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Abstract:
This thesis examines middle-class social relations in nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh, giving particular attention to how the cities’ inhabitants dealt with sectarian conflicts. These cities occupied an unusual position within the UK as they were both stateless capitals, towns that no longer possessed a national parliament, but still performed many of the administrative functions of a capital city. Being a stateless capital affected Dublin and Edinburgh in contrasting ways and this distinction shaped the wider character of each city and middle-class social relations within them. The thesis adopts philanthropy as a vantage point from which to explore these issues as charitable institutions occupied a unique place in nineteenth-century towns, being a junction between voluntary association and official government activity.

Presbyterian Edinburgh and predominately Catholic and Anglican Dublin were both home to vibrant philanthropic associational cultures based on similar middle-class values. Contrary to older analyses, Presbyterianism did not promote a greater interest in participating in voluntary activity any more than Catholicism discouraged it. There were, however, differences between the cities. Edinburgh was a more ostensibly successful city by contemporary middle-class standards. Its organisations helped it to overcome social divisions to a greater extent than their counterparts in Dublin. The contrasting nature of state-charity relations in each city partly explains this difference. Overt central state intervention in Edinburgh’s philanthropic institutions was rare, hence Edinburgh was seen as a society trying to manage its own problems. Dublin by contrast, appeared to be a dependent city as its charities received substantial parliamentary aid. Hence, Edinburgh could present itself as a self-confident capital city whereas Dublin, although a more overt centre of power, sometimes appeared to be simply an intermediary through which London influenced the rest of Ireland. Although both cities were part of the UK mainstream associational culture, charitable activity also emphasised their Irish or Scottish characteristics. These national attributes were not perceived as equally attractive. Philanthropy associated Edinburgh with Enlightenment and education, by contrast it connected Dublin with poverty and dependency.
Lay Summary:
This thesis examines middle-class social relations in Dublin and Edinburgh between 1815 and 1845. These cities occupied a unique position within the United Kingdom. They were both stateless capitals as they no longer possessed a national parliament but performed many of the functions of a capital city. Being a stateless capital strongly shaped both cities but it did so in contrasting ways in each. This thesis uses philanthropy as a vantage point from which to explore the effects of capital status on middle-class interactions in each city. Philanthropy occupied a key junction between voluntary activity and official authority and can therefore reveal much about the identities of middle-class inhabitants and their relationship with the power structures that shaped the cities.

The thesis highlights many similarities between the cities and demonstrates that philanthropic activity sometimes helped to reduce sectarian tensions in each. Yet in Dublin charitable activity often exacerbated existing religious and other social conflicts and that city was less able to manage diversity among its middle-class inhabitants than was Edinburgh where charities often highlighted the values that philanthropists shared in spite of their other differences.

The thesis also reveals that philanthropy shaped the image of Dublin and Edinburgh. The methods and language used by charities in both Dublin and Edinburgh were very much within the UK mainstream, and made both cities familiar to inhabitants of other parts of the UK. Yet charity also enhanced the national characteristics of each city, making them seem more ‘Irish’ or more ‘Scottish’. Charity added to Edinburgh’s image as a centre of educational excellence. By contrast philanthropy associated Dublin with poverty and dependency, the kind of negative characteristics that British commentators often connected with Ireland.
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Introduction.

The great cities of an empire are, at least equally with its great men, a species of public property. In the history of both, that of their country is involved; the events that mark the annals of both are the epochs of the national annals; nor can the character of the one, or the topography of the other, be delineated, but in connexion with the most important national institutions and affairs.

The Metropolis of Scotland is inferior to none of the cities of Europe in associations of this kind... She has still her royal Holyrood; her temples of religion, of benevolence, and of science, forming a sort of panoramic history of all the civil and ecclesiastical changes through which the country has passed:—of her kingly races; her martyrs and reformers; her princely merchants; and her noble triumphs as a school of literature and medicine.¹

Like the inhabitants of nineteenth-century Edinburgh, Dublin’s residents used the epithet metropolis to describe their city. Sometimes they claimed it was ‘a metropolis for the poor, but not the rich’, but their language revealed a belief that Dublin was, and was entitled to be, the preeminent Irish city.² Reference to Dublin and Edinburgh as national metropolises reflected their unique positions within the nineteenth-century United Kingdom. Both were what Graeme Morton has termed ‘stateless capitals’.³ They had lost their Parliaments at the Anglo-Scottish (1707) and British-Irish (1801) Unions respectively, yet they continued to perform many of the administrative functions of a capital city. This distinguished Dublin and Edinburgh from the UK’s other urban centres and suggests that attention must be given to how living in a capital city affected residents’ everyday lives.⁴ This thesis compares the impact of capital status in Dublin and Edinburgh on interactions among each city’s middle classes, broadly defined to include professionals, publicans, and prestigious artisans. In other words, it

---

¹Thomas H. Sherpherd and John Britton, Modern Athens! Displayed in a Series of Views or Edinburgh in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1829), iii.
²1854 (338) Report from the Select Committee on Dublin Hospitals; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index (n.p., 1854), viii.
investigates how the characteristics and official power structures acquired by virtue of being a capital, such as national law courts, affected social relations among middle-class groups. It also considers how capital status shaped the wider image of each city. The thesis demonstrates that Dublin and Edinburgh were similar cities but that the contrasting ways in which capital status manifested itself in each reinforced differences between them. The central state intervened more overtly in Dublin’s charities, exacerbating social conflict there and augmenting Dublin’s reputation as an ‘Irish’ city in the eyes of British commentators as they connected this apparent dependence on the central state with contemporary Irish stereotypes of poverty and mendicancy.

Several historians have considered Dublin’s position as national capital. Mary E. Daly provided an incisive analysis of the complexities of civic identity in Dublin after it was restored as capital of a predominantly rural Ireland with which it seemed to have little in common. Similarly, Erika Hanna’s examination of the mid-twentieth-century campaigns to protect Dublin’s Georgian buildings, demonstrated the city’s uncomfortable place within the nation as questions were raised about whether its architectural heritage was really Irish. By contrast, although both contemporary and later commentators used the appellations ‘second city of the Empire’ or ‘deposed capital’ to describe nineteenth-century Dublin, few historians have examined how being a capital city affected the day-to-day lives of the city’s inhabitants in that time period.

Ciarán Wallace attempted a systematic analysis of state-society relations in early twentieth-century Dublin, drawing on comparisons with Edinburgh. Yet although ostensibly studying two capital cities, he gave little attention to Dublin’s position as capital, and Dublin Castle, the home of the Irish administration, rarely featured in his work. This was a significant omission as the presence of the Dublin Castle administrative complex shaped the city. The ‘Castle’ as it was called, enabled the

---

central state to intervene more overtly in Dublin than in Edinburgh, and this accounts for many of the differences between the cities. Wallace also focused on the period after significant widening of the local government franchise in 1898. Less attention has been given to Dublin in the early nineteenth century when middle-class access to local government was contested and, when relations between communities and the central state were being renegotiated as they were throughout the UK.  

Jacqueline Hill’s studies of Dublin’s Protestant communities in the years before municipal reform in 1840, have revealed much about the connection between religion and identity in this period and how sectarian differences infiltrated many aspects of the city’s economy and society.  

David Dickson has shed light on Dublin’s economic and cultural life in the early nineteenth century, and briefly explored the Union’s influence on the city. Yet even Hill and Dickson’s seminal studies failed to fully analyse the social impact of capital status.

Edinburgh’s position as capital has received more attention from historians. Graeme Morton in particular has highlighted how interactions between the central and the local state helped to define Edinburgh as capital of the ‘stateless nation’ of Scotland. Morton developed a valuable model for such interactions, arguing that the central state ‘enshrined’ the city’s local government and voluntary organisations: Westminster passed legislation that protected local institutions, enabling them to manage themselves and to influence the rest of Scotland. Edinburgh was therefore able to enjoy a level of autonomy that allowed it to define itself as the self-governing Scottish capital. Richard Rodger emphasised how Edinburgh’s long-established non-governmental institutions, such as trusts, shaped the city’s long-term development.

---


constant presence of these bodies in Edinburgh over centuries helped to stabilise the city’s economy against more unpredictable market forces during the nineteenth century and enhanced its role as a centre of historical authority.\textsuperscript{12} The city also presented itself as Scottish capital in other ways including through its built environment. From the 1830s, for example, Edinburgh increasingly adopted architectural styles inspired by a romantic Scottish nationalism.\textsuperscript{13}

Yet while Edinburgh’s position as capital has been acknowledged, many questions still remain about how this was experienced by its inhabitants. Rodger gave a sense of how complex the expression of identity in Edinburgh might be when he indicated that in the later nineteenth century some city-based official ceremonies reinforced national themes while others strongly emphasised civic pride.\textsuperscript{14} Morton’s \textit{Unionist Nationalism}, relying heavily on data from the 1850s, argued that voluntary associations reflected and reinforced a strong sense of Edinburgh’s position as national capital.\textsuperscript{15} By contrast, Andrew Dalgleish’s unpublished study of the city’s voluntary associations between 1780 and 1820, argued that these organisations reflected and promoted affiliation to the city rather than the nation.\textsuperscript{16} By adopting a different time period to Dalgleish and Morton, and giving particular attention to the 1830s when some of Edinburgh’s middle classes gained a role in the soon to be bankrupt Town Council, this thesis provides a fresh perspective on geographical identity in the city. It highlights the significance of interactions between national and city affiliations that gave rise to a form of Scottish identity that was partly unique to Edinburgh.


\textsuperscript{15} Morton’s study extended from 1830 to 1860 (and beyond) but much of the data on voluntary organisations came from the 1850s, Graeme Morton, \textit{Unionist Nationalism, Governing Urban Scotland 1830-1860} (East Linton, East Lothian, 1999), 113-132.

Scottish identity has often been conceived as rural, but historians of Scottish towns have argued that Scotland had distinctive civic traditions compared with the rest of the UK. According to Rodger and Paul Laxton, for example, a higher level of local government involvement in sanitation was consistent with Enlightenment ideas of rational intervention in governance to improve public welfare. Yet, although these studies made brief reference to England, the presence of a peculiarly Scottish urbanism has not been tested sufficiently. Brief comparisons with Ireland by Hill and Matthew Potter suggest that there were similar urban traditions in each country. This thesis’s sustained comparison indicates that Edinburgh did have more active local government institutions but this was not a result of significant differences in attitudes towards urban governance.

Comparative approaches have been criticised for sacrificing ‘depth for breadth’ and this thesis will not be able to provide the same detail on each city as two single city studies of the same length. The danger of ‘flattening’ and missing crucial local context is also increased, and one must be aware of differences in language use where the same words might have different meanings in each of the places compared. In nineteenth-century Scotland for example, the term police was applied to many aspects of town management including sanitation, whereas in Ireland it was usually confined to the administration of law and order. The long-running series of comparative volumes produced by Irish and Scottish social and economic historians contain examples of how Ireland and Scotland can be successfully compared in spite of such hazards. For

---


example, Donald MacRaild’s study of Orangeism in Ireland and Scotland went beyond providing social profiles of lodge members in both countries and highlighted connections between what were two very different movements in each place.\(^{21}\)

Although dissimilar in many ways, Dublin and Edinburgh were both part of the United Kingdom and were both connected with Westminster and Whitehall. This aids comparison as their inhabitants had to interact with many of the same kinds of state authority. The 1830s and 1840s are particularly interesting decades to investigate in this regard as they were years during which British elites made significant efforts to fully integrate Ireland both administratively and culturally into the United Kingdom.\(^{22}\)

As Deborah Cohen noted, in practice historians rarely avoid making some comparisons, albeit implicitly or briefly, and often based on limited knowledge of the places invoked to provide the contrasts.\(^{23}\) Planned comparison, even if asymmetric, provides a more thorough way of exploring similarities and differences. Unlike older interrogations of case studies like Theda Skocpol’s *States and Social Revolutions*, recent studies have primarily used comparison as a nuanced methodology for raising new questions.\(^{24}\) By considering issues usually only explored in the context of one place, comparison provides new insights into the other places studied.\(^{25}\) For example, J. Matthew Gallman’s *Receiving Erin’s Children*, which analysed the response of Philadelphia and Liverpool to Irish Famine migrants, highlighted the innovative role played by the state in welfare provision in Liverpool, something that would have been


\(^{22}\) Hoppen, *Governing*, 63-65, 72-76.

\(^{23}\) Cohen, ‘Comparative’, 64-65.


more difficult to detect without the American perspective. Similarly, by applying the concept of stateless-capital status, an idea developed for Edinburgh, to Dublin as well, this thesis sheds new light on the nature of social interaction in both cities.

The concentrated nature of urban life that is produced by the interweaving of many characteristics and activities in a limited space, makes towns particularly suited to comparison and it has become an established method in urban history. The complexity of city life allows even studies that rely heavily on statistics, such as Rodger’s examination of wages and employment in Scottish cities in the later nineteenth century, to produce nuanced conclusions. Rodger highlighted the characteristics of the individual urban centres compared, including the peculiar significance of the professions in Edinburgh, while also revealing features that applied to all of the Scottish cities examined. For example, the increase in women’s clerical employment that occurred in other European cities in the later nineteenth century was not apparent in urban Scotland. As Nicolas Kenny and Rebecca Madgin have pointed out, simply examining activity that took place in a town does not constitute urban history. Urban history must be interested in ‘urbanness’, the characteristics that make a town a town, and this concern requires comparison, whether explicit or implicit, with other urban centres. The increasing interest of urban historians in transnational connections has also allowed their comparisons to become more nuanced, enabling them to take into account exchanges between their chosen cities.

Urban history has recently been enriched by an increased focus on space and on the ways in which the built environment affected inhabitants’ behaviours. Towns, however, were shaped by more than their architecture or physical spaces. Urban living was also a reflection of the numerous complex networks, partnerships, and hostilities that grew up when many individuals and institutions existed alongside each other in

28 Kenny and Madgin, “Every Time”, 4-8.
29 Kenny and Madgin, “Every Time”, 4-8.
30 For example Simon Gunn and R.J. Morris (Eds), Identities in Space: Contested Terrains in the Western City since 1850 (Aldershot, Hampshire, and Burlington, Vermont, 2007).
one setting. Comparing Dublin and Edinburgh will indicate that there were many parallels in the nature of social interaction in each city, notwithstanding their contrasting topographies.\textsuperscript{31}

The nature and image of a nineteenth-century town was shaped by many factors including its economy, local politics, religious conflicts, and its architecture and public monuments, but the way in which the town appeared to be dealing with its social problems was also an important element. The extent to which it seemed willing and able to provide for its ‘own’ poor, however defined, was a measure of the town’s success or failure. This makes philanthropy a particularly good vantage point from which to investigate city image. Charities occupied a key mediating role between official authority structures and the social lives of the urban middle classes. They involved voluntary association as people ‘freely’ came together to establish, manage, and fund them. Yet as they tried to tackle the social and environmental problems of a nineteenth-century town, charities involved themselves in urban governance and often interacted with official government authorities.\textsuperscript{32} The multifaceted nature of philanthropy means that its analysis can shed much light on nineteenth-century urban societies more generally. Rather than focusing on the services provided by charities or their effects on interactions between rich and poor, this thesis explores how charity affected the social relations and identities of those that can be broadly defined as middle-class. This allows it to engage with early nineteenth-century debates on urban governance. The thesis also examines the ways through which philanthropy shaped the image of Dublin and Edinburgh as cities, and their place within Ireland, Scotland, and the UK.

One cannot fully understand how charities affected middle-class relations without engaging with the literature on philanthropic motivation. Keir Waddington’s discussion of those supporting London’s hospitals between 1850 and 1898 captured the complexity of nineteenth-century charity more generally:

\textsuperscript{31}Shane Ewen, \textit{What is Urban History?} (Cambridge, and Malden, Massachusetts, 2016), 73-75.

Philanthropy was no simple phenomenon. The motivations for supporting a medical charity were made up of a number of inspirations that could exist simultaneously in the philanthropists’ act of giving, combining altruism with self-interest and duty.\textsuperscript{33}

Yet exploring the variety of possible stimuli for philanthropy helps us to understand how charities presented their work to the public, and how their managers interacted with each other.

Frank Prochaska claimed that a Christian-inspired kindness towards one’s fellow human beings was the primary motivation for charity.\textsuperscript{34} His argument reminds us that sometimes we should take philanthropists’ stated aims at face value without reading ulterior motives into their words. Philanthropists’ kindness however was not always directed towards those receiving relief. The managers of The Hospital for the Incurables, Donnybrook, Dublin, for example, provided a refuge for the disabled as a benevolence to the public who would be spared the distress of seeing them.\textsuperscript{35} Others have considered the cynical, and sometimes unstated side of charitable motivation. Gareth Stedman Jones’s \textit{Outcast London} drew on anthropological ideas about the gift to argue that philanthropists used charitable gifts to encourage the poor to behave in ways that they thought desirable.\textsuperscript{36} As with completely altruistic views of charity, such interpretations should be used with caution. Accounts that present philanthropy wholly in terms of social control have rightly been condemned for claiming to account for every possible outcome.\textsuperscript{37} Yet, although they also had other motivations, many nineteenth-century philanthropists saw charity as a way of reforming those who received it. The persistent interest in rehabilitating prisoners, paupers, and freed slaves indicates the importance of moral reform in this period, while inculcating morality was the primary concern of most charitable education.\textsuperscript{38}


\textsuperscript{34} Frank Prochaska, \textit{Christianity and Social Service in Modern Britain: The Disinherited Spirit} (Oxford, 2008), 2.

\textsuperscript{35} Gary A. Boyd, \textit{Dublin 1745-1922, Hospitals, Spectacle & Vice} (Dublin, 2006), 151-152.


\textsuperscript{38} Himmelfarb, ‘Age’, 53, Hugh Cunningham, ‘Introduction’, in \textit{Charity, Philanthropy, and Reform: from the 1690s to 1830}, Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes eds (Basingstoke, Hampshire, 1998), 7-8,
Desire to demonstrate benevolence and to promote moral reform were both inspired by contemporary Christian beliefs, highlighting the need to take contemporary ideas seriously. Historians have frequently interpreted religious conflicts as status disputes, an important perspective in an era when membership of an established Church brought with it formal and informal privileges, something particularly true in Dublin. Yet, as Boyd Hilton indicated, the first half of the nineteenth century was an intensely religious age in which religious, social, and economic concepts were closely entwined. Failures to consider philanthropists’ religious beliefs provides a partial and anachronistic picture.

Examining ideas about the purpose of philanthropy and the best ways of supplying it, sheds much light on contemporary views about how society more generally should work. It also reveals attitudes towards different official authority structures and the social influence of Church and state. Historians have identified a nineteenth-century ‘ethos of voluntarism’ in which voluntary activity rather than state involvement was seen as the best remedy for social problems. Yet, as Hilton and Morton have indicated, not all forms of state intervention were considered equally malign; aiding charitable education for example was thought more acceptable than state involvement in many other forms of philanthropy.

To fully investigate the effects of charity on social relations, the response of the middle classes to different types of state interference needs to receive more scholarly attention. Analysing interactions between charitable institutions and the variety of forms of official authority that operated in Dublin and Edinburgh will provide a nuanced insight into broader ideas about how the middle-class inhabitants of each city thought their societies should operate as well as how they and others perceived their cities.


Being involved in the management of philanthropic organisations enhanced an individual’s reputation. The ways through which nineteenth-century charities communicated with the middle-class public, such as annual reports, public meetings, and newspaper notices provided ample space for donors and managers who wished to see their names publicly highlighted. Employment opportunities at philanthropic institutions offered further openings for personal ambition. Voluntary hospitals provided high-profile appointments for medics, the eminence of which allowed some to build up extensive private practices.\(^{43}\)

As well as augmenting the reputation of individuals, the presence of elaborate philanthropic institutional buildings or even a reputation for being charitable could enhance a town’s image. Most studies of the development of civic pride in nineteenth-century UK towns, and the role of charity in this process, have focused on the years after 1860. The effects of philanthropy on the reputations of towns in the early nineteenth century needs to be investigated in more detail, especially for Dublin where the subject has received little attention.\(^{44}\) Charity was an ambiguous activity, raising funds required drawing public attention to poverty or other social problems which could damage the town’s reputation as well as enhance it. This thesis’s comparative approach allows it to engage with the multiple, sometimes contradictory, effects of philanthropy.

Since Tocqueville, historians and social scientists have claimed that voluntary associations influenced interpersonal interactions in ways that extended beyond the organisations’ stated functions.\(^{45}\) As well as potentially fostering paternalistic relations...

---


between rich and poor, charitable activity affected how philanthropists interacted with each other. The Irish national school system, a system of state-aided charity, tried to promote co-operation among Protestant and Catholic philanthropists by encouraging applications for assistance from schools supported by both denominations. Most charities did not state such aims so openly but in practice many helped to improve relations among philanthropists and investigating such impacts on middle-class social interactions is a central concern of this thesis. As R.J. Morris indicated in a nuanced and often misinterpreted argument, voluntary organisations sometimes reinforced shared identities among groups that were otherwise at odds. Different Churches, for example, might insist on forming their own denominational educational charities and they might openly criticise the work of other religious groups active in the same field. Yet, the fact that these organisations all used the same procedures such as public meetings, newspaper advertisements, and annual reports, helped to create a sense that they were all ultimately doing the same thing, and that they all shared the same basic values. This did not eliminate social difference but it provided a way of managing it by partly defusing the conflict related to it.

Morris focused on the advantages of the subscriber democracy: organisations that theoretically permitted all those who paid the required subscription and agreed with their aims to join and play a role in management. He argued that these flexible organisations allowed the urban middle classes to order relations among themselves. Subscriber democracies were common in both Dublin and Edinburgh but as long-established capital cities they had each developed a wide range of other institutional modes for managing charitable activity. As well as considering subscriber democracies,
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this thesis examines charitable trusts and other forms of institutional philanthropy whose social impact has received less attention from historians. Chapter two highlights the wider cultural meaning of various types of organisational structures and their effects on society. It indicates, for example, that there was much debate about trusts and other enclosed forms of charitable governance as reformers in each city campaigned to involve a greater range of middle-class inhabitants in their management. As well as shedding light on philanthropy such debates reveal contemporary ideas about urban society and how diversity within it should be managed.

Exploring the concept of civil society enables analysis of how nineteenth-century urban societies responded to the diversity that characterised them and allows for an investigation into the role of voluntary organisations in these processes. The concept has been used for centuries, its origins can be traced to ancient times and it became a particularly important term in political discourse in the eighteenth century, but its meaning has changed significantly over time and continues to be contested. It has been employed for various purposes, in some cases it is used to describe social characteristics or institutions, in others it is adopted as part of a normative vision for improving society. Yet, whilst it is important to recognise the longstanding debates on its meaning, reflecting on the concept, and the ways it has been used can helpfully inform analyses of voluntary organisations and their impact on society.

The re-emergence of scholarly interest in civil society that followed the collapse of Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe in the early 1990s, focused on voluntary activity. Since then, civil society has perhaps most frequently been used simply to denote the collection of voluntary associations in a particular place. However, the ways in which it is employed in practice, often imply more than this, and indeed it is sometimes used explicitly, and most usefully, to mean a specific type of
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49 An important exception is Gorsky, *Patterns*. David Edward Owen, *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964), considered forms of charitable involvement beyond the subscriber democracy, but it was less concerned with the kind of social impact of interest in this thesis.


A civil society is one in which voluntary organisations enable that society to manage conflict between different social groups. Recent uses of the term, whether normative or descriptive, have centred on the mediation of social difference and the prevention of conflict based on ethnic, class, or other differences. Being a successful civil society allows a town to cope with its intrinsic diversity and by using the concept we can encourage reflection on the impact of voluntary associations on the town as a whole. Employing this term, therefore, illuminates the aims and arguments of this study. For example, this thesis asks how the state authorities that defined capital status in each city influenced the strength of civil society in each. In other words, how did interactions between these state bodies and charities affect how the cities coped with diversity, a question through which we can better understand the social impact of being a stateless capital.

Awareness of voluntary organisations’ potential to limit conflict encourages historians to focus on the associations’ ‘constructive’ aspects and studies frequently emphasise how voluntary organisations have promoted broader affiliations rather than impeded their development. One important exception is research on Weimar Germany which has demonstrated how a strong associational culture reinforced social conflict and ultimately resulted in a project that aimed to eliminate diversity rather than mediate and protect it. More work, however needs to be done to explore how voluntary associations’ effects were shaped by the different environments in which they operated, and the comparative approach employed here will enable this to be analysed in detail. Comparing Dublin and Edinburgh reveals how the differing nature of stateless capital status in each city affected the strength of civil society in each, while also highlighting how both cities were influenced by their wider UK context. The thesis


53For example Tanja Bueltmann, Clubbing Together: Ethnicity, Civility and Formal Sociability in the Scottish Diaspora to 1930 (Liverpool, 2015), 193-224, see also essays in Graeme Morton et al. (Eds), Civil Society, Associations and Urban Places, Class, Nation and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Europe (Aldershot, Hampshire, and Burlington, Vermont, 2006).

54For example Sheri Berman, ‘Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic’, World Politics, 49 (No.3) (1997), 401-429.
will therefore add to the historiography of Dublin and Edinburgh, as well as to UK urban history more generally.

Managing difference was a major challenge for Dublin and Edinburgh in the early nineteenth century as they were both home to socially-significant divisions of occupational status, gender, political affiliation, and in particular, religion. One of this thesis’s main aims is to examine how each city managed (or did not manage) to prevent these differences from provoking irreconcilable social conflict. To do this, of course, it is necessary to outline the nature of social diversity in each city and this will be done in chapter one.

Irish-Scottish comparisons of philanthropy are particularly worthwhile because Morris suggested a possible contrast between nineteenth-century Scotland and Ireland: he claimed that a vibrant associational culture greatly eased social divisions in Scotland, civil society might have failed in Ireland as voluntary organisations’ practices failed to have the same conciliatory effects there.55 These were however very brief comments made in a review article and have never been fully explored. Alvin Jackson has made valuable comparisons of associational culture in late nineteenth-century Ireland and Scotland, noting how, unlike their Scottish counterparts, the Irish Catholic middle classes often used voluntary associations to work against rather than with the state, threatening political stability and limiting the ability of voluntary organisations to reduce social conflict.56 Associational activity, however, was not the main focus of his research, and he did not explore the construction of civil society in either nation in great detail. Indeed, it will be seen that, in the early nineteenth century, many Irish Catholics were prepared to work with the state to achieve at least some of their goals.

While Dalgleish and Morton have already applied Morris’s ideas about the social roles of voluntary associations to Edinburgh, carrying out a focused study of Edinburgh’s charities, sheds much new light on that city, especially for the eventful but under-researched 1830s and 1840s, a time of significant debate about the city’s

governance; it adds even more to the history of Dublin where philanthropy has never
been studied in this way. Taking into consideration the relationships between charities
and different forms of authority, reveals how the authority structures that characterised
stateless-capital status affected interactions among middle-class groups in each city. It
also sheds light on how the middle-classes saw their cities and how each city was
perceived by those outside. By assessing the strength of civil society in Dublin and
Edinburgh, the thesis offers unique insights into how stateless capital status and the
cities’ other social characteristics, such as religious difference, impacted middle-class
life in each.

Exploring how the cities coped or failed to cope with diversity also enables
analysis of how charities influenced the development of common identities. Historians
have interpreted the concept of identity in a variety of ways. Indeed, Rogers Brubaker
and Frederick Cooper have argued that it has been defined in so many, sometimes
mutually exclusive ways, as to be virtually useless. In practice the term is employed
too frequently to eschew entirely, and this thesis will use it in a restricted manner,
simply to imply a sense of affiliation. Geographical identity, for example, is used here
to refer to a sense of connection with a specific place and this thesis will explore
affiliation with a variety of local and national geographical areas. As stateless capitals, it
will be seen that relations between civic and national identities were complex in each
city.

