

The
WITTENBERG
History
JOURNAL

Wittenberg University • Springfield, Ohio

Volume XXXIII

Spring 2004

**The Wittenberg History Journal
2003-2004 Editorial Staff**

Editor..... Mark Huber '04
Co-Editors..... Jenny Burns '05
 Sarah McCance '04
Editorial Staff..... Vanessa Earley '04, Ed VanWormer '06,
 Katie Proctor '06
Advisor Dr. Jim Huffman

The Hartje Paper

The Martha and Robert G. Hartje Award is presented annually to a senior in the spring semester. The History Department determines the four finalists who write a 600 to 800 word narrative essay dealing with a historical event or figure. The finalists must have at least a 2.7 grade point average and have completed at least six history courses. The winner is awarded \$500 at a spring semester History Department colloquium and the winning paper is included in the *History Journal*. This year's Hartje Paper award was presented to Mark Huber.

Table of Contents

Hartje Award Winner

Soloman's Rock

by Mark Huber 1

Pious vs. Holy: The Relationships and Differences Between
the Lives Of Laywomen and the Lives of Female Saints That
Depict the Evolution of Sanctity in Byzantium

by Jenny Burns 4

John Henry Lloyd

by Vanessa Earley 18

Behind Stone Walls and Between the Lines: Bethlem Doctors'
Perceptions of Insanity in Early Victorian London

by Sarah McCance 27

More Than Rosie: A Look Beyond The Image

by Carissa Reidel 40

Address correspondence to:

Editor
The Wittenberg University History Journal
Department of History
Wittenberg University
PO Box 720
Springfield, OH 45501-0720

The 2003-2004 edition of the *Wittenberg History Journal* is dedicated to the History Department Faculty in recognition of their dedication to their students and the betterment of the Wittenberg community. Thank you.

Solomon's Rock

Mark Huber

If you needed a covert location to play cards at Wittenberg College in the 1840s, away from the watchful eyes of the faculty, "Solomon's Rock" provided the place. A gang of card players discovered just that when they began to use the room created by some large cliffs at the south end of the college to "indulge their nefarious practices ad libitum."¹ The name did not come, however, from a famous student or successful card player but rather from an esteemed preacher of morality and president of the Board of Directors, Solomon Ritz.² The rock provided a natural shelter on the relatively clear campus, where Ritz had once jested that the fissure be covered over and used to accommodate the students in light of the expensive endeavor of building the first college edifice.³ The irony that this den of card playing was named for someone who spent his life preaching against such evils was not lost on his contemporaries. In fact, one observer suggested that, "if ever this place be appropriated to the students [Solomon] should be prepared with a scourge of small cords to drive these money-changers out of the temple."⁴

Few have heard of this early frontier pastor, for whom a rock was named, and even fewer know the extent of his accomplishments. Like many characters throughout history, he has been viewed as playing a smaller role in a bigger drama. Even so, for those who knew him during his lifetime it would have been difficult to push Solomon Ritz out of the limelight.

As a self-characterized evangelist, he constantly sought out new areas in which to organize congregations and form new parishes.⁵ Throughout his thirty-eight years in the ministry he served as a pastor of seventeen congregations, many of which he organized himself, as he preached in pulpits spanning five states.⁶ A hard preacher to ignore, a colleague not too fond of Solomon scoffed: "He always measured his success in preaching by the wetness of his under clothes when he was done. If they were dry he reproached himself for not having 'cried aloud'."⁷ In addition to his colorful preaching style he was known for his enthusiastic support, and advocacy for, such divisive issues in the Lutheran church as "revivals, protracted meetings, prayer-meetings, family-worship, [and] temperance."⁸

These activities made him a natural ally of the similarly minded Ezra Keller, president of Wittenberg College. As a result of their ideological similarities Solomon poured his energy into Wittenberg and greatly helped to sustain the institution during its formative years. He acted as the first agent for Wittenberg College, collecting the funds the infant institution needed to survive, and also served as a member of the Board of Directors.⁹ Through his aiding of revivals and other events at Wittenberg, Solomon's charisma and energy made him a natural favorite of the students. He also earned the respect of Keller and the rest of the Board, and when Keller died prematurely in 1848, Solomon preached the funeral sermon.¹⁰

A constant follower of the ever-expanding frontier, Solomon eventually left Ohio to seek out new and more spiritually destitute places in which to exhort the gospel. His success in organizing Lutheran congregations led him through Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana. Not finding any Lutherans to organize in the furthest stretches of Iowa, he took up farming for two years, preaching on the weekends to anyone and everyone who would listen.¹¹ Solomon spent the remaining years of his life preaching, returning to Ohio and to some of the churches he had organized previously.

History has been able quietly to tuck Solomon Ritz away into the vast recesses of the past. His contemporaries, however, would have had difficulty ignoring him. Passionate, personable, and pious, Ritz dedicated himself to his work and life, building up the church and spreading the gospel wherever he went. The impressive number of Lutheran churches left in his wake offer a silent testimony to his noisy life.

Another silent testimony to Solomon's life also remains. Somewhere south of Wittenberg University lies "Solomon's Rock," waiting for a new gang of card players.



Works Cited

- Diehl, Michael. *Biography of Rev. Ezra Keller: Founder and First President of Wittenberg College*. Springfield, OH: Ruralist Publishing Co, 1859.
- English Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio. *Minutes of the Seventh Session of the English Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio and Adjacent States*. Massillon, OH: Luce and Worstell, 1842.
- Lutheran Observer*. 2 December 1836. 23 October 1840. 16 August; 8 November 1844. 18 August 1846. 19 March; 7 May 1847. 2 July; 15 October 1847. 6 February 1848; 14 April; 13 October 1848. 4 April 1851. 30 January; 6 February; 13 February 1874.
- Morris, John G. *Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry*. Baltimore, MD: James Young, 1878.
- Ritz, Solomon. *A Dialogue: Luther and the Reformation*. Mansfield, OH: Wesleyan Branch Book Concern of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America, 1854.
- Smith, Arthur H. *A History of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church 1836- 1920*. Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1924.
- Wentz, Abdel Ross. *Gettysburg Lutheran Theological Seminary: Volume Two Alumni Record*. Harrisburg, PA: The Evangelical Press, 1964.
- Wittenberg College Catalogs, 1845-1885*, Archives, Thomas Library, Wittenberg University.

Endnotes

- ¹ J.G.H. [J. Hamilton], Untitled, *Lutheran Observer*, 18 August 1846, p.2.
- ² *Wittenberg College Catalogs, 1845-1852*, Archives, Thomas Library, Wittenberg University.
- ³ J.G.H., Untitled, p.2.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ L.M. Kuhus, "Rev. Solomon Ritz: In Memoriam," *Lutheran Observer*, 13 February 1874, p.1.
- ⁶ Abdel Ross Wentz, *Gettysburg Lutheran Theological Seminary: Volume Two Alumni Record* (Harrisburg, PA: The Evangelical Press, 1964).
- ⁷ John G. Morris, *Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry* (Baltimore, MD: James Young, 1878), 552.
- ⁸ L.M. Kuhus, "Rev. Solomon Ritz: In Memoriam," p.1.
- ⁹ Ritz served as an agent for Wittenberg College from 1845-1852, served on the board from 1845-1852, and served as President of the Board in 1848. *Wittenberg College Catalogs*.
- ¹⁰ Michael Diehl, *Biography of Rev. Ezra Keller: Founder and First President of Wittenberg College* (Springfield, OH: Ruralist Publishing Co, 1859), 352.
- ¹¹ L.M. Kuhus, "Rev. Solomon Ritz: In Memoriam," p.1.
- ¹² Solomon Ritz circa 1850, Lutheran Collection, Thomas Library, Wittenberg University.

Pious vs. Holy: The Relationships and Differences Between the Lives of Laywomen and the Lives of Female Saints That Depict the Evolution of Sanctity in Byzantium

Jenny Burns

Those holy women who came to be revered in Byzantium demonstrate that there were many paths to sanctity in the Christian East. Sanctification¹ was a possibility not just for consecrated virgins, but for wives and mothers, and even for former prostitutes.

— Alice-Mary Talbot, "Women"

"The arena of virtue...is open to women no less than to men, and God the prize-giver generously grants the rewards and victory crowns to both sexes equally. Neither sex, nor fortune, nor weakness of the body, nor differences in station, nor anything else is an obstacle for entering the contests to those who desire to do so...nor does the master of the games accept those who have chosen celibacy over those who bear the yoke of marriage."² This quote, from the *vita* of Saint Mary the Younger, addresses the question of what constituted sanctity in Byzantium, especially, what constituted *female* sanctity. Estimated to have been written after 1025 A.D., the *vita* of St. Mary the Younger provides historians with an essential key to unlocking this mystery.³ Earlier Christian women saints were either martyrs, ascetics, or at least celibate; however, St. Mary the Younger achieved sainthood even though she was a married laywoman with children.⁴ What brought about this change in the requirements of sanctification for women? I propose that a combination of several factors, which will be elaborated on later, led to the *reluctant* sanctification of a handful of married women. The change in the characteristics necessary for female sanctity from asceticism to simply the requirement of living a good secular life, which can be seen in the selection of *vitae* used in this study, along with the lack of more laywomen saints like St. Mary, aid the argument that the change in what constituted female sanctity in Byzantium was a reluctant experiment, one that the church deemed unnecessary to continue further. To prove this, it is necessary to examine the *vitae* of several female saints who can be representative of differing reasons for sanctity. Additionally, it is important to illustrate how these women, who became the models of Christian ideals, reflected or molded the societal values that affected the lives and religious commitment of laywomen in Byzantium.

The evolution of the characteristics of sainthood can be examined somewhat

chronologically through the lives of St. Synlectica, a 'desert mother' of early Byzantium and through the changes in female sanctity that appear in the *vitae* of St. Mary the Younger and St. Thomaïs of Lesbos, two married laywomen that achieve sanctity although they remained married, lived in the secular world, and in St. Mary's case, bore children, whose *vitae* were written around the tenth century. It is also imperative that, while studying what made these women "holy" in the eyes of the Byzantine Orthodoxy, one also must investigate the relationships between the values present in the *vitae* and those that affected laywomen of the time. It is important, however, to restrict analysis of this topic to urban women because the few existing primary sources concerning women seem to revolve exclusively around city life. This study will utilize the *vitae* of the female saints mentioned above, along with several other primary sources, in an effort to elaborate on the changes in reasons for female sanctity, in order to draw connections between these religious changes and what was occurring at the time in Byzantine secular society. Furthermore, the focus of this work is on the changes in the characteristics of female sanctity, which occurred between the ninth and eleventh centuries A.D.; nevertheless, to fully examine the reasons for this change, earlier periods in Byzantine history must also be studied to some extent.

The first female saints were martyrs to the persecution of the Christian faith. These women martyrs were able to achieve sanctity along with men because only "under persecution could women realize an equality with men; neither the imperial authorities nor Christians themselves recognized any difference of sex in this context of suffering."⁵ However, martyrdom as a method for achieving sanctity ended with the decline of the persecution of Christians in the fourth century.⁶ From then on, prevalent in *vitae* of female saints is the necessity of having "male" characteristics to make oneself holy. Most female saints were martyrs, ascetics, or hermits, like Synlectica, a 'desert mother.' She lived as a hermit in the Jordanian Desert during the early period of Byzantium, and when discovered by Silas, she appears to be a man, or a eunuch, but not a woman, so dedicated to asceticism she had been.⁷ "The ideal for saintly women was to deny their femininity and emulate men; some female ascetics [like Synlectica] ate so little that their breasts shriveled up and their menstrual periods ceased."⁸ Thus, through starvation, they made their bodies into as "male" a vessel as possible, and they did this to combat the negativity associated with being female in the quest for sanctity. Neophytos the Recluse, the creator of the monastery of the Enkleistra near Paphos in Cyprus, was considered a "Cypriot holy man," and he wrote a good deal on women and sanctity in the twelfth century.⁹ "Saintly women require not only a denial of sexuality (as is the case with male saints), but a denial of their very sex. In the light of which it is justified to conclude that Neophytos' 'good women' are 'good' precisely because they have ceased to be 'women'."¹⁰ He also removes femininity from those women he deemed "good" by neutralizing their sexuality through emphasis on their virginity, old age, or unmarried status.¹¹ If that which gives woman her sexuality is removed, then she "has been rendered powerless—therefore good."¹² Furthermore, for Neophytos, the preservation of virginity in women became the defining characteristic of those virgin women who achieved sainthood. "Even though other means of achieving sanctity are acknowledged, virginity is by far their most often praised qualification, placed higher

than even female saint's faith or martyrdom."¹³ Taking on the characteristics of a man or an un-gendered person, was a reoccurring task that early Byzantine female saints had to accomplish to achieve sanctity.

The rejection of female sexuality that was essential to female saints like Syncletica became a model for Byzantine women who sought a alternative to marriage. "Christianity certainly offered women some scope for involvement in the life of their community. In particular, they found a role in the ascetic life... 'Christianity became a liberating force in the lives of women' via the search for God through renunciation."¹⁴ The church supported women who chose virginity and a life committed to God over marriage. "The threat of marriage and ensuing procreation frequently prompted women to assert their spiritual vocation. Since celibacy was still held to be superior to the exercise of sexuality, they continued to commit their virginity to Christ in a ceremony that established the spiritual equivalent of marriage...the expression of a strong religious commitment could transform the regular pattern of female existence."¹⁵ Additionally, it was not uncommon for women to have been married, had children, and once their children had grown, then become celibate and enter a convent to devote themselves to Christ through an ascetic existence.¹⁶ Although asceticism became a model for women in Byzantium, the majority of women were by no means encouraged to venture forth into the desert like Syncletica, for not only could they endanger themselves, they could also disrupt the hermitages of male monks and become a sexual temptation; instead, women "were urged to create their own 'desert', a place free from the demands of the world, within their own home or in a house shared with other women."¹⁷ Therefore, ascetic women most often entered convents or at least lived with other ascetic women. These female groups formed a sort of replacement for the family these women had to renounce because of their ascetic form of religious commitment, which separated them from the majority of women who lived as wives and mothers.¹⁸

Piety, however, was a unifying ideal characteristic for Byzantine women, whether they were nuns or wives, because it was a socially acceptable form of religious commitment. Piety, as understood in this study, is a characteristic that was highly valued in Byzantium and was displayed through Christian acts, such as prayer and charity. Charity was the most common means of displaying piety in women. "Charity was an activity that everyone was supposed to perform in imitation of Christ and his saints, and...giving to the poor (or to the church) amounted to giving to Christ."¹⁹ Additionally, because hagiography consistently depicted charity as an important saintly characteristic, people were compelled to emulate saints through philanthropic activities.²⁰ Though men did partake in charitable activities, it was women, especially, who were known for it; Angeliki E. Laiou, in her article, "Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women," states that "the blend of pragmatism and piety is, I think, particularly striking in the case of women."²¹ Laiou then sees pious acts as an integral and rather socially required of "good women." This was probably true because charity was one of few socially acceptable reasons for women to leave the home and enter the public realm so that they could interact with people outside their families.²² Charity was also acceptable for women because it was a religious activity, which seems to be the only reason that well-bred women, in particular, were allowed to intermingle with their community, though

most women of means gave charity in the form of donations of funds.²³ Furthermore, "Christian women...inherited a tradition of service dedicated towards the relief of poverty and illness, creating forms of a more private religious expression..."²⁴ That women's religious commitment occurred increasingly in the private and domestic realm was a product of the limitations that men and the church placed on women's ability to hold official, public positions in the church.

The only official position that women were able to hold in the church was that of deaconess, which was developed in the early days of Christian Byzantium. The church held that deaconesses had to be over the age of sixty (or later, forty) and have been known as extremely pious women.²⁵ Thus, the women who were allowed to partake in this official role in the church had been sufficiently desexualized by old age and menopause. Originally, when the Byzantine Empire was first Christianizing, women were needed to baptize adult women through triple immersion because modesty and decency dictated that male priests could not do this.²⁶ However, once infant baptism became the norm, deaconesses were no longer needed to fulfill this capacity. They then became simply a group of women who were known as nurses, givers of charity, in effect, social workers, and they survived as an order until the twelfth century.²⁷ It is important to understand that the order of deaconesses was small, and that most Byzantine women performed charity within their domestic role as wife and mother.

