Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Rachel Cawkwell March 24, 2014

Representations of Charitable Relationships in *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch*

by

Rachel Cawkwell

Dr. Laura Otis
Adviser

Department of English

Dr. Laura Otis

Adviser

Dr. Paul Kelleher

Committee Member

Dr. Patrick Allitt

Committee Member

2014

Representations of Charitable Relationships in *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch*

By

Rachel Cawkwell

Dr. Laura Otis

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of English

2014

Abstract

Representations of Charitable Relationships in *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch*

By Rachel Cawkwell

In nineteenth century England, private charity practices shifted from sporadic, individual and parish-based actions to regimented and collective organized events. Public discussion about the most effective manner of bestowing charity not only inspired these changes but accompanied their trial period prior to England's transition to a welfare state. Victorian realist novels participated in this debate via the manner in which they portrayed charitable relationships. Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* and George Eliot's *Middlemarch* depict philanthropy within distinct frameworks, representing different ideologies about interpersonal relationships: where *Jane Eyre* values the potential for reciprocity in direct relationships, *Middlemarch* embraces the reality of a network-oriented society. Published twenty-four years apart, the novels not only reflect the changing charitable discourse through their differences, but they also comment on the effectiveness of popular ideas. Analyzing each type of charity in the novels reveals the extent to which the relationship models shape the readers' perceptions of characters' philanthropic actions. Both books demonstrate the potential for literature to enrich and alter public conception, as well as provide insight into charitable practices relevant to the modern era.

Representations of Charitable Relationships in *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch*

By

Rachel Cawkwell

Dr. Laura Otis

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of English

2014

Acknowledgements

Last summer, I spent the weekdays contacting stakeholders in a high school district; creating, distributing, and analyzing surveys; and organizing community events. On the weekends, I read the likes of *Oliver Twist* and *Felix Holt*, centuries and an ocean away from local Atlanta issues. Though seemingly disparate activities, my weeks were united through a single line of questioning: what does it mean to be part of a community? Whether in action or in imagination, I contemplated what it means to help others and how different individuals—elderly, African American women and white college students, Mr. Rochester and Adèle—interacted across their differences.

This thesis is a product of both my literary and community-building experiences. I owe immense thanks to my thesis advisor Dr. Laura Otis, who has been a continual source of inspiration and guidance in this project and beyond. I also want to thank my committee members Dr. Paul Kelleher and Dr. Patrick Allitt, for their enthusiastic support and advice. Additionally, I want to thank my major advisor, Dr. Sheila Cavanagh for encouraging me to approach my thesis as a culmination of my academic and extracurricular passions. Thus, I also owe thanks to the Center for Community Partnerships' Community Building and Social Change Fellowship and the staff and students that comprise Volunteer Emory for providing me valuable experiences that justify and inform my interest in charitable relationships.

While the vitality of the above direct relationships merit their individual mention, in the spirit of *Middlemarch*'s pervasive web imagery, I know that my thanks are due to individuals several nodes away from this project: all the professors and students who have influenced my opinions, my family and friends who read my work and let me talk endlessly about literature and service, and the Emory and Atlanta communities for being my home for the past four years. My gratitude extends along every strand of the ever-expanding web of people who impact me.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The Victorian era marked a period of prolific novel-writing, and debate on the value of novels accompanied this rise in the volume and popularity of novels. Since the novel's inception, critics have worried about the negative impact presented by a long-form realistic tale. While some feared the repercussions of depicting immoral action, there was also agreement about the potential for the novel to set a positive moral example. But how does a positive example make an impact? Does it present the tragedies of the world and provoke our sympathy? Can it inspire us to adopt a charitable demeanor? Or to take to action? While the study of actual readers' responses to Victorian literature is a project for future research, I aim in this thesis to show the laden potential of novels to effect change, particularly how *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch* each participated in the Victorian discourse on charitable work.

For many, the primary power of novels lies in their ability to impact readers' emotions. In *Principles of Success in Literature*, George Henry Lewes claimed that "in Science, the paramount appeal is to the Intellect – its purpose being instruction; in Art, the paramount appeal is to the Emotions – its purpose being pleasure" (Lewes 58). He pits science against art, intellect against emotion, and instruction against pleasure; literature would be associated with the latter of each grouping. A sentence which follows shortly thereafter softens this binary by suggesting that "a work of Art must of course indirectly appeal to the Intellect" (58). Yet still, he sees the primary effect of the novel as pleasure, not instruction.

Confining literature to emotional rather than intellectual grounds restricts the potential of literature, just as modern conceptions of sympathy and pity lack the empowering understanding and connection of empathy. Novels may speak to emotions, but they speak to ideas as well; John Ruskin claimed that they created a "sharpening of intellect and an accession of

ideas…accomplished, not by severe study, or intense thought, but by the repose of a wearied brain and the relaxation of a leisure hour" (Ruskin 367). His assessment mirrors the earlier claim of Sir Philip Sydney, in "The Defense of Poesy," that poems can "imitate both to delight and teach, and delight to move men to take that goodness in hand, which without delight they should fly as from a stranger…which being the noblest scope to which ever any learning was directed" (Sidney). The form of the novel, itself a relatively new form for England, rising in the 18th century[1], is distinct from other literary forms in its interest in personal psychology, unfolding the hearts, but also minds, of its central characters. Instruction serves as a primary goal of literature, which in fact teaches better than other forms because it entertains the reader.

The natural biases of narration influence readers' understandings and interactions with the social world through implicit and occasionally explicit cultural assumptions. The meaning behind these assumptions may be relevant beyond the book's own time period: understanding the how charitable interactions occurred in the nineteenth century may shed light on relationships today. Literature, however, is tightly linked to its time of production, a cultural object worthy of study for understanding ideas and conventions of a certain period. The power of literature can be seen when a historical text, such as David Owen's seminal *English Philanthropy 1660-1960,* opens with a quote from *Middlemarch*[2]. While Owen uses Casaubon's statement about the "wide field" of philanthropy to frame his particular philanthropic focuses, literature is more than an

---

[1] See Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkley: University of California, 1957. Print.

[2] Reviews shortly after the publication of *English Philanthropy* note that "to make sense of three centuries of such diversity poses for the social historian a formidable challenge. Owen, in the first half of his survey, meets that challenge, sometimes brilliantly, always intelligently," noting the second half to be less well integrated (Roberts 238). In addition to W.K. Jordan's *Philanthropy in England 1480-1660,* Owen's text was the "only modern study of English philanthropy from the sixteenth century to the present" (Mowat 239). As the first of its kind for the time period, Owen's text does precisely what Mowat predicted, forming the "framework for future research" (Mowat 239). In *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England,* F. K. Prochaska explicitly states that it uses Owen as its starting point, saying that "the original object in undertaking this study was to fill one or two gaps in David Owen's distinguished *English Philanthropy 1660-1960*" (Prochaska vii).

aesthetic tool to capture the audience with recognizable cultural currency before abandoning literary subjects for other sources. As a product of both an individual author and the author's culture, literature can provide valuable insight into the beliefs of an author and the ideology of a particular population.

Nineteenth-century novels in particular prove useful for analyzing ideology due to authors' realist approaches. Harry Shaw describes the relationship between nineteenth-century realism and history in *Narrating Reality: Austen, Scott, Eliot* as "an attempt to deal with situations which involve partial knowledge and continual approximation, and in which history, existing on a continuum with our other forms of experience and being, can be known and represented with varying degrees of accuracy" (Shaw 29). While novels can only approximate reality, they "engage us in ways of thought and feeling that open onto reality as a presence" (Shaw 28). Historical documents and facts may have greater accuracy, but novels create a sense of reality by donning the garments of society, the seemingly inconsequential details of habit and belief. Speaking to the aims of George Eliot, the novelistic "fusion between fact and value" allows an author to place her work within a continuum of witnessing reality and advocating for a new system, ideally striking a balance of "showing how the real and ideal might inform one another" (Graver 79). An historicist approach to literature allows us to understand charitable discourse in Victorian novels as more than a reflection of the charitable concerns of the time but as an active part of societal conversation through fictional experiments and commentary.

Historical Framework

To understand the place of literature within charitable discourse, it is necessary to first present the historical framework. David Owen's *English Philanthropy* presents 19th-century

charity as a period of transition: the decrease of public charity led to experimentation in the realm of private charity, which, unable to provide universal support, was eventually replaced by greater governmental involvement by the end of the century (Owen 6). Unlike Owen, I do not limit my reading of charity to "pecuniary philanthropy" over a wide range of years; I take advantage of literature's insight into cultural norms and conventions to explore a wider sense of philanthropy within a narrower date range and locale (Owen 1). Restricting my focus to changes in private charity within the nineteenth century, I am interested in the philosophical stances and relationships of individuals undertaking charitable work voluntarily, albeit there are certain social pressures to be involved. During the Victorian period, philanthropy was an open issue, part of popular, including literary, debate, rather than confined to a specialized population within government.

Private individuals and societies pioneered new fields of charity and dictated terms of assistance due to the general hands off approach of the government, epitomized in the Poor Law. In 1834, this law was modified from its previous Elizabethan version, after a royal commission report in 1832 confirmed popular distrust of the law's efficacy: in addition to causing low wages and decreasing agricultural production, the law was administered corruptly (*Social* 38). The first recommendation in the 1834 Report stated that, barring medical assistance, "all relief whatever to able-bodied persons or to their families otherwise than in well-regulated workhouses….shall be declared unlawful" (*Social* 56). The Poor Law fashioned government support as a final resource to be sought only in desperation. Indeed, the 1834 report considers the conditions of the workhouse to be a test of need: if a person agrees to the rules of the poor house, "the compliance proves the truth of the claim, namely, his destitution" (*Social* 58). Despite the report's language that "relief in a well regulated workhouse would not be a hardship," the workhouses in reality

had inhumane conditions (*Social* 56). The poor were not treated as deserving citizens, but rather the "paupers—like prisoners—were required to wear distinctive clothing or 'uniforms,'" (Lee 83). Additionally, the "design of the buildings in which they were housed" shows how the "narrowest of conceptual margins" separated paupers from criminals (Horn *Labouring* 210). The reputation of the workhouses was so terrible, that the majority report of the 1909 Poor Law Commission notes that "the name 'Poor Law' has gathered about it associations of harshness, and still more of hopelessness" to the extent that the commissioners do not know if they can simply revise the law under the same name (*Social* 116).

The government's minimal support was meant to motivate the masses to work hard to avoid poverty, but it did not eliminate support of the poor; instead, it shifted the shaping of philanthropic efforts to private individuals. One of the most prominent private philanthropies in the latter part of the century, the Charity Organisation Society, was formed directly out of Poor Law proceedings, and this private organization saw one of its primary aims as creating "a clearly marked boundary between public and private relief" (Owen 222). Private philanthropy, however, followed the trajectory of public philanthropy towards greater distrust of the poor. With the growth of cities and new patterns of labor, charity could not continue in the same form as it had before with the same effects. Owen notes that "direct almsgiving and neighborhood charity, which in a village could be carried on without fear of being unduly imposed upon, now served to encourage the professional mendicant" or beggar (Owen 92). In 1815, an article in *Quarterly Review* claimed that "indiscriminate" giving was "a direct encouragement to idleness" ("Minutes" 140). In conjunction with this increasing public opinion, there was a growth of societies which acted as intermediaries between charity givers and receivers, in lieu of government structures. Many of the early societies were particularly interested in dealing with

the existence of beggars or mendicants. The name of these organizations, Mendicity Societies, reveals that their primary focus was not on helping individuals but fixing the problem of mendicants. While the term "mendicant" is associated with friars who live on alms, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, by the nineteenth century, people were not looking at begging as a viable way of obtaining funds, but a social ill to be discouraged ("Mendicant" 1a).

Not only did both public and private philanthropy move towards negative conceptions of the poor, but both developed in terms of organizational structure and an emphasis on supervision. The 1834 report on the Poor Law recommended a national board to oversee the smaller parochial administrators and required yearly reports. Private philanthropies followed suit with increased emphasis on oversight. The want of more systematic methods can be seen as early as 1815 when an article claimed that there was little effect in "diminishing the number of vagrants and street beggars" by London's "numerous institutions for the relief of suffering humanity, its munificent charities, both public and private, for alleviating distress in all its shapes" ("Minutes" 120). The problem was viewed not as a lack of funds but as a "want of some systematic appropriation" ("Minutes" 121). The paragon of the new scientific approach is the Charity Organisation Society (COS). Formed in 1869 in London, the COS was a highly organized effort to control charitable giving. The COS had no direct power over individual charities and was not particularly effective, but it had immense power in "setting the terms of social discourse for an entire generation and shaping both the idea of poverty and the conception of the problem of poverty" (Himmelfarb 186). As a monitory institute, it seemed "more interested in checking inefficient philanthropy than in promoting positive efforts," particularly after it took an aggressive stance against Dr. Barnardo's Homes in 1877 (Owen 230). COS's emphasis on monitoring was also a concern on the scale of interaction; while the society still emphasized contact between rich and poor, their

policy excluded spontaneous in-person donations. For charitable individuals unassociated with the COS, these interactions appeared sinisterly similar to Bentham's idea of supervisory control in the Panopticon. In the structure of a Panopticon, the prisoner is observed by an organized network, but cannot see himself who is observing him, just as COS visitors might collect information but they do not reciprocate the house visiting process; their own houses are not visited and observed (Foucault 200). The COS and their opponents differed in philosophy along the lines of a network-oriented and individual-oriented mindset. COS members conceived charity as a network of interactions towards a class of people, rather than a personal interaction with one's neighbor.

In the countryside, organizations like the COS did not exist as prevalently, correlating with the concentrations of both the poor and the would-be organizers. The difference between country and city affairs is evident in an 1838 report of the Society for the Suppression of Mendicity, which claims that "those who have only witnessed poverty in the country (in England, at least) have no idea of the squalid wretchedness in great towns" ("Reports" 343). The report compares the most humble cottage with "its little plot of garden, surrounded by the fresh air, and smiled upon by the blessed light of the sun, and in winter…cheered by its bright bit of fire" to the city dwelling where "three, sometimes four families are inmates of the same filthy dark *cellar*' (343). The restriction of space in a city makes it feel like a prison, without components of warmth, health, and happiness present in the country. The report emphasizes the correlation of quality of life and location, noting the greater ability to feed and warm oneself in the countryside. The greater specialization of work in the city means that workers not only lack the means of production, as Marx claims, but also the time and access to the full set of life necessities such as firewood and garden vegetables.

The independence of the countryside poor was not an ideal reality as the Society for the Suppression of Mendicity's report suggests. Where individuals in a city have access to each other, rural individuals are isolated to their individual parishes. Before the 1865 Union Chargeability Act, individual parishes were responsible for their own paupers, which meant that it was financially favorable for landowners to "keep the number of people down to as few as possible, so as to reduce the level of poor rate expenditure" (Horn *Labouring* 13). While there existed some "pockets of sheltered, protected and regimented rural communities" supported by landowners, they were few compared with the plentitude of "more independent, self-reliant, and exposed villages" (Thompson 97). The state of charity relied on the direct influence of a few wealthy individuals and charitable efforts were limited to the bounds of those individuals' parishes. While the countryside eventually experienced more systematic and organized charitable organizations, literature and popular conception retained a view of rural England as a place of positive, direct charitable relationships.

Literary Focus

The growth of public interest in charitable affairs coincided with an increase in representation of charitable affairs in Victorian literature. Earlier novels were not devoid of charitable scenes, yet the consequences of charitable interactions was generally less developed. Mr. B. in Samuel Richardson's 1740 novel *Pamela* mentions charity as a part of his wife's role, but he describes it with little enthusiasm. He tells her, "I will tell you what we will do, with regard to Points of your own private Charity…For I will allow you Two hundred Pounds a Year, which *Longman* shall constantly pay you, at Fifty Pounds a Quarter, for your own Use, and of which I expect no Account" (Richardson 366). Mr. B.'s lack of interest in the outcome of his

wife's charity reveals a lack of care about charity in general, which is confirmed when, in response to her happiness about her allowance, he responds, "Don't be uneasy, my Dear, about these Trifles" (366). The reader only learns about the superficial guidelines of upper class society, as imagined by Richardson, rather than the conventions of philanthropic relationships. The reader gets a better taste of how money and gifts define relationships in relation to Mr. B.'s gift-giving to Pamela and her family, prior to and after her marriage.

The social interactions and opinions of those who give and receive charity become more prominent in Victorian literature. Previous literary criticism has focused particularly on the confluence of sympathetic discourse on cross-class interactions[3]. Feeling with a character of a different class may promote empathy in a reader when the individual confronts a similar scene in reality, but intellectual conceptions of class relations, which have been less studied, can additionally inspire action. A closer parallel to my interest in the conventions of social interactions underpinning charity can be found in David Siegel's work on the role of condescension in Victorian charity. In "The Failure of Condescension" and then *Charity and Condescension,* Siegel looks at the condescension scene as a convention of Victorian literature and society. He notes that the fixed nature of conventions allows for them to be the battlegrounds for ideological changes, and he details how condescension changes from a tool for reconciliation between classes to a barrier between classes. Building off of Siegel and others' work, I am interested in continuing to understand the relationship between the giver and receiver in terms of each other's expectations. I am interested in charity givers' frameworks, whether it means the giver condescends, maintains her sense of identity, or gains in the transaction.

[3] Such work includes Elizabeth Deeds Ermath's "George Eliot's Conception of Sympathy," which considers how unity within and between people comes from a necessary difference and Lara Freeburg Kees's "'Sympathy' in Jane Eyre," which analyzes the sympathy between Jane and Rochester in terms of racial language.

The ideological framework and conventions of relationships in charity are present within many Victorian novels. Although space does not allow a complete examination of the Victorian canon, I will provide a brief analysis of three mid-century novels that suggest a trend of charitable relationships within literature: Anthony Trollope's *The Warden*, Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*, and Charles Dickens's *Bleak House*.

The primary philosophical debate in *The Warden* centers on the question of proper charitable actions. The narrator weighs the benefits of a direct relationship with the warden Mr. Harding with those of monetary funds. Though the system supporting Mr. Harding is corrupt—he receives funds which should be directly benefiting the men in the almshouses—the narrator suggests that the removal of a direct charity provider lessens the positive impact of the funds: "And how fared the hospital under this resolve of its visitor? Badly indeed….the warden's house is still tenantless…Six have gone, and the six vacancies remain unfilled! Yes, six have died, with no kind friend to solace their last moments, with no wealthy neighbor to administer comforts and ease the stings of death" (Trollope 280). With the reformation of the countryside, the narrator displays a fear of what happens when direct relationships are lost completely in the gift-giving process.