Dalgleish’s analysis revealed some of the ways through which philanthropy
mediated political and social tensions in Edinburgh between 1780 and 1820. He
argued that charities allowed some groups excluded from the formal institutions of
power in Edinburgh to participate in urban management. This was particularly
significant in the years before municipal reform when many middle-class groups were
unrepresented in the Town Council and in the management of established institutions

57 C.f. Maria Luddy, Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century Ireland (Cambridge, 1995),
Margaret H. Preston, Charitable Words: Women, Philanthropy, and the Language of Charity in
Nineteenth-Century Dublin (Westport, Connecticut, 2004), Karen Sonnelitter, Charity Movements in
Eighteenth-Century Ireland: Philanthropy and Improvement (Martlesham, Suffolk, and Rochester, New
York, 2016).
58 Frederick Cooper with Rogers Brubaker ‘Identity’, in Frederick Cooper, Colonialism in Question
Theory, Knowledge, History (Berkeley, and Los Angeles, California, and London, 2005), 59-77.
more generally. The time period investigated in this thesis is part of a longer ‘Age of Reform’ that began in the late eighteenth century and stretched into the mid-nineteenth. During these decades campaigners challenged many established institutions, and sometimes succeeded in altering their administration to include a wider number of social groups. Even critics of J.C.D. Clark’s claims that England was an ancien régime society before 1832 can nevertheless agree that numerous traditional authorities continued to wield power in Britain in the early nineteenth century. From Parliament downwards, these institutions increasingly attracted the ire of reformers, but reform itself was a term with a variety of contemporary meanings, and reformers had many, sometimes mutually contradictory aims. Governance that was transparent, efficient, and good value for money was one of the central objectives of reformers. This was partly why many reformers gave so much attention to ending monopolies, but they also valued increased participation in governance for its own sake. Most did not wish to open contemporary institutions to everyone, but they did want to make them more representative of middle-class opinion. Reform, then, was often an attempt to cope with difference, albeit on a limited scale, opening the administration of institutions to some groups that had previously been excluded from their management. Considering the strength of civil society is therefore a particularly productive way of approaching questions of urban authority during this period. The institutions affected by this desire to broaden management were many, as well as Parliament, town corporations, and the established Churches, reformers targeted other forms of regulatory authority such as Colleges of Physicians, allowing the debates on reform to permeate many aspects of urban middle-class life.
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59 Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 236-238.
61 Gorsky, Patterns, 58-62.
Analysing charities allows the multifaceted nature of reform to be explored. Some philanthropic institutions themselves were condemned as monopolies, and reformers attacked charities with enclosed management structures in the same way as they did the ‘close corporations’ of local government. More generally, the fact that charities interacted with so many different types of authority, enables many aspects of reform to be investigated. By analysing the relationships between charities and local government institutions for example, this thesis explores the social impact of municipal reform in each city, and especially the significance of earlier reform in Edinburgh. Opening local government to broader participation at an earlier stage, helped to make civil society in Edinburgh stronger than in Dublin. By considering the priorities of reformers, and whether their aims varied in different environments, this thesis highlights the limits of charities’ ability to mediate diversity as well as their successes.

The thesis is structured to allow systematic exploration of each of these issues. The first two chapters provide the context upon which the later chapters build their analyses of the interactions between charities and authority structures. Chapter one outlines the economic, social, and cultural background of both cities in this period, and by doing so highlights the social diversity that characterised each city. It also provides an overview of the kinds of voluntary associations that were operating in Dublin and Edinburgh, and the ways in which these were presented to the public. Chapter two considers the cultural meaning of charities’ management structures and examines the extent to which different kinds of administrative rules enabled the cities to cope with difference. It gives particular attention to the management structures of older charities noting that these were often more closed to the public than subscriber democracies. These more enclosed structures have received little attention in studies of associational culture, yet in cities with a long history, such as Dublin and Edinburgh, they continued to shape the environment in which all philanthropic organisations, old and new, operated, well into the nineteenth century. Chapter two also highlights the importance of charities’ formal management structures and local context in shaping organisations’ influence on the wider world.
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Chapter three explores the impact of the religious authority associated with established and non-established Churches. By focusing on a variety of denominational charities, it discusses the interaction between philanthropy and religious diversity and assesses the extent to which denominational charities might have highlighted shared values across the denominations in spite of sectarian tensions. Chapters four and five examine the interaction between philanthropy and the central and local state respectively. They consider the contrasting authority structures through which stateless capital status manifested itself in each city and how these distinctions affected the ability of Dublin and Edinburgh to cope with diversity. They give due attention to subtle forms of interaction such as patronage of philanthropic organisations by state officeholders, as well as to more overt forms of interference. It will be seen that the relative importance of these different types of intervention helped to shape broader perceptions of both cities.

Chapter six examines the influence of authority stemming from occupation, profession, and social position on philanthropy. It discusses issues specific to the cities’ positions as national or regional authority centres: such as the involvement of large numbers of aristocrats in the management of charities, or the influence of the professional regulatory bodies in operating from each. It also engages with the wider debates on occupational status that were taking place through the nineteenth-century UK. By doing so, the chapter sheds light on some of the ways through which differences of class, profession, and gender were (or were not) mediated in Dublin and Edinburgh, contributing to a multifaceted view of middle-class social relations in each city.

The final chapter considers these issues from a different perspective by analysing the ways in which philanthropic activity affected geographical identities and the image of Dublin and Edinburgh. This allows issues of local and national affiliation in both capitals to be explored. Reflecting on these matters and the findings of other chapters will shed light on the position of each city within the United Kingdom and demonstrate that although both cities were part of UK mainstream associational culture, charitable activity also emphasised their Irish or Scottish characteristics. These national attributes were not perceived as equally attractive. Philanthropy associated
Edinburgh with Enlightenment and education, by contrast it connected Dublin with poverty and dependency.

Although this study seeks a broad view of the philanthropic environment in each city, it would not be possible to examine all of the many charities operating in early nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh. Instead the thesis combines analyses of case studies of key organisations with overviews of each city’s ‘philanthropic associational world’ taken from almanacs, newspapers, and official reports, sources that each collated information on a variety of charities. This allows philanthropy in each city to be viewed from a variety of different perspectives, and by doing so illuminates wider society in Dublin and Edinburgh. This approach more effectively highlights the effects of philanthropy on each city than would study of institutional records alone.

The most comprehensive almanacs available for each city were used. For Dublin these were *The Treble Almanack* [sic] (1810s and 1820s), *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland* (1830s to 1843), *Thom’s Almanac* (1844 onwards) and for Edinburgh: *The Edinburgh Almanack* [sic] and *Universal Scots Register* (1810s to 1830s, continues into the 1840s as *Oliver and Boyd’s New Edinburgh Almanac*). These did not provide a complete picture of philanthropy in either city, but by including descriptions of many individual charities in one place, they were one of the central methods through which each city’s philanthropic associational culture was presented to the public. Newspapers contained charities’ advertisements, and reports and comment on philanthropic activity, alongside coverage of other news. They are therefore major sources for investigating the interaction between philanthropic organisations and the wider city, indeed their coverage helped to further shape such social relations. Considering newspapers of various editorial stances allows insight into the place of social diversity within the philanthropic associational cultures of Dublin and Edinburgh. Official reports, particularly investigations into charitable activity,
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64 See chapter one.
education, and poverty, commissioned by the House of Commons, provide similar perspectives.\textsuperscript{66}

The thesis focuses mainly, though not exclusively, on educational and medical charities partly because these organisations have been said to have affected society in contrasting ways. Being closely connected with moral instruction meant that educational philanthropy provoked religious conflict throughout the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{67} By contrast, Hilary Marland argued that in denominationally-divided Huddersfield and Wakefield, medical institutions were capable of receiving cross-denominational support in a way that many other charities were not.\textsuperscript{68} A focus on medical and educational philanthropy allows us to consider charities of various sizes and geographical ranges: from small parochial schools, to large medical hospitals which served the entire city, to national educational charities based in Dublin and Edinburgh with auxiliary branches throughout Ireland or Scotland. This combination of perspectives provides insight into the effects of philanthropy on the city as a whole, while enabling the examination of religious, geographical, and professional affiliations. From a practical point of view, the activities of these institutions tended to be well documented and much of their fundraising material has survived, allowing their communications with the public to be traced over time and analysed in detail.

Case studies were usually chosen from examples of directly comparable charities in either city, though, lack of suitable extant sources meant sometimes other, similar, but not identical types of charities, had to be selected instead.\textsuperscript{69} At the same time, sources were occasionally chosen to reflect differences between the two cities. In particular, the thesis considers a greater number of general hospitals for Dublin

\textsuperscript{66}These reports, whether commissioned by the House of Commons or some other central state body, were primarily accessed through the House of Commons Parliamentary Papers database, relevant reports were initially identified using Peter Cockton, \textit{Subject Catalogue of the House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1801-1900} using interactive browsing interface on House of Commons Parliamentary Papers (old format) http://parlipapers.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk/subjectCatalogue.do

\textsuperscript{67}Brown, \textit{National Churches}, 72-91, 93-98.

\textsuperscript{68}Hilary Marland, \textit{Medicine and Society in Wakefield and Huddersfield 1780-1870} (Cambridge, 1987), 144-145.

\textsuperscript{69}See for example in chapter three where it is highlighted that good records for a congregational school from a dissenting Presbyterian congregation in Edinburgh could not be located and so congregational Bible societies were used to compare with the schools of the other denominations.
where there was more of this kind of institution operating, than for Edinburgh. Similarly, contrasts in the nature of state authority structures in Dublin and Edinburgh, meant that different kinds of official state reports must be given attention for each.

The date range under investigation only partly covers the ‘Age of Reform’ and its limits highlight some of the challenges arising from the thesis’s comparative approach. The advent of the Great Famine produced significant changes in Dublin’s philanthropic environment that makes it difficult to extend the research beyond 1845, even though a later endpoint would allow greater exploration of the effects of the Disruption, the split that occurred in the Church of Scotland in 1843. Some flexibility has been adopted, and this study looks slightly beyond 1845 when required, especially when considering the impact of religious change in Edinburgh. Nevertheless, examination of the 1830s and early 1840s, allows close analysis of years when reform was a subject of immense significance to both cities. The time period also saw the advent of the Dublin Castle administration of the Earl of Mulgrave which actively worked to promote Catholics and liberal Protestants to positions of authority, as well as the return of the Tories in 1841 which brought the conservative administration of Earl de Grey to the Castle.

It is not possible to examine the vast number of incidents relating to charity that occurred in either city between 1815 and 1845. To produce a broad perspective the thesis combines ‘snapshots’ from newspaper analyses, charitable administrative records, and almanacs for selected years (1824, 1845, and to a lesser extent 1836 and 1815). This allows some analyses of the changes that occurred across our time period, and it is complemented with examinations of the impact of key developments such as municipal reform. The study follows changes in the administration of several case studies over time to get a sense of charities’ ongoing interactions with the public over several decades.

As stateless capitals, Dublin and Edinburgh occupied unique positions within the United Kingdom, yet due to their national role, exploring issues of diversity and identity within them sheds light on wider questions of Scottishness, Irishness, and
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Britishness. By considering the interaction between philanthropy and middle-class life in each city the thesis engages with nineteenth-century understandings of urban society and how such towns and cities managed their social conflicts. It also allows detailed consideration of the role of each city as a stateless capital and of the position of Dublin and Edinburgh within the broader context of Ireland, Scotland, and the UK.
Chapter One.

Associational Worlds.

Passing by the Chapel of Sts. Michael and John in Smock-alley, on Sunday last, I heard the singing of psalms and music within. Willing to shake off all trammels of bigotry and superstition, and burst for ever the deadly cerements, with which I had been bound by the prejudices of a distinctive religion and education, the bane of our fine country, having also heard that a Charity Sermon was announced for that evening, in support of a multitude of poor destitute children, I walked in, determined to contribute my mite.

*Freeman’s Journal* 16 November 1827.

Writing in the *Freeman’s Journal* in 1827, this ‘correspondent’ described how they had attended a charity sermon for a Catholic charity school. The article indicated that some of Dublin’s wealthy liberal Protestants supported Catholic charities, even, like the correspondent, going so far as to sometimes attend fundraising sermons in Catholic chapels. However, the correspondent also observed that religious prejudice prevented many from emulating their actions, noting that the public face of philanthropy in Dublin was often confessionalised with separate Protestant and Catholic charities reminding inhabitants of the city’s religious divisions. Yet, while such separation was a reflection of religious conflict, it did not always further promote sectarian animosity. Allowing philanthropists of different religious persuasions to join charities of their own denominational affiliation provided a basic way of defusing tensions and managing religious diversity by reducing sectarian conflicts within individual charities if not necessarily between them. The correspondent commended the quiet and restrained conduct of the sermon’s attendees reflecting how even the recognition of basic familiar practices could enhance a sense of affiliation among different groups. Sectarian divisions were also significant in Edinburgh in this period, and the impact of charitable activity on such conflicts in both cities is worth exploring in detail. This chapter will begin to explore the interactions between philanthropy and religious divisions in each city, and begin to assess the extent to which charity fulfilled its conciliatory potential in practice.

According to Wallace, later nineteenth-century Dublin was so confessionally divided that Protestants and Catholics rarely joined the same organisations and one
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¹Hereafter *FJ.*
can speak of separate Catholic and Protestant associational worlds. Much less attention has been given to the first half of the century when the Catholic Church was much weaker. Issues of reform including Catholic Emancipation, municipal reform, and access to state employment dominated the agenda for Dublin’s Catholic activists, publicly demonstrating that they had much in common with the city’s liberal Protestants as well as with reformers throughout the UK. Though early nineteenth-century Edinburgh has been more extensively studied, much remains to be explored about the relationship between reform and charity in that city.

To assess how philanthropy impacted on social and cultural differences in each city, it is necessary to consider what those differences were. This chapter starts by outlining the social, cultural, and economic environment in each city. It then highlights the types of philanthropic institutions active in Dublin and Edinburgh between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the beginning of the Irish and Scottish Famines, and how the philanthropic associational environment in each city was presented to the middle-class public through newspapers and almanacs. The chapter gives attention to the 1820s, a decade during which the Irish campaigns for Catholic Emancipation became mass movements and the financial crash of 1825/1826 occurred. The latter crisis significantly damaged Edinburgh’s property market and shaped the development of both cities. The chapter draws on data from 1824 to provide information on both societies just before these major changes. The chapter also highlights some of the developments that occurred in the associational culture of both cities between 1824 and 1845, especially with regard to religion. Here and throughout the thesis, comparison between 1824 and 1845 is used to get a sense of change over time in this eventful period. This is supplemented with some data from 1815, which sheds light on earlier years, and from 1836, which provides insights into conditions during the period when the reforming Earl of Mulgrave headed the Dublin Castle administration and
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2Wallace, ‘Fighting’, 944-946, see also Jackson, Two Unions, 136-139, 213-214.
4Rodger, Transformation, 82-84, 98, Dickson, Dublin, 286-287.
made strong efforts to conciliate Catholics. The chapter ends by examining two religious disputes that affected philanthropy in either city in the 1820s, these provide examples of the differing challenges that each city faced and how philanthropy shaped these challenges.

I.

Socio-economic characteristics strongly affected the supply of and demand for philanthropy in nineteenth-century towns and cities. They determined who was likely to require relief, how often they would need it, and who could afford to supply it. A city’s population size and overall levels of wealth and poverty were not the only factors that influenced this, the relative prominence of different occupational groups could affect the supply of philanthropy. A potential philanthropist’s occupation, for example, determined whether they had sufficient free time to attend charities’ board meetings. Conversely, charitable activity could shape the ways in which different occupational groups perceived each other. Morris and others have argued that voluntary organisations played a central role in class formation, the associations helped individuals to see themselves as middle-class. Morris, like E.P. Thompson, saw class as a social relationship rather than a purely economic category, but this was still a relationship based on the interactions of production and consumption. Some knowledge of a city’s economic attributes is therefore necessary to examine the interaction between class and voluntary associations. Unlike earlier analyses of associational culture, this thesis does not make class its central focus and instead gives greater attention to religious affiliation. Nevertheless, occupational, and social status more generally, remained socially significant differences in this period, and so must form part of this thesis’s analysis.
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6 For example, Rodger, *Transformation*, 21.
There were significant economic and demographic differences between early nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh. Dublin had a larger population for the entire period under review even though Edinburgh generally grew at a faster rate. Census figures for 1841 record a population of 138,182 for the city of Edinburgh compared with 199,762 for Dublin city; and the latter figure omits Dublin’s self-governing suburbs, which were closely integrated with the city economy.\(^9\) The figures for Edinburgh omit the nearby port of Leith, which, was a substantial town in its own right, with its own specific characteristics, though the two frequently interacted.\(^11\)

As Rodger highlighted, the professional commercial middle classes constituted a substantial proportion of Edinburgh society, for example, they made up 20.8 per cent of the city’s population in 1831. As well as creating a consistent demand for the services and luxury goods that Edinburgh produced, this large middle class were a potentially significant supply of philanthropy, having both the income and time to support charitable institutions.\(^12\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dublin city (1831 boundaries of civic area)</th>
<th>Great Dublin Area (including suburbs and surrounding baronies)</th>
<th>Edinburgh (city excluding parishes of North and South Leith)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>185,881</td>
<td>309,582</td>
<td>112,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>204,155</td>
<td>351,211</td>
<td>136,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>199,762</td>
<td>348,013</td>
<td>138,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Dublin, by contrast, is usually presented as a city in decline. Contemporaries and later writers attributed this to the exodus of gentry after the British-Irish Union, although the impact of the 1825/1826 financial crisis on the Dublin textile industry has also been highlighted. Dickson argued that this crisis led to significant deindustrialisation in the city.\(^13\) According to the 1821 census, 56.6 per cent of the Dublin workforce were
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\(^{11}\) Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 24-25, 46.


\(^{13}\) Dickson, *Dublin*, 286-287.
‘chiefly employed’ in ‘Trades, Manufacturing or Handicrafts’. By 1841 less than 34.0 per cent were employed in craft or manufacturing occupations. While occupational classifications were not completely comparable between the censuses, this does suggest significant deindustrialisation.14 Edinburgh’s economy also suffered after the 1825/1826 crash as its building industry ground to a halt and took decades to recover.15 Yet it had a much more vibrant, albeit small-scale manufacturing sector than Dublin, and industrial occupations employed over 60 per cent of its male workforce by 1841.16 Dublin’s economy was also less diverse and general labourers made up 10.5 per cent of its workforce in 1841, compared with 3.7 per cent in Edinburgh.17 Despite the contrasts between them, however, service provision for their city’s inhabitants and for the entire nation remained a significant economic function for both cities.

As Dickson argued, emphasis on the gentry’s ‘desertion’ of Dublin after the Union (1801) somewhat obscured the growing strength of the city’s professional and business sectors.18 According to Daly, professionals made up 8.4 per cent of Dublin’s male workforce in 1841.19 While this is lower than Rodger’s estimate for Edinburgh for the same year (13.3. per cent), it was considerably higher than for Glasgow (4.4 per cent).20 This ready supply of professionals shaped charitable activity in each city. Morris noted that professionals played a significant role in philanthropy in nineteenth-century
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14 1824 (577, 1823) Abstract of the Answers and Returns made Pursuant to an Act...Intituled, "an Act to Provide for Taking an Account of the Population of Ireland... (n.p., 1823), xxiii, 'City of Dublin', in 1843 [504] Report of the Commissioners Appointed to take the Census of Ireland, for the Year 1841 (Dublin, 1843), 22, see also Dickson, 'Death', 126.
15 Rodger, Transformation, 82-84, 98, 153.
16 Rodger, 'Employment', 29.
17 'City of Dublin', in Report of the Commissioners...for...1841, 22. Rodger, 'Employment', 36. These censuses did not indicate how many people in the occupations listed were unemployed, Penelope J. Corfield, Power and the Professions in Britain 1700-1850 (London and New York, 1995), 31.
18 Dickson, 'Death', 125-126.
20 The Edinburgh figures are for the city and suburbs see Rodger 'Employment', 29, both Daly and Rodger used versions of the Armstrong classification system but it is unclear if they adapted it in exactly the same way. There were also differences between the categories used in each city’s 1841 censuses, which means that they are not completely comparable, 'City of Dublin', in Report of the Commissioners...for...1841, 22, 1844 [588] Occupation Abstract, M.DCCC.XLI. Part II. Scotland (n.p., 1844), 22-37.
Leeds even though they constituted a relatively small proportion of the population.\textsuperscript{21} The much greater number of professionals in Dublin and Edinburgh and the occupational opportunities available for medics in the cities’ large hospitals and dispensaries, ensured that professional concerns strongly shaped the nature of charitable activity and wider social life in each.\textsuperscript{22}

Although Edinburgh was wealthier, there was significant poverty in both cities, and the deteriorating housing conditions of the poor in Edinburgh’s Old Town increasingly attracted criticism. A situation exacerbated by stagnation in the city’s property market after 1825/1826.\textsuperscript{23} Inhabitants of each city were concerned about the same social issues including vagrancy and disease and the nature of their philanthropic responses were often very similar. There was a spatial element to poverty in both cities. Edinburgh’s wealthier inhabitants were increasingly resident in the city’s extended royalty or New Town,\textsuperscript{21} and in its suburbs, while wealthier Dubliners were moving eastwards towards the northeast, and increasingly towards self-governing suburbs in the southeast of the city, though levels of social segregation in Dublin were not as acute at this point as they would become later in the century.\textsuperscript{21} Average house prices in the southwest of Dublin fell from £28 12s 0d in 1830 to £13 0s 6d in 1854, reflecting the increasing impoverishment of that part of the city.\textsuperscript{25} In Edinburgh the professional middle classes formed a much greater proportion of the population of the New Town than the Old Town, as can be seen from Table 2, reproduced from Rodger’s *Transformation of Edinburgh.*

\textsuperscript{21}Morris, *Class, Sect*, 219-223, 323-324.  
\textsuperscript{22}See chapter six.  
\textsuperscript{23}Rodger, *Transformation*, 82, 418-421.  
\textsuperscript{24}Or more correctly New Towns Rodger, *Transformation*, 67, 182.  
\textsuperscript{26}Dickson, ‘Death’, 121.
Table 2: Residence and occupation in Edinburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>% 'capitalists, bankers, professional and other educated' individuals</th>
<th>% Shopkeeping and handicraft</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>New Town (North central/north east).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen’s</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>New Town (North central/north west).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>New Town (North central/north west).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>New Town (North central/north east).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Yester’s</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>Old Town (South central/south east).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Church</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>Old Town (Central/east).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Church</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>Old Town (South east).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolbooth</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>Old Town (Central).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canongate</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>Suburban (eastern) extension of High St and the Cowgate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Greyfriars</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>Old Town (South central).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New North</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>Old Town (Central).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Greyfriars</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>Old Town (South central).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>Old Town (Central).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tron</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>Old Town (Central).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Cuthbert’s</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>Western and southern suburb.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rodger, Transformation, 18-19.

An analysis of a ‘one in ten’ sample of the A-Z section of the 1845-1846 Edinburgh Post Office Directory revealed that all but one of the advocates in the sample had an
address in the extended royalty. Similarly only one of the advocates listed in the occupation section of this directory had an address in the ancient royalty (Old Town), most had addresses in the extended royalty or St Cuthbert’s suburb. An analogous pattern was seen in Dublin where none of the barristers identified in a one in ten sample of the A-Z directory of 1845 Thom’s had an address in the southwest of the city, and there was only one in the northwest despite the presence of the main law courts there. The rest were divided almost equally between the northeast and southeast, though the latter may have been of a somewhat higher status, with a quarter of KCs resident in Merrion Square by 1836. Many of the cities’ charitable institutions remained in older, poorer areas at some distance from the homes of the wealthiest citizens, though some new charities were formed in newer high-status residential areas including the Edinburgh New Town Dispensary and the City of Dublin Hospital, Baggot-street. This reflected the incomplete nature of spatial segregation in both cities and there were always some poor residents in the wealthier areas. It was also prestigious for Scotland’s national missionary and religious education societies to be based in a select area and several, including the Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools (Gaelic School Society) and the Edinburgh Bible Society (EBS) had New Town addresses. Whatever their location, the intended geographical focus of a charity helps to reveal philanthropists’ affiliations with locality, city, and nation.

27 The one in ten sample was taken by taking every tenth name in the A-Z section of the directory, this was based on the method used by Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary.’ One in ten samples were taken from A-Z lists contained in (for 1824) The Post-Office Annual Directory...for 1824-25 (Edinburgh, 1824) and (for 1845) The Post-Office Annual Directory...for 1845-46 (Edinburgh, 1845) for Edinburgh and The Treble Almanack for the Year 1824...containing I John Watson’s Stewart’s Almanack...III. Wilson’s Dublin Directory...(Dublin, 1824) and Thom’s Irish Almanac and Official Directory for the Year 1845 (Dublin, 1845) for Dublin. These gave a sense of the occupational characteristics of the cities’ middle classes without requiring a full analysis of each directory, their small sample size indicates conclusions must be treated with caution.

28 Dickson, Dublin, 318.

29 See charities’ addresses in 1845 Thom’s, 657-703, Oliver and Boyd’s New Edinburgh Almanac and National Repository...for 1845 (Edinburgh, 1845), 501-504, 509-521.

30 1845-46 PO Directory, 40, 47.

31 See chapter seven.
Wealthier residents increasingly moved to the north east and southeast of the city, including to areas beyond the Grand Canal to townships south of the municipal area.

Figure 2: Map of the Dublin Liberties.

Part of the Dublin Liberties in the southwest of the city, one of the poorest areas of Dublin. From Clarke, Map of Dublin City.
Figure 3: Maps of southeast and northeast Dublin city.

(i) Southeast. (ii) Northeast.
The southeast and northeast of Dublin included some of its most prestigious areas. From Clarke, Map of Dublin City.

Figure 4: Map of Edinburgh city.

From W.H. Lizard, Plan of Edinburgh and Leith: From the best Authorities Engraved expressly for the Letter Carriers Directory, 1836, including: Map of the County of Mid-Lothian Ten Miles Round Edinburgh, And Leith (Edinburgh, 1836). The wealthy moved to the New Town areas as well as to suburbs in the south and west (see below).
Figure 5: Map of Edinburgh Old Town.


Figure 6: Map of Edinburgh New Town.

Philanthropy in each city was also shaped by inward migration. Edinburgh experienced significant migration from rural Scotland and Ireland in the decades considered here. Over half of the population increase in the Old Town between 1801 and 1831 was accounted for by Highlander and Irish migrations.\textsuperscript{32} This relatively poor population increased demand for philanthropic services, especially given that many of these migrants did not qualify for relief under the Scottish Poor Law. Migration from Scottish regions also brought potential philanthropic donors to Edinburgh, some of whom, such as the officeholders in the Orkney and Zetland Charitable Society, administered organisations to aid migrants from these regions.\textsuperscript{33} Net migration into Dublin remained at a lower level than to Edinburgh. However, as Prunty indicated, Dublin was a point of transit for migrants from elsewhere in Ireland and rural migrants constituted a disproportionate number of the city’s relief recipients. Some individuals travelled to Dublin for the purpose of receiving temporary assistance from specialised charities, particularly the city’s many hospitals.\textsuperscript{34} The inhabitants of Dublin and Edinburgh believed that their charities served a disproportionately high level of migrants because of the metropolitan character of their cities. Even when complaining about the costs of this, they argued that it was part of the function of a national capital.\textsuperscript{35}

The nature of each city’s stateless-capital status was also shaped by the authority structures operating in each, structures that often interacted with philanthropic organisations. Outside London, Dublin was unique among the UK’s towns and cities in being home to a large state administrative complex based at Dublin Castle, which was the centre of the Irish government and the link between Whitehall and the rest of Ireland.\textsuperscript{36} Headed, in principle at least, by an appointed Lord Lieutenant, political changes at Westminster and Whitehall affected how the Castle administration interacted with charities and with wider society. For example, the attempts of the reforming Mulgrave administration to allow Catholics and liberals a greater share in governing Ireland extended to the management of charitable institutions, while the

\textsuperscript{32} Rodger, \textit{Transformation}, 421.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Report of the Orkney and Zetland Charitable Society; 26th January 1835...}(Edinburgh, 1835), 3-4.
\textsuperscript{34} Prunty, \textit{Dublin Slums}, 197-199, 283, Dickson, \textit{Dublin}, 315.
\textsuperscript{35} See chapter five.
\textsuperscript{36} For the variety of government institutions connected with Dublin Castle see \textit{1845 Thom’s}, 236-242.
return of the Tories in 1841 emboldened those who wished to increase conservative Protestant influence in philanthropic education.\textsuperscript{37} State administration in Scotland was not centralised to the same extent, but Edinburgh contained several important government agencies including the Scottish Exchequer Office and the Excise Office.\textsuperscript{38} Each city housed the highest national law courts, ensuring the residence of many legal professionals.\textsuperscript{39} In Edinburgh, these courts were the highest courts of the distinctive Scottish legal system, further enhancing the image of the city as the centre of administration in Scotland. Dublin and Edinburgh were also centres of non-state, but nationally important established authorities: institutions that possessed some sort of traditional or regulatory power. These included professional regulatory bodies, some of which, such as the King and Queen’s College of Physicians in Ireland (K&QCPI) and the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh (RCPEd.) had been established for centuries while others, including the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI) and the Dublin-based Law Society had been founded more recently.\textsuperscript{40} By using a comparative approach to explore interactions between associational culture and the cities’ unusually high concentration of governance structures, this thesis provides a nuanced examination of the contrasting ways in which stateless-capital status shaped Dublin and Edinburgh. It also allows assessment of whether Peter Clark’s assertion that the presence of official authorities fuelled the formation of associations in cities in the eighteenth century, applied in the nineteenth.\textsuperscript{41}

Ecclesiastical authorities were among each city’s most important established authorities and it is essential to investigate the relationship between religious authority and charities not only because religion often inspired the work of philanthropists, but

\textsuperscript{37}See chapter four.
\textsuperscript{38}1845-46 PO Directory, 421.
\textsuperscript{39}The House of Lords excepted. According to city directories the number of barristers in Ireland increased from 887 in 1815 (of which at least 547 had Dublin addresses) to 1245 in 1845 (at least 751 with Dublin addresses). The total membership of the Faculty of Advocates for Scotland as a whole increased from 288 in 1815 to 393 in 1845. The Treble Almanack for the Year 1815...containing: I John Watson’s Stewart’s Almanack...III. Wilson’s Dublin Directory,...(Dublin, 1815), 1845 Thom’s, The Edinburgh Almanack, and Universal Scots and Imperial Register for 1815 (Edinburgh, 1815), 1845 Oliver and Boyd.
\textsuperscript{40}The RCSI was founded in 1784, the Law Society in 1830 Dickson, Dublin, 312, 318.
\textsuperscript{41}Peter Clark, \textit{British Clubs and Societies, 1580-1800, The Origins of an Associational World} (Oxford, 2000), 95, 114-115, 131-133, 146.
because religion was a way through which the inhabitants of nineteenth-century urban centres understood their world. Specific denominational groups might interpret their environment in different ways based on their particular beliefs, and might even have contrasting views about the proper role of religion in society. H. Richard Niebuhr distinguished between ‘Church’, ‘Sect’, and ‘Denomination’: a ‘Church’ was an organised religious group that claimed to represent the whole nation, ‘Sect’ a much narrower grouping who perceived themselves to be an ‘elect’ who alone understood religious truth, and ‘Denomination’, something in between these two extremes, which the individual could choose to join or leave. For simplicity this thesis uses denomination and Church interchangeably and simply to mean a formally-structured religious grouping. Considering Niebuhr’s typology is, however, useful for highlighting diversity in attitudes about the nature of religion and about how Churches should relate to wider society, including the extent to which they felt that they should tolerate beliefs that they did not share. This was a central issue in the early nineteenth-century UK as debates raged over the place of the established Churches in society, or indeed, whether Church establishments should exist at all. Philanthropy, and the role of churches role within it, was a central means through which such debates took practical form. To understand the relationship between Churches and charities in Dublin and Edinburgh it is necessary to consider the cities’ contrasting religious environments.

