” (Samuel Johnson, 75). For a suggestive recent analysis of Savage’s controversial personality, see Blakey Vermeule, The Party of Humanity, 119–53.
38. In 1728, fresh from receiving the royal pardon for his murder of James Sinclair, Savage published one of his most famous poems, “The Bastard.” Samuel Johnson characterizes the time of “The Bastard” composition, in the house of Lord Tyrconnel, as “the Golden Part of Mr. Savage’s Life, [when] he had no reason to complain of Fortune: his Appearance was splendid, his Expenses large, and his Acquaintance extensive. He was courted by all who endeavored to be thought Men of Genius, and caressed by all who valued themselves upon a refined Taste” (Life of Savage, 44).
40. See Loftis, Steele at Drury Lane, 184.
41. Canfield, “Shifting Tropes of Ideology in English Serious Drama,” 220.
42. James Thompson, “Sure I have seen that face before,” 295. See also Nandini Bhattacharya’s argument that “from the very beginning . . . Indiana’s entry into respectably society is negotiated by means of her virtue, even had her birth as a commoner been an obstacle otherwise” (Reading the Splendid Body, 106).
43. Ironically, the role of Indiana in the Drury Lane performances of The Conscious Lovers was played by Anne Oldfield, an object of Savage’s perennial (if not necessarily erotic) attachment and herself a mother of two illegitimate children.
44. Connely, Sir Richard Steele, 381.
46. Cave, Recognitions, 120.
47. Note that the subject of “tokens” will assume a renewed prominence in eighteenth-century cultural imagination after the opening of the London Foundling Hospital in 1739. At the time of Steele’s writing, however, fictional tokens did not have many real-life resonances, for indigent mothers who murdered their infants or abandoned them to a certain death did not leave tokens with them. For a discussion of tokens left with the young charges of the foundling hospital by their mothers later in the century, see Laura Schattschneider, “The Infant’s Petitions.”

48. As discussed earlier (in my analysis of Andria), the meaning of the term illegitimate, when used in the texts of the antiquity, is different from the one generally used in this study and common in the eighteenth century.

49. Robert Markley, personal communication.

50. Goux, Oedipus, 19.

51. Ibid., 115.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Defoe, The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders, 1. Subsequent references to Moll Flanders, unless otherwise noted, will be from this edition and placed in parentheses.

2. In arguing that Moll Flanders should be read in the context of the eighteenth-century infanticide prevention campaign, I follow the long-standing scholarly tradition of historicizing Defoe’s novel, represented by Paula Backsider’s Daniel Defoe: Ambition and Innovation and Daniel Defoe: His Life; Ian Watt’s The Rise of the Novel; Maximilian E. Novak’s “Some Notes Toward a History of Fictional Forms”; John Bender’s Imagining the Penitentiary; Lincoln Faller’s Crime and Defoe; Gregory Durston’s Moll Flanders; and Robert Mayer’s History and the Early English Novel. As William Warner observes in Licensing Entertainment, “[T]he very coarseness of Defoe’s narrative filter allows his writings to conduct a more ample and complex documentation of eighteenth-century realities” (150).


4. Although I use the word infanticide as interchangeable with child murder throughout this study, the former term was not widely used in the eighteenth century. For a discussion of terminology associated with child murder during this period, see Jackson, New-Born Child Murder, 6, and Dickinson and Sharpe, “Infanticide in Early Modern England,” 36.

5. For information on the British legal system’s dealings with infanticide, see Hoffer and Hull, Murdering Mothers; Jackson, New-Born Child Murder; Wrightson, “Infanticide in Earlier Seventeenth-Century England” and “Infanticide in European History”; Damme, “Infanticide”; May, “She at first denied it”; and Francis, “Monstrous Mothers, Monstrous Societies.”

6. Richard Burn, in his 1763 Ecclesiastical Law, states that “every lewd woman who shall have any bastard which may be chargeable to the parish, the justices of the peace shall commit such woman to the house of correction to be punished and set to work, during the term of one whole year” (I:120). Adair points out that corporal punishments for the “parents of illegitimate children, especially the mothers—
have been noted for Somerset, Nottinghamshire, Sussex and the West Riding of Yorkshire. In the Isle of Man persistent female sexual offenders were dragged into the sea behind a boat in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries” (152). Wrightson reports the intervention of manorial courts as in the case of the “Jury of one Lancashire Manor, [that] fined the father of a pregnant girl until he was forced to turn her out” (“Infanticide in Earlier Seventeenth-Century England,” 66).

7. The 1624 Statute (21 Jac. I c. 27) focused on unwed mothers and stated that “[If] any Woman . . . be delivered of . . . Male or Female, which . . . should by the Lawes of this Realm be a bastard, and . . . she endeavour to conceal the Death thereof, as it may not come to light, whether it be borne alive or not, but be concealed, in every such Case the Mother so offending shall suffer Death as in the case of Murther . . . .” (Pickering, Statutes at Large, 298). Consequently, as Jackson points out, the assumption that only mothers of bastard children had motives for murder “served to justify the complementary belief that the murder of a newborn child by a married woman, because motiveless, could only be explained in terms of some evident disease.” So in the 1668 case when “a married woman of good reputation’ was indicted for murdering her newly born child, [she was judged to be possessed by] the ‘temporary phrenzy’ [and] found not guilty to the ‘satisfaction of all that heard it’” (New-Born Child Murder, 40). Similar laws were passed in France (1156, 1586, 1708), Sweden (1627), Württemberg (1658), Scotland (1690), Bavaria (1751), Canada (1758), and the United States (1855) (Schwartz and Isser, Endangered Children, 36–37). In England, the Lord Ellenborough’s Act of 1803 restored the presumption of stillbirth and introduced an alternative verdict: if an illegitimate mother were acquitted on a charge of murder, she could still be punished with a two-year imprisonment. Interestingly, this act still centered on unwed mothers and their bastard children; it took the next piece of legislation dealing with infanticide, the 1828 Offences against the Person Act, to dispatch with the distinction between illegitimate and legitimate children.