Where *The Warden* limits its scope to direct relationships and the countryside, Gaskell's *North and South* explores these items in conjunction with network relationships and urban environments. Through the main characters Margaret Hale and John Thornton, the narrator aligns the style of direct relationships to women and the countryside and network relationships to men and the city. Margaret loved her country home in rural Helstone since "its people were her people" and she was able to read to the elderly, help the sick, and teach the young (Gaskell 15). She only begins to like the city when "she had found a human interest" and visits with the

Higgins family regularly at their home. Mr. Thornton, however, believes in the natural separation of the classes working in the factory and an inevitable discord between their interests. As the two characters influence each other, the result is an experimental factory which will "bring the individuals of the different classes into actual personal contact" (426). Thornton reimagines the systemized factory through direct relationships, calling this new style a "breath of life." There must still be a division of labor where people relate to each other indirectly, but Thornton now believes that an idea "would lose its vitality, cease to be living, as soon as it was no longer carried on by that sort of common interest which invariably makes people find means and ways of seeing each other, and becoming acquainted with each other's characters and persons, and even tricks of temper and modes of speech" (427). Greater contact between the classes humanizes each party so that the exchange of labor for pay is strengthened by an exchange of conversation and hopefully ideas.

Compared to these previous two texts, Dickens' *Bleak House* treats charity more holistically, concerning charity in the form of child fosterage, will creation and charitable societies. The narrator's dislike of women's charitable societies particularly demonstrates his concern with network-based philanthropy. The reader experiences women's societies through Mrs. Jellyby and Mrs. Pardiggle. The former "devotes herself entirely to the public," specifically African charities, leaving no time at all for her children (Dickens 49). While Mr. Jarndyce insists that Mrs. Jellyby "means well," her inability to watch her children seems to justify Esther's claim that "it is right to begin with the obligations of home" (83-84). Mrs. Pardiggle does not neglect her children, but she neglects to develop real relationships with them; instead, she tries to treat them as empty vessels to be filled with her passion for philanthropy. She brings them everywhere and insists that they donate their little funds. Her lack of heart is associated with her

diction of business. She talks about kids having the "capacity of doing charitable business" and calls herself "a woman of business" (126, 127). Both women are less concerned with the direct relationships near them, which leads to problems for those around them, most directly their children. However, both characters are caricatures, rather than believable beings, making it hard to judge how far Dickens' portrayal is from a realistic philanthropic woman. Like *The Warden* and *North and South*, *Bleak House* proves an example of Victorian literature with deep interest in the means of charity.

While all three books are worthy of greater study, and examples from these novels will appear briefly as supplemental examples in the rest of the essay, I have chosen to compare the presentation of interpersonal relationships and rural philanthropy in Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* and George Eliot's *Middlemarch*. These two novels are well suited for examining the change in how Victorians understood charity relationships because they depict charitable relationships differently despite several common factors. Both novels explore multiple types of charity within a similar setting, the 1830's English countryside. Both are written by female authors with female protagonists. Yet *Jane Eyre*, written in 1847, emphasizes individual, emotional connection in philanthropy while *Middlemarch*, finished in 1872, concerns itself with communal interactions. These differences in charitable approach align with changing beliefs about charitable actions and the underlying principles of class relations. *Jane Eyre* represents a disappearing, direct form of relationship between givers and receivers while *Middlemarch* projects modern understanding of network-based relationships onto an earlier time period.

The differences in representations of charitable relationships do not necessarily derive only from the changing structure of society; the novels are written by different authors whose personal histories and situations impact their manner of storytelling. George Eliot was highly

educated and kept intellectually engaged with philosophical and scientific discoveries alongside her partner George Henry Lewes; conversation in her intellectual community about neural networks would have impacted how she conceived of social networks[4] in addition to any arguments she read while editing *Westminster Review* or conversations she had about the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, to which she "dutifully contributed in 1874" (Menke 624). Eliot's life differs from that of Charlotte Brontë, who went to boarding school and subsequently worked as a governess and teacher. In her biography of Brontë, Elizabeth Gaskell compares the fictional Lowood to Brontë's experience at Cowan Bridge, where the food was of a low quality and she was "in constant disgrace with her teachers" (Gaskell 57). The authors' particular experiences likely shaped the ways that they wrote about charitable relationships as well, but the experiential source of the authors' ideas does not imply that the written beliefs were held by only the authors themselves. The popularity of each novel within its own time frame—by 1879, *Middlemarch* had sold nearly 30,000 copies (Haight 443) and *Jane Eyre* had immediate success (Gaskell *Life* 262)—suggests that the novels resonated with the English population. Readers were not necessarily seeking out the charitable outlooks in the two novels, but regardless of whether the texts were used in formal arguments about charity, each would have informally provided readers with ideas about charitable relationships.

In this thesis, I will investigate both novels individually in order to demonstrate the consistency in charitable relationship representation within a given book. Per novel, my sections are structured by different types of charity. Both *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch* depict a range of charitable acts: the fostering of children, donations to public institutions, home visits to local poor, a range of charitable professions, and wills. Each of these forms has its own history and

[4] See Otis, Laura. *Networking: Communicating with Bodies and Machines in the Nineteenth Century*, 2001.

structure, and the direct and network relationship patterns uniquely impact how each form is represented. I will shift between examples at three levels of the novel—overall structure, plot details, and language choice—but I will take a moment here to treat each of these categories separately in regards to the novels generally.

Structurally, *Jane Eyre*, as the title suggests, follows a single woman's journey, including her experiences with philanthropy. *Middlemarch* does not center on an eponymous hero but rather deals with the intersections of townspeople's lives. Where *Jane Eyre* progresses in a forward marching style through a series of numerical chapters, *Middlemarch* is divided into eight thematic books. Within the books, the chapters do not occur in strictly chronological order, but occasionally look forward or backward, and individual chapters conspicuously frame themselves within the overlapping storylines. These structural differences, in addition to point of view and appeal to the reader, align each novel distinctively with individual interest and group concerns, direct relationships and network relationships.

The novels' structures facilitate the ways in which charitable acts occur in their respective plots. Jane Eyre meets and assesses charitable individuals one at a time, considering each with respect to their personal views and actions. She describes the strained relationships with Mrs. Reed and Mr. Rochester as foster parents without direct comparisons or equality in judgment. She cares less about the unnamed donors to Lowood than the individual teachers with whom she interacts, and she does not think about Lowood when considering the Olivers' donations to their local school. Jane's primary concerns are individual relationships founded on reciprocity. In contrast, in *Middlemarch*, Dorothea's plan to build better cottages in her neighborhood weaves through the entire novel, evolving as new characters interact with it.

Rather than dealing with people as individuals, Eliot founds each relationship in terms of the larger social network or a network of money.

On a third and final level, the diction of charity shifts between *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch*. Jane judges charitable interactions by the guidelines of reciprocation, endurance, and distance. Jane preferences actions which allow for the receiver to in some way reciprocate the giver. Reciprocation is naturally at odds with theories of endurance—single persons insensitive to what happens around them—and plans of distant assistance, in which there can be little interaction between giver and receiver. *Middlemarch*, on the other hand, devalues the individual desires of characters, which figure largely in *Jane Eyre*. It shifts the conversation from intentions to results, considering the ways that reality differs from charitable plans. Language in *Jane Eyre* emphasizes the qualities and integrity of individuals, while that in *Middlemarch* considers societal influences and scientific or experimental results.

Neither book favors charity blindly or trumpets one particular cause or approach. Instead, both novels comment on examples of charitable giving, speaking to foundational philosophies of charity. In line with philanthropic discussions of its time, *Jane Eyre* stresses relationships between giver and receiver, providing unique insight into the importance of reciprocity instead of a Christian, ascetic model of endurance. *Middlemarch* points out the increased systems approach that emerges out of the 1830's into Eliot's present day, but the novel cautions about negative externalities that result when systems are not fully considered, even suggesting that they cannot be completely understood, and that they present new moral problems. Together, these two novels provide commentary on the changing world of philanthropy from individualistic to systematic approaches and the parallel shift in conceiving of personal relationships as direct interactions or tenuous connections in a web.

CHAPTER ONE

Jane Eyre: Reciprocity in Direct Relationships

Jane Eyre defines the direct and individually-centered nature of her ideal charitable relationships when she identifies through physiognomy the contours of Mr. Rochester's charitable nature. For Jane, physiognomy reveals an individual's characteristics and role in the world. Looking over Rochester's features, she notes "a solid enough mass of intellectual organs, but an abrupt deficiency where the suave sign of benevolence should have risen" (195). Believing in physiognomy requires goodness to be predetermined and outwardly visible. It is the mark of an individual, not based on external forces. Rochester tries to establish the effect that society has on the individual, explaining that "when I was as old as you, I was a feeling fellow enough; partial to the unfledged, unfostered, and unlucky; but fortune has knocked me about since" (195). To reconcile these adjacent concepts requires separating mental processing—thoughts about philanthropy—from emotions—feelings about the poor. Rochester admits he is not a "general philanthropist"; his reasoning does not incline towards assistance, although he could feel tender about the generally disadvantaged. It is the emotional capacity which shrank with time while philanthropic potential remained constant, grounded in the individual's natural tendencies.

Instead of philanthropically viewing the general populace collectively and appreciating the need to give at large, he explains that he "bear[s] a conscience" (195). The clear distinction he draws between philanthropy and conscientiousness is between a public and a private act. Philanthropy denotes donating to others, to society, while conscience cannot be separated from the individual himself. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines philanthropy as "love of mankind; the disposition or active effort to promote the happiness and well-being of others; practical

benevolence, now esp. as expressed by the generous donation of money to good causes" ("Philanthropy" 1a). The focus of this goodness is "mankind" and "others," while *conscience* means an evening of debts within oneself, doing good to reciprocate for the goods one has received or to compensate for past wrongs done. Conscience is an awareness of the self in the equation of goodness. Two of the categories of definition for conscience in the *Oxford English Dictionary* are "senses involving consciousness of morality or what is considered right) (I) and "senses without a moral dimension" (II). There are more definitions under the moral dimension (6 numbered definitions), and definitions 8-10 are rare or obsolete in the non-moral section, leaving only 7 commonly used ("Conscience"). Yet in both cases, the definition is focused on consciousness and self-awareness.

Jane does not necessarily claim that Rochester's conscience is preferable to general philanthropy, but she does not challenge the value of conscientiousness either. She can appreciate the comparable good that conscience achieves in the same way that she values the particular traits of an individual, taking the time to assess physiognomy, no matter how unscientific the science seems to readers today.

Jane's appreciation of independence and the role of the individual occurs throughout the novel. *Jane Eyre* typifies what Philip Momberger calls Brontë's primary interest: "the experience of a single consciousness" (Momberger 349). As a first-person novel, the book moves from event to event in chronological order, accompanying a single individual through time and space. Even in addressing the reader, Jane shows her control over telling the tale. When desperate and begging in the village, she says, "Reader, it is not pleasant to dwell on these details," and then decides to move quickly forward in the story, saying, "Let me condense now. I am sick of the

subject" (492, 493). It is worth noting that Jane exerts her control in accordance to her personal beliefs; here she chooses not to linger on suffering or celebrate endurance.

The "doctrine of endurance" is the first formal philosophy Jane encounters through her childhood friend Helen Burns (78). The pair of Jane and Helen recalls the daughters Passion and Patience in *Pilgrim's Progress*.[5] In Bunyan's tale, Christian, the pilgrim protagonist, meets two girls: Passion, who "seemed to be much discontent" and "*will have all now*…in *this* World" and Patience, who is happy to wait quietly for glory in the afterlife (Bunyan 39). While Helen teaches Jane to be more reserved and patient, Jane does not subscribe to the holiness of endurance; patience tempers her passion, but she will remain patient only up to a point. She does not clamor for excessive goodness for the present—she tells Rochester that she has "little experience" of gifts and reserves her opinion of their goodness until she can consider all their "faces"—but she will not suffer unnecessary hardship (Brontë 178).

The foundations of Helen's belief are the Christian thought which powers Bunyan's narrative. Although Helen makes no direct references to Biblical passages, the language of endurance appears in Biblical sections such as 2 Timothy, which says, "thou therefore *endure* hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ" and "Therefore I *endure* all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory" (2 Timothy 2:3, 10; emphasis added). These same Christian influences were influential in shaping early philanthropic approaches. A home visiting guide from 1846 claims that the "undeserving are those who are the most forward to ask assistance, and the most likely to misemploy it when given" (Charlesworth 159). The poor should be expected to endure silently. The 8th Report of the

[5] Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is a novel with which most Victorian readers would be familiar. Paul Wheeler places it in the literary classics alongside the Bible and *Arabian Nights* (Wheeler 11).

Commissioners appointed by Parliament to inquire respecting Charities in 1823 somewhat mockingly explains the popular notion of the deserving poor: "the objects of distress, it is said, who shun the broad glare of daylight, who hide their heads and pine in solitude, must be sought out and comforted by the hand of charity" ("Eighth" 108).

In comparison to Helen's model, Jane advocates for people to take joy in assisting others and to aim for mutual companionship. Jane values situations in which all parties feel capable of contributing. The ability to reciprocate is essential to resentless gift-giving, as evidenced by French sociologist Marcel Mauss. Mauss conducted the "first systematic and comparative study of the widespread custom of gift exchange," published in his 1925 piece "An Essay on the Gift" (Mauss ix). While charity posits itself as a type of gift giving that demands no return payment, Mauss denies that a gift can be given without some reciprocation. He claims that "a gift necessarily implies the notion of credit" (Mauss 35). Gift giving requires that both parties partake. In discussing Maori gift exchange[6], Mauss claims that "the thing given is not inert. It is alive and often personified, and strives to bring to its original clan and homeland some equivalent to take its place" (Mauss 10). He places the expectation of return on the giver, yet the inherently personal nature of the gift allows reciprocation to come in a different form. This reciprocation can occur in actions, words, or feelings.

The system of exchange in *Jane Eyre* exists between individuals rather than clans of Maori, yet the principles of reciprocity hold. Readers must consider the effect of gift giving on the personal scale where relationships consist of direct give and take rather than interrelated actions diffused across a network. Historian Alan Kidd reaffirms the continuance of direct gift-

[6] The Maori are the indigenous people of New Zealand. They are one group of people that Mauss studies in addition to people in the Pacific Northwest and Melanesia.

reinforced relationships in market societies despite the fact that market reciprocity is primarily defined in terms of commodity and contracts (Kidd 183). He notes that "gift exchange remains a deep-rooted element," and that its power lies in the reciprocity which "creates solidarity and affirms relationships" (Kidd 183, 186).

The power of direct relationships aligns with the philosophy of Thomas Chalmers, a Victorian era Scottish minister and political economist who "fiercely resented the notion of public assistance partly because it would do violence to this sacred rapport" between the rich and poor (Owen 226). He wanted to retain strong relationships between charity providers and receivers, and rather than look at poverty as a systemic issue, he located the "source of social distress" within the individual person in need (Owen 226). Chalmers advocated for individualism in treating problems and has been credited with the modern concept of the case study. Chalmers successfully organized a new parish called St. John's in 1819, which attempted to reproduce the small country feel in his larger parish by having 25 deacons partitioning the parish and responsible for aid in each section. His ideas were not particularly popular in his time, with many doubting how successful the approach would work in more urban areas and whether they could function without a leader like Chalmers (Coats).

The action in *Jane Eyre* occurs mainly in secluded areas, yet Jane's movement in towns shows a more nuanced fear about direct charity breaking down in city life. In applying to work at Thornfield, Jane is excited about Thornfield's closeness to Millcote, a manufacturing town, since it should provide "life and movement" (129). Yet industry stays largely on the periphery of the novel until Jane finds herself starving and homeless after escaping Thornfield. As she fails to get help within the town, she repeatedly addresses the reader to express her lack of anger towards the townspeople. At one point, she claims, "I blamed none of those who repulsed me. I felt it was

what was to be expected" (492). She sees them judging her as an individual beggar, and she believes that any beggar might attract suspicion and "a well-dressed beggar inevitably so" (492). She sings a refrain of no blame to each individual with whom she interacts, feeling instead shame herself at her situation. The failure does not lie specifically in the fact that she is in a city, but in the fact that she is a stranger; however the sheer population of cities necessitates a greater sense of anonymity and isolation. Jane does not expect assistance when she has given nothing in return, stressing that the expected returns are acquaintance rather than the gloves or labor she wishes to exchange.

In all of the instances of charity she encounters, Jane juxtaposes theories of endurance and reciprocation, valuing the latter for its promotion of individualism and independence. She finds this the case with benefactors and foster parents, funders of schools, in her own teaching experience, and in the home visits and missionary intents of her cousin St. John. She does not discriminate between types of philanthropy, rather seeing a similar philosophic approach common to all forms.

Caretakers and Benefactors

When Mr. Brocklehurst interviews Jane prior to her departure from the Reeds' home, he provides her with the vocabulary to understand the type of charity she has received. In hearing Mrs. Reed referred to as a benefactress, Jane thinks, "Benefactress! benefactress!...they all call Mrs. Reed my benefactress; if so, a benefactress is a disagreeable thing" (Brontë 43). Through repetition, Jane processes the word, defining it for herself through her experiences and redefining it for the reader. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary,* the term "benefactor" denotes "one who renders aid or kindly service to others, a friendly helper; one who advances the interests of a

cause or institution, a patron," but, for Jane, it connotes something more unpleasant ("Benefactor" 1). Jane's experience of the term "benefactress" is the "disagreeable" relationship with the Reed family. Jane can never reach agreement with the Reeds because they do not allow her to reciprocate their charity through either feeling or action.