As discussed, piety in women was most commonly expressed through charity, a rather private form of religious commitment. Piety in Byzantine women increasingly occurred in the domestic realm, thus reflecting the change in the tenth century in what was considered "holy" according to the hagiographical texts concerning female saints. At this time, a handful of female saints, especially St. Mary the Younger who lived in the tenth century, found sanctity through living good "female" lives in the domestic realm of society. Charity and pious activities, such as church attendance and prayer became defining *saintly* characteristics for these elevated women. That women such as St. Mary the Younger and St. Thomaïs of Lesbos were elevated to sainthood is especially important because they were *married* women who remained married and were still seen as able to become saints. Because this was such a departure from the traditional ideas of female sanctity, such as the need for virginity, or at least chastity, and asceticism, the *vitae* of these married women who became saints are extremely valuable to the historian seeking to discover the ideals that Byzantine society held for women. At least locally, these pious housewives, inspired cults. St. Mary and St. Thomaïs "provided attractive role models for the secluded women of the Byzantine Empire. Asceticism in remote hermitages or even retirement to a convent was not an option for many women, but most could identify with Thomaïs and Mary, emulate their piety and charity, and if necessary, bear with fortitude the miserable existence of a 'battered wife.'²⁸ This is especially mentioned in the *vita* of St. Mary when all the women of Vizye came to her deathbed.²⁹ Obviously, charity and prayer are among the most pious activities that these women partook in, but beyond that, their *vitae* depict them as good *secular* women, as good wives and mothers, even though they were beaten by their husbands. "The cases of St. Mary and St. Thomaïs showed that it was possible to achieve sanctity outside the confines of a hermitage or convent, through unusual devotion to the poor as well as patient endurance of adversity."³⁰

Additionally, the *vitae* depict the domesticity of St. Mary the Younger and St. Thomaïs of Lesbos. St. Mary is described as, "the image of meekness, the pillar of moderation, the exemplar of love of God, the model of charity, the paradigm of piety for everyone."³¹ While also portrayed as "flushed with the proper modesty with regard to all," St. Mary is the image of a good wife because of "her good housekeeping, her industriousness, the plainness and simplicity of her dress, her temperance at the table, and all other artless <aspects of her life>."³² St. Thomaïs was known for her skill at weaving and for withstanding the beatings of her husband well.³³ These two women, St. Mary the Younger in particular, are portrayed as saints whom could most likely be emulated by other women. They display the valued characteristics of piety and modesty, among other qualities, that Byzantine laywomen could aspire to. Unlike many other female saints, St. Mary lived a good secular life; it would be much more realistic for other women to seek to imitate her charity toward others and her devotion to her husband than it would be to leave their lives behind and try to live like Syncretica as a desert ascetic. However, true as this may be, the *vita* of St. Mary the Younger does make mention of the worth of fasting, though nowhere near the extent that the ascetics took it. "As for her diet, when her husband was with her, she observed only the forty-day fasts. But when he was away on campaign, she abstained from meat at all times, pretending it was because of her husband's absence, but in truth because of the benefits of fasting."³⁴ This is an example of how she, and St. Thomaïs as well, endeavored to live a "semi-monastic" life within their domestic and secular lives.³⁵ Although the *vitae* of St. Mary and St. Thomaïs, demonstrate these traits of the former standard of asceticism, they are not the focus and are not cited as the reason these pious housewives were sainted. No, these women were sainted because they were the image of holinesses and piety within the realm in which society dictated they should exist. "Despite everything [beatings] they uphold the ideal of Christian marriage. Their example gave spiritual value to a woman's role in marriage, which, if not lacking, was underplayed...this model of the good wife replaced that of the female ascetic as the ideal of female sanctity."³⁶ For this reason, it follows that women and the family were becoming increasingly important in Byzantine society.

Perhaps the characteristics that constituted female sanctity did not change; rather, they were created. If early female saints only achieved sanctity by denying their very gender, their femininity, then can it not be considered that they became saints because they ceased to be women? The church saw fit to elevated them to sainthood because they had cleansed themselves of both their femininity and very womanness, in other words, what made them unfit for sainthood, and in their quest for holiness, they became, in essence, men. Therefore, when the church elevated married and rather youthful women who were also mothers in the tenth and eleventh centuries to sainthood, it can be interpreted that they were, for the first time, deeming that women could achieve sanctity as women and not only as women emulating men. However, this change in dogma was reluctant, and though it occurred with the sainthood of St. Mary the Younger and St. Thomaïs of Lesbos, few, if any, other women achieved sainthood under similar circumstances. Additionally, St. Mary the Younger and St. Thomaïs of Lesbos, the married women saints, never gained much popularity among the women of Byzantium, their cults remained local, their Lives

only survive in one or two copies, and few, if any, icons of them are known.³⁷ Perhaps the sainthood of St. Mary the Younger does not represent the church's changing ideas on women's ability to achieve sanctity as many historians believe, for it is evident in the *vita* of St. Mary that the ecclesiastical authorities had extreme reservations about the sanctity of St. Mary. "For," said the archbishop, "we know this woman to have been good and her life to have been virtuous; but we cannot believe that she has been found worthy of such grace. God has granted the ability to perform miracles to chaste men, holy monks, and martyrs. She, on the other hand, lived with a man, and did not change her mode of life, nor did she ever do any great or extraordinary things. Whence her power to perform miracles?"³⁸ Instead, could it be possible that the church made her a saint to combat the adverse effects that the former ideal of female holiness through virginity and chastity had on the patriarchal society of the Byzantine Empire? Perhaps the religious ideal of asceticism led to problems within the secular realm of Byzantine society, problems that the church may have later sought to resolve through a new model for female sanctity.

The earlier Byzantine religious ideal of asceticism, when practiced by women, defined a good and pious woman as one who rejected family, marriage, and even femininity itself. This ideal was perpetuated in the *vitae* of female ascetic saints, which became a vehicle for spreading the stereotype of the holy ascetic woman as the only route to sanctity for women. This was especially evident in the fourth and fifth century hagiographical texts. "Christian authors emphasized the ideal of virginity or, failing that, chastity within marriage..."³⁹ The focus of what was holy for women was the renunciation of what made a woman a woman in Byzantium: her sexuality, her role as a wife, and her role as a mother. At this time, even the charitable acts that laywomen partook in as a socially acceptable pious activity, were far beneath the renunciation of femaleness in the characteristics of sanctity. "But in fourth- and fifth-century texts, the focus is more often on the self-denial and endurance of the ascetic hero than on her or his good works. Ministering to the sick attracted less praise than patient endurance of one's own, perhaps revolting, illness."⁴⁰ Another problem that arose from idealizing the ascetic woman is that if a woman's role in society was to marry, produce children, and run a household and if the very definition of holiness for women demanded the rejection of all of these things, what did their role become? The answer lies in these women's revocation of their gender as and their metamorphosis into a being that was "socially invisible as a woman."⁴¹ This contradiction is explained quite well by Gillian Clark in her essay, "Women in Asceticism in Late Antiquity: The Refusal of Status and Gender." "There were few opportunities for a woman to be a hero. The denial of gender can be read as a simple refusal to believe that femaleness has anything going for it. As a bishop once said to his deacon, who had asked about the remarkable woman Olympias, 'Do not say 'woman': say 'what a remarkable human being,' for she is a man despite her outward appearance.' If you live in a culture which has no role models for women except the virtuous wife and the temptress, it is not surprising for you to reject identity as a woman to aim for identity as a hero."⁴² So if these holy ascetic women were, in effect, not women any longer, they gained power and independence, which were unintended consequences of the ascetic ideal. "In their Christian commitment one can get an impression of female force, and in the way this was handled by society one

senses a male appreciation of something with potentially dangerous proportions.⁴³ Independence in women, though found through religious commitment, was not something that Byzantine society would have wanted to foster. Nevertheless, the church supported female asceticism wholeheartedly, and in some ways set out to present marriage as a "spiritually inferior form of life," as Jerome said, which was a result of elevating asceticism. "Over there the babies are prattling, the children hang on her for kisses, the accounts are being added up, and the money got ready for payment. Here a posse of cooks, girded for action, is pounding meat, and a crowd of weaving-women chattering. Then a message comes that her husband has brought his friends home. She circles the rooms like a swallow: is the couch smooth? Have they swept the floor? Are the cups properly set out? Is dinner ready? Tell me, where in all this is the thought of God? (*Against Helvidius* 20, PL 23. 214)."⁴⁴ Although this woman is certainly the model of a good wife in Byzantium, she is inferior because she is married. Furthermore the church "supported the establishment of convents, the devotion of young girls and widows to celibacy against the social pressures of marriage, and the practice of the spiritual marriage... These developments gave women new possibilities for expressing female sanctity within society and even within marriage, possibilities which were quickly exploited."⁴⁵ And as we will see, these possibilities were most certainly exploited by women. Women gained some forms of independence in their rejection of pressures to marry using the excuse of devoting themselves to a celibate existence. In some social classes, such as the elite class of Constantinople, this caused a demographic crisis because there were too few marriageable women of high birth because too many had been committed to virginity and a religious life.⁴⁶ In Byzantine society, female independence and the ability for women to refuse pressure to marriage were not things that the patriarchal society valued or wanted to perpetuate; perhaps these secular consequences of the ascetic religious ideal, were reasons for changing paths to female sanctification.

As the ascetic religious ideal for women lived on, the adverse effects discussed above influenced the church to take action to rework its concepts of the holy and pious woman. Eventually, it took steps to reverse the idea that marriage (and the sexual intercourse that ensued) was inferior. The legal valorization of marriage occurred with the publication of the *Ecloga*, a law code, in 741, which identified the family as the most important social institution.⁴⁷ Additionally, marriage was valorized in the eyes of the church in the eighth century as well, and with this the church recognized "marriage not only as a necessary institution (a recognition that came rather early) but also as the proper and blessed state for a woman."⁴⁸ This gave women's role recognition and began "the evolution of a model that gives women a positive role within the institution of marriage, an evolution that may most easily be seen in the changing concept of female holiness."⁴⁹ Additionally, because of the need to instill faith in women that their role was indeed a good and proper one, one can surmise that the church sought to achieve this by invoking the power of hagiography; this experiment was undertaken with the elevation of married laywomen, like St. Mary the Younger, to sainthood. However, the change began with the sanctification of women like St. Matrona, who was married and had a child, but was able to achieve sanctity later in life after she had left these things behind.⁵⁰ As stated above, this phenomenon came to a climax with the sanctification of St. Mary the Younger and St.

Thomaïs of Lesbos. St. Mary's *vita*, especially, seems to have been written with the motive of proving that "charity was a prime virtue; extreme abstemiousness and asceticism in a married woman were not..." because "the whole story revolves around the idea that a married woman may nonetheless achieve sanctity, and that marriage is not only the normal way of life, but also a good state to be in."⁵¹ However, this left the church contradicting itself in the characteristics necessary for female sanctity.

In Byzantium, contradictory positions in church teachings were prevalent throughout the Empire's existence. The church's position concerning women taught that the Virgin Mary, a mother and married woman, was the most holy of women, but at the same time, it only allowed women who had renounced that role and their very "womanness" to be elevated to sainthood and deemed holy. "There was always a tension in Byzantium between the Christian acetic ideal of virginity and celibacy, and the promotion of marriage, which provided a legitimated outlet for sexual relations and the procreation of children, indispensable for the perpetuation of the population. Marriage was, after all, a sacrament of the church, and the family was the basic unit of society. The most important role of women was to bear children, and it as mothers that they are most often praised."⁵² The new form of female sanctification that the church recognized, with the elevation of St. Mary the Younger to sainthood, represents not a total revolution in the characteristics of sanctity in women, but instead, an experiment in it. This would serve to combat the trend of women retaining virginity, which the church had always supported, in order to gain independence, something that the Byzantine patriarchal society could not condone. St. Mary the Younger represents the long valued *secular* characteristics of a good woman, and she is sainted in hope that, by giving women the model of a saintly mother and wife, they would no longer seek to break out of this role for religious reasons.

One may argue that this line of reasoning is flawed, that women already had a holy model of motherhood to emulate in the Virgin Mary. The cult of the Virgin Mary developed in the fifth century; the church depicted Mary, the *Theotokos*, as "an indisputably good woman as well as a mother..." which "inspired a model of maternal and familial Christian dedication."⁵³ Additionally, the *Theotokos* became an extremely important model for Byzantine women; hence, the many images, such as icons of her displaying motherhood through the depiction of Jesus in her arms, that survive today.⁵⁴ However, women could not truly aspire to be *like* the Virgin Mary, for she was a part of the holy family and above all people. However, women *could* aspire to be like a saint like St. Mary the Younger. The hagiographer depicts St. Mary the Younger as the incarnation the Virgin Mary in many ways. As the Virgin Mary gave birth to Jesus, St. Mary the Younger also gave birth to holy sons, Stephen who changed his name to Symeon, an ascetic monk and later priest, and Vannes, who became St. Marinos. "It was indeed meet and proper that such sons should have been born to such <a mother>, holy ones from the holy one, admirable ones from the admirable one, kind ones from the kind one, sainted sons from the sainted <mother>, for they have been dedicated to God at birth, or rather even before birth, since their mother had dedicated herself to God ever since she was a baby, out of her own free will, and had become a dwelling place for all the virtues that delight the Lord of all."⁵⁵ Additionally, St. Mary is likened to the Virgin Mary in her *vita*, and like the Virgin Mary, she is described as one who can intervene on the behalf of people. She is

referred to as "revered mother Mary," which is an extremely strong similarity with how the Virgin Mary is referred to.⁵⁶ However, St. Mary the Younger was a married woman, and unlike the Virgin Mary, partook in all which that state entailed, including sexual intercourse. This seems to be the most difficult aspect of St. Mary's life for the church to deem saintly. Her hagiographer makes this evident in the *vita*. An archbishop and a monk speak out against naming Mary a saint. The monk is quoted stating, "It is not possible for someone who lives a secular life, eats meat, and enjoys the pleasures of marriage to receive from God the grace of working miracles, while monks, who deprive themselves of every pleasure, who are mortified and distressed in everything, who, on top of that, devote themselves to singing hymns day and night, are not deemed worthy of such grace."⁵⁷ This contradicts with the opening statements in the *vita*: "Although she was a woman, although she was married and bore children, nothing hindered her in any way from finding favor with God: neither the weakness of <female> nature, nor the annoyances of wedlock, nor the needs and cares of childrearing. To the contrary, it was these things which gave her the occasion to find favor <with God>, and thus proved that those who believe and claim that such things form an obstacle to virtue are foolish and create *pretexts for sins*."⁵⁸ The *vita* of St. Mary the Younger exists as a document of the contradiction between the traditional views of the church and the "experimental" ones that, according to the hagiographer, allow a woman such as Mary to become a saint. Additionally, because this phenomenon never became widespread, it can be assumed that the church did not want people who partook in sexual intercourse, even in the most respected of ways, to become saints.

However, an interesting connection can be made from this discussion to the lack of new women saints after those that were made saints around the same time as St. Mary the Younger. "There were very few new female saints in Byzantium after the mid-tenth century, although male saints continued to proliferate, especially in the Palaiologan period. Instead, there is much praise of the good wife and mother, the pious laywoman who engages in charitable works... The model for a woman's life very clearly had become that of a good wife and mother. This evolution was possible because the church had accepted fully, since at least the ninth century, both marriage and the sexual relations it entails."⁵⁹ The church's acceptance of marriage and "the sexual relations it entails" can be seen in the *vita* of St. Mary the Younger. Her Life is a reflection of the church's changed views on women, the importance of motherhood, and the valorization of marriage, which would be consistently preached for years to come; however, that St. Mary the Younger achieved sanctity for those same characteristics would not be widely publicized, thus her cult remained local, few, if any, images remain of her, and her *vita* only survives in one manuscript. Similarly, the *vita* of St. Thomaïs of Lesbos, who is the other prime example of a married woman who becomes a saint while remaining married, survives in only two manuscripts.⁶⁰ However, that these two married women achieve sanctity no matter what the circumstances behind their elevation is an important occurrence in women's Christian history.

Because the trends toward keeping women in the home, the increased value in Byzantine society of the family, and the great importance placed on motherhood all correspond to the changing definition of what was saintly and holy in Byzantine

female saints, it can be believed that the relationship between the lives of holy women and the ideals that laywomen tried to emulate in their own lives is a close one indeed. As discussed, however, this different type of sanctity in Byzantine women did not simply occur because it was a reflection of the ideal role for most women; church dogma does not change that drastically without a more concrete meaning. The suggestion that the concept of female sanctity within marriage emerged as an experiment to give women a more socially acceptable model of piety and holiness to emulate seems to explain the sanctification of married women like St. Mary the Younger. St. Mary the Younger and St. Thomaïs of Lesbos were sainted even though they did not embody the long-held religious ideal of asceticism that was so essential to the sanctity of earlier women. Furthermore, evidence suggests that the clergy were against the sanctification of these women, which is why their elevation to sainthood can only have been a reluctant change, one that may have only occurred because of demographic crisis and societal worries over the independence that women found in ascetic religious commitment. Additionally, the theory that the sanctification of St. Mary and St. Thomaïs was part of a reluctant experiment provides some explanation for the lack of new female saints in Byzantium that fit this model, as well as the lack of new female saints in general; the church discovered that it no longer needed to give women a saintly example to follow in order to foster the ideal of the good Christian woman.