8. Similar arguments have recently been made about Victorian England. As Schwartz and Isser have pointed out, in the second part of the nineteenth century, it was thought that “the punitive bastardy legislation embodied in the Poor Law with its refusal of ‘outdoor’ relief, the difficulty of getting fathers to support their children, and the inability of women to find work . . . forced more neonaticide and abandonment” (31).

9. Wrightson, “Infanticide in European History,” 7. Also, for an important recent discussion of the comparative effects of Protestant and Catholic measures against bastardy, see Watt, “The Impact of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation.”

10. As Alan Macfarlane observes, the “hint that the bastard’s religious status was extremely dubious occurs in Thomas Becon’s works, where he cites the old law that bastards should not be allowed to enter the congregation of the faithful.” Macfarlane also cites a case of “a man of Great Totham [who] was presented at the archdeaconry court in 1612 ‘for inconsistency and bastardy for which cause he hath not beene [sic] admitted the holy communion this last Easter’” (“Illegitimacy and Illegitimates in English History,” 78–79).

11. Dickinson and Sharpe point out that although the capacity “to keep their pregnancy secret until a very last stage” may appear “remarkable to the modern
observer,” unmarried women in the early modern era regularly managed “to maintain such secrecy.” By exhibiting exceptional “physical and psychological resilience,” they ensured that even a birth would “pass unnoticed by other members of an infanticidal mother’s household” (45).


13. Sometimes such sermons warned parishioners about the mortal sin of killing an infant before baptism. To kill the unbaptized newborn was to detract from the community of Christian souls in heaven, because “a child before he is baptized is not a child of God but a child of the Devil” (Stone, The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 472–74. For further discussion of the evolution of ecclesiastical views on infanticide, see Kellum, “Infanticide in England in the Later Middle Ages,” and Walker, Crime and Insanity in England.

14. On the practice of neighborly snooping after women suspected of being pregnant out of wedlock, see Jackson, New-Born Child Murder, especially chap. 2.


16. Once the child had been introduced to the community through the baptismal ceremony, his parent(s) became publicly accountable for him and were much less likely to attempt to murder or expose him. Interestingly, according to the nineteenth-century Napoleonic Code, the murder of a child prior to registration was considered a much heavier offense than the murder of a registered child. Stripped of all religious connotations, the code explicitly addressed the fact that “until registration the child enjoyed less protection than the ordinary citizen from the normal deterrents of the law” (Walker, 126).


23. Brownlow, The History and Design of the Foundling Hospital with a Memoir of the Founder, 2–3. As Susan Chaplin suggests, by the first decades of the eighteenth century, the image of an infanticidal mother as an object of compassion begins to replace the image of such mother as a monster (Speaking of Dread, especially the chapter “The Discipline of Sensibility: Infanticide, Sensibility, and Femininity in The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Biddulph”).


25. Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, 36.

26. Recent research of Luc Racaut offers an unexpected additional context for Addison’s concerns about England’s lagging behind the Catholic countries in preventing infanticide. As Racaut demonstrates, from the outset of the Reformation, Protestants had been the subject of a “blood libel” by Catholics, routinely accused of sacrificing their own children during their religious orgies. In the eyes of the early modern Catholic polemists, especially those in France, this blood
libel “served to justify further persecutions of [heretics, i.e., of Protestants], in the same way that it had been used against Jews across the ages” (“Accusations of Infanticide on the Eve of the French Wars of Religion,” 34).

27. For a suggestive recent discussion of A Modest Proposal and cultural representations of child murder, see McDonagh, Child Murder and British Culture, 18–23.

28. See also Defoe, Augusta Triumphans.

29. Quoted in Nichols and Wray, 16. Interestingly, the issue of “public benefit” in conjunction with infanticide was raised once again later in the century, even though the “public” was now defined on a very different scale. In the famous 1798 An Essay on the Principle of Population, Malthus lists the primary “checks” on population growth, such as war, famine, and disease. Thus alluding to the late-eighteenth-century visitations of smallpox, he notes that “small-pox is certainly one of the channels, and a broad one, which nature has opened for the last thousand years, to keep down the population to the level of the means of subsistence.” He also mentions that in addition to three major checks, there are other “active and able ministers of depopulation,” such as abortion and infanticide, though he does not discuss in detail the workings of these lesser “ministers,” except by informing his readers that infanticide had been historically practiced in Australia, the Pacific, North and South America, Central Asia, India, China, and ancient Rome and Greece (32). The teleological implications of the Malthusian theory of population checks do not fare well with economists and historians today; indeed, it is often viewed as inspired in its conception but still an oversimplified account of complex mechanisms involved in the dynamics of population growth (see Fogel, The Relevance of Malthus for the Study of Mortality Today; Hollander, The Economics of Thomas Robert Malthus; and Dupaquier, Fauve-Chamoux, and Grebenik [eds.], Malthus Past and Present). Historian Rudolph Binion points out that Malthus “reduces human behavior to laws of nature expressible in mathematical terms, [thus following] a common ambition of the philosophes throughout the Enlightenment, overawed as they were by the example of the natural scientists of the seventeenth century who had seemingly reduced all physical phenomena to a few simple and elegant mathematical formulae—or rather who had purportedly detected those simple and elegant formulae encoded in nature” (“’More Men Than Corn,’” 565). For a suggestive recent analysis of the implications of Malthusian “world of surplus population” for late-eighteenth-century politics, see Lamb, Preserving the Self in the South Seas, 286.


31. Quoted in May, 35–36.

32. For an analysis of “The Cruel Mother; being a True Relation of the Bloody Murther Committed by M. Cook” and a series of other pamphlets depicting child murder, see Francus. Another recent study of eighteenth-century ballads dealing with infanticide is Symonds’s Weep Not for Me. See also John Richetti on the popularity of early-eighteenth-century pamphlets about “sensational crimes and domestic violence” (“Popular Narrative in the Early Eighteenth Century,” 5–6).