Edinburgh hosted the annual meeting of the General Assembly of the (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland, which was a nationally important event. There was also a diverse array of other denominations operating in the city. Edinburgh’s Post-Office Directory for 1824-25 listed twenty Church of Scotland churches or chapels of ease, as well as chapels or meetinghouses for the following denominations: United

---

Associate Synod (UAS\textsuperscript{45}) (six), Relief (four), Scottish Episcopal (six), Independent (two), Baptist (five), (one each for) Cameronian, Associate Synod, Original Burgher, Original Anti-Burgher, Methodist, Roman Catholic, Berean, Unitarian, Glassite, and Society of Friends. There was also a ‘New Jerusalem Temple’ and a synagogue.\textsuperscript{46} By 1835 Dissenting Presbyterian services were attracting similar numbers to those of the Church of Scotland.\textsuperscript{47} Religious divisions partly mirrored other social differences as Dissenting Presbyterians were often of lower status than members of the established Church or Episcopalians but these distinctions were not clear-cut.\textsuperscript{48}

Religion was a significant source of conflict in Edinburgh and often involved the city’s governance authorities. The Town Council was patron of many of the city’s Church of Scotland churches, and a tax (the Annuity Tax) was levied for their support. The tax remained incredibly controversial and it produced frequent and intense disputes between Presbyterian Dissenters and members of the Church of Scotland. Concerns about falling church attendance among the urban poor led to the early nineteenth-century campaigns for ‘Church Extension’ in Scotland and other parts of the UK. Through these campaigns the established Church sought funds, often from the state, to build more churches in Edinburgh and other large towns. These churches were to provide both spiritual and poor relief services for parishioners as a response to the perceived material and moral deprivation associated with urbanisation.\textsuperscript{49} By making the Church of Scotland central to their activities, the Church Extension campaigns alienated Dissenters, some of whom became Voluntaries opposed to all forms of state support for religious denominations. Each group presented different models for dealing with the challenges and diversity of urban life.

\textsuperscript{45} Also known as the United Secession Church, Callum G. Brown, \textit{Religion and Society in Scotland since 1707} (Edinburgh, 1997), 24.

\textsuperscript{46} 1824-25 PO Directory, 29-31, a similar range of denominations appeared in \textit{The Edinburgh Almanack, and Universal Scots and Imperial Register for 1824} (Edinburgh, 1824), see 339, 357, 360, 363-367.

\textsuperscript{47} Rodger, \textit{Transformation}, 128.


\textsuperscript{49} Brown, \textit{National Churches}, 68-74, 170-173.
There were also significant tensions between Evangelicals and Moderates within the Church of Scotland. These overlapped with disputes within the Church about patronage as most of the Non-Intrusionists who opposed lay patronage were Evangelicals while Moderates tended to support it. The conflicts over patronage led to the Disruption of 1843 when many Non-Intrusionist clergy and lay members left the Church of Scotland and founded the Free Church, formally entrenching another layer of religious diversity in Edinburgh society. Overall Edinburgh was characterised by a complex, shifting series of conflicts and alliances between different religious groups.

Dublin was also an important religious centre, although not the primal see of established (Anglican) Church of Ireland, the Dublin Diocese was one of the most significant in Ireland and its Archbishop was a prominent clergyman with a nationally important role. The established Church’s influence was further enhanced by its links with prominent institutions such as the University of Dublin or Trinity College Dublin (TCD) whose fellowships remained restricted to members of the established Church long after they admitted non-Anglicans in 1793. Dublin played an important role within the Irish Catholic Church, and the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin were influential figures. The ecclesiastical section of Dublin’s 1824 Treble Almanack focused primarily on the Church of Ireland in addition to the city’s two Anglican cathedrals, it listed twenty-one Church of Ireland churches. The Almanack did not mention any Catholic chapels despite the fact that, according to the Reverend Henry Young’s Catholic Directory (1821), there were thirteen Catholic chapels in Dublin as

---

52 Armaugh was the Primal See.
55 1824 Treble Almanack, 194-197. It also listed the French Calvinist church, Peter-street, and the Danish and Lutheran church Poolbeg-street.
well as numerous convents.\textsuperscript{56} Dublin also housed places of worship of other
denominations including various branches of Presbyterianism, Baptists, the Society of
Friends, Methodists, Moravians/United Brethren, Independents, Lutherans, ‘Walker’s
Society’, and ‘Kelly’s Society’.\textsuperscript{37}

Definite statistics on denominational membership are not available but, overall,
Protestant Dissenters were a small minority in Dublin. Catholics formed a majority of
the city’s population but Anglicans constituted at least twenty per cent of the
population and until municipal reform, they had a monopoly of local government
appointments.\textsuperscript{58} Despite the rough correlation between Anglicanism and wealth, there
was a growing and rising Catholic middle class in the city, some of whom were involved
in the campaign for Catholic Emancipation and other O'Connellite movements.\textsuperscript{59}

Dublin’s religious tensions were substantial and they tended to be between Catholics
(sometimes supported by liberal Protestants) and conservative Protestants.\textsuperscript{60} Dublin
had a small but disproportionately wealthy Quaker population, and some historians
have emphasised the significance of their philanthropic endeavours, but it was
Protestant-Catholic tensions that dominated public discourse about charity.\textsuperscript{61} These
conflicts frequently centred round the dangers of proselytism that were involved in the
 provision of charitable education and poor relief, and studying philanthropy therefore
provides a way of getting to the heart of the city’s religions divisions.

The presence of extensive established Church infrastructures in each city
ensured that religious matters overlapped with broader debates on national and local
government and their role in welfare provision. Edinburgh’s Church of Scotland kirk
sessions retained a role in official poor relief efforts as the compulsory poor rate was

\textsuperscript{56} Henry Young, \textit{The Catholic Directory Dedicated to Saint Patrick,…of the Dioceses of}

\textsuperscript{57} The city’s small Jewish population did not have a place of worship, John James McGregor, \textit{New
Picture of Dublin…}(Dublin, 1821), 137-147, 158.


\textsuperscript{59} Bob Cullen, \textit{Thomas L. Synnott: The Career of a Dublin Catholic 1830-70}
(Dublin and Portland, Oregon, 1997), 9-10, 15-27.

\textsuperscript{60} Hill, \textit{Patriots}, 301-316, 331-345, Irene Whelan, \textit{The Bible War in Ireland: the “Second Reformation”
and the Polarization of Protestant-Catholic Relations, 1800-1840}
(Madison, Wisconsin, 2003), 153-160.

\textsuperscript{61} Dickson, \textit{Dublin}, 323-324, Helen E. Hatton, \textit{The Largest Amount of Good, Quaker Relief in Ireland}
supplemented by church collections. In theory, the Church of Ireland parish remained a unit of local government in Dublin with welfare responsibilities that included the care of deserted children, even if these were not always undertaken in practice. Physical church infrastructures also affected philanthropy. Churches and chapels were used for fundraising charity sermons in both cities, while churches, convents, and other religious buildings acted as collection points where donations for various charities could be left. Hence, each city’s charities existed in a complex environment, shaped by a whole range of institutions, practices, and spaces, which are explored in this chapter and throughout the thesis. Particular attention is given to the ways in which charity did (or did not) help the cities to cope with sectarian divisions which were perhaps the most socially significant differences in early nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh.

II.

Mainstream almanacs provide a guide to the type of organisations operating in both cities. They not only furnished information on individual charities, by containing a specific section on the city’s ‘Charitable and Benevolent Institutions’, they provided a semi-official record of associational philanthropy for the middle-class public and by doing so helped to shape how charities affected the wider city. The 1824 Treble Almanack listed seventy charitable organisations operating in Dublin, whilst the Edinburgh Almanack for the same year listed sixty-one though nine of these served Leith specifically and there was one in each of the smaller towns of Prestonpans and Tranent. By 1845 Thom’s Almanac listed one-hundred and thirty-two philanthropic organisations operating in Dublin and Oliver and Boyd’s Almanac listed ninety-five for Edinburgh, four of which were in Leith. Though these almanacs were not completely comprehensive they suggest a significant growth in the number of charitable associations in both cities since 1824.

---

64 See charity appeals in Dublin Evening Mail (hereafter DEM) 21 January 1824, IF 2 January 1824.
65 See appendix.
The almanac lists indicated that the cities’ associational worlds had much in common, with charities performing the same kinds of functions in each. For example, both cities were home to charities with clear reforming intentions such as the Edinburgh Magdalene [sic] Asylum, the Magdalen Asylum on Dublin’s Leeson-street which was associated with the Church of Ireland, and the city’s many Catholic Magdalen asylums. Each city boasted a range of medical charities, including general hospitals such as the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary (RI), the Meath Hospital and County of Dublin Infirmary, the City of Dublin Hospital Baggot-street, specialist hospitals such as the Edinburgh Eye Infirmary, and the Dublin Lying-In Hospital or Rotunda, and stand-alone dispensaries that provided outpatient treatment and advice. Medical charities were particularly common in Dublin, there were at least five standalone dispensaries and twelve specialist hospitals operating in the city in 1824. There were also seven general hospitals, a significantly different situation from Edinburgh where the RI dominated general hospital care. 66 There were also numerous poor relief organisations in each city, some of which, such as Dublin’s Mendicity Institution67 and Edinburgh’s House of Refuge, aimed to prevent street-begging through the provision of material relief and the diversion of casual almsgiving. As centres of religion and education, Dublin and Edinburgh had many charity schools and missionary societies. Some of these claimed a broad Christian neutrality, which they did not always fulfil, while others were explicitly denominational (See Tables I and II in the appendix).

As national capitals, Dublin and Edinburgh were home to many charities designed to serve all of Ireland or Scotland such as the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Kildare Place Society/KPS) and the Sabbath School Union for Scotland. Hospitals in both cities treated patients normally resident elsewhere in Ireland or Scotland, who travelled to Dublin and Edinburgh to receive medical care. 68 These charities both reflected and enhanced the metropolitan image of

66 Some other hospitals were listed with no information about whether they were general or specialist institutions and they have not been included in this count, 1824 Treble Almanack, 189-221, see also ‘Wilson’s Directory’, in The Treble Almanack for...1824, 15 [pagination differs from the main Almanack].

67 Or the Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin.

both cities. Each city had its specific national characteristics, Dublin, predictably had a much higher concentration of charities with Catholic connections than any British city. The Scottish Poor Law manifested itself in Edinburgh society through three Charity Workhouses in the city and suburbs. Unlike English or Irish Poor Law establishments, these Workhouses received income from voluntary church door collections as well as from compulsory local rates. Overall, though, the range of charities operating in each city resembled those in large towns throughout the UK, and the residents of these towns would have recognised much that was familiar in the philanthropic landscapes of Dublin and Edinburgh.

The foundation of charities in Dublin and Edinburgh was often inspired by the same transnational ideas that were influencing philanthropy throughout contemporary Europe and North America. Those establishing the Dublin Mendicity Institution in 1818 modelled their charity on similar organisations operating elsewhere, including Edinburgh. Indeed direct links were formed between charities throughout the UK. Auxiliaries to London-based national missionary societies operated in both Dublin and Edinburgh, some of Edinburgh’s missionary associations were active in Ireland, some Irish missionary organisations raised funds in Edinburgh, and funds were raised in Dublin for the small-scale but growing efforts of the Catholic Sisters of Charity in Edinburgh. Debates on poor relief, medicine, and education in each city were influenced by the broader UK context. Leading Non-Intrusionist cleric and social commentator, the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, was influential in Ireland and England as well as Scotland, while even seemingly local debates, such as those on Irish Charitable Bequests legislation or on the education of the poor in Ireland, received significant attention in the Edinburgh press.

---

69 Cage, *Poor Law*, 45-63.
Charities can be classified in a variety of ways including by function, by management structures and modes of funding, or by their cultural connections such as their denominational affiliation. This study focuses on how philanthropic institutions presented such characteristics to the public because the nature of charities’ public interactions was key to their social significance. It was through these connections that those beyond a charity’s core supporters became aware of the organisation’s activities, structures, and affiliations. The wider public’s reactions to such efforts affected the extent to which charities promoted or restricted social conflict. This chapter gives particular attention to the relationship between religion and charities, and how this affected charities’ public interactions in order to provide an introduction to the major confessional matters explored throughout the thesis.

Charities with clearly stated denominational connections operated in both cities. These included the Methodist Female Orphan Asylum Connected with the Established Church in Dublin, and Edinburgh’s Episcopal Free School. Several missionary charities with overt Protestant aims, such as the Hibernian Bible Society (HBS), were based in Dublin.73 There were also identifiable Catholic philanthropic organisations in the city, i.e. charities with connections with Catholic religious orders or Catholic parochial chapels, or charities designed to promote Catholic religious education even if predominantly lay-managed.74 Expressions of blatant intolerance were becoming increasingly frowned upon in both cities, but some organisations went to unusual lengths to emphasise their religious neutrality; the managers of two Dublin charities, the Society for the Relief of Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers and the Dublin Mendicity Institution highlighted the interdenominational composition of their committees to the public and constantly emphasised their (genuine) opposition to Protestant-Catholic discord.75

73 1824 Treble Almanack, 189-193, see appendix.
74 Almanac entries sometimes revealed the presence of Roman Catholic clergymen on charities’ boards of management but this does not necessarily identify them as ‘Catholic charities’ References to the involvement of a parish or religious order or the articulation of clearly-stated Catholic aims is required to reveal this, and only references which clearly state such connections have been counted. A similar approach is used for classifying denominational charities in general.
75 Dickson, Dublin, 299.
Yet although some organisations openly stated their denominational connections, or lack thereof, classifying charities according to their religious affiliation is not always a straightforward matter, particularly for Edinburgh. Edinburgh’s missionary societies can even be difficult to distinguish from each other as several had similar names. For example, the Edinburgh Bible Society (EBS) was established in 1809 as an auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS), but it split from the parent society in 1825 as a result of the Apocrypha controversy (see below). In 1828 a society with a similar name, the Edinburgh Auxiliary Bible Society (EABS) was founded to re-establish a connection with the BFBS and both organisations existed alongside each other for decades. As Dalgleish has indicated, in the 1810s most of Edinburgh’s missionary societies had a nondenominational Protestant ethos, and their boards of management included Church of Scotland, Episcopal, and other (Protestant) Dissenting clerics, and this trend continued to some extent into the 1820s and beyond. The Edinburgh Auxiliary Missionary Society (EAMS), for example, claimed to support Protestant ‘Missions in general’ and donated to missions associated with many religious groups including Baptists and Methodists.

At the same time the established Churches retained a privileged position in charitable institutions with no overt denominational affiliations. Church of Ireland bishops were ex-officio governors of the Rotunda Lying-In Hospital in Dublin and places were reserved for Church of Scotland clergymen on the boards of some of Edinburgh’s most prominent charities including the RI. Of course, even where places were not officially set aside, boards of management might be dominated by one religious group, or charities that claimed to serve all denominations may have favoured one in practice. Nevertheless, the ways in which philanthropic institutions presented

---

their management structures to the public itself shaped the organisations’ social effects and impacted on the wider associational environment. For example Dalgleish argued that assertions of religious inclusiveness allowed Edinburgh’s voluntary organisations to promote a common middle-class identity among groups otherwise divided by religion.\(^8\)

Dickson claimed that the ‘public profile [of Catholic charities] was low’ in pre-Emancipation Dublin.\(^8\) If this was the case, such charities might not have influenced society in the same way as standard subscriber democracies. A much greater number of identifiably Catholic philanthropic institutions appeared in 1845 Thom’s compared with the 1824 Treble Almanack. This partly reflected the founding of new institutions such as St Vincent’s Hospital a general medical hospital established in 1834 by the Sisters of Charity, and the Catholic Book Society (CBS) founded in 1826 to distribute cheap Catholic educational literature.\(^8\) However, several of the charities listed in 1845 Thom’s but omitted in the 1824 Treble Almanack had been founded before 1824. The Almanack’s neglect of well-established Catholic institutions such as the House of Refuge Stanhope-street, and St Bridget’s Female Orphan Society, as well as its omission of Catholic chapels, suggests that religious division affected the ways in which Dublin’s charities were presented to the public. Yet this was not because Dublin’s Catholic institutions shunned publicity.\(^8\) Young’s 1821 Catholic Directory contained a vast amount of information on the charities associated with the city’s Catholic chapels, lay-groups, and religious houses, including nineteen charities connected with convents or monasteries (See Table 3).\(^8\) Indeed Catholic charities were not shy about advertising their need for funds on the front pages of the liberal Freeman’s Journal

\(^8\)Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 141-142.
\(^8\)Dickson, Dublin, 299.
\(^8\)Prospectus of an Institution Intended to be Established in St Stephen’s-Green, Dublin by the Sisters of Charity... (Dublin, 1834), First Report of the Catholic Book Society, for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge Throughout Ireland... (Dublin, 1828).
\(^8\)Founded in 1811, the House of Refuge Stanhope Street provided shelter for ‘young women of good character’. Donal S. Blake, Mary Aikenhead (1787-1858) Servant of the Poor, Founder of the Religious Sisters of Charity (n.p., 2001), 39-40. St Bridget’s Orphan Society Tullow School had been founded in 1804, 1845 Thom’s, 670, 676, 1836 [35] [36] [37] [38] [39] [40] [41] [42] Poor Inquiry (Ireland). Appendix (C)....Part II. Report on the City of Dublin.... (London, 1836), 19aa [hereafter Poorer Ireland C].
\(^8\)Young, Catholic Directory, 10-28.
Table 3:
**Dublin charities connected with monasteries and convents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish.</th>
<th>Charity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s of the Conception.</td>
<td>Female School 102 Abbey-street: teachers from Religious Sisters of Charity Stanhope-street Convent [Lay governesses also had a role in the management of this charity].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys School connected with Dominican Friary Denmark-street [included lay involvement in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinitarian Institution (charity boarding school) managed by Religious Sisters of Charity North Williams-street Convent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls Charity Day School ‘attached to’ Religious Sisters of Charity North William-street Convent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day School connected with Presentation Monastery Hanover-street East [used the ‘Lancasterian Plan’, lay involvement in its management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s Parish.</td>
<td>St Patrick’s General Free Schools, Cuffe-lane: taught by members of the Calced or Grand Carmelite Convent French-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas’ Parish.</td>
<td>Parochial School taught by members of Presentation Monastery 14 Mill-street [used the ‘Lancasterian System’, lay involvement in its management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day School managed by Discalced Carmelite Nunnery Warren-mount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orphan Institution Harold’s Cross at which Nuns of St Clare’s Convent, Harold’s Cross educated female orphans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Day School managed by the Nuns of St Clare’s Convent Harold’s Cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Charity School: teachers from Discalced Carmelite Convent St Joseph’s Ranelagh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas’ Parish (continued).</td>
<td>Day, Evening and Sunday Free School (male) Milltown managed by monks of Franciscan Monastery Mount Alverne near Milltown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish.</td>
<td>Charity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael and St John’s Parish.</td>
<td>St. Bonaventure’s Charitable Institution ‘to provide an Asylum for poor Catholic Children, rescued from schools dangerous to faith and morality’. The Institution was ‘held in’ Franciscan Friary (Adam and Eve’s) Merchant’s Quay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Catherine’s Parish.</td>
<td>Female Charity School connected with Augustinian Friary, John’s-street [lay involvement in its management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James’ Parish.</td>
<td>Boys Parochial School: taught by members of Mill-street Monastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s Parish.</td>
<td>Charity School attached to Capuchin Friary, Church-street [lay involvement in its management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charity School managed by Nuns from St Clare’s Convent North King-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michan’s Parish.</td>
<td>House of Refuge for Destitute Females of Good Character, Stanhope-Street run by Religious Sisters of Charity [lay involvement in its management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Charitable School managed by Nuns at Presentation Nunnery George’s-Hill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Young, *Catholic Directory*. (The specific names of charities were not always given, they are included above where known).

Information on Catholic charities was available in 1820s Dublin but the absence of the institutions of the city’s largest denomination from one of the main brands of almanac, highlights a difference between Dublin and Edinburgh. In the 1820s, information on all of Edinburgh’s main denominations could be found in one semi-official source, presenting a picture of a multidenominational society in which a variety of religious groups participated in urban governance. This suggested that all of the denominations shared the same basic values. Initially in Dublin, Catholic charity was not always presented as part of the city’s philanthropic associational culture and its omission suggested to the almanac-reading public that it was not part of the city’s governance activity broadly understood. By the 1840s new brands of Dublin almanac listed Catholic philanthropic organisations alongside their Protestant counterparts, reflecting the improving legal and social status of Catholics in the city.85

85 See for example *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...1841* (Dublin, 1841), *1845 Thom’s*. 
Newspapers were also a medium through which charities frequently publicised their activities and newspaper coverage also provided a broader picture of the cities’ associational cultures to their readers. Each city possessed a diverse newspaper press ranging in editorial opinion from conservative to liberal to radical. This chapter draws on a range of newspapers: for Edinburgh: the conservative *Edinburgh Evening Courant*, the liberal *Scotsman*, and from 1840 *The Witness* which was associated with Non-Intrusionist and later Free Church interests, and for Dublin: the liberal *Freeman’s Journal* and the ultra-Protestant *Dublin Evening Mail*. It analyses these newspapers to assess whether denominational associational worlds existed in either city. Newspapers contained information on a greater number of charities than almanacs did. In the first fourteen days of 1824 the *Freeman’s Journal* and the *Dublin Evening Mail* referred to twenty-eight charities that did not appear in the 1824 *Treble Almanack*! Many of these references were in fundraising advertisements for Church of Ireland and Catholic parochial schools, institutions that relied heavily on voluntary donations and which highlight the ‘blurred boundaries’ that often existed between Churches and private charity. (See Table 4 below). Analysis of newspapers for 1820s Dublin indicates that the relationship between religion and charity was not straightforward and philanthropic organisations had multiple, and sometimes contradictory effects on the city’s sectarian conflicts.

---

87 These newspapers have been chosen because of their high circulation figures (or in the case of the *Scotsman* its broader impact and commentary on charities). An ultra-conservative newspaper was not selected for Edinburgh because these tended to be relatively short lived see R.M.W. Cowan, *The Newspaper Press in Scotland, A Study of Its First Expansion 1815-1860* (Glasgow, 1946), 33-38, 49-60, 63-71, 258, Brian Inglis, *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland 1784-1841* (London, 1954), 168-173.
Table 4:
Charities appearing in the *Dublin Evening Mail* or *Freeman’s Journal* in first fourteen days of 1824 that were not listed in the *Treble Almanack* for the same year.89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Charitable Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michan's Free Schools and Orphan House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew's Parish Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Nursery for Orphans and Female Orphan House, Paradise Row.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent Strangers’ Friend Society90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors’ Friend Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset Nourishment Dispensary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor School, 102, Abbey-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free School, Saint James's Parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poor Schools of Saint Michael and Saint John.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan School, Townsend-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrician Asylum for Aged and Infirm Men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Penitents Retreat, Mecklenburgh-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows and Aged Women's Asylum, Archbold's Court, 35 Cook-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity School St. Bridget's Parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial Schools of St Mark's Parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Parochial School of St. Peter's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda Female Orphan School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary's Parochial School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Refuge, Stanhope-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Female Charity (Methodist Widows’ Alms House).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul's Roman Catholic Free Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas's Female Parochial Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Charity School, Usher's Quay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's Chapel and Free Schools, Phibsborough [record of donation to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee for building these schools].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anne's Parochial School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine's Parochial School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James's Alms House.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: *FJ, DEM.*

89 Names are given as they appeared in newspapers (a practice followed for each table unless otherwise stated). The denominational affiliation of the parochial schools were not clarified in all entries.

90 AKA The Benevolent or Strangers’ Friend Society.
Table 5:
Charities appearing in the *Edinburgh Evening Courant* or *Scotsman* in the first three months of 1824 that were not listed in the *Edinburgh Almanack* for the same year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland Missionary Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Wightman’s Charity School (Under the Management of Tolbooth Kirk Session).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Relief of Destitute Imprisoned Debtors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Society for Promoting the Education of the Native Irish through the Medium of their Own Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Yester’s Local Sabbath Evening Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval and Military Bible Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: *EEC, Scotsman.*

Catholic charities publicised their activities in the liberal *Freeman’s Journal* where their advertisements appeared alongside those for neutral charities and those with Church of Ireland connections, highlighting commonalities among the city’s denominations. Some Dublin newspapers were less ecumenical. The charities featured in the ultra-Protestant *Evening Mail* tended to be for Protestant or neutral charities, so that its readers were less exposed to information on Catholic philanthropy.\(^9\) Readers’ choice of an ultra-Protestant newspaper suggests that they already felt that they had little in common with their Catholic neighbours, but omission of advertisements for Catholic charities may have reinforced such attitudes. Interactions between press and charities in 1820s Dublin potentially both increased and decreased sectarian tensions in an associational world that was partly, but not completely divided by religion.

Religious tensions increased in Dublin in the 1830s and 1840s, exacerbated by controversies over the position of the Church of Ireland in Irish society and the O’Connellite repeal campaigns.\(^9\) The way in which information about charities was presented to the public also became more confessionalised in these years. The *Freeman’s Journal* continued to include advertisements for neutral charities, but its pages contained an increasing number of appeals for Catholic organisations. By

---

\(^9\) Based on a search of the *DEM* for January and February 1824, and on advertisements for charity sermons in the same newspaper from January-March 1824.

January 1845, half of the charities advertising in its pages emphasised a connection with the Catholic Church.\(^{93}\) This increasing Catholic focus was related to John Gray’s acquisition of a share in the newspaper in 1841, as well as to more general social change. Although Protestant, Gray was closely associated with repeal and with Catholic causes.\(^{94}\) By 1845, most of the charities advertising in the Mail were either Protestant missionary groups or associations that only served the Protestant poor. Thirty-two of the forty-three fundraising advertisements that appeared in the newspaper in January and February 1845 were for such charities.\(^{95}\) Only five of the fifty-two references to charities in the Mail in the same months appeared in the Freeman’s Journal, and all but one of these referred to the neutral Roomkeepers’ or Mendicity societies.\(^{96}\)

Analysis of newspapers suggests that in the 1820s, Edinburgh’s associational world was less denominationally-divided than Dublin’s as advertisements that overtly stated charities’ religious affiliations were less common. Yet while this reflects less severe religious divisions, it also makes it difficult to discover denominational connections. One rough way of estimating them is to examine newspapers’ advertisements for charity sermons since, as Dalgleish indicated, the location of the sermon partially associated the charity with a particular denomination. Advertisements in the conservative Edinburgh Evening Courant did not suggest strong confessional connections, the newspaper contained notices for charity sermons in many churches and chapels including those of the established Church, the UAS, Scottish Episcopalians, Methodists, Independents, and the Relief Synod.\(^{97}\) The liberal

---

\(^{93}\) See for example advertisements in *FJ* during January 1845. With the exception of a reference to St Michan’s Parochial School in a notice reporting the proceedings of a vestry meeting (*FJ* 7 March 1845) a search on the Irish News Archive database for ‘parish school’ reveal no references to Church of Ireland parochial schools in *FJ* for 1845.


\(^{95}\) DEM 1 January 1845, see similar advertisements for St Thomas’s Parochial Schools *DEM* 10 January 1845, Protestant Orphan Society 15 January 1845, St Anne’s Parochial Schools 5 February 1845.

\(^{96}\) Based on a search of *FJ* using the Irish New Archive for each entry identified in *DEM*.

\(^{97}\) Based on a search of *EEC* from January to November 1824, the denominations of the churches and chapels were cross checked with 1824-27 PO Directory, for examples see *EEC* 1 January 1824 sermon in Bristo-street chapel (United Associated Synod), 3 January 1824 Tolbooth church (Church of Scotland), 21 February 1824 St John’s chapel (Scottish Episcopal), 29 March 1824 Nicholson Square chapel (Methodist) and Albany-street chapel (Independent), 10 April 1824 Roxburgh Place chapel
Scotsman was a frequent critic of the established Church but it also contained advertisements for charity sermons held in various places of worship including Church of Scotland churches.98 Nor did the Scotsman provide space for denominational charities that were omitted from the Courant, all of the charity sermons advertised in the Scotsman between January and November 1824, appeared in the Courant.99 In the 1820s, these newspapers did not reflect, or fuel the development of separate associational worlds based on denomination, rather by drawing together information on charity sermons in various places of worship, they emphasised to the newspaper-reading public that different denominational groups used similar fundraising methods.