While the Reeds do not mention the degree to which Jane represents a financial burden, the household relates to Jane in economic terms. They do not find Jane worthy of the charity she receives because she does not work. In "'The Low, Vague Hum of Numbers': The Malthusian Economies of *Jane Eyre*," Linda Schlossberg claims that Jane feels separated from the Reed household because "she contributes nothing to the household domestic economy" (Schlossberg 497). The household members dismiss Jane's abilities to reciprocate the Reeds' philanthropy. John Reed informs her, "You have no business to take our books; you are a dependent, mama says; you have no money; your father left you none; you ought to beg, and not to live here with gentlemen's children like us, and eat the same meals we do, and wear clothes at our mama's expense" (Brontë 8). While Schlossberg points out how John differentiates between gentlemen's children and orphan children, she does not mention John's diction in the preceding statement: John tells Jane that she has "no business" and that she is a "dependent." According to the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)*, a dependent is "a person who depends on another for support, position, etc.: a retainer, attendant, subordinate, servant" ("Dependent" 2). Jane in fact uses this term to describe her working position at Thornfield upon realizing that Miss Fairfax is "no great dame, but a dependent like myself" (Brontë 147). Thus the title on its own does not suggest that Jane does not contribute meaningfully to the household. Yet it is coupled with the claim that she has "no business," albeit referring to her right to read the Reeds' books. The phrase suggests that John sees Jane as lacking in "a person's duty, part or role" in the household, and equally without

"regular, habitual, or stated profession"—the two *OED* definitions of "business" when used in a possessive sense ("Dependent" 10a, 13a). Her status as an orphan impedes her from defining the terms of any relationship within the house. The servant Abbott confirms that, while John labels her akin to a servant, her actual place is one "less than a servant, for [she does] nothing for [her] keep" (11).

Jane's lack of reciprocation does not come from a lack of will. Mistakenly, both contemporary and modern reviewers have believed that Jane's lack of reciprocation derives from a personal failing: an 1853 review, Jane was described as "proud, and therefore she is ungrateful, too" while Schlossberg expressed in 2001 Jane's "determined refusal to feel grateful" (qtd. in Gilbert 338, Schlossberg 498). Both place a lack of gratitude on a personal decision rather than a natural mimicry facilitated by her relationship with Mrs. Reed. Jane's aunt cannot see Jane as equivalent to her children so Jane does not respond as Mrs. Reed's child, but rather with anger and spite. Her negative reaction displays the negative side of Maussian principles of gift exchange. For Mauss, gift-exchange acts as an equalizer where "confusion of personalities and things is precisely the mark of exchange contracts" (Mauss 18). By keeping Jane distant, Mrs. Reed prohibits any exchange of emotions and empathy, only an exchange of reserve and contempt.

A further lens through which to grasp the benefactor-recipient relationship in *Jane Eyre* is through the subversive mimicry of postcolonial theory. While Homi Bhabha's theory of mimicry has many dimensions, part claims that the colonized mimic the colonizers, creating a destabilizing mirror which is "almost the same, but not quite" (Bhabha 130). Calling it a "double vision," Bhabha sees this power "in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also [disrupting] its authority" (Bhabha 129). The colonist's viewpoint of "gifting" their culture and

finding that the result is not identical, but rather resistant, correlates with Mrs. Reed's one-sided gift-giving. In restricting gift-giving to a single side, Mauss thinks an individual would disrupt "the ends and peace of the whole…the rhythm of its work and pleasures, and hence in the end…the individual" (Mauss 75). Blocking reciprocal exchanges breaks down the effectiveness and mutual gain of the system, seen in the ire Jane spits at her benefactress.

Jane does attempt to contribute to the household despite her feelings and her relatives' attempts to block her action. Mrs. Reed admits that she keeps Jane physically apart although "she regretted to be under the necessity of keeping [Jane] at a distance" (Brontë 3). She places the blame on Jane and claims that distance is necessary since Jane lacks a "sociable and childlike disposition" (3). Jane attempts to understand what she has done wrong, asking, "What does Bessie say I have done?" but Mrs. Reed does not condescend to supply a substantial reason for both physical and emotional distance (4). Jane internalizes this distance. She calls herself "a discord," a single note which distracts from the otherwise harmony of the household; she does not purposefully misplay but is by nature separate (16).

Although Jane feels like a discord, there is no material basis behind her separation from the Reeds. Admittedly, Schlossberg points to the ways in which Jane is characterized as a different animal species, making her physically distinct from her relatives, and Jane herself claims to have "physical inferiority" to her cousins (Schlossberg 496, Brontë 3). Yet Mrs. Reed does not find physical limitations to be insurmountable when it comes to her son, who remains at home "on account of his delicate health" (Brontë 7). Mrs. Reed extends emotional sympathy to her son but not to Jane, her object of charity. Jane cannot offer emotional recompense since it depends on first being offered from the position of power. Philanthropy works similar to sympathy as theorized by Lara Freeburg Kees, where "the sympathizer…remained in the

position of power as the one who could choose whether or not to extend sympathy" (Kees 877). Jane explains that "if they did not love me, in fact, as little did I love them" (17). Setting up her sentence to suggest cause and effect, Jane finds herself dependent on the Reeds not just for food, but for instructing her emotionally. Her feelings change in direct proportion to their emotional expenditures on her. Jane separately categorizes gifts of sustenance and affection in parallel to Mrs. Reed's own manner. She recognizes that while her aunt supplies one type of charity, she lacks the other. When Bessie momentarily relieves her suffering in the Red Room, Jane begs of her aunt "Oh aunt, have pity! Forgive me! I cannot endure it—let me be punished some other way! I shall be killed if—" (20). Jane requires the psychological and emotional sympathy that Mrs. Reed lacks to the same degree she needs Mrs. Reed's physical assistance. The terror of the red room represents an actual reality for Jane that requires her to physically "endure" and presents the threat of physical death.

When Jane visits Mrs. Reed on her deathbed, Jane hopes to alleviate her aunt's spirit of endurance by applying the philosophy of reciprocity she develops in her relationship with Rochester. The sense of equality of spirit between Jane and Rochester is foreshadowed in their first encounter. Having fallen from his horse, Rochester is on Jane's level. She revels in the moment because she finally feels that she is able to do something: "My help had been needed and claimed; I had given it: I was pleased to have done something; trivial, transitory though the deed was, it was yet an active thing, and I was weary of an existence all passive" (170). The activeness of doing good excites Jane, and in her following relationship with Rochester, she continues to give rather than just receive; she exchanges ideas with him through conversation, rather than simply taking commands.

Jane's experience with reciprocal interpersonal relationships leads Jane to try to reconcile any turmoil she caused in her childhood. The distance that time provides allows Jane to approach anew her relationship with Mrs. Reed. She claims that "time quells the longings of vengeance, and hushes the promptings of rage....I came back to her now with no other emotion than a sort of ruth for her great sufferings, and a strong yearning to forget and forgive all injuries" (343). Jane hopes that approaching her aunt with forgiveness will lead to reciprocal forgiveness, but Mrs. Reed reveals an unchanging demeanor. Her unwillingness to change and be changed by a direct personal relationship persists from an early prejudice against Jane. Mrs. Reed explains, "I had a dislike to her mother always," and "I hated it [baby Jane] the first time I set my eyes on it" (345-6). Although Jane seeks to relieve a sense of enduring battle in her relationship with Mrs. Reed, her aunt will not yield. Mrs. Reed played her role of benefactress without any emotional sympathy, having been biased from prior history and first acquaintance. The relationship of provider-recipient was determined by the provider in a way that the recipient cannot manipulate or adjust, despite her best intentions. Jane in fact claims that "many a time, as a little child, I should have been glad to love you if you let me" (357). She was not able to give love that was not received by Mrs. Reed.

In addition to emotional payment, Jane also attempts economic reciprocation. As a child, "Bessie now frequently employed [her] as a sort of under-nurserymaid, to tidy the room, dust the chairs, etc." (Brontë 39). Jane proceeds to account her attempts at this job:

> Having spread the quilt and folded my night-dress, I went to the window-seat to put in order some picture-books and doll's house furniture scattered there; an abrupt command from Georgiana to let her playthings alone (for the tiny chairs and mirrors, the fairy plates and cups were her property) stopped my proceedings; and then, for lack of other

> occupation, I fell to breathing on the frost-flowers with which the window was fretted, and thus clearing a space in the glass through which I might look out on the grounds, where all was still and petrified under the influence of a hard frost. (39)

Jane only manages to do work with regard to her own possessions—a quilt and her night-dress—since Georgiana restricts Jane from helping. Jane's detailed description of the doll furniture in parentheses suggests that her actions are somewhat prompted from a jealous interest in these items rather than a simple desire to repay through cleaning. It is at the "command" of Georgiana that Jane finds herself without "occupation." Unable to reciprocate the charity she has been given through work, Jane finds herself simply "breathing," relegated to her own body and only able to define enough space for herself to look out on a cold, hard world.

While looking outdoors, Jane notices a "little hungry robin" which she decides to feed with the "remains of [her] breakfast of bread and milk" (40). Rather than diffuse her need to contribute into nature in general, Jane directs her reciprocal energy toward a direct object, a robin. Jane's relief indicates the burden she feels from receiving charity, similar to the feeling of danger Mauss found among the Maori who felt that the "thing given is not inert," but "strives to bring to its original clan and homeland some equivalent to take its place" (Mauss 10). Jane's relief is not explicit but enacted by a sash containing crumbs: after tugging at it, suddenly, "the sash yielded; I scattered the crumbs, some on the stone sill, some on the cherry-tree bough" (40). The spread crumbs are not confined to a single location, but spring outward as Jane's small contribution. However, this action produces some guilt in that Jane is redistributing the gift of food provided to her by the Reeds rather than directly reciprocating the Reeds. Jane's charitable act is furtive. When Bessie asks what she is doing, Jane does not respond right away, but "gave another tug before [she] answered, for [she] wanted the bird to be secure of its bread" (40). She

fears not being able to follow through on her act, and her guilt shows on her face, prompting Bessie to exclaim, "You look quite red, as if you had been about some mischief: what were you opening the window for?" (40). Jane's inability to directly reciprocate the Reeds' charity leads to a partial reprieve from her burden of debt toward this robin.

Jane's urge to feed the birds, providing for the hungry, recurs when she is listless on the marshes after leaving Thornfield. She thinks it is "far better that crows and ravens…should pick my flesh from my bones, than that they should be prisoned in a workhouse coffin and moulder in a pauper's grave" (Brontë 495). Though either condition leaves her dead, Jane would rather be in the country where she can potentially contribute to the hungry birds. Jane conceives of her indebtedness to nature or to God in a direct fashion where her own body repays the privilege of her existence.

Jane's relationship with Mrs. Reed aligns with Adèle's relationship with Rochester, despite differences in age. Adèle is only seven or eight compared to ten-year-old Jane, who began the novel, and she also exerts agency, as Mr. Rochester asks Adèle whether she wants to live with him (147, 7, 151). Though younger and less restricted than Jane was, Adèle recognizes that Mr. Rochester has "not kept his word" to be her guardian as he vacates the house frequently (151). In *The Madwoman in the Attic*, Gilbert and Gubar speak to the thematic absenteeism in *Jane Eyre*: "Mrs. Fairfax [was the]…surrogate of an absent master, just as Mrs. Reed was a surrogate for dead Mr. Reed or immature John Reed, and Miss Temple for absent Mr. Brocklehurst" (348). This absenteeism marks a similar failure between Mrs. Reed and Mr. Rochester. When he is around, he is slightly better than Mrs. Reed, willing to go through the motions of reciprocation as Adèle parades around in a dress he gave her. These slight allowances speak more to Rochester's endurance of suffering than his reciprocity with Adèle, as he bears the

similarity of Adèle to her "maman" (207). Most of the time he wants Adèle to remain as still as Jane was asked to be. Before giving her a present, he tells Adèle, "Don't bother me with any details of the anatomical process, or any notice of the condition of the entrails: let your operation be conducted in silence" (191). Her disembowelment of the gift is a joke to him, a pretend surgery. The threat of matrimony to Blanche Ingram means Adèle going to school, further mirroring Jane's life path.

Jane intercedes in Adèle's life to correct the problematic imbalance that echoes her own childhood. She saves Adèle not only from a poor boarding school, but during her time as governess, Adèle is able to transfer some of her fellow feeling to Jane as Mr. Rochester's intermediary. To Mr. Rochester, Adèle is a "poor thing" that he "took…out of the slime and mud of Paris, and transplanted…here, to grow up clean in the wholesome soil of an English country garden" (214). He condescends to her, viewing her as an object and considering her destitution light-handedly, as a bit of a joke. Jane takes Adèle's situation seriously. She makes it clear that "Adèle is not answerable for either her mother's faults or [Mr. Rochester's]," seeing beyond the limits of Mrs. Reed, who did not like her for her own mother (215). She resolves indeed to have the opposite reaction, wanting to "cling closer to her than before" (215). She values Adèle's situation since it allows them to have a relationship on an even keel: Jane asks "how could I possibly prefer the spoilt pet of a wealthy family, who would hate her governess as a nuisance, to a lonely little orphan, who leans towards her as a friend?" (215). She does not want to save Adèle, looking forward to being her friend. Jane is able to make amends for her own childhood fosterage by promoting directness in relations when Adèle does go to school. She makes sure the school is "near enough to permit of [Jane's] visiting often," correcting Rochester's decision to send her to a place not unlike Lowood which is strict and leaves Adèle thin (678). Although

Rochester never explicitly treats his ward better, the reciprocity between Rochester and Jane and then Jane and Adèle creates a chain of positive direct relationships and a functional home life.

The second type of caretaker Jane and Adèle experience is the boarding school, and for Jane, school additionally experiences the school as a form of charity from distant benefactors. Jane's experience with charitable school supporters differs widely in the cases of Lowood and the Olivers: where the former is a case of absenteeism that leads to suffering, the latter is her ideal of philanthropic involvement. While Gilbert and Gubar speak to the presence of women in the place of men, temporary and less powerful agents, the absenteeism in the book goes beyond gender bounds. Mr. Brocklehurst, even when present, acts as a figurehead for the collective support of "different benevolent-minded ladies and gentlemen in this neighbourhood and in London" (70). While the male and female donors might be conceived of as a supporting network, they are described instead as being embodied and represented in a direct agent. Yet as a direct agent, Brocklehurst lacks the emotional investment of Miss Oliver.

Though he is a donor himself, Brocklehurst's presence at the school does not indicate greater involvement or connection with the students than those shown by the distant donors. Jane notes that "he never took steps to make himself liked" (98). He holds himself at a distance and takes pleasure in informing the students that his daughter thinks their clothing makes them "almost like poor people's children" (46). While Brocklehurst thinks "humility is a Christian grace," he only forces the students to learn this lesson while he lets his daughter Augusta wear a silk gown and feel distinct from the Lowood girls (46). He threatens to cut Julia Severn's hair in the name of humility just as his own daughters walk in with "a profusion of light tresses, elaborately curled" (92). He holds the charity girls at a distance from himself and his family, rather than acknowledging that all share the same reality. His dual standard mirrors the

allowances for misbehavior and illness that Mrs. Reed allows in her own children while demanding more of Jane.

Aside from Mr. Brocklehurst, Lowood's subscribers are not connected to the occurrences of the school. They do make improvements to the school, but only after the high number of typhus fever deaths "[drew] public attention on the school" (120). Donors are not more privy to information than the public; it is only with "inquiry" that they know "the unhealthy nature of the site; the quantity and quality of the children's food; the brackish, fetid water used in its preparation; [and] the pupils' wretched clothing and accommodations" (120). After this exposé, when "several wealthy and benevolent individuals in the country subscribed largely," their investment comes in more than terms of funds alone (120). They donate for the specific purpose of "the erection of a more convenient building in a better situation" and with the expectation of "new regulations…improvements in diet and clothing," and the creation of a committee to manage the school's funds (120-121). Though regulations and an advisory committee sound like features of the Poor Law of 1834, these changes are not at the expense of valuing the poor as unworthy; the donors instead have a greater emotional bond and closer connections than previously. More donors must be involved directly in the decision-making of the charity and in close proximity to their good works.

In comparison to the Lowood School, Jane's second house of learning has a much more involved benefactor. Jane experiences Miss Oliver's attachment to the school in her first encounter. Miss Oliver explains that when she heard that there was a new schoolmistress, she "put on [her] bonnet after tea, and ran up the valley to see her" (545-546). Her enthusiasm precipitates as haste. Likewise, her care is evident in her inquiry about the furnishings of the house and the attendant she provided. Miss Oliver happily informs Jane that she "shall come up

and help you to teach sometimes," albeit her motive is less of a desire to do good than to have variety in her own life; Miss Oliver says, "It will be a change for me to visit you now and then" (546). When she does come, it is "made in the course of her morning ride," part of her schedule, and more in sync with her wish to see Mr. Rivers teach catechism than to teach herself (551). Her reasons for involvement may appear selfish, but I would not go as far as Marianne Novy, who compares Rosamond Vincy in *Middlemarch* to *Jane Eyre's* Rosamond Oliver (Novy 67). Where Vincy looks down on her fellow townspeople, Oliver acts in a way that knits together the community. Where Rosamond Vincy is interested in other people only in terms of her social network, Rosamond Oliver has direct relationships with the individual children in the school, even inviting them to her home. Miss Oliver suggests that her father "give the whole school a treat at Christmas," and above supporting the school at large, the family cares to support additional students: when St. John reveals that Jane is an heiress, Jane has just found out that she is expecting four new students, two for whom the Olivers will pay (569). Miss Oliver's physical presence and emotional availability provide the opportunity for reciprocation and fellowship that was unavailable to Jane at Lowood.

Professional Charity: Educators

While the beginning of the 19th century saw an increase in enthusiasm for popular education and a similar increase in societies for helping the poor, when Jane becomes involved in education, she is the sole schoolmistress in the village working directly with the children. The narrator does not mention other types of school support, such as the prominent National Society, which started in 1809 and raised 725,000 pounds by its 50th anniversary (Owen 116). Nor does the narrator consider the impact that the government can have on schooling systems, despite the

fact that the first educational grant was given in 1833: 20,000 pounds for school buildings (Owen 119). Instead, the role of the individual teacher takes the forefront, placing Jane into the position of a teacher[7].

Organizing her own school for the poor girls in St. John's parish provides Jane with her greatest philanthropic agency. This experience provides the clearest window into understanding the feelings and ideas of charitable individuals. In his article "Charlotte Brontë on the Pleasure of Hating," Christopher Lane claims that Brontë's "novels are haunted—and sometimes overwhelmed—by surplus enmity" (Lane 200). Though he focuses on *Villette* and *Shirley*, Lane makes it a point of common knowledge that critics view *Villette* as "a sublime fulfillment of the hostility surfacing in *Jane Eyre*" (201). While Lane goes on to complicate this progression of enmity, I am interested in the hostile undercurrents Lane notes in *Jane Eyre*, in particular related to philanthropic enterprises. Philanthropy surfaces but once in Lane's article, in relation to critic Peter Gay: "'The rage to improve the world,' Peter Gay writes of Victorian philanthropy, was 'usually called benevolence,' but was in practice closer to 'what Freud called a reaction formation—a defense mechanism that converts aggressive feelings into their opposite and masks them" (211). If Jane has misanthropic underpinnings, Gay's claim would suggest the existence of reaction formation in Jane's good works in the charity school. Yet this misanthropy sounds more similar to Helen Burns's beliefs as she asks Jane to "love [her] enemies; bless them that curse

[7] While voluntary societies and public support for schools were increasing, Bronte's decision to make Jane a teacher corresponds with an actual rise in female teachers and governesses. By 1841, the census showed that there were 29,840 schoolmistresses and governesses in England and Wales, notably more than the 17,620 males in these positions (Horn *Victorian* 195). The need for these positions increased over the century, climbing to 171,670 women schoolmistresses and governesses by 1901 (195). At the same time, the literary convention of the governess was being established around the time *Jane Eyre* was written; Patricia Thomson marks the start of this convention with Lady Blessington's *The Governess* in 1839 (Thomson 43).

