



LJMU Research Online

Rogers, H

Kindness and Reciprocity: Liberated Prisoners and Christian Charity in Early Nineteenth-Century England

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/6548/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Rogers, H (2014) Kindness and Reciprocity: Liberated Prisoners and Christian Charity in Early Nineteenth-Century England. Journal of Social History, 47 (3). pp. 721-745. ISSN 0022-4529

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

Helen Rogers

*Kindness and Reciprocity: Liberated Prisoners and Christian Charity in Early
Nineteenth-Century England*

Liverpool John Moores University, UK

h.rogers@ljmu.ac.uk

Abstract

This article interrogates historiographical debates over discipline and charity in the penal reform era. We cannot evaluate philanthropy solely in terms of class discipline or normalization, it argues, if we wish to understand the often intimate relationships binding agents and recipients of charity, even in the prison. While deconstructing the language of sympathy employed by penal reformers, historians have been sceptical of purportedly grateful prisoner testimony. This article proposes we reconsider such evidence to ask how “kindness” was understood and felt by benefactors and recipients, in terms of what they said and - as importantly - what they did. Drawing on new scholarship on kindness and reciprocity, it explores the active role of prisoners and their families in negotiating the philanthropic exchange.

The article investigates a pioneering rehabilitation programme run by Sarah Martin, prison visitor at Great Yarmouth Borough Gaol, 1818-1843.

Scrutinizing her accounts of working with offenders, it analyzes immediate and longer-term reactions by prisoners and their families to Christian

instruction and welfare. Reconstructing the post-discharge experiences of 43 “liberated prisoners,” it assesses the role played by Christian reclamation in desistance from crime, alongside employment and family ties. Testimony from former offenders and their relatives suggests most did not see Christian ideals of duty and fellowship as alien to their values; rather, these corresponded with a laboring-class ethics of kinship and neighborliness. If we want to appreciate the agency of the poor in the wider charity economy, the article concludes, we must examine how recipients acted in accordance with their own social and moral codes and not only with those of their benefactors.

Keywords: Discharged prisoner, offending, rehabilitation, penal reform, philanthropy, charity, Christianity, kindness, reciprocity, gift exchange, Sarah Martin, Great Yarmouth

Kindness and Reciprocity:

Liberated Prisoners and Christian Charity in Early Nineteenth-Century

England

It is no longer fashionable to examine the early programs for prisoner reform in terms of charity and compassion. Nowhere have the humanitarian motives of philanthropists been subject to more revision than in the historiography on penal reform in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹ Since the groundbreaking work on the formation of the modern penitentiary by Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* (1975) and Michael Ignatieff in *A Just Measure of Pain* (1978), the reconstitution of the criminal as penitent, individualized subject of a regulating gaze has been its dominating theme.² However benevolent reformers believed their intentions to be, scholars have argued that moral correction amounted to normalization and control. The coercive nature of prisoner reform has been seen as prefiguring the disciplinary methods promoted by Victorian philanthropy: domestic missions, rescue societies, reformatories and the Charity Organisation Society. Yet the Foucauldian premise that state and voluntary institutions worked to reconstruct their subjects as “docile

bodies” has tended to obscure the intimate and affective relationships that sometimes bound reformers and those they hoped to serve.

In this article I re-examine the association between discipline and charity by investigating the pioneering scheme of prisoner reclamation undertaken by Sarah Martin (1791-1843), Christian visitor at Great Yarmouth Borough Gaol between 1818 and 1843. Martin was exceptional among prison philanthropists in attending to the condition of offenders not only under sentence but after release, helping them find employment and supporting destitute families. Though her work received little notice outside Yarmouth during her lifetime, the Prison Inspector Captain William John Williams recorded conversations with Martin in his annual reports, 1836-43, and recommended her methods be adopted elsewhere with the formation of Discharged Prisoner Associations.³ In her “Liberated Prisoners Book,” Martin tracked what she saw as the progress and backsliding of ex-offenders, noting letters and visits from former inmates and their relatives. Only extracts from this book survive in Martin’s posthumous memoir (1844) and in the Reports of the Prison Inspectorate.⁴ Focusing on this evidence, I consider how the convicted may have experienced the philanthropic

exchange, and what their responses might tell us about the meanings of kindness and reciprocity for the poor.

Despite growing interest in the history of emotions, kindness has been analyzed more as discourse than as felt experience.⁵ In a seminal article, Randall McGowen dissected the rhetoric of compassion deployed by penal reformers, arguing that they invoked a “powerful sympathy” with the “outcast.”⁶ Correction based exclusively on physical punishment and harsh confinement, they contended, would only “harden” the wrongdoer; instead, through personal intercourse and religious instruction in a well-managed prison, philanthropists could awaken offenders’ moral sensibilities and affections. “It is wonderful to observe the effects of kindness and care on some of these forlorn poor creatures,” wrote Elizabeth Fry in 1820 of female inmates at Newgate Gaol; “- how it tenders their hearts, and makes them susceptible of impression.”⁷

Prisoners were expected to “feel an inner compulsion to join in sympathy with those who confined them,” claimed McGowen, and this “identification” marked “the crucial moment in their reformation,” when they assented to the class mentality of their teachers.⁸ At Newgate, for example, the women unanimously raised their hands “to be bound by”

Fry's rules and "to assist each other in obedience."⁹ Sympathetic engagement, concludes McGowen, betrayed reformers' "yearning for order and the repression of social difference."¹⁰ Yet this is to view the philanthropic relationship – the experience of a "powerful sympathy" – from the perspective of the guide. What of recipients who appear willingly to have consented to discipline? Eagerness to adopt a new line of conduct, as in the case of the Newgate women, may have been influenced by fellow inmates and their kin outside the prison gates as much as by their instructors.

To investigate inmate responses to prison discipline and reclamation we must turn to writings by Christian reformers, since independent testimony by the convicted, aside from autobiographies by atypically well-educated prisoners, has rarely survived.¹¹ Illness prevented Sarah Martin including in her memoir, as she had intended, "a few short accounts of some prisoners, to whom God brought the truth with power to their conversion."¹² The editor followed Martin's original plan by incorporating examples of reclamation from the "Liberated Prisoners Book," alongside cases of more diffident offenders, to illustrate the transformative effects of Christian instruction and the challenges facing prison discipline. Martin's

Brief Sketch was the first in a series of memoirs and treatises by chaplains and visitors to use prisoner voices, biography, confessions, and letters to vindicate the salutary and lasting effects of Christian pastorship.¹³ In the 1840s, as debates intensified over the merits of deterrence versus reclamation, and particularly over the competing systems of separate confinement and silent association, reformers invoked prisoner testimony to support their preferred methodology.¹⁴

That penitent “voices” of the convicted were conscripted to legitimate prison discipline seems to confirm the discursive power of the Victorian prison. Consequently, they have received only cursory attention from scholars. More interested in the ways that inmates subverted power than in their apparent complicity with it, historians have been skeptical of prisoner avowals of contrition, thankfulness, and reformed character. Possessing meagre skills in literacy, prisoners “were suddenly overwhelmed by the full impact of self-confident middle-class evangelical religious and moral propaganda,” contended Ursula Henriques; “[t]he techniques described as deterrence and reformation might nowadays be called brain-washing.”¹⁵ By contrast, Ignatieff emphasized less the susceptibility of prison scholars than the gullibility of their teachers. The “repeated credulity

of Victorian chaplains,” and the middle-class more generally, “towards patently contrived criminal repentances” revealed their “desire for a social order based on deferential reconciliation.”¹⁶ Recent scholars have accorded inmates more agency and capacity for resistance, interpreting apparently “confessional” testimony as a form of mimicry whereby inmates mouthed the words their instructors wished to hear.¹⁷ Yet no one has attempted to identify the “authors” of these first-person – and frequently anonymized – narratives, nor to read their testimony in the context of their life histories.¹⁸

While we should be alert to the mediated nature of prisoner testimony, David Englander’s analysis of letters sent by Victorian paupers to poor law officials suggests alternative ways of reading the words and agency of inmates in total institutions. Overwhelmingly, workhouse complainants abided by the respectful and deferential conventions of the petition and memorial. Their correspondence was not “an unmediated expression of pauper sentiments,” contended Englander, “[b]ut neither was it an inauthentic expression of those sentiments” for, in listing injustices and claiming their rights, petitioners defied their “outcast” status and asserted their place and entitlements within society.¹⁹ Similarly, though the responses of prisoners and their relatives captured in Sarah Martin’s papers

are inflected by her deeply pious voice, nonetheless they cast light on the moral economy of the poor. This testimony allows us to investigate the immediate and longer-term reactions of inmates to prison discipline and Christian teaching. But it also points to the ways Martin developed her work with the Yarmouth poor in answer to their conceptions of need and justice, and their expectations of appropriate conduct and Christian charity.

In preparation for the Prison Inspector's visit in 1840, Martin tabulated a list from the often lengthy entries in her "Liberated Prisoners Book." It showed, "A GLANCE at some Persons who seemed after their Imprisonment to have been Reclaimed or Improved," most of whom she had "seen or obtained accounts of" in autumn 1839. The visitor recorded thirty-three reformed offenders: their initials, age, offence, ability to read and write; their length of stay, behavior in jail, and former character; the period since their departure, subsequent employment, whereabouts, family relationships, and present character. In some cases, Martin briefly cited the "words" of liberated prisoners or their relatives, testifying to their reform and gratitude to the teacher.²⁰ By combining references to former prisoners in the Inspector's Reports for 1839 and 1840 and in Martin's memoir, I have identified forty-three apparently reclaimed offenders.²¹

Tracing these individuals through jail, census, parish and convict records, I reconstruct their encounters with the Christian visitor and their post-committal experience. Before examining how this evidence allows analysis of the personal and reciprocal dynamics of Christian charity or “the gift exchange,” and the meanings of kindness for the poor, I investigate the disciplinary context of Martin’s prison work and the distinctiveness of her approach to rehabilitation.