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

- Halsall, Paul, trans. and intro. "Life of St. Thomaïs of Lesbos." In *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot, 291-322. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996.
- Laiou, Angeliki E., trans. and intro. "Life of St. Mary the Younger." In *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot, 239-290. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996.
- Metaphrates, Symeon. *The Life of St. Matrona of Perge*. Translated by Khalifa Ben Nasser. *Internet Medieval Sourcebook*. December 1997. Available at <<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/matrona.html>> (22 October 2003).
- Vivan, Tim, trans. and intro. "A Narrative About Syncletica Who Lived in the Jordanian Desert." In *Journeying into God*, 46-52. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Secondary Sources:

- Angold, Michael. *Church and Society in Byzantium Under the Comneni, 1081-126*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Clark, Gillian. "Women and Asceticism in Late Antiquity: The Refusal of Status and Gender." In *Asceticism*, eds. Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis, 33-48. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

_____. *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Galatariotou, Catia S. "Holy Women and Witches: Aspects of Byzantine Conceptions of Gender." *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 9 (1984/85): 55-94.

Herrin, Judith. "In Search of Byzantine Women: Three Avenues of Approach." In *Images of Women in Antiquity*, ed. Averil Cameron and Amelie Kuhrt, 167-190. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983.

_____. "Public and Private forms of Religious Commitment Among Byzantine Women." In *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*, ed. Leonie J. Archer, Susan Fischler, and Maria Wyke, 181-203. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Kazhdan, Alexander. "Byzantium and Social Welfare," In *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, ed. Emily Albu Hanawalt and Carter Lindberg, 67-82. Kirksville, MO: The Thomas Jefferson University Press at Northeast Missouri State University, 1994.

_____. "Women at Home." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 52 (1998): 1-17.

Laiou, Angeliki E. "Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women." *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985): 59-102.

_____. "Women in Byzantine Society." In *Women in Medieval Western European Culture*, ed. Linda E. Mitchell, 81-94. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999.

Smith, Julia M. H. "Did Women Have a Transformation of the Roman World?" *Gender and History* 12.3 (November 2000): 552-571.

Talbot, Alice-Mary. "Byzantine Women, Saints' Lives, and Social Welfare." In *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, ed. Emily Albu Hanawalt and Carter Lindberg, 67-82. Kirksville, MO: The Thomas Jefferson University Press at Northeast Missouri State University, 1994.

_____. "Female Sanctity in Byzantium." In *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2001.

_____. "Women." In *The Byzantines*, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo, 117-143. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Endnotes

¹ For this study, sanctification is defined as the process through which one becomes a saint.

² Angeliki E. Laiou, trans. and intro., "Life of St. Mary the Younger," in *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996), 254.

³ *Ibid.*, 245.

- ⁴ Alice-Mary Talbot, "Byzantine Women, Saints' Lives, and Social Welfare," in *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. Emily Albu Hanawalt and Carter Lindberg (Kirksville, Missouri: The Thomas Jefferson University Press at Northeast Missouri State University, 1994), 110.
- ⁵ Judith Herrin, "Public and Private Forms of Religious Commitment among Byzantine Women," in *Women in Ancient Societies: 'An Illusion of the Night'*, eds. Leonie J. Archer, Susan Fischler, and Maria Wyke (New York: Routledge, 1994), 182.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷ Tim Vivian, trans. and intro., "A Narrative About Syncretica Who Lived in the Jordanian Desert," in *Journeying into God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996), 47.
- ⁸ Alice-Mary Talbot, "Women" in *The Byzantines*, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997), 118.
- ⁹ Catia S. Galatariotou, "Holy Women and Witches: Aspects of Byzantine Conceptions of Gender," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 9 (1984/85): 57.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 85.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 82.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 84.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ Julia M. H. Smith, "Did Women Have a Transformation of the Roman World?," *Gender and History* 12.3 (November 2000): 557.
- ¹⁵ Herrin, *Forms of Religious Commitment*, 188.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 183.
- ¹⁷ Gillian Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 101-102.
- ¹⁸ Alice-Mary Talbot, "Female Sanctity in Byzantium," in *Women and Religious Life in Byzantium* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2001), 8.
- ¹⁹ Alexander Kazhdan, "Byzantium and Social Welfare," in *Through the Eye of a Needle: Judeo-Christian Roots of Social Welfare*, eds. Emily Albu Hanawalt and Carter Lindberg (Kirksville, Missouri: The Thomas Jefferson University Press at Northeast Missouri State University, 1994), 81.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 73.
- ²¹ Angeliki E. Laiou, "Observations on the Life and Ideology of Byzantine Women," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 9 (1985): 65.
- ²² Angeliki E. Laiou, "Women in Byzantine Society," in *Women in Medieval Western European Culture*, ed. Linda E. Mitchell (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1999), 89.
- ²³ Talbot, "Saints' Lives and Social Welfare," 106 and 109.
- ²⁴ Herrin, "Forms of Religious Commitment," 186.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 183.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*

- ²⁷ Talbot, "Women," 183-184.
- ²⁸ Talbot, "Saints' Lives and Social Welfare," 118.
- ²⁹ Laiou, "Life of St. Mary the Younger," 266.
- ³⁰ Talbot, "Saints' Lives and Social Welfare," 109-110.
- ³¹ Laiou, "Life of St. Mary the Younger," 257.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Paul Halsall, trans. and intro., "Life of St. Thomas of Lesbos," in *Holy Women of Byzantium: Ten Saints' Lives in English Translation*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996), 303, 306.
- ³⁴ Laiou, "Life of St. Mary the Younger," 261.
- ³⁵ Talbot, "Female Sanctity in Byzantium," 12.
- ³⁶ Michael Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium Under the Comneni, 1081-1261* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 434.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 15.
- ³⁸ Ibid., 268.
- ³⁹ Smith, "Transformation of Roman World," 559.
- ⁴⁰ Gillian Clark, "Women in Asceticism in Late Antiquity: The Refusal of Status and Gender," in *Asceticism*, eds. Vincent L. Wimbush and Richard Valantasis (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 37.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., 40.
- ⁴² Ibid., 43.
- ⁴³ Judith Herrin, "In Search of Byzantine Women," in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, eds. Averil Cameron and Amelie Kuhrt (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 179.
- ⁴⁴ Clark, "Women in Late Antiquity," 99.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Clark, "Women in Late Antiquity," 53, 56.
- ⁴⁷ Laiou, "Women in Byzantine Society," 86.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 88.
- ⁵⁰ Symeon Metaphrates, *The Life of St. Matrona of Pergé*, trans. Khalifa Ben Nasser, *Internet Medieval Sourcebook*, December 1997: Available from <<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/matrona.html>> Accessed on 22 October 2003.
- ⁵¹ Laiou, "Life of St. Mary the Younger," 250.
- ⁵² Talbot, "Women," 118.
- ⁵³ Herrin, *Forms of Religious Commitment*, 185.

⁵⁴ Ioli Kalavrezou and others, *Byzantine Women and Their World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 114, 121, 123, 207.

⁵⁵ Laiou, "The Life of St. Mary the Younger," 286-287.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 289.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 273.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 254.

⁵⁹ Laiou, "Women in Byzantine Society," 89-90.

⁶⁰ Halsall, "Life of St. Thomas of Lesbos," 291.

John Henry Lloyd

Vanessa Earley

In 1938, upon being asked who the greatest player in baseball was, a St. Louis sportswriter replied, "If you mean in organized baseball my answer would be Babe Ruth; but if you mean in all baseball, organized or unorganized, the answer would have to be a colored man named John Henry Lloyd."¹ If you say the name Babe Ruth today, baseball fans know who you are talking about and probably have legendary stories they can recite. However, if you say the name John Henry Lloyd today, not very many fans will know who you are talking about. Despite the fact that he was one of the greatest players of his time and, arguably, of all time, Lloyd receives little to no recognition outside of those who study the Negro Leagues, which he played in from 1905 to 1932.² His status in baseball history has been hindered both by the time in which he played and the lack of respect that the modern baseball establishment and baseball scholars have for Negro League players.

John Henry Lloyd was born on April 25, 1884, in Palatka, FL. He was raised mainly by his grandmother following his father's death and his mother's remarriage. Leaving school after elementary school, Lloyd began working and playing on the local amateur team. He eventually moved to Jacksonville while still a teenager, where he began playing for a semipro team, the Young Receivers.³

His professional career began in Macon, GA, as a catcher with the Macon Acmes.⁴ He soon became considered a "baseball wunderkind" in the South and was able to move to the North and gain a position on the Cuban X-Giants in 1906.⁵ Lloyd went on to play in Philadelphia beginning in 1907, where he began playing shortstop, the position for which he would gain acclaim for.⁶

Lloyd soon found fame in both the United States and Cuba as a premier shortstop and hitter. During his prime, Lloyd bounced from team to team; he later stated, "Wherever the money was, that's where I was."⁷ And wherever Lloyd went, success seemed to follow him. He was consistently among the top batters in the league, with some of his higher batting averages being .373 in 1916, .333 in 1920, and .349 in 1923.⁸ While playing in the Cuban Winter League for many years, Lloyd was also consistently at the top, putting up impressive batting averages like .400 in 1910 and .393 in 1915.⁹ Defensively, he was considered to be one of the best in the game. Frank A. Young, a sports editor for the *Chicago Defender*, wrote in 1942, "He started his professional baseball career as a second baseman, but as the years rolled in, Lloyd was better at shortstop where he was second to none – white or black."¹⁰ Lloyd earned the nickname "El Cuchara," or the shovel, in Cuba because of his propensity to scoop up dirt with the ball while fielding.¹¹

Later in his career, slowed down by age, Lloyd shifted from the more physically demanding shortstop position, going between first and second base, and also

began managing. However, even though he had played for over twenty years, Lloyd was still a formidable force on the field. He posted a batting average of .563 in 1928, at the age of 44.¹² According to box scores in the *New York Age*, there were occasions when Lloyd hit perfectly in games, going 6 for 6 in a double header on July 27, 1929, and going 3 for 3 in a game on May 24, 1930.¹³ He also gained a reputation for being a strong leader and example for his players, earning the nickname "Pop." A commentary in the *New York Age* creating a Negro League all-star team spelled out how Lloyd was thought of: "Lloyd is the daddy of them all. Fielding, hitting, running and throwing and a wonderful field general. I would also make him captain of the team."¹⁴ Before leaving the game, Lloyd left one more important mark: he helped break down the color barrier at Yankee Stadium in 1930, playing in the first African American game ever at the stadium.¹⁵

Following his lengthy career, Lloyd retired to Atlantic City, NJ, and worked as a janitor for the Atlantic City school district in addition to playing on semipro teams until 1942, when he quit at the age of 58.¹⁶ Though he had no children of his own, he became a father figure to many of the children of Atlantic City:

The youngsters cluster about him between sessions. They call him "Pop" and love to listen while he spins baseball yarns of the past. Sometimes they refuse to break away from him and "Pop" had to pick them up bodily and carry them into their classrooms. He is their hero, this big, soft-hearted, soft-spoken, congenial man with a tired look in his eyes, but the bubbling spirit of youth in his heart.¹⁷

Lloyd later served for many years as the commissioner for Atlantic City Little League, who later named a field in his honor. John Henry Lloyd died of arteriosclerosis on March 19, 1965, twelve years before he was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.¹⁸

During his time, Lloyd was commonly known as the "black Honus Wagner" and was considered one of the best players in baseball, white or black.¹⁹ Today, for the scholars and former players of the Negro Leagues, Lloyd's name still stays near the top of the list of the greatest players ever. Several books and articles taking surveys of past players and historians on who should be named to the all time greatest players' list for the Negro Leagues include John Henry Lloyd among the most mentioned.²⁰ However, despite the respect Lloyd got from his contemporaries and continues to get from scholars of the Negro Leagues, his name rarely comes up when the greats of baseball are recalled outside of a discussion of the Negro Leagues. One is pushed to wonder why this is, considering the career Lloyd led. What reasons could there be that Lloyd is not recognized today?

One reason that comes to mind is that of simple statistics. If Lloyd simply did not stack up as a player to the other, more recognized players, his lack of recognition might be understandable. If, compared to other Negro League players, both his contemporaries and later players, and compared to Major League players, Lloyd's batting averages and fielding were not as good, or did not place him among the top notch players of either league, the lack of acknowledgement could be understood. However, a look at Lloyd's statistics puts him in the company of many great players, white or black, and, in many cases, put him above them.

While most of the statistic books compiled on the Negro Leagues do not include fielding statistics, from what is written on Lloyd one can deduce that, defensively

speaking, he was a top rated player. "He was a graceful fielder, with exceptional range, who glided across the infield from second base to third, snatching hits from frustrated players."²¹ As mentioned before, he was often compared to Honus Wagner, considered to be one of the best shortstops ever to play in the Major Leagues. Connie Mack once said, "You could put John Henry Lloyd and Honus Wagner in a paper bag, and whichever one you pulled out, you couldn't lose."²²

Lloyd was also a top notch hitter in the Negro Leagues during his era and his numbers stack up favorably against those players of the later Negro Leagues. He held single season batting averages that were in the top five in thirteen years of his career, placing him with the likes of Oscar Charleston and Joe Williams, as well as later players like Josh Gibson.²³ Not many have come close to Lloyd's best single season batting average of .563; Josh Gibson's closest was .462.²⁴ Lloyd is also in the top ten of the Negro League players in lifetime batting averages, with an average of .337.²⁵

It would also be errant to say that Lloyd's batting averages did not compare to those of the white major leaguers. While it can be difficult to fairly compare the statistics of the black and white players, as the length of their seasons differed and the reliability of Negro League statistics is not always very good, some generalizations can be made. By looking at the batting champions of Major League Baseball, one can see that Lloyd would have held his own. The highest single season average in Major League Baseball is Roger Hornsby's 1924 record of .424, significantly lower than Lloyd's .563.²⁶ Lloyd's batting averages were, for the most part, consistently close, if not higher, than the major league's highest averages in the same years.²⁷ Lloyd's lifetime average of .337 would also place him in the top twenty of all-time major league leaders, placing him ahead of players like Stan Musial, Cap Anson, and Joe DiMaggio.²⁸

As I stated above, these statistics are not completely comprehensive nor are they adjusted to take into consideration things like season length, but the overall point is made that Lloyd would deserve to be recognized if the basis for recognition rested solely on statistics. So, if it is not for the fact that he was not a good enough player, what other factors could come into play which would keep Lloyd from being a recognizable figure?

One such factor could be that he played in an earlier era of the Negro Leagues, one which received little publicity. Even a cursory glance at newspapers at the beginning of Lloyd's career show that the first black teams received little press attention as compared to white baseball, even in African American newspapers. For example, Lloyd played for the Chicago-based Leland Giants in 1910, a team which is considered one of the best ever assembled.²⁹ In 1910, one of Chicago's white newspapers, the *Chicago Evening Post*, had very few mentions of the Leland Giants, mostly consisting of simple listings of games to be played; there were only a couple of instances when specific players were even mentioned.³⁰ The *Evening Post's* sports page was, however, dominated by news of the two white Major League teams, the White Sox and the Cubs.³¹ That same year the African American newspaper, *Chicago Defender*, rarely printed box scores or accounts of the Leland Giants' games; when they were included, they often were given a very small portion of the page.³² In contrast, the *Chicago Defender* in 1910 often carried at least a quarter of a page of news regarding white baseball during the season.³³ As African American baseball often

went virtually unreported in the early years, those who did not make an effort to find out about it probably knew very little, and players like Lloyd did not receive the same recognition later players received who benefited from more press attention.

The later players, such as Josh Gibson and Satchel Paige, are also more recognizable today because they were playing around the time of integration, a time in which white fans and the baseball establishment were paying more attention to the Negro Leagues. Prior to the signing of Jackie Robinson, there were many failed tryouts involving some of the Negro League stars, like Robinson and Sam Jethroe; these tryouts, and the failure of teams to sign black players, were brought to the attention of Americans by the press, such as columnist Dave Egan and sportswriter Sam Lacy.³⁴ Following the signing of Jackie Robinson, white owners began scouting and raiding the Negro Leagues for talent, pressured both by the success of other teams who had signed black players and by the increasing emphasis on integration in Major League Baseball. Players like Roy Campanella, Larry Doby, Sam Jethroe, and Dan Bankhead, who were all former Negro Leagues players signed to the majors, may have been pushed into obscurity had it not been for the fact that Major League Baseball had decided to integrate at that time and was looking for black talent.³⁵ Lloyd and his contemporaries, playing before the period of integration, did not have the benefit of this attention from the press and Major League Baseball.