33. Similarly, as Dickinson and Sharpe observe, “[M]en figured very rarely as principals in infanticide prosecutions. . . . [T]hey were very rarely thought to be involved in the deaths of . . . illegitimate children, and were extremely unlikely to be convicted” (41).
34. Adair, 79.
35. Complicating Adair’s assertion is Jeffrey R. Watt’s recent reminder that unlike their Catholic counterparts, early modern Protestant magistrates were generally more active in at least “trying to establish the paternity of illegitimate children” (150).
36. The French Foundling Hospital was opened in 1670. Bray, Coram, and Defoe often refer to it as an example that British “Men of Sense” should emulate. See, for example, McClure, Coram’s Children, 3–15.
37. Quoted in Solkin, Painting for Money, 162.
38. On “gypsies” in Moll Flanders, see Benedict, Curiosity, 168, and Durston, 48. Compare to Robert A. Erickson’s discussion of one “Jenny Hackabout,” a real-life bawd and procuress, who, “after leaving off the trade of bawd because, of the expense of keeping off Indictments, bribing the Informers, and other Accidents” became so successful a midwife “that there was scarce a Whore about Town but was her Customer”; Jane was also expert at disposing children, as soon as they were born, to “Gypsies” for “forty shillings” (Mother Midnight, 269).
39. The case is described in Macfarlane, 76–77.
41. Ibid.
42. For a detailed analysis of Mother Midnight’s relationship with Moll, see Erickson, “Moll’s Fate.”
43. As Warner observes, Defoe’s “narratives indulge what they censure, repeat what they proscribe” (Licensing Entertainment, 151).
44. As P. Hudson and W. R. Lee have argued, “As long as male wages remained precariously low or male employment was casual or seasonal, most married women were obliged to seek work in the non-formal economy. Wives were forced to supplement family income because of the persistent and serious economic need. Women were able to find supplementary income in childminding, casual cleaning and taking in lodgers . . . laundry work and trading in consumables. Much activity of this kind drew on women’s neighbourhood and kinship networks and involved reciprocity and payment in kind as well as monetised transactions” (Women’s Work and the Family Economy in Historical Perspective, 30).
45. Clark, Correspondence of the Foundling Hospital Inspectors, xxxvi.
46. Ibid., xxxvi–xxxvii.
47. Solkin, 159.
48. Quoted in Nichols and Wray, 27.
49. For a related discussion of Moll’s “immunity from the fruits of her miscellaneous unions,” see Flynn, The Body in Swift and Defoe, 70.
50. As Amy L. Masciola observes, there “appears to have been as much concern among commentators about “single women’s sexuality going ‘wholly undiscovered’ as there was for the lives of innocent children” (“The Unfortunate Maid Exemplified,” 64).
52. As Francus puts it, Moll’s “abandonment of her children is a . . . displaced infanticide” (156). In discussing infanticide from the perspective of the mother,
Notes

*Moll Flanders* prefigures the much later novel, Elizabeth Inchbald’s *Nature and Art.*

53. Compare to Novak’s argument about the “cycle of necessity” in Defoe’s fiction—his tendency to excuse (if partially) and explain the faults of his characters, including Moll (*Defoe and the Nature of Man*, 76, 78–82). See also George A. Starr on the comparison between Moll’s reasoning about “doing away with the child” and the passage dealing with child abandonment in his 1728 *Street-Robberies* (*Defoe: Spiritual Autobiography*, 147, n. 22), and Alryyes’s discussion of “marriage and fertility” as “decidedly superceded by the hero’s freedom” (154).

54. Moll’s matter-of-fact reasoning about the difficulties of her situation could be seen in light of what J. Paul Hunter characterizes as Defoe’s “accomplishment—an accomplishment repeated in times in novels ever since—in making Moll’s life seem ordinary even though it violates community standards in ways unthinkable to most readers” (*Before Novels*, 36). On the other hand, Moll’s descriptions of her “perplexity” and “apprehensions” echo in suggestive ways what Dana Rabin has recently described as an increased use of “the language of the mind” in the Old Bailey infanticide trial transcripts from the 1720s and the 1730s: “By claiming that they were ‘not sensible,’ ‘agitated in mind,’ ‘almost distracted,’ ‘stupefied,’ ‘confused’ and ‘delirious,’ defendants and witnesses explained a wide range of emotional states from confusion to delusion and insanity. . . . This language and the larger interest in sensibility convinced those participating in the courtroom dialogue—from the defendants and witnesses to the judges and prosecutors—that the women accused of infanticide had no criminal intention of murdering or hurting their children and that they should not be held responsible for the crime” (“Bodies of Evidence, States of Mind,” 81).


57. Ibid., 75.

58. On Defoe’s general tendency to cut his characters’ “description of significant and potentially interesting events” in their lives, see Faller, 100.

59. For a related discussion of the apparent lack of coherence in Moll’s account of her birth, see Alkon, *Defoe and the Fictional Time*, 143.

60. Nancy K. Miller is convinced that Moll is illegitimate (*The Heroine’s Text*, 5), although, strictly speaking, we have no conclusive evidence for it in the text.

61. In one of the funniest mother-son exchanges of early modern English literature, Humphrey asks Moll to bring him “a wife from London” (267). Both Humphrey and Moll are happily oblivious of the fact that her brother/husband had also brought himself a “wife from London” and that the number of Moll’s children scattered through London should make her worry about history repeating itself.

NOTES

63. See Starr for a different reading of Moll’s tendency to place the responsibility for her misdeeds on external evil agents (Defoe and Casuistry, 153–54).

64. Miller, 10. For a different reading of the invocations of “fate or Providence” in Defoe, see Warner, Licensing Entertainment, 151.

65. As David Morse observes in his discussion of Burney’s Evelina, “[T]he contradiction involved in her social progress and in the whole trajectory of the novel, is that she must gain both knowledge and experience of the fashionable world in order to preserve and protect the virtue that she has, yet at the same time she has to stay as unspoiled as she was at the outset” (The Age of Virtue, 149).

66. Of course, as Richetti has observed, “[T]he facts are that [Moll] could have as easily come to her criminal career through any number of alternative sets of circumstances which are not related to the lack of state provisions for orphans and deserted children” (Defoe’s Narratives, 97).