I. Charity and Correction

Yarmouth Gaol was typical of small, local prisons that were slow to respond to improvements advocated by reformers and, from 1835, by the Prison Inspectorate.²² That year Inspector Williams found only rudimentary classification and frequent communication between all categories of inmates.²³ By the late 1830s the prison provided separate sleeping and living quarters for the sexes and those sentenced to the jail, House of Correction, or debtors’ wards, yet it lacked space to keep inmates apart and the will to keep them silent.²⁴ Usually it housed between thirty and forty prisoners, and most shared sleeping cells and took classes together in day rooms. While regulations were exercised with some discretion, as in other

local and county jails, complacency characterized the attitude of the jail authorities to prisoner welfare; a regular minister was not appointed until 1831, and a school teacher only after Sarah Martin's death.²⁵ "[I]f any degree of order be observable among the prisoners," the Inspector concluded, it was "solely due to the employment and instruction" provided by the prison visitor.²⁶

In her approach to reclamation Martin deployed the principle of "uniting kindness with strictness" advocated by Elizabeth Fry.²⁷ She compiled a detailed register of her scholars, sketching their "character" and circumstances, while tracking their conduct and learning in her "Everyday Book."²⁸ Charismatic and authoritarian, for Martin there was just one route to salvation: "Some of her friends only pity and excuse where they might correct her," she wrote of a factory girl sentenced to one month for theft but who was "[v]ery obedient and grateful to me;" "Kindness to the fallen should be extended to raise and elevate, not excuse!"²⁹ If some inmates saw compassion in their teacher's fierceness, others challenged her pedagogical methods and benevolent intentions.³⁰ Though classes were supposed to be voluntary, effectively lessons formed part of the jail's correctional regime.³¹ Some prisoners recognized the disciplinary function

of Martin's lessons and books which she showed the jailor. After she informed him of two boys who were insolent when reprimanded for writing "bad words" in their books, they complained of "*my unkindness* in going there to get prisoners punished" (my emphasis).³²

Martin might be read, therefore, as the archetypal Panopticon agent; she even described her "pleasing office" at the jail as that of "an observer."³³ But this would be to misrepresent her close, personal involvement with inmates. As Richard Ireland has pointed out, the penitentiary ideal envisaged a system of classification, supervision and inspection that would be fixed, rational and impersonal, but this was seldom realized in local and county jails; "The real life of the Victorian prison dealt not with categories but with persons, for even when categorization took place it did so on the basis of human judgement and decision."³⁴ Martin's record keeping was not designed to understand criminals as an aggregate but rather to track the reactions of individuals to Christian intervention. Her notes betray the influence of reformist discourse on delinquency and prison discipline; occasionally she remarked that troublesome prisoners might be separated to prevent their "contaminating" influence, or put to the tread-wheel.³⁵ Nevertheless, her

approach to reclamation was grounded more in day-to-day interactions with inmates than in contemporary penology.

Analysis of 721 admissions for the three years 1839-41 provides a snapshot of the jail population she taught, though in the following discussion, the 89 individuals committed for debt are excluded since Martin rarely worked with debtors.³⁶ Of 632 committals on charges of crimes and misdemeanors, over 80% were heard summarily and most were of a petty nature, relating to public order, vagrancy, pilfering, and so on.³⁷ Almost all those charged came from the working classes, with roughly a third of males entered as employed or apprenticed in a trade, a third as laborers or hawkers, and nearly a fifth as having gone to sea. 15.5% of inmates were female, of whom about two-thirds were single, and whose occupation, if listed, was mostly factory worker, servant, or prostitute.³⁸ Over half of prisoners were under twenty-one, and nearly all came from Yarmouth and its vicinities or the wider county of Norfolk. Repeat offenders, as Martin knew well, constituted a substantial proportion of the jail's population and its more refractory residents. Preventing recidivism was one of the major goals of her work with inmates and liberated prisoners.

In the absence of systematic national data on recidivism prior to the Police Act of 1856, scholars have dismissed contemporary anxieties about the nature and extent of habitual criminality. However, since there has been almost no historical analysis of actual repeat offenders in the early nineteenth century, we have little sense of how widespread recidivism was, nor its consequences for individuals and their families.³⁹ In the years 1839-1841, 493 individuals were admitted for crimes or misdemeanors; a quarter (124) had been committed previously in that period, or were listed with a prior conviction. These repeat offenders were responsible for 41.6% of the total number of charges and many returned several times before they were transported, desisted, or learned to evade detection.⁴⁰ Martin never tolerated the “excuse” that want justified crime and yet her account books reveal how she understood that poverty and unemployment often lead to persistent criminality. Consequently, she supplemented moral and spiritual guidance with carefully calculated practical assistance and supervision.

As well as preaching sermons and teaching literacy through the Bible, Martin provided tools and materials so inmates could learn new skills and support themselves on release. Further assistance was given to help discharged prisoners find work, though it was withdrawn from those who

returned to “bad habits.” With a bad leg and no work, J.M. was given 1s. 6d. to cover his rent for three weeks; a shilling to buy sticks to sell when his leg recovered; 3s. for a new pair of shoes; and 1s. 9d. for bread while he searched for employment. Martin’s approach to “useful work” was grounded in an astute understanding of the opportunities provided by - and requirements needed to labor in - the mixed economy of the port: “Tools for T. M-: saw, 2s. 6d.; sway, 2s.; hand-plain, 1s.; square, 6d.; compasses, 6d.; stock shave, 6d.”⁴¹

Martin’s practical knowledge of the labor market derived from her social proximity to inmates. Like other Christian philanthropists, she spoke to prisoners as a “friend” and “fellow sinner” but she was exceptional in being a working woman and their neighbor, in contrast to wealthy and connected reformers like John Howard and Elizabeth Fry.⁴² Orphaned in childhood, Martin was raised by her grandmother, a glove-maker, and from the age of fifteen worked as a dressmaker.⁴³ The visitor lived among those she served, renting a two-room apartment in one of the narrow rows surrounding the jail, which housed the port’s laboring population and where most inmates resided.⁴⁴

Martin was no detached observer, therefore, nor distant lady do-gooder and her presence within their own community may have predisposed prisoners and their families to her guidance. As Frank Prochaska has pointed out, Martin is comparable with the “countless working-class philanthropists” who taught in Sunday Schools, joined the temperance movement, subscribed to charities and friendly societies, or set up their own benevolent associations. While such lowly philanthropists might represent the “deferential” poor who supported social harmony and “Church and King”, as Prochaska suggested, many, including Martin, were anything but deferent in their vociferous piety and fierce independence.⁴⁵

The visitor resisted any intervention that might jeopardize her standing with prisoners, for only if she worked voluntarily would they understand they must freely accept the Lord’s message. By the late 1830s Martin spent most days in the jail but in 1841, when the town corporation sought to acknowledge her service by paying her £12 per annum, she fought remuneration “as an odious thing, a fetter,” only relenting when the authorities threatened to bar her from the jail.⁴⁶ With an allowance of a day’s wage from a female benefactor, donations from Fry’s Ladies’ Association, and sale of prisoners’ work – baby-linen, spoons, seals, straw

hats, and more - she ploughed over £400 into her prison charities. Inmates were recruited, therefore, to Martin's charitable enterprise, working not just for their own improvement, but to benefit other discharged prisoners.⁴⁷

Though some inmates saw Martin's intervention as coercive, there is ample evidence that many viewed her as an independent, powerful advocate who might arbitrate between themselves and authority, whether the jailor, magistrates or employers. Prisoners, Martin insisted, should accept her guidance and support as the "gift" of God, for whom she was merely the vessel.⁴⁸ She expected them to engage with her as their friend and instructor, rather than patron. Accepting her kindness need not have equated with deference and submission, as we can see by examining the responses of two former inmates, discussed below, to their prison education. Their declarations of gratitude raise questions about how historians have understood the significance of Christian giving and receiving for the poor.