Lloyd is also a victim of history; historians really did not pay much attention to the Negro Leagues until the 1970s, after which Lloyd and most of his contemporaries had passed away. The early Negro League players are sorely underrepresented in oral histories and interviews conducted by historians because of this fact. Included in the table of contents of some of the books which compiled these interviews are the debut years of the players interviewed. The earliest debuts of players in these books fall in the mid 1920s, twenty years after Lloyd's debut in professional baseball.³⁶

These later Negro League players who are included in oral histories and interviews do not always remember players like Lloyd because they were not around at the same time. There are some younger players who were managed by Lloyd who had first hand experiences with him. One such player is Bobby Robinson, who had this to say: "Pop Lloyd was playin' then. He was an outstanding player. A class by hisself. He could do it all."³⁷ However, players like Robinson are few and far between. Usually any comment made about Lloyd in interviews is based on hearsay from older players who told them stories. Representative of this is a comment made by Quincy Troupe: "Willie Wells was the greatest shortstop in my time, and some people say of all time. I guess most old-timers go with John Henry Lloyd, but I never saw him."³⁸ Because the players of Lloyd's era are not around to contribute their stories to the annals of history, their stories are lost and the recognition that some of them deserve is lacking.

Another factor that could play a role in the lack of recognition for Lloyd could be contributed to the lingering effects of racism that still inhabit the baseball establishment today. Unfortunately, the baseball establishment and baseball scholars and enthusiasts have not been quick to right the wrongs of the past. They are often unwilling to consider Negro League players in recognizing the greats of the past and, when it does occur, it is often with an air of tokenism.

Negro League players are rarely mentioned when baseball writers and historians compile lists of what they consider the greatest players of all time. For example, an

article in the Society for Baseball Research's journal hypothesizing on what kind of salaries baseball greats would make if they played today does not include one Negro League player that did not play in the majors for an extended period of time, such as Roy Campanella. The authors state,

The selection of old-time players...is based strictly upon our judgment. We have included most of the twentieth-century Hall of Fame players, and we have attempted to include all other quality players as well as the more commonly recognized players...We believe that we have not overlooked any hitters or pitchers who might be ranked in the top 50 of each table.³⁹

The authors mention that they included "most of the twentieth-century Hall of Fame players," but they did not include any of the Negro League players who, by 1992 when the article was written, had been inducted into the Hall of Fame. They also state that they tried to include other "quality players," but they did not see fit to include the quality players of the Negro Leagues. While, admittedly, it would be harder to formulate the Negro League players' salaries than for the white players, if the authors, as baseball scholars, were really committed to including all quality players and Hall of Fame members, they would have made an effort to include the Negro League players who had been shut out of the majors by the color line.

While the baseball establishment has moved in some aspects to recognize the Negro League players, they too often fall into the trap of quotas and tokenism. For example, letting nine Negro League players into the Hall of Fame in the 1970s was seen as a major step, but baseball also considered it a completed step at the time. In 1971, the Hall of Fame created a Special Committee on the Negro Leagues to select a group of Negro League players who deserved recognition.⁴⁰ The Special Committee consisted of

five former players (Eppie Barnes, Roy Campanella, Monte Irvin, Judy Johnson, Bill Yancey), three former 'executives' or promoters (Frank Forbes, Ed Gottlieb and Alex Pompez) and two writers (Sam Lacy and Wendell Smith). Joe Reichler and Dick Young also met with the committee, although they didn't vote.⁴¹

Between 1971 and 1977, the Special Committee voted in nine players: Satchel Paige, Buck Leonard, Josh Gibson, Monte Irvin, Cool Papa Bell, Judy Johnson, Oscar Charleston, Lloyd, and Martin Dihigo.⁴² The induction of these players was a major step in the right direction for the Hall of Fame.

However, after the Special Committee on the Negro Leagues inducted these nine players in the 1970s, they "voted to disband, informing the Hall of Fame that their assignment had been completed...and the power to select Negro League players was transferred to the Veterans Committee."⁴³ The Hall of Fame's Veterans Committee has inducted nine more Negro League players since the 1970s: Rube Foster, Ray Dandridge, Leon Day, Bill Foster, Willie Wells, Joe Rogan, Joe Williams, Turkey Stearnes, and Hilton Smith.⁴⁴ However, not much has changed despite these additional inductions. Five of these inductions stemmed from pressure from Negro League players on the Veterans Committee, including Buck O'Neil, who, by the 1990s, were frustrated by the lack of inductions for Negro League players since the

demise of the Committee on the Negro Leagues and demanded a separate committee. "In 1995, the Hall finally agreed to consider Negro Leaguers on their own ballot, but only for five years."⁴⁵ There continue to be arguments for more of the Negro League players to be inducted because they too deserve the recognition.⁴⁶ However, James Riley, the research director at the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum, is not hopeful about the extent to which Negro Leaguers will be allowed into the Hall of Fame: "There's still a bias against Negro Leaguers. It's residual from the original mind-set that kept them out of the majors to start with."⁴⁷

Some argue, however, that the number of Negro League players inducted into the Hall be kept at what they consider a reasonable number. Robert Peterson made the argument in his book, *Only the Ball Was White*, that

during that 1900-1947 era, the Negro percentage of America's population remained fairly constant at ten percent. Arbitrarily, then, it could be assumed that ten percent of the Hall of Fame members for that era should be Negroes... This means that eight Negroes who played behind the color line should be added to the Hall of Fame.⁴⁸

While Peterson did write his book prior to the first Hall of Fame inductions and was attempting just to get Negro League players in the door, he does not make much of an argument for inducting all of the players who deserve that honor. Bill James calls Peterson's number "a modest, reasonable minimum."⁴⁹ I would agree that it is a nice minimum, a number to shoot for, but not a number to stop at. I would also agree that the Hall of Fame should show some restraint in who they induct so as to keep induction into the Hall a privilege and honor, not a right. However, electing eighteen black players to the Hall of Fame when they are under much pressure, and then essentially ignoring the Negro Leagues when they are not, says that the Hall is only interested in filling a quota and alleviating protests, not in truly acknowledging all those who deserved recognition.

Despite the fact that he was possibly one of the greatest baseball players of all time, John Henry Lloyd continues to be ignored outside of the realm of Negro League study. Unfortunately, not much can be done to rectify the fact that the early Negro League teams and Lloyd himself did not get much publicity. Nor can much be done about the fact that the remaining Negro League players do not remember Lloyd, as he played in an earlier era. However, the baseball establishment and baseball enthusiasts and scholars can change their approach to how they handle the Negro League players. Until they realize that the Negro League players deserve to be recognized to the fullest extent, not just as a token gesture, players like Lloyd will continue to languish in the shadows of history.

Bibliography

"Batting Average Leaders," Official Site of Major League Baseball. Available from www.mlb.com; Internet.

Chicago Defender. 1910.

Chicago Evening Post. 1910.

Clark, Dick and Larry Lester, ed. *The Negro Leagues Book*. Cleveland, OH: Society for American Baseball Research, 1994.

Gustafson, Elizabeth, Lawrence Hadley, and Mary Jo Thierry. "Who Would be the Highest-Paid Baseball Player?" *The Baseball Research Journal* 21 (1992): 86-92.

"Hall of Famers by Induction Year." Baseball Hall of Fame. www.baseballhalloffame.org; Internet.

Holway, John. *The Complete Book of Baseball's Negro Leagues*. Fern Park, FL: Hastings House, 2001.

James, Bill. *Whatever Happened to the Hall of Fame?*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994.

Kelley, Brent. *Voices from the Negro Leagues*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998.

———. *The Negro Leagues Revisited*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000.

McCord, Jeff. "Color Commentary." *Texas Monthly* 27 (Aug. 1999): 52.

McNeil, William. *Baseball's Other All-Stars*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000.

———. *Cool Pappas and Double Duties*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2001.

New York Age. 1925-1930.

Peterson, Robert. *Only the Ball was White*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Reisler, Jim, ed. *Black Writers/Black Baseball*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1994.

Rhoden, William. "Keep the Vote Between the Lines." *Sporting News*. 31 January 1994: 7.

Ribowsky, Mark. *A Complete History of the Negro Leagues, 1884-1955*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Publishing Group, 1995.

Towle, Mike. "Interest in Negro Leagues on the Rise." *Sporting News*. 11 May 1992: 17.

Troupe, Quincy. *20 Years too Soon*. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press, 1995.

Tygiel, Jules. *Extra Bases: Reflections on Jackie Robinson, Race, and Baseball History*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

"United States – Race and Hispanic Origin: 1790-1990." U.S. Census Bureau. Available from www.census.gov/population/documentation/twps0056/tab01.pdf; Internet.

USA Today. 1999. 25 June.

Wise, Bill, ed. *1963 Official Baseball Almanac*. Greenwich: Fawcett, 1963.

Endnotes

- ¹ This quote is widely reported, however, with slight variations in the wording. Robert Peterson, *Only the Ball Was White* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 79.
- ² These are the official years that Lloyd played; he also played on various amateur and semipro teams prior to and after these dates. Dick Clark and Larry Lester, eds., *The Negro Leagues Book* (Cleveland: The Society for Baseball Research, 1994), 203.
- ³ Peterson, *Only the Ball Was White*, 75.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ Mark Ribowsky, *A Complete History of the Negro Leagues* (New York: Birch Lane Press, 1995), 66.
- ⁶ Peterson, *Only the Ball Was White*, 76.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 77.
- ⁸ John Holway, *The Complete Book of Baseball's Negro Leagues* (Fern Park, FL: Hastings House Publishers, 2001), 110, 144, 179.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 76, 109.
- ¹⁰ Jim Reisler, *Black Writers/Black Baseball* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1994), 65.
- ¹¹ William McNeil, *Cool Papas and Double Duties: the All-Time Greats of the Negro Leagues* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2001), 209.
- ¹² Holway, *The Complete Book of Baseball's Negro Leagues*, 238.
- ¹³ "Perfect Score for Lloyd at Bat on Sunday," *New York Age*, 27 July 1929, 6; "Oms Pitches Cubans to Win Over Lincolns," *New York Age*, 24 May 1930, 6.
- ¹⁴ "'Old Timer' Picks an All-Star Baseball Team," *New York Age*, 10 January 1925, 6.
- ¹⁵ "Lincoln Giants Win 5 Of 6..." *New York Age*, 12 July 1930, 6.
- ¹⁶ Clark and Lester, eds., *The Negro Leagues Book*, 48.
- ¹⁷ Peterson, *Only the Ball Was White*, 78.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 79.
- ¹⁹ William McNeil, *Baseball's Other All-Stars* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000), 53.
- ²⁰ Examples of these kinds of books and articles are: McNeil, *Baseball's Other All-Stars*; McNeil, *Cool Papas and Double Duties: The All-Time Greats of the Negro Leagues*; Tom Weir, "Negro Leaguers had Major Stats," *USA Today*, 25 June 1999, 6(C).
- ²¹ McNeil, *Baseball's Other All-Stars*, 53.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ Holway, *The Complete Book of Baseball's Negro Leagues*, 62-265 passim.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 479.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 472.

- ²⁶ Bill Wise, ed. *1963 Official Baseball Almanac* (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, 1963), 210.
- ²⁷ Holway, *The Complete Book of Baseball's Negro Leagues*, 62-265 passim; Wise, *1963 Official Baseball Almanac*, 210-211.
- ²⁸ "Batting Average Leaders," Official Site of Major League Baseball. Available from www.mlb.com; Internet.
- ²⁹ McNeil, *Baseball's Other All-Stars*, 47.
- ³⁰ *Chicago Evening Post*, 1910.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² *Chicago Defender*. 1910. While the *Defender* has fewer mentions of the Giants than the *Evening Post* it must be kept in mind that the *Defender* was issued weekly and the *Evening Post* was daily.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ Jules Tygiel, *Extra Bases* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 70.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 105.
- ³⁶ Some examples of books like this include: Brent Kelley, *The Negro Leagues Revisited* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000) and Brent Kelley, *Voices From the Negro Leagues* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1998).
- ³⁷ Kelley, *The Negro Leagues Revisited*, 6.
- ³⁸ Quincy Troupe, *20 Years Too Soon* (St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society, 1977), 148.
- ³⁹ Elizabeth Gustafson, Lawrence Hadley, and Mary Jo Thierry, "Who Would be the Highest-Paid Baseball Players?" *The Baseball Research Journal* 21 (1992): 87.
- ⁴⁰ Jeff McCord, "Color Commentary," *Texas Monthly* 27 (Aug. 1999), 52.
- ⁴¹ Bill James, *Whatever Happened to the Hall of Famer?* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), 189.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 188.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 188.
- ⁴⁴ "Hall of Famers by Induction Year," Baseball Hall of Fame. www.baseballhalloffame.org; Internet.
- ⁴⁵ McCord, "Color Commentary," 52.
- ⁴⁶ Examples include: William Rhoden, "Keep the Vote Between the Lines," *Sporting News*, 31 January 1994, 7; Mike Towle, "Interest in Negro Leagues on the Rise," *Sporting News*, 11 May 1992, 17; and McCord, "Color Commentary."
- ⁴⁷ McCord, "Color Commentary," 52.
- ⁴⁸ Peterson, *Only the Ball Was White*, 254. Peterson's estimate of the African American population between 1900-1947 is fairly accurate. The actual percentage of the African American population for each decade ranged from 9.69% in 1930 to 11.62% in 1900, with the average percentage for 1900-1947 being 10.38%. "United States - Race and Hispanic Origin: 1790-1990," U.S. Census Bureau. Available from www.census.gov/population/documentation/twps0056/tab01.pdf; Internet.
- ⁴⁹ James, *Whatever Happened to the Hall of Famer?*, 191.

Behind Stone Walls and Between the Lines: Bethlem Doctors' Perceptions of Insanity in Early Victorian London

Sarah McCance

Throughout the nineteenth century, British approaches to insanity's definition and treatment underwent a fundamental restructuring. Insanity, seen in previous centuries as a bestializing influence or a punishment for sin, increasingly came to be recognized as an illness. Based on this idea, methods of treatment also began to change, as approaches designed to address the mind rather than the body were employed. However, the old stigmas remained embedded in the new language of therapy, particularly in the works of medical officers at more conservative institutions. An exploration of texts written by a group of doctors employed at the same asylum within a narrow timeframe highlights the type of prejudices carried by men of their position, offering new insights into treatment of the period and clarifying the problems faced by nineteenth century psychiatry.

Although the history of insanity as a discipline did exist before the 1960s, it changed so drastically during this decade that it would be almost unrecognizable to its former practitioners. The whiggist interpretation which dominated the old historiography portrayed the creation of asylums as the result of altruistic reform movements designed to counteract the eighteenth century legacy of confinement and punishment. In the second half of the twentieth century, this traditional approach has been superseded by a revisionist narrative, with contributors from a number of fields seeking to expose the less philanthropic motives for the creation of asylums in industrializing societies. Although the most recent scholarship has focused on the historical reconstruction of specific incidents rather than attempts at sweeping narratives, many of the attitudes expressed still owe a great deal to this revisionist, multidisciplinary spirit.

The majority of the fundamental questions about the meaning of insanity and asylums were raised in Foucault's *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, originally published in French in 1961. It took several years for the English-speaking historical community to feel the full impact of Foucault's scholarship, in part because of a four-year delay in translation but more significantly because of Foucault's position outside the mainstream of the discipline. A philosopher and cultural analyst, he has been quoted as saying, "I am not a professional historian; nobody is perfect," and his critics would argue that his not being a historian should be obvious to anyone reading his work.¹ He has been accused of oversimplifying, ignoring empirical data, and mixing up dates, all cardinal sins to the conventional historian.² Yet, despite his inadequacies, the theoretical groundwork he established cannot be ignored by modern-day scholars of madness.

Foucault's argument is that in the classical period (roughly 1600-1800), the "great confinement" swept through Europe. The insane were incarcerated at much higher rates than before, and the idea that they, by definition, belonged in asylums became prevalent. This was done not for their protection or rehabilitation, but to remove them from society, essentially cutting off any dialogue between reason and madness. Madness had nothing to contribute to society, economically or intellectually, and so the insane were invalidated as human beings. The sane were pitted against the insane in a struggle in "which men, in an act of sovereign reason, confine their neighbors, and communicate and recognize each other through the merciless language of non-madness."³ He goes on to outline various ways in which society responded to this threat, most notably through institutionalization and the bestialization or infantilization of the insane.