Notes to Chapter 3

1. Richardson, Clarissa, 53. All subsequent page references will be to this edition and noted parenthetically in the text.


4. Zomchick, 60.

5. Ibid., 62.


7. Moore’s biographer, John Homer Caskey, considers Rosetta an invention of Moore’s, not corresponding to any particular character in Steele’s play, except perhaps Indiana’s Aunt Isabella, since like Isabella, Rosetta takes Fidelia under her protection (The Life and Works of Edward Moore, 41). I think that Rosetta in her vivacity also bears some resemblance to Steele’s Lucinda. Also in The Conscious Lovers, Lucinda and Indiana turn out to be sisters, and one important consequence of this discovery is the halving of Lucinda’s fortune. In the case of Moore’s Fidelia, she is the sister of Colonel Raymond, Rosetta’s suitor, and by being readmitted into her family, she makes Rosetta’s fortune smaller indirectly—via diminishing the portion of Colonel Raymond.

8. Quoted in Caskey, 39.

9. The name of the young lady remained unknown. The meeting is reported in Anthony Amberg’s “Introduction,” 49. All subsequent page references will be to this edition and noted parenthetically in the text.

10. Quoted in T. C. Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, Samuel Richardson, 286.


12. Moore abandoned the plan of turning Clarissa into a play by 1751.

13. Quoted in McKillop, Samuel Richardson, Printer and Novelist, 162.

14. See McKillop, 184.

15. Fielding wrote to Lyttelton on August 29, 1749, “I never wished for Power
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more than a few Days ago for the Sake of a Man whom I love, and that more perhaps from the Esteem I know he bears toward you than from any other Reason. The man is in love with a young Creature of the most apparent worth, who returns his Affections [Jenny Hamilton, whom Moore would marry in May 1750]. Nothing is wanting to make two very miserable People extremely blessed but a moderate Portion of the greatest of human Evils” (quoted in Battestin and Battestin, Henry Fielding, 482).

16. Ibid.

17. Fielding’s letter to Lyttelton was written in May 1749—after Richardson inserted the reference to The Foundling in his Clarissa—so I cannot argue that Fielding’s support of Moore’s matrimonial plans played any role in Richardson’s decision to use that reference (besides, it is not clear that Richardson would even know of the letter to Lyttelton at the time it was written). My point, however, is that Moore and Fielding were friends before the publication of The Trial of Selim (1748), and there must have been other instances of their friendship that Richardson was aware of. After all, he did group Moore and Fielding together in his humorous response to Moore’s letter of praise for Clarissa (this happening shortly after Fielding’s own admiring comments on Clarissa), observing that “the poor Clarissa may be admitted to fill a gap in the Reading World; while Mr. Moore and Mr. Fielding are . . . reposing their Undestandings” [sic] (quoted in McKillop, 169).

18. Warner, Reading Clarissa, 75.

19. See, for example, London on Clarissa’s “making of herself into a saint” (34); Richetti on Clarissa’s “passion play of holy dying” (The English Novel in History, 117, but also 115); Castle on Richardson’s rendering of Clarissa “into a decomposing emblem of martyred Christian womanhood” (Clarissa’s Ciphers, 173); Leo Braudy on Clarissa as an “anti-physical saint” (“Penetration and Impenetrability in Clarissa,” 189); and Doody on Clarissa’s being “martyr for her faith . . . without knowing it” (Natural Passion, 105).

20. Compare to Doody’s argument that “Lovelace has concluded that tragedy is feminine (and therefore inferior), comedy masculine (and therefore superior). Unconsciously he deeply believes that since the male must always be the superior force, the tragic in life never takes precedence over the comic unless a weak male permits the usurpation” (Natural Passion, 115). For a related argument, see also Doody, “Saying ‘No,’ Saying ‘Yes,’” 89. See also Ronald Paulson, who suggests that by ultimately rendering Clarissa’s story tragic, Richardson implicitly contrasts it “with comedy, Fielding’s genre” (The Beautiful, Novel, and Strange, 132–33). Similarly, Miller observes that “entrapped by the logic gender, Lovelace makes a mistake of genre: he fails to perceive that Clarissa is not made for comedy” (89). Finally, see Richetti’s recent further development of his earlier argument that Lovelace’s “subversive and specifically aristocratic comedy of seduction and stratagem replaces the essentially novelistic sense of reality that characterizes Clarissa’s good faith negotiations with her family in the opening volumes of the novel, when she seeks to evade the marital and economic destiny planned for her and to develop her own sense of integrity and self-determination” (in his “Richardson’s Revisions in the Third Edition of Clarissa,” forthcoming).

22. In fact, the opposite argument has been made, which is that The Foundling “may have been colored by Clarissa as it certainly was by Pamela” (McKillop, 70). However, we have no reason to assume that the influence could not have been mutual, given Clarissa’s and The Foundling’s history of continuous revisions and their respective authors’ friendship at the time.


24. That I haven’t been able so far to discover any other such scenes in the literature of the period does not mean that they don’t exist.

25. Warner, Licensing Entertainment, 202–3. Richardson’s relationship with romance remains debated by eighteenth-century scholars. Richetti sees Clarissa as “a massive rejection of romance, a transformation of the clichés of the amatory pattern into a monumental novel without parallel in English or in European fiction” (The English Novel in History, 99). Doody argues that in Clarissa, Richardson appropriates the “conventions of the ‘inflaming Novels’ and ‘idle Romances’ which he condemns” (A Natural Passion, 128). Albert J. Rivero suggests that in The History of Sir Charles Grandison, Richardson lets “Mrs. Shirley and Lady G. mount their attack on romance . . . to expel the ‘foreign,’ the ‘romantic,’ from Richardson’s own narrative” (“Representing Clementina,” 211). Warner points out that for Richardson, “producing a ‘new species of writing’ [pivoted] upon a shift of style—from decadent ornamentation to ‘an easy and natural manner,’ from aristocratic ostentation to ‘simplicity.’ Richardson will reform the novel by redressing it” (Licensing Entertainment, 202).