II. Kindness and the Gift Exchange

In 1835 six members of a smuggling gang served six months for illegal trafficking, during which time Martin urged them to renounce a profession involving “fraud and habitual lying.” Embracing her values meant giving up a trade that offered the seamen independence, male friendship, mutuality, and some comfort and security for their families. They would have to forsake, for instance, the smugglers’ club that supported them while in prison yet, apparently, they left determined to follow the Christian course laid out by their teacher.⁴⁹

Charles Redwood, master of the vessel, was without work for fourteen months with a wife and family to maintain but, in 1840 and no longer in need, he called on Martin to tell her he was now master of a “respectable” merchant’s ship. He presented his teacher with a vase covered in shells and a “curious” glass box, brought back from France; “[h]is gratitude,” Martin related, “for what he thought his obligation to me.” Neither could Edward Cole reconcile his unlawful occupation with his Christian education. In letters to Martin, the sailor and his wife explained his determination to abandon smuggling. Cole obtained work on a schooner and twice visited Martin, recounting the struggles of his former shipmates

to leave their trade. By August 1840, he told her, all had ceased trafficking.⁵⁰

The mariners' desire to let their teacher know her work had not been wasted and to repay her kindness with a small gift or heartfelt testimony is striking, for they appear to have been enacting their sense of obligation that traditionally characterized Christian charity. In his anthropological examination of the "gift exchange" in archaic societies, Marcel Mauss proposed that acts of giving and receiving, while apparently "voluntary, disinterested and spontaneous" were "in fact, obligatory and interested," while the "accompanying behavior," though ostensibly generous, can more accurately be categorized as "formal pretence and social deception."⁵¹ His approach has inspired numerous historical examinations of relations between rich and poor, and the cultural meanings attached to charitable activities. In pre-modern societies, scholars have argued, reciprocal giving confirmed social bonds and solidarity but held in place relationships of patronage and inequality.⁵²

Christian obligation and reciprocity have been seen as girding the paternalist ideals and structure of pre-industrial society. As these gave way to free-market values with urbanization and industrialization, only the

deserving – those prepared to work hard, provide for their families, and teach their children the Bible – were deemed worthy of assistance. Increasingly, relief was no longer given freely but had to be earned. Not only must recipients appear grateful, they must convince the donor they had internalized acceptable social norms. Thus, for many scholars, charity constituted a form of ideological discipline, accommodating the poor to the class structures and ethos of industrial society.⁵³ Nonetheless, most have doubted the optimistic claims made by philanthropists of success in winning the laboring classes to industry, sobriety and domesticity. In short, many historians have speculated that recipients of charity merely repeated the words their benefactors wanted to hear.⁵⁴

New work on kindness, however, offers an alternative way of interpreting the interaction between the Christian teacher and former smugglers.⁵⁵ In an essay on the “practice of kindness” among the early modern elite, Linda Pollock has criticized the “coldly functional approach” of studies that “strip social relationships of their intrinsic warmth.” Kindness was a word employed liberally in aristocratic correspondence to cement bonds of patronage, confer and answer favor, foster civility, smooth over disagreements and mollify complaints. We should not assume,

Pollock cautioned, that it served only to mask power and injustice for, as a “cluster concept,” kindness connected ideals and practices of “civility, courtesy, hospitality, gentleness, love, liberality, amity, mercy, favour and comfort.” Above all, “kindness was simultaneously an act of giving and a loving disposition of mind.”⁵⁶ Identifying its meanings for people in the past, Pollock suggested, allows us to examine the experience of affect that has been missing from historical investigations of the gift exchange.

By contrast with the copious terminology of kindness in early modern elite writing, Martin rarely deployed the words “kind” or “compassion” in her surviving journals and sermons, but it was at the heart of her Christian message and the behavior she urged prisoners to adopt.⁵⁷ Crucially, it involved meeting ties of Christian kinship – taking care of family, neighbors, friends and fellow sinners, and not just the individual soul. In tracing the meanings of kindness for prisoners, their families and the visitor, therefore, we must attend to social and personal interactions rather than exclusively to spoken and written discourse.

Mateship, for instance, had bound the six seamen as a crew and, it seems, underpinned their “reclamation” in prison and sustained it on release. Camaraderie with and pressure from cellmates influenced other

prisoners in their responses to Martin's instruction. Studies of religious education in the penal system have emphasized its role as an individualizing technique of power, subjecting the prisoner to the authority of the Bible, chaplain, schoolteacher, and prison regime.⁵⁸ However, while many inmates at Yarmouth will have been swayed, at least temporarily, by Martin's charismatic power, the success of her pedagogy rested on relationships between her students.⁵⁹ At the end of their sentences, the six smugglers addressed the jail congregation "and entreated them to listen to [Martin's] advice, and treat her with respect."⁶⁰ In urging prisoners attend to Martin's word, the sailors appealed to their kindly feeling towards a teacher motivated by compassion for them. The mariners were no passive recipients of Christian instruction but had become its active promulgators.

The sailors' communal display of gratitude and private acknowledgement of their debt should not be reduced to the performance of customary deference and politeness; rather it demonstrated responsibility for themselves and care for others. After discharge, Redwood and Cole seem to have looked out for their former shipmates, encouraging them to follow the path set by Martin. That the two men went out of their way to thank their teacher suggests not only pride in overcoming

substantial challenges en route to what Redwood termed a “respectable” living, but also their desire to release Martin from the burden of their care. Perhaps this was the meaning of Redwood’s presents, showing he was finally in the position to “gift” his teacher as her equal.

It is telling, nevertheless, that Redwood expressed his thankfulness to Martin with two ornaments, for her response to these “curious” presents hints at the differences between her strict and pious conception of duty and alternative expectations of friendship and generosity among the poor. Little “luxuries” - objects of display rather than utility - were the means by which many laboring people expressed hospitality and liberality, often to the disapprobation of domestic missionaries and charity workers.⁶¹ Martin generally disapproved such trinkets but, in this instance, appears to have understood the significance of the gifts for the seaman, and accepted them graciously.

Redwood continued working as a mariner and his sons followed him to sea. The census returns suggest the precariousness of this living and interdependence of family members that may have predisposed him to Martin’s gospel of Christian kinship. In 1851 his household included his widowed daughter, a mother-of-two, who labored as a charwoman. In

1861, two years after Redwood's death, his daughter, now married to a seaman, was living next door to her mother who was caring for two of her grandchildren.⁶² The census records seem to confirm Redwood's attachment to a family that shared his conception of kinship ties and responsibility.

Pollock has proposed "a new approach to exploring values and culture, one intended to move social history beyond the analysis of material conditions and power relations" and "which does not privilege instrumental relations at the expense of affective ones."⁶³ Interactions, however, between the Christian visitor and former offenders, such as Redmond and Cole, cannot be understood beyond – or apart from - the material conditions and fields of power that structured laboring-class life in and around Great Yarmouth, nor the dynamics of the criminal justice system. But neither are they entirely reducible to power as we can see by exploring the encounters between Martin and prisoners' families.

III. Families and Keeping Straight

There is no indication that Martin questioned or challenged the economic inequities and social injustices that brought many offenders to jail, or left

their families destitute. When prisoners raised such issues, she refused their protest, advising they submit to divine grace.⁶⁴ She could, nonetheless, help them activate considerable discretionary powers that operated within the local judicial system.⁶⁵ In her study of London police courts from the 1820s onwards, Jennifer Davis has argued that the legitimacy and effectiveness of stipendiary magistrates as agents of law enforcement depended on their being seen to be fair towards their predominantly working-class clientele. Daily interaction with the poor led some magistrates to interpret their responsibility as providing “a poor man’s system of justice,” independent counsel, and monetary assistance to those in need.⁶⁶ Similarly, the poor of Yarmouth appear to have called on Martin to act as their advocate as well as an unofficial relieving agent. Sometimes she attended Quarter Sessions and may have advised the Justices about the character of those in the dock. Certainly magistrates were among the regular subscribers to her charities and, via Martin, gave small sums of money to inmates on release.⁶⁷ Frequently she supplemented the meagre assistance that the jail authorities doled out to destitute prisoners, and even persuaded masters to re-employ contrite offenders.⁶⁸ The convicted and their relatives seem to have viewed Martin, therefore,

not only as a purveyor of alms, but as an influential mediator who could negotiate on their behalf with the authorities and employers.

James Nudd's wife, for instance, approached Martin when her family faced the workhouse. To feed their four children during the fisherman's six month sentence for stealing deals out of the sea, Elizabeth had to sell the donkey her husband used to hawk fish, and ask the parish for outdoor relief. She turned to Martin in desperation when parochial officials miscalculated the date of Nudd's release and refused to reconsider their decision to withdraw the family's bread allowance. "They must all have gone into the workhouse, except some efficient means of support had been immediately adopted," concluded Martin.⁶⁹

What persuasive powers did Elizabeth Nudd use to convince Martin of her husband's worthiness and dire need of her young family? Though the teacher judged Nudd's behavior in jail as "good," he had been in prison before and was "too fond of public houses." Nonetheless, Martin cajoled the magistrates into paying £1 for a donkey, and authorized Nudd to seek an animal. The discharged prisoner did not take advantage of this charity, finding an ass, with change to spare, for 18 shillings; "He engages to lead the donkey frequently to my residence for me to see, and inform me of his

success.” Elizabeth Nudd took care to assure Martin of her husband’s conduct; “His wife says he has been a most improved character.” Like other “reclaimed” prisoners and their relatives, both husband and wife “acknowledged his imprisonment to have been a good thing.” Martin last recorded the family in the “Liberated Prisoners Book” six months later, noting they “greatly valued” the donkey.⁷⁰ The census returns suggest the purchase not only saved the family from the workhouse but helped Nudd secure an independent livelihood. For the rest of his life he worked as a carter and his sons followed him into the same trade.⁷¹

In the first historical work to examine the long-term effects of criminality and punishment on Victorian offenders, Barry Godfrey, David Cox, and Stephen Farrall have plotted the life cycles of “habitual offenders” in late nineteenth-century Crewe. Regular employment and a decent enough home, frequently combined with marriage and settled family life, were key factors, they found, in enabling desistance from crime.⁷²

Investigation of the post-committal experience of Yarmouth’s liberated prisoners suggests similar patterns of desistance but also allows us to speculate on how a specific intervention could instigate or accelerate this process.⁷³ Desire to support a family was probably the most significant

element in keeping ex-offenders out of trouble and, consequently, older and married prisoners were more susceptible to reclamation. Twenty-seven of the forty-three liberated prisoners were aged eighteen or over (62.8%). Only two of these - both men – appear to have been reconvicted.⁷⁴