Many historians of insanity in Britain have protested against the unhesitating application of Foucault's theories to British history by undiscerning scholars. In his introduction to *Mind-Forg'd Manacles*, historian Roy Porter notes several differences between the French and English cases. He argues that the rates of institutionalization were much lower in England, and indeed in most of Europe, than Foucault supposes; that the insane were not made to work in accordance with a popular ideology regarding the value of labor; and that lunatics were not treated as cruelly as a reading of *Madness and Civilization* would convey.⁴

At roughly the same time that *Madness and Civilization* was working its way into the scholarly consciousness, Richard Hunter and Ida Macalpine published *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry, 1535-1860*. Essentially a collection of historical texts, this sourcebook has been consulted by almost every student of English insanity since its publication in 1963. The endurance of the book can be credited to the variety of sources it contains, the length of time surveyed, and the stated goal of the authors to treat "important themes and movements such as the development of legislation, the mind and brain controversy, mesmerism, phrenology and non-restraint" at length.⁵ The efforts of Hunter and Macalpine began the process of alleviating the problem of "how little groundwork had been done and how few studies of original material made" up to that time.⁶

The work of Thomas Szasz represents a less scholarly but still important use of the history of insanity. *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of a Theory of Personal Conflict* uses historical examples in an attempt to argue that "although mental illness might have been a useful concept in the nineteenth century, today it is scientifically worthless and socially harmful."⁷ A psychiatrist himself, Szasz takes pains to protect the validity of psychiatry while emphasizing insanity as a social construction, rooted in the times and places in which it occurs. While his arguments are considered controversial at best, his research is an important sign of a growing interest in the history of insanity and its treatment and has provided a number of young scholars with fuel for argumentative papers.

One of the most notable contributors to the revised history of insanity is Andrew Scull, a sociologist by training, whose "status as a disciplinary 'outsider' has not prevented him from becoming one of the most influential historians of psychiatry working today."⁸ His first book on the subject, *Museums of Madness: The Social Organization of Insanity in Nineteenth-Century England*, included a call for historians to "transfer [their] attention away from the rhetoric of intentions and to consider instead

the actual facts about the establishment and operation⁹ of asylums. He proceeds to do so through a detailed analysis of the rise and fall of asylums and the accompanying approaches to treatment.

Like most important scholarly arguments, Scull's ideas have stimulated both discussion and disagreement. He has been criticized for his Marxist tendencies which, in the nature of Foucault, tend to portray the evolution of asylums as a mechanism which removes the undesirable classes from the economic and social arena. Janet Oppenheim condemned his willingness "to invoke the 'English ruling classes,' the 'English elite,' or the 'upper classes' as if they formed an undifferentiated mass functioning in unison to suppress all threats to their hegemony."¹⁰ Porter has raised sharp objections to his characterization of new treatment methods as an abrupt break with previous techniques, rather than the result of a process with causal links to the past.

Another "disciplinary outsider" whose contributions have been widely discussed is Elaine Showalter, author of *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*. A professor of English, Showalter specializes in feminist literary criticism. In *The Female Malady*, she applies this approach to the study of women and insanity, concluding that "while the name of the symbolic female disorder may change from one historical period to the next, the gender asymmetry of the representational tradition remains constant. Thus madness, even when experienced by men, is metaphorically and symbolically represented as feminine: a female malady."¹¹ Her work has drawn considerable criticism of both her historical and symbolic analyses. Nancy Tomes points out that "given the numerical predominance of women over men...and the tendency of women to live longer, the slight majority of women in...asylums...hardly seems to constitute a 'feminization.'"¹² Joan Busfield corroborates and expands on this objection and adds a convincing discussion of the male archetypes of insanity, noting that the existence of these types weakens Showalter's connection between women and symbols of insanity.¹³

Roy Porter has written extensively on the nature of insanity and its role in English history. A social historian with an interest in a wide range of topics, including medical history and the history of sexuality, Porter began his study of history of insanity in 1987 with the publication of two books, *The Social History of Insanity* and *Mind-Forg'd Manacles: A history of madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency*. In *Mind-Forg'd Manacles*, he approaches many of the essential questions of madness—the nature of insanity, the rise of asylums, the development of psychiatry as a discipline—from a deeply historical viewpoint, tracing these factors over an extensive period of time in order to ground them in the narrative of English history. In addition, he studies the testimony of the insane, exploring the psychiatric revolution through the eyes of its patients. Porter's work serves to integrate and contextualize previous scholarship, heightening the academic rigor of the discipline.

All of the scholars discussed above laid an important theoretical groundwork in the study of insanity in history. Recent authors have worked at filling in the gaps in the narrative, writing studies of specific institutions, personalities, and phenomena that had been overlooked in broader works. Books such as *Masters of Bedlam*, written by Scull, Charlotte MacKenzie, and Nicholas Hervey, and the essential *The History of Bethlem*, by Jonathan Andrews, Asa Briggs, Porter, Penny Tucker, and Keir Waddington, which provide useful references on a specific English institution, serve as

examples of this advance. This move toward specific histories shows the maturing of the discipline and a deepening understanding of the historical conceptualization and treatment of insanity, which will continue to be augmented and revised by future studies.

The work of Roy Porter and his colleagues provides a useful overview of the history of Britain's oldest mental institution. Founded in 1247 by Simon FitzMary as the priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem, the building first housed lunatics in 1403. Due to its status as a Catholic institution, Bethlehem was threatened by the religious turbulence that dominated English politics in the Medieval period. It was dissolved by Henry VIII in the middle of the sixteenth century, but recreated as a secular institution after the City of London petitioned for its survival. In 1619, Bethlehem attracted unwanted attention due to reports that the Master, the eponymous Dr. Hilckiah Crooke, had embezzled large sums of money from hospital funds. Dr. Crooke was fired and the governors attempted to improve record-keeping. The hospital moved to a new French-inspired building at Moorfields in 1675 and then to St. George's Fields, Southwark, in 1815.¹⁴

In addition to its age, Bethlehem gained prominence in English popular mythology as an exemplification of madness. The name Bethlehem is the source of the variant Bedlam, originally used in 1528 to specify the hospital but evolving into a term for general lunacy and then to its present meaning of "a scene of mad confusion or uproar."¹⁵ "Bedlam scenes" were particularly popular among dramatists of the early seventeenth century.¹⁶

Andrews and his associates note that this emergence of Bedlam in the national consciousness may be rooted in the Governors' decision, in the 1590s, to open the institution to the public.¹⁷ Although exact data on the number of entrants cannot be determined, the asylum certainly developed into a major tourist attraction, comparable in repute to Westminster Abbey. The experience of touring the wards was portrayed as religiously and morally instructive, showing the sane the dangers of vice, but it is unlikely that moral reflection was the primary motive for visitors. There was also the experience of seeing the insane and hearing their ravings. In the late eighteenth century, however, the upper classes grew hesitant about the advisability of such visits. As a result of elite pressure, general admission to the wards was stopped in 1770. Visiting died out, but the image of Bedlam had entered popular culture. Twenty-four years after asylum tours ended, newspapers still ran cartoons of Bedlam, which one would presume could be easily interpreted by contemporary audiences.¹⁸

At the turn of the nineteenth century, Bethlehem was a highly-recognized but fundamentally standard institution. Manacles and chains were in heavy usage, in part due to the low staff-patient ratio. In 1815 it was noted that there were only four attendants to 120 patients; a ratio used to rationalize the reliance on mechanical restraint. Popular cures for insanity included leeching, blistering, purging, and vomiting—all physical treatments widely used for other types of illnesses. These conditions were not abnormal; in fact, they could readily be observed at most other hospitals of the period.

The 1815 House of Commons Select Committee on Madhouses changed this perception of Bethlehem as a typical asylum. Intending to investigate "the conditions endured by those insane confined in institutions, with no effort being made to gather comparable data on lunatics in the community,"¹⁹ the evidence heard and reports

published turned into a condemnation of the York Asylum and of Bethlem. Patients were found chained in small, unpleasant rooms. Some were naked or semi-clothed. The attentions of the medical staff were found wanting. The discovery of an inmate, James Norris, who had been chained to the wall in an intricate and extremely restricting iron apparatus for nine years, became a symbol of all that was wrong with the institution.²⁰ As a result of the testimony given by Bethlem employees and outside surveyors, John Haslam, the apothecary, was dismissed in disgrace and Dr. Thomas Monro, the hospital physician, was allowed to resign (although his place was taken over by his son, Edward Thomas Monro). Bethlem, one of London's most recognizable institutions, found its reputation severely damaged by the movement toward asylum reform which came to the fore in the early nineteenth century.

This movement was fueled by a number of factors. A general attitude of reform, guided by Enlightenment thought, took over the popular mentality of the period, bringing with it efforts to reform such cultural edifices as prisons and workhouses. With regards to asylums, a growing sympathy to the insane as suffering fellow human beings began to develop in the eighteenth century and continued to gain acceptance. The work of Phillipe Pinel, a French physician whose *A Treatise on Insanity* (first printed in English in 1806) advocated reduced use of restraint and a turn to more subjective, psychologically-oriented methods of treatment, provided an alternative to the old system of confine and punish. This new philosophy of asylums, which became known as moral management, "was a general, pragmatic approach which recognized the lunatic's sensibility and acknowledged (albeit in a highly limited and circumscribed sense) his status as a moral subject."²¹ Although the groundwork was laid by Pinel, it was focused and anglicized in Samuel Tuke's *Description of the Retreat*, published in 1813. The book contains an account of the founding of the York Retreat in a Quaker community by the author's grandfather and an explanation of the methods used there, which were designed to encourage a return to a rational state through intense staff-patient interactions promoting respectable behavior. By 1815, *Description of the Retreat* had impressed upon philanthropists that the insane could be handled, and even cured, without using mechanical restraint.

The writings of Bethlem's medical officers reveal much about the issues of the era and the underlying ideas these men held about their patients. They viewed their work through lenses of class, gender, and religion, judging the sanity of their patients against the standards of the times. Many of their published works also deal, directly or indirectly, with the struggle for jurisdiction over the insane that preoccupied medical men throughout the nineteenth century.

For most of its history Bethlem has been a very tradition-bound institution, and as such the treatments used there during the Victorian era had a greater resemblance to the confinement techniques of the past than the moral management approach popular at the time. During the Lunacy Commission Hearings, Thomas Monro stated that he was still using the treatments handed down to him by his father since he "knew none better"²² (four successive generations of Monros—James, John, Thomas, and Edward Thomas—served as Bethlem physicians throughout the period of 1728-1855). The medical staff of the hospital also published relatively little; John Monro's *Remarks on Dr. Battie's Treatise on Madness*, printed in 1758, was the first written work by a Bethlem physician, although there had been doctors in practice there for two hundred years.²³ Even after the publishing silence was broken, texts remained scarce.

The papers that do exist can be credited in part to a growing interest in the treatment of the insane and the debate about who should care for them. As rates of institutionalization increased, the mad-keeping trade became highly lucrative. At the same time, proponents of the moral management approach demonstrated that laypersons could effectively oversee the insane in small, highly-regulated environments, and provide what seemed to be a higher quality of care than was available at the asylums. This combination of factors heightened competition for available lunatics, particularly lunatics whose families were able to pay well for their loved ones' room and board.

This jurisdictional debate was heavily entangled with one of the fundamental questions of psychiatry: is insanity a disease of the mind or of the brain? Is it possible to have a functional disorder without an organic basis? Not surprisingly, most doctors maintained that insanity was organic in nature. Convincing the public of this contention was a vital step in gaining control over the population of mental patients. William Lawrence, surgeon to Bethlem from 1816 to 1867, gives a fair description of the moral managers' position in *Lectures on physiology, zoology, and the natural history of man*:

They who consider the mental operations as acts of an immaterial being, and thus disconnect the sound state of the mind from organisation, act very consistently in disjoining insanity also from the corporeal structure, and in representing it as a disease, not of the brain, but of the mind. Thus we come to disease of an immaterial being, for which, suitably enough, moral treatment has been recommended.²⁴

As will be discussed later, Lawrence was firmly against this assessment of the situation.

As the century progressed, mad-doctors grew in their objection to the mind-oriented analysis of insanity. Bryan Crowther, Lawrence's predecessor in the post of surgeon, found no evidence that insanity was rooted in physical alterations within the brain. In *Practical Remarks on Insanity*, published in 1811, he recognizes that "very desirable information has been obtained [from postmortem brain dissections], in as much as that the appearances on dissection are not to be considered either cause or effect of insanity [emphasis added]."²⁵ However, he goes on to state that:

the insane are subject to diseases, incidental to such as are of sound mind...and it is under this circumstance that the physicians to insane asylums have the twofold opportunity of directing the necessary medicinal treatment of their patient, conjointly with proper management; and it is in these instances that they deservedly merit a distinction from others, who have neither been conversant nor acquainted with mad persons.²⁶

Elsewhere in the book, he attempts to defend medical involvement in the treatment of the insane through alternate reasoning. His argument is that "it is true, that in many instances [management of the insane as a curative means] has induced success, when the known medical means had certainly failed; yet judiciously combined, surely their mutual co-operation would encourage us to hope for a more favorable termination of the disorder, than when either is separately employed."²⁷

Whether Crowther is being generous to his opposition or is simply a man who must be honest about his beliefs despite the consequences is unclear. However, it is important to note that he bases his argument in doctors' familiarity with the habits of the insane and in their ability to treat non-mental illnesses, rather than any inherent qualification to treat insanity itself. It is possible that in this early period, eighteen years after Pinel's mythical liberation of the inmates of Bicêtre and still two years before the publication of Tuke's *Description of the Retreat*, the concept of moral management was not sufficiently grounded in the English public mind as to threaten the established order. Four years later, however, representatives of Bethlem could not afford to take such an even-handed approach to the issue.

Haslam's strongly-worded *Considerations of the Moral Management of Insane Persons* (1817), published after his dismissal from his job as Bethlem apothecary and "symptomatic of the arrogance and self-belief that presumably enabled him to bear up under all these trials," placed him firmly on the side of the medical profession. He decried the "zealots of reform," who sought to alter what they did not have the experience to understand.²⁸ In an interesting turn of phrase, he uses the language of philanthropy and reform to defend the established institutions:

Before the pure spirit of benevolence and christian piety devised the foundation of charitable institutions for lunatics, these miserable objects were allowed to wander, and considered as interdicted persons—when they became troublesome or offensive they were whipt from tything to tything, and stockt, punished and imprisoned [sic]. The enlightened commiseration of modern philanthropists has afforded them every protection, as the existing public and private asylums sufficiently evince.²⁹

He seeks to create a sense of the tradition and progress in order to defend the asylums against lay reformers, but fails to address any of the accusations made against Bethlem and himself.

Two years later, William Lawrence (see p.14) presented more support for the involvement of medical doctors in the treatment of madness. His argument was largely based in the organic interpretation of insanity. Here an intriguing discrepancy comes to light. Lawrence states, "I have examined after death the heads of many insane persons, and have hardly seen a single brain, which did not exhibit obvious marks of disease."³⁰ This is in marked contrast to Crowther's assertion that insanity could not be detected in postmortem dissections. As Lawrence took over Crowther's post, it is probable that they were drawing from a fairly similar demographic of specimens, so such a discrepancy seems unlikely. Furthermore, Crowther's account mentions two other men, an "anatomical teacher of acknowledged eminence" and "another gentleman, whose anatomical skill is also acknowledged," both of whom found little or no correlation between insanity and physical evidence in the brain.³¹

Alexander Morison, who was appointed as Bethlem's first Resident Physician in 1835, gained that position in part due to his very different approach to the issue of medicine and insanity. In 1823, Morison began teaching courses designed to train medical students in the techniques of treating mental disorders. He published his lectures in 1825, and continued to revise and add to them for the next two decades.³² In the introduction to the first edition, he argues for teaching this important branch of

knowledge in terms that leave no doubt that insanity should remain in the physician's domain. He points out that "a knowledge of [mental disorders] is indispensable, not only to the practitioner more immediately engaged in the treatment of diseases of the mind, but also to every one who is called upon to give a certificate of the mental condition of his patient."³³

These certification procedures provided a governmental legitimization of the doctors' campaign for authority over the insane. The requirement of a physician's certificate of insanity was legislated in the eighteenth century as part of the 1774 Madhouses Act, which arose from a growing concern among the public about the treatment of the insane. This early movement toward government regulation supports Porter's contention that the changes in "appropriate" ideas of asylum regulation and management were not a sharp break from the eighteenth century, as Scull had argued (see p.5-6). The Madhouses Act, a "reluctant and ineffectual intervention by the Government,"³⁴ which created a committee for inspecting private madhouses but gave them no power to take away licenses, also mandated "that every Certificate upon which any Order shall be given for the Confinement of any Person...shall be signed by Two Medical Practitioners except 'Pauper Lunatics' or 'Parish Patients' for whom only one medical certificate was required."³⁵ The idea had first been proposed to the College of Physicians in 1754, but they rejected the responsibility on the grounds that "the Execution of That Trust will be attended with such Difficulties as will make it very inconvenient to the College to perform it."³⁶ In the nineteenth century, however, this assumption that physicians were most qualified to determine insanity provided an inherent authority and kept doctors involved in the running of both traditional and moral management asylums.