26. For a different reading of Lovelace’s demand of Clarissa’s heart, see Zomchick’s argument that having treated Clarissa as a thing throughout the novel, Lovelace cannot “free himself from the compulsion [of doing so] even after Clarissa’s death, when he wishes to possess her stilled heart” (88).

27. Compare to Terry Eagleton’s view that what “circulates” in the novel, what unifies its great circuits of textual exchange, is simply Clarissa herself, whether as daughter or lover, rival or confidante, protégée or property-owner” (The Rape of Clarissa, 56).


31. Belford’s condemnations of bastardy grew even louder in the third edition, prompting Mark Kinkead-Weekes to observe that Belford’s “sermon on Belton’s love of the bastards” represents a didactic imposition rather than a “genuine improvement” (“Clarissa Restored?” 170–71).


33. Colman, The English Merchant, 7. All subsequent page references will be to this edition and noted parenthetically in the text.

34. As Freeman reminds us, “[W]hile each genre offers a particular cultural logic with which to engage particular social issues and categories of identity, form itself is not intransigent but rather transformed and rearticulated in relation to the cultural work it is asked to perform” (235).
Notes to Chapter 4

1. The sentiment belongs to Mrs. Deborah Wilkins, who declares that she cannot “touch” any of “these misbegotten wretches” and further claims that Tom “stinks” and “doth not smell like a Christian” (35).

2. For a discussion of Blifil’s illegitimacy, see Alter, *Fielding and the Nature of the Novel*, 41–42.

3. For an analysis of Nancy Miller’s illegitimacy, see Amory, “Law and the Structure of Fielding’s Novels,” 344–47.

4. Teichman underscores the difficulty of coming up with a “universal definition [of illegitimacy], a single set of necessary and sufficient conditions” that could help us to classify a child as a bastard, when she points out that the definition of bastardy depends on the definition of marriage and “that the status (or statuses) recognized as marriage varies considerably from one . . . community to another” (23).


7. Castle, “‘Matters Not Fit to Be Mentioned,’” 75.


9. The full quotation is as follows:

   *Posthumus:* . . . We are all bastards,
   And that most venerable man which I
   Did call my father was I know not where
   When I was stamped. Some coiner with his tools
   Made me a counterfeit . . .

   (Cymbeline, in *Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, II.v.2–6)

10. For contemporary critical analysis of Savage’s relationship with his mother, see Nussbaum, “‘Savage’ Mothers”; and Bowers, “Critical Complicities.” Nussbaum argues that Savage and Johnson succeed in presenting Mrs. Brett as “a bizarre instance of the Other, the marginal human, a monstrosity” (174), and Bowers analyzes Savage’s and Johnson’s suggestive linkage of virtuous motherhood and financial largesse. See also Holmes, *Dr. Johnson and Mr. Savage*, particularly 53–82.

11. MacLean, *The Name of the Mother*, 62

12. Translated by and quoted in ibid., 159.


15. As Novak observes, commenting on Peregrine’s cruel practical jokes, “Peregrine is probably a ‘hero’ admired only by Smollett” (*Eighteenth-Century English Literature*, 134). For a related discussion of Peregrine’s pranks, see Beasley, “Smollett’s Art,” 160.


17. Ibid., 78.

NOTES

19. For a related discussion, see Schmidgen, "Illegitimacy and Social Observation," 147–48. Speaking of Smollett’s Ferdinand Count Fathom, Schmidgen points out that his “rapid accommodation to new surroundings and situations belongs to the cultural repertoire by which bastards were constructed in the eighteenth-century” (147). Schmidgen also analyzes Chesterfield’s letter to his illegitimate son, in which the father seems to advise the young man to cultivate his “chameleonic gifts.” Tom Jones, in Schmidgen’s analysis, demonstrates a milder version of such “gifts,” by being “remarkably willing to be guided by circumstances” and possessing a “dramatic responsiveness to his immediate surroundings” (148).

20. Rawson, _Henry Fielding and the Augustan Ideal under Stress_, 7. See also Campbell, “The Exact Picture of his Mother,” for a discussion of Joseph Andrews’s status as a foundling.

21. Richardson, of course, agreed eagerly that it was “truly coarse”; quoted in Paulson and Lockwood, _Henry Fielding_, 172.

22. This particular response belonged to an anonymous critic writing under the pen name of “Aretine” (quoted in ibid., 68). It is remarkable how consistently those disliking _Tom Jones_ focused on its treatment of illegitimacy. “What Reason,” Richardson fumed famously, “has [Fielding] to make his Tom illegitimate, in an Age where Keeping is become a fashion?” (quoted in ibid., 174). The anonymous author of _An Examen of the History of Tom Jones_ wrote that he could not believe that Allworthy did not have “the Prudence to instill into his vicious Foster-Son a Remembrance of his disadvantageous Birth” (quoted in ibid., 190).

23. Ibid., 173. For a recent analysis of Astraea and Minerva’s exchange with Richardson concerning Fielding, see Michie, _Richardson and Fielding_, 43–44 and 81–82.

24. For a discussion of the conventions of the “foundling” motif in _Tom Jones_, see J. Paul Hunter, _Before Novels_, and Damrosh, Jr., _God’s Plots and Man’s Stories_. For a discussion of Fielding’s parodying the conventions of the classical foundling narrative, see the argument advanced by James Thompson, who observes that the scene in which Allworthy recognizes his bank bills “is one in a long series of recognitions, of Mrs. Waters, Partridge, Tom’s ancestry, his essential goodness, each in its own way, a classic anagnorisis” (_Models of Virtue_, 133).

25. Compare it to Zimmerman’s observation that _Tom Jones_ abounds in “plausible but false narratives” (_The Boundaries of Fiction_, 142).