Like Dublin, Edinburgh’s associational world appeared to become more confessionalised over time. By 1845, the Church of Scotland and Free Church had established missionary committees to supplement the work of voluntary missionary societies. These were not strictly voluntary associations, but they undertook similar work to missionary societies and sometimes raised money via subscriptions.100 The popular Edinburgh newspaper The Witness, founded in 1840, was publicly associated with Non-Intrusionist interests and after 1843 with the Free Church. As well as containing the kinds of general news that one would expect in a standard newspaper, it provided information specifically related to the Free Church including details of upcoming Sunday services.101 The newspaper reported on the opening of Free Church charity schools and meetings of missionary organisations held at Free Church venues, events that were sometimes overlooked by the Scotsman and the Courant.102 In fact only half of the charity sermons advertised in The Witness between January and

---

98 Cowan, Newspaper, 124-125.
99 It was decided to omit those held in December 1824 because of the focus on fundraising after the Tron fire in this month Rodger, Transformation, 91-94.
101 Cowan, Newspaper, 236-243, for example The Witness 11 January 1845.
102 For example The Witness 4 January 1845, 15 January 1845.
March 1845, appeared in the *Courant* suggesting the growth of a separate Free Church associational world reflected in and further promoted by *The Witness*. Yet this confessionalisation was incomplete and some charities advertised in all three newspapers. *The Witness* contained advertisements for collections that took place in the chapels of non-Free Church denominations and even the churches of the established Church. The *Courant* and *Scotsman* continued to contain advertisements for charity sermons in many venues. In Dublin, the *Evening Mail* promoted charities that deliberately emphasised distinctions between Protestants and the city’s majority denomination, whereas *The Witness* promoted inter-Protestant missionary charities which drew on the common Protestant heritage of many of Edinburgh’s inhabitants and indicated that charity might have been sometimes able to act as unifying force even through a Free Church newspaper.

The charity sermon was itself a way through which philanthropic institutions communicated with the public. The ability of sermons to identify a charity with a particular denomination was problematic for organisations that wished to emphasise their nondenominational character. As Dalgleish noted, in the 1810s some of Edinburgh’s missionary and educational societies held sermons in the places of worship of one denomination in order to appear neutral. Between 1816 and 1820 the Edinburgh Gratis Sabbath School Society held sermons at Burgher and Relief chapels as well as in Church of Scotland churches. Even in the 1840s, some missionary activity could appropriate the infrastructure of more than one denomination. In 1845, the Wesleyan Missionary Society held sermons in Wesleyan and Church of Scotland places of worship, while *The Witness* praised the Free Church and Presbyterian...
Dissenters for making their places of worship available for celebrations of the Jubilee of the London Missionary Society in the same year. In Dublin, the Roomkeepers’ Society held sermons in Protestant and Catholic churches and the Charitable Infirmary Jervis-street, whose charity sermons were usually preached in Catholic chapels, held at least one in an Anglican church in 1829. Overall, however, such interdenominational efforts were rare in Dublin. Nor did Dublin have an equivalent of Edinburgh’s ‘church door collections’ when collections for one of the city’s larger charities, such as the RI, were held at the doors of all the places of worship in the city on the same day. Again, philanthropy was presented as a force for uniting different denominations in Edinburgh to a greater extent than it was in Dublin.

The collections also suggest that local authorities played a greater role in regulating society in Edinburgh as permission from the Town Council and the Presbytery of Edinburgh was sought to hold them. The situation in Dublin was more chaotic, numerous charity sermons were advertised in the city’s newspapers, and while the advertisements requested that no other charity choose the same Sunday for their sermon, clashes occurred and sermons were sometimes cancelled because of them. This reflected different approaches for coping with diversity in each city. In Edinburgh it was possible for differing, and sometimes mutually hostile, religious groups to coordinate to support the same charity, in Dublin there appears to have been more of a ‘free market’ for charity sermons allowing individuals greater choice about which charities they supported.

By 1845, charities’ use of newspapers had helped to fuel the creation of partially separate confessional associational worlds in both cities, and particularly in

---

112 Edinburgh City Archives (hereafter ECA) SL73/1/1 ‘Edinburgh Newtown Dispensary. Misc Legal Papers, 1818-1843’ ‘Petition from the Managers of the New Town Dispensary 1818’.
113 For example DEM 26 March 1824, 2 April 1824, Laurence M. Geary, Medicine and Charity in Ireland, 1718-1851 (Dublin, 2004), 33-35.
Dublin, yet in neither case were the associational worlds hermetically sealed. One way of further exploring the interaction of religion and philanthropy is to examine the different scandals about charities’ religious functions that occurred in either city. The analysis below provides an insight into two such controversies in the 1820s, giving an idea of how such issues were dealt with in the pre-1832 world.

III.

When comparing late eighteenth-century Ireland and Scotland, S.J. Connolly, R.A. Houston, and R.J. Morris argued that Ireland was the more contentious society because the Catholic-Protestant conflicts that characterised Irish society were more divisive than the kind of social tensions seen in contemporary Scotland where a shared anti-Catholicism served to unite society, an outlet not available in Ireland.114 Similarly, Morris and Morton argued that Protestantism acted as a uniting force in mid-nineteenth-century Scottish society and the divisions between its various Presbyterian groups were fundamentally different to the more divisive Catholic-Protestant tensions that became increasingly significant in later nineteenth-century Scotland.115 Despite bitter divisions between Edinburgh’s various Presbyterian groups, they had enough in common to frequently co-operate on philanthropic projects particularly in the 1820s. As Dalgleish indicated, many of Edinburgh’s Bible societies presented their work as ‘Christian’ rather than specifically denominational which ensured that at least some of these charities had interdenominational memberships. They provide an example of how shared values among Edinburgh’s Protestants allowed a measure of interdenominational co-operation.116

Yet, sometimes, significant religious conflicts did occur in Edinburgh’s charities in the 1820s. In 1824, the EBS disaffiliated from the BFBS in 1825 as a result of the Apocrypha controversy in which the BFBS was accused of tolerating the presence of the Apocrypha in Bibles supplied to missionary groups in Continental Europe.117 In 1828, a new organisation, the EABS was established to support the efforts of the

114 Connolly et al. ‘Identity, Conflict’, 4-5.
BFBS. Like most British players in the Apocrypha controversy, the EABS agreed that the Apocrypha should not form part of the Bible. Yet they took a pragmatic response to Continental demand for Bibles that included the Apocrypha, arguing that it was better to cooperate with groups that supplied these Bibles than to prevent the Bible being withheld completely.\textsuperscript{118} Unsurprisingly, tensions arose between the EBS and EABS, and these were played out publicly. Speakers at EBS meetings condemned the establishment of the EABS and the EBS remained hostile to the newer organisation for years. EBS members claimed that while they supported an individual’s right to interpret the Bible themselves, they could not condone the ‘errors’ that the BFBS was aiding by its actions.\textsuperscript{119} In fact, the EBS reviewed the controversy in 1845 when it published newspaper advertisements attacking the BFBS entitled ‘Warning to the Public. British and Foreign Bible Society.’\textsuperscript{120} The advertisements included a detailed account of an EBS meeting that reminded the public that the BFBS’s policies remained objectionable, and claimed that the BFBS were trying to keep this ‘carefully concealed’ from public knowledge.\textsuperscript{121} The EBS publicly declared those who ‘subscribed’ to the views articulated by the EABS were not welcome in their organisation. Yet although these disputes were severe they still highlighted underlying values that those on both sides shared as both made public efforts to express their hostility to the Apocrypha.

For contemporaries, charitable education primarily meant inculcating morality and its provision was a divisive subject in early nineteenth-century Edinburgh, as it was in the rest of the UK, as different religious groups voiced their often mutually contradictory opinions on the subject. Yet the persistence of some shared values among the city’s main religious groups ensured that educational charity was less controversial there than in many parts of the UK.\textsuperscript{122} Dalgleish for example indicated


\textsuperscript{119}`Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Edinburgh Bible Society’, in \textit{Twentieth Report of the Edinburgh Bible Society. With an Appendix Containing Extracts of Correspondence, & c.} (Edinburgh, 1829), 9-27.

\textsuperscript{120}For example \textit{Scotsman} 7 May 1845 see also the ‘debate’ between the societies that took place via their advertisements: 14 May 1845, 24 May 1845, 31 May 1845, 9 July 1845, 12 July 1845, 23 July 1845.

\textsuperscript{121}\textit{Scotsman} 7 May 1845.

\textsuperscript{122}For example see chapter four.
that the approach in Edinburgh was more conciliatory than in contemporary England where there was frequent conflict between the proponents of the two popular monitorial educational systems of Joseph Lancaster and Dr Bell, with the former supported by nonconformists and the latter by Tory Anglicans. Many of Edinburgh’s Tories supported the Lancasterian School Society and that Society praised both Lancaster and Bell in its public statements.\textsuperscript{123} The more conciliatory approach to educational charity was aided by the esteem in which Scotland’s tradition of parochial schools was held by a wide range of Edinburgh’s inhabitants, again indicating that they could agree on much in relation to education in principle at least.\textsuperscript{124}

There were several attempts by members of different religious denominations to jointly promote charitable education in Dublin, but the kind of issues over which Catholics and conservative Protestants disagreed, such as the use of the Bible without comment, limited their success.\textsuperscript{125} The KPS was established in Dublin in 1811 to promote nondenominational education throughout Ireland. It initially attracted the support of high-profile Catholics including Daniel O’Connell, but from the 1820s Catholics and some of their liberal Protestant supporters began to criticise the scriptural materials that the Society prepared for use in schools as these did not contain Catholic commentary. Several prominent members, including O’Connell, left the Society and condemned it as Protestant proselytising agency.\textsuperscript{126}

Although this was an all-Ireland debate often focusing on rural schools, it had a particularly large impact in Dublin which served as a focus for this discontent, reflecting and reinforcing its capital status. Complaints were publicised at large Catholic Association meetings held in the city, as well as in the Dublin press, sustaining the


\textsuperscript{126} Hislop, \textit{Kildare Place}, 3, 5.
conflict and increasing antagonisms. For example, in 1824 Dr Doyle Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, wrote to the Pro-Secretary of the Catholic Association criticising the KPS, his complaints were read at an Association meeting in Dublin and then reported in the *Freeman’s Journal*. The Bishop had condemned the KPS’s use of Bibles without commentary as ‘the demoralizing and antichristian principle, of committing the Sacred Scripture to the interpretation of every prating Sophist, of every senseless child, of every silly old woman.’ Doyle’s language is unlikely to have endeared the Society’s supporters to him. Such controversies were exacerbated by the fact that the KPS received funds from Parliament until 1831. In 1830 the *Freeman’s Journal* argued that the grant should instead be directed to education acceptable to Catholics and the newspaper noted that meetings had been held throughout Ireland to petition Parliament on the subject.

Dublin’s efforts to promote charitable education sometimes reinforced religious divisions, a pattern that will be seen throughout this study. Religion has often been seen as a badge of social identity but this chapter has indicated that doctrinal issues also mattered. The KPS conflicts were more threatening to social harmony because they tended to highlight doctrinal differences, whereas the Apocrypha controversies, though bitter, provided opportunities for a range of groups in Edinburgh to publicly demonstrate their shared belief that the Apocrypha did not form part of the Bible. The rest of the thesis will indicate that such contrasts continued into the 1830s and 1840s, though the relationship between religion, philanthropy, and social conflict continued to be multifaceted.

**Conclusion:**

Despite differences in their population size and relative wealth, Dublin and Edinburgh were quite similar places. Both were stateless capitals with charities, regulatory bodies, and official authority structures that claimed national as well as civic importance. Their national position also made them significant sectarian battlegrounds. Religious differences were reflected in and reinforced by the ways in which charities communicated with the public in either city, with evidence of growing

---


128 *FJ* 9 November 1830.
confessionalisation of charities’ press advertising by 1845. Yet these disputes were more divisive in Dublin and fuelled greater philanthropy-related conflict there than in Edinburgh, where educational and missionary charities, although dealing with sensitive subjects, often helped to unite rather than divide religious groups.

Much remains to be investigated to fully explore these issues, not least a consideration of charities with close connections to individual parishes and congregations.\textsuperscript{129} Similarly, as noted, there were other ways of classifying charitable organisations including through their rules and structures, and the effects of different kinds of management structures on charities’ relationships with social diversity needs to be considered and this will be done in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{129} See chapter three.
Chapter Two. 
Rules, Structures, and Historical Authority.

There are probably eight or ten thousand Hospitals, Charities, or Schools, in Britain, to which considerable funds have been bequeathed, under the influence of vanity, benevolence, or superstition. Many of these become useless from change of circumstances; many are mere nests of jobbing and corruption. Two thirds of the whole, we believe, are mischievous, either from defects in their constitution, or from abuses in their administration....When a person makes the public his heir, why should his posthumous arrangements be....absolutely immutable. A Foundation meant to be in existence three centuries hence, is an experiment, made under ignorance of the conditions necessary to insure its success, and generally by persons of little knowledge or foresight.

Scotsman 31 January 1835.1

The Scotsman’s comments reflected the newspaper’s concerns about endowed charities; philanthropic institutions funded by bequests or other endowments, and usually managed by trustees. The Scotsman’s anxieties about these institutions were shared by reformers across the UK. Their concerns led to the appointment of various temporary commissioners to explore the subject from the 1810s onwards, and eventually to the establishment of a permanent Charity Commission in 1853.2 As the newspaper’s comments indicated, even the most private of charity was believed to be a public matter. This of course partly reflected a desire to see the institutions’ functions performed properly but it also revealed broader ideas about who should hold power in society and how they should be held accountable. Martin Gorsky emphasised the importance of endowed forms of charitable governance in Bristol. As a long-established and wealthy urban centre, Bristol inherited a variety of modes of philanthropic giving, some of which had been in use much longer than the relatively recent subscriber democracy form.3 Subscriber democracies therefore did not exist in a vacuum in Bristol or any other town with even a little history. The long-established character of Dublin and Edinburgh encouraged many different modes of philanthropic administration, all of which influenced broader social interactions. By 1845 each city was home to charitable organisations that were more than one hundred years old. It is surprising that the influence of ‘history’ on philanthropy has received

1Emphasis in original.
3Gorsky, Patterns, 39-47.
little attention for either city, despite Richard Rodger’s assertion that ‘as capital city and a city of capital, nineteenth-century Edinburgh was shaped by the power of the past.’

Charities often left their management structures and membership rules unchanged for decades or even centuries after their initial establishment. These structures therefore reflected attitudes towards public participation from around the time of the charities’ foundation. Analysing them reveals the extent to which the philanthropic institutions were designed to cope with social difference or at least the extent to which they claimed to welcome a diverse range of participants. This was why some contemporary reformers wanted to transform charities as well as state bodies. As the Scotsman indicated, many endowed charities were believed to be corrupt, with critics arguing that they resembled the pre-reform Parliament or self-selecting town corporations. Actual scandal was not required to attract censure. Condemnation of Bristol’s endowed charities increased in the 1820s and 1830s simply because their governance structures were increasingly seen as unrepresentative and hence illegitimate. Analysing charities reveals much about contemporary attitudes towards historical institutions more generally. Endowed charities and subscriber democracies can be considered as ‘older’ and ‘newer’ institutional forms respectively with ‘newer’ subscriber-based organisations connected with the contemporary desire to widen public participation in politics and ‘older’ forms of charity linked with the idea of representation through corporate structures. The openness of charitable governance influenced the extent to which rising middle-class groups could participate in the management of their city.

Clark’s controversial English Society emphasised the significant role that established institutions played in England up to the 1830s. Examining views about ‘older’ and ‘newer’ charitable forms provides a distinctive perspective on attitudes towards historical institutions. One must however be aware of the specific contexts in

---

1 Rodger, Transformation, 12.
2 Gorsky, Patterns, 64-68, Pentland, Radicalism, 27-28.
3 See for example Gorsky, Patterns, 75-77, 82-84.
5 See for example Clark, English Society, 427-446.
which such charities operated. Stewart J. Brown argued for the application of Clark’s ideas to Britain as a whole rather than just England. Yet there were differences between England and Scotland in this regard, Scottish elites often combined interest in preserving ‘older’ historical forms with desire for limited change. They generally welcomed the abolition of the English Test and Corporation Acts, for example, because this removed an anomaly that banned members of Church of Scotland from serving on English local government bodies. By the early nineteenth century, relatively recent Enlightenment ideas were becoming incorporated into Scottish historical traditions. David Barrie, for example, indicated that the concept of civic virtue became linked with idea of the ‘common good’ which had been a central feature of Scottish urban governance for centuries. In Dublin, as in many English towns, defence of established institutions often had a sectarian purpose. Dublin’s conservative Protestants saw changes such as municipal reform as an attack on their spiritual values as well as their political power. The differing cultural environments of Dublin and Edinburgh produced contrasts in how similar institutional structures were interpreted and used.

This chapter will examine the complex interactions between formal procedures and the wider contexts in which the philanthropic associations operated. It begins by classifying charities according to their modes of governance, demonstrating the broad range of approaches to philanthropic involvement in each city. It then examines medical case studies to emphasise the significance of associations’ formal rules and structures. Finally, it considers missionary and religious tract societies, to highlight how charities with similar rules functioned in the contrasting environments of Dublin and Edinburgh.

---

11 Pentland, Radicalism, 192.
12 Barrie, ‘Police’, 64.
This section provides a starting typology, classifying charities in both cities according to their membership qualifications and the extent to which members could become involved in management, both factors that reflected perceptions about the ‘types’ of people best qualified for governance. It starts by providing a broad classification based on charities’ formal procedures, but there was much diversity within each of the categories outlined. Overall, however, when it came to management structures, most types of organisation existed in each city, if not in exactly the same proportions. The cities had similar vibrant associational cultures, representing broadly comparable responses to social problems. Therefore, for both, it is useful to imagine a scale based roughly on apparent ease of access to membership or management as articulated in the organisations’ formal rules. Subscriber democracies represented one end of this scale, being technically the least discriminating in their membership conditions, while endowed charities were the other extreme, being the most enclosed type. In practice subscriber democracies varied significantly in their openness. Nevertheless, the fact that these organisations in principle welcomed all those who agreed with their aims and paid the required subscription, meant that they differed considerably from the typical endowed charity. Subscriber democracies generally required that their members formally endorse their officeholders, the management of endowed charities, by contrast was usually fixed by their founders’ wills or trust deeds, or by the founders’ executors.\footnote{For examples see The Statutes and Rules of George Watson’s Hospital... (Edinburgh, 1801), xiii-xix, The Statutes of George Heriot’s Hospital... (Edinburgh, 1811), 1-2, 8-9.}

Endowed charities were often placed in the hands of those who already wielded significant power such as members of local government institutions or representatives of trade bodies.\footnote{For example the Merchant Maiden Hospital was managed by ‘four Old Bailies, and Old Dean of Guild, who serve as such in the Town Council of Edinburgh; three Ministers of the Gospel of Edinburgh or Suburbs to be elected by the Ministers thereof; the Master of the Merchant Company of Edinburgh; three Assistants of the said Company to be elected by the Master, Assistants and Treasurer thereof; and nine others, who have been Masters, Assistants, or Treasurers of the Company, or Benefactors to the Hospital, to be elected by a General Meeting of the said Company’ the Treasurer of the Hospital, and ‘two of the name of ERSKINE, to be elected and presented yearly’, Statutes of the Maiden Hospital Erected by the Company of Merchants of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine (Edinburgh, 1804), 9-10.} The prestigious charitable boarding school, George
Heriot’s Hospital (founded 1628), for example, was governed by “The Lord Provost, Magistrates, Ministers, and those of the Ordinary Council of the City of Edinburgh.” The Dean and Faculty of Advocates managed the endowment fund for Chalmers’s Hospital, a medical charity. Alternatively, the administration of endowed charities was given to a group of named individuals who held office for life and selected who filled vacancies in their numbers. This allowed management to be controlled by a particularly narrow group. For example, named nominees or their successors, constituted half of the board of St Patrick’s (Swift’s) Hospital in Dublin. This board was dominated by members of prominent Anglican gentry families such as the Beresfords and the Ponsonbys who held high-level positions in the Church and state.

As well as potentially reinforcing elite identity among their managers, endowed charities were in principle forces for conservatism in times of rapid change. Rodger argued that Edinburgh’s trusts created stability as they functioned in the long term, according to fixed rules, helping to counter some of the disruptive effects of the city’s growth. Some contemporary commentators criticised Heriot’s lack of openness. In 1829 the election of an internal candidate as House Governor at the School raised accusations of ‘jobbing’, reflecting the belief that enclosed management structures fostered corruption. Yet while some of Edinburgh’s trusts were extremely powerful, their influence sometimes promoted rather than impeded change. As a major landowner and holder of feu-duties, Heriot’s played a pivotal role in property development in the city. Its influence was further extended in 1838 when it began to found a network of primary schools (Foundation Schools) throughout Edinburgh.

16 1824 Edinburgh Almanack, 315.
17 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 511, the institution itself was not opened until 1864 Oliver and Boyd’s Edinburgh Almanac and National Repository for the Year 1896, Being Leap Year... (Edinburgh, 1896), 1103.
18 St Patrick’s was a hospital for ‘lunatics and idiots’ founded in 1740 endowed by Jonathan Swift, Poorer Ireland C, 66-68.
19 Elizabeth Malcolm, Swift’s Hospital: A History of St Patrick’s, Dublin, 1746-1989 (Dublin, 1989), 108-114, Geary, Medicine, 102.
20 Rodger, Transformation, 6-14, 105, 113-119.
21 Caledonian Mercury (hereafter CM) 17 September 1829.
22 Rodger, Transformation, 26, 57, 59.
23 Rodger, Transformation, 111-113 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 509-510.
This latter change was partly due to the influence of the reformed Town Council within Heriot’s management, and it will be considered again when the thesis examines the relationship between local government and philanthropy. It is worth noting here, however, that the expansion of the new Foundation School system changed the environment in which Edinburgh’s other charities operated. The managers of St Mary’s Parish School\(^{24}\) complained about the Foundation Schools’ provision of free education. They claimed that this undercut their own efforts by creating a sense of entitlement among the poor that encouraged their pupils to withhold fees.\(^{25}\)

Alternative income sources meant that endowed charities did not have to appeal to the public in the same way as subscriber democracies, but Edinburgh’s hospital schools regularly advertised when their managers wanted to purchase supplies, had employment vacancies, or had land that they wished to feu.\(^{26}\) Dublin’s endowed charities were fewer, less wealthy, and generally kept a lower profile, but they were not completely absent and they too sometimes allowed established elites to influence the philanthropic environment in the city whether through the provision of charitable services or the employment of teachers and doctors.\(^{27}\) Charities’ rules and structures provided a way through which past attitudes about urban governance continued to influence nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh. Contemporary criticism of ‘older’ charitable forms indicated that these organisations and the principles on which they were based remained important, influencing debates on philanthropy.\(^{28}\) Those condemning ‘older’ enclosed institutions in Edinburgh, for example, presented ‘newer’ subscriber democracies as better alternatives.\(^{29}\)

\(^{24}\) See chapter three.

\(^{25}\) National Records of Scotland (hereafter NRS), CH2/139/33 St Mary’s School Minutes 1828-1849, ‘Meeting of the Directors of St Mary’s School’, 25 February 1845, 284-288.

\(^{26}\) Based on search of \(EEC\) for 1824 and on a search for ‘Heriot’s Hospital’ in \(CM\) from 1815-1828 on 19\(^{th}\) Century British Library Newspapers database: Of the seventy-seven references to Heriot’s Hospital in the \(Mercury\) for these dates thirty-nine related to Heriot’s role as a property holder.

\(^{27}\) See 1845 \(Thom’s\) and the sketch of Dublin’s charitable activity in Poorer Ireland \(C\).

\(^{28}\) Gorsky, \(Patterns\), 66-67, 74-75, 85, Morris, \(Class, Sect\), 169-170.

Table 6:
Charitable trusts operating in Edinburgh in 1845.

George Heriot’s Hospital.
George Watson’s Hospital.
John Watson’s Institution.
The Maiden Hospital Founded by the Craftsmen of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine (Trades’ Maiden).
The Maiden Hospital, Founded by the Company of Merchants of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine (Merchant Maiden).
Trinity Hospital.
James Gillespie’s Hospital and Free School.
Donaldson’s Hospital.
Chalmers’ Hospital.
Mortification by the late Joseph Thomson Nortonhall of Eildon.
Craigcrook Mortification.

Sources:  Rodger, *Transformation*, 1845 Oliver and Boyd, The Edinburgh Almanack, and Universal Scots and Imperial Register for 1825 (Edinburgh, 1825), Law, Education, Statutes of the Maiden Hospital Founded by the Company of Merchants of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine, Rules and Constitutions of the Maiden Hospital founded by the Craftsmen of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine (Edinburgh, 1814), *The New Picture of Edinburgh for 1816, being a Correct Guide to the Curiosities...* (Edinburgh, 1816).

Table 7:
Charitable trusts operating in Dublin in 1845.

Erasmus Smith’s Schools.
Netterville Charities.
Netterville General Dispensary.
Pleasants’ Asylum.
St. Patrick’s (Swift’s) Hospital.
Trustees of the Charities of the Late Dr Sterne, Bishop of Clogher.

Sources: 1845 Thom’s.

Thinking about the organisations as part of a spectrum helps to demonstrate that it was not just a case of endowed charity versus subscriber democracy, there were philanthropic institutions in each city that shared features of both. These ‘hybrid’ organisations included medical, overt reform, missionary, and educational institutions. They also varied among themselves in terms of the openness of their management structures, but it is helpful to distinguish two types:

The first group were organisations where membership required payment of a minimum subscription and adherence to the association’s views but where further restrictions also applied. As in many elite social clubs, new members frequently needed to be approved by existing members. Theoretically at least this created a more

30 Though he argued for the novelty of subscriber democracies, Dalgleish did recognise some diversity among older charities, Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 64.
tightly-controlled organisation than a subscriber democracy, while providing more opportunities for new individuals to get involved than a standard endowed charity.\textsuperscript{31} Methods for approving new members varied, but it was often by ballot, increasing the ease with which applicants could be excluded. This kind of charity operated in both cities and included the Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting Knowledge of the Christian Religion (ADV) founded in Dublin in 1792. The ADV had an Anglican ethos and a management dominated by higher Church of Ireland clergy. Fifteen members had to be present at a new member’s election and one rejection in seven votes led to the candidate’s exclusion.\textsuperscript{32} This group also included the Incorporated Society for Promoting English Protestant Schools in Ireland (Charter Schools) whose members had to be Protestant donors and were only admitted at general meetings.\textsuperscript{33}

This form of organisation seems to have been particularly common in Edinburgh and included the Church of Scotland-affiliated Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge (SSPCK), founded in 1709, and the Edinburgh Orphan Hospital and Workhouse founded in 1733.\textsuperscript{34} Some later eighteenth-century foundations also fit into this category including the Edinburgh Magdalene Asylum (founded 1797) and the Edinburgh Destitute Sick Society (founded 1785).\textsuperscript{35} These organisations indicate how estimating the practical ‘openness’ of membership can be difficult. The Destitute Sick Society required members to pay a lower subscription

\textsuperscript{32} Whelan, \textit{Bible}, 55-57, 79-80, 93, \textit{1824 Treble Almanack}, 189-190, \textit{Laws of the Association for Discountenancing Vice, and Promoting Knowledge and Practice of Religion and Virtue} (Dublin, 1796), 4-6.
\textsuperscript{33} The Third Report of the Commissioners for Enquiring into the State of all Schools on Public or Charitable Foundations in Ireland, in 1809 (142) (Ireland.) \textit{Reports, Presented to the House of Commons, from the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland. I. Free Schools of Royal Foundation. II. Schools of Navan and Ballyroan, of Private Foundation. III. The Protestant Charter Schools} (n.p., 1809), 16-21.
\textsuperscript{34} An Abridgement of the Statutes and Rules of the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge (Edinburgh, 1732), 6-8, \textit{Statutes of the Corporation of the Orphan Hospital and Workhouse at Edinburgh. To which is Prefixed An Account of the Said Hospital...} (Edinburgh, 1777), 9-10.
\textsuperscript{35} See Table III in appendix.
than many subscriber democracies, yet it imposed a membership veto on new members with the potential to exclude many who could afford to pay.\textsuperscript{36}

The Magdalene Asylum required new members be approved by three-quarters of a general meeting and a ballot could be held on their admission at the request of just one member. In practice, ballots were not demanded, but it is not clear if this was because new members were always welcomed or because no one risked nominating anyone unless they were certain that they would be accepted.\textsuperscript{37} The latter is more likely since new members were rarely nominated. No one was proposed for membership in 1836, for example.\textsuperscript{38} The institution published annual reports but overall it was criticised for failing to communicate extensively with the wider public.\textsuperscript{39} In 1839, during a public meeting for the Edinburgh Lock Hospital which discussed the need to increase co-operation with the Magdalene Asylum, a subscriber to the latter complained about its inward-looking nature. He said that ‘he had watched anxiously for a public meeting, but never heard of one taking place.’\textsuperscript{40} His comments indicate how charities with ‘older’ institutional forms were the subject of public debates in this period. These debates were part of ongoing discussions about the legitimacy of different forms of urban governance.