As these doctors were so firmly connected with asylums and the experiences of the insane, it is useful to explore their assumptions about the institutions and people with which they worked. The physicians of Bethlem diagnosed their patients according to contemporary standards of sanity, which included specific judgments on correct behavior according to class, gender, and religion. Evidence of these assumptions can be found interspersed throughout their writings. These references, although rarely overt, provide valuable insights about the medical mindset and, by extension, the treatment received by the inmates of Bethlem.

Several sources indicate that the pauper and moneyed lunatics were perceived very differently. A now-infamous exchange between Dr. Monro and a member of the Committee on Madhouses during the 1815 hearings illustrates this attitude (italics are the words of the interviewer):

What are your objections to chains and fetters, as a mode of restraint?

They are fit only for pauper Lunatics; if a gentleman were put into irons, he would not like it...

What idea do you fix to the words, that a gentleman would not like irons?

In the first place, I am not accustomed to gentlemen in irons; I never saw anything of the kind: it is a thing so totally abhorrent to my feelings, that I never considered it necessary to put a gentleman in irons.

Do you or not think that a man in a superior rank of life is more likely in a state of insanity to be irritated by such a mode of confinement, than a pauper Lunatic?

Most assuredly.³⁷

Given that Dr. Monro, in this excerpt and elsewhere in his testimony, displays no moral objection to the use of mechanical confinement, his belief that he “never considered it necessary to put a gentleman into irons” is an unusual statement. Taken as a whole, however, this sentiment betrays a strong class consciousness and a belief that class and background not only shapes a man while sane, but also while in the grips of insanity. Immediately prior to this statement, Monro testifies that the function of irons is to prevent madmen “from being riotous and mischievous.”³⁸ The implication, then, is that gentlemen, even insane gentlemen, are less prone to this sort of behavior. In addition, Monro betrays a belief that it is inherently wrong to put a gentleman in chains, although he has no objection to chaining paupers. This distinction carries an unspoken acknowledgment of the idea that paupers and gentlemen are entirely different species of men, and as such must be treated differently.

This belief in the intrinsic difference between social classes may be rooted in the civilizing power of education. In Alexander Morison’s *Outlines of Mental Diseases*, the author notes that “education conducted with too great severity may lead to insanity; but the opposite extreme is the more common cause of it—an education not conducted on the principle of bringing the inclinations and affections under the control of religious and moral principles, and of repressing ideas of hurtful tendency.”³⁹ Education served a psychological as well as an intellectual function, training the person to function under socially-espoused “religious and moral principles.” A greater degree of this type of education would contribute to the more tractable nature of gentlemen, as portrayed by Monro.

The inability to use one’s education was recognized as a fact legitimately noted in the discussion of insanity. *Outlines of Mental Diseases* includes, in a section on the physiognomy of insanity, the picture of a man who “had received a good education, but indulgence in solitary vice brought on a state of general imbecility.”⁴⁰ There is a definite cause-and-effect relationship established between his imbecility and his “solitary vice,” implying that moral turpitude is a gateway to madness. This is not the only example of moral or religious interpretations of madness by doctors. Bryan Crowther explicitly links religious devotion with sanity in *Practical Remarks on Insanity*. He describes a “furiously deranged madman” who, when he realized that he was about to die, “requested a person to sit down and pray with him...he earnestly joined in the devotion. Which circumstances, I think, fully justify the conclusion, that had his insanity been occasioned by the diseased appearances, manifest on opening the head, such *lucid interval* could not have taken place [emphasis added].”⁴¹ A proper sense of Christian piety, then, is taken as a definite sign of lucidity.

This type of religious or moral judgment is particularly evident in discussions of homosexuality. In *The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases*, Morison includes a particularly virulent discussion of “monomania with unnatural propensity,” describing it as

a variety of partial insanity, the principal feature of which is an irresistible propensity to the crime against nature. This offence is so generally abhorred, that...the punishment...is death, formerly rendered more dreadful by burning or burying alive the offender. Being of so detestable a character, it is a consolation to know that it is sometimes the consequence of insanity; it is, however, a melancholy truth, that the offence has been committed in christian countries, by

persons in full possession of their reason and capable of controuling [sic] their actions, and it is said to be still more prevalent in countries where the purifying and restraining influence of the christian religion does not prevail.⁴²

Here Morison decries homosexuality while reaffirming the rationalizing influence of Christianity. He does not, however, establish an absolute correlation between homosexuality and insanity. This loophole allows for judgment of homosexuality without confining oneself to the language of treatment and cure.

In addition to the poor, the uneducated, and those of unorthodox sexual orientations, women were also uniquely paired with insanity in the minds of physicians. Although it is probable that Showalter's case is exaggerated (see p. 5-6), there is certainly evidence that women were considered uniquely susceptible to certain illnesses due to the nature of their constitutions. Morison's *Outline of Mental Diseases* outlines three phases in a woman's life that were considered likely to bring about insanity: "the efforts of the constitution in establishing the menstrual discharge, ...the puerperal [or postpartum] state, [and] the critical period of female life,"⁴³ or menopause. Haslam corroborates this idea, noting that "in females who become insane the disease is often connected with the peculiarities of their sex."⁴⁴ He goes on to use women's supposedly innate sense of decorum as a justification for the necessity of medical involvement in the field of mental illness, stating that "the education, character, and established habits of medical men, entitle them to the confidence of their patients: the most virtuous women unreservedly communicate to them their feelings and complaints, when they would shudder at imparting their disorders to a male of any other profession; or even to their own husbands."⁴⁵ These impressions combined paint a picture of women as the victims of their own unpredictable biologies, hesitant to impart the unsavory details of their illnesses to any but the most qualified of men.

The medical staff of early nineteenth-century Bethlem had definite preconceptions about their clientele based on their class, gender, sexuality, and propriety of religious devotion. Specific groups were made insane by specific defects in their makeup, defects not present in upper-class men. Their attitudes reveal a definite grounding in the beliefs and value structures of their time period, which in turn influenced their approaches to treatment. As such, their beliefs have played an important role in the development of British psychiatry.

The history of psychiatry, the study of how human beings think, has been dominated by increasingly complex ideas of treatment. It has also been the story of how the insane experienced life at the hands of their keepers, doctors, and therapists. Developments at Bethlem in the early nineteenth century demonstrate the status of the discipline at this juncture in the crucial reformulation of the insane as ill human beings rather than sub-humans forsaken by God. The writings of Bethlem physicians demonstrate that, although the language of discussion changed, contemporary moral schema and financial interests influenced the images of insanity, even in professional texts. This type of analysis serves to highlight not only the preconceptions of that time period, but also more current problems with the mental health industry. An exploration of the societal norms enforced by late twentieth-century therapeutic discourse could highlight the flaws of the modern system and help to advance the discipline.

Bibliography

- Andrews, Jonathan, Asa Briggs, Roy Porter, Penny Tucker, and Keir Waddington. *The History of Bethlem*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Busfield, Joan. "The female malady: Men, women and madness in nineteenth century Britain." *Sociology* 28, no. 1 (1994): 259+.
- Foucault, Michel. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Hunter, Richard, and Ida MacAlpine, eds. *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry, 1535-1860*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Megill, Allan. "The Reception of Foucault by Historians." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48, No. 1 (Jan-Mar 1987): 117-141.
- Oppenheim, Janet. Review of *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain, 1700-1900*, by Andrew Scull. *The American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (Dec 1994): 1691.
- Porter, Roy. "Bethlem/Bedlam: methods of madness." *History Today* 47, no. 10 (Oct 1997): 41-47.
- Porter, Roy. *Mind-Forg'd Manacles: A history of madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Scull, Andrew. *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain 1700-1900*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Scull, Andrew T. *Museums of Madness: The Social Organization of Insanity in Nineteenth-Century England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.
- Scull, Andrew, Charlotte MacKenzie, and Nicholas Hervey. *Masters of Bedlam: The Transformation of the Mad-Doctoring Trade*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Skultans, Vieda, ed. *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Szasz, Thomas. *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of a Theory of Personal Conduct*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Tomes, Nancy. Review of *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830-1980*, by Elaine Showalter. *The American Historical Review* 92, no. 1 (Feb 1987): 131-132.
- Tomes, Nancy. Review of *Social Order/Mental Disorder: Anglo-American Psychiatry in Historical Perspective*, by Andrew Scull. *The American Historical Review* 96, no. 2 (Apr 1991): 478-479.

Endnotes

- 1 Allan Megill, "The Reception of Foucault by Historians," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48, no. 1 (Jan-Mar 1987): 117, 128-9, 132-3.
- 2 Ibid., 132-3.
- 3 Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Random House, 1965), ix.
- 4 Roy Porter, *Mind-Forg'd Manacles: A history of madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 7-9.
- 5 Richard Hunter and Ida Macalpine, *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry, 1535-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), xii.
- 6 Ibid., vii.
- 7 Thomas Szasz, *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of a Theory of Personal Conflict* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), ix.
- 8 Nancy Tomes, review of *Social Order/Mental Disorder: Anglo-American Psychiatry in Historical Perspective*, by Andrew Scull. *The American Historical Review* 96, no. 2 (April 1991): 478.
- 9 Andrew Scull, *Museums of Madness: the Social Organization of Insanity in Nineteenth-Century England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), 15.
- 10 Janet Oppenheim, review of *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain, 1700-1900*, by Andrew Scull. *The American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (December 1994): 1691.
- 11 Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985), 4.
- 12 Nancy Tomes, review of *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*, by Elaine Showalter. *The American Historical Review* 92, no. 1 (February 1987): 132.
- 13 Joan Busfield, "The female malady: Men, women and madness in nineteenth century Britain," *Sociology* 28, No. 1, 259+.
- 14 This summary of Bethlem's early history condensed from Roy Porter, "Bethlem/Bedlam: methods of madness," *History Today* 47, no. 10 (Oct 1997): 41, 44.
- 15 *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s. v. "Bedlam" [database online], available at http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/00019256?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=Bedlam&edition=2e&first=1&max_to_show=10, 10 Nov 2003.
- 16 Jonathan Andrews, et. al., *The History of Bethlem* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 130-1.
- 17 Ibid., 11.
- 18 Ibid., 185.
- 19 Andrew Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain 1700-1900* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 116.
- 20 *The History of Bethlem*, 424.
- 21 *The Most Solitary of Afflictions*, 98.
- 22 "Bethlem/Bedlam," 42.

- ²³ *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 411.
- ²⁴ William Lawrence, *Lectures on physiology, zoology, and the natural history of man, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons*, 1819, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 750-1.
- ²⁵ Bryan Crowther, *Practical remarks on insanity; to which is added, a commentary on the dissection of the brains of maniacs; with some account of diseases incident to the insane*, 1811, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 660.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 660-1.
- ²⁷ Bryan Crowther, *Practical remarks on insanity*, in Vieda Skultans, *Madness and Morals: Ideas on Insanity in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 135.
- ²⁸ Andrew Scull, Charlotte MacKenzie, and Nicholas Hervey, *Masters of Bedlam: The Transformation of the Mad-Doctoring Trade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 37-8.
- ²⁹ John Haslam, *Considerations on the Moral Management of Insane Persons*, 1817, in *Madness and Morals*, 105.
- ³⁰ *Lectures on Physiology*, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 751.
- ³¹ *Practical Remarks on Insanity*, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 660.
- ³² *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 769.
- ³³ Alexander Morison, *Outlines of lectures on mental diseases*, 1825, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 772.
- ³⁴ Jonathan Andrews, et. al., *The History of Bethlehem* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 417.
- ³⁵ *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 454-5.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 452.
- ³⁷ Committee on Madhouses, "First Report, Minutes of Evidence Taken Before the Select Committee...", 1815, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 703.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ³⁹ Alexander Morrison, *Outlines of Mental Diseases*, 1824, in *Madness and Morals*, 33.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 76.
- ⁴¹ *Practical Remarks on Insanity*, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 660.
- ⁴² Alexander Morison, *The Physiognomy of Mental Diseases*, 1838, in *Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry*, 773.
- ⁴³ *Outline of Mental Diseases*, in *Madness and Morals*, 32.
- ⁴⁴ *Considerations on the Moral Management of Insane Persons*, in *Madness and Morals*, 223.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

More Than Rosie: A Look Beyond The Image

Carissa Reidel

The image that comes to mind when thinking of women working in war production factory jobs during World War II is most commonly Rosie the Riveter. Women are viewed by the majority of today's population as called to work during the war by patriotic duty. Rosie worked because there was a war, because her country needed her, and because she needed to protect her loved ones. Nowhere in this image does the need for money or professional opportunities ever emerge. Were such women simply motivated by the patriotism of the era or were they influenced by other motives? If so, why has such a representation not been acknowledged and presented to the public?

The U.S. government promoted and produced the notion of a patriotically motivated woman working in war production factories, and this view has persisted ever since. Contrary to this is the experiences of the women working in such jobs, their motivations and experiences and how they relate to the image promoted by the government. The motivations of the women working in the factories during World War II varied greatly and were much more complicated than the image promoted by the government would suggest. Women were motivated by patriotism as well as financial opportunities. Still, the oversimplified notion of women as motivated by patriotic duty persisted because it was the portrayal that society wanted to accept and that has been overwhelmingly presented since the end of World War II.

The scholarship on women working in war production factories is a rather recent field of study. The subject itself is sixty years old, and only in the last thirty years has enough time passed for historians to feel adequate distance from the subject to study it objectively. Much of this work is deeply influenced, directly or indirectly, by the women's movement. Many of the studies about women in the factories during World War II were written in the 70s when feminism was gaining momentum, or written later by women influenced by the changes in society and thinking due to the movement. At its core, such work is trying to expand women's history as well as the understanding of women in industrial jobs.

The scholarship of women in war production jobs is also grounded solidly in the tradition of social history. It looks at the creation of societal gender roles and how they changed in response to women in factories, as well as how the women changed. It also examines the societal tools which were used to recruit women. Research about women involved in war production is often found in works on the American home front, as well as in works solely on women in the war effort. Works on the home front show the nature of total war and how it affected the general population in all aspects of life. Studies which focus solely on women's participation in the war effort

show the importance of the women's contributions and the variety of the work which they did.

A major portion of the research concerning women in war production factory jobs is collections of oral histories of those who worked in such factories. Studs Terkels' works, *The Good War: An Oral History of World War Two* and *What Did You Do in the War, Grandma?*, are such examples of collections of oral testimonies.¹ Works of this type show the experiences of individuals during the war and the challenges they faced. Sherna Berger Gluck's work, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited: Women, the War, and Social Change*, and Nancy Baker Wise and Christy Wise's work, *A Mouthful of Rivets*, record the personal testimonies of women working in factories during the war, and then present them in a manner which argues the historians points of views.² Their work shares the experiences of women in factories, but also puts forth an argument that these women were motivated by a wide range of factors, and that they were a diverse group with varied backgrounds and circumstances. Gluck and the Wises argue that women had more motivations, such as financial motivations, for working than has been the common perception.

Other studies focus on the process of how women became a major presence in the work force during the war and analyze their experiences. The scholarship focuses on many things, such as the use of propaganda to mobilize women to work in the factories. It looks into propaganda produced by the government, such as posters and songs, and propaganda produced by the media, such as magazines, newspapers, and advertisements. All of the propaganda shows women as extremely patriotic and capable workers. The studies show the women's experience in factories, such as how the women got along with fellow male employees, how the women were trained, the jobs they occupied and the consequences such work had on their family lives. It gives insight into women's motivations, and describes what the environment in factory work was like.

In her book, *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender, and Propaganda during World War Two*, Maureen Honey predominately looks at women's employment in factories as well as general employment patterns before the war and the consequences that such work had on society. Honey argues that the war provided an opportunity for women to enter into a realm of work that they had not previously been allowed to enter and that the government and industry created an extensive propaganda campaign to justify this shift to the public. She looks at this campaign by analyzing magazines, such as *Post*, *Ladies Home Journal* and *McCall's*, as well as popular fiction and advertisements. Honey shows how such items depicted the government's message and its portrayal of working women. As she states, "All indications are that the magazine industry was at least aware of propaganda needs and tried to cooperate within the restrictions of editorial policies."³ Honey argues that working women were part of a war effort and had opportunities to move up in their occupations. The role of propaganda was to justify the employment of women in industry to the public and women themselves. The government needed women and it used all available resources to break down images of femininity and gender roles to get that labor force. By analyzing in detail the propaganda and the government's own documents, Honey came to the conclusion that propaganda was used to mobilize women and justified doing so by claiming it was simply their civic duty, nothing else. She states, "The

more forceful view was that women took war jobs out of duty, not because they would benefit from them personally.⁴ Honey argues that such work changed women and, though many were forced out of their jobs following the war, the experience stayed with them and led to future tension between women and society over their desire to work.