Kindness towards dependents was, for Martin, a principal characteristic of the reclaimed offender. Christian instruction seems to have given some men a newfound sense of marital fidelity and paternal obligation. Matthew Wade abandoned his children after his wife died. He served twelve months for embezzling from his master and Martin doubted his “assurances of future good conduct,” but on release he had been “industrious and upright,” “a kind parent to his children.” Wade remarried and in 1841 was supporting his own children and those of his new wife as a coalheaver.⁷⁵ Similarly, in 1821, James Bull had left his wife and family, offering himself in marriage to another woman, only to be committed for six months for felony. On discharge he returned to his family, “became a good husband, and never deserted them after.”⁷⁶ In 1841 he was still with his family and his eldest son had adopted his trade as a bricklayer.⁷⁷ Census returns show that sons of many former male offenders followed in their father’s trade. These employment patterns are a fair indicator both of

family stability and the capacity of former offenders to fulfil at least one of the prime responsibilities of fatherhood – initiating sons into the labor force.⁷⁸

If rehabilitation depended on the commitment of offenders to renounce some of their former habits, of equal importance was the determination of family members to keep errant relatives on the right track. The builder Henry Howard was, according to Martin, “one of the most thoughtless of men,” convicted of stealing a wooden box and fifteen pennies. He could neither read nor write and, sentenced to one month, declined instruction in jail. Yet, on his release, Martin visited Howard’s family, leaving his “two fine boys” with a book to teach their father every evening. A few days later Mrs Howard told Martin she had spent “the happiest Sunday” for many years. Her husband could read the first leaf of his Lesson Book and “her heart was full of thankfulness.” Martin pledged to see the boys frequently and “superintend” the father’s progress “in the hope that attachment to his home and family may follow, and the public house be forsaken.” Never reconvicted, Howard was working as a builder in 1841 and his eldest son had entered his trade.⁷⁹

Mrs Howard may have felt compelled to present her husband to Miss Martin as a convert to sober domesticity but, just as plausibly, along with other wives, she may have welcomed Martin's homely Christian values and expressed gratitude to the teacher for persuading her husband to abandon the alehouse. Many working-class women were attracted to temperance knowing that excessive drinking could result in destitution and violence.⁸⁰ Yarmouth had yet to see the development of independent working-class movements that elsewhere were offering alternative venues of rational recreation to the tavern for working men, and sometimes their families.⁸¹ Heavy-drinking based around male occupations, drew considerable numbers of individuals into offending, particularly in relation to public order and work-based appropriation.⁸² Employment was structured around exclusively male occupations connected with the port: sea-faring, rope-making, laboring, and so on. Only Grout's silk factory had a workforce of young, single women and, outside of service, opportunities for female employment, such as plain needlework and braiding nets, were limited and low-paid. Most married women relied on their husbands bringing in a regular income and had much to gain from securing their attachment to the home.⁸³

Families, therefore, could play a crucial role in keeping former inmates on the straight-and-narrow and some co-operated with Martin by updating her on the progress of ex-offenders and seeking help in dealing with troublemakers. Relatives persuaded the teacher to extend yet another chance to those who had resisted reclamation. After his parents died, Benjamin Beverley was raised by his aunt who turned him out of her house when he threatened to stab her. Thereafter, he lived in outhouses and was jailed four times for thieving. Following his last imprisonment for breaching the peace, Martin refused to visit the boy but relented after an appeal from his aunt who insisted he wished to reform. Three years since discharge Beverley was “perfectly reclaimed,” and his aunt proudly reported he was “the man before the mast” on a merchant vessel and “respected” by his master.⁸⁴

If relatives helped ex-offenders stay out of trouble, some liberated prisoners seem to have striven to share their religious teaching with their family. Susan Barnard was indifferent to instruction during her first imprisonment for larceny in 1832 and appeared similarly reluctant on her return in 1835.⁸⁵ She carefully made her needlework neat on the outside but, like other truculent female prisoners, left the inside undone. After a

couple of months she settled down, and by the year's end could read and was "perfectly reclaimed." Subsequently she "had been the means of reclaiming her husband," a sawyer. Barnard met Martin once a month, and contact with the teacher may have helped her keep straight, for she "suffer[ed] much from poverty and illness, without complaint."⁸⁶ Six of the forty-three liberated prisoners (14%) were women, proportionate with their number in jail. None re-offended.

We might read the purported efforts of ex-offenders to share religious principles with their family as evidence of genuine commitment to Christian reform. Yet they and their relatives had much to gain from Martin and it will have been in their interest to appear well in her eyes. Did the shoebinder, Eleanor Simmonds, for instance, make sure she presented herself as a "respectable" married woman, who, "though very poor," "conducts a family as she ought," pledging to keep for her eldest child the Testament given by her former teacher? I can find no record of Simmonds's marriage and she was always entered in the census under her birthname.⁸⁷ The brief sketches of discharged prisoners that Martin gave the Prison Inspector only hint at accommodations they may have made to retain the teacher's approbation. Longer extracts in Martin's memoir from the

“Liberated Prisoners Book” suggest the tenor of these encounters; the challenges many faced returning to work, family, and social life; and the experiences of those who could not match their teacher’s exacting expectations. But, as the following two cases illustrate, even those who lapsed from, or refused to accept, Martin’s strict program of reform may not have been indifferent to her teaching.

IV. Resistance and Negotiation

Though some prisoners proved receptive to Martin’s emphasis on kindly obligation, we must assume that many struggled to reconcile habits of moderation and temperance with the pleasures and solidarities of traditional laboring-class culture, especially when these were integrated into the routines of working life. Of the two adult liberated prisoners who reoffended, neither appears to have entered a skilled trade. During six-months for felony Thomas Ellis, aged twenty-three, was “uncommonly diligent and obedient” and “laboured hard to learn” despite “inferior capacity and imperfect memory.” On release he could read easy lessons from Scripture.⁸⁸ Ellis returned to salt-fishing and unwisely visited his teacher after the end-of-season festivities. Probably he did so out of pride

rather than bravado, for he seems to have wanted her to recognize his accomplishments as wage-earner and provider. He appeared “quite smart” with a “a new hat on, new blue slop, yellow silk handkerchief.” Martin was suspicious: ““You have been to the ale house?”” ““Yes,’ he replied, ‘but not to drink, we have had our making up dinner, the owners pay for it; I only took a little ale; I was forced to it.’” Martin was unconvinced: ““Ale is poison with you; I wish you would spare a little money for the savings’-bank.””⁸⁹

Like so many of the laboring poor who disappointed domestic visitors, Ellis had opted for consumption and display over future security. Martin’s report of her conversation with Ellis, however, suggests less his outright resistance to her exacting expectations of Christian manhood than uncertainty over precisely what these entailed. His answer to Martin’s lecture, intentionally or not, asserted kindness and liberality over prudence; ““for I bought my mother a gown, and a pair of shoes; and my sister a new gown, and a hat, for they are so poor; and my sister’s child a new frock.”” He tried again to impress his teacher, telling her about ““two such beautiful books”” he had bought. He must have been disappointed. ““How foolish! why not let me buy them for you; what are they about?’ ‘I don’t know; may I bring them to show you? and may I write you some copies on paper, to

make you a present of, because you taught me?” Ellis still sought his teacher’s approbation; perhaps he hoped for further assistance or wanted to give her something in return for her attention. Martin was cautious: “I told him to bring the books, as I wished to see him again. His kind feeling to his mother is right. The public house was his ruin at first, and with this want of firmness, much is to be feared.”⁹⁰

It is doubtful Ellis stayed out of the alehouse. In 1841, and recently married, he was remanded for striking a policeman. Such assaults invariably involved drunkenness. If, as a young man, Ellis took pride in treating his family, he seems to have struggled to hold down a permanent occupation for prison and census records show him in low-paid, unskilled, casual jobs: gardening, fishing, salting, laboring. His wife had to manage without him when he was sentenced to twelve months in 1844 for stealing rope. It was his last conviction. In 1851, when Thomas and Johanna Ellis were entered in the census as coalheaver and silkweaver, it appears he had yet to achieve one of the prime criteria of independent manhood; the ability to maintain his wife at home.⁹¹

The prisoners Martin found most difficult to influence were juvenile males and they were also the most likely to reoffend. Since the 1780s, as

Peter King has shown, magistrates in many localities had devised strategies for keeping young offenders, especially first-timers, out of prison - fines, whipping, admission to reformatories - to prevent their being "schooled in crime" by "hardened criminals." At Yarmouth, by contrast, imprisonment - often combined with a short period of solitary confinement - was, by the late 1830s, the only form of punishment used short of transportation. Rates of juvenile incarceration were high. In the years 1839-41, those aged eighteen or under represented 41% of the prison population at Yarmouth, in comparison with 30% in London and well under 20% in Bedfordshire.⁹² Recidivism rates at Yarmouth were highest among juveniles. Of 255 cases involving repeat offenders, 1839-41, where age was entered, 62% were under twenty-one; 45% under eighteen.

Juveniles were by far the most disruptive inmates and the most frequently punished for disciplinary infractions. Martin devoted particular attention to these prisoners, especially during and following their first commitment, seeking their admission to a Sunday school on release and setting them up with the means of earning. Despite her hopes for sixteen juveniles listed as Liberated Prisoners, half were reconvicted of whom four would be transported. Robert Harrod's history illustrates the challenges

faced by these boys if they were to follow Martin's course and the many pressures that diverted them from it.