There was a second group of hybrid charities in which subscribers’ access to management was limited to a much greater extent than in a standard subscriber democracy. Sir Patrick Dun’s Hospital in Dublin was established as the training Hospital for the K&QCPI. It was intended to be funded entirely by a bequest, but even before it opened it became clear that this would not prove sufficient and attempts


\textsuperscript{38}These conclusions were drawn from a search of the Edinburgh Magdalene Asylum Minutes for 1824, 1836 and 1845 ECA, Edinburgh Magdalene Asylum Directors and Sub-Committee Minute Books (hereafter EMA Minutes) SL237/1/2 January 1808-September 1825, SL237/1/3 October 1825-July 1838, SL237/1/4 July 1838-July 1849. See also the list of members elected since 1797 that was recorded in the minutes of the annual meeting held 15 December 1845, EMA Minutes 1838-1845, 328-331.

\textsuperscript{39}Report of the Edinburgh Magdalene Asylum for 1829 (Edinburgh, 1829). The attendance at the Annual meetings of the Society was nineteen (for 1815), fourteen (1816), ten (1824), EMA Minutes 1808-1825, 10 January 1815, 235, 5 January 1816, 258, 13 January 1824, 334, nine (1836), 1 December 1836 EMA Minutes 1825-1838, 439, sixteen (1845) 15 December 1845, EMA Minutes 1838-1845, 327.

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Scotsman} 9 January 1839.
were made to tap other income sources including subscriptions. Donors paying the relatively high subscriptions of either £10 a year or £100 in one donation were eligible to become governors but only twelve out of twenty-two places on the Hospital’s management were reserved for them. All of the other managers held their positions \textit{ex-officio}, most were K&QCPI officeholders or members of central state bodies, and they alone had the power to choose the board of management for the subsequent year.\footnote{The Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of the King’s Bench, the Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, the President, Vice-President, and Censors of K&QCPI, and the Provost of TCD, \textit{1824 Treble Almanack}, 208, \textit{Poorer Ireland C}, 75-76.} Between 1815 and 1823, the \textit{ex-officio} managers were prepared to disregard this and the board was chosen by the whole body of governors but the practice had to be ended when it was discovered that this was illegal. Formal structures mattered, they sometimes restricted the ways in which managers interacted with subscribers or the public, even when most of the managers wanted to be more open.\footnote{Royal College of Physicians of Ireland Heritage Centre (RCPIH), Sir Patrick Dun’s Hospital, PDH/1/2/1/1 Minute Book, Volume 2, 8 January 1822-13 February 1838, 4 May 1824, 18-22, 7 June 1825, 32-34.}

The RI allowed subscribers to play a greater role in its administration than Dun’s since anyone subscribing above (an admittedly substantial) £5 could become a member of the Incorporation. They could sit on its Court of Contributors which had the power to make general rules for the hospital and receive reports from its management.\footnote{Charter of the Royal’, 37-42, A. Logan Turner, \textit{Story of a Great Hospital, The Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh 1729-1929} (Edinburgh, 1987), 72-73.} The management itself, however, remained relatively closed as most governors held their positions \textit{ex-officio} and the board of management elected its own successors. As one of Edinburgh’s largest philanthropic institutions and its main medical charity, the Infirmary was the subject of intense public interest, which as will be seen, revealed much about wider debates on the nature of authority in the city.

The Edinburgh-based Orkney and Zetland Charitable Society was also part of this second group of hybrid charities. Established in 1822, it aided Northern Islanders resident in the capital. Subscription entitled one to membership but its management was restricted to natives of the two island groups.\footnote{Report of the Orkney and Zetland Charitable Society.} It was one of an increasing number of charities with a regional focus founded in Edinburgh in this period including the
Edinburgh Caithness Association (1838) and the Edinburgh Upper-Ward of Lanarkshire Association (1840). They often supported charitable activity in their chosen region rather than in Edinburgh itself and were a response to increased migration to the city from the rest of Scotland. They were an attempt to aid migrants who fell on hard times but were ineligible for relief from Edinburgh’s Poor Law institutions. At a meeting of the Edinburgh Aberdeenshire Club, the Earl of Erroll argued:

> It was much to be wished, he stated, that every other county in Scotland had an association in Edinburgh for charitable purposes of this nature, as, by such means, the destitute would be provided for among their friends, or by the parishes on which they had a legal claim, on the one hand; and, on the other, this metropolis would be relieved of the great mass of pauper strangers with which it was over-burdened.

Such organisations provided another way of coping with Edinburgh’s increasingly diverse society. They also suggest that local autonomy and regional identity were more significant in Scotland than in Ireland as there were no equivalents in Dublin. However, given that capital cities by their nature tend to attract migrants, these charities allowed Edinburgh to partially abdicate its metropolitan role, something at odds with Edinburgh’s image as a self-confident capital city.

By emphasising geographical origin, these organisations represented a dilution of subscriber democracy’s meritocratic elements. Yet they were not divisive, the *Scotsman*, for example, generally commented positively on their work. By contrast, charities such as the Adelaide Hospital that were designed to aid Protestants only, were founded in Dublin from the 1820s onwards and represented a further polarisation of Dublin society. Older Dublin charities such as the Charter Schools had restricted entry to its management to Protestants only, but few of the city’s subscriber democracies had any specified confessional requirements in their membership, even if they were dominated by one religious group in practice. The advent of these newer Protestant-only charities, which otherwise had relatively open structures, represented a reaction
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45 Oliver and Boyd.
46 *Scotsman* 3 March 1831.
47 See chapter seven.
48 *Scotsman* 12 March 1834, see also *Scotsman* 24 January 1829, 12 October 1842, 27 March 1847.
against the improving status of Catholics in Dublin and the threat that conservative
Protestants thought this posed to both their spiritual independence and social
privileges.\footnote{See chapter six.}

Charities with this second type of hybrid structure were of course quite similar
to subscriber democracies that had large numbers of \textit{ex-officio} governors. The EBS,
for example, allowed all members who were clergy to attend and vote at meetings of its
managing committee. The Dublin Mendicity Institution, perhaps in an effort to add
legitimacy to its anti-street-begging objectives named numerous local and national
officeholders as \textit{ex-officio} governors including:

\begin{quote}
the Lord Mayor, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Lord Chancellor, the twelve Judges, the
Master of the Rolls, [the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and his coadjutor
bishop] the most Reverend Doctors Troy and Murray, and their successors, the Chief
Secretary and the Under Secretary in the Civil Department to the Lord Lieutenant, the
Representatives in Parliament for the County and City of Dublin, His Majesty’s
Attorney and Solicitor General, the Provost of Trinity College, the Deans of Christ
Church and Saint Patrick’s, the Archdeacon of Dublin, the Aldermen, Recorder, and
\end{quote}

Yet there were still significant differences. By electing the rest of their governors at
their annual meetings, subscriber democracies appeared more open in principle,
allowing them to more easily represent themselves as responsive to all subscribers.

Most types of organisation existed in each city, although ‘older’ management
structures appear to have been somewhat more common in Edinburgh (see Tables III
and IV in the appendix\footnote{These tables just provide a starting point for analysing the diversity in each city and only include a
small selection of charities.}). The Edinburgh Charity Workhouse, which as a Poor Law
institution does not entirely fit into the spectrum of organisations examined here, had a
corporate administrative structure. Its management included representatives of the
‘Faculty of Advocates, the Church of Scotland Kirk Sessions, the Episcopal Clergy, the
College of Physicians, the Merchant’s Guild, and the Trades’ Corporations.’\footnote{\textit{Regulations for the Charity Work-House or Hospital of Edinburgh} (Edinburgh, 1750), 3-7. The Town
Council took over the institution in 1843, its management changed again in 1845 under the new Poor
Club}, 22 (1938), 54-55.} This
resembled the city’s endowed charities, and again indicates the continued significance of ‘older’ kinds of representation in that city. By contrast, some of Dublin’s oldest charities were subscriber democracies. By the 1820s, two of the oldest hospitals, the Charitable Infirmary, Jervis-street and Mercer’s Hospital were virtually controlled by their subscribers. Mercer’s had been founded by the will of Mary Mercer in 1724 but it also received subscriptions. It had three *ex-officio* governors, but these were rarely involved in the Hospital’s management, instead the administration was almost completely in the hands of the subscribers even though they contributed a relatively low proportion of its income.\(^{53}\) In spite of these contrasts, we cannot simply conclude that Edinburgh was a more ‘closed’ society than Dublin. Proposing such a bald dichotomy ignores how ‘openness’ was determined by many factors including variation in subscriber democracies’ membership conditions, differences in the nature of charities’ interactions with the public, and each city’s broader authority structures.

As well as recognising variation between subscriber democracies and other types of charities, diversity among subscriber democracies must also be considered. For example, minimum annual subscription rates varied significantly in each city. The Edinburgh New Town Dispensary allowed those donating ten shillings to join, while the Edinburgh Institution for the Education of Deaf and Dumb charged one guinea.\(^{54}\) In Dublin, one could become a member of the Charitable Association for four shillings and four pence per year.\(^{55}\) As Dalgleish argued, the relatively low minimum subscription charged by Edinburgh’s Bible societies helped these organisations to build solidarities among different status groups within the middle class and beyond.\(^{56}\) He claimed they were able to charge these lower subscriptions because they had much lower costs than ‘educational, medical and policing charities’, but subscription levels were determined by more than an organisation’s function. Institutions for example, might set their minimum subscription to resemble those of other, similar charities.

\(^{53}\) *Poorer Ireland C*, 93-95, 60a.

\(^{54}\) The subscription-level seems to be generally given in British pound sterling and should be comparable between the cities, however this is not always clear and hence comparison must be made with caution.

\(^{55}\) See appendix.

\(^{56}\) Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 154-161. Lower donations which brought no privileges, might be accepted.
because a social expectation developed about what these levels should be. In both cities, deaf and mute children were educated in high-cost residential charitable institutions. The minimum membership subscriptions for each was a relatively substantial one guinea per year. Yet by their nature, both cities ‘Deaf and Dumb Institutions’ were able to sustain a high level of communication with the public. Both published annual reports and both held public meetings at which the educational progress of their pupils was displayed, and this was then further publicised through accounts in the newspaper press. Both organisations attributed a social meaning to the size of the financial contributions they received by having a graduated scale of subscription levels linked with increasing privileges. This scale allowed a range of social groups to be involved while still roughly reflecting hierarchies based on wealth and status and indicated that the cost of the charities’ services was only one factor in determining the minimum subscription requested.

An organisation’s geographical focus within the city was also significant. Charities with an intense local focus often had to charge lower subscriptions to ensure that they had sufficient personnel to carry out their work, in the process they signalled a willingness to allow those of lower status to participate. The minimum subscription level for membership of the Leith Walk Auxiliary Bible Society was a half penny per week. The Dublin-based Roomkeepers’ Society operated quite a sophisticated system for responding to applications. It divided the city into four districts, each of which required a team of inspectors to assess claims. Membership of this Society was secured by paying just eight shillings eight pence per annum or two pence per week, allowing most of its inspector positions to be filled primarily by ‘tradesmen.’ By contrast, when

57 Morton, Unionist Nationalism, 110-113.
58 See below for information on missionary associations, A Short Account of the Institution for the Education of Deaf and Dumb Children of the Poor Established on the 25th June 1810. Under the Care and Tuition of Mr Robert Kinniburgh. (Edinburgh, 1814), Scotsman 3 July 1839, Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 91, Third Report of the National Institution for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb. Established in Dublin, May 18, 1816. (Dublin, 1819), FJ 21 February 1820.
59 See chapter six for more on how charities’ relationships with issues of class, status, and occupational difference.
61 Poorer Ireland C, 1-3, 5, 9.
the higher subscription Dublin Mendicity Association attempted to establish a similar, though more ambitious district-focused scheme it failed, as it could not maintain a sufficient number of active members to keep the system functioning.\textsuperscript{62}

The central state intervened directly in a small number of Dublin charities producing another kind of management structure as seen in the Westmoreland Lock Hospital, which treated syphilitic women, and the Dublin House of Industry. The latter began as a workhouse-like institution in 1773 designed to relieve the unemployed and punish beggars; by 1820, it had developed into a large institutional complex that included several hospitals and asylums.\textsuperscript{63} These charities were almost completely dependent on state funds by 1815, and Dublin Castle selected their boards of management. The Castle administration maintained a particularly close relationship with the House of Industry, frequently communicating with it about its activities.\textsuperscript{64} Like charitable trusts, these institutions provided limited openings for new individuals to become involved in their administration and they did not need to encourage the same kind of middle-class response as subscriber democracies. The House of Industry made some efforts to communicate with the wider world. As well as advertisements requesting supplies, the institution worked to ensure that its new services were well publicised. In 1820 it advertised its new institution for the treatment of hernia sufferers in the provincial press as well as in Dublin newspapers. In 1827 it opened the Talbot Dispensary to treat the poor in the North West of the city and publicised this by distributing handbills throughout the district served.\textsuperscript{65} The institution made a great effort to reach the poor and may have put relief recipients at the centre of their

\textsuperscript{62}Woods, \textit{Dublin Outsiders}, 33-34, \textit{Suggestions for District Committees. Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin} (Dublin, [1819?]).

\textsuperscript{63}1830 (7) \textit{Charitable Institutions, Dublin. Copy of a Letter from the Right Honourable Lord Francis Leveson Gower, Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to the Commissioners Appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to Report on Certain Charitable Institutions in the City of Dublin...} (n.p., 1830), 66-68, for the House of Industry's development see J.D.H. Widdess, \textit{The Richmond, Whitworth and Hardwicke Hospitals, St. Laurence’s Dublin. 1772-1972} (Dublin, 1972), especially 9-20, 31-36, 43-56, 73-85.

\textsuperscript{64}1828 (176) \textit{House of Industry, and Foundling Hospital, Dublin. Accounts of the Period when First Established; their Object...} (n.p., 1828), 3, 1830 (7) \textit{Charitable Institutions, Dublin}, 71.

\textsuperscript{65}National Archives of Ireland (hereafter NAI) BR/2006/86 Box 8, Board of Governors Minutes House of Industry 1819-1820, 14 April 1820 244-245, 247-248, \textit{HJ} 15 June 1827, 27 September 1827, 5 November 1827.
activities to a greater extent than many of Dublin’s other charities, which often focused more on winning middle-class approval.

A level of insulation from donors’ opinions allowed heavily state-aided charities to pursue controversial ventures more easily than subscriber democracies. In Dublin the treatment of poor syphilitic patients, an unpopular cause, was undertaken mainly by state-funded hospitals. Despite contemporary fears, lower subscriber control did not necessarily lead to poorer service provision though, as will be seen, it had other adverse social effects. In fact central state interference was sometimes prompted by public opinion or wider social change. Dublin’s charities struggled to cope during the post-Napoleonic crisis. The House of Industry was criticised for overspending and overcrowding produced disturbances within the House. The government responded to this by restructuring the Institution’s management to reduce costs. It replaced the House’s board of (paid) governors with one (paid) governor and seven (unpaid) visitors. The government also made the institution prioritise medical treatment and care for incurable ‘lunatics’ and ‘the aged and infirm’ above its other functions.

Government control of the House of Industry enabled it to respond to Catholics’ interests. The institution possessed both Catholic and Anglican chaplains from its earliest days. Similarly, the influence of a reforming Whig government enabled Catholic medic Dominic Corrigan to gain a position at the House’s prestigious hospitals in 1840. Until then, despite his fame, Corrigan had been working at the surgeon-dominated Charitable Infirmary where, as a physician, he had few research opportunities. Direct government interference therefore occasionally provided a way to cut through engrained social prejudices in Dublin. The House of Industry and Lock Hospital were, however, special cases as they received a much greater proportion of

66. i.e. the Westmoreland Lock Hospital and the House of Industry Hospitals (the Richmond) The only other hospital with a venereal disease ward (Dr Steevens’s [sic] Hospital) received its income primarily from the state and from endowments 1854 (338) Report from the Select Committee, 4, 28.
67. See chapter four.
68. Prunty, Dublin Slums, 203.
69. 1828 (176) House of Industry, and Foundling Hospital, Dublin, 3, 1820 (84) (Ireland.) Report of the Commissioners Appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to Inspect the House of Industry...(n.p., 1820), 4-5, Widdess, Richmond, 73-77.
their income from government than the city’s other grant-assisted institutions. Such overt central state interference was absent in Edinburgh though local government intervention was more common there.

On balance, however, a similar variety of organisational types operated in each city as can be seen from Tables III and IV in the appendix, which include just a fraction of the total number of philanthropic institutions active in each in the 1820s. This variety was partly a reflection of the cities’ social complexity and diversity. Indeed, as well as these city-focused and nationally-focused philanthropic organisations, there were parochial charities operating in each. These institutions provide a way through denominational authority can be assessed and they will be chapter three’s main focus.

II.

Medical philanthropy differed from other contemporary charitable endeavours. A need for suitable premises and specialised equipment often made general hospitals more costly to establish and administer than poor relief organisations or Bible societies. Marland argued that hospitals’ more substantial financial demands produced distinctive social effects. She indicated that medical charities united Huddersfield and Wakefield’s religiously-divided elites to a much greater extent than other charities because they maintained a message that appealed to all denominations as they could not afford to alienate any potential donors. Hospitals were multifaceted institutions designed to train medical students as well as to treat the sick poor; subscribers, patients, lay managers and medical practitioners all influenced their activities. It might be expected that higher costs would limit hospitals’ social impact by encouraging such institutions to rely on the very rich. In practice hospitals’ large

---

71 See chapter four.
72 See Tables III and IV in the appendix and chapter five.
74 Marland, Medicine, 144-145, 327-330.
75 See chapter six for how medical practitioners’ professional interests shaped medical charity.
resources enhanced their perceived social significance making them an important focus for debates on philanthropy and urban governance in Dublin and Edinburgh.\(^{76}\)

Founded in 1729, the RI’s management structures had been laid down in its Charter of 1736 and remained unchanged until the later nineteenth century.\(^{77}\) A hybrid organisation, it was dominated by members of Edinburgh’s established authorities including the Lord Provost, the President of the RCPEd., and representatives of the Faculty of Advocates.\(^{78}\) (See Table 8 below). Only six out of twenty places on the board of management were reserved for subscribers and the board had the power to choose its own successors.\(^{79}\) The board of managers chose twelve of their number to be ordinary managers who managed the hospital’s day-to-day affairs.\(^{80}\) The Infirmary’s connection with wider authority structures was enhanced by the dominant position it had developed within the city’s medical infrastructure by 1815. There were some specialist hospitals in the city but the RI dominated general hospital care. Apart from the small Casualty Hospital opened in Leith in 1837, the only other comparable hospital was the Surgical Hospital founded by James Syme in 1829 but even this was much smaller than the RI and relatively short-lived.\(^{81}\) Attempts to establish an infirmary to rival the RI in the 1820s failed.\(^{82}\) By contrast in Dublin there were at least ten charitable general hospitals of varying sizes operating by 1845. In fact, the establishment of such institutions was relatively common in nineteenth-century Dublin. The Adelaide, St Vincent’s, the City of Dublin Hospital Baggot-street, and the Whitworth Chronic Hospital were all founded between 1815 and 1845, providing an increasing number of choices for subscribers.\(^{83}\)

---

\(^{76}\) It will be seen that this was particularly the case for the RI, for Bristol see Gorsky, *Patterns*, 198-200

\(^{77}\) Logan Turner, *Great Hospital*, 74-75.

\(^{78}\) Charter of the Royal’, 37-42.

\(^{79}\) Charter of the Royal’, 39-40, a change was introduced in 1840 allowing contributors to nominate their six representatives see below.

\(^{80}\) Logan Turner, *Great Hospital*, 61-65.

\(^{81}\) See chapter six, for the Casualty Hospital see David H. Boyd, *Leith Hospital 1848-1988* (Edinburgh, 1990), 8.

\(^{82}\) See chapter five.

\(^{83}\) *1845 Thom’s*, 657-703 for the bed capacity of Dublin’s hospitals and a comparison with the RI see ‘Appendix, No. 2: A Plan for the Consolidation of the Dublin Hospitals’, in 1856 [2063] *Report of the
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Table 8:
Royal Infirmary managers for 1841 (and their representative status).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Right Honourable Sir James Forrest of Comiston, (Lord Provost of Edinburgh).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or in his absence the Dean of Guild).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deacon Convener of Trades Scott.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Graham (President of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh (RCPEd.)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or in his absence the Vice President of the RCPEd).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Hope (Member of RCPEd.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Alison (Member of RCPEd.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr MacWhirter (Member of RCPEd.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christison (Member of RCPEd.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Monro (Professor of Anatomy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Gillespie (Member of Royal College of Surgeons Edinburgh (RCSEd.).)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Hunter (Member of RCSEd.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Hon. Charles Hope (Lord President of the Court of Session).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Hon. Sir Wm Rae Bart MP (One of the Members of the Faculty of Advocates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Henry Jardine (One of the Members of the Society of Writers to the Signet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd. Dr Brunton (One of the Ministers of Edinburgh).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Forbes Esq Banker (One of the six Contributors recommended by the General Court).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James MacKay Esq Jeweller (One of the six Contributors recommended by the General Court).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mitchell Innes Esq of Parson's Green (One of the six Contributors recommended by the General Court).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McKenzie Esq WS (One of the six Contributors recommended by the General Court).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McLaren Esq Merchant (One of the six Contributors recommended by the General Court).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Swinton Esq (One of the six Contributors recommended by the General Court).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RI Minutes 1838-1842, 4 January 1841, 408.

The RI's dominant position made it the focal point for debate on medical charity and on Edinburgh society more generally. The hospital’s Court of Contributors only met once a year but these meetings were lengthy affairs sometimes held over several days. The Court’s proceedings were often reported in the newspaper press. In 1817, junior

---

81 Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Hospitals of Dublin. With Appendices (Dublin, 1856), 22-24, 26, 28, 31-35.

82 For example Scotsman, 7 December 1833, 26 November 1834, 8 March 1837, Report by the Lord Provost’s Committee, to the Town Council, Regarding the Royal Infirmary... (Edinburgh, 1837), Remarks by the Managers of the Royal Infirmary, upon Report Approved and Circulated by the Magistrates and Council of the City of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, [1837]).

83 Scotsman 9 January 1819, 13 February 1819, 8 January, 1823, 3 January 1838, 8 January 1840, Report Respecting the Affairs and Management of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh for the Period from 1st October 1836 to 1st October 1837 (Edinburgh, [1837?]), 7-10, for a decision to hold the Court of Contributors behind closed doors in 1818 see Lothian Health Services Archive (hereafter LHSA) LHB1 1 Royal Infirmary Minutes 9 January 1819-August 1824 (hereafter RI Minutes 1819-1824), 2 March 1818, 194-197.
medical staff made complaints about the standard of patient care at the Infirmary. This became public and resulted in an inquiry into the alleged abuses. Although this investigation cleared the Infirmary’s managers of misconduct, the controversy fuelled a debate about the hospital’s governance that lasted for over two decades. Critics argued that the Infirmary’s restrictive administrative structures made it liable to corruption.

The *Scotsman* gave the subject sustained attention and numerous pamphlets were published on the issue. Critics highlighted specific problems with the institution’s day-to-day administration, but they also discussed the principles on which they felt hospital administration in general should be based. They argued that those contributing to the Infirmary were entitled to manage it, and favourably cited examples from Glasgow, Manchester, and London where subscribers controlled the hospitals that they supported. The *Scotsman* argued that even if introducing ward visitors prevented abuses at the Infirmary, contributors were still entitled to manage the institution by virtue of their donations. Censure of this charity reflected more general contemporary criticism of middling groups’ exclusion from positions of authority.

The scandal encouraged those who had previously shown little interest in the institution to subscribe and become members of the Court of Contributors. The Hospital’s managers complained that:

> A set of Gentlemen, many of them of distinguished talents and high respectability...[became] Members of this Incorporation...[in order] to...investigate a management with which they had hitherto had no concern.  

This suggests that they were primarily interested in open management as a matter of principle rather than the details of the hospital’s administration. For them it was not merely about the abuses, it was about power relations in society and the factors that entitled one to participate in that society’s governance. The idea that the RI should be
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86 Logan Turner, *Great Hospital*, 200-202. For example, the *Scotsman* referred to these issues at least eighteen times between September 1817 and December 1818: search for ‘Royal Infirmary’ in *Scotsman* using the ProQuest Historical Scotsman. Pamphlets included *Letter to the General Contributors of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh: Containing Observations on the Minutes of Evidence...*(Edinburgh, 1818), *A Second Letter to the General Contributors of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh: Containing Remarks at the Meeting Held on the 30th March 1815...*(Edinburgh, 1818). For continuation of the debate into the 1830s see *Scotsman* 28 December 1831, 23 January 1833 and chapter five.

87 For example *Scotsman* 18 April 1818, 16 January 1819, 28 January 1819, 8 December 1820, 29 January 1823, 7 January 1824, 17 January 1824, see also *Report of the Lord Provost’s Committee to the Town Council Regarding the Royal Infirmary*, see also *Scotsman* 11 June 1825, 9 January 1828, 21 February 1829, 31 December 1835.

88 LHSA LHB1 1 Royal Infirmary Minutes 8 December 1813-December 1818, 7 March 1818, 214-215.
managed by its subscribers continued to be articulated by the Infirmary’s critics until the 1830s at least.

The RI’s managers were certainly prepared to restrict communication with the public and they blocked attempts to publish the results of their investigations into the 1817 scandal by entering their report in Stationers’ Hall. Although they appealed to the wider public, the managers approach to funding reveals much about their social priorities and the enclosed nature of the institution. They often first tried to deal with financial problems through personal networks. In July 1828, for example, they responded to growing funding issues by appealing to the Duke of Buccleuch and other Scottish nobles. Appealing to wealthy, high-status people presumably made financial sense but it also showed the managers desire to recognise existing social hierarchies. Similarly in 1833 the managers drew up an alphabetical list of contributions to check which of their ‘friends’ were not subscribing so that they could personally ask them to do so.

Critics claimed that the hospital’s managers were withholding information about the institution’s investment income and were attempting to make it dependent on such funds so that they would not have to rely on subscribers. St Mary’s kirk session were so concerned about these allegations that they demanded to see details of the RI’s stock holdings before they considered making a collection for the hospital.

Unease about the hospital’s closed nature were voiced by other official bodies. In 1839 members of Edinburgh Town Council claimed that

The middle class of the Community of Edinburgh complain that they have not heretofore been properly represented in the Management, and on this account do not contribute so generally as they would otherwise do.

89 RI Minutes 1813-1818, 15 April 1818, 246, 20 April 1818, 247. The contributors did not always champion wider public engagement, during the above debates the Court agreed to hold its proceedings behind closed doors and contributors had to apply for tickets, RI Minutes 1813-1818, 2 March 1818, 194-197.


92 Scotsman 7 January 1824.

93 NRS CH2/139/1 St Mary’s Kirk Session Minutes 1825-1843, 19 November 1826, 15-16.

94 LHSALHB1 1 Royal Infirmary Minutes 12 January 1838-January 1842, 30 December 1839, 277-278, for more see chapters five and six.
As a result of these concerns the Court of Contributors were allowed to nominate the six subscriber representatives on the managing committee and it was agreed that three of these six would always be chosen as ordinary managers.\textsuperscript{95}

In practice, these changes to the RI only marginally opened up the institution’s management to broader middle-class involvement, though they were of significant symbolic importance and were welcomed by the Court of Contributors. The first three ordinary managers elected from the contributors’ list in 1841 were Duncan McLaren, Esq., Merchant, William Mitchell Innes of Parsons Green, and James Mackay, Esq., Jeweller.\textsuperscript{96} The selection of McLaren, a future Liberal MP, suggests the change provided some representation for political views beyond an elite Whig-Tory dichotomy.\textsuperscript{97} However, the other two representatives appear to have been high-profile individuals. William Mitchell Innes of Parson’s Green was a Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and a director of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland.\textsuperscript{98} James MacKay had already served as Infirmary manager before the change. The charter was not altered and the administration remained a corporate structure with the same established groups represented. Even the managers chosen by occupational bodies, tended to be high-profile. In 1841 the Faculty of Advocates was represented by Sir William Rae Bart MP, Lord Advocate for much of the period between 1815 and 1845.\textsuperscript{99}

The Charitable Infirmary, Jervis-street Dublin was founded about a decade before the RI but by 1820 it was governed according to a ‘newer’, more open institutional form. Subscribers of two guineas per year (or twenty guineas for life) were governors. They selected the hospital’s managing committee and its medical officers. Unlike most subscriber democracies where the annual meeting approved the next

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{95}Report by the Lord Provost’s Committee, 5-6, RI Minutes 1832-1842, 30 December 1839, 277-278, 18 December 1840, 382-383, 21 December 1840, 384-385.
\textsuperscript{96}RI Minutes 1832-1842, 4 January 1841, 406-409.
\textsuperscript{98}Scottsman 5 December 1840, 19 January 1842.
\end{footnotesize}
year’s managing committee openly, Jervis-street’s managers were chosen by ballot granting subscribers significantly more agency.\(^{100}\)

Examining the frequent disputes between the Charitable Infirmary’s medical officers and lay managers sheds light on issues of representation within the hospital and within wider Dublin society.\(^{101}\) In 1819, lay managers applied for and received a new charter that appropriated the power to elect medical officers from the Infirmary’s medics to themselves. This was a response to the medics’ blatant disregard for electoral rules; all but one of their appointments since December 1799 had been ‘invalid’.\(^ {102}\) Rules might be ignored for a significant time, but when detected such violations were taken seriously. Here, as in Edinburgh, formal structures mattered. Elections for Jervis-street’s managers and medical officers attracted large attendances, and printed lists of candidates were circulated to voters’ houses. The election of a large number of new individuals to the managing committee led one governor to call for an investigation as he claimed that several of those that had voted had not been qualified to do so.\(^ {103}\) His complaints did not change the result but it demonstrated that the elections were not a formality. Turnover on Jervis-street’s managing committee varied significantly from year to year. Between 1832 and 1841 the number of new names on the fifteen person committee compared with the previous year varied from none to ten.\(^{104}\)

Jervis-street also had a relatively diverse management from the 1820s onwards with Catholic Archbishop Daniel Murray sitting alongside conservative Protestant MP Thomas Ellis.\(^{105}\) Like the RI, Jervis-street’s managing committee included members of...
prestigious occupations such as barristers and police magistrates. Yet simply the fact that it is significantly easier to identify the RI’s managers suggests that those at Jervis-street were of lower status. Jervis-street had a reputation for welcoming the support of more humble individuals until the late 1830s at least. A speaker at a meeting of St Mary’s Parish in July 1839 complained that the hospital had recently reversed its policy of accepting subscriptions of as low as five shillings preventing ‘industrious parishioners’ to play a part in supporting it. Though Jervis-street allowed much greater subscriber involvement than the RI, these comments indicate that similar concerns about hospital administration influenced debates on charity in both cities, highlighting common values among some inhabitants of each.