[her]" (81). Instead, Jane finds meaning in teaching because she manages to develop reciprocal relationships with the girls she teaches.

Prior to obtaining the opportunity to teach at her own school, Jane expresses her interest in setting up such a school, although she does not specifically look to create a charitable school. When Rochester pretends to be a fortuneteller, he asks if she has "some secret hope to buoy [her] up and please [her] with whispers of the future" (294). She answers in the negative: "Not I. The utmost I hope is, to save money enough out of my earnings to set up a school some day in a little house rented by myself" (294). While it is unclear whether she objects to her dream being labelled secretive or buoyant, she does not express her teaching dreams in figurative or fantastic terms. Nor does she frame her actions as charitable; her primary interest in it is the ability to be independent as she discusses her earnings and a schoolhouse she herself rents.

Rochester-as-fortuneteller dismisses her dream as "mean nutriment for the spirit to exist on" (294). This debasement comes in a joking manner, as he is primarily trying to draw out her affection for him, but his words suggest he attributes little value to professional work in general and to her teaching profession in particular. Nor does belittlement of the teaching profession appear to be entirely class-based. St. John regards the actual position he provides for Jane with the same disdain with which Rochester regards her dream position: "he seemed half to expect an indignant, or at least a disdainful rejection of the offer" (532). The offer is not precisely Jane's ideal, as she does not own the building, but she does have full control of the curriculum. In fact it is the very "independent" nature of the position that overpowers any worry about the "plodding" nature of the work (532). Additionally, her drive to work comes from a desire to reciprocate the kindness St. John's family has shown her through housing, sick care, and food. St. John confirms that Jane grasps the limited reach of the position, specifically asking her "you know what you

undertake, then?" (533). She does not enter the position hatefully but is aware of its positive and negative aspects.

Despite her realistic outlook, Jane does find herself surprised at the beginning of her work by the lack of reward. She hopes to have "some happiness" in teaching the girls, but she does not expect "much enjoyment" and is "weakly dismayed at the ignorance, the poverty, the coarseness of all [she] heard and saw round [her]" (539). She does not take joy in her pain or feel hostility towards the children. Jane even carefully spares herself from self-judgment, writing "but let me not hate and despise myself too much for these feelings [of dismay]: I know them to be wrong—that is a great step gained; I shall strive to overcome them" (539). She tries to remain positive and look towards the future rather than congratulating herself for enduring suffering in the present. Jane hopes to "live on from day to day" believing that the power of improvement lies in her own mind and powers (539).

Jane's expectations for displeasure in running a school are based on her experiences working at Lowood, a charity school itself, for two years, where she modeled Miss Temple's behavior. Miss Temple is in charge of the school when Mr. Brocklehurst is away, and she is kind to the students, even giving them food from her own expenses (66). Yet Miss Temple does not stand up directly to Mr. Brocklehurst, and she lets other teachers, such as Miss Scatcherd, inflict cruelty on the students. Because of this, movie versions of *Jane Eyre* often modify Miss Temple's position. In the 1996 film version, for example, Miss Temple is kind to Jane and Helen but appears to be the subordinate of Miss Scatcherd. The idea that a good character could be a bystander to the unkind actions around her does not work for a modern film audience. Yet in the novel, Jane somewhat adopts this attitude of quiet suffering from her friend. Jane describes having "imbibed from her something of her nature and much of her habits; more harmonious

thoughts: what seemed better regulated feelings" (122). Jane explains that she had given in to "duty and order," and that Jane "believed [she was] content: to the eyes of others, usually even to [Jane's] own, [she] appeared a disciplined and subdued character" (122). Yet Jane does not consider this her natural state but rather an assumed state to please her friend Miss Temple. When Miss Temple leaves to marry Reverend Nasmyth, Jane feels herself "left in [her] natural element" (122). Having lost the training of Miss Temple, she reverts to her natural belief in liberty. She does not ask for full liberty, only a "new servitude," since servitude "must be a matter of fact" (124). She wants only to serve elsewhere, exerting a small amount of her will, which has generally been weakened at Lowood.

At the Olivers' school, Jane has no servitude at all but happiness built on her growing relationships with her pupils. At the beginning, her students appeared "hopelessly dull; and at first sight, all dull alike: but [she] soon found [she] was mistaken. There was a difference amongst them as amongst the educated; and when [she] got to know them, and they [her], this difference rapidly developed itself" (549). The progress of her pupils is evident: she sees her school triple, from twenty scholars where only three can read to sixty, including "some half-dozen…as decent, respectable, modest, and well-informed young women as could be found in the ranks of the British peasantry" (533, 585). In a lengthy description of their change, she continually refers to it in reciprocal terms. Jane talks about "their amazement at [her]" in the same sentence in which she calls them "sharp-witted girls enough" and explains how she "began personally to like some of the best girls and they liked [her]" (549).

After receiving her uncle John's fortune, she leaves her teaching position but promises to visit weekly. At this juncture, Jane reveals the extent of reciprocity in her teacher-student relationships. She makes sure that her leave is "not barren on [her] side," which gains financial

implications after her following statement that "to give somewhat when we have largely received, is but to afford a vent to the unusual ebullition of the sensations" (585). Despite appearing to reference her newly found fortune, when she discusses the other "side" of the parting, the side of the students, she considers exclusively their emotions. Jane feels "gratification…to find [she] had really a place in their unsophisticated hearts" (585). She realizes that the gift they have received from her—their education and relationship with her—can only be repaid by her continued presence in their lives, so she keeps the reciprocation looped, promising "that never a week should pass in future that [she] did not visit them, and give them an hour's teaching in their school" (585). Jane no longer values teaching for the ability to own and run the school independently; she calls it "their" school and looks forward to teaching as her way of giving. This is not the misanthropy Lane reads in Brontë's works, where he thinks she "sometimes implies that these characters would be happiest if they could dissolve these ties completely" (Lane 201). While teaching may require an exceptional amount of Jane's energy, she believes in the benefit of the resulting direct relationships. Jane can express her citizenship through relationships; citizenship does not need to be "inseparable from aggression" or repressed suffering (Lane 201).

Professional Charity: Home Visitors

While visiting the poor has been consistently viewed as a duty of the professional parish minister, in the 1830s and 1840s, visiting the poor in their homes became popular among middle and upper-class individuals, particularly women (Siegel 403). In discussing these home visits, an 1823 report from Poor Law Commissioners noted that "this species of charity is equally prevalent in town and country—it is quite in vogue" ("Eighth" 108). Home visits continued to

flourish over the nineteenth century. By 1889, the Church of England had on record 47,000 home visitors, and their numbers continued to grow, almost doubling by 1910 (Goodlad 7). The conception of this form of charity and its place within philanthropy did shift, however.

A home visit allows for personal interaction, a chance to give physical, monetary or religious support. Religion served as a major motivator for these personal encounters, as is evident from the organization of visitors through the Church of England. Historian Frank Prochaska specifically cites Matthew 25 as a "powerful influence on these women" visitors (Prochaska 121). In this passage, Jesus says first to his worthy followers, "For I was a hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me" (Matthew 25:35-36). Visiting is as important as providing food, water, shelter, and clothing. The Bible then clarifies that "inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me" (Matthew 25:40; original emphasis). Interacting with the poor then becomes a religious experience in itself, bringing one closer to God. The Bible also suggests that Christians "be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares" (Hebrews 13:2). In addition to the potential benefits of this interaction, Matthew 25 also provides negative reinforcement, as those who did not feed, water, shelter, clothe and visit the poor must go "into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41). Prochaska lists fervent religiosity as the distinct feature of nineteenth-century philanthropic women, or more specifically "their belief, inspired by Christ, that love could transform society" (Prochaska 15).

Yet the congregation of poor in cities meant that it was harder to indiscriminately give, requiring greater structure. The structure of visiting within cities increased with the advent of

visiting organizations. Visitors were encouraged to not give physical sustenance in a sporadic way, stressing instead the scriptural opportunity. By not providing food, the visitors do not reciprocate the privilege of welcome into a cottage with direct benefits. Instead, the supposed benefit comes in the form of created connections in a circuit or rather the positive influence of being connected to the network of Christian thought and a circle of gentlewomen. That is not to say that visitors never provided funds nor that prior visits were chiefly about physical giving. In an 1846 guide for female visitors, Maria Charlesworth, an English author whose father was a clergyman, discusses the restriction of giving physical aid to the deserving poor and "counsel and warning" to the undeserving poor, those who are "most forward to ask assistance" (Charlesworth 159). Even with the so-called deserving, Charlesworth notes that "it is well to avoid as much as possible, the constant association of our visits with the bestowment of charity; the poor are degraded by it, and we take the position of a mere dispenser of money, rather than of one who comes as a welcomed friend" (162). She does not mean that "less should be bestowed upon the deserving poor" only that it should not "induce a spirit of dependence" (163). Similarly, the Society for the Suppression of Mendicity reports in 1839 that "'Go, work'…is very easily said; but we know that it is not so easily done" (344). Yet their primary conclusion in terms of how to relieve the problem of mendacity is in claiming that it is "a point of clear and urgent duty, not to give money in the streets—but *tickets,* which will ensure attention to the case, and relief, if relief be really required" (369). The object of the ticket solidifies the concept of the deserving poor's "return 'gift'…i.e. the status of being deserving," as well as the religious fervor of home visitors (Kidd 187). The deserving poor additionally follows religious thought; in Matthew 5, Jesus blesses among others those who are "poor in spirit," "meek," "they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness," and "they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake" (*Matthew*

5:3-11). Those which will "inherit the earth" and "see God" are not the forthcoming and resourceful, but those that are needy in a passive way. This system retains a focus on independence and individualism. The concept of society or a network ironically increases individualism as each person becomes a unique hub in the network with a particular role and function.

The level of organization varied based on geography. In more rural areas, "individual women worked on their own initiative" while "in large towns, District Visitors did similar work in a more organized capacity on behalf of the church or chapel to which they belonged, reporting to it regularly on the work they had carried out and the individuals they had encountered" (Summers 34-35). The title "District Visitor" connotes a job position, and this business diction was coupled with a formal reporting system. A visiting society was an opportunity for women to have something like a profession since the religious and home-making nature of the role was seen by men as a natural extension of feminine home occupations. Though these changes were beneficial for the women visitors and meant to increase efficiency of service, they fostered feelings of Panopticon-like oversight. This difference can be illustrated in the country-based and city-based approaches of Margaret in *North and South* and Mrs. Pardiggle in *Bleak House.* Margaret approaches her urban house visits in the same manner she approached her country visits; she focuses on reciprocity, letting Bessie know that visiting her has "done me good" (135) Meanwhile, in Dickens's *Bleak House*, Esther dislikes her first house visiting, feeling like she is "intrusive and out of place," primarily because Mrs. Pardiggle, the charity woman who set up the visit, is "much too business-like and charitable" (132, 130). Where things can go unseen in the countryside, they are under observation in the city.

Home visits in *Jane Eyre* do not include instances of urban, organized, female societies, but some of the fears regarding these increasingly popular groups are projected onto the more traditional form of home visits: those of the clergy. The first mention of home visits is associated with Jane's father, a clergyman who "caught the typhus fever while visiting among the poor of a large manufacturing town" and who passed the disease on to his wife (Brontë 32). This description elicits the pity of Bessie, who "sighed and said, 'Poor Miss Jane is to be pitied too,'" somewhat romanticizing the home visiting by conflating it with how Jane's mother married for love and was "cut...off without a shilling" (Brontë 32). Yet Bessie's pity simultaneously connotes home visiting with tragedy and danger.

The image of individuals not connected with societies, visiting for religious reasons, continues with St. John, the character seen home visiting most frequently in *Jane Eyre*. With St. John, the dual nature of home visits is further explored, with Jane celebrating the goodness of the act yet noting the spirit of endurance it requires. Though St. John's home visiting is an expected part of his profession rather than part of an organization's mission, his manner of visiting the poor embodies the form of home visiting that the Charity Organisation Society (COS) would advocate beginning in the 1870's. The COS did not want individuals to provide pecuniary support or to visit spontaneously (Siegel 402, 404). When St. John is called off to visit a dying woman, he takes only his cloak, no additional goods, and, since the woman is dying, seems to be going purely for spiritual support. He was invited by a young boy and is thus expected to call. The rest of his visits, not associated with the dire need of his parishioners, lack spontaneity as well.

Jane, however, finds his style of interaction unsettling. When she first mentions St. John's home visiting, she frames it in terms of how it has limited their relationship. After

describing the amiable routine she has established with St. John's sisters, she explains that the same intimacy "did not extend to him" (526). The first reason for their emotional distance is his physically separation: "he was comparatively seldom at home: a large proportion of his time appeared devoted to visiting the sick and poor among the scattered population of his parish" (526). Jane focuses on his physical distance, emphasizing that he is away from home and that the population of the parish is scattered. She notes that he does not handle matters of the home, but those separate from it, an attitude which extends into her opinions of his missionary intentions.

More troubling than his separation from home is his attitude of endurance rather than enjoyment. Jane comments that his time "*appeared* devoted to visiting the sick and poor" rather than saying that St. John is devoted to his parishioners (526, emphasis added). St. John is dedicated—"no weather seemed to hinder him"—but Jane describes it as a routine, rather than a valuable or beloved activity (526). She describes how "he would, when his hours of morning study were over, take his hat, and, followed by his father's old pointer, Carlo, go out on his mission of love or duty" (526). By focusing on his actions, she makes this a labor about St. John rather than his parishioners. She places the activity as secondary in importance to him, after his morning study, and she places in the casual details of his hat and pointer to characterize it as a mere "pastoral excursions" (526). Though St. John has chosen this activity and it is part of his routine, she admits that she cannot tell whether or not he enjoys it. Duty and love are not combined but placed in opposition. When he insists on persevering despite poor weather, she notes he has a "peculiar smile, more solemn than cheerful" (526).

After this initial description, Jane only mentions one additional individual act of home visiting. As with the first example, this instance occurs after a moment of relative bliss with St. John's sisters. They have just returned home when "a poor lad [came]...to fetch Mr. Rivers to see

his mother, who was drawing away" (593). Despite requiring a journey of four miles through the dark and wind, St. John goes without saying a word, even after the housekeeper voices concern. When he returns three hours later, Jane notes that "he looked happier than when he set out" (593). She may not have realized St. John's feelings towards his work earlier, but now she notes that he feels at ease with himself as he knows that "he had performed an act of duty; made an exertion; felt his own strength to do and deny" (593). While this account sounds better than Jane's initial description, she repeats that his action centers on doing something for himself rather than for someone else. She uses forceful terms—"performed" "exertion" "strength"—rather than natural terms or those of beneficence.

After this scene, Jane again returns to a scene at home, with St. John being out of place. As with her first description of his home visiting, Jane points to St. John's inability to help except from a distance through language. He does not stay with them, but "escaped from [their vivacity]: he was seldom in the house; his parish was large, the population scattered, and he found daily business in visiting the sick and poor in its different districts" (594). The population is still described as "scattered," although this time she exchanges the word "duty" for "business." Jane rejects St. John's emotional distance from individuals which precludes him from receiving strong emotional reciprocation from his parishioners and which creates his pitiful spirit of endurance.

Professional Charity: Missionaries

While the structure of missionary work follows naturally from St. John's home visits, Jane reflects on the role of the missionary prior to meeting her cousin. When Mr. Rochester spends lavishly on Jane, she imagines herself as a slave: "I thought his smile was such as a sultan

might, in a blissful and fond moment, bestow on a slave his gold and gems had enriched" (401). It is only when Rochester actualizes her thoughts with the language of slavery, saying he "would not exchange this one little English girl for the grand Turk's whole seraglio," that she decides to assert her independence and reject a paradigm of slavery. She says "I'll not stand you an inch in the stead of a seraglio...so don't consider me an equivalent for one" (402). Rochester does not deny his similarity to a slave-owner but rather plays into the scenario by asking how Jane will spend her time while he is "bargaining for so many tons of flesh and such an assortment of black eyes" (402). Where Rochester speaks of slaves in terms of their parts with no sense of human wholeness, Jane claims that she would prefer to act as a missionary. She would rather "preach liberty to them that are enslaved" and "stir up mutiny" until the situation is reversed, with Rochester "fettered amongst our hands" (402). While missionary work functions as a form of charity, Jane immediately relates the benefits to herself.

In "Christianity and the State of Slavery in *Jane Eyre*," Sue Thomas justifies the inclusion of missionary work as historical allusion, claiming Jane replicates "the work of William Knibb, an English Baptist missionary working in Jamaica, who had been for a brief time charged with inciting mutiny among slaves, the 1831 revolt now known as Sam Sharpe's Rebellion" (Thomas 58). Unlike with Jane's practical wish of teaching at her own school, in her missionary daydream she relates to others emotionally, "[identifying] with the triumph rather than the suffering of the missionary martyr" (Thomas 69). Jane is not seriously considering missionary work, and she primarily chooses her example in order to reassert the balance of power between Rochester and herself. Yet this playful, hypothetical situation still reveals the core of Jane's principles. She sees herself on an equal footing with the slaves, so that Rochester will be chained alongside "our hands"; the slaves are not characterized as "others" but share

Jane's desires and are actively involved in rebellion. Her position aligns her more with an abolitionist than a missionary, as Thomas notes that "missionary societies would routinely counsel missionaries going to the West Indies that they were to address the spiritual and not civil or temporal condition of slaves" (Thomas 62).

Jane has the chance to study the nuances of the missionary life in her time with St. John. As with education, the narrator treats missionary work from the individual perspective, not connecting it with any larger society. Missionary societies were prominent by the time the novel was written. The London Missionary Society was formed in late 1795, and its support grew over the beginning of the nineteenth century, from 15,000 pounds of annual income in 1813 to 40,000 in 1825 and 93,000 by 1860. (Owen 125-126). Instead, St. John's relationship to missionary work is portrayed as very personal and unique to his experiences.