Aged nineteen, Harrod was sentenced with two other lads to seven years transportation in 1844 for stealing £4 6s. from a public house.⁹³ All had been in and out of Yarmouth Gaol. Having absconded from his apprenticeship to a twinespinner, in 1840 Harrod had been one of five boys Martin labored to save from delinquency. No matter how genially it was received, Martin's kindness and evident affection for these boys could not compete with the lure of youthful camaraderie.⁹⁴ Within a year Harrod was recommitted. Unlike most of her young charges, Martin believed he had "good and careful parents" who struggled to keep their "wilfully idle" son from roaming at night with his companions.⁹⁵

Probably Harrod's family life was more troubled than Martin realized. Like many young offenders, he had lost his father and was living with a step-father, a twinespinner.⁹⁶ Family conflict seems to have led to his first prison sentence at the age of twelve in 1837 when, at his mother's request, he was committed for a week for absenting himself from home. That commital reminds us of the attachment of many working-class people to familial and communal codes of conduct and order, and their willingness to

appeal to the magistracy to enforce these standards when they were flouted by relatives or neighbors.⁹⁷ Following Harrod's release in 1840, his mother appears to have found in Martin an ally in keeping her son under supervision. The boy called on Martin to say he hoped to go to sea, perhaps wishing to escape from ropemaking and his step-father. She gave him a pair of scales, weights, a basket, and a stone of sprats. Proudly Harrod returned to say he had made ninepence and given his mother some money; "I shall see his mother soon, although I believe the boy, at this time, is going on rightly."⁹⁸

On one of Harrod's visits to Martin she showed him a letter from a former inmate; apparently she used examples of reclaimed offenders to encourage the newly discharged. The teacher's stilted report of Harrod's reply hints at the difficulties faced by the letter-writer and the boy's uncertainty about his own future. "'Tis a nice letter,'" Harrod said, vowing not to return to jail; "I wish he could get some work; when people come out of that place 'tis a hard matter; thank God, I have got work."⁹⁹ Harrod's response conveys, perhaps, something of his desire – at least some of the time - to meet his teacher's approval and become a "good man." Yet there seems hesitation too: uncertainty about what he wanted and what might

be possible; recognition of the challenges in going straight and what he must give up. The teacher's faith was not rewarded. Harrod served ten imprisonments at Yarmouth and, though he learned to read and write under Martin, was put in solitary seven times for misbehaving during lessons, talking in divine service, unruliness and fighting.¹⁰⁰ Read in conjunction, Martin's journals and the penal records suggest a boy torn by different ways forward: the drudgery of ropemaking; hardship at home; adventures of a life at sea; pride in earning his own living; high-jinks with his free-and-easy mates.

Documentation concerning Harrod's life in Van Diemen's Land shows him opting for an alternative life to that mapped by Martin. On arrival he seems to have calmed down, getting through his probation with a clean record until, weeks before his ticket-of-leave was due, he was convicted of stealing an axe with two young men, one a former inmate from Yarmouth. The patterns of juvenile friendship, so feared by penal reformers, were difficult to break and the "old companions" paid hard for an offence that probably began in fun, serving twelve months hard labor. None reoffended.¹⁰¹ Harrod found employment with a small-time farmer, boat owner, and publican who was in and out of the insolvency courts, losing

several premises in mysterious fires. The boy must have liked this chancer with whom he stayed, learning to sail and compete in the annual regatta.¹⁰²

Under a very different mentorship to Martin's, Harrod was inducted into the rituals of adult male employment, sport and sociability, achieving his ambition to go to sea that he had nursed with his Yarmouth teacher.

The discipline of work and the values of manly independence appear to have anchored Harrod; he married and established a stable family life. The literacy skills acquired with Martin surely helped him become his own man, with a boat business shunting goods, and managing a hotel and store.¹⁰³ The Tasmanian records reveal, however, how far Harrod's lifestyle departed from the sober conduct advocated by Martin; the publican and his hotel were renown for heavy drinking.¹⁰⁴ They also show the economic vagaries that will have unsettled many former prisoners, whether transported or remaining in Yarmouth, and whether committed or not to moral probity. Loss of Harrod's boat in a storm, shortly before his death, bankrupted his widow who had to sell her possessions - sofa, chairs, tables, bedsteads, bedding, culinary utensils - the small comforts that a life of industry, if not sobriety, had bought.¹⁰⁵

While Robert Harrod and Thomas Ellis exemplify the kinds of prisoners who proved unwilling or unable to adopt the strict code of Christian conduct exhorted by Sarah Martin, neither was indifferent to her teaching or interest in them. Both sought her good opinion. Their desire for approval cannot be explained simply as calculation and opportunism, even though they undoubtedly hoped to gain from her assistance. Martin's journals are full of her chiding remarks to prisoners but show how most attempted to improve their skills in literacy and employment, and many encouraged others to do likewise. Few were vehemently and consistently resistant to her teaching or her care. Reputedly, the prisoners called her "the good Miss Martin" – an encomium that suggests they valued the attention she showed them.¹⁰⁶ What are the implications of these intimate relationships between Martin and the laboring poor, inside and outside Yarmouth's jail, for understanding the philanthropic exchange in the wider prison sector and society?

V. *Rethinking Philanthropy*

In an early revisionist interrogation of his study, *A Just Measure of Pain* and Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, Michael Ignatieff questioned the social

control thesis implicit in each work, with their emphasis on the reformatory project as a strategy of class rule. Crucially, neither account acknowledged the significance of normative values and ideas about social order within non-elite groups. Certainly reformers and state-bodies strove to drive a wedge between the deserving and undeserving, delinquent and industrious poor. But, Ignatieff pointed out, similar lines of demarcation were drawn by the working classes, “both in their resort to law and in the informal sanctioning of behavior which enforced their codes of respectability.”¹⁰⁷

The codes of respectability to which Ignatieff gestured were not embraced uniformly by the laboring poor. They could be the source of conflict and negotiation among them, as shown by Martin, a working woman herself, and by interactions between the family members with whom she dealt. Some relatives turned to Martin precisely because they saw her as an enforcer of ideals which they held dear. In an economy of scarcity, the values of industry, honesty, familial care, mutuality and neighborliness were integral to the survival strategies of many working people. But these values were shaped too by a broadly Christian outlook that demanded individual responsibility and fellowship with others. It appears to have been this personal and involved model of character that

resonated forcefully with considerable numbers of prisoners, rather than the atomized “modern individual subject” that we associate with disciplinary society.

Following Gareth Stedman Jones, scholars have suggested the poor took what they could get from the army of charity workers and missionaries that passed through their streets, but remained indifferent to an alien value-system of respectability, thrift and restraint.¹⁰⁸ As Peter Mandler put it, the poor learned to “coax” from their social superiors the assistance that formerly had been considered their right, yet the “use” they made of hard-won charity differed invariably from that intended by the benefactor.¹⁰⁹ This approach usefully stresses the agency of the poor in getting what they needed but may overstate their opportunism and calculation. Obscured are feelings of kindness and mutual understanding that might be forged between the parties.¹¹⁰ The concerns and hopes of donors and recipients may not have diverged quite so often nor always as sharply as Stedman Jones and Mandler implied. To appreciate why former offenders were keen to thank Martin for her attention, we need to consider the many ways in which the poor participated in the charitable transaction rather than seeing

them in the one-dimensional guises of passive recipient, manipulative exploiter, or defiant transgressor of ideology.

The complex dynamic between givers and receivers of charity and “improvement” might be teased, therefore, from the interstices between philanthropic discourse and documentary evidence about the lives of the poor, as I have sought to do by comparing the visitor’s journals and records relating to the convicted. In line with other reformers, Martin wished to prevent the “contaminating influences” of offenders over each other and yet, through day-to-day contact with inmates, she found they could exercise a beneficial influence over each other, and her teaching sought to harness their desire to act well for others.¹¹¹ That Martin’s reclamation project developed out of her engagement with, and in response to, prisoners should remind us not to judge reformers entirely on what they said, for their practice might be more flexible, imaginative and kind-hearted than their public pronouncements admitted.¹¹²

Significantly the favorable reviews of Martin’s memoir, that brought her work before the public in the late 1840s, highlighted the sympathetic and personal nature of her engagement with prisoners and their families.¹¹³ Many echoed the Prison Inspector’s call that Discharged Prisoner Aid

Societies should be established along the line set out by Martin.¹¹⁴ Until the end of the century, Martin's work was cited in treatises on prison discipline and prisoner reclamation, and seems to have encouraged some reformers to turn their attention to the welfare of prisoners' families and to supporting former offenders. Since her early efforts at Newgate, Elizabeth Fry had regretted the British Ladies' Society for Promoting the Reformation of Female Prisoners lacked resources to support liberated prisoners. On a tour of Yarmouth Gaol in 1832, Fry met Martin and approved her work, and subsequently she endeavoured to form societies for the relief of ex-offenders.¹¹⁵ The prominent jail chaplains, John Field at Reading and John Clay at Preston, commended Martin's work with liberated prisoners and also provided some assistance to inmates on release.¹¹⁶ In 1850 the chaplain at Chester Castle Gaol planned to visit former offenders in their homes.¹¹⁷ Yet no substantive policy was developed towards post-prison welfare by the Christian reformers, who were divided by the different weight they placed on discipline and reclamation, strictness and kindness, and who practiced quite distinctive approaches to the management, employment and education of prisoners.¹¹⁸