Leila J. Rupp, who wrote *Mobilizing Women for War: German and American Propaganda 1939-1945*, argues that propaganda was a vital tool in the mobilization of women to work in war production factories. Rupp states, "The correlation between intensive propaganda and successful mobilization does not mean that the women entered or did not enter the labor force solely in response to propaganda."⁵ Other factors, such as "financial incentives," which were not part of the governmental campaign, also influenced women to enter the labor force. The role of the propaganda takes on the dimensions of justifying using women in the labor market to society.⁶ Rupp states that, "Propagandists intended to persuade, but they may in fact serve the function of informing the public."⁷ Therefore, the use of studying propaganda is not to see how it affected women primarily, but to see how society reacted to it and how society's response then affected the women. Rupp's main argument is that the changes in women's roles were only temporary and returned to prewar conditions after the war due to society's unwillingness to let gender roles be permanently altered. Therefore, both Rupp and Honey look at the experiences of women working in war factories differently. Each look at the influences of society and government, but Honey argues women's roles were changed by the war even if only slightly, while Rupp argues that such roles were unaffected in the long run by the war. Both historians' work is typical of scholarship focused on women working in war production factory jobs during World War II.

Another facet of the scholarship that is equally prominent are detailed analyses of the government's campaign to entice women into the factories. There are many historians who have dedicated their time to analyzing the government's media message. Some examples of such works are *Visions of War: World War II in Popular Literature and Culture* and *Mightier than the Sword: How the News Media Have Shaped American History*.⁸ These works analyze the image that was being projected to society during the war and what impact that message of the patriotically motivated women could have had on those of the time and their actions. In short, they analyze the power of media on people's lives and argue much along the lines of Honey and Rupp.

The historians studying women working in war production jobs during World War II have focused the women's mobilization and experiences in detail. By putting together the scholarship of Gluck, Wise, Honey and Rupp, one gets a more complete idea of women working in the war. One receives a fuller picture of how society and the government perceived women and how the women perceived themselves and their situation. Only in this manner does a more complex image and discussion of such women emerge. What emerges from all of the varying scholarship is that women were portrayed as solely working in the factories because it was their civic duty, but in reality this was a simplification of the women's motivations to work.

The most common image of a working women during World War II is Rosie the Riveter, a woman motivated by patriotism to join the workforce. Such an image was part of the propaganda produced by the U.S. government. The government was faced

with a labor shortage problem and, to continue the production of essential war items such as planes, tanks and ammunition, the government needed workers to sustain production levels. The solution, as stated by the War Production Board, was "large numbers of women who do not normally consider themselves a part of the industrial labor supply," who would provide the labor needed. The reasoning for such a choice was that the government viewed the women as a relatively untapped labor resource that would supply a temporary workforce.⁹ From the onset, officials in the U.S. government put forth an image about the kind of women that should be filling industrial jobs. The government always assumed these workers would be women who were housewives or who had no previous work experience. They would simply be a temporary labor supply to fill jobs left behind by soldiers.

The government produced images to recruit women workers that were directly influenced by its views of the type of women which it thought would be employed. The campaign's primary tool was patriotism. As Doris Weatherford states, "Over the radio came the call for women workers; the air waves informed, cajoled, persuaded and, most of all, appealed to one's patriotism," much the same way that all media recruited for jobs.¹⁰ Consequently, the message was clear to women: their country, husbands, and brothers needed them. It was their duty to work. As Gluck states, "Self sacrifice was required to bring their husbands and sons home safely and to preserve the way of life they cherished."¹¹

Such ideas can be seen in the example of Rosie the Riveter. The poster of Rosie projects the images of a strong capable woman, one who can meet the demands of production and the needs of the nation (see Appendix A). Other posters conveyed and reinforced the patriotic feeling by proclaiming "Victory is in Your Hands," "Shopgirl Attacks Nazis," and (trying to allay [societies] nagging doubts) "War Workers Stay Womanly."¹² There is also a song about Rosie the Riveter which expands the character's public exposure. The song informs the listener about Rosie's life and reasons for working (see Appendix B). In the song, Rosie works every day "all day long" for the war effort. Not only is she working for the war effort, but Rosie is also working to "[protect] Charlie," her boyfriend who is a Marine. The point of the song is that it is one's duty to make sacrifices for the country and to help the war effort, to help loved ones. To do anything less suggests that one is not a true American, that one is not "red, white and blue."¹³

Another series of posters that highlights the government's views of women workers is a series titled *Jenny on the Job*. Posters of *Jenny on the Job* were produced by the U.S. Public Health Services and depicted things that related to women's health and factory work. At the same time, they reinforced traditional perceptions of women. The posters depicted a young, slender and attractive woman. They showed Jenny engaged in various activities such as lifting boxes and eating. The posters were titled such things as, *Jenny on the Job Eats Man Size Meals*, *Jenny on the Job Wears Styles Designed for Victory*, and *Jenny on the Job Lifts Weight the Easy Way* (see Appendix C, D, and E). The implications are that "Jenny" must do manly things like eat "man size meals" and lift weight if she works in the factories, but she must also be feminine, even in her work pants that are designed for victory (simply being functional and safe, while giving the factory uniform a glamorized look.)¹⁴ The posters romanticized women in such jobs; Jenny is always happy and sweet looking and maintains distinctly feminine qualities.

Thus while the major appeal of war work as promoted by the government was patriotism, the government attempted to promote factory work as alluring and feminine, while still keeping the image of work as a man's job.¹⁵ The government wanted to portray women's work as exciting and enchanting because, prior to the war, women in the work force carried a "stigma of economic necessity" and as one author states, "one of its most effective strategies was to glamorize the working woman" in eliminating such necessity.¹⁶ The image that was not promoted by such posters is that of women working for financial need and occupational opportunity. Rather, women like Rosie and Jenny are portrayed as still being feminine and only temporarily working in factories out of duty to their nation and loved ones. As Susan M. Hartman states, "the intent of such messages was to associate women with the durable goods production and heavy labor, they reinforce the traditional notion that women were essentially delicate and sexually alluring."¹⁷ Doing this, the government justified employing women though it went against current gender roles. Portraying women and their jobs as exciting and feminine by the government was a tool to ease the transition of women entering such jobs and to ease society's fears. As Rupp states,

Perhaps glamorizing of war work signified an attempt to ease the transition from the apron-clad housewife of the prewar image to the woman war worker in pants. Rosie the Riveter, like the flapper, was exotic in appearance, even perhaps in lifestyle. But the new image did not mean that the ideal American woman had changed beyond recognition. Beneath her begrimed exterior, she remained very much a traditional woman.¹⁸

Women may have been taking on new roles, but the government was careful to show that they were the same and would return to their prewar lifestyles when the time came.

Government and industry never viewed female employees as permanent fixtures. In fact, married women workers were viewed as working "only to enable the family to buy 'extras,'" while single women were working until they were married.¹⁹ Such a perception was the opposite of male workers, who were seen as the person responsible for earning a living to provide for their families. It was therefore commonly believed that it was the male's traditional role to work while woman's true role was one of homemaker. Hartmann states, "Because the work was conceptualized ideologically as sacrifice for a national cause, and women were representations of sacrifice, the implicit message that women could do all kinds of work was muted and eventually silenced altogether."²⁰ Therefore, the justification for women working in factories as patriotic response, counteracted the reality that women were capable of doing men's work.

The government's perception and portrayal of the female workforce was not representative of the women that actually responded to governmental recruitment. Many of these women had worked in factories before World War II. In a survey done in March of 1944, of all women working, "61 percent had been working before Pearl Harbor, 17 percent had been too young or unable to work, and only 22 percent had been housewives."²¹ Such findings suggest that the government did not correctly characterize the female labor force. Whereas the government promoted and argued that the women recruited into factory work would have been homemakers, in reality

the women who responded were those who had previously worked outside the home. These statistics show that there may have been more than the governmental argument of patriotism motivating women.

Still, the images of patriotically motivated women working in production factories which were perpetuated during the war years, had an impact on the perceptions of these women. Society was informed of women's roles during the war repeatedly through the same posters, songs and other recruitment tools focused towards women. If women had separate motives or women had already worked, the public was generally not informed of this. Rather, the image that the public perceived was the one the government gave them. Therefore it seems natural then that society's predominate image of women working in the factories was of patriotic individuals who would return to previous gender roles upon the end of the war.

Companies in Springfield, OH, also sent messages about women working in factories as a patriotic duty, reinforcing the idea of what women's roles were supposed to be and promoting the same images as the government. Robbins & Myers, a local Springfield company often simply called R & M, produced war goods for the armed services. One of the major items R & M produced was the sub-assembly units for the Norden Bombsight equipment, as well as, hoist, cranes and exhaust fans for the army and navy.²² The company received the Army-Navy "E" award for excellence due to its "outstanding production record" and it continued to receive added white stars for its sustained excellence in production.²³ Much of the work that the company did was supported by a large number of female employees working on the factory floor. The company created its own newsletter, the *R & M Co-Operator* which was distributed to its employees monthly. In 1943, the *Ladies Day* section of the *Co-Operator*, written by the female employees, estimated that twenty five percent, roughly 5,000 members of the Springfield workforce, was female, up from 1917-1918's fifteen percent. In the company itself, 1,250 women were employed in 1943 versus 880 during World War I.²⁴ The article discusses the important roles of women in war production and how women rallied to the factories to fill essential positions while championing their success. The article validates the women who worked for the nation, and serves as a celebration of the accomplishments of women. The women of the company who produced the article rejoiced over the abilities of women to help the war effort as well as their abilities to gain numbers in the workforce.

The writers also addressed society's fear of such work "unsexing the women." One story that the authors of *Ladies Day* share shows that women would not be "unsexed," but would stay feminine: "While the cameraman was setting up the picture machine, every girl in sight was fussing with her black hair. Miss Miller snickered as she looked into the stern eye of the camera, then forgot all about production records, left her lather and ran off to 'doll up a bit.'"²⁵ The story shows that women can work in factories but, ultimately, women will always embrace their feminine roles. It reiterates that factories were not the place for women and that their presence was only temporary, that, as Rupp states, "inside her coveralls, [there was] the same prewar woman who cooked, cleaned and cared for her family."²⁶ The message that comes across to the female employees reading the article is to be proud of accomplishments and abilities, but also not to challenge gender roles.

An article in the *Ladies Day* section of the January 15, 1944, edition of the *R & M Co-Operator* urges female employees of the company to recruit more women. It told of

the plight of women across the world who were involved in the war effort and urged women to bring more women in to help the war effort. It championed sacrifice for one's nation and portrayed that sacrifice as minimal pain compared to the alternative. In the end the article's sole purpose and mode of recruitment was that "Uncle Sam needs these girls."²⁷

In general, the *Ladies Day* section of the R & M newsletter projected a traditional image of gender roles to the women that worked in its factory. The section was devoted to domestic, non-work related, issues which faced women, like the duties of running a home. In fact, the section appeared more as a mini magazine focused on women rather than a factory newsletter. *Ladies Day* was always one page out of the total *R & M Co-Operator*, but the focus of the section was always on beauty tips and cooking recipes, such as how to care for your skin in the winter weather and how to keep brown sugar from getting hard.²⁸ The rest of the *Co-Operator* is about working in the plant, how many new trainees there were, letters published from employees in the armed services, poems by employees, general gossip such as who went where for vacation and who was sick, and information on output and the use of the goods manufactured there. In one way or another everything in the newsletter but the *Ladies Day* section was tied to life within the company or to the war. *Ladies Day* was a section that reinforced the roles of women at the time, the role of homemaker and maintaining femininity. Rarely did it focus on the role that women held in the factory. These same themes of reinforcing traditional roles of women caused tension within the larger community of Springfield as well.

The *Springfield Daily News* offered an outlet for the public to talk to one another and to voice many of the public's wartime controversies. On June 25th, 1942, page four is the Public's Forum, the op-ed section. In the section, a letter addressed a controversy that had been going on within Springfield. The over women wearing slacks in public; a local minister had called such action immoral, and, in the words of the author, "[condemning] them to hell."²⁹ The debate was partly based on factories' female employees, for they wore slacks to work to be practical and as a safety measure. But the other part of the debate was over women wearing slacks outside the factory. As one resident stated, "A lot of women are doing wonderful and patriotic work in the present war, but there are a lot of others who just want to 'show off' in front of men."³⁰ Such actions caused uproar among the community because traditionally women did not wear slacks, and men did. The action seemed to suggest to the public the loss of women's femininity, which would alter existing societal gender roles. Some men accepted the fact that women could wear slacks, but grieved that it was allowed and acceptable: "I am willing to concede the loss of our pants, age-old symbol of our dominance, as the major home front casualty of this war."³¹ Such men believed that wearing pants caused women to lose the "esthetic value of exalted femininity which men normally gave them."³² Many men and others were worried about women losing their role and becoming more like men, gaining power and prestige. Still some people responded with the argument that such clothing was common sense: "slacks are a very practical mode of dress for our women war workers, and dresses are very dangerous around moving machinery."³³ Others responded with respect for women and the work that they were doing: "The women slack wearers are trying to earn a living and they are giving their best efforts toward a

successful termination of our country's war effort."³⁴

Women working in the factories also took part in the debate. They pointed to the work they were doing as justification of their dress and demanded respect for such work:

The next time some of you males, and some females as well, are tempted to give some verbal or written criticisms, stop and think. Most of us are working in factories, where dresses are out-of-place. We are of necessity doing work formally done by men. They didn't wear skirts and dresses did they? ...Working in a factory is no picnic, you know.³⁵

Women demanded to be recognized for what they had been doing, for supporting the nation in its war effort, for working long hours doing hard jobs, and for supporting themselves. While justifying women wearing pants, the debate reiterates such changes in women's work as patriotically driven. Women worked out of "necessity," or, better stated, patriotic duty, and when the men returned they would have their jobs back.

Still, the dispute shows that the images that were being promoted to society and the changes women went through caused tension. Members of society knew that women were needed for the war effort, that without women in the factories the soldiers and the war machine could not continue. The community was informed of this daily in the government's call for all to sacrifice, in rationing, buying bonds, and work. However, when women worked in the factories in Springfield and challenged societal gender roles, it made the general public uncomfortable. Women were seen as becoming more like men and less like women, and the foundation of society seemed shaken and its members voiced their opinion. The government's response, and the response of the industry, was that women were not losing their femininity. They were simply using their skills in different ways and would soon return to their traditional jobs. Women's skills in the home were praised for preparing them for the workforce and women were portrayed as feminine and glamorous in their jobs, as *Jenny on the Job* or the tale of Miss Miller in the Springfield *R & M Co-Operator*.

The U.S. government created an image of women workers in factory jobs during World War II as civically minded and society accepted that fully. But was such an image really representative of the women's motivations to work? What the government promoted and how society responded shows an interesting aspect of the factories, but is there an aspect being ignored, such as financial opportunities? Is there more to the experiences of women in the factories?

The only way to know if the government's portrayal of women's motives for working in factories during World War II is correct is to compare it to the women's own words. The wealth of recent scholarship that documents oral histories from these women allows one to do this. Looking at such sources gives a more diverse image of women and their reasons to choose such war production work.

In 1943, a woman named Josephine von Miklos published a book called *I Took a War Job*, which chronicled her choice to take a war job and her experiences. Von Miklos, who had already held a job in the fashion industry as well as a Ph.D., left her job to work in a factory. To von Miklos her world of fashion seemed frivolous and unrealistic in the face of the war: "To hell I said, with penthouse studios and cocktails and fashion shows and driving through Central Park at dusk, where the building are

purple and breath-taking. To hell with dreaming of bigger and better jobs, and of making love to Fifth Avenue."³⁶ In essence, von Miklos was purely motivated by patriotism. She felt that she needed to help her nation. Therefore, she sacrificed the life she had in favor of a new one which was devoted to the war effort, the need for money never factored into her decision. She was overqualified, alone, and in a job that she did not particularly like, but she did it because she was helping her country. It is this patriotism which carried her and gave her strength to deal with the challenges she faced in factory work: "Yes, fighting and working in war plants are grim business, but somebody's got to do it, and it might as well be me. And, anyway, it is the only way I know in which I can say, thanks, America, thanks for everything, I've had a wonderful time."³⁷

Other women were also motivated to work because of patriotic reasons. Doris Whitney had a reaction similar to von Miklos. She had been living a life that revolved around gambling and horse racing and one day thought to herself, "Jeez, I'm living this indolent life, and the war is going on. I should do something serious."³⁸ She joined the war effort by working in an aircraft factory. Faiga Fram Duncan remembers a woman who she called Bataan Mother. Her son was captured when Bataan fell and she did not know whether he had lived or died, but it was for him that she worked. For the personal reason of helping her son and the patriotic reason of helping the men in the armed forces, she returned to work each day.³⁹

However, such women who worked for their fighting brothers and husbands were truly unrepresentative of the whole. As Gluck states, "In reality only one in ten new women workers had husbands in the service. (And only 8 percent of *all* women were married to service men.)"⁴⁰ While such women who appear singularly motivated for patriotic reasons existed, there were also women who worked for financial reasons, for the opportunity, and for a combination of reasons.