St. John sees charity as an offshoot of religion, that "from the minute germ, natural affection, she [religion] has developed the over-shadowing tree, philanthropy" (563). For him, philanthropy extends from natural affection, the bonds between individuals. Yet he excludes himself from the "germ" itself, as he speaks of the abstract female "religion" in comparison to the living Rosamond whom he will not marry. While he considers his nature "cultivated" by religion, Jane finds fault with his abstraction of his natural qualities. Prior to this conversation, she thought to herself that "should he become the possessor of Mr. Oliver's large fortune, he might do as much good with it as if he went and laid his genius out to wither, and his strength to waste, under a tropical sun" (558). Jane does not deny that St. John has good aims in the abstract: he talks of his "great work" as the "carrying of knowledge into the realms of ignorance—of substituting peace for war—freedom for bondage—religion for superstition—the hope of heaven for the fear of hell" (561). He would not be a missionary who thinks only of religion and not of

the people's wellbeing, but he works in the abstract rather than in the concrete, individual sense: "he is a good and a great man: but he forgets, pitilessly, the feelings and claims of little people, in pursuing his own large views" (627).

St. John attempts to prepare Jane to be a missionary's wife, but the work fatigues her rather than providing any joy or excitement to reciprocate for her long hours. St. John functions similarly to Jane's cousin John Reed, trying to align Jane with his viewpoint instead of treating her as an individual. If John represents the tolls of family generosity, St. John evokes the misery of religious benevolence. Jane does not suffer in her school teaching, but she becomes exhausted in learning the missionary way. She feels herself restrained, and "did not love [her] servitude" (599). When he kisses her, she feels that it "were a seal affixed to [her] fetters" (599). Jane does not ascribe to this form of long-standing suffering any more than she allowed herself to suffer in the context of the Reed household. After she returns to Rochester, he self-pityingly says that she returns because she enjoys sacrifice, but Jane insists that she is sacrificing nothing: "What do I sacrifice? Famine for food, expectation for content. To be privileged to put my arms round what I value—to press my lips to what I love—to repose on what I trust" (671). Her exchange is literal, trading Rochester's love and her expected life with St. John as a missionary.

St. John's belief in suffering and sacrifice as inherent in charity comes from his philosophical division of mental and emotional capabilities. While this binary is never directly challenged by a character, the language surrounding St. John's conversations undermines the distinction between emotions and intellect. The narrator uses the shared diction of physical endurance and childbearing to break the division, as childbearing is generally considered an event as emotional as it is physical. The connotations of childbearing not only skews St. John's idea that some women are fit to serve while others are not—as women are theoretically

uniformly formed for childbirth—but it also establishes a new way in which feminine expectations relate to charitable actions.

St. John informs Jane why she is fit to do his "Sovereign's service": "God and nature intended you for a missionary's wife. It is not personal, but mental endowments that have given you: you are formed for labour, not for love" (626). He divides people between physical and emotional tendencies, valuing physical endurance over capacity for feeling. The mutual exclusivity of these categories is not unique in Jane's nature. In discussing the woman after whom he lusts, he says, "Rosamond a sufferer, a labourer, a female apostle? Rosamond a missionary's wife? No!" (561). He places the two women on opposite poles of a binary: love and labor. Labor, however, does not only mean hard physical activity; it can refer to childbirth, particularly because St. John uses it to describe two female characters and potential wives. He essentializes the ability to do physical work, making the term "labourer" synonymous with "sufferer" and "missionary's wife" and claiming it as a God-given quality. Yet he uses the phrase "formed for labour" rather than fit for work or able to toil, which emphasizes Jane's body and its shape, which is indeed formed for childbirth.

Jane herself does not directly attack this binary, telling St. John's sister that "he has told me I am formed for labour—not for love: which is true, no doubt" (626). Yet this sentence is not said in full seriousness as her following sentence chastises St. John for thinking of marriage as physical endurance rather than emotional fulfillment: "But in my opinion, if I am not formed for love, it follows that I am not formed for marriage" (626). In keeping with his binary, Jane addresses her ability to be a missionary as separate from her marriage to St. John. When Jane considers his proposal, she asks herself, "Can I *receive* from him the bridal ring, *endure* all the forms of love…can I *bear* the consciousness that every endearment he bestows is a sacrifice

made on principle?" (609, emphasis added). The term "forms of love" connotes physical realization of emotional matter, and indeed her thoughts transform emotional material into physical things which can be received, endured, and born. The unspoken concept of childbearing frames her ultimate decision to refuse St. John's proposal and insistence on her God given position on a binary. Jane's refusal of St. John's proposal is ultimately her denial of separating her heart from her body.

More important than the complication of St. John's binary is the way in which the binary is broken. The childbirth language points to males devaluing feminine strength and discounting female sexuality. It further complicates charitable action by revealing the ways in which charitable discourse thinks of charity as both inherently feminine—Jane talks of "missionary labours"—and unsuitable for women. Though St. John thinks of Rosamond as unfit to be a laborer, the breaking of the labor-love binary allows readers to address her ability to be a missionary. Within her home, she successfully supports a school for children and the children who attend it, which St. John does not value in the same way he does his own missionary work. The idea of "bearing" and female endurance as inherently linked to goodness extend beyond the chapters with missionary work. When Jane becomes an heiress, she thinks, "[Those] I had loved barrenly, I could now benefit" (579). She celebrates her newfound ability to help others, using language that suggests fulfillment of a feminine expectation of production. The abilities for women to bear children and to engage in charitable works are alternatively presented as physical and natural expectations and difficult but chosen decisions. Though relegated to implicit meaning within language rather than frank discussion, female ability is presented not as a binary or even simple spectrum, but a panoply of possibilities. St. John's values, tied with his righteous proselytizing, restricts women to a single field, rather than treating them as unique individuals.

By searching for larger patterns of labor- and love-formed people, he misses Jane's ideal that people must be understood and interacted with on a person by person basis.

Wills and Inheritance

The final form of charity Jane encounters is inheritance. Similar to the charity of familial benefactors, wills are a type of benevolence that is somewhat expected to "confirm the continuance of the family" after death (Hepburn 4). In fact, Jane's position in the Reed household derives, not from a written will, but the last words of her uncle. Wills were not common in the 1840s, with only 10 percent of the English and Welsh population having a will as of 1841, but they were devices regularly used in literature (qtd. Hepburn 10). The unexpected nature of wills in literature does mirror historical reality. Alastair Owens conducted in a study in the first half of the nineteenth century in the industrial city Stockport and found that wills were generally made within the last three months of a person's life (Hepburn 11). Inheritance functions as a unique form of charity that is generally sizeable and life-altering while being simultaneously expected and unexpected.

When Jane receives her inheritance, she is not joyful immediately, because she feels unable to reciprocate the gift. She notes that "the words Legacy, Bequest, go side by side with the words Death, Funeral" (574). The money lacks the interchangeability of a commodity: the money becomes a physical representation of an unfulfilled relationship with her uncle. Yet she is able to transfer her emotions of gratitude and familial spirit onto the person who physically delivers the news, as St. John is both deserving of funds and revealed to be her cousin. Jane expresses her ability to play a role in charity, rather than be a passive being, through discussing her independence. Her joy regarding the inheritance comes only when she realizes that these

funds will grant her independence. She does not mean to be a fully independent being, but it means she can choose how to invest in her connections and to tighten her relationships to others by paying her perceived debts. She claims that "the independence, the affluence which was [hers], might be theirs too" (579). In her freedom she will also "attach [herself] to Diana and Mary" (581). Having been given wealth, she reciprocates by giving to others and establishing a familial bond to the women where inheritance alone could not create a bond to the giver.

In fulfilling her debt to her cousins, Jane mentions that any of her previous attempts to reciprocate their kindness amounted to nothing: she was loving "barrenly" (579). She does not consider her actual affections to count or to have mattered. Despite the fact that Jane imports the reciprocity of emotion, here Jane defines the worth of her relationship through money. The importance of money in relationships is heightened because Jane, who had earlier talked about Rochester as her equal, can only become his wife when she has wealth that, if not rivaling his, at least raises her status closer to his. While she previously talked about her kinship with Rochester, she was also very conscious of their class differences. She does not take monetary gifts from him lightly. When owed 15 pounds, she prefers him to be 5 pounds in debt to her than in excess by 35 pounds, when he initially offers her a 50 pound note (334). Their class difference becomes corporeal in the literal money over which they flirtatiously fight. Only when Jane is financially independent does her decision to stay with Rochester become her own choice.

Jane requires that inequalities be balanced in the physical world, where exchanges occur directly between individuals. Even potentially abstract entities such as wealth and God become focalized as physical objects and a force acting through individuals respectively. She simplifies relationships with abstract entities into direct interactions. Whether dealing with two individuals or a person and an entity, Jane treats the interaction as a single case to which both parties

contribute equally. This model of relationships informs Jane's opinions of philanthropic work, in which "good" is successfully achieved only when two parties are able to reciprocate each other's benevolence.

CHAPTER TWO

Middlemarch: Surprises in the System

Despite being located in a similar environment to Thornfield, the community of Middlemarch is structured entirely differently. Raymond Williams notes that it is generally "taken for granted that a country community, most typically a village, is an epitome of direct relationships," but the fictitious town of Middlemarch lacks the overt concern about direct relationships and reciprocity found in *Jane Eyre* (Williams *English* 17). The novel does not lack interest in interpersonal relationships, but direct interactions are less important than the overarching network of individuals. The townspeople of Middlemarch relate to each other through more theoretical than substantial means: debt, loans, societal ties, political beliefs, religious beliefs. In any direct interaction between two people, a third party—another person or an abstract entity—is also present as well.

In fact, the outside forces in *Middlemarch* help contribute to the realistic feeling of the individual characters, according to an 1881 paper by psychologist James Sully. Sully believes in the reality of Eliot's characters not only because of their individual descriptions or actions but also the communities which they inhabit. He does state that the high quality of Eliot's characters is "due, first and mainly, to that fact of organic complexity which we feel to be the deepest thing in our own structure," yet they are not just formed by internal measures (384). While he only mentions it as "another thing," he describes social environment as a key part of Eliot's fiction in making individuals come alive. Indeed it is the "social surroundings" which he claims are given "as an essential, the most essential…as the part of the environment which has most to do in determining form which the congeries of crude impulses making the germ of individual character shall assume, in fixing the habitual channels of the emotions, the direction of the aims, the form

of obligations" (Sully 383). I disagree that the environment is the germ or seed of a character; rather, the social surroundings influence the ways a seed develops. Society does not shape first instincts, but it can narrow decisions down to specific channels, and it certainly forms obligations. Sully comes closer to the truth of the role of society when he claims that "a personality is only a concrete living whole when we attach it by a net-work or organic filaments to its particular environment, physical and social" (Sully 382). The individual gains purpose and vividness only when they grow organically into a network.

George Eliot's ability to extend perception beyond the individual consciousness has been a well debated point of literary criticism. Gillian Beer claims that in *Middlemarch,* George Eliot "seeks out ways beyond the single consciousness," while Elizabeth Ermath highlights the influence of Feuerbach's Essence of Christianity in its advocacy of the "therapeutic and liberating value of a double consciousness" (Beer *Darwin's Plots* 172, Ermath 24). In *George Eliot and Community*, Suzanne Graver sees Eliot's attention to communities as a reaction to the individualist values embodied in *Jane Eyre*. Claiming that the "preceding four centuries of European life seemed to be characterized by the growing prevalence of individualist values and the gradual decline of communal ones," Graver states that Eliot "participated in a tradition of social thought that was preoccupied with the rediscovery of community" (Graver 1, 3). She looks at the "relationship between the concreteness her fictional communities attain and a tradition of social thought in which community becomes an abstraction" (Graver 9). I would argue that, compared to earlier fiction, like *Jane Eyre*, *Middlemarch* is a move towards abstraction. Rather than community being a set of distinct units or individual people, the community is more fluid as a collection of all interpersonal interactions. Eliot places the physical, named community at the center of the story and describes it in great detail, yet she also creates a metaphorical community

connected through shared interests and histories. She bolsters this second community through her consistent use of network imagery and the interweaving of multiple storylines.

This underlying relationship structure informs the way characters conceive of charity and goodness. At Dorothea's moment of greatest anguish, having discovered her love for Ladislaw after seeing him with Rosamond, Dorothea contemplates her next actions: "she yearned towards the perfect Right, that it might make a throne within her, and rule her errant will" (788). She addresses "Right" as a single, commanding figure, but her answer does not come through an individual being, like the shout Jane receives across the moors in *Jane Eyre*. Instead, Dorothea looks outwards at the expansive world around her. She is drawn by the "light piercing into the room," which guides her to the image of three individuals—a man, a woman, and a baby—and beyond them other indistinguishable figures. She connects them all through the light: "Far off in the bending sky was the pearly light; and she felt the largeness of the world and the manifold wakings of men to labour and endurance. She was a part of that involuntary, palpitating life, and could neither look out on it from her luxurious shelter as a mere spectator, nor hide her eyes in selfish complaining" (788). As a connecting entity, light brings her close to a different class and a different gender while she simultaneously realizes her physical separation. Dorothea's secular worship of the "Right" points her towards the interconnectedness of life. The focal point is not those suffering, with her as a spectator, nor herself as separate from others. The connection to others becomes a thing of nature, an "involuntary" part of living as pure and simple as the sunlight.

Though the light's active nature and well-timed arrival suggests the hand of a higher power, neither God nor the narrator has a direct relationship with the people of *Middlemarch*, acting instead indirectly to increase awareness of the system rather than cause any change of

events. Dorothea's light is distinct from the divine light that causes Jane Eyre's salvation as she wanders starving on the moors. Jane's light is similarly divine: it persists throughout the elements, "shining dim, but constant, through the rain," and it appears shortly after she begs Providence, "Sustain me a little longer! Aid—direct me!" (Brontë 495). Yet, Jane's light appears as the divine working through human means—a human lit the candle—while Dorothea's light is a more distant, passive light pointing Dorothea to awareness of but not necessarily action toward others.

While in this moment the light reminds Dorothea of societal connectivity, she has been aware of networks throughout the novel. Dorothea's ideology does center on the action of doing good, but she defines goodness in terms of connection to a network of positive intentionality. She expresses it to Ladislaw when she first sees him after her return to Middlemarch, saying "that by desiring what is perfectly good, even when we don't quite know what is and cannot do what we would, we are part of the divine power against evil – widening the skirts of light and making the struggle with darkness narrower" (392). She calls this philosophy of desiring, if not necessarily doing, good as her religion, her "life" (392). Again light figures prominently, associated with the good, but most importantly it is associated with "widening…skirts" as opposed to dark's "narrowness." The femininity of the widening skirts suggests Dorothea's failure to take action throughout the novel relates to her gender, and her actions can only assist on the outside edges of community, through connections.

While Dorothea's lack of success is frustrating, the devaluation of the individual self extends beyond the female condition to all people within a network. The image which best captures the insignificance of the individual compared to the system is the image of the pier-

glass at the start of Chapter 27. The narrator introduces it as "this pregnant little fact," a trifle of knowledge:

> Your pier-glass or extensive surface of polished steel made to be rubbed by a housemaid, will be minutely and multitudinously scratched in all directions; but place now against a lighted candle as a centre of illumination, and lo! the scratches will seem to arrange themselves in a fine series of concentric circles round that little sun. It is demonstrable that the scratches are going everywhere impartially, and it is only your candle which produces the flattering illusion of a concentric arrangement, its light falling with an exclusive optical selection. These things are a parable. The scratches are events, and the candle is the egoism of any person now absent… (264)

Unlike the sunlight which opens Dorothea's gaze, candlelight illuminates only a narrow section of the pier glass. Where the hand holds the candle, this manmade object, will determine the scope of what the eye sees and the sense of order the mind constructs. The bluntness of the parable, which is stated in a short, staccato line, connotes a certain obviousness to the sins of selfishness. The narrator gives an example of selfishness that is all selflessness in appearance: Rosamond staying with her parents and sick brother to support them while truly desiring proximity to Lydgate. The narrator suggests the differences between appearances and reality in charity. But the image is also important because it suggests an even level for all human events: "scratches…going everywhere impartially." Nor is the image presented as itself alone, a pier-glass to consider only one's reflection, but rather it is couched in details of those who impacted it: the "eminent philosopher among [the narrator's] friends" who mention it and the housemaid who scrubbed the surface ensure a sense of connectedness even at the level at which the symbol is presented.

The subjectivity of the world, based on the placement of the candle before the pier glass or the viewpoint of a character, requires characters to be aware of each other's aims and biases. The inability for characters to see anything but their own particular conception of the world leads to their lack of success across the board, with charitable acts included. Caleb speaks in favor of determination when thinking of hiring Fred, saying that "I call it improper pride to let fools' notions hinder you from doing a good action. There's no sort of work…that could ever be done well, if you minded what fools say. You must have it inside you that your plan is right, and that plan you must follow" (410). Yet Caleb's determination to trust others leaves him in debt when Fred cannot keep his promise. Caleb ends up more successful than most of the characters, as he generally considers the needs of his business, his family, and Fred, but most residents suffer due to a common blind resolve. As Casaubon settles plans to marry Dorothea, the narrator mentions that "certainly, the mistakes that we male and female mortals make when we have our own way might fairly raise some to wonder that we are so fond of it" (73). And after Lydgate helps Bulstrode with his faintness after being publicly confronted, he says to himself, "I shall do as I think right, and explain to nobody" (740). Insistence on working alone does not help when society is an interwoven web of connections.

Just as foolish are characters' wishes to have complete mastery over a given situation. In *Darwin's Plots*, Gillian Beer explains that all of the characters in *Middlemarch* desire "visions of unity" (Beer 173). In Casaubon's hunt for the key to all mythologies and Lydgate's search for a definitive tissue as the foundations of life, there exists the shared idea that the network can be bounded and simplified. Yet the network can never become a closed system: Casaubon ignores the work of the Germans, and Lydgate neglects the social and monetary networks of *Middlemarch*. In terms of charitable action, the unbounded nature of social life has the power to

produce anxieties about whom we are able to help and whom we should be helping. Thus individuals continue to pursue direct forms of charity, such as fostering family members and local charities, similar to those seen in *Jane Eyre*, but the frame of the network creates additional doubt about the effectiveness of these measures.