By mid-century, the Christian reformers were under sustained attack from critics, who ridiculed their credulity in falling for what Dickens called the “pattern penitence” of offenders, and challenged their claim that scriptural instruction in prisons reduced recidivism.¹¹⁹ The appearance of contrite prisoner memoirs in the 1840s and 1850s may testify to the waning influence of moral reformers rather than, as has often been assumed, their success. Locked in a policy debate over whether the silent association of inmates or their solitary confinement was the better means of correction, the Prison Inspectorate ignored Williams’s recommendations for post-discharge welfare. In the late 1840s, corporal punishment was reintroduced and by the 1850s the new model penitentiaries were well underway to becoming warehouses of incarceration rather than sites of rehabilitation.¹²⁰ In 1862 Joshua Jebb advised the formation of Discharged Prisoner Aid Societies but these were slow to develop. By 1887 such a society was attached to every prison in England and Wales but in 1896 only 26,000 men and women were assisted out of 169,137 released. Of fifty societies, just eleven helped wives and families while only twenty kept in touch with ex-offenders.¹²¹

VI. Conclusion

Though Martin steeled herself against disappointment she sought proof of lasting redemption, as her “Liberated Prisoners Book” reveals. I have followed in her footsteps, scouring prison papers, census returns and parish registers for evidence of desistance, and presented what I can find about the lives of former offenders. These sources do not enable us to confirm with certainty the enduring influence of Christian instruction on individuals. Some “reclaimed offenders” no doubt followed a secularized version of Martin’s program. Read alongside each other, however, the fragmentary evidence of individual lives illuminates the varied as well as shared experiences of those who fell foul of the law in the early nineteenth century, and the straitened conditions in which most pieced their lives back together.

When liberated prisoners were successful in keeping out of the law’s reach, it was invariably because they had family and friends supporting them and found employment, often with Martin’s assistance, that gave them some security and the capacity to provide for dependants. This was as much the case for those who remained indifferent to Martin’s pious conception of respectability as for those who saw “the light.” While

inmates and their relatives may have played up to the prison visitor to win what they could, many welcomed her intervention for they shared the values of honesty, integrity, decency, and industry that were rooted in laboring-class life as much as hard-drinking, pleasure-seeking and chance-taking.

In the end we simply have the testimony and actions of former offenders and their families affirming Martin's kindness and instruction had made a difference. We should take such evidence seriously. That considerable numbers went out of their way to inform the visitor of their circumstances or to give her a small token in return for her care should be read, I believe, as confirmation of the profound impact she made on many individuals, both in terms of their self-respect and the welfare of their families. This was far more than the ritualistic, obligatory and deferential performance of the "gift exchange." In thanking Martin for her kindness, they sought to demonstrate their own kindness and capacity to care for others – in other words, their agency.

Historians of crime and deviance have been far more attentive to evidence of resistance, to moments when the convicted appear to have contested rather than complied with social norms. But the personal cost of

deviance, to individuals and their relatives and friends, was high. While many ex-offenders may have returned undetected to illicit activities when presented with the need or opportunity, many too, probably the majority, opted sooner or later for legitimacy over illegality. If we are to understand this as anything other than repression and defeat, we need to examine the meanings of moral and social order for the poor, and the role played by their conceptions of wrong- and right-doing in social discipline. To hear the many voices of the past – to listen to dialogues as well as disputes – we need to exercise generosity and openmindedness in our reading of social interactions.

And so to the “liberation” of Thomas Anderson. Prior to a fourteen-year sentence of transportation for embezzlement in 1822, the warehouse man had been “fond of taverns and gaming.” For most of his six months at Yarmouth Gaol he resisted Martin’s strictures and the teacher frequently discovered him playing cards. Only in the final month did he listen to her admonishments and “heartily expressed his thanks to me.” Departing for the hulks, he promised his “upright intentions” towards Martin and his “amiable wife.” On board the convict ship *Caledonia* he was orderly and well-behaved - a “good man.” He had nothing to gain from Martin when he

wrote to her from Van Diemen's Land wishing her success in instructing prisoners. Subsequently, she understood, he had sent for his wife and children to join him. We will never know if the letter was written before or after he liberated himself from his assignment, absconding four years into his sentence, for the authorities never caught up with him and, consequently, neither have I.¹²²

Acknowledgements

For advice and encouragement, I thank: the editor and anonymous readers; participants at Leeds History Seminar, the North-west Long Nineteenth Century Seminar, and Liverpool John Moores University CCSE Seminar; and Meg Arnot, Andrew Davies, Barry Godfrey, Peter Gurney, John Herson, Ruth Livesey, Hamish Maxwell-Stewart, Glenda Norquay, Linda Pollock, Julie-Marie Strange, and Alison Twells.

¹ Randall McGowen, "Power and Humanity, or Foucault among the Historians," in *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body*, Colin Jones and Roy Porter eds (London, 1994) 91-112. For historical

interrogations of the language of humanitarianism deployed in allied campaigns against corporal and capital punishments, see: V.A.C. Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People 1770-1868* (Oxford, 1994); Randall McGowen, "The Body and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England," *Journal of Modern History* 59.4 (1987): 651–79.

² Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Alan Sheridan trans., (Harmondsworth, 1991); Michael Ignatieff, *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1950* (London, 1978). Some studies have qualified this approach, highlighting differences between policy ideas and actual practice. These have concentrated on administrators and opinion makers rather than on the experience of incarceration. For important examples, see Margaret DeLacy, *Prison Reform in Lancashire, 1700-1850: A Study in Local Administration* (Manchester, 1986); Martin J. Wiener, *Reconstructing the Criminal: Culture, Law, and Policy in England, 1830-1914* (Cambridge, 1990).

³ 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons of Great Britain II, Northern and Eastern District, Fifth Report*, House of Commons Parliamentary Papers Online

(Proquest, 2005): 124-31, [121]. Hereafter, reports in this series are shortened to *Inspectors of Prisons*.

⁴ Martin's short autobiography was published as *A Brief Sketch of the Life of the Late Miss Sarah Martin of Great Yarmouth, With Extracts from the Parliamentary Reports on Prisons; Her Own Journals &c* (Yarmouth, 1844).

All references are to an expanded version, *Sarah Martin, The Prison Visitor of Great Yarmouth, With Extracts from her Writings and Prison Journals* (London, n.d.); hereafter *Sarah Martin*.

⁵ Jan Plamper, "The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns," *History and Theory* 49.2 (2010): 237-65.

⁶ Randall McGowen, "A Powerful Sympathy: Terror, the Prison, and Humanitarian Reform in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain," *Journal of British Studies* 25.3 (1986): 312-334.

⁷ *Memoir of the Life of Elizabeth Fry*, Katherine Fry and Rachel Elisabeth Cresswell, eds, (London, 1848), Vol. 1, 375; cited by McGowen, "Powerful Sympathy," 329.

⁸ McGowen, "Powerful Sympathy," 327.

⁹ E.R. Pitman, *Elizabeth Fry*, (Boston, 1884; Gutenberg, 2005), 60.

¹⁰ McGowen, "Powerful Sympathy," 333. For an alternative interpretation of Fry's work, see Annemieke van Drenth and Francisca de Haan, *The Rise of Caring Power: Elizabeth Fry and Josephine Butler in Britain and the Netherlands* (Amsterdam, 1999), especially 15-19. While examining the disciplinary aspects of philanthropic women's "caring power," van Drenth and de Haan acknowledge the responsiveness of activists like Fry to other women's needs, and their development of a distinctively female or feminist ethic of care.

¹¹ Philip Priestley, *Victorian Prison Lives: English Prison Biography, 1830-1914* (London, 1985); Sarah Anderson and John Pratt, "Prisoner Memoirs and their Role in Prison History" in *Punishment and Control in Historical Perspective*, Helen Johnston, ed., (Basingstoke, 2008), 179-198.

¹² Sarah Martin, 24.

¹³ John Clay pioneered the genre in his campaigning literature but may have been influenced by reports of Martin's work with inmates; see Walter Lowe Clay, *The Prison Chaplain: A Memoir of the Rev. John Clay, B.D., Late Chaplain of the Preston Gaol* (Cambridge, 1861) 85-6. See also Colin Arrott Browning, *The Convict Ship; a Narrative of the Results of Scriptural Instruction and Moral Discipline* (London, 1844); *Memoir of . . . Elizabeth Fry*

(1848); John Field, *Prison Discipline and the Advantages of the Separate System of Imprisonment* (London, 1848); Rev. H.S. Joseph, *Memoirs of Convicted Prisoners, Accompanied by Remarks on the Causes and Prevention of Crime* (London, 1853).

¹⁴ For an overview of these debates, see Randall McGowen, "The Well-Ordered Prison: England, 1780-1865," *The Oxford History of the Prison: the Practice of Punishment in Western Society*, Norval Morris and David J. Rothman, eds (Oxford, 1995), 71-99.

¹⁵ U.R.Q. Henriques, "The Rise and Decline of the Separate System of Prison Discipline," *Past and Present* 54.1 (1972): 61-93 [83].

¹⁶ Ignatieff, *Just Measure of Pain*, 213. See also J. J. Tobias, *Crime and Industrial Society in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 1967); James Bennett, *Oral History and Delinquency: The Rhetoric of Criminality* (Chicago, 1981).

¹⁷ Sean Grass, *The Self in the Cell: Narrating the Victorian Prisoner* (London, 2003); Anna Schur, "The Poetics of 'Pattern Penitence': 'Pet Prisoners' and Plagiarized Selves," in *Stones of Law, Bricks of Shame: Narrating Imprisonment in the Victorian Age*, Jan Alber and Frank Lauterbach, eds (Toronto, 2009): 134-53.