Some women were greatly motivated by the money that could be made in the factories. A historian stated, "Some women saw an opportunity to earn more money than was possible in the lower-paying, more traditional 'women's' jobs of that period."⁴¹ They were motivated by the money that they could save for their lives after the war, that they could use to help their families, and money that was their own. Katie Lee Clark Knight and her husband were so motivated by the money that was involved in the war production factories that they left their home in El Paso and moved to the West Coast so they could both take jobs. "Of course, being young, we wanted to go where the big money was. At that time, that was good money. I remember I made, I think it was \$50 a week."⁴² It was for the money that she, as well as her husband, decided to radically change their lives, something that went against the governmental image. Knight saw a chance to improve her situation and she took it and fully embraced the opportunity. The money that was saved was used after the war to better her situation by buying a house: "We went back to El Paso after that, before we started traveling, and bought a home."⁴³

Tina Hill also worked in the plants that created products for the war effort. When a friend told her that there was lots of money to be made in war plants, enough to not have to "work in the hotel or motels," she took her advice and got a job. Her reaction to the job was excitement about the increase in pay: "And what I liked about it was the money. I felt like if I could make more money, I could do more with it."⁴⁴

Hill went to work in factories because the pay was good and she could “do more with it,” such as provide better for her family, get a better living space and even have money of her own to spend on herself. Polly Crow chose her job because it allowed her to “have her cake and eat it to [sic];” she could work the swing shift and still be home during the day to take care of her son, as well as earn money to save for later: “I’m gonna start sockin’ it in savings and checking too so’s we’ll have something when our sweet little Daddy comes home.”⁴⁵ Not only was she motivated by the money and her ability to save it, but the money was her own and it gave her power and excitement to be in control of her own finances: “Opened my little checking account too and it’s a grand and a glorious feeling to write a check all you own and not have to ask anyone for one.”⁴⁶

Women were motivated by money and by patriotism, but these incentives were not necessarily separate from each other. Weatherford states, “Given the opportunity of earning their own paychecks and the satisfaction of contributing to the war efforts, millions were glad” to work in the factories.⁴⁷ Often women were motivated by both patriotism and money, as well as other things. Margarita Salazar McSweyen worked for Lockheed subassembly plant in Los Angeles during the war. To her, the time was an exciting one to be living in, a time of struggle and full of new experiences: “it was exciting and being involved in that era. You figured you were doing something for your country—and at the same time making money.”⁴⁸ For McSweyen, the need to help her country was a reason for work, and made her feel good to have a job, which she needed to help support her family, and she could also contribute to the war effort. Althea Bates Gladish, who operated a machine in Massachusetts, also shows the same tendency of money and patriotism both being motivating factors: “The money however was not the most important point of my working that summer. It was kind of a patriotic duty.”⁴⁹ To her, the money mattered, but so did the war.

Other factors that influenced women were the opportunity to work or the ability to have a better job that had not been previously offered to women. The job was important to women because they needed it and the opportunities in war production factories were a step up from the traditional employment which women had been offered. The Wises argue that “some women saw the opportunity to earn more money than was possible in the lower-paying, more traditional jobs of that period.”⁵⁰ For some, work was just a natural experience. Geraldine Amidon Berkly always knew she would work like all the other women in her family: “Working during the war didn’t change my mind about working. I was always going to be a career person. It never entered my mind that I’d do anything else.”⁵¹ But the war production factories gave her an opportunity which she took, and it allowed her to work in new kinds of jobs. When working in factories she made sure that she worked men’s jobs: “I was adamant about getting a man’s job. Every time I applied somewhere, I wanted to take a man’s job.”⁵² The war factories allowed her to do men’s jobs, like riveting, that she would not have had before and it “broadened” her view on life. After going to work in a war production factory, Mildred Admire Bedell also had a new perspective on life; she took hold of the opportunity to work during the war and always kept a job: “I was a mother with three children, and I had graduated from high school and had no idea of how to work. I had no career. All of a

sudden, I was making money, I was head of a household, and it made a different person of me. I had never been without a job since that day."⁵³

However, the truth was that women took jobs in war production factories because it provided better opportunities. Honey argues, "The flood of positive images of working women promoted non-working women to expand their vision of what life could offer," to strive for something more than house work.⁵⁴ Those that had never worked before, as well as those who had in different jobs, liked the opportunity and did not want to quit. A survey "taken in 1944 revealed that seventy percent to eighty percent of women in war production areas planned to remain in the labor force after the victory was won, and they wanted to keep the jobs they were then performing."⁵⁵ The women wanted to keep their jobs even after their soldiers returned; this does not support the patriotic image of the female worker gladly giving up her job to return to the kitchen. This can be seen by the exit patterns of women at the end of the war. Women who had never worked before did not quit when the men came back, but held on to their jobs until they were fired to make room for the returning soldiers. This showed that patriotism was not the only reason for working because, if it was, then the women would have gladly quit.

Women were motivated by more than the governmental image of patriotism. The image is not inaccurate but oversimplified because it does not show that financial concerns and job opportunities that interested women. The question that then arises is why does the image of patriotically driven women working in war production factories still exist if it is a simplified image? Why have the other images and motivations of such women are not recognized? Rupp suggests that the image of women may have changed drastically during war but that the image does not change because the larger culture never viewed it as a permanent change. She states, "The economic role and the popular image of women may change drastically in the course of a modern war, but basic ideas about women's proper sphere, characterized by cultural lag even in the case of long-term economic developments change little."⁵⁶ Basically, during the war the image of women changed, but after the war it reverted to its common perception. Members of society did not want to change and only did so temporarily to accomplish what it needed to win the war. The government intended that the use of women in such jobs would be temporary, "the mode of adaptation of public images assured that the wartime range of options would contract once again in peacetime," and so it promoted an image which would recruit women for a short period.⁵⁷ Therefore, society was not ready to accept the role of women as workers, equal in ability and strength to men, after the war.

Society chose to not recognize the motivations of women working in factories during the war other than patriotism because such motivations went against the traditional gender roles it was trying to reinforce. The simple fact is that, as Rupp states, "the mobilization propaganda directed at women allowed the public to accept the participation of women in unusual jobs without challenging basic beliefs about women's roles."⁵⁸ Since the propaganda of the government did not hurt the image of women's roles, its message could be remembered and passed on through the years and not interfere with societal messages. It became a part of the war memory and the nostalgic view of women working in war production factories.

By looking at women's experiences and motivations, a new image of these women can be recovered and shared. To do this, more communities need to take the

oral histories of the women who worked in war production factories during World War II. The scholarship that exists is a start which sparks interest and discussion, but it is one that is generally focused mostly on women in major urban coastal areas. Smaller communities across the United States need to record these women's testimonies while they still have the chance. They need to talk to these women to find out what motivated them, and to learn of their experiences during the time. This will provide a wealth of new information and discussion. If such testimonies are taken and more scholarship is written to explore the complex, differing experiences of women working in war production factories it will allow these women and their stories to emerge from behind the patriotic shadow of Rosie the Riveter and de-simplify the image of women in war production factories.

Appendix A

"Rosie the Riveter"



Bird, William. *Design for Victory: World War II Posters on the American Home Front*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.

Appendix B

"Rosie the Riveter"
by Redd Evans and John Jacob Loeb

All the day long,
Whether rain or shine,
She's a part of the assembly line.
She's making history,
Working for victory,
Rosie the Riveter.
Keeps a sharp lookout for sabotage,
Sitting up there on the fuselage.
That little girl will do more than a male will do.
Rosie's got a boyfriend, Charlie.
Charlie, he's a Marine.
Rosie is protecting Charlie,
Working overtime on the riveting machine.
When they gave her a production "E,"
She was as proud as she could be.
There's something true about,
Red, white, and blue about,
Rosie the Riveter.

Miller, Alan and His Orchestra "Rosie the Riveter," *Songs that Won the War: Rosie the Riveter*. LaserLight Digital 12 499.

Appendix C

"Jenny on the Job Eats Man Size Meals"

Jenny on the Job: Eats Man Size Meals.
Washington D.C.: United States Public
Health Service, 1943.
[http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/
digilib/llscgi60.exe](http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/digilib/llscgi60.exe).



Appendix D

"Jenny on the Job
Wears Styles Designed for Victory"

Jenny on the Job: Wears Styled Designed for Victory. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943.
<http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/digilib/llscgi60.exe>.



Appendix E

"Jenny on the Job
Lifts Weight the Easy Way"

Jenny on the Job: Lifts Weight the Easy Way. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943.
<http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/digilib/llscgi60.exe>.



Bibliography

- Bird, William. *Design for Victory: World War II Posters on the American Home Front*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.
- Campbell, D'Ann. "Wives, Workers and Womanhood: America During World War II." Ph. D. diss., University of North Carolina, 1979.
- Gluck, Sherna Berger. *Rosie the Riveter Revisited: Women, the War and Social Change*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987.
- Hartmann, Susan M. *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Higonnet, Margaret Randolph, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel, and Margaret Collins Weitz, eds. *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Holsinger, M. Paul and Mary Anne Schofield, eds. *Visions of War: World War II in Popular Literature and Culture*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Press, 1992.
- Honey, Maureen. *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender, and Propaganda During World War Two*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.
- Jenny on the Job: Eats Man Size Meals*. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943. <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/digilib/llscgi60.exe>.
- Jenny on the Job: Wears Styled Designed for Victory*. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943. <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/digilib/llscgi60.exe>.
- Jenny on the Job: Lifts Weight the Easy Way*. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943. <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgi/digilib/llscgi60.exe>.
- Kossoudji, Sherrie A. and Laura J. Dresser. "Working Class Rosies: Women Industrial Workers During World War Two." *The Journal of Economic History* vol. 52, no.2 (June 1992): 431-446.
- Litoff, Judy Barrett and David C. Smith. *Since You Went Away: World War II Letters From American Women on the Home front*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1991.
- Miller, Alan and His Orchestra "Rosie the Riveter," *Songs that Won the War: Rosie the Riveter*. LaserLight Digital 12 499.
- O'Brien, Kenneth Paul and Lynn Hudson Parsons, eds. *The Home-Front War: World War II and American Society*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- R & M Co-Operator* (Springfield, OH.). 15 March 1944 - 15 January 1946.
- Rupp, Leila J. *Mobilizing Women for War: German and American Propaganda 1939-1945*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978.

- South Kingstown High School Students. *What Did You Do in the War, Grandma!* South Kingstown, Rhode Island: Linda P. Wood and Judi Scott, 1989.
- Springfield Daily News* (Springfield, OH.). 4 May- 21 August 1942.
- Streitmatter, Rodger. *Mightier than the Sword: How the News Media Have Shaped American History*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1997.
- Summerfield, Penny. *Reconstruction Women's Wartime Lives: Discourse and Subjectivity in Oral Histories of the Second World War*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Terkel, Studs. *"The Good War:" An Oral History of World War Two*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1984.
- von Miklos, Josephine. *I Took a War Job*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1943.
- Weatherfield, Doris. *American Women and World War II*. New York: Facts on File, 1990.
- Wise, Nancy Baker and Christy Wise. *A Mouthful of Rivets: Women at Work in World War II*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.

Endnotes

- ¹ Studs Terkel, *"The Good War:" An Oral History of World War Two* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1984). South Kingstown High School Students, *What Did You Do in the War, Grandma!* (South Kingstown, Rhode Island: Linda P. Wood and Judi Scott, 1989).
- ² Sherma Berger Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited: Women, the War and Social Change* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987). Nancy Baker Wise and Christy Wise, *A Mouthful of Rivets: Women at Work in World War II* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994).
- ³ Maureen Honey, *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender, and Propaganda during World War Two* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), 41.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, 55.
- ⁵ Leila J. Rupp, *Mobilizing Women for War: German and American Propaganda 1939-1945* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1978), 167.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁸ Rodger Streitmatter, *Mightier than the Sword: How the News Media Have Shaped American History* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1997).
- ⁹ Sherrie A. Kossoudji and Laura J. Dresser, "Working Class Rosies: Women Industrial Workers During World War Two." *The Journal of Economic History* vol. 52, no.2 (June 1992): 432.
- ¹⁰ Doris Weatherfield, *American Women and World War II* (New York: Facts on File, 1990), 117.
- ¹¹ Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited*, 12.
- ¹² Weatherfield, *American Women and World War II*, 117.

- ¹³ Alan Miller and His Orchestra, "Rosie the Riveter," *Songs that Won the War: Rosie the Riveter* (LaserLight Digital 12, 499).
- ¹⁴ *Jenny on the Job: Eats Man Size Meals*. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943. <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgl/digilib/lscgi60.exe>. *Jenny on the Job: Wears Styled Designed for Victory*. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943. <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgl/digilib/lscgi60.exe>. *Jenny on the Job: Lifts Weight the Easy Way*. Washington D.C.: United States Public Health Service, 1943. <http://www.library.northwestern.edu/otcgl/digilib/lscgi60.exe>.
- ¹⁵ Susan M. Hartmann, *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982), 56.
- ¹⁶ Streitmatter, *Mightier than the Sword: How the News Media Have Shaped American History*, 141.
- ¹⁷ Kenneth Paul O'Brien and Lynn Hudson Parsons, eds. *The Home-Front War: World War II and American Society* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1995), 92-93.
- ¹⁸ Rupp, *Mobilizing Women for War*, 151.
- ¹⁹ Honey, *Creating Rosie the Riveter*, 26.
- ²⁰ O'Brien and Parsons, *The Home-Front War: World War II and American Society*, 96.
- ²¹ Kossoudji and Dresser, "Working Class Rosies: Women Industrial Workers During World War Two," 433.
- ²² "R & M at War," *R&M Co-Operator* (Springfield, OH.), 1943, 5.
- ²³ W.S. Quinlan, "A Message From Our President," *R&M Co-Operator* (Springfield, OH.), 1943 1.
- ²⁴ Pauline Biscup, Georgia Bobo, Mary Fisher and Martha Kambeitz, "Ladies Day," *R&M Co-Operator* (Springfield, OH.), 1943, 23.
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ Rupp, *Mobilizing Women for War*, 153.
- ²⁷ Pauline Biscup, Mary Fisher, Georgia Bobo, and Martha Kambeitz, "This is War," *R&M Co-Operator* (Springfield, OH.), 15 January 1944, 21.
- ²⁸ Pauline Biscup, Mary Fisher, Georgia Bobo, and Martha Kambeitz, "A Cooking Dija' Know," 15 January 1944, 21.
- ²⁹ "Defending Slacks," *Springfield Daily News* (Springfield, OH.)..25 June 1942, 4.
- ³⁰ "Women in Slacks," *Springfield Daily News* (Springfield, OH.), 10 June 1942, 4.
- ³¹ "Women's Slacks," *Springfield Daily News* (Springfield, OH.), 21 April 1942, 4.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ "Defending Slacks," *Springfield Daily News* (Springfield, OH.)..25 June 1942, 4.
- ³⁴ Ibid.
- ³⁵ Ibid.
- ³⁶ Josephine von Miklos, *I Took a War Job* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1943), 4.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 11.
- ³⁸ Wise and Wise, *A Mouthful of Rivets*, 59.

- ³⁹ Ibid., 51.
- ⁴⁰ Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited*, 13.
- ⁴¹ Wise and Wise, *A Mouthful of Rivets*, 2.
- ⁴² Ibid., 24.
- ⁴³ Ibid., 25-26.
- ⁴⁴ Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited*, 36.
- ⁴⁵ Judy Barrett Litoff and David C. Smith, *Since You Went Away: World War II Letters From American Women on the Home Front* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1991), 147.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ Weatherfield, *American Women and World War II*, 125.
- ⁴⁸ Gluck, *Rosie the Riveter Revisited*, 71.
- ⁴⁹ Wise and Wise, *A Mouthful of Rivets*, 66.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., 2.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 9.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Ibid., 7.
- ⁵⁴ Honey, *Creating Rosie the Riveter*, 138.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 23.
- ⁵⁶ Rupp, *Mobilizing Women for War*, 174.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., 175.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., 177.