Caretakers and Benefactors

As in *Jane Eyre*, the first form of charity the reader encounters in *Middlemarch* is a familial benefactor and caretaker, but unlike the commanding presence of Mrs. Reed who dominates Jane's childhood, Mr. Brooke's role blends into his larger society as factors beyond himself influence Dorothea's upbringing. Though Jane Eyre and Dorothea Brooke are both orphans, Dorothea spends her childhood with her sister and the promise of "seven hundred a-year" (9). Not only connected to wealth, Dorothea is connected to memories of her parents, as they died when she was twelve, and she still has physical items they owned. The first event of the book finds Dorothea and Celia looking through their mother's jewels, firm connections to the past. Dorothea can choose to overlook the jewels because she "[has] other things of mamma's – her sandal-wood box, which I am so fond of – plenty of things" (13). She deals casually with the memory of her mother, deciding to keep two pieces for herself for joy of the colors rather than their connection with her deceased parent. Unlike Jane's inheritance, these jewels lack a complete embodiment of the previous owner but can take on a new life. Because Dorothea takes family and wealth for granted, her relation with her benefactor lacks an essentialized gratitude.

Like Jane, Dorothea and her sister Celia are educated apart from their benefactor; Mr. Brooke only takes in Dorothea and Celia when they have finished their education. The narrator describes the girls' education and care as "plans at once narrow and promiscuous," broken

between two families, "first…an English family and afterwards…a Swiss family at Lausanne" (8). The suggestion of concurrent narrowness and promiscuity implies that their education was chosen with specificity but without a clear logic that was shared with the children. Though Jane feels her individual influence affecting her path in life—she has an interview with Mr. Brocklehurst shortly after upsetting her aunt—Dorothea experiences a more fated travel through childhood, decided by the social network connecting wealthy families. Though broken into two parts, including a move to the continent, her fosterage bears the mark of loved ones past, while Jane must be sent for as a baby and arrives in the night to a family unprepared.

While Mr. Brooke says he wants "to remedy the disadvantages of their orphaned condition," the narrator does not imply that the girls are particularly needy (8). They are not in such great need that Mr. Brooke takes them in after their parents die; the fact that he does not take the girls in earlier further suggests the extent to which their fosterage was planned. Mr. Brooke seems to be fulfilling an established role, accepting the girls into his society rather than acting out of necessity and condescendingly keeping them separate. His part is less similar to the Reeds' than that of Jane's uncle, John Eyre, who wished to adopt Jane at a similar age to Dorothea when she moved to Tipton Grange. Like John Eyre, Mr. Brooke leaves his fortune to his adopted niece: "if Dorothea married and had a son, that son would inherit Mr Brooke's estate, presumably worth about three thousand a-year – a rental which seemed wealth to provincial families" (9). The worth of his estate is akin to the amount Jane expects to receive from her uncle when St. John informs her of her inheritance—she "had been calculating on four or five thousand" instead of the twenty thousand pounds she received. Hers is a lump sum of money compared to Brooke's recurring fortune of three thousand pounds, with these funds not accounting for the worth of the estate itself. Yet both these values are small, Middlemarch's

narrator claims, compared to the fortunes being made in the present from "future gold-fields, and of that gorgeous plutocracy which has so nobly exalted the necessities of genteel life" (9). Though the Brookes seem upper-class compared to Jane, they are "provincial" by modern standards. Within their context, however, Dorothea and Celia are not isolated and unsure of a future due to the comfort of their funds.

Because of their wealth, Dorothea and Celia become part of a larger social circle in Middlemarch who involve themselves with the girls' upbringing. Unlike the Reeds, who face no social scrutiny for their role in raising Jane, the entirety of Middlemarch seems invested in Mr. Brooke's actions toward Dorothea and Celia. Dorothea's actions cause social anxiety: the "peculiarities of Dorothea's character caused Mr. Brooke to be all the more blamed in neighbouring families for not securing some middle-aged lady as guide and companion to his nieces" (10). The specific society taking objection is called "the world – that is to say, Mrs. Cadwallader the Rector's wife, and the small group of gentry with whom he visited in the north-east corner of Loamshire" (10). When Dorothea decides to marry Casaubon, the matter is again considered a community affair. After time has passed, Sir James thinks, "If Cadwallader – if every one else had regarded the affair as he, Sir James, had done, the marriage might have been hindered. It was wicked to let a young girl blindly decide her fate in that way, without any effort to save her" (285). Dorothea's education and marriage are the responsibility of "every one," which in Sir James's circle likely means the gentry. While this statement contains Sir James's bias against Casaubon and Mrs. Cadwallader was likewise biased against Dorothea, these biases and their continued interest in their neighbors' affairs speak to the interconnectedness of the community. The difference between commentary on Jane and on Dorothea does not appear to be because Jane is a child and Dorothea an adult; wealth appears a better indicator. The "small

group of gentry" that actively vocalizes its thoughts about Mr. Brooke's fostering decisions works in a similar way to Rochester's acquaintances, who talk at length about Adèle's education, even if it only serves as a gateway for amusing recollection of their own governesses.

The role of family obligation in patronage is better tested with the character of Will Ladislaw. He receives early support from Mr. Casaubon, his cousin. Like Brontë's Rochester, Casaubon deals more with conscience than philanthropy. When Sir James, upset about Dorothea's wedding plans, asks Cadwallader about Casaubon's "heart," he explains that Casaubon "is very good to his poor relations; pensions several of the women, and is educating a young fellow at a good deal of expense…I believe he went himself to find out his cousins, and see what he could do for them" (69). Cadwallader does call this justice, since "Casaubon would not have had so much money by half" if his maternal aunt had not been disinherited (69). Yet his generosity to family members falls short of Dorothea's expectations for contributing to the general populace; despite Cadwallader's insistence that "not every man would ring so well as that," Dorothea takes family generosity as an expected justice. She wonders whether "inheritance [is] a question of liking or of responsibility," finding herself convinced it is a matter of responsibility (371). She discusses it as a business-like duty, somehow connected to family matters: "the fulfillment of claims founded on our own deeds, such as marriage and parentage" (371). Such thoughts prompt her to believe that more should be done for Ladislaw, namely "the giving him his true place and his true share" (374).

Yet Ladislaw is not interested in being an object of charity. He divorces himself from Casaubon's aid by claiming that his personal defects would only be corrected if he were in "that more strenuous position which his relative's generosity had hitherto prevented from being inevitable": he prefers the strain of poverty, allowing funds to go towards others who "might

have a better claim" (290). In a world of networks, Ladislaw cannot thrive without connection to others, despite his best intentions. When he leaves Casaubon's patronage, he quickly gains the patronage of Mr. Brooke. The transfer of care from relative to business partner blurs the lines between familial and business patronage. Ladislaw stays at Brooke's house, like the Miss Brookes before him. When Mr. Brooke first conceives of writing to invite Ladislaw to Tipton Grange, the narration read: "Why not? They could find a great many things to do together" and he says that "since Celia was going to marry immediately, it would be very pleasant to have a young fellow at table with him, at least for a time" (292). The casual language of "things to do" and dining together suggests companionship; Brooke even suggests that Ladislaw will serve as a replacement for his previous ward and relative. He mentions his scheme of working with the *Middlemarch Pioneer*, but these are "dim projects"; he cares less for the specifics in a business-deal sense than in a paternal encouragement, providing himself with youthful entertainment.

With a network model of relationships, the recipient of direct charity does not have to have a strong relationship with the benefactor. The concept of charity does not foreground Dorothea's and Mr. Brooke's relationship; they are connected both by family and their social surroundings in a way which decreases the importance of his position as her caretaker. While there are some forms of reciprocity in these direct relationships, if either party is unhappy with the terms, it is easier for them to disentangle themselves from this particular relationship. When Ladislaw dislikes the impositions of Casaubon, he chooses to go his own direction. Having faith in the larger network of society, Ladislaw dissolves one charitable relationship in favor of another, despite being on the receiving end of both.

Home Visitors

Unlike the women of *Jane Eyre* who do not take to home visiting, this charitable activity constitutes a major part of Dorothea's routine. Dorothea's actions mock St. John's role of praying for the sick. She is likely to "[kneel] suddenly by the side of a sick labourer and [pray] fervidly as if she thought herself living in the time of the Apostles," but her kindness is not presented as a feminine virtue or an expected duty. Rather it feels comically anachronistic and the result of Dorothea's "love of extremes"; this love is the primary reason the narrator suggests a man might "hesitate before he made her an offer" of marriage (9). From the start, Dorothea's religious beliefs and the actions they motivate are not poised to succeed. She attempts to connect herself to a historic network, a people and culture who have come before, rather than being aware of those in her more immediate network.

The primary means by which the narrator addresses Dorothea's false charity is that she takes for granted her home visits; they are mere routine. The narrator casually mentions an "infant school which [Dorothea] had set going in the village," which she visits prior to dividing jewels with Celia (11). She mentions charity as one of several little things: "little errands of shopping or charity such as occur to every lady of any wealth when she lives within three miles of a town" (431). She does not expand upon these circumstances and suggests that charity is as incidental as shopping. She includes "village charities" among a list of items that would provide "a Christian young lady of fortune…her ideal of life" if only she had "some endowment of stupidity and conceit" (28). Dorothea has too great "an active conscience and a great mental need" to be appeased by simple interaction (28). She cannot be "content" (28). Indeed, Wright notes that "we find nowhere in her [Eliot's] works any description of the home conditions of the very poor," as Eliot substitutes "historical detail" for "vast philosophical background" (Wright

1108). Both Dorothea and the author, in favor of the system that connects people, place less emphasis on the scenes of direct interaction between different classes.

Even if Dorothea does not investigate the home spaces of the poor, *Middlemarch* does contain some direct interactions of charity between unequal neighbors. Compared to Dorothea's frustration with simple giving, Miss Noble takes a great delight in house visits. Though poor herself, she has a basket which "held small savings from her more portable food, destined for the children of her poor friends among who she trotted on fine mornings; fostering and petting all needy creatures being so spontaneous a delight to her, that she regarded it much as if it had been a peasant vice that she was addicted to" (169). Miss Noble can call the poor she visits her friends, but she still mythologizes them. She sees her act as a type of condescension by placing herself above them and calling them "creatures" and "petting" them. Her great delight is caricatured to the extent that she will not let others see her hoarding food; her care for others becomes asceticism worthy of the narrator's scorn. Yet this poor woman's joy starkly contrasts with Dorothea's ambivalence, lending some credence to the statement, "one must be poor to know the luxury of giving" despite the humor of the situation (169). By being more aware of her own network, the poor, Miss Noble delights more than Dorothea, who interacts across a gap of social connection.

The fullest form of interaction with the poor comes through Ladislaw. The primary purpose of his relations is not to feed them but to socialize with them: he "liked to surprise and please them" (463). His interaction with the poor is not spoken of as devious political schemes or acts of pity, but part of mutual enjoyment. The narrator reminds the readers that "in Rome he was given to ramble about among the poor people, and the taste did not quit him in Middlemarch" (463). He acts from taste or preference, not hunger or need, and he passes time

with them as friends, rather than having fixed times of interaction. In addition to activities for pure enjoyment, such as going "out on gypsy excursions," the narrator mentions one occasion of charity: providing nourishment in the form of a "small feast of gingerbread" (463). Yet the excitement and benefit are less in this "small" meal than in the greatness of the attention and care. The gingerbread itself is dwarfed by the extravaganza of the situation, which began with collecting sticks en masse, creating a bonfire, and putting on a puppet show. Nor is this charity—the donation of time and energies—directed at single individuals, making them recognize the moment as a formal gift. He heads out with "a troop of droll children" (463). The sense of full engagement comes in Ladislaw's work in London: he is "in the thick of a struggle against [wrongs]" (836).

The success of Ladislaw's relationships lies in the fact that he places himself directly within the network of the poor without creating any false barriers of self-pride or assumption. The directness of interpersonal relationships is desirable, yet at the same time, characters must accept that complete directness is impossible. Closeness in personal relationships can still occur in a network system, but it requires complete immersion within the system. Ladislaw can leave the gypsy children and inhabit another network, but for the time in which he is present, he must be fully present and not draw attention to the differences that shape him as an individual.

The Female Charitable "Professional"

Dorothea is more concerned with larger plans that impact networks of people than single individuals, casting her into the same vein as late nineteenth-century women who pursued charitable work for their professional endeavors. Rather than care for house-to-house charity, Dorothea, at the novel's start, hopes "for the time when she would be of age and have some

command of money for generous schemes" (9). The first project in which Dorothea invests her energy is a housing scheme, which her uncle refuses to support. Nor does her primary companion Celia sympathize. Her sister claims that she "cannot bear notions" and condescendingly calls it Dorothea's "favourite *fad* to draw plans" (32, 37). This belittlement worries Dorothea, as she considers "what was life worth – what great faith was possible when the whole effect of one's actions could be withered up into such parched rubbish as that?" (37).

Her original suitor, Sir James Chettam, does support her interests. He thinks highly of reform and proposes to "take one of the farms into [his] own hands, and see if something cannot be done in setting a good pattern of farming among [his] tenants" (17). Although he calls Dorothea's housing plans "worth doing," he also describes it as "sinking money" (31). The negative costs of the project are mitigated by Sir James's consideration of this project as part of his courtship. As he leaves Dorothea's home with one of her plans, he "also took away a complacent sense that he was making great progress in Miss Brooke's good opinion" (32). Yet, when their relationships falls through, he does continue to support the validity of her housing plans, wishing that she and her "wonderfully good notions" could persuade her uncle into better managing his estate (381). Cottages are eventually engaged, but not on Dorothea's watch. She looks to convince her father to "engage Mr Garth, who praised [her] cottages" by arguing along his interest in Parliament, that "one of the first things to be made better is the state of the land and the labourers" (389). Ultimately, it is his experience of being yelled at by a tenant that convinces him to rehire Caleb Garth. Dorothea's ideas have some validity, but she cannot put them into action without working through her network, and even then, random connections in the network can influence the outcome.

While Dorothea hopes that her marriage to Casaubon will allow her to form new connections with an intellectual community, he neither provides her access to his work nor ways to pursue her housing interests. When Casaubon is courting her, she is slightly displeased that he "apparently did not care about building cottages" (33). As his fiancée, she hopes to learn more about the state of cottages, put she gathers "nothing from him more graphic about the Lowick cottages than that they were 'not bad'" (76). She finds herself feeling "some disappointment, of which she was yet ashamed, that there was nothing for her to do in Lowick" (78).

When Casaubon dies, Mrs. Cadwallader sees this as a new opportunity for Dorothea to achieve her housing dreams through a marriage. Cadwallader wants to match her with a Lord Triton, believing this will suit her interests. She does not particularly revere Dorothea's plan-making, claiming that Lord Triton is "full of plans for making the people happy in a soft-headed sort of way" (817). Cadwallader is unable to set up this direct match, and afterwards blames her social network for Dorothea's marriage to Will. She believes that if they "had Lord Triton down here to woo her with his philanthropy, he might have carried her off before the year was over" (817). She emphasizes that Dorothea cares most of all about philanthropy as a concept more than about anything else.

Rather than trying to succeed in philanthropy through a second marriage, Dorothea hopes to spend her widow's inheritance through her own efforts. When asked if she will ever marry, she says, "Not anybody at all. I have delightful plans. I should like to take a great deal of land, and drain it, and make a little colony, where everybody should work, and all the work should be done well. I should know every one of the people and be their friend. I am going to have great consultations with Mr Garth" (550). Dorothea simplifies the concept of community and naively thinks she can control her network so that all members are her friends. She does not understand

the components that go into a project, calling the plans "delightful" and her future consultations "great." While Celia does not entirely believe in the good Dorothea can do, her discussions with Dorothea suggest that Dorothea's insistence on pursuing an independent project is a misappropriation of her abilities which could be better utilized through her family connection. As Dorothea withdraws from Clifton, Celia complains, "There is nothing to be done there…it makes you quite melancholy. And here you have been so happy going all about Tipton with Mr Garth into the worst backyards. And now uncle is abroad, you and Mr Garth can have it all your own way; and I am sure James does everything you tell him" (536). Dorothea has the ability to affect her surroundings by working within her family, but she chooses to live by herself and chase a larger project, a utopia. Eventually her family restricts her actions, as "Sir James and [her] uncle have convinced [her] that the risk would be too great" (765). Though Dorothea hopes to act independently, she cannot, since she lacks basic organizational information. In *Angel Out of the House*, Dorris Williams Elliott suggests that "women's vocational dreams, however 'ardent,' have little chance of succeeding in a society increasingly dominated by the expert—unless they, too, become experts, as did Nightingale, Hill, and the other mid-century philanthropic heroines" (Elliott 212).

Dorothea's inability to succeed on her own places her in opposition to the convention of the philanthropic heroine that was popular in Eliot's time (Elliott 190). By the 1870's, women could have semi-professional lives in organization societies; even then, Sarah Ellis, a female author and writing about charitable work in 1869 noted that "so soon as a woman begins to receive money, however great her need…the heroine is transformed into a tradeswoman" (qtd. in Prochaska 6). By placing her heroine in an earlier time period, Eliot constructs a character who has the same hopes but "lacks the possibilities for fulfilling her ambitions" as characters in later

fiction can (191). This adjustment of time by itself would reaffirm the convention within the novel by emphasizing the difference in opportunities available to women in the 1870s versus the 1830s. However, Eliot acts against the convention by not taking Dorothea's ideas seriously; the time change is accompanied by humor which mocks Dorothea's desires. Elliott suggests that this humor is key to revealing the popular image of the philanthropic heroine as "romanticized and illusory" (191). George Eliot was familiar with her contemporary female writers, as is evident in her 1856 essay, "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists," in which she bemoans the poor techniques of four popular works as representatives of larger categories of female writing. While she does not directly attack charitable characters, she expresses frustration at the overwrought descriptions of perfect women, mentioning that one Miss Mayjar in *The Enigma*, was "an evangelical lady who is a little too apt to talk of her visits to sick women and the state of their souls" (Eliot "Silly" 454). Dorothea's complexity, particularly her lack of success and the humorous depiction of her religious fervor, allows her to distinguish herself from what Eliot considers to be silly descriptions. While Dorothea is doomed in her projects, it is more than a factor of the time or a general limitation of women: it derives from her persistence in a single vein, aiming to be a heroine rather than understanding her network fully.