Not all of Dublin’s hospitals provided subscribers with as much agency as Jervis-street, but the presence of so many hospitals in the city, and the relative ease with which they could be founded there, provided opportunities for a variety of people to participate in their administration. Dickson claimed that most of Dublin’s hospitals remained in Protestant hands in this period, but as Laurence M. Geary rightly pointed out, Catholics played a significant role in the management of the Charitable Infirmary. The founding of St Vincent’s Hospital in 1834 also provided opportunities for Catholics to become involved in medical philanthropy, while the establishment of the Adelaide Hospital in 1839 to serve Protestants only, indicated that the growing confessionalisation of Dublin’s associational culture spread to its hospitals to some extent.

The presence of at least some subscriber-managed general hospitals meant that altering such institutions’ management structures was a less urgent matter in Dublin than it was in Edinburgh. Those that wanted to donate to general hospitals had a much greater range of options in Dublin. Yet this was a period of medical reform throughout
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106 1845 Thom’s, 662, cross-checking names with A-Z Directory in same volume, examples include Sir Nicholas Fitzsimon, Sir J.P. Magistrate, Head Police Office, and Christopher Copinger, esq. Barrister.
107 R.J. Morris, ‘Qualitative to Quantitative by Way of Coding and Nominal Record Linkage. The Search for the British Middle Class’, History and Computing, 11 (No.1/2) (1999), 18. Jervis-street’s managers were much less likely to be unique names in 1845 Thom’s A-Z Directory than those of the RI in 1845 PO Directory. Of course, the fact that most of the RI’s managers held their position ex-officio made them easier to identify.
108 FJ 31 July 1839.
109 Dickson, Dublin, 313, Geary, Medicine, 18, 31.
the UK, issues of hospital administration were discussed in Dublin as they were elsewhere, and the Rotunda Lying-In Hospital came in for criticism.\textsuperscript{110} Subscribers had to contribute a very substantial 10\textpounds{} a year or 100\textpounds{} for life to qualify as a governor of the institution, and not all such contributors were able to become involved in management as the charter limited the number of governors to sixty including eleven appointed \textit{ex-officio}.\textsuperscript{111} Noting these limitations, a state inquiry suggested that the Hospital open up its management structures to allow greater subscriber participation.\textsuperscript{112} The issue did not receive extended attention in the Dublin press but the Hospital, along with the RI and many English institutions, was criticised for its lack of openness in the reforming medical journal \textit{The Lancet}.\textsuperscript{113} These hospitals were all the subject of a common debate about public participation in urban governance across the UK.

Medical dispensaries were also an important vehicle for such discussions. In 1818 the Edinburgh Public Dispensary, a subscriber democracy that had been founded in 1776, received a new charter. This charter increased the minimum membership subscription, reducing access to management. It also controversially introduced three \textit{ex-officio} managers representing established authorities: the Lord Provost, the president of the RCPEd. and the president of the RCSEd., into what had hitherto been a completely subscriber-managed institution.\textsuperscript{114} Similar issues arose when the New Town Dispensary was founded in 1815. Its opening was opposed by medics at the RI and the Public Dispensary. Professional rivalries and fear of occupational competition were no doubt central here, but the New Town Dispensary’s management structures were also criticised for being overly democratic because they gave

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{111} 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 5, 64.
\bibitem{112} 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 57, see chapter four.
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\end{thebibliography}
subscribers the right to elect managers and medical officers. As L. Stephen Jacyna argued, promotion of this type of management was linked with ‘Whig’ demands for greater public involvement in city administration more generally.\textsuperscript{115} The relative openness of charities’ management structures was an important and continuing source of contention in early nineteenth-century Edinburgh and formed a crucial part of the wider debate on middle-class participation in the city’s administration.

Dispensaries were also common in Ireland being part of a grand jury-aided system of ‘Medical Charities’ along with County Infirmaries and Fever Hospitals. 45 Geo. c.III enabled the formation of dispensaries funded by a combination of voluntary contributions and grand jury rates across Ireland.\textsuperscript{116} These dispensaries were the subject of intense debate in the 1830s and 1840s, and although the controversies focused mostly on rural institutions, the medical officers of Dublin’s charities contributed significantly to these disputes. In 1842 for example, the Dublin-based Corrigan conducted a survey of Irish medics’ opinions of the dispensary system with the intention of revealing a desire for reform throughout the country.\textsuperscript{117}

Though focused on the same basic issues of participation and governance, debates on dispensaries in Dublin took a somewhat different form to those in Edinburgh. Since 1818 Ireland’s partially grand-jury-funded dispensaries had been administered by subscribers of one guinea or more.\textsuperscript{118} Therefore, ensuring that donors controlled such institutions was not as urgent an issue for reformers in Dublin as it was in Edinburgh. Instead they looked at less formal barriers to involvement in the charities, with the religious affiliation of dispensary officers given particular attention.\textsuperscript{119} This contrast was enhanced by continued anti-Catholic prejudice which meant that gaining legal rights did not always lead to increased opportunities in practice, and so Catholics looked beyond merely altering formal rules to secure change. Debate on the

\textsuperscript{115}Henry Cockburn, \textit{Memorials of His Time} (Edinburgh, 1856), 268-269, Jacyna, \textit{Philosophic}; 25.

\textsuperscript{116}See Geary, \textit{Medicine}, for detailed discussion of the Irish Medical Charities system.

\textsuperscript{117}See the ninety questionnaires sent to Irish Dispensary Doctors RCPIH DC/3/3/2 Corrigan Papers Questionnaire to Dispensary Doctors January-February 1843. Geary, \textit{Medicine}, 170.

\textsuperscript{118}Geary, \textit{Medicine}, 63. It is not clear which, if any Dublin dispensaries were awarded Grand Jury presentments, though St Mary’s Dispensary definitely applied. Some of the city’s hospitals, however, were in receipt of such grants \textit{IF} 13 November 1840.

\textsuperscript{119}Geary, \textit{Medicine}, 177-180.
management of medical institutions in Dublin was shaped by a complex range of factors including religious and professional concerns, but, as in Edinburgh the issue of who controlled the charities remained significant as it was linked with wider debates about who was thought fit to govern.

III.

Formal structures mattered but their impacts were shaped by the multifaceted environments of both cities. This section analyses interactions between formal rules and the wider cultural milieu by examining missionary, Bible, and religious tract societies. While institutional Churches became more heavily involved in philanthropy in the 1830s and 1840s in both cities, many missionary and religious tract organisations maintained a subscriber democracy structure. These included the EBS, the EABS, the EAMS, the Sunday School Society for Ireland, and the Religious Tract and Book Society for Ireland. Edinburgh’s missionary societies maintained relatively low minimum subscription levels, often less than ten shillings per year. By contrast, Dublin’s missionary and Bible societies often charged more, with one guinea being the most common rate. This was partly a reflection of financial need, the lower number of potential Protestant donors necessitated higher individual contributions, but it also publicly advertised that the charities were less welcoming.

Of course, joining a subscriber democracy not only involved paying a membership fee, it also meant subscribing to the organisation’s goals. Missionary and Bible societies were established to promote religious ‘truth’ but members sometimes differed in their interpretation of that truth and on the actions necessary to promote it.
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120 See chapter six.


122 The subscription levels were set in the 1810s but generally remained unchanged for decades, Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 155, The Thirty-First Annual Report of Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools; with an Appendix... (Edinburgh, 1842), 2-3, Twentieth Report of the Edinburgh Bible Society, iv

123 See appendix.

In response, these organisations often publicly attempted to control their members’ views. The establishment of the CBS highlighted how even when trying to encourage membership, the managers of such organisations also tried to protect their vision of ‘truth’. Although subscription entitled one to membership, all Catholic Bishops in Ireland were guardians of the Society *ex-officio*.\(^{125}\) The CBS’s clerical founders purposely retained control over its initial formation in spite of practical difficulties caused by their lack of business experience. They wanted to prevent lay involvement:

> in order that the Society might be perfectly formed, and its system and plans be matured, before it would be subjected to the indiscriminate interference of the Public, by which the original intention might be frustrated.\(^{126}\)

This was not just a reflection of the doctrinaire nature of the Catholic Church, it highlighted a common response to the problems faced by missionary and religious education charities as they tried to attract members while also protecting ‘truth’. Some clerical managers championed subscriber democracy in other circumstances. The Catholic Archdeacon of Dublin, the Rev. John Hamilton was a strong promoter of Catholic missionary activity but when governor of Jervis-street Hospital he stoutly defended that Hospital’s open system of administration.\(^{127}\) Similarly, the Rev. Matthew Flanagan, the CBS’s first secretary, was heavily involved in subscriber-controlled interdenominational poor relief efforts in Dublin.\(^{128}\)

> These attempts to project one version of truth provoked conflict, yet they also helped to contain it. As Morris argued, establishing a variety of voluntary organisations, each reflecting different perspectives, provided a way of partially defusing tensions.\(^{129}\)

The creation of the EABS, although a result of religious conflict, also in some ways,

\(^{125}\) *First Report of the Catholic Book Society*, 5-8, also see appendix.
\(^{127}\) See chapter six, Mary Purcell, ‘Dublin Diocesan Archives-Hamilton Papers (1)’, *Archivium Hibernicum*, 43 (1988), 31.
\(^{129}\) Morris, *Class, Sect*, 173-175.
opened up Edinburgh’s associational culture to another viewpoint and enhanced subscribers’ options, and this was partly true for the CBS in Dublin as well.

Charities’ annual meetings put the associations on display. Reports were read, resolutions passed, and managing committees elected. These gatherings allowed missionary or Bible societies to communicate their religious message. However, they also allowed those outside the organisations’ management to criticise the charities’ work and hence damage as well as enhance their reputations. Perhaps in reaction to their minority position, Dublin’s Protestant missionary organisations seem to have put on a greater and more coordinated display than Edinburgh’s. Every year in the same week, several of these charities held their AGMs at Dublin’s Rotunda, the large assembly rooms owned by the Lying-in Hospital to which they gave their name. Sometimes referred to as meetings of the ‘national societies’, Protestant publications such as the Evening Mail reported on these gatherings collectively as well as individually. The meetings were elaborate affairs with clergy and other supporters speaking at length about the organisations’ work. Lord Roden, prominent Evangelical and Orange Order leader, chaired or spoke at some of them. The Dean of Ardagh presided at the 1836 anniversary meeting of the Irish Society, which was also addressed by several high-profile speakers including Henry Sirr, former Town Major of Dublin, and evangelical Congregationalist minister the Rev. William Urwick. The 1845 annual meeting of the Church Education Society for Ireland (CES) was addressed by the Anglican Archbishop of Tuam and by MP Frederick Shaw, Recorder of Dublin. For the Evening Mail, the meetings were a way of improving the moral character of the city and making Dublin a reforming influence throughout Ireland:

130 For a good example of this see Morris, ‘Voluntary Societies’, 102-103.
131 For example DEM 9 April 1824, David Stuart, Christian Anniversaries Contrasted with Jewish Festivals: a Sermon, Preached on Occasion of the Annual Meetings of the Principal National Societies of Ireland, for Propagating the Gospel at Home and Abroad... (Dublin, 1824).
It is consolatory to turn from the reflection of Seditious Meetings, Aggregate Meetings, and Meetings of Stock Jobbing Companies, to a consideration of those sublime subjects which have occupied the attention of the Christian public the last week. There have been reports, ascertaining the situation of the several Institutions in the Country; and it gives us sincere satisfaction to state, that they are all progressively improving, and widely extending.\textsuperscript{131}

The organisations’ critics in the \textit{Freeman’s Journal} on the other hand used the meetings to ridicule the charities:

\begin{quote}
 beyond the arithmetic are the sacred assemblies at the Rotunda in the week of jubilee, when fanaticism usurps the throne of fashion, and the waltzes and mazurkas of the gay give place to the more fantastic gambols of the godly....There are societies of every genus and species...The genius of another Linnaeus would be necessary to reduce the enterprises of our Dublin devotees to class and order\textsuperscript{136}
\end{quote}

Both supporters and critics responded to the meetings as a single phenomenon, a phenomenon that helped to enhance Dublin’s position as a capital of charity.

Edinburgh’s missionary societies adopted some similar tactics, they held their meetings in substantial venues such as the George-street Assembly Rooms, or in large churches and chapels such as Dr Peddie’s UAS Chapel Bristo-street which accommodated at least a thousand people.\textsuperscript{137} As in Dublin, the meetings often had a national focus. Organisations that were active in the Highlands and Islands, such as the Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools (Gaelic School Society), strongly emphasised national solidarity, promoting the idea that Edinburgh was the capital of Scottish philanthropy.\textsuperscript{138} Some Edinburgh organisations also scheduled their AGMs for around the same time of year. For example, in 1836, the SSPCK, the Scottish Bible Society (SBS), and the Scottish Missionary Society (SMS), all held their general meetings within one week of each other, possibly in order to coincide with the General Assembly.\textsuperscript{139} In Dublin, however, the associations chose their dates so that they would meet around the same time as each other not another event. In fact, the rules of

\textsuperscript{131}DEM 9 April 1824.
\textsuperscript{136}FJ 14 May 1833.
\textsuperscript{137}Scotsman 4 May 1831, 6 January 1830, 19 May 1832, 27 February 1833, 30 January 1836, 26 October 1836, 8 February 1845, as in Dublin the venues were said to be full.
\textsuperscript{138}Scotsman 19 March 1831.
\textsuperscript{139}EEC 30 May 1836, the SSPCK was not a subscriber democracy, EEC 2 June 1836, the General Assembly started at the end of May, Scotsman 18 May 1836, 25 May 1836.
several charities required that they hold their annual meeting in the same week as the HBS.\(^{140}\) Holding many meetings in the same large venue in close succession reflected the knowledge that they would attract similar audiences, but it also reflected the charities’ desire to demonstrate strength, unity, and success.

The Dublin associations’ published accounts of their meetings in their annual reports, but overall they made greater efforts to control access to them than their counterparts in Edinburgh. The *Freeman’s* *Journal* mocked this secrecy and pretended to welcome it:

> We pass over the Sunday School Society, which celebrates its orgies with closed doors. Liberality is a virtue; but surely ladies and gentlemen ought not to be blamed if they choose to keep their twaddle to themselves. Much were it to be desired that this sort of niggardliness were more common.\(^{141}\)

Yet this was part of a long newspaper report on the meetings of the ‘national societies’ meetings reflecting the attention that such proceedings attracted from critics as well as supporters.

The Edinburgh-based organisations generally advertised their meetings as open to all those ‘interested in’ or ‘friendly to’ their aims, whether members or not.\(^{142}\) In practice, of course, other devices, such as holding meetings during the working day might be used to exclude unwelcome groups.\(^{143}\) Nevertheless, Edinburgh’s organisations at least presented a welcoming face to the public. Entry to missionary societies’ meetings in Dublin was usually by ticket only and even members had to apply for tickets in advance. Tickets might be issued as a response to high demand and to raise funds, yet by requiring that even members apply in advance for tickets, the ‘national societies’ demonstrated a desire to control who would be present.\(^{144}\) Non-members had to make separate applications that were scrutinised by the organisations’ managing committees. Advertisements for the meetings repeatedly stated that no one


\(^{141}\) *FJ* 14 May 1835.

\(^{142}\) *Scotsman* 9 May 1832, 21 February 1835, 10 May 1843, and 22 January 1845.

\(^{143}\) *A* charity’s other publications, such as the EBS’s reports, could reveal who would not be welcome.

\(^{144}\) For an example of tickets used to raise funds and cope with demand, *Scotsman* 30 January 1836.
would be admitted without a ticket. The membership of Dublin’s Protestant missionary charities was diverse, and as Irene Whelan pointed out, far from completely illiberal. It included strong supporters of Catholic Emancipation as well as resolute opponents. Yet the organisations presented a less welcoming front to the public than their counterparts in Edinburgh.

The cities’ contrasting religious environments amplified differences between their associational cultures. Inter-Protestant tensions, whether within or between denominations significantly affected associational culture in Edinburgh. The Gaelic School Society was associated with Protestant Dissenters and with Evangelicals within the Church of Scotland, this drew it into the conflicts between Evangelicals and Moderates. In 1840 The Witness used an article on the Gaelic School Society to criticise Moderatism. The newspaper argued that the Society’s work in the Highlands and Islands was essential because ‘In no part of Scotland has Moderatism [sic] been more gross and rampant.’ Moderates in turn censured the Society, at the 1831 General Assembly, the Society’s critics claimed that it had done nothing to stop its teachers’ preaching, even though such activity was contrary to the Society’s rules. In the latter case, however, raising these grievances caused limited disturbance as efforts were made to quickly end the discussion. In fact, these tensions only boiled over after the Disruption when Gaelic School Society members criticised Highland ministers and banned Church clergy from the Society’s board of management to reassure its teachers, most of whom had joined the Free Church. This was a drastic measure but it took an official split in the Church to make it happen and even then several
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145 See advertisements for meetings in DEM 2 April 1824, 26 February 1836, 4 April 1836, 28 March 1845, Morris, Class, Sect, 188-193.
146 Whelan, Bible, 129-136.
147 Inter-Protestant tensions also occurred in Ireland in the early part of the period considered here. In the early 1820s some Church of Ireland clerics criticised the HBS. They claimed that the association was allowing those hostile to the Church of Ireland to speak at its meetings, Saunders’s News-Letter (hereafter SL) 5 November 1821.
149 The Witness 29 April 1840.
150 Scotsman 1 June 1831.
members objected, arguing that it was incompatible with the Society’s interdenominational ethos.

Catholic-Protestant tensions caused problems earlier in Dublin. The larger Rotunda gatherings generally passed off trouble free, but meetings of auxiliaries to the ‘national societies’ produced significant conflict elsewhere in Ireland. In October 1824 attempts by a Catholic priest to address a meeting of the Galway Auxiliary to the HBS, led a Society supporter to call the 10th Hussars. Press coverage of such incidents fuelled significant controversy in Dublin as well as in their immediate localities.\textsuperscript{152} Irish religious tensions even surfaced in Edinburgh where Irish Catholics sometimes disturbed the meetings of Protestant educational and missionary charities operating in Ireland.\textsuperscript{153} The \textit{Scotsman} described these interruptions in a satirical article:

> If we go to a Missionary Society, to enjoy a quarter of an hour’s quiet railing against the old lady of Babylon, as a good Protestant should do, up gets a lump of a man, with a brogue as broad as his shoulders, and a speech longer than his head, in defence of her reputation, and insists on our hearing his last word.\textsuperscript{154} These interruptions were managed in a relatively calm manner, but their occurrence in Edinburgh with its much lower Catholic population suggestions that they would have happened in Dublin if proceedings there had been more open, explaining why Dublin’s Protestant missionary groups took greater precautions to control their meetings.

The nature of Dublin’s religious tensions meant some of the city’s charities presented themselves to the public in a different manner to their Edinburgh counterparts. The restrictions they imposed were one way of coping with diversity and reducing conflict. They however also proclaimed that these charities were less accessible to the general public creating the impression that middle-class individuals were less involved in managing Dublin’s social problems than their counterparts in Edinburgh.

Examining the different ways in which missionary subscriber democracies interacted with the public is important for understanding how each city responded to difference, but one should not ignore the persistence of educational charities with

\textsuperscript{152}For example \textit{FJ} 25 October 1824, \textit{DEM} 25 October 1824.

\textsuperscript{153}For example \textit{Scotsman} 8 March 1826, 23 February 1828.

\textsuperscript{154}\textit{Scotsman} 16 August 1828.
‘older’ management structures. The SSPCK continued to run many schools throughout Scotland and remained prominent in Edinburgh holding its annual meetings in the city. Its managers attempted to maintain an attractive public image being aware that their choice of president had symbolic importance. In 1803 they prevented anyone from holding the position for more than two consecutive years in order to increase the number of prominent aristocrats with which the organisations could be associated. In 1844, some SSPCK members objected to the Earl of Breadalbane’s (successful) nomination as president because they thought that it might damage the Society’s reputation since he had taken a leading (pro-Free Church) role in the Disruption. The symbolic position of president provided a limited way through which the Society remained responsive to public opinion in a quickly changing world. Charities with ‘older’ organisational structures shaped the environment in which subscriber democracies operated. Every Gaelic School Society report reaffirmed support for the SSPCK and the younger society claimed that its aim was to supplement not replace the older organisation. Reporting on their 1842 annual meeting the Gaelic School Society even emphasised that one participant, John Tawse who seconded a resolution, was SSPCK secretary. In practice, the Gaelic School Society was competing with the SSPCK but its managers clearly felt that they had to appear to respect the older charity.

The Irish Charter School system was dismantled in the early 1830s after the Incorporated Society lost its parliamentary funding. Yet Whelan was incorrect to conclude that this heralded the total destruction of the Society, this hybrid charity survived and began to manage day schools. In some ways the Society’s presence in Dublin remained more significant than the SSPCK’s in Edinburgh. The Incorporated
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155 For example it ran a school in the Edinburgh Charity Workhouse, *Scheme of the Society’s Establishment from May 1, 1833, to May 1, 1834* (Edinburgh [1834?]), 3, 16.
156 NRS GD95/1/6 Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, Minutes of General Meetings March 1795-March 1813, 6 January 1803, 213.
158 The Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools, with an Appendix... (Edinburgh, 1843), 2, 6.
Society continued to run day schools in Dublin whereas the SSPCK decided to close its school in Warriston’s Close in 1836. The SSPCK’s decision was not a reflection of the Society’s weakness but rather related to contemporary views of cities and how they should function. The SSPCK’s managers argued that it was hypocritical for them to fund a school in ‘the Metropolis’ when they refused aid to other towns on the basis that towns by their nature should have sufficient resources to support such institutions. In fact, the SSPCK not only survived in this period but diversified into other projects such as the translation of the Bible into Gaelic.

The persistence of ‘frozen’ historical forms continued to shape how social difference was managed in each city. The SSPCK had been closely connected with the established Church from its foundation, but after the Disruption, many of the Society’s teachers joined the Free Church and the Society’s management tried to support them. The managers argued that both the Free Church and the Church of Scotland had much in common and were fundamentally different in ‘church governance and discipline’ from the Scottish Episcopal Church or ‘Independent Churches.’ They claimed that this meant that the Society could be connected with both the Free Church and the established Church without violating its constitution. However, a legal challenge revealed that this was contrary to the Society’s rules and the Church of Scotland retained their privileged position within the Society. Similarly, the Charter Schools’ attempts to relax their rules and allow the children of Catholics to be excused from Protestant religious instruction were frustrated when a legal opinion indicated
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159 NRS GD95/1/8 Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, Minutes of General Meetings, January 1823-November 1837, 3 March 1836, 497.
161 Donald E. Meek, ‘Protestant Missions and the Evangelization of the Scottish Highlands, 1750-1850’, International Bulletin of Missionary Research, 21 (No.2), (1997) (unpaginated), see for example the role of Church of Scotland Presbyteries in assessing the quality of the SSPCK’s teachers, SSPCK Minutes 1838-1860, 22 December 1842, 174.
that this would violate their charter.\textsuperscript{164} Rules and structures sometimes prevented charities’ managers from adapting to religious change.

\textbf{Conclusion:}

As Rodger emphasised, nineteenth-century Edinburgh was strongly influenced by ‘the power of the past’. Charities founded in the eighteenth and even the seventeenth century were still affecting society in Edinburgh in 1845, and while such charities may have been less common in Dublin, they did help to shape that city as well, a subject that has received little attention from historians. These older charities continued to affect the environment in which other charitable institutions operated, and newer institutions often had to respond to the older organisations’ presence. Although older charities’ management structures often represented anachronistic ideas about how a society should function, their persistence provided a target for reformers whose criticisms shed light on how views of society were changing. Efforts to open the management of older charities such as the changes made to the governance of the RI, can be seen as attempts to cope with diversity and so were part of the process through which civil society was strengthened. By highlighting the spectrum of management forms that existed, this chapter has indicated that we should not focus unduly on subscriber democracies or see them as completely distinct from earlier modes of philanthropic organisations. To fully appreciate the impact of early nineteenth-century associational culture, one must recognise its varied nature.

Comparing medical institutions in Dublin and Edinburgh highlighted how formal rules and structures mattered: they affected charities’ internal administration and shaped public perceptions of the organisations. Campaigners in each city pressed for increased middle-class control of medical charities, as they did for other public institutions. The greater opportunities available to subscribers in Dublin, coupled with continued prejudice against Catholics meant that campaigning for greater control for subscribers was not always as high a priority there as it was in Edinburgh, but Dublin’s reformers were still aware of how charities’ management structures influenced the ability of underrepresented groups to participate in urban governance.

\textsuperscript{164} Trinity College Dublin Manuscripts and Archives Library (hereafter TCD) IE MS 5230 Incorporated Society for Promoting Protestant Schools in Ireland Board Book [8], 1819-1836, 2 February 1820, 13-19.
Charities new and old, reserved places on their boards of management for those holding office in other institutions of authority such as local government. These other forms of authority were of course also contested and sometimes altered during this ‘Age of Reform’, and later chapters will consider how reforms to these institutions affected charities, in particular the impact of municipal reform on philanthropic associational culture will be examined in chapter five.¹⁶³

Charities’ rules and structures mattered, yet they did not exist in a vacuum and their effects depended upon the context in which they operated. Charities with very similar rules on paper could implement them in different ways in contrasting environments. Dublin’s higher Catholic population, and more intense Protestant-Catholic conflicts, meant even Protestant missionary charities that adopted a subscriber democracy form there, operated in a more closed manner in practice than their counterparts in Edinburgh. Philanthropy, however, was a multifaceted and ambiguous activity, the existence of even basic similarities between their organisations’ procedures, may have promoted a sense of familiarity among the supporters of Protestant missionary societies across the UK. Later chapters will give due regard to the complex interactions between charities’ formal rules and the broader contexts in which they operated. The next chapter, which explores denominational authority in both cities, will again indicate that sectarian tensions affected charitable associational cultures in contrasting ways in each city, but it will also show that even Catholic philanthropy in Dublin could both reduce as well as provoke conflict, by highlighting shared values.

¹⁶³See chapters four and five.
Chapter Three.
Denominational Authority: Practices and Prejudices.

NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION. If there be any Liberal Protestants still weak enough to support the Board, on the ground of its giving a conjoint education to Protestants and Roman Catholics, and securing to the latter some knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, where the whole is unattainable: if any labour under such a delusion, we say, let them read the following authoritative “note and comment” upon the practice of the Board, as modelled by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy:—

"APRIL 3, 1839.—The Right Rev. Doctor Keating, Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Ferns, has ordered that the Scripture Lessons, and also the Lessons on the Truth of Christianity, being the Appendix to the Fourth Book of Lessons, shall no longer be used in schools of his diocese; therefore we prohibit their use henceforward in this school, by the Roman Catholic boys here in attendance. "WILLIAM BRENNAN, P.P., and Treasurer." The school referred to in the foregoing, is that of St. Mary’s New Ross. But the order extends to the whole diocese of Ferns.

DEM 10 April 1840.