¹⁸ For a comparable attempt to reconstruct the life history of an anonymous former convict interviewed by Henry Mayhew, see F.B. Smith, "Mayhew's Convict," *Victorian Studies* 22 (1979): 431-48. For a critique of Smith's methodology that pays closer attention to the mediated nature of the convict's and journalist's discourse, see A.L. Beier, "Identity, Language, and Resistance in the Making of the Victorian 'Criminal Class': Mayhew's Convict Revisited," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 499-515.

¹⁹ David Englander, "From the Abyss: Pauper Petitions and Correspondence in Victorian London," *London Journal* 25.1 (2000): 69-83 [79-81].

²⁰ 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 121.

²¹ Sarah Martin, 118-120, 127-32; and 1839 [199], *Inspectors of Prisons, Fourth Report*, 171-4.

²² Seán McConville, *A History of English Prison Administration. Volume 1. 1750-1877* (London, 1981).

²³ 1836 [117-II], *Inspectors of Prisons, First Report*, 67-72.

²⁴ Helen Rogers, "Singing in Gaol: Christian Instruction and Inmate Culture in the Nineteenth Century," *Prison Service Journal* 199 (2012): 35-43.

²⁵ W.J. Forsythe, *A System of Discipline: Exeter Borough Prison, 1819-1863* (Exeter, 1983); Richard W. Ireland, *"A Want of Order and Good Discipline": Rules, Discretion and the Victorian Prison*, (Cardiff, 2007); Sarah Martin, 15.

²⁶ 1836 [117-II], *Inspectors of Great Britain, First Report*, 71.

²⁷ Evidence of Elizabeth Fry, 1831-32 (547) *Report from Select Committee on Secondary Punishments, Parliamentary Papers*, 116-129:122, Q.1909.

²⁸ Contained in one of Martin's "Everyday Books," the Register covers November 1839-June 1842. Martin's surviving books are held by Great Yarmouth Museums at the Tolhouse; Norfolk Record Office holds a few other papers.

²⁹ Sarah Martin, 1840 Register, no. 185; Great Yarmouth Borough Gaol Registers December 1838-December 1850, Norfolk RO, Y/L2 9, 29 December 1840. Norfolk RO holds the surviving jail records.

³⁰ *Sarah Martin*, 114-8.

³¹ *Sarah Martin*, 24.

³² "Everyday Book," 3 January 1840.

³³ *Sarah Martin*, 24.

³⁴ Ireland, *"Want of Order,"* 43.

³⁵ *Sarah Martin*, 113, 121, 126. For an overview of this discourse see Tobias, *Crime and Industrial Society*, 52-77.

³⁶ My analysis of the jail registers 1839-41 includes those held for further examination or trial, and those found not guilty.

³⁷ Only 16.3% of cases were referred to the Quarter Sessions. These figures correspond with high levels of summary justice at the London magistrates courts in the late eighteenth century when only 15% of cases were referred to the higher courts; see Drew D. Gray, *Crime, Prosecution and Social Relations: The Summary Courts of the City of London in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke, 2008), 27-8. For summary justice, see Peter King, *Crime, Justice and Discretion in England, 1740-1820* (Oxford, 2000), 82-125.

³⁸ Most assessments of female offender rates are based on indictable offences; for example, Malcolm Feeley and Deborah Little, "The Vanishing Female: The Decline of Women in the Criminal Process, 1687-1912," *Law and Society Review*, 25 (1991), 719-57. If summary convictions were included, Peter King has suggested, the rate of female offenders might be higher. However, the Yarmouth figures, albeit for three years only, indicate that summary and indictment rates for women may not have diverged

widely. King cites females as 16.51% of all Norfolk indicted offenders, 1843-7. See King, *Crime and Law*, pp. 165-223, and Appendix 6.3.

³⁹ V.A.C. Gatrell and T.B. Hadden, "Criminal Statistics and their Interpretation," in *Nineteenth-Century Society: Essays in the Use of Quantitative Methods for the Study of Social Data* (Cambridge, 1972), 336-396; Leon Radzinowicz and Roger Hood, "Incapacitating the Habitual Criminal: The English Experience," *Michigan Law Review* 78.8 (1980): 1305-1389; Peter King, "The Rise of Juvenile Delinquency in England, 1780-1840," *Past and Present*, no. 160 (1998): 116-166. Using qualitative analysis, Ireland finds no significant rise in the confinement of persistent offenders in Carmarthenshire 1840-1870; *Want of Order and Good Discipline*, 150-1, 174-5.

⁴⁰ My figures probably underestimate repeat offending since the jailor often miscalculated or omitted previous convictions. In 1843 the Prison Inspector reported that of 27 inmates convicted or charged with crimes or misdemeanors, 16 (59%) had prior convictions; 1843 [517] *Inspectors of Prisons, Eighth Report*, 180-1. This figure corresponds with John Clay's assessment of a 56% reconviction rate at Preston in the 1840s; see

Margaret May, "Innocence and Experience: The Evolution of the Concept of Juvenile Delinquency in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," *Victorian Studies* 17.1 (1973): 7-29 [11]. Most studies of crime and punishment in the period do not analyze reconvictions but, for comparison with a local study of repeat offending in the late century, see Barry S. Godfrey, David J. Cox, and Stephen D. Farrall, *Criminal Lives: Family Life, Employment and Offending* (Oxford, 2007).

⁴¹ Anon, *Sarah Martin, The Prison Visitor of Great Yarmouth: A Story of a Useful Life* (London, n.d.), 116-117.

⁴² See the Funeral Sermon Martin wrote to be delivered following her death to her "friends", the prisoners: "You ever heard me with kind attention, when I was your fellow worshipper"; *Sarah Martin*, 81-96 [95].

⁴³ *Sarah Martin*, 5-7, 12-3.

⁴⁴ 1841 Census, HO 107/793/4.

⁴⁵ F. K. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1980) 163-4.

⁴⁶ *Sarah Martin*, 31-3.

⁴⁷ *Sarah Martin*, 15, 21-3, 28-9.

⁴⁸ *Sarah Martin*, 37.

⁴⁹ Great Yarmouth Borough Gaol Committal and Discharge Book, Sept 1831-Dec 1838, Y/L 2/6, 18 May 1835; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons*, 126-7.

⁵⁰ 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons*, 126-7; 1839 [199] *Inspectors of Prisons*, 173-4.

⁵¹ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, Ian Cunnison trans., (1954; London, 1970) 1-2.

⁵² E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (London, 1991); Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, *The Culture of Giving: Informal Support and Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2008); Linda Zionkowski and Cynthia Klekar, eds, *The Culture of the Gift in Eighteenth-Century England* (Basingstoke, 2009).

⁵³ Gareth Stedman Jones, "The Defamation of the Gift: The Problem of the 1860s," in *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society* (Oxford, 1971), 241-61; Peter Mandler, "Poverty and Charity in the Nineteenth-Century Metropolis: An Introduction," *The Uses of Charity: The Poor on Relief in the Nineteenth Century Metropolis*, Peter Mandler, ed., (Philadelphia, 1990) 1-37; Alan J. Kidd, "Philanthropy and the 'Social History' Paradigm," *Social History* 21.2 (1996): 180-192 [186-7].

⁵⁴ For a summary of this scholarship, see Martin Hewitt, “The Travails of Domestic Visiting, Manchester, 1830-70,” *Historical Research* 71.175 (1998): 196-227.

⁵⁵ William S. Hamrick, *Kindness and the Good Society: Connections of the Heart* (Albany, 2002); Adam Phillips and Barbara Taylor, *On Kindness* (London, 2010). In their insightful study, Phillips and Taylor examine philosophical, religious, moral and psychological discourses on kindness in the modern period but not its practice, nor the perspectives of its recipients.

⁵⁶ Linda A. Pollock, “The Practice of Kindness in Early Modern Elite Society,” *Past and Present* 211 (2011): 121-158 [153-4].

⁵⁷ *Sarah Martin*, 67-96.

⁵⁸ Rosalind Crone, “Attempts to (Re)shape Common Reading Habits: Bible Reading on the Nineteenth-century Convict Ship,” *A Return to the Common Reader: Print Culture and the Novel, 1850-1900*, Beth Palmer and Adelene Buckland, eds (Farnham: 2011), 103-20.

⁵⁹ Helen Rogers, “The Way to Jerusalem: Reading, Writing and Reform in an Early Victorian Gaol,” *Past and Present* no. 205 (2009): 71-104 [86-7].

⁶⁰ 1836 (117-II) *Inspectors of Prisons, First Report*, 69; *Sarah Martin*, 139.

⁶¹ Gareth Stedman Jones, "Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London, 1870-1900: Notes on the Remaking of a Working Class,"

Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-Class History 1832-1892

(Cambridge, 1993), 179-238 [200-2].

⁶² 1851 Census, HO 107/1760; 1861 Census, RG 9/1094; *England & Wales,*

Free BMD Death Index: 1837-1915 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA:

Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2006.

⁶³ Pollock, "Practice of Kindness," 125.

⁶⁴ See her exchange with F.J. [Francis James], a prisoner who was

subsequently reclaimed; *Sarah Martin*, 114-8.

⁶⁵ Peter King, *Crime, Justice and Discretion in England, 1740-1820*

(Oxford,1999).

⁶⁶ Jennifer Davis, "A Poor Man's System of Justice: The London Police Courts

in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century," *The Historical Journal*, 27:2

(1984): 309-335, citing *Select Committee on Metropolitan Police Offices,*

Parliamentary Papers 1837, XII, q. 1210: 315.