Dorothea's poor understanding of her network becomes most evident in her attempts to support Lydgate's fever hospital. When Dorothea pledges her money to the hospital, she says with some jealousy, "I am sure I can spare two hundred a-year for a grand purpose like this. How happy you must be, to know things that you feel sure will do great good! I wish I could awake with that knowledge every morning" (440). Convinced of Lydgate's "grand purpose," as she previously was of Casaubon's, the narrator describes her feelings as "impetuous generosity," which makes her want to clear Lydgate's name when his reputation suffers from his interactions

with Bulstrode (733). She is particularly conscious of her direct relationship to Lydgate, claiming to her family that, "I cannot be indifferent to the troubles of a man who advised me in *my* trouble, and attended me in my illness" (734). She tells him, "There is no sorrow I have thought more about than that – to love what is great, and try to reach it, and yet to fail" (764). His failure with the hospital will be hers as well. Lydgate has given up, planning on abandoning the hospital, but she "formed a plan of relieving Lydgate from his obligation to Bulstrode," believing this will be enough for him to stay (769).

While Dorothea understands big picture ideas and individual relationships, she struggles to understand how multiple events and people can intersect. She simply wants to pursue what seems like the solid and singular "right." Despite her hopes of reinvigorating the hospital through her direct relations with Lydgate, other factors in the system end up spoiling her plans. In fact, Dorothea herself abandons the hospital in the end, not thinking of how her new-found poverty with Will Ladislaw might affect Lydgate; she thinks only of herself, saying, "I don't mind about poverty – I hate my wealth" (811). Her poor conception of practical relationships becomes humorous when, at the pinnacle of her relationship with Will in the novel, she draws "her head back and held his away gently that she might go on speaking…'We could live quite well on my own fortune – it is too much – seven hundred-a-year – I want so little – no new clothes – and I will learn what everything costs" (812). She does not submit to sensuality but considers practicality and logistics, despite, ironically revealing how distant those matters have been from her mind. She has not understood her own spending and reveals what a poor leader she would have been on any of her individual projects.

By the time she marries Will, she has given up her insistence on acting independently. Where she "used to despise women a little for not shaping their lives more, and doing better

things" she tells Ladislaw as he says his first farewell to Middlemarch that she has "almost given it up," referring to doing as she liked (545). Rebecca Mitchell attributes Dorothea's failure to her "overdetermined, insistent self differentiation" (Mitchell 62). Mitchell's hypothesis complements Gillian Beer's claim that "in *Middlemarch* wholeness can be approached only through relations. The visionary must find expression, if at all, through the imperfect here and now of ordinary lots" (Beer "Myth" 112). Despite Dorothea's confidence in the larger network of life, as a woman, she finds she fails to connect to the network on a practical level. She must be satisfied to find her happiness by connecting to a network of men by marrying Will.

Professional: Physicians

Part of the fullness of *Middlemarch* is that it considers a wide variety of social roles.Jobs are considered beneficial to social good: medicine, scholarship, and politics included. This relates to the increased specialization in modern times. Imraan Coovadia suggests that "for [Adam] Smith, the weaving together of individual lives is a result of modern economic specialization, or division of labor" (Coovadia 829). Highly skilled professions, like physicians, grew over the nineteenth century, while "sub-professions" such as teaching and nursing "increasingly became dominated by women" (Rubinstein 287).

The changing in work patterns of the Victorian period additionally aligns with a change in opinions about work. Alan Mintz claims that "enthusiasm for work is a virtual touchstone of Victorian sensibility" (Mintz 1). Max Weber suggests that the success of capitalism and the enthusiasm for work developed after the Reformation. The Reformation helped extend the Catholic idea of a calling from a calling for the churchhood to one for work in general. Called the Protestant work ethic, this new sense of vocation transformed the idea of work from a means

to an end into something good to do for its own sake: "labour must…be performed as if it were an absolute end in itself, a calling" (Weber 25). While the characters of *Middlemarch* do not necessarily believe in some of the Protestant ideas Weber studied, such as predestination, Weber suggests that the Protestant work ethic became part of a larger Western culture without retaining its religious foundations.

The Protestant work ethic, which does not feature favorably in *Jane Eyre*, receives a nuanced approval in *Middlemarch*. In *Jane Eyre*, St. John speaks about his missionary work as a calling, saying that God led him to it: "after a season of darkness and struggling, light broke and relief fell" (543) Relief comes not in the form of leisure but of work, as "God had an errand for [him]" (543). Jane, however, wishes he would not follow that line of work, asking him to "relinquish that scheme" (561). St. John does not consider it a scheme, replying passionately, in fragmented sentences, "Relinquish! What! my vocation? My great work? My foundation laid on earth for a mansion in heaven?" (561). Jane is not convinced of St. John's purpose, pressing him about the worth of Miss Oliver's feelings. Jane similarly dismisses his claim that "God and nature intended you for a missionary's wife…you are formed for labour, not love" (605). She works tirelessly with St. John in learning Hindu, but she does not find work in itself to be valuable. Jane values relationships with individuals more than work on its own.

In *Middlemarch*, however, the characters insist on doing work, and professional lives are an important way of fulfilling one's role in society. I would not suggest that the novel ascribes to the framework of the Protestant work ethic completely; for example, the narrator questions Bulstrode's sense of religious vocation in his work. However, the characters are preoccupied with what work they should do, not with whether they should work. Mary Garth insists that Fred Vincy finds a job suitable to him, Dorothea wants to be part of some good works, Farebrother

wants to be able to do good work for his money rather than have to gamble, Ladislaw attempts to find some meaningful work in politics, and Lydgate wants his medical work to be revolutionary.

Lydgate, who pursues medicine, has a profession with lower esteem, but the potential to help others in a charitable fashion. Lady Chettam places Lydgate towards the bottom of the social totem pole by stating that she likes "a medical man more on a footing with the servants" (91). This aligns with historical reality as "a mere 20 percent of doctors at mid-century were estimated to have university educations" (Sparks 12). Yet, the role of the physician also became progressive; the end of the eighteenth century marked "the first time there appeared physicians who sought to use their skills for the benefit of the masses" (Owen 121). Lydgate does not accept pay for the majority of the work he does over the course of the novel. Because Lydgate comes from a more established family, he is an anomaly, and his philanthropic profession comes across almost as a form of condescension.

The hospital itself is a feat of distant philanthropy. Bulstrode explains that Lord Medlicote provided the land and timber but "is not disposed to give his personal attention to the object" (124). Lydgate must provide the energy for the project. Lydgate's dreams align well with innovations in medicine: while there had been previous experiments with fever wards in general hospitals in the mid-eighteenth century, the end of the eighteenth and start of the nineteenth brought individual fever hospitals (Owen 122). Some, like Middlemarch's hospital, were the result of individual philanthropy, although, as Lydgate finds, they struggled to get regular subscribers; a London fever hospital unable to secure private philanthropy required parish funds and a large grant from Parliament to continue their services (Owen 123).

Yet Lydgate has high hopes for a fever hospital, believing it can be the "nucleus of a medical school" (124). His aim allows him to connect local work with knowledge that can help

the world, defining his plan as such: “to do good small work for Middlemarch, and great work for the world” (149). One of the key reasons he is attracted to medicine is that “it wanted reform, and gave a man an opportunity for some indignant resolve to reject its venal decorations and other humbug, and to be the possessor of genuine though undemanded qualifications” (145). Lydgate believes that the countryside will be a suitable place to attempt reform, and Bulstrode confirms his hopes, saying that “eminent men in the metropolis” have consulted him upon the “backwardness under which medical treatment labours in our provincial districts” (125). As outsiders, both Bulstrode and Lydgate undervalue the network of physicians within the town. Lydgate comes from a place of condescension, believing himself one of these eminent men, and he thinks naively of country life: he believes he will “live among people who could hold no rivalry with that pursuit of a great idea which was to be a twin object with the assiduous practice of his profession” (147).

Lydgate’s lack of awareness of the preexisting networks in Middlemarch hinders his medical plans. He considers his work philanthropy and compares it favorably to “those philanthropic models who make a profit out of poisonous pickles to support themselves while they are exposing adulteration, or hold shares in a gambling-hell that they may have leisure to represent the cause of public morality” (147). He does not want the ends to justify the means, but to begin with reform immediately. He has little respect for the doctors who dispense faulty drugs or those who gamble, making a joke of their situation by alliterating on profit and pretending someone could have shares in hell. Yet he also suspects that these individuals have nobler causes. He does not account for the fact that people could truly believe that the pills they are giving are worthy; Mr. Chiceley, for example, is content to continue his practice because he feels that “you never hear of a reform, but it means some trick to put in new men” (157). Wrench

holds stock in his medical practice because it is a "time-honoured procedure" (448). Lydgate does not try to understand the other doctors' reservations due to their lack of experience with anything else: they stick to what they know because they believe it has withstood time's test and have no guarantees that the new ways will be better. Lydgate celebrates his background and distinction in intellect—the narrator claims Lydgate's only commonness is "his feeling and judgment about furniture, or women, or the desirability of its being known (without his telling) that he was better born than other country surgeons"—but he does not appreciate that his difference in cultural background could affect his views on medicine (150).

Thus, despite auspicious beginnings, Lydgate's inability to concern himself with the individuals around him thwarts his plans. He tolerates but does not appreciate the necessity of having connections to wealth in his business. In discussing his wealthier clients, he tells his wife, "I don't really like attending such people so well as the poor. The cases are more monotonous, and one has to go through more fuss and listen more deferentially to nonsense" (293). Yet this also implies he has no interest in listening to the poor either. In his first reform, not taking payment for dispensing drugs, he did "foresee that his new course would be even more offensive to the laity" (444). Even with this forethought, he does not bother to explain the reform, and his interactions even with a non-patient still effect his web of practitioners. Lydgate was "injudicious enough to give a hasty popular explanation of his reasons" to Mr. Mawmsey, "an important grocer" (445). With only a brief explanation, not fully answering his questions, Mawmsey cannot repeat this explanation suitably to his wife or counterbalance the satisfaction he has had in responsibly taking his previous medicine.

Lydgate's lack of concern about his larger network not only hurts his patient base, but it proves personally detrimental when he finds himself in debt. When Lydgate begins to accrue

debt himself, his wife suggests that he take advantage of his network and borrow money from his friends. When Lydgate considers borrowing from his friends, he thinks that he "would rather incur any other hardship (590). Rosamond is more aware of social networks, in terms of class and status groups, and she urges Lydgate to ask for money from her father or his family. Yet her awareness of the networks is limited in that she does not understand the conventions and expectations inherent in the relationships between individual nodes. She only believes that "what she liked to do was to her the right thing" regardless of what others believe (585). Her meddling leads to them receiving condemnation from both sources rather than support.

Networks of money underlie the social and charitable networks existing in *Middlemarch*. Lydgate mentally separates the economic hardships of his free labor from the hardships his wife incurs, not comparing the "numerous strands of experience lying side by side (589). Yet eventually he cannot escape the necessity of money in his profession. Lydgate takes a loan from Mr. Bulstrode, but again, his blindness to the social network's connections to the financial network render him unsuccessful socially, as Bulstrode's money has been acquired by improper means. Lydgate fails to succeed in his medical reform plans due to a willful ignorance of the professional and monetary connections needed to succeed.

Professional: Politicians

Because *Middlemarch* takes place during the Reform Bill, the professional role of the politician is seen as an important way to make changes for the good of the community. Mr. Brooke, though frequently a character for comic relief, considers a serious profession in politics. He views politics as his way of contributing to society, and he hopes to "sit on the independent bench, as Wilberforce did, and work at philanthropy" (19). William Wilberforce was an

Evangelical who successfully campaigned for the abolition of the slave trade and slavery itself, which would occur shortly after the time period of *Middlemarch* (Rubinstein 306). A more pressing issue than slavery, however, presented itself in the Reform Bill.

The Whig government aimed to reform pocket boroughs, rotten boroughs, and the vote, expanding it to all the middle class. Historian W. D. Rubinstein says that "276 out of 489 English MPs in the 1820s were elected from seats controlled by an owner or patron," or so called pocket boroughs (Rubinstein 36). Rotten boroughs, on the other hand, were "those with insignificant numbers of voters" (37). The vote had different qualifications depending on the seat, ranging "from boroughs where only members of town corporation could vote to some boroughs with virtual manhood suffrage" (37). Although attempting comprehensive reform, the Whigs faced opposition, even resigning as a government on May 8, 1832 and incurring the May Day until May 15, 1832 where the government came close to anarchy (38). Mr. Brooke seems more inclined to be part of the national fervor than part of solving a political problem.

Even though Mr. Brooke has good men behind him to set up his campaign, with Will writing for the *Pioneer*, he has no understanding of the national political issues or connections within the town. The narrator explains how the audience of "weavers and tanners…were not more attached to him than if he had been sent in a box from London" (Eliot 502). Even if he says in his speech, "I am a close neighbor of yours, my good friends," it does not make him any better known among voters (504). Even to those who know him, no one can take his position seriously because his national ideas do not align with his personal practices. When Mr. Hackbutt informs Mr. Hawley about Brooke's reform position, Hawley replies, "Let Brooke reform his rent-roll. He's a cursed old screw, and the buildings all over his estate are going to rack" (358). A rival newspaper, the *Trumpet*, points out Brooke's contradictory stance at length, indicting him as

"one who would dub himself a reformer of our constitution, while every interest for which he is immediately responsible is going to decay: a philanthropist who cannot bear one rogue to be hanged, but does not mind five honest tenants being half-starved…but we all know the wag's definition of a philanthropist: a man whose charity increases directly as the square of the distance" (383). They do not necessarily deny that Brooke wants to do good in the country, but they hint that he has no right to do so when he has business to handle in the countryside. Nor are these cheap political shots, as Sir James points out that another part of the reality in another section of the *Trumpet*'s attack; the newspaper said that Brooke "roars himself red at rotten boroughs, and does not mind if every field on his farms has a rotten gate," and Brooke admits Dagley recently complained of a poor gate (383). When Brooke then visits Dagley to complain of his son's poaching, it is clear how greatly he neglects his tenants. While Brooke is aiming to spearhead reform, Dagley hopes reform will fix up Brooke; he warns him "you'd better let my boy aloan, an' look to yoursen, afore the Rinform has got upo' your back" (397).

While Mr. Brooke stands behind all of the "right" ideas and has a strong network in his own newspaper, outside networks prove influential in keeping him from office. Like other characters, Brooke believes strongly in his end vision, himself in Parliament, but he pursues it without bothering to understand those around him.

Professional: Religious Men

Like Jane, suffering at the hands of St. John's learned pursuits, Dorothea finds herself struggling alongside Casaubon. Unlike Jane, Dorothea was excited about the prospect of learning. Prior to marriage she thinks to herself, "Everything seems like going on a mission to a people whose language I don't know; – unless it were building good cottages," suggesting that

marriage will allow her to conduct missions but know the language (29). Her missionary work is not necessarily out of the country or religious in nature, as she thinks of building cottages as akin to a mission. Yet she finds her husband strictly interested in religious affairs. Mr. Brooke explains that Casaubon "doesn't care much about the philanthropic side of things; punishments, and that kind of thing. He only cares about Church questions" (53). While "punishments" is not exactly Dorothea's idea of philanthropy either, Mr. Brooke is not wrong in casting Casaubon as disconnected from the effects of religious study on the general populace.

Dorothea longs for Casaubon to turn his actions to use, moving his work from an internal space to external benefit. While in Rome on her honeymoon, she asks her husband, "All those rows of volumes – will you not now do what you used to speak of? – will you not make up your mind what part of them you will use, and begin to write the book which will make your vast knowledge useful to the world?" (199-200). He only embarks on this project when he approaches death; even then, he does not write his key to all mythologies but has Dorothea "go through this [his notebooks] aloud, pencil in hand, and at each point where [he says] 'mark,' will make a cross" (476). It is only "the first step in a sifting process which [he has] long had in view" (476).

While Dorothea was originally enthusiastic for him to work on this project, by the time he begins she is wary of its success, and she finds herself contemplating the "deep difference between that devotion to the living, and that indefinite promise of devotion to the dead" (479). Her disenchantment with his project is partially due to Will's insistence that Casaubon is behind the times, but the failure also speaks to the complexity of the world system. Beer notes that "the typical concern of the intellectual characters in the book is with visions of unity, but a unity which seeks to resolve the extraordinary diversities of the world back into a single answer: the key to all mythologies, the primitive tissue, allegorical painting" (Beer *Darwin's Plots* 173).

Unaware of changes in modern thought as he focuses only on an ancient network, Casaubon cannot successfully integrate all religious learning.

Bulstrode additionally views his work as essentially moral work, although to the reader it appears to be convoluted business practices. Bulstrode is identified as a "philanthropic banker…who predominated so much in the town that some called him a Methodist, others a hypocrite, according to the resources of their vocabulary" (88). Though labeled philanthropic, Bulstrode is also called unkind names by those around him due to his dominating spirit. His power is ascribed to both knowing "the financial secrets of most traders in the town" and his "beneficence that was at once ready and severe" (155). Unlike in *Jane Eyre*, where Mrs. Reed restricted Jane from reciprocating, Bulstrode demands "obligations" in his business procedures, and he follows up with the results: "He had gathered, as an industrious man always at his post, a chief share in administering the town charities, and his private charities were both minute and abundant" (155). While St. John in *Jane Eyre* considers religion his calling, Bulstrode thinks about religious and moral work in business terms.

Bulstrode's philanthropic actions are described with the diction of the workplace: industrious, post, chief, administer. He works in a scientific manner, "[inquiring] strictly into the circumstances both before and after" (155). He does not talk of the joy he receives, only the hope, fear, and gratitude. The narrator admits Bulstrode's principle is "to gain as much power as possible, that he might use it for the glory of God" (155-156). He recounts the "happiest time of his life "as a young banker's clerk, thinking of the ministry as possibly his vocation, and inclined towards missionary labour" (615). Mintz claims that Bulstrode represents a "classical unity of religious conviction and economic practice," yet Bulstrode finds himself "carrying on two distinct lives; his religious activity could not be incompatible with his business as soon as he had

argued himself into not feeling it incompatible" (Mintz 18, Eliot 617). Bulstrode's business and religious networks are not compatible, as the people of Middlemarch have differing religious beliefs, yet he attempts to force together the two networks regardless of others' wishes.

While Bulstrode strives to gain power, his inability to hold business, religion and charity together leads to his social upheaval. Through Raffles' blackmailing and Bulstrode's medical negligence, Bulstrode's false unity falls apart. Raffles may appear to be one of the excessively convenient "devices and contrivances of Victorian fiction," yet these very tools are "realistic in spirit, because they are synecdoches for the mass of connections, some invisible and some invisible between all persons of a modern society" (Coovadia 828). Coovadia sees these values aligning with Adam Smith's ideas that power is "a property of the network" and "no single point of view can claim absolute authority" (Coovadia 828, 821). Bulstrode is taken down by his network; his former associations and connections cannot be easily erased.