Religion was perhaps the foremost force motivating and shaping philanthropic activity across the British Isles during the nineteenth century, and this of course could be a source of significant social tension. Here the Evening Mail highlighted a major concern of Dublin’s conservative Protestants: their fear that philanthropic endeavour enabled Catholic priests to extend their authority over the minds and consciences of the poor. The newspaper not only criticised the role of the priest specifically, but objected to the ways in which Catholic charities in general operated. It argued that such charities were more secretive than their Protestant counterparts. In 1842, when an official report into philanthropy in Dublin noted that a significant number of charities had not provided them with returns, the newspaper speculated that it was the Catholic organisations that had not responded:

We should observe, by-the-bye, that the good feeling of the commissioners has prevented them from giving the particulars of the answers, obviously to guard against any invidious comparisons being drawn between charities of different denominations. But we would venture a good wager that those from which answers have not been returned are not the Protestant charities.¹

The ultra-Protestant Evening Mail needed no encouragement to condemn Catholic institutions but some of its concerns have been echoed by later historians. Maria Luddy and Alison Jordan have argued that Irish Catholic charities were dominated by

¹ DEM 25 July 1842, the report was 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin). It primarily looked at institutions that were aided by state funds but it also attempted to assess philanthropic provision in Dublin more generally.
clerics and other religious orders. They also claimed that these charities interacted with the public to a lesser extent than their Protestant counterparts. Their work however concentrated on the later nineteenth century when the Irish Catholic Church had become significantly more powerful than it was before 1845. More work is needed to assess whether Catholic charities appeared to be governed by the same rules as their Protestant counterparts in the early nineteenth century.

Dublin’s Catholic charities did not completely shun publicity. By 1845 Thom’s Almanac listed many Catholic philanthropic institutions alongside the city’s other charities, presenting them as just one of several acceptable responses to Dublin’s social problems. Yet, given that the ways in which charities interacted with the public shaped their wider social effects, the procedures of Catholic charities, and public knowledge about them, need to be investigated in more detail. If Catholic charities were primarily administered by clerics, then they may have seemed less able to represent middle-class diversity than institutions managed by lay philanthropists. Similarly, it is important to establish the extent to which Catholic charities publicised their procedures and aims as the level of public knowledge about them determined how successfully they could highlight the values that they shared with their Protestant counterparts. If the Protestant middle classes could not see Catholics adopting the same kind of practices as themselves then it reduced the ability of philanthropy to promote cross-confessional affiliations, threatening civil society.

Some historians have suggested that Catholics and Protestants viewed philanthropy in different ways in the nineteenth century based on contrasting denominational values. Timothy P. O’Neill argued that Catholic charity was less influenced by political economy than Protestant charity and less concerned about the potential pauperising effects of relief. According to recent studies of nineteenth-century French and Canadian towns, members of the St Vincent de Paul were more concerned about how charitable activity improved their own piety than how it affected
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3See for example 1845 Thom’s, 661, 670, 676-677.
the poor. Other research, however, indicates that one should generalise about denominational attitudes to poverty and relief with caution. Prominent Irish Catholics shared contemporary concerns about pauperisation and some adhered to Thomas Chalmers’s views about the dangers of welfare provision, suggesting that they had more in common with the UK’s Protestant middle classes than has sometimes been presumed.

The ways in which charities responded to and accommodated the growing demand for increased rights for those outside the established Churches was a central concern in Dublin and Edinburgh. Dalgleish has argued that participating in voluntary organisations allowed Edinburgh’s Dissenters to claim equality with adherents of the established Church in the city’s social life. However, as he did not look beyond 1820, Dalgleish was unable to consider the Church’s attempts to reassert its power during the next three decades through increased pressure for Church Extension and the General Assembly’s missionary schemes, activities that had direct implications for philanthropy. The disestablishment campaigns initiated by Edinburgh’s Voluntaries in 1829 also altered the environment in which charities operated, as did the Disruption. Philanthropy became increasingly denominational in many parts of the UK over the course of the nineteenth century and we have already seen evidence that this was also true for Dublin and Edinburgh. This chapter will explore the impact of these changes on associational culture in each city in greater depth giving particular attention to how the Catholic Church in Dublin interacted with charities and how this compared with both cities’ Protestant denominations.
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7 Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 140-142.  
9 *The Witness* 1 January 1845, 4 January 1845, 15 January 1845, 22 January 1845, 1 February 1845, 8 February 1845.  
The government commissioned reports on ‘Religious Instruction’ in Scotland and Ireland in the mid-1830s. These reports provide a detailed record of the philanthropic activities of a wide variety of congregations, as well as offering an insight into how governments approached the issue of spiritual diversity. By surveying the religious instruction provided by all Christian denominations, the Whig government was publicly acknowledging dissenting groups, and giving official validation to individual choice in religion. Scope for personal choice is central to the relationship between religion and civil society. A certain level of religious freedom is required for civil society to function; restrictions on the participation of members of particular religious groups in associational culture, make it difficult for voluntary organisations to mediate sectarian conflicts.

Ernest Gellner has argued that ‘prescriptive religious codes’ damaged civil society by preventing the tolerance of diversity necessary for its existence. Gellner did not imply that every religion had this effect, but he has claimed that some specific faiths such as Islam were not conducive to civil society. Such sweeping assertions are unhelpful as they prevent us from understanding the often nuanced relationships between particular denominations and associational activity. As David Herbert has argued, we must consider the wider context in which a religious group operates before we can fully understand its impact on associational culture. Herbert’s analysis of Catholic voluntary organisations in Communist and post-Communist Poland demonstrated that when operating under the unusual conditions of Communism, the Polish Catholic Church formed institutions that were more democratic than it had hitherto or would later be involved in. Similarly, in early nineteenth-century Dublin the Catholic Church was in a much weaker position, both legally and financially than it would be later in the century, and it was therefore prepared to look outward and work with lay Catholics and Protestants to a greater extent than it would later. This was a time when the goals of lay and clerical Catholics, such as Emancipation, parliamentary

reform, municipal reform, and Church reform were shared by many British campaigners, creating many potential allies that Dublin’s Catholics could work with.

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the relationship between philanthropy and the institutions of the Church of Ireland, the Church of Scotland, the UAS, and Catholic Church. This allows it to assess whether the boundaries between the Catholic Church and its affiliated charities in Dublin, were blurred to a greater extent than those of other denominations. It considers how opportunities for lay Catholics to participate in philanthropy compared with members of other Churches, and what the implications of this were for the strength of civil society in Dublin. The section also introduces the issue of clerical authority in philanthropy. The Catholic priest was the bugbear of conservative Protestants but whether his position actually differed from that of other denominations’ ministers needs to be investigated more thoroughly, and this section asks whether Catholic priests restricted the work of lay philanthropists to a greater extent than did other clerics. The second section focuses on a small number of parochial and congregational charities providing an in-depth insight into how denominational philanthropic institutions interacted with the wider public, and assessing how such relationships, strengthened or weakened civil society.

I.

Missionary societies had clear spiritual purposes but medical charities and poor relief institutions have sometimes also claimed religious objectives. The Edinburgh Society for the Relief of the Destitute Sick and the Edinburgh Lying-In Institution were both intended to promote the spiritual as well as the bodily welfare of the poor. The entry for the Lying-In Institution in 1845 Oliver and Boyd claimed that: “The visiters [sic]...take every opportunity of promoting the religious and moral improvement of the persons relieved.” The managers of some Dublin hospitals also expressed interest in serving the spiritual welfare of their patients. In 1825 ‘Erinesis’, the Lancet’s correspondent in Dublin, described the ‘strange mixture of bibles and bottles, tracts and pill-boxes, piled up in a formidable array on every table’ in the Meath Hospital as


15 Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 77-80.

16 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 520.
religious and medical objectives mingled.17 According to 1845 Thom’s the Adelaide Hospital had: ‘a twofold object....the furnishing of medical attendance, and also pastoral support and consolation, exclusively to Protestants in reduced circumstances.’18

The Edinburgh Society for the Relief of Indigent Old Men also aimed to provide both spiritual support and material aid. The Society employed a missionary to visit its pensioners though this activity was financed separately and managed by a committee distinct from the main charity. This committee sometimes met in Rose-street UAS chapel but at least some of its members were adherents of the Church of Scotland. Patrick Dalmahoy, W.S., for example, was a member of the Association supporting the Missionary as well as a member of the Church of Scotland until the Disruption.19 The missionary was required to record the scriptural knowledge of those visited and whether they attended any place of worship but he did not promote the views of a specific denomination. When commenting on the ‘quality of religion’ of those he visited, the missionary praised the scriptural knowledge of pensioners from a range of denominations, including the occasional Catholic.20 The association was interested in promoting spiritual welfare but it took the same interdenominational approach as the Evangelical City Mission and many of Edinburgh’s nationally-focused missionary societies.21

Some of Dublin’s charities attempted to supply both spiritual and material aid on a nondenominational basis. The Victoria Asylum was one of the few institutions for ‘penitent women’ that served both Catholics and Protestants, providing each with their

17 The Lancet, 26 Nov. 1825’, quoted in Geary, Medicine, 32.
18 1845 Thom’s, 658.
19 The Post-Office Annual Directory...for 1834-35 (Edinburgh, 1834), 23, 155-156, ECA SL136/1/1
20 Edinburgh Indigent Old Men’s Missionary Society Minutes, 16 March 1832, 2-11.
own chaplain. The Mendicity Institution provided religious instruction for the children of both Catholics and Protestants on the same premises. Yet the denominations were kept separate during these classes and the religious education of children remained a controversial issue within the charity. While there was a desire in Dublin to promote interdenominational philanthropy, and while liberal Protestants sometimes supported Catholic charities, genuinely interdenominational charities were relatively rare. Many of the Dublin-based organisations that provided both physical and spiritual aid, such as St Patrick’s Deanery School and Dorcas Association and the Adelaide, were established on a denominational basis. Increasing sectarian division was also reflected in other ways. In the late 1830s an Alms-house belonging to Dublin Corporation formally prohibited the admission of Catholics and it seems likely that the Old Men’s Asylum Russell-place adopted a similar policy. In the 1820s almanac entries for the Asylum made no mention of religion whereas by 1845, Thom’s recorded that the institution aided ‘twenty-four Protestant old men.’

Religious divisions also affected charity and relief in Edinburgh. Many dissenting denominations collected funds for the poor of their own congregations, whilst some of Edinburgh’s philanthropic institutions favoured applicants of a particular denomination when there was competition for places. There was a charity school in St Mary’s Parish, for example, that gave preference to Episcopalian pupils. Nevertheless, much greater efforts were made to articulate charities’ religious exclusiveness in Dublin. The mere fact that more philanthropic organisations publicly declared that they only served specific denominations made Dublin’s associational culture more sectarian.
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22 1845 Thom’s, 702, The Complete Catholic Directory, Almanac, and Registry, for the Year of Our Lord, 1845 (Dublin, 1845), 235.
24 SL 16 April 1840.
25 Hill, Patriots, 362n31, compare 1824 Treble Almanack, 214 with 1845 Thom’s, 320.
27 NRS CH2/139/183 Edinburgh, St Mary's Kirk Session Papers relating to St Mary's Parochial School, including a List of Governors (1826-1844), Proposal to erect a Parochial School for the Parish of St. Mary’s [1830].
Catholic clerics and institutions became increasingly involved in charity in Dublin during the early nineteenth century as the Church slowly gained in strength. According to *The Complete Catholic Directory, Almanac, and Registry* for 1845, female religious orders were educating 2979 ‘Poor children’ in the city and its environs. According to the *First Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction in Ireland* (1835), Dublin contained at least four charity schools run by female religious orders, one school with connections to the ‘Brotherhood of the Christian Schools’ (Christian Brothers) and two ‘attached to’ Roman Catholic chapels. The newspaper-reading public were reminded of the Catholic philanthropic presence through the front pages of the *Freeman’s Journal* which contained many fundraising advertisements for Catholic parochial schools, charities which had both Church connections and voluntary elements.

Yet charities might be associated with a particular Church but not always controlled by it. In practice, the boundaries between Church-run and ‘voluntary’ activities were often very blurred. Recent work on Catholic sociability has indicated that clerical dominance should not be overstated. Even in devotional organisations such as confraternities, relations between the clergy and the laity could be complex. Such associations were sometimes used by lay Catholics to create alternatives to official Church structures through which they could exercise more power. Similarly, lay influence within denominational charities was often significant and, as noted, these organisations relied at least partly on voluntary contributions. Religious orders became involved in a wide range of subscription-financed ventures in Dublin in this period including hospitals, Magdalen asylums, and schools, but the orders did not always control them. Orders taught in many of Dublin’s charity schools but sometimes they were powerful employees rather than managers. The administration of several
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28 *Catholic Directory....for....1845*, 228.
29 *First Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, Ireland*, 78b-132b.
31 See chapter six.
Catholic Magdalen asylums involved lay governors or governesses as well as nuns.\textsuperscript{37} Higher levels of poverty, competition among the city’s many Magdalen asylums, and a greater tradition of newspaper advertisement by charities in Dublin ensured that its Catholic Magdalen institutions communicated with the newspaper-reading public to a greater extent than their Edinburgh counterpart.\textsuperscript{38} Nor was the Catholic Church a monolithic body and Catholic ‘religious’ were sometimes divided among themselves. Some members of the Sisters of Charity, for example, were hostile to the establishment of the Sisters of Mercy in Dublin in 1831 and religious orders and secular clergy sometimes quarrelled over issues of authority.\textsuperscript{39}

Church involvement in philanthropy was not solely a Catholic phenomenon and there were many Church of Ireland parochial schools and alms-houses in Dublin.\textsuperscript{40} The boundaries between official Church influence and voluntary lay activity were very blurred in these charities. As will be seen, they used voluntary methods to collect money and lay involvement in their administration was often high. In Edinburgh too, many charities occupied an ambiguous position between voluntary associations and official Church structures. This was, after all, a period during which proponents of Church Extension attempted to transfer the work of voluntary charities to the Church of Scotland, while continuing to employ voluntary methods such as subscription.\textsuperscript{41} As well as the individual Church of Scotland ‘Schemes’ there was a ‘Lay Association in Support of the Five Schemes of the Church of Scotland’ which had many features of a voluntary organisation. It was founded at a large public meeting, governed by a president, vice-presidents, general committee, secretary, and treasurer,
and it encouraged annual subscriptions. Yet the funds raised were managed by the Church and the Association reported on its activities to the General Assembly.

Analysing charities connected with a parish or individual congregation highlights the complexity of Church-charity relations. The 1835 *Report on Religious Instruction* described a wide range of missionary and educational activity connected with Edinburgh’s churches and chapels, some of it of recent origin. Several Church of Scotland parishes established ‘mission stations’ that held services for poor parishioners who did not attend the parish church because they could not afford seat rents or ‘suitable’ clothing. Some Church of Scotland parishes and dissenting congregations paid missionaries to visit parishioners or the residents of a particular area. For example, the congregation of the UAS Cowgate chapel employed a missionary for the Cowgate area. More permanent institutions including Sabbath schools, day schools, and evening schools were also established in connection with both Church of Scotland and dissenting congregations. The ‘voluntary’ nature of this activity varied significantly. In some cases, ministers paid missionaries out of their own money, in some the voluntary income came from a bequest, and in others parishioners raised a subscription. Sometimes charities established using voluntary funds were managed by the kirk session, in other cases donors were allowed to play a role in their administration.

The Rose-street UAS Missionary Society, founded in December 1831, required that members be members or ‘ordinary hearers’ of the Rose-street congregation, though the Society otherwise had relatively open administrative procedures and no minimum subscription. Bristo-street UAS congregation was connected with a variety of semi-independent societies including a Missionary Society,
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38. *Scotsman* 3 June 1846.


a Ladies’ Benevolent Society, a Day School, a Sewing School, a Christian Instruction Society, and a Young Men’s Association for Mutual Improvement. The reports of all these organisations were published together as the ‘Reports of the Religious Societies in Connexion with the United Associate Congregation of Bristo Street’ reflecting a desire to communicate with the subscribing public. Yet the Christian Instruction Society and the Young Men’s Association each required that new members not only be part of the Bristo-street congregation but also that they be proposed and seconded by existing members of the Society, making them significantly more closed than a standard subscriber democracy. This was another way through which religious educational organisations attempted to protect ‘truth’ and, in consequence, limited the diversity of their memberships.

Links between Edinburgh’s charities and their associated Churches were complex. In some cases efforts were made to demonstrate that the charities had their own independent existence even when they were closely connected with the kirk session. This was perhaps to attract support from beyond the congregation, or because they feared closed management structures would be perceived as corrupt. A parochial school was established in 1826 in the recently founded New Town parish of St Mary’s in the northeast of the city. It was intended to serve the parish as a whole, and not just the congregation. Although it was stated to be for pupils of ‘all classes’, it was founded in response to a lack of affordable schooling for working-class children and provision was made for parents who could not afford the fees. The schoolmaster’s salary was to come primarily from pupils’ fees, but the building of the School was financed mainly by subscription. The kirk session purposely appealed to parish residents who were not congregation members, and all donors of three guineas or more were eligible to participate in the School’s administration. Yet, although St Mary’s Parochial School

---

[42] Reports of the Religious Societies in Connexion with United Associate Congregation of Bristo-street, Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1845), 9, 11.
[43] Caldwell, St Mary’s, 3-7, 47.
[44] St Mary’s School Minutes, 17 February 1830, 21-38, 8 February 1837, 161-163, 21 April 1837, 166 ‘Proposal to erect a Parochial School for the Parish of St. Mary’s’, NRS CH2/139/126 St. Mary’s Kirk Session-Reports on St Mary’s school, with Subscription List of 1827, and Other Papers (1827-1838). ‘Report by the Directors of St Mary’s [sic] School April 1834 (handwritten draft)’.
[45] See also First Report on Religious on Instruction, 139.
remained a distinct organisation, the kirk session played a significant role in its management, indicating how complex the interactions between Church-run and voluntary activity within charities could be (see below). Table V in the appendix, which provides examples of philanthropy associated with Church of Scotland parishes and dissenting congregations in Edinburgh, demonstrates the variety of such interactions including informal sponsorship of missionaries and schools connected with, but independent of the kirk session, as well as many other types of connection.

Denominational authority could of course be exerted through the participation of clergy in the management of charity, even if that institution had no official Church links. As Dalgleish has suggested, the presence of many clerics of a particular denomination on a charity’s governing board might associate it in the public mind with that religious group even if the charity claimed to be nondenominational. Indeed the inclusion of clergy on charities’ boards of management raises questions about how these organisations were viewed by the outside world and is connected with wider issues of governance and legitimacy. Writings on civil society have emphasised the importance of free choice of association as a condition for its development. Those motivated by their religious beliefs, however, may not have seen their activity as ‘free choice’ or been happy to tolerate the work of rival denominations. Given their role as religious representatives, this was perhaps particularly true of clerical participation in charity. The influence of Evangelicalism greatly increased clerical involvement in charity throughout the UK. Not only were the Evangelicals themselves philanthropically active but their example encouraged non-Evangelical clerics to also become involved as charitable associations came to be seen as vehicles for re-exerting Church authority. For clerics wary of Evangelicalism, promoting their own version of charitable education helped counter the influence of charity schools with an Evangelical ethos. As Dalgleish has indicated, members of the Church of Scotland established the SBS as a more orthodox response to the Dissenter-dominated EBS. Clerics might therefore have been increasingly expected to join charities whether they

---

46 Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 165.
48 Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 152, 166, 176-177, 246-247.
wanted to or not, and involvement in institutional philanthropy might have been increasingly perceived as a normal part of a clergyman’s job.

Many of Edinburgh’s clerics were on the boards of several charities. 1845 *Oliver and Boyd* listed ninety-one individual clergymen as officeholders in charities, of these fifty were involved in more than one charity and twenty-one held office in four or more.49 The relatively high number of clerics involved, and many instances of multiple participation suggest that a ‘standardised’ clerical occupation was developing of which charity work was an expected component. This was part of a wider trend towards the professionalisation of clerical activity across the UK.50 Although, not every cleric was involved in philanthropy to the same extent which indicates that individual motivations were also important.

Clerics might have sometimes accepted the request to become officeholders in prominent charities simply to avoid the social embarrassment that would have accompanied refusal. Indeed, for some clerics nominal philanthropic involvement was not a choice at all. In both cities, the rules of many charities reserved places on their management for holders of specific clerical offices.51 Established Church clerics were frequently *ex-officio* governors of older charities, but this was also the case in some newer charities.52 In Edinburgh, Donaldson’s Hospital, a residential educational institution established by the bequest of printer James Donaldson (d. 1830), was managed by a group that included ‘The Senior Minister of the Established Church Parish of Saint Cuthbert’s’.53 Such rules led to the involvement of particular clergymen in multiple charities. The Rev. Dr Alexander Brunton, minister of Tron parish and Professor of Hebrew at Edinburgh University was on the board of several of the city’s
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49To avoid repetition, this count does not include secretaries or treasurers, see also Brian Heeney, *A Different Kind of Gentleman, Parish Clergy as Professional Men in Early and Mid-Victorian England* (Hamden, Connecticut and Springfield, Ohio, 1976), 1-10, 93-101.

50Heeney, *Different Kind*, 1-10, 93-101, also see chapter six.

51Such *ex-officio* governors might never attend meetings, but this chapter indicates that at least some did.

52See chapters one and two.

531845 *Oliver and Boyd*, 511. The fund was initially administered by nominated trustees who were mostly Writers to the Signet, National Library of Scotland (NLS) ACC 11896/6 ‘Deed of Constitution of Donaldson’s Hospital by John Irving Esq. and Walter Cook Esq, the surviving Trustees of the late James Donaldson Esq, of Broughton Hall._Dated 22d. November 1844, and recorded in the Books of Council and Session 17” February 1845,’ in Donaldson’s Hospital Minutes 1845-1861, 6-20. *Oliver and Boyd’s New Edinburgh Almanac and National Repository for the Year 1852...*(Edinburgh, 1852), 592.
charities including Donaldson’s Hospital, Heriot’s, the RI, and the Parochial Institutions. He was also Convener of the General Assembly’s India Mission Committee between 1834 and 1847. He took this work seriously even when he was present on a managing committee by virtue of his office. He regularly attended the RI’s board meetings and coordinated between the Hospital and the city’s Church of Scotland ministers to organise citywide church door collections for the charity, and he was also an active governor of Heriot’s. Similarly during his tenure as Archdeacon of Dublin, John Torrens was an officeholder in a wide range of charities including the Hibernian Society for the Care of Soldiers’ Children, the Protestant Orphan Union, St Peter’s Church of Ireland Parish Schools, and the CES.

Given the role of Evangelicalism in promoting charitable involvement, philanthropy in early nineteenth-century Scotland has been almost exclusively identified with Evangelical clergymen. This view is understandable since almost all Church of Scotland missionaries joined the Free Church, and UAS and Free Church ministers played a significant role in Edinburgh’s large missionary organisations, but in practice the situation was more complex than this. Church of Scotland Evangelicals were a diverse group, not all of whom left at the Disruption and several Church of Scotland clergymen held offices in Edinburgh’s missionary charities after 1843. Along with clergies from other denominations including Episcopal, Independent, and Relief Churches, many Church of Scotland clergymen were involved in philanthropic

55 Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland…1841, 595, Torrens was Archdeacon of Dublin from 1818 to 1852, Malcolm, Swift’s Hospital, 312, 1845 Thom’s.
57 Esther Breitenbach, Empire and Scottish Society: The Impact of Foreign Missions at Home, c.1790 to c.1914 (Edinburgh, 2009), 56.
58 Of the management places filled by clergy in the list of charities in 1845 Oliver and Boyd, twenty-five were filled by UAS ministers, twenty-three by Free Church ministers and twenty-three by Church of Scotland ministers (secretaries and treasurers omitted). These are management places rather than individuals, (see below and appendix). Denomination was identified from the list of churches and chapels in 1845-46 PO Directory, 419.
societies more generally.\textsuperscript{59} Some of these, including Dr Brunton, were on the Moderate wing of the Church.\textsuperscript{60} Principal Lee, ‘committed moderate’ and fierce critic of Thomas Chalmers, was involved in several charities, including the Edinburgh Auxiliary Naval and Military Bible Society and the Institution for Deaf and Dumb.\textsuperscript{61} According to \textit{1845 Oliver and Boyd}, the most philanthropically active clerics in Edinburgh were the Rev. William Muir, a Church of Scotland clergyman who attempted to act as a negotiator between different parties before the Disruption and who ‘stayed in’ after it, and the evangelical Episcopalian the Rev. D.T.K. Drummond.\textsuperscript{62} (See Table VI in appendix).

Clerics were particularly heavily involved in philanthropy in Dublin. Of the 2358 officeholder or officer positions in Edinburgh’s charities listed in \textit{1845 Oliver and Boyd}, 373 and 15.8 per cent were filled by clergymen.\textsuperscript{63} Of 3043 similar places listed in the \textit{1845 Thom’s} for Dublin, 826 or 27.1 per cent were clerics.\textsuperscript{64} These figures do not give a complete picture of clerical involvement since they omit much activity associated with individual parishes and with regular clergy. They do suggest, however, that Dublin’s philanthropic associational culture was presented to the public as more clerically dominated than Edinburgh’s.\textsuperscript{65} Differences in levels of clericalisation created contrasts between otherwise analogous charities. Clerical attendances were significantly higher at meetings of the Incorporated Society (Charter Schools) than at those of the SSPCK even though both of these organisations had close connections with

\textsuperscript{59} Of the individual clergyman that have been identified in the charities in \textit{1845 Oliver and Boyd} sixteen were Free Church, seventeen Church of Scotland, ten UAS, two Relief Church, three Episcopalians, eight of other denominations.

\textsuperscript{60} \textit{The Witness} 23 May 1840.

\textsuperscript{61} Fergus Macdonald ‘Lee, John (1779-1859)’, ODNB (Online Edition) accessed 7 October 2017, \textit{1845 Oliver and Boyd}.


\textsuperscript{63} The number of clerical officeholders (including secretaries etc.) and of servants and officers such as chaplains was taken from the charities listed in \textit{1845 Oliver and Boyd}. The figure includes all places rather than unique names.

\textsuperscript{64} The number of officeholders (including secretaries etc.) and of servants and officers such as chaplains was taken from the charities listed in \textit{1845 Thom’s}. Again this is a count of all places and some individuals are included more than once.

\textsuperscript{65} For the concept of ‘clericalisation’ of charity see Gauvreau, ‘Forging a New Space’, 39.
established Churches and were based on similar models. The situation in Edinburgh was complicated by the role of elders within its Presbyterian denominations, but ordained elders were considered lay people and their involvement in philanthropy was not viewed as equivalent to that of clerics.

It was much more common for higher clergy, such as bishops, to be officeholders in Dublin’s charities. This was, of course, because of differences in the governing structures of the cities’ main denominations so that there were simply a greater number of higher clergy in Ireland than in Scotland. 1845 Thom’s indicated that Catholic bishops were officeholders in many Dublin charities but one of the most striking features of the almanac record for that year was the prominence of senior Church of Ireland clerics. They had long been involved in philanthropy in the city but the establishment of new charities affiliated with the Church of Ireland, such as the Scripture Readers’ Society and CES meant that the almanac record began to contain entries for associations with a multitude of senior Anglican clerics among their officeholders. The CES entry in 1845 Thom’s, for example, included twelve bishops, twenty-one deans, and twenty-nine archdeacons, as well as nine other clerics, among its management. Despite Edinburgh’s many religious charities, philanthropy there appeared to be controlled by the city’s lay middle classes to a greater extent than in Dublin where clerics were more prominent. Though the authority of clerics was generally respected, philanthropic involvement in Edinburgh might have seemed more a matter of ‘free choice’ and hence more legitimate and more representative of middle-class diversity, than in Dublin.

There were, however, limits to lay interference in spiritual philanthropy in Edinburgh. Lay missionaries were employed in both cities and although the Edinburgh City Mission claimed that they had become widely accepted in that city, their use remained controversial because some believed that they usurped the role of the clergy.