27. Lennard Davis sees its intersection of “news”—the reportage of the ongoing Jacobite uprising—with the action of the novel proper as indicative of Fielding’s commitment to journalism and symptomatic of his larger project of evolving a new “factual” style of writing fiction (_Factual Fictions_, 204). Homer Obed Brown offers an interpretation of the same episode based on the structural similarities between the politics of succession that prompted the uprising and the genealogical instability shaping the history of Allworthy’s family (“_Tom Jones_,” 211). These arguments participate in the discussion of the social and economic referentiality of Fielding’s fiction started by Ian Watt in his 1957 _The Rise of the Novel_ and continued by such scholars as Paulson in 1967 (_Satire and the Novel in_
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Eighteenth-Century England; Alter in 1968 (Fielding and the Nature of the Novel); and Andrew Wright in 1975 (Henry Fielding: Mask and Feast).

28. Compare to Braudy’s discussion of Fielding’s depiction “of situations in which human sympathy is thwarted by the stereotyped ideas of character—Tom’s bastardy, for instance” (Narrative Form in History and Fiction, 171).

29. Compare to Hunter’s observation that “Tom is not a military hero, a great warrior who can save the nation singlehandedly at a moment of crisis” (“Fielding and the Disappearance of Heroes,” 139).

30. Compare to Richetti’s argument that the presence of history in Tom Jones should be read as an indication of an absence—a sign of what this novel is not about. As he points out, Tom’s “personal preoccupations (his pursuit of Sophia) prevent him from participating in the historic battle of Culloden and the defeat of Prince Charles.” The main characters are thus “abstracted from such areas of historical and potentially troublesome experience to be more or less appropriated by comic pattern and plot. The sociohistorical is a backdrop from whose involvements characters are snatched by the benevolent hand of a narrative system with its own aesthetic and didactic purposes” (The English Novel in History, 170).

31. Parker, The Author’s Inheritance, 78.

32. We know that Ralph Allen, on whom Allworthy was presumably modeled, actively contributed to several charitable foundations, including the London Foundling Hospital. See Martin Battestin’s notes to the Battestin/Bowers edition of Tom Jones.

33. McClure, Coram’s Children, 55.

34. See, for example, Fielding’s praise of the Foundling Hospital in The Champion 21 (February 1739/40).

35. Note that whether intentionally or not, Bennett echoes Thomas Coram’s old complaint about the abandoned infants thrown on the “dust heaps” of London.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. Quoted in Nichols and Wray, 255.
2. Quoted in ibid., 255.
5. See Nichols and Wray, 16.
7. Coram wrote that “Noblemen and Gentlemen highly approving the said Ladys Charitable inclinations [had] by another Instrument in Writing Declared their hearty Concurrence” (quoted in Nichols and Wray, 16).
8. Quoted in ibid., 20; emphasis added.
10. Linda Colley points out that before the introduction of a census in 1800, it was widely believed that “Britain’s population was in decline” (Britons: Forging
NOTES

the Nation 1707–1837, 240). See also Andrew, 55; Solkin, 158; and Ramsey, “A mad intemperance . . . of building,” 211–16, for an analysis of the fears of depopulation as one of the leading factors in the public support for the Foundling Hospital. Compare to Lieutenant Lismahago’s characterization of Scotland as a “nation, whose people had been for many years decreasing in number, and whose lands and manufactures were actually suffering for want of hands” (Smollett, The Expedition of Humphry Clinker, 256–57).

11. Solkin 2, 179, 19.
12. For an important analysis of the hospital’s location and outlook, see Ramsey, 225–34.
13. Brownlow, 60.
15. Foucault, Madness and Civilization, 251.
17. See McClure, Coram’s Children, 72.
18. For Dr. Johnson’s rather idiosyncratic critique of the hospital and the governors’ subsequent reaction to it, see McClure’s “Johnson’s Criticism.”
20. Adair, 213. See also Adair, 204, and Fildes, 147–49, for the figures comparing the number of foundlings to the number of illegitimate children in London.
22. Ibid., 28.
25. Ibid., 233.
26. Solkin, 159.
27. Quoted in Nichols and Wray, 21.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Coram became estranged from the Foundling Hospital in the early 1740s. As McClure observes, “from May 1742 to the end of his life, Coram had little official contact with the Founding Hospital” (Coram’s Children, 55).
33. McClure, Coram’s Children, 46.
34. Ibid.
35. Bray, A Memorial Concerning the Erecting in the City of London or the Suburbs thereof of an Orphanotrophy or Hospital for the Reception of Poor Cast Off Children or Foundlings, 28.
36. McClure, Coram’s Children, 46.
38. Ibid., 63.
39. Ibid., 88.
40. Ibid., 64.
41. For the full list, see Brownlow, 141–44. Note that the list is prefaced by the
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name of one perfunctory “patron” who happens to be a female—“Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria.”

42. Andrew, Philanthropy and Police, 64.

43. Burney, Evelina, or The History of a Young Lady’s Entrance into the World, 136.

44. Nussbaum, 165. As Nancy Armstrong points out, by contrast with the “old agrarian” days when a private “household [had been] a largely self-contained social unit,” the whole colonial/imperialist project of England was now perceived as hinging upon the stability of each individual family, a perception duly reflected, as Armstrong points out, in the increasing popularity of the conduct books legitimizing the “new domestic economy” grounded in “interest-bearing investments” (Desire and Domestic Fiction, 75).


46. Staves, Married Women’s Separate Property, 223.

47. Goodman, “Public Sphere and Private Life,” 15. For a useful critical reassessment of the notion of a separate private sphere for the eighteenth-century woman, see also McDowell, 8. Elizabeth J. MacArthur complicates the division between the private (female) and public (male) spheres by proposing the notion of the “embodied” public sphere. She argues that men and women become “public-sphere subjects through a process of assuming their corporeality, especially their sexuality” (“Embodying the Public Sphere: Censorship and the Reading Subject in Beaumarchais’s Mariage de Figaro,” 68).


49. For a related discussion, see Rachel G. Fuchs’s analysis of the encouragement of “domestic motherhood” for “poverty-stricken married mothers,” who might be tempted to abandon their babies (160).

50. In addition, Smollett could be using this example to imply that Lady V. is truly if unostentatiously religious. Fuchs observes that all eighteenth-century European religions “advocated private, voluntary charity to the deserving poor among their co-religionists, and strongly urged individualized personal contact between charitable donors and recipients” (165).