Wills and Inheritance

The professional world hinges on a network of money, but the centrality of inheritance plots to *Middlemarch* illustrates the importance of the monetary network in social interactions. In "George Eliot and the Precious Mettle of Trust," Mallen discusses the formalization of the gold standard in Victorian England. The 1844 Bank Charter Act officially made paper money a promissory entity, requiring individuals to trust its value tacitly. While no money in *Middlemarch* is worthless, the tacit trust encouraged by a paper money system is betrayed by individuals' wills. Unlike inheritance in *Jane Eyre*, which appears unexpectedly to rebalance Jane's sense of debt, the inheritances in *Middlemarch* each disrupt expectations and trust. While characters expect inheritances to be reflections of their direct relationship with another

individual, the wills reveal that there are no direct relationships. The written nature of these documents allows society to see the unspoken and underlying connections in interpersonal relationships.

Fred Vincy bases his future on his expectations from Mr. Featherstone. Fred believes he will inherit from his rich, elderly relation, so he does not develop any fiscal responsibility to the extent that Featherstone half believes a rumor that Fred is betting on his inheritance (109). While Fred quickly disputes this fact, he also expects more money from Mr. Featherstone than the 100 pounds that are "less than his hopefulness had decided that they must be" after he clears his name with Featherstone; after all, he owes 160 pounds to Caleb Garth (134). When Featherstone dies, he leaves two wills, one of which satisfies Fred's needs, leaving him ten thousand pounds, the other of which leaves him nothing (338). The latter supersedes the former, and Fred is left ill-prepared for life. Featherstone leaves the bulk of his will to a relative outside of the Middlemarch network, Joshua Rigg, a formerly unacknowledged son. Featherstone additionally leaves funds for the construction of "almshouses for old men, to be called Featherstone's Alms-houses" (337-338). Featherstone's relative Solomon notes that, "Peter was a bad liver, and almshouses won't cover it"; a small amount of charity at one's end does not seem worthwhile to the mourners, but their reason sounds of bitterness due to the lack of funds they received in the will (339). The narrator, however, preempts the reader's agreement with Solomon by claiming earlier that Featherstone, in life "loved money, but he also loved to spend it in gratifying his peculiar tastes, and perhaps he loved it best of all as a means of making others feel his power more or less uncomfortably" (323). In his death, he gives his money as a way to show his power, just as Bulstrode uses his gifts for power in life.

Watching the procession of Featherstone's funeral, Dorothea wonders about how she knows so little of her neighbors' lives; yet she herself soon learns Fred's own lesson that familial charity is not to be taken for granted. Upon Casaubon's death, she discovers that her inheritance depends upon her not marrying Will Ladislaw. Rather than considering his relationship with Dorothea as exclusive, Casaubon considered it grounded in relation to Ladislaw.

For Dorothea, her relationship to Ladislaw depends upon an earlier will: the one which denied Ladislaw his inheritance. Will's grandmother was disinherited due to an outside party, the man of lower socioeconomic status whom she married. Dorothea attempts to address inheritance in a more straightforward manner, without the complications of class or expectation, insisting that she must repay a debt to the Ladislaws. She asks herself "Was inheritance a question of liking or of responsibility?" and the narrator explains that "all the energy of Dorothea's nature went on the side of responsibility – the fulfilment of claims founded on our own deeds, such as marriage and parentage" (371). This last comparison makes family matters—inheritance, marriage, and parentage—all matters of duty rather than personal preference. She also treats the previous disinheritance as still relevant despite a gap of two generations, and she wishes for Casaubon to alter his will to provide inheritance to Will. Casaubon does alter his will, but the changes further limit Will's inheritance rather than augmenting it.

Will's inheritance similarly modifies his relationship with Bulstrode. The banker attempts to establish a direct relationship with Will in order to "make amends for the deprivation which befell [his] mother" (622). He looks to correct Will's lack of fortune that "would have probably already been [his] had [Will's] grandmother been certain of [his] mother's existence and been able to find her" (622). These sentiments echo Dorothea's, although Bulstrode admits that he himself was part of the reason for Will's original separation from these funds. Despite offering

five hundred pounds while Bulstrode lives, Will refuses the money because of the social implications that Lydgate will be blind to later; on leaving Bulstrode's company, Will says, "My unblemished honour is important to me" (624). The network through which money passes can leave a "stain" on the money and all connections made thereafter can be affected by its new associations (624).

In discussing George Eliot's use of inheritance plots, Raymond Williams claims that she makes them central to the action and then "has to make [the inheritance] external, contradictory, and finally irrelevant, as her real interest transfers to the separated, exposed individual, who becomes sadly resigned or must go away" (Williams "Knowable" 263). While I agree with Williams about the necessary externalization of the wills, as characters realize that they do not have clear lines of connection to the dead, I disagree with his assignment of Eliot's "real interest." The inheritance acts as a tool to solidify, or rather, put into writing, the social network of the novel. The funds are not irrelevant to the characters, but they do take a secondary spot in the narrator's considerations to the larger ways in which people connect. After Featherstone's will is read, and all involved parties give their reactions, the narrator generalizes the instance to discuss the relation of historical instances to parables and then ends with an offhand mention of the Reform Bill. The narrator's continual mentions of forces seemingly outside the scene in question disrupts the reader's conception of relevancy and the extent of the social network.

CONCLUSION

Both *Jane Eyre* and *Middlemarch* build on historically accurate details of countryside philanthropy to portray charitable relationships that contribute to popular debates on philanthropic matters. As England transitioned toward greater centralization, oversight and systematization of philanthropy, both novels questioned the boundaries of the process. *Jane Eyre* resisted the ideological shift, remaining rooted in direct charitable relationships. Primarily depicting negative instances of these relationships, the novel does not suggest that the country remain in its present state of charity, but it proposes that the shift should allow for a greater degree of reciprocity and points to the potential benefits of direct relationships. *Middlemarch* similarly relies on negative depictions of charity to define what makes for positive charity relationships, but the novel embraces a shift to network-based relationships. Working within a network framework and shining light on the newly evolving structures of society, *Middlemarch* thinks through the implications of a network-based model for those who do not see the network. The lack of fulfillment in *Middlemarch* suggests space for greater fulfillment in a more enlightened or at least aware future, the time in which *Middlemarch* is written rather than the one in which it occurs.

Investigating the philosophies of charity providers and recipients allows us to better understand how individuals consider their own agency and responsibility to help others. In a direct relationship model, people have a more restricted scope of responsibility and agency but more of both within their domain. When Jane marries Rochester, she does not discuss wanting to provide greater funds to change the Lowood school, or continuing her support of the school where she taught. She primarily cares about being present and helpful in the time that she spends with a person. In a network model, people have a wider range of responsibility to others and the

potential to impact many others, but the links to others are weaker, decreasing person to person responsibility and the likelihood of making a large impact in the face of competing forces. Dorothea is thus able to and believes she should support disparate individuals such as Lydgate and Caleb Garth. At the same time, she can just as easily abandon her connections with them and go to London, and the forces of Bulstrode or Rosamond or Fred can intercede.

Beyond contributing to the Victorian dialogue on charity and class relations, Victorian literature can shed light on the modern world. The development of the Victorian world of private philanthropy works as a historical comparison for the current growth of the American nonprofit sector. In 1994, Lester Salamon described a world-wide increase in the third sector due to grass-roots movements, globally oriented North American non-profits, and reduced economic growth in the 1970s. He describes the fear that welfare states are "encouraging dependence" alongside a "new-found interest in 'assisted self-reliance' or 'participatory development'" (Salamon 116). This growth has continued into the 21st century as the nonprofit sector workforce was second in size only to retail and manufacturing workforces in 2010, accounting for 10.7 million paid workers (Lambert). The number of nonprofits has also increased 24% from 2000 to 2010, and the sectors' overall revenue grew 41% after inflation (Lambert).

While Victorians eventually moved away from private philanthropy toward state-based aid, forces in America are resistant to the idea of increased government support. As America continues in this strain, to what extent does it base its approaches on direct versus network relationships?

At the intersection of direct and network relationships is the community building paradigm. The essence of building community is creating a network of connected individuals, but a network built on strong, direct relationships. In this paradigm, the primary goal is to build a

sense of community through increased social capital, building greater relationships within the community, and measurable progress towards becoming the community's ideal. In 1997, Paul Mattessich and Barbara Monsey selected 48 out of 525 studies which fit their criteria of place-based community building efforts which successfully built social capacity (Mattessich). Within these, they established the important traits involved in a community building program, resulting in a total of 28 qualities of the community builders, the program design, and the community itself which tended to lead towards success. Rather than focus on just the program itself, the qualities of the individuals involved matter, including traits such as flexibility, commitment, and trustworthiness. Unlike Victorian philanthropy which largely treated individuals as subjects of charity, the community building paradigm treats individuals as active members in shaping their community, allowing for a feeling of reciprocity.

The combination of direct and network language in the community building breaks the dichotomy of thought that separated the two primary sides of the philanthropic debate in Victorian England. Just as Lewes misconstrued literature by separating the emotional and intellectual potential of texts, community members cannot be fully satisfied in either the direct relationship or network model. While the former is no longer realistic in a globalizing world, the latter lacks substance or rather depth of understanding. Instead of choosing between personal relationships and an organized approach, the modern community building paradigm makes network relationships more substantial, formed of thicker matter than tenuous web filaments. Small scale communities and direct relationships can be imagined as the basic image of a fractal which appears the same when zoomed out to a larger community level. Charity formulated through this interpersonal relationship model would continue to emphasize the importance of reciprocity and involvement of both the giver and receiver while allowing the individual to place

his or her worth in perspective to a larger picture. This approach toward charity is not necessarily superior; it is simply the way in which the scratches on Eliot's pier glass appear beneath a modern light bulb. Recognizing how modern charity builds on assumptions about human and class relationships will allow individuals looking to make a positive influence to act with greater intentionality and clearer purpose.

Works Cited

Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot, and Nineteenth-century Fiction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983. Print.

---. "Myth and the Single Consciousness: *Middlemarch* and "The Lifted Veil"" *This Particular Web: Essays on Middlemarch*. Ed. Ian Adam. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1975. 91-115. Print.

"Benefactor, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2013. Web. 2013

Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *October* 28 (1984): 125–133. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1993 Modern Library ed. New York: Modern Library, 1993. Print.

Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

Charlesworth, Maria Louisa. *The Female Visitor to the Poor; Or, Records of Female Parochial Visiting, by a Clergyman's Daughter*. 1846. *GoogleBooks*. 2006. Web.

Coats, A. W. "Introduction." Introduction. *Poverty in the Victorian Age*. Ed. A. W. Coats. Vol. 3. Germany: Gregg International Limited, 1973. Print.

"Conscience, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2013. Web. 2013

Coovadia, Imraan. "George Eliot's Realism and Adam Smith." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 42.4 (2002): 819–835. Print.

"Dependent, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2013. Web. 2013

Dickens, Charles. *Bleak House*. London: Penguin Classics, 2011. Print.

"Eighth Report of the Commissioners Appointed by Parliament to Inquire Respecting Charities." 1824. *Poverty in the Victorian Age*. Ed. A. W. Coats. Vol. 3. Germany: Gregg International Limited, 1973. Print.

Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. London: Penguin Classics, 2011. Print.

---. "Silly Novels by Lady Novelists." 1856. *Victorian Fiction: A Collection of Essays from the Period*. Ed. Ira B. Nadel. New York: Garland, 1986. Print.

Elliott, Dorice Williams. *The Angel Out of the House: Philanthropy and Gender in Nineteenth-Century England*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2002. Print. Victorian Literature and Culture Series.

Ermarth, Elizabeth Deeds. "George Eliot's Conception of Sympathy." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 40.1 (1985): 23–42. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1979. Print.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *The Life of Charlotte Brontë*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

---. *North and South*. Lexington, 2013. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979. Print.

Goodlad, Lauren M. E. *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State: Character and Governance in a Liberal Society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003. Print.

Graver, Suzanne. *George Eliot and Community: A Study in Social Theory and Fictional Form*. Berkeley: University of California, 1984. Print.

Haight, Gordon S. *George Eliot: A Biography*. New York: Oxford UP, 1969. Print.

Hebrews. *The Holy Bible, King James Version*. New York: Oxford Edition, 1769. *King James Bible Online*. 2008. Web. Jan. 2014.

Hepburn, Allan. "Introduction: Inheritance and Disinheritance in the Novel." Introduction. *Troubled Legacies: Narrative and Inheritance*. Ed. Allan Hepburn. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2007. 3-25. Print.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *Poverty and Compassion: The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991. Print.

Horn, Pamela. *Labouring Life in the Victorian Countryside*. Guernsey: Alan Sutton, 1987. Print.

---. *Victorian Countrywomen*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991. Print.

Kees, Lara Freeburg. "'Sympathy' in Jane Eyre." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 45.4 (2005): 873–897. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.

Kidd, Alan J. "Philanthropy and the 'Social History Paradigm'" *Social History* 21.2 (1996): 180-92. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Mar. 2014.

Lambert, Jaclyn. "Infographic: What Is Driving Nonprofit Sector's Growth." *Infographic: What Is Driving Nonprofit Sector's Growth?* Nonprofit Quarterly, 10 Dec. 2013. Web. 13 Feb. 2014.

Lane, Christopher. "Charlotte Brontë on the Pleasure of Hating." *ELH* 69.1 (2002): 199–222. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.

Lee, Robert. *Rural Society and the Anglican Clergy, 1815-1914: Encountering and Managing the Poor*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006. Print.

Lewes, George Henry. *The Principles of Success in Literature*. Ed. Fred N. Scott. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1891. Print.

Mallen, Richard D. "George Eliot and the Precious Mettle of Trust." *Victorian Studies* 44.1 (2001): 41–75. Print.

Matthew. *The Holy Bible, King James Version*. New York: Oxford Edition, 1769. *King James Bible Online*. 2008. Web. Jan. 2014.

Mattessich, Paul W., and Barbara R. Monsey. *Community Building: What Makes It Work: A Review of Factors Influencing Successful Community Building*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, 1997. Print.

Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Trans. Ian Cunnison. London: W.W. Norton &, 1967. Print.

Menke, Richard. "Fiction as Vivisection: G. H. Lewes and George Eliot." *ELH* 67.2 (2000): 617–653. Print.

"Mendicant, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2013. Web. 2014

Mintz, Alan. *George Eliot & the Novel of Vocation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1978. Print.

"Minutes of the evidence taken before the committee appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into the state of mendicity and vagrancy in the metropolis and its neighbourhood." 1815. *Poverty in the Victorian Age*. Ed. A. W. Coats. Vol. 3. Germany: Gregg International Limited, 1973. Print.

Mitchell, Rebecca N. "The Rosamond Plots: Alterity and the Unknown in Jane Eyre and Middlemarch." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 66.3 (2011): 307–327. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Jan. 2014.

Momberger, Philip. "Self and World in the Works of Charlotte Brontë." *ELH* 32.3 (1965): 349-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 3 Jan. 2014.

Mowat, C. L. "English Philanthropy, 1660-1960 by David Owen." *Social Service Review*39.2 (1965): 239-40. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Jan. 2014.

Novy, Marianne. "'Middlemarch' and George Eliot's Female (Re) Vision of Shakespeare." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 90.1 (1991): 61–78. Print.

Otis, Laura. *Networking: Communicating with Bodies and Machines in the Nineteenth Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2011. Print.

Owen, David. *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960.* Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1964. Print.

"Philanthropy, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, December 2013. Web. 2013

Prochaska, F. K. *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-century England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980. Print.

"Reports of the Society for the Suppression of Mendicity." 1839. *Poverty in the Victorian Age*. Ed. A. W. Coats. Vol. 3. Germany: Gregg International Limited, 1973. Print.

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela; Or, Virtue Rewarded*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Rubinstein, W. D. *Britain's Century: a Political and Social History, 1815-1905*. London ; New York : New York: Arnold ; Co-published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press, 1998. Print. The Arnold History of Britain.

Roberts, David. "English Philanthropy, 1660-1960 by David Owen." *The Journal of Modern History* 37.2 (1965): 237-38. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Jan. 2014.

Ruskin, John. "Essay on Literature - 1836." *The Victorian Muse: Selected Criticism and Parody of the Period*. Ed. Ira B. Nadel. New York: Garland, 1986. Print

Salamon, Lester M. "The Rise of the Nonprofit Sector." *Foreign Affairs* 73.4 (1994): 109-22. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb. 2014.

Schlossberg, Linda. "The Low, Vague Hum of Numbers': The Malthusian Economies of 'Jane Eyre." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 29.2 (2001): 489–506. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.

Shaw, Harry E. *Narrating Reality: Austen, Scott, Eliot*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1999. Print.

Sidney, Sir Philip. "The Defence of Poesy." *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1858) *The Defence of Poesy*. Poetry Foundation, 13 Oct. 2009. Web. 13 Feb. 2014.

Siegel, Daniel. "The Failure of Condescension." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 33.2 (2005): 395–414. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.

Social Welfare in Transition; Selected English Documents, 1834-1909. Ed. Roy Lubove. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1966. Print.

Sparks, Tabitha. *The Doctor in the Victorian Novel: Family Practices*. Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2009. Print.

Sully, James. "George Eliot's Art." *Mind* 6.23 (1881): 378–394. Print.

Summers, Anne. "A Home from Home - Women's Philanthropic Work in the Nineteenth Century." *Fit Work for Women*. Ed. Sandra Burman. New York: St. Martin's, 1979. 33-63. Print.

Thomas, Sue. "Christianity and the State of Slavery in 'Jane Eyre'." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 35.1 (2007): 57–79. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.

Thompson, F. M. L. "Landowners and the Rural Community." *The Unquiet Countryside*. Ed. G. E. Mingay. London: Routledge, 1989. 80-98. Print.

Thomson, Patricia. *The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal, 1837-1873*. London: Oxford UP, 1956. Print.

Trollope, Anthony. *The Warden*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkley: University of California, 1957. Print.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Routledge Classics, 2005. Print.

Wheeler, Michael. *The Art of Allusion in Victorian Fiction*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1979. Print.

Williams, Raymond. *The English Novel; from Dickens to Lawrence*. New York: Oxford UP, 1970. Print.

---. "The Knowable Community in George Eliot's Novels." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 2.3 (1969): 255-68. *JSTOR*. Web.

Wright, Walter Francis. “George Eliot as Industrial Reformer.” *PMLA* 56.4 (1941): 1107–1115. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Sept. 2013.