---

66 Based on a comparison of meeting attendances in 1845 at both charities TCD MAL IE MS 5231 Incorporated Society for Promoting Protestant Schools in Ireland Board Book 9 1837-1845, Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian, Minutes of General Meeting January 1838-November 1860.
67 Brown, National Churches, 24.
68 Brown, National Churches, 24.
69 1845 Thom’s, 663-664.
in promoting and controlling religious truth.\textsuperscript{70} The \textit{First Report on Religious Instruction} noted that the established Church had recently ceased aiding two missionary societies because they used lay missionaries.\textsuperscript{71} Similar concerns were expressed in Dublin. The managers of Dublin’s Parochial Visitors’ Society, an organisation that provided spiritual guidance to poor Anglicans, was cautious in defending its use of lay visitors. It emphasised that: ‘these visitors are by no means to be considered as instructors or preachers, or as infringing, in any way, on those duties which peculiarly belong to the clergy.’\textsuperscript{72} This was stressed even though most of their visitors were training to be ministers. In fact they emphasised that if the visitors ‘go beyond...[their circumscribed role] the parochial minister has the power of dismissing them.’\textsuperscript{73}

Despite such concerns, the \textit{Report} indicated that one of Edinburgh’s Church of Scotland parishes (New Greyfriars) employed a Baptist as a lay missionary, again reflecting a high level of shared values among the city’s denominations.\textsuperscript{74} As expected, the almanac record also highlighted a greater level of interdenominational co-operation among clerics in Edinburgh’s national- and city-focused organisations: forty-seven charities included ministers of more than one denomination; such pluralism was much rarer in Dublin.\textsuperscript{75}

\section*{II.}

The managers of Dublin’s Catholic charities shared their Protestant counterparts’ anxieties about relief provision, and the articulation of these common viewpoints may

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{70} \textit{Report of...a Public Meeting of the Friends of the Edinburgh City Mission}, 1-2.
\item \textsuperscript{71} 1837 (31) \textit{First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction Scotland}, 31.
\item \textsuperscript{72} 1845 Thom’s, 688.
\item \textsuperscript{73} 1845 Thom’s, 688.
\item \textsuperscript{74} ‘Appendix’, in 1837 (31) \textit{First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction Scotland}, 111.
\item \textsuperscript{75} For Edinburgh: based on an analysis of clergymen in the management of charities in \textit{1845 Oliver and Boyd} (treasurers and secretaries omitted). Denomination was assigned using entries for Edinburgh churches and chapels in \textit{The Post-Office Annual Directory...for 1845-46}. This is a count of individuals. For Dublin: analysis of the denominations of clergymen involved in the charities listed in \textit{1845 Thom’s}. Denominations were identified using the list of Dublin clergy in the \textit{Dublin General Almanac and General Register of Ireland...1845} (Dublin, 1845), the Mendicity and Roomkeepers’ Society were omitted as it was well-known that they were interdenominational, Protestant missionary organisations and other overtly Protestant organisations were also omitted because their affiliations were equally well-known.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
have partially eased religious tensions. Dublin’s most ecumenical charity, the Mendicity, expressed strong concerns about the potential dangers of relief provision. Similarly, advertisements for Catholic charity schools emphasised their institutions’ moral value in a similar way to their Protestant counterparts. For example, a fundraising advertisement for the Female Orphan School associated with Bethesda Anglican chapel in the Freeman’s Journal on 20 January 1824 closely resembled an advertisement for schools connected with the Catholic chapel on Francis-street that appeared in the same newspaper four days later. Both had a similar format and emphasised the same values. The former said that pupils were ‘carefully instructed in the knowledge of the Christian Religion, and trained up in habits of industry and cleanliness.’ The latter claimed that pupils would be provided with ‘the benefit of Christian Education’ where: ‘the rising generation of the poor will acquire such salutary instruction as may enable them, instead of being the scourge, to become useful and even respectable Members of Society.’ As in many contemporary charities, the managers of the Schools of St Michael and John’s Catholic Parish investigated all applications for admission to check if they were ‘deserving objects.’

As chapter two indicated, the use of similar practices and procedures also revealed common ethical ground, especially in relation to attitudes towards participation, administration, and control. The more the middle-class public were aware of these shared procedures, the greater the ability of philanthropic organisations to promote and reinforce common values among them. Analysing parochial and congregational charities provides a particularly insightful perspective on how religion promoted or hindered a sense of common purpose, as their managers had to consciously decide on the balance between clerical and lay authority with the organisations. This section compares examples of Catholic parochial charities with philanthropic organisations associated with parishes or congregations of the Church of Ireland, the Church of Scotland, and the UAS. It gives particular attention to the

77 *FJ* 20 January 1824.
78 *FJ* 24 January 1824.
79 See for example Dublin Diocesan Archives (DDA) E4 P/23/1 St. Michael and St John’s Charity School Minutes and Accounts 1814-1836, 18 December 1823, 9 September 1824.
following case studies: For Dublin: St Peter’s (Church of Ireland) Parochial Schools, the charity Schools of the United (Catholic) Parishes of St Michael and St John’s, and the Education Society of the United (Catholic) Parishes of St Mary, St Thomas, and St George. For Edinburgh: St Mary’s (Church of Scotland) Parish School, the Rose-street (UAS) Congregational Missionary Society, and the ‘Religious Societies’ connected with the (UAS) Congregation Bristo-street, particularly its Missionary Society.

Care must be taken when comparing these organisations, not least because the Dissenting Presbyterian charities were of a different nature to the others. There were also significant contrasts between the associated parishes. As a wealthy New Town parish, Edinburgh St Mary’s did not experience the high levels of poverty of the Old Town, although it was home to many members of ‘the poor and working classes’ whom the school was designed to serve. St Peter’s Church of Ireland parish was the location of recent high-status housing developments in the Merrion and Pembroke areas, helping to give it one of the largest proportions of Protestants of any Dublin parish, although it was still majority Roman Catholic. It was, however, a much bigger parish than Edinburgh St Mary’s and contained very poor sections in its northwest. St Michael and John’s parish was in a relatively poor area just south of the Liffey around Exchange-street while the northside united parishes of St Mary, St Thomas, and St George contained prosperous sections in their northeast and poorer areas elsewhere.

The Education Society of the United Parishes also differed from the parochial schools as it was designed to establish a series of separately managed schools, rather than directly administer an individual institution. Nevertheless, good quality records have survived for these organisations and comparing them will help to reveal contrasts, and in particular parallels between the cities and between denominations. Where necessary, this analysis is supplemented by details on other similar charities, such as St

---

80 Caldwell, St Mary’s, also see chapter one.
Peter’s Free Catholic Schools North Circular Road, another philanthropic school linked with a parochial infrastructure, located on the northside of Dublin city.

Lay people played a significant role in many of Dublin’s Catholic charity schools, particularly during the 1820s and 1830s. Printed notices advertising the claims of St Peter’s Free Catholic Schools indicated that both clerics and non-clerics were involved in their fundraising and management, and the long list of names to whom donations could be given included Daniel O’Connell, several businesses, and collectors appointed specifically for that purpose. 83 A letter from Archbishop Murray to Catholic Archdeacon Hamilton in 1838 noted that teaching at ‘the Female School in Marlboro’ Street’ had up to recently been carried out by ‘the Ladies of the Parish.’ 84 According to the First Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, Ireland several lay managed schools in Dublin provided Catholic religious instruction, including ‘St Peter’s orphan school, kept by Mr and Mrs O’Neill.’ 85

The Education Society of the United Parishes and St Michael and John’s Schools, shared many of the features of a subscriber democracy. The latter was partly funded by subscriptions and run by annually elected officeholders, most of whom were non-clerics. It held events such as annual dinners for its ‘Friends and Subscribers.’ 86 While dinners might seem elitist they provided another way of communicating charities’ values to the wider public since speeches made at them were reported on in detail in the press. 87 The Education Society of the United Parishes had close links with Catholic institutions. The original officeholders included eight of the clergy of the Church of the Conception, which was the parochial chapel, although there were many more lay governors, including several Protestants. 88 The charity was established at a

83 DDA Murray Papers Education Undated Schools 2 File 33/15/1, 33/15/2, 33/15/3, also see below.
84 DDA Hamilton Papers Letters from Dr Murray to Archdeacon Hamilton 1824 to 1852 1838 73 1 November 1838 (File references for Murray-Hamilton letters differ from the rest of the Hamilton Papers).
85 First Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, 76b-123b.
86 See for example Michael and John’s Minutes 12 February 1824, 25 February 1830.
87 See chapter seven.
88 DDA E3 23/7 Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes 1826-1833, list of original officeholders (unpaginated) [third page of book]. There were fifty-three lay committee members in the list. The Church of the Conception was the Metropolitan Catholic Church or Pro-Cathedral.
meeting of ‘the Catholic Inhabitants of the United Parishes of St. Mary, St. Thomas, and St. George’ and was ‘convened by’ Archbishop Murray in the Catholic Church of the Conception. Yet the meeting followed the same format as a subscriber democracy’s, and was the subject of detailed press reports. Like most subscriber democracies, a minimum subscription of £1 was required to become a member of the Society’s committee. Committee members and officeholders only held their positions for one year unless the annual meeting decided otherwise.

The Society presented itself as beneficial to Protestants as well as Catholics. They passed resolutions that referred to the ‘sacred and civil obligations as Christians and Citizens’ and the need for education that ‘daily inculcates religious and social duties, and offers no violence to the feelings of any sect or persuasion.’ The meeting tried to conciliate wealthy Protestants even when condemning Protestant institutions. One speaker claimed that: ‘The Protestant wealth of Ireland had always been arrayed on the side of liberality, their [Catholics] only enemies were the Corporation of the Church and the swindling Corporation of Dublin.’ By condemning these ‘close corporations’ the charities’ supporters demonstrated that they shared the concerns of contemporary British reformers. Although a Catholic organisation, the Education Society’s procedures and the concerns of its supporters were in line with growing liberal and reform sentiment in Britain.

Lay attendance at the Education Society’s meetings was usually higher than clerical and rather than trying to shut the laity out the Society’s biggest problem was attracting sufficient attendees. The everyday administration of the Society closely resembled that of the missionary societies connected with the UAS congregations of
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89 'Education of the Poor’ Printed Resolutions of meeting held 12 December 1826 in cover of Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes, see also Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes, 15 December 1826.
90 Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes, 16 January 1827.
91 'Education of the Poor’ Printed Resolutions of meeting held 12 December 1826.
92 'Education of the Poor’ Printed Resolutions of meeting held 12 December 1826’, see also Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes, 15 December 1826.
93 LF 13 December 1826.
94 Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes, 8 April 1831. Clerics were a majority of attendees at only two of the twenty meetings between 11 January 1817 and 3 April 1827, Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes.
Bristo-street and Rose-street, though, clerical attendance was lower at the latter. In principle, the Rose-street charity welcomed those of lower social status as it did not have a minimum membership contribution but it was more closed that the Education Society in other ways. The Rose-street and Bristo-street societies were hybrid organisations as they insisted that members be regular attenders of their respective chapels. Hence these organisations presented a less inclusive face to the public than the Education Society of the United Parishes. In each case establishing denominational charities provided a way of coping with difference. Yet the Education Society, no doubt partly fuelled by an effort to counter Catholics’ reputation for intolerance, was perhaps the most likely to emphasise common values across the denominations.

Some of Edinburgh’s congregational charities, such as St Mary’s Parish School, allowed those who were not members of their congregations to become managers. Subscriptions for the School were solicited from all householders of the parish and the minister, the Rev. Henry Grey, told the kirk session that ‘the Plan of having the Parochial School strictly a Sessional School would probably not be approved of by the Subscribers.’ He argued this because St George’s kirk session had had to allow donors a role in the management of a parish school, but it also reflected efforts to attract subscribers from outside St Mary’s congregation. After much discussion on how best to manage the School’s property, those subscribing three guineas or more were named as proprietors and were eligible to become directors. At the same time, the School and the kirk session remained closely connected and one third of directors’ places were reserved for members of the session. This again reflects the very ‘blurred
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95 The Rev. John M’Gilchrist, president of Rose-street UAS Congregational Missionary Society, was often the only clerical attendee at the Society’s meetings. Rose-street Missionary Society Minutes, see for example minutes for 1844. Similarly, a Rev. Peddie was often the only clerical attendee at Bristo-street Missionary Society meetings. NRS CH3/313/16 Bristo-street Associate Congregation Missionary Society Minutes 1843-1853, see for example minutes for 1844. The Rev. William Peddie was president of the Missionary Society but his father James Peddie was also minister of the same congregation and sometimes it is difficult to distinguish their involvement in the Religious Societies of this congregation, Reports of the Religious Societies, Kenneth B.E. Roxborough, ‘Peddie, James (1759-1845) (also includes William Peddie (1805-1893)’, ODNB (Online Edition) accessed 7 October 2017.


97 St Mary’s Kirk Session Minutes, 1 April 1827, 21-22, Caldwell, St Mary’s, 48.

98 St Mary’s School Minutes 17 February 1830, 35-38.
boundaries’ that arose when congregational charities made efforts to appeal beyond their regular attendees.

Yet St Mary’s Parish School, with the official role given to its kirk session and the high subscription required to become a director, was more closed to the public than the Education Society of the United Parishes. The latter encouraged penny-a-week subscriptions from ‘servants and workmen’, and in an organisation that also included high-profile officeholders such as Lord Cloncurry this acceptance of small contributions was an attempt to encourage a sense of cross-class solidarity.\textsuperscript{99} Paying a small fee for their children may have allowed parents at Edinburgh St Mary’s to feel like they had a similar stake in that organisation though in practice they were more like consumers whose children could be dismissed if they did not pay.

St Peter’s Church of Ireland Parish School also combined voluntary aspects and connections with official Church structures. The Schools were governed by their patron the Archdeacon of Dublin, and a committee of twenty-eight. Their income came from charity sermons, donations, and subscriptions rather than from parish vestry funds.\textsuperscript{100} In 1850/1851 the managing committee included only eight clerics and two lay church wardens and there were nine women on the committee indicating that the charity provide some opportunities for those who did not hold formal positions within the parish.\textsuperscript{101} Women occasionally made up a majority of those present at St Peter’s Schools’ meetings but the limited nature of the records makes it difficult to assess the extent to which they had a decision-making role.\textsuperscript{102} Bristo-street’s ‘Ladies’ and ‘Female’ societies also included women on their managing committees, but the Education Society of the United Parishes, the Schools of Saint Michael and John’s, St

\textsuperscript{99}‘Education of the Poor’ Printed Resolutions of meeting held 12 December 1826, also see chapter six.
\textsuperscript{100}Based on a search of financial information in Representative Church Body (hereafter RCB) P45.5.5 St Peter’s Vestry Minutes 1835-1872 from 1833-1845, Catherine Mary MacSorely, The Story of Our Parish (St Peter’s Dublin) (Dublin, 1917), 27, entries from 1836 in St Peter’s Female Boarding School Minutes, 1823 (229) Education, Ireland. Returns to Orders of the Honourable House of Commons, dated 10th July 1822, and 26th February 1823, for Accounts Relating to the Diocesan and Parish Schools in Ireland (n.p., 1823), 52.
\textsuperscript{101} Report of the St. Peter’s Parochial Male and Female Boarding, Sunday, Daily and Infant Schools, For the Year 1850 (Dublin, 1851), 2.
\textsuperscript{102}Based on a search of RCB P.45.13.1.3 St Peter’s Schools Minute Books, 1841-58 from 1 November 1841 to 5 July 1844.
Mary’s School, and the UAS Missionary Societies did not. Women acted as collectors for all of the organisations, and this provided some outlet for coping with gender-based social diversity but it was a limited one, reflecting the difficulty that even elite women faced in breaking into mainstream philanthropic associational culture in the early nineteenth century.

St Peter’s Anglican Schools was not a standard subscriber democracy. At least eighteen of the committee of twenty-eight listed in the Schools’ annual report for 1850 did not appear in that report’s subscription list and administrative minutes provide no indication that subscribers elected governors. In practice meetings were poorly attended and clerics often dominated numerically. Like all of the other philanthropic institutions examined here, St Peter’s Schools highlight how blurred the boundaries between Church and charity could be. Historians miss much of the intricacies of contemporary social life when they focus on strictly ‘secular’ voluntary organisations or on ‘pure’ subscriber democracies. All of the charities here had some connection with official Church structures and both clergy and lay donors were involved in their management. In some ways the Catholic charities were, and publicly declared themselves to be, the most open to broad middle-class participation. (See Table VIII in the appendix).

Religious and clerical authority could of course be exerted in other ways. According to Hill the majority of Dublin’s O’Connellite repealers saw the Catholic hierarchy as moral ‘guardians’ and took their advice on education seriously. Clerical influence was apparent in the Education Society of the United Parishes. Attempting to comply with ‘the resolutions of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, on the subject of education’, the Society aimed to ensure all Catholic children would be taught by Catholic teachers, without, they claimed, interfering with the religion of their

103 Reports of the Religious Societies.
104 See chapter six for more on gender and philanthropy.
105 Report of the St. Peter’s, 2, 9-10. This potential overestimate of involvement comes from the fact just surnames were used to identify committee members in the subscription list.
106 See for example attendances at meetings between January and November 1836, St Peter’s Female Boarding School Minutes.
non-Catholic pupils.\textsuperscript{108} Such influence was not unique to Catholic organisations, however, and there were parallels with Dublin’s Church of Ireland charities. Clerics were entrusted with significant authority at St Peter’s Anglican Schools. The parish clerics, for example, were asked to ‘draw up rules for the better encouraging the apprenticing of the Children.’\textsuperscript{109} They were frequently involved in auditing the School accounts and they had the power to waive fees for individual pupils.\textsuperscript{110} The Schools also called on the spiritual expertise of the parish clergy when assessing new teachers’ ‘Scriptural Knowledge.’\textsuperscript{111} The Schools were based on respect for the Church of Ireland’s authority and their managers emphasised adherence to ‘Scriptural and Church principles.’\textsuperscript{112} Edinburgh St Mary’s School did not make such overtly denominational claims but children at its associated Sabbath School were expected to attend services at the parish church where places were reserved for them.\textsuperscript{113}

Although significant, clerical authority did not go unquestioned in Dublin’s Catholic charities. In December 1828, the lay trustees of St Peter’s Free (Catholic) Schools wrote to Archbishop Murray objecting to an announcement by their parish, Fr William Young, that he would close the Schools if subscriptions did not increase. The trustees addressed their concerns to the Archbishop but they clearly argued that they were the only ones entitled to close the institution.\textsuperscript{114} Similarly, the Education Society of the United Parishes applied to the Catholic Association for financial aid in the face of opposition from one of the Society’s clerical supporters who accused the Association of trying to usurp the clergy’s educational role.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{108} ‘Education of the Poor’ Printed Resolutions of meeting held 12 December 1826.

\textsuperscript{109} St Peter’s Schools Minute Books 1841-58, 10 July 1843 (unpaginated).

\textsuperscript{110} See for example St Peter’s Schools Minute Books 1841-58, 8 January 1844, RCB P.45.13.1.1 St Peter’s Parish Female Boarding School Minute Book 1830-1852, St Peter’s Female School Minutes, 4 January 1836, 143, 12 February 1844, 247, 14 October 1844, 159-160, 8 December 1845, 181, see also 2 October 1836, 154, 14 April 1845, 169-171. \textit{Report of the St. Peter’s}, 2.

\textsuperscript{111} St Peter’s Female School Minutes, 18 April 1845, 26-27, see also 5 September 1831, 43-44.

\textsuperscript{112} DEM 22 January 1845.

\textsuperscript{113} St Mary’s School Minutes, 11 August 1830, 63, CH2/139/183 Printed Notice: ‘Sabbath Evening School’.

\textsuperscript{114} DDA Murray Papers 1828 Ordinary File 3/0/11/11-12 ‘The trustees of St Peter’s R.C. Free Schools and Chapel, N.C. Road, to Fr Wm Young, P.P’ 16 December 1828.

\textsuperscript{115} IF 13 December 1826.
Edinburgh’s philanthropic associational culture may have been less clericalised than Dublin’s but clerical authority was still substantial there. The Rose-street Missionary Society employed lay missionaries but when they chose Mr Jamieson as ‘their Foreign agent’ in Jamaica they felt it necessary to arrange for him to be ordained.\textsuperscript{116} The managers of Bristo-street Missionary Society invited clergymen from other congregations to address the Society’s annual general meetings, reflecting and reinforcing their status.\textsuperscript{117} Edinburgh’s UAS clerics clearly wielded authority based on their position and knowledge. UAS charities were also shaped by the denomination’s wider governance structures. The UAS Presbytery of Edinburgh and the Synod’s Foreign Missions’ Committee provided funds for the support of some of the charities’ missionaries.\textsuperscript{118} Similarly, Church of Scotland clerical networks were important for fundraising in Edinburgh. Kirk sessions received requests via their clerical moderators from ministers involved in ventures such as the Parochial Institutions and the General Assembly’s missions, requesting church collections be held for these organisations.\textsuperscript{119}

Ministers also shaped much philanthropic effort in their own parishes. In 1845 St Mary’s minister, the Rev. Dr Grant,\textsuperscript{120} circulated an address via the Parochial School’s managers to encourage parents to send their children to the Parochial Sabbath Schools and to church services.\textsuperscript{121} The ministers of Tron parish, the Rev. Dr Brunton and the Rev. Mr Hunter, were active in initiating several philanthropic ventures. They suggested that a parish missionary be employed, they encouraged charitable responses to emergencies such as harsh weather, and they argued that the Sabbath Schools should be extended. The kirk session implemented all of these

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{117}Bristo-street Missionary Society Minutes, 25 September 1843, 1-2, 6 September 1844, 4-5.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{118}Rose-street Missionary Society Minutes, 23 August 1836, 114-116.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{119}St Mary’s Kirk Session Minutes, 27 March 1825, 3-4, 20 November 1825, 4-5, 3 December 1826, 18, 7 May 1827, 25-26, NRS CH2/122/21/2 Canongate Kirk Session Minutes 1828-1835, 7 January 1830, 3 March 1830 (unpaginated), NRS CH2/130/2 Lady Yester’s Kirk Session Minutes 1835-1860, 19 November 1835.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{120}The Rev. Henry Grey left the Church of Scotland at the Disruption and was replaced by Rev. Dr Grant, see below.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{121}St Mary’s School Minutes, 16 October 1845, 301-302.
\end{flushright}
proposals. In Dublin and Edinburgh clerics of all denominations were valued as religious experts by their co-religionists. Yet although such clerical intervention was considered desirable, the more it occurred, the less the lay middle classes appeared to be managing their towns’ problems.

III.

While historians disagree on when Ireland’s Devotional Revolution began, they generally agree that the Irish Catholic Church greatly extended its influence as the nineteenth century progressed. As Luddy indicated, that growing power included increasing control over Irish Catholic charities. This trend, and a more general confessionalisation of Dublin’s philanthropic associational culture, began in the period considered here as demonstrated by the foundation of new overtly denominational charities from the 1820s onwards. Even Michael and John’s Schools became increasingly associated with Catholic Church structures over time. By 1834, parishioners rather than subscribers were electing the Schools’ presidents. The Education Society of the United Parishes had ceased to exist by 1845, but fears about Protestant proselytism prompted the establishment of a new Catholic educational organisation, the Association for the Preservation of Faith, to serve the parishes in 1851. The management of this new organisation was more clerically-dominated than its predecessor, and included the parochial clergy, the clergy of the nearby parish of St Laurence O’Toole, and several groups of regular clergy. Only ‘a limited Number of Catholic Laity of the Parish’ were involved. The extent of clericalisation should not be exaggerated, the Association planned to work with some lay Catholic organisations such as the Ladies’ Association of Charity. Overall though it does reflect a trend towards increasing Church control.

122 NRS CH2/142/26 Tron Kirk Session Minutes 1840-1869, 27 December 1840, 7 February 1841, 17 April 1841, 13 May 1843 (unpaginated).
124 Michael and John’s Minutes, 18 February 1834.
125 At a general Meeting of the Clergy, Secular & regular of the United Parishes of St Mary St Thomas & St George…..24th of November 1851’, in the Minutes of Education Society of the United Parishes.
Confessionalisation and growing Church authority were not exclusively Catholic phenomena. Campaigns for Church Extension, increasing hostility between Voluntaries and members of the Church of Scotland, and the Disruption, indicated that both were alive and well in Edinburgh. The establishment of new charities based on the congregation or parish represented an increasing confessionalisation of philanthropy in both cities even if in Edinburgh these charities still claimed to promote a nondenominational Protestantism. Rose-street Missionary Society, for example, distributed the London New Monthly Missionary Magazine published by the London Missionary Society, an association that attracted interdenominational support in Edinburgh, but it also promoted its own specific confessional position by circulating publications produced by their own denominations.\footnote{127}

The UAS Synod attempted to exert greater control over congregational philanthropy by taking over missions previously administered by individual congregational societies, and by attempting to establish a more centralised funding system to subsidise poorer congregations’ missionary efforts.\footnote{128} The desire of denominations to exert greater spiritual authority over their members reinforced the confessionalisation of charity in Edinburgh. St Mary’s Parochial School Report for 1838 noted that attendance at the parish’s Sabbath School decreased because a recently opened Dissenting Sabbath school had attracted away the children of Dissenters.\footnote{129} The Disruption affected St Mary’s School in a similar way. Tensions arose within the school’s management over the influence of those who had joined the Free Church. One of the latter, Patrick Dalmahoy, resigned as secretary because some of the School’s managers argued that that position should be held by a member of the Church of Scotland.\footnote{130} The Disruption led to the resignation of several School

\footnote{127}Rose-street Missionary Society Minutes, 24 May 1836, 110-111, 26 November 1844, 326, 25 March 1845, 334-336, 22 December 1845, 342. In 1845 membership of the Edinburgh Auxiliary to the London Missionary Society included ministers of the Free Church, the Church of Scotland, the UAS, Baptists and Independents, 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 502, 1845-46 PO Directory, 419. c.f. Roger H. Martin, Evangelicals United; Ecumenical Stirrings in Pre-Victorian Britain, 1795-1830 (Metuchen, New Jersey,1983), 61-71.\footnote{128}Rose-street Society Minutes, 18 November 1844, 324-325, 26 November 1844, 325-326, 26 January 1846, 342-344, Bristo-street Missionary Society Minutes, 2 December 1844, 6-7, 8 October 1845, 7-8.\footnote{129}CH2/139/126 ‘Report of Committee on St. Marys [sic] Sabbath School 15. Nov 1838’ (handwritten draft).\footnote{130}St Mary’s School Minutes, (letters following the meeting of 6 May 1844), 269-270.
directors including the institution’s president, former parish minister Henry Grey. At least one of the former managers, Mr Walter Ferrier, became involved in a new Free Church school instead.\footnote{131}{St Mary’s School Minutes, 8 May 1845, 289.} The Disruption was handled in a relatively conciliatory manner at St Mary’s School with thanks for past services being expressed on one side and good wishes for the future, on the other.\footnote{132}{St Mary’s School Minutes 14 May 1844, 276-277, 8 May 1845, 289.} Increasing confessionalisation of philanthropy sometimes helped to contain religious conflict but it also publicly highlighted increased denominational separation.

**Conclusion:**

The Catholic priest had long been a figure of fear for conservative Protestants, and his role in philanthropy, especially educational philanthropy, was an increasing source of concern for them. Historians have echoed this, suggesting that, by restricting lay involvement in philanthropy, Catholic priests limited charities’ broader conciliatory effects. Catholic clerics and other religious occupied a privileged position within Catholic charitable organisations but their authority did not go unchallenged. Some of Dublin’s Catholic charities used the same procedures as their Protestant equivalents in Dublin and their Presbyterian counterparts in Edinburgh. Perhaps motivated by a desire to emphasise their tolerance, many Catholic charities stressed that they were based on the same open principles as other contemporary philanthropic organisations. Some of Dublin’s Catholic charities came closer to contemporary reformers’ ideals of participation than Protestant organisations, and actively encouraged lay participation in urban governance. Procedural similarities and Catholic charities’ frequent use of the newspaper press, highlighted some of the values that Dublin’s Catholics and Protestants shared, helping to promote at least a basic sense of understanding among the confessional groups even at a time of rising hostility.

Church influence over Catholic charities increased over time but growing denominational control of charities was a general UK trend not something unique to Dublin or Ireland. In a very basic sense, what was happening in Dublin was only unfamiliar because it was based on Catholic-Protestant division rather than intra-Protestant disputes. Though of course doctrinal differences and a long history of anti-Catholicism in Britain made that contrast significant. Growing confessionalisation
signalled a failure to cope with religious diversity, philanthropists of different denominations were unable to co-operate with each other in the management of individual charities. Yet in some ways the separation helped to contain conflict and, when the organisations continued to use similar procedures, may have partly defused it. These charities, though denominational and in some cases closely connected with church structures, helped to strengthen civil society in both cities.

Catholic clerics exerted sizable power and influence over Catholic charities, even when they were not involved in the organisations’ administration, but on balance, their role was not very different from clerics of other denominations. Perceived as holders of religious expertise, clerics were given a trusted role in charities and this may have decreased opportunities for lay philanthropists, potentially reducing voluntary organisations’ ability to cope with middle-class diversity. This also reinforced the idea that the clerical occupation was a profession. Overall philanthropy in Edinburgh appeared less heavily clericalised, and so the city’s middle classes seemed to exert greater control over the governance of their city than their Dublin counterparts.

Educational charity was one of the most religiously controversial forms of philanthropy. It also received much attention from the central state, as can be seen by the commissioning of reports on religious instruction in Ireland and Scotland. The significance of this state intervention will be considered in chapters four and five.
Chapter Four.

Central State Authority, Patronage, and Shins of Beef.

In January 1842, Daniel O’Connell informed a meeting of the Repeal Association that:

A friend…had told him that in passing through the Park a day or two ago he had seen a cow with three legs grazing there. He….had asked an explanation….and it was hard to obtain it. But the mystery was now cleared up to his entire satisfaction—he understood it all. The fact was, that the Lord Lieutenant….had sent out the beast on pasture, that another leg might grow upon her in lieu of that she had lost (roars of laughter). So there was a history of Lord De Grey’s present to the Mendicity.

13 January 1842.

O’Connell was referring to the Tory Lord Lieutenant Earl De Grey’s recent Christmas donation to the Mendicity Institution. The Lord Lieutenant usually made sizable donations of food to the charity at Christmas, but as demand for the institution’s services had decreased following the opening of Dublin’s Poor Law Workhouses in 1840, the charity’s managers had asked De Grey only to supply what was necessary for a Christmas dinner. De Grey’s political opponents in Dublin, however, used the smaller gift to ridicule him for his apparent parsimony, claiming that he had just sent a single cow’s leg to the charity. Even ten years later, an anonymous author writing on Dublin charities in the Irish Quarterly Review referred to De