51. Richardson, The History of Sir Charles Grandison, 3:358. Subsequent references to Grandison, unless otherwise noted, are from this edition and are noted in parentheses.

52. See Jackson, New-Born Child Murder, 34, 142–43; Hoffer and Hull, 68–69; and Rabin, 77.

53. On the whole, infanticide was associated in the eighteenth century with unmarried women (Rabin, 76) “drawn from the lower classes” (Dickinson and Sharpe, 49).

54. Montagu, 421.

55. Chaber, “‘This Affecting Subject’: An ‘Interested’ Reading of Childbearing in Two Novels by Samuel Richardson,” 234.


57. See Jackson, New-Born Child Murder, 48.

58. At one point, Harriet explicitly laments Sir Thomas’s insistence on keeping Sir Charles abroad because it has brought him together with Clementina.

60. On the evolution of the British strict settlement, see Habakkuk, 1–76.

61. Explaining to Lord L. why he cannot provide a proper dowry for his daughter Caroline, Sir Thomas mentions that he holds his Irish “estate in fee” (1:329). The ostensible purpose of this remark is to introduce the dutiful letter written to Sir Thomas by his son; its real purpose, as I argue, is to illustrate the precariousness of Sir Charles’s and his sisters’ financial situation.

62. Under the conditions of the strict settlement, the older son should be consulted about all actions concerning the estate. This rule does not apply if the estate is held in fee simple.

63. Habakkuk, 374.

64. Historians connect the widespread adaptation of the strict settlement with royalist families’ attempts to prevent confiscation and selling of their estates under the Commonwealth. As Habakkuk points out, if “the royalist was a tenant for life, only his life interest was for sale—an interest not very attractive to purchasers in general, and therefore easily bought in cheaply by some member of the royalist family. But if the royalist were tenant in tail—an interest which could easily be enlarged—the confiscated estate when put up for sale could well pass by purchase into the hands of a stranger” (11).

65. Based on a manuscript that records Richardson’s “private thoughts concerning the marriage settlement to be made for his oldest daughter and a Bath surgeon,” Staves infers that he was quite well informed about the legal repercussions of the various settlement arrangements (60).

66. McClure, *Coram’s Children*, 10. See also Habakkuk, 214.

67. Charming as Richardson made his Charlotte, her views differ from his on many occasions. For example, it is unlikely that he, a successful printer coming up in the world, approved of her repeated snubbing of “cits” (2:322; 3:267)—the well-to-do representatives of London City.


69. Ibid., 37.

70. Brownlow, 28.

71. Richardson here foreshadows the argument that Rousseau would make in his 1762 *Emile*, namely that woman’s “dignity depends on remaining unknown; her glory lies in her husband’s esteem, her greatest pleasure in the happiness of her family” (quoted in Colley, 240).


**Notes to Chapter 6**

1. Dr. Johnson claimed in the 15 April–15 May 1757 issue of the *Literary Magazine* that when he “wandered through the Hospital, [he] found not a child that seemed to have heard of his creed, or the commandments”–an accusation that prompted the governors of the Hospital to threaten the *Literary Magazine* with a
Notes

libel lawsuit. For the full story of Dr. Johnson’s rather heavy-handed critique of
the hospital, see McClure, “Johnson’s Criticism of the Foundling Hospital and Its
Consequences.”

2. This is Philip Jennings of Coley, not his father, Peter Jennings of Stratfield Saye.

3. See Clark, xxiii.

4. See the previous chapter for a discussion of Juliana Dodd’s role in the 1759
scheme to pay the nurses an extra three pence a week to enable them to buy the
children’s clothing themselves instead of receiving it from the Hospital.

5. Burney, Memoirs of Doctor Burney, arranged from his own Manuscripts, from
Family Papers, and from Personal Recollections, by his daughter, Madame d’Arblay, 1:233.
All subsequent quotations from the novel refer to this edition and are marked parenthetically in the text.

6. Burney, Evelina, 35, 289. All subsequent quotations from the novel refer
to this edition and are marked parenthetically in the text.

7. See Doody, Frances Burney: The Life in the Works; Cutting-Gray, Woman as
“Nobody” in the Novels of Fanny Burney, 109–130; Straub, Divided Fictions: Fanny Burney and Feminine Strategy, 160–61; Gallagher, Nobody’s Story: The Vanishing Acts of

8. Doody, Frances Burney, 41.


12. Ibid. See also Schmidgen’s consistent reference to Evelina as a “bastard”
(151–56).

13. See, for example, the story of a spectacular infant swapping in Bennett’s
The Beggar Girl and Her Benefactors—right down to the copying of the tattoo on the
heiress’s side that was supposed to establish her identity beyond doubts. Such
tales responded, among other things, to the fear of well-to-do parents, who left
their infants with wet nurses immediately after birth, that by sucking their nurses’
milk, the children would also imbibe these women’s hidden vices and thus
undergo subtle personality changes.


15. As Patricia Meyer Spacks observes about Evelina’s attempt to “understand
her own [story, a] depressed sense of possibility governs [her. She] interprets on
the basis of fear rather than desire” (Desire and Truth: Functions of Plot in Eighteenth-
Century English Novels, 161.


17. Ibid., 115.

18. For a related discussion, see Greenfield, 42.

19. When I use the term unquestionably, I do it to contrast such heroines with
Defoe’s Moll Flanders—a quasi-bastard/quasi-foundling, whose bastardy is never
stated unequivocally. Fielding’s Nancy Miller could be considered another exam-
ple of a quasi-bastard because one has to read between the lines to realize that
Nancy was born prior to her parents’ marriage.