⁶⁷ Sarah Martin's Account Book, "Donations for General Purposes, 1824-

1841."

⁶⁸ See “Everyday Book,” 15 and 16 April 1841. On one occasion, Martin approached at least three employers besides a boy’s former master before finding him a position; see Matilda Wrench, *Visits to Female Prisoners at Home and Abroad* (London, 1852), 62-3.

⁶⁹ *Sarah Martin*, 118-19; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 128-9.

⁷⁰ *Sarah Martin*, 119-20; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 128-9.

⁷¹ 1841 Census, H.O. 107/793/1; 1851 Census, H.O. 107/1806; 1861 Census, R.G. 9/1192.

⁷² Godfrey et al, *Criminal Lives*, especially 165-182. See also Barry S. Godfrey, David J. Cox, and Stephen D. Farrall *Serious Offenders: A History of Habitual Offenders 1840-1940* (Oxford, 2010). For a comparable Swedish study see Lotta Vikström, “Before and after Crime: Life-Course Analyses of Young Offenders Arrested in Nineteenth-Century Northern Sweden,” *Journal of Social History* 44.3 (2011): 861-88.

⁷³ For an examination of the long-term effects of a Catholic reformatory program, see Catrien Bijleveld and Frans van Poppel, “The Success of the Civilization Offensive: Societal Adaptation of Reformed Boys in the Early

Twentieth Century in the Netherlands,” *Journal of Social History* 44.4

(2011): 1173-94

⁷⁴ Thomas Ellis (below), and R.D. [Robert Doyle], 1839 [199] *Inspector of Prisons, Fourth Report*, 172-3.

⁷⁵ Gaol Book, 23 January-November 1836, Y/L 2/2, 31 October 1836; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 128-9. 1841 Census, HO 107/794/5.

⁷⁶ 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prison, Fifth Report*, 124-5.

⁷⁷ 1841 Census, HO 107/1805.

⁷⁸ Andrew Walker, “Father’s Pride? Fatherhood in Industrializing Communities,” in *Gender and Fatherhood in the Nineteenth Century*, Trev Lynn Broughton and Helen Rogers, eds (Basingstoke, 2007), 113-25.

⁷⁹ Gaol Book, 1 October 1836; 1839 [199] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fourth Report*, 172; 1841 Census, HO 107/793/8. For a similar case, see A.B. [Arthur Bland] in 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 126-7; Gaol Book, 8 December 1835.

⁸⁰ Harrison, Brian *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872* (London, 1971).

⁸¹ By illustration, there appears to have been no substantial Chartist activity in Yarmouth.

⁸² Godfrey et al, *Criminal Lives*, 78-105, 172-3.

⁸³ Only a sixth of the thirty married women admitted 1839-41 were listed as employed.

⁸⁴ Great Yarmouth Borough Gaol Register, 1808-1838 (Y/L2/8 Norfolk RO), 22 March 1835; Committal and Discharge Book, 10 February 1836; 1839 [199], *Inspectors of Prisons, Fourth Report*, 172; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prison, Fifth Report*, 126-27.

⁸⁵ *England & Wales, Criminal Registers, 1791-1892* Ancestry.com., Midsummer 1832, HO 27; Piece: 44, 34; Gaol Registers, 22 March 1835.

⁸⁶ "Everyday Book," 31 October 1836; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 126-7; 1841 Census, HO 107/793/6.

⁸⁷ Gaol Register, 4 April 1837; 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 128-9.

⁸⁸ Martin's Register, 1839, no. 3; "Everyday Book," 9 November 1839.

⁸⁹ *Sarah Martin*, 127-8

⁹⁰ *Sarah Martin*, 127-8; 1841 Census, HO 107/793/6

⁹¹ Gaol Registers, 12 February 1837; 10 December 1841; Index and Receiving Book, Y/D 41/28, 23 February 1844; 1841 Census, HO 107/793/6; 1851 Census, HO 107/1806.

⁹² Peter King, *Crime and Law in England, 1750-1840* (Cambridge: 2006), 80, Figure 2.1.

⁹³ Robert Harrod per *Theresa*, 1845, Police no. 15914, Con 33/1/67; Joshua Artis, *ditto*, Police no. 15826; William Jenkins, *ditto*, Police no. 15933. Aged 11, Artis was one of Martin's Liberated Prisoners, as was Jenkins's brother, Abraham; see 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 128-9.

⁹⁴ See Helen Rogers, "Oh, what beautiful books!': Captivated Readers in an Early Victorian Prison," *Victorian Studies* 55.1 (2013): forthcoming.

⁹⁵ Martin's Register, 1841, no. 53.

⁹⁶ 1841 Census, HO 107/793/1; Indent Con 14/1/29. Two-thirds of male convicts from Yarmouth to Van Diemen's Land had lost one parent or both.

⁹⁷ Davis, "Poor Man's System of Justice"; David Philips, *Crime and Authority in Victorian England: The Black Country 1835-60* (London, 1977).

⁹⁸ *Sarah Martin*, 128-9.

⁹⁹ *Sarah Martin*, 128-9.

¹⁰⁰ Gaol Keeper's Journal, Y/L2 48, 9 June 1841 and 23 June 1842.

¹⁰¹ Conduct Record, Con 33/1/67; Sorell Lower Courts, Record of Cases Heard in Petty Sessions, 27 December 1848, Tasmania State Archives, LC 484/1/1. Joseph Anderson per *Bangalore*, 1848, Police no. 20670, CON33/1/90. For a study of convict recidivism, and factors militating against desistance, see Barry Godfrey, "The Last Fleet': Crime, Reformation, and Punishment in Western Australia After 1868" *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 41.2 (2008): 236-58.

¹⁰² *Hobart Town Courier and Van Diemen's Land Gazette*, 24 July 1840, 3; *Mercury* (Hobart), 13 May 1863, 2 and 13 April 1864, 2; *Colonial Times*, 3 Dec 1847; *Hobartan Mercury*, 7 January 1856, 3; *Historic Australian Newspapers, 1803-1954*, <http://newspapers.nla.gov.au/>.

¹⁰³ CON52/3 p218; CON52/4; Marriage to Sarah Cowburn, State Archives of Tasmania, RGD37 926/1851; Marriage to Mary Kain, RGD37 140/1863.

¹⁰⁴ *Mercury* (Hobart), 8 Dec. 1865, 2 and 14 August 1876, 3.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 11 May 1874, 3; 2 October 1876, 2-3; and 20 December 1876, 4.

¹⁰⁶ *Sarah Martin. . . Useful Life*, 70.

¹⁰⁷ Michael Ignatieff, "State, Civil Society, and Total Institutions: A Critique of Recent Social Histories of Punishment," *Crime and Justice*, 3 (1981): 153-192 [174].

¹⁰⁸ Stedman Jones, "Working-Class Culture," 196-201.

¹⁰⁹ Mandler, "Poverty and Charity," 12, 1-2.

¹¹⁰ Seth Koven resisted caricaturing slum philanthropists in late-Victorian London as "hypocritical agents of class control," insisting the "seemingly opposed impulses" "to love the poor and to discipline their disruptive power" were bound together. While hinting at the reciprocal and intimate aspects of charitable encounters, Koven focused on how these answered the social, emotional, psychological and sexual needs of the slummers rather than those they served; Koven, *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton, 2006), 284-5.

¹¹¹ Sarah Martin, 113-4, 125-6.

¹¹² Hewitt finds that despite repeated concern to separate "deserving" from "undeserving" cases, "the predominant rhetorical motif" of the Manchester District Provident Society in the 1830s was "the need to re-establish intercourse between rich and poor"; "Domestic Visiting," 207.

-
- ¹¹³ For a much-cited early review, see [John Bruce], “Life of Sarah Martin – Prison-Visiting,” *Edinburgh Review* (1847) LXXXV, 320-340.
- ¹¹⁴ 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 121.
- ¹¹⁵ Gaol Keeper’s Journal, 1825-35 (Y/L2/46) 22 November 1832.
- ¹¹⁶ Clay, *The Prison Chaplain*, 84-6; Field, *Prison Discipline*, 365-8.
- ¹¹⁷ Chaplain of the Castle, Report, Quarter Sessions Files, Cheshire Record Office, QJF 278/2/3.
- ¹¹⁸ Robert Allen Cooper, “Jeremy Bentham, Elizabeth Fry and English Prison Reform,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42. 4 (1981): 675-690.
- ¹¹⁹ Charles Dickens, “Pet Prisoners,” *Household Words* 5 (27 April 1850): 97-103 [101].
- ¹²⁰ McConville, *A History of English Prison Administration*.
- ¹²¹ Joshua Jebb, “Assistance to Prisoners on Discharge,” *Congres International de Bienfaisance* vol. 2 (1862), 79-87; 1897 [C.8299] *Report to Her Majesty's Commissioners of Prisons on the Operations of Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies; by the Rev. G. P. Merrick*, 5, 76-8. For work-in-progress on late Victorian rehabilitative strategies and prisoner licenses, see Barry Godfrey, David J. Cox, and Helen Johnston, “The Costs of Imprisonment”; and Joanne Turner, “Returning Home: The Reintegration of

Women Released from Local and Convict Prisons” (unpublished papers, SOLON Modern Activism Conference, Liverpool 2012).

¹²² 1840 [258] *Inspectors of Prisons, Fifth Report*, 124-25; Thomas Anderson per *Caledonia* (2), 1822, Police no. 143, Conduct Record, CON31/1/1; *Hobart Town Courier*, 2 February 1828, 2. The words “At Large” are just discernible on his Conduct Record.