21. Ibid., 115.
NOTES

22. Horace Walpole; quoted in Habakkuk, 154.
24. Freeman, 203. Interestingly, as Geyer-Kordesch has demonstrated, the class-related modification of a fictional story of seduction, illegitimacy, and infanticide can also move in a different direction. Goethe’s adaptation in his Faust of a ballad called “The Three Riders,” featuring the abduction and rape of an innkeeper’s daughter, results in the loss of the original ballad’s “warning on rape and lack of protection for women in public places. . . . The cautionary power of the ballad is recast in a sugary sentiment of middle-class distancing as ‘folklore’” (111).
26. Note that an alternative reading could be suggested by Greenfield’s discussion of the complicated relationship between Evelina and her guardian, who, as Greenfield argues, is “deeply attached” to her and may thus “harbor sexual feelings” for her (42–43).
28. Quoted in Clifford, xvii.
29. As Fizer observes, “when Evelina is acknowledged as Belmont’s true daughter, her own criminality shifts to Polly Green” (88).
30. As Evelina tells Mr. Villars, at the time that Dame Green came up with her scheme, “her husband was dead, and she had little regard for any body but her child” (375).
31. Burney’s interest in what Barbara Darby sees as the “plot of usurpation and constitution” (Frances Burney Dramatist: Gender, Performance, and the Late-Eighteenth-Century Stage, 146–47) is not limited to Evelina. Darby notes that it is also present in The Woman-Hater (1801), about which Doody observes, “[it] is as if Burney rewrote Evelina from the view of ‘the little usurper,’ ‘poor Polly Green’” (Frances Burney: The Life in the Works, 308).
32. Doody, Beyond Evelina, 483.
33. Ibid.
37. For a different reading see James Thompson’s Models of Virtue, 153.
38. Doody, Frances Burney, 62.
40. Quoted in McClure, Coram’s Children, 11.

Notes to Chapter 7

1. Rachel Ramsey, personal communication. I am indebted to Ramsey for her observation that Brunswick square would be associated in Austen’s readers’ mind with the London Foundling Hospital.
Notes


3. See Greenfield for a discussion of Emma's “unique capacity to render Emma's thoughts and their inaccuracy simultaneously” (150).


5. For different critical readings of Harriet's relationship with Emma, for instance, on Emma’s possibly lesbian attraction to Harriet, see Mudrick, *Jane Austen: Irony as Defense and Discovery*, 192, and Wilson, “A Long Talk about Jane Austen,” 69. See also Johnson (*Jane Austen*, 123) for a response to Mudrick’s and Wilson’s interpretation. On Emma’s Pygmalion-like “shaping” of Harriet, see Sabor, “Staring in Astonishment: Portraits and Prints in Persuasion”; Dwyer, *Jane Austen*, 97; Harris, *Jane Austen's Art of Memory*, 170; and Neill, 24. On Austen’s hostility toward “female ties outside the family,” as exemplified by Emma’s relationship with Harriet, see Todd, *Feminist Literary History*, 101. Finally, see Greenfield for an interpretation of “Emma’s apparently inappropriate attachment to Harriet Smith” in terms of Emma’s desire to compensate “for the marriage and thus loss of Miss Taylor” (150).


8. Siskin, *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700–1830*, 201. Also, see Greenfield for an alternative argument that in Emma, “Austen seems less fearful of formulaic implications . . . maybe because she is more confident of her own originality” (145).


11. Ibid., 58.


13. For Booth’s analysis of the double perspective of the heroine provided by the simultaneous inside and outside view, see *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 243–70.


15. Interestingly, Mudrick has characterized Emma’s attempt to “talk away . . . Harriet’s parentless illegitimacy” as “nonsense” (190).

16. For a seminal analysis of Austen’s indebtedness to the novels of contemporary women writers, see Doody, “Jane Austen’s Reading.” For a recent elaboration of Doody’s argument, see Udden, “Veils of Irony: The Development of Narrative Technique in Women’s Novels of the 1790s,” 160–77.
17. Greenfield, 162.

18. But see Johnson for a suggestive complication of our ready tendency to critique Emma’s habit of romanticizing her reality (Jane Austen, 134–36)

19. As Ramsey observes, by the late eighteenth century, “as the city continued to spread, the Governors [of the Hospital] found themselves in possession of some of London’s most valuable development property” (233). For more information about Brunswick Square as a part of the developed foundling hospital’s estate, see Nichols and Wray, 279–84.

20. Bray, 1.


22. For an important analysis of the colonial overtones of Clarence Hervey’s treatment of Rachel/Virginia, see Greenfield 119–21.


24. The theme of Emma’s “education” of Harriet mirrors in suggestive ways the theme of Emma’s own education and particularly her relationship with her multiple guardians—from Ms. Taylor to Mr. Knightley. See, for example, Margaret Kirkham’s discussion of Emma’s upbringing by her “hero-guardian” (Jane Austen: Feminism and Fiction, 138).

25. Though we can also read it, of course, as Neill does, as “a joke at Emma’s expense” (108).

26. McKeon, 158.

27. Interestingly, the year 1875 is considered “the turning point” in the overall history of European illegitimacy. After that, the rates of illegitimacy began to decline. For a discussion, see Ehmer, 320.

28. As James Thompson points out in a different context, “inheritance, as the crux of courtship plots is gradually repressed [it lies at the center of Clarissa and Tom Jones, but already by Pride and Prejudice and Emma it has been pushed to the margins] because it is the site of contradiction and confusion” (Models of Virtue, 153).

29. For an argument about the “strong” linkage between “the economic success of children” and “inheritance patterns” in early modern Europe, see Bonfield, “Developments in European Family Law,” 114.

30. Quoted in McClure, Coram’s Children, 11.

31. We never hear of such siblings, but there is no reason to think that they don’t exist. Of course, Harriet’s anonymous father still is known to help her out financially, but his help is clearly considered a supplemental source of Harriet’s income, since the primary source is provided by her husband’s industry.

32. As Robert has demonstrated, the psychosocial opposition between the archetypes of “bastard” and “foundling” has continued to animate nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature. For an analysis of Sartre’s self-characterization as “bastard” and “Nobody’s son,” see also Maclean, 157–63.

33. For a discussion of Esther’s illegitimacy, see Schor, Dickens and the Daughter of the House, 101–123.
Notes to Postscript


2. After watching the movie, students in my eighteenth-century course (Spring 2001, University of Kentucky) unanimously agreed that Fielding’s novel must have caused a scandal upon its first publication because of its sexual explicitness.

3. Homer Brown, 211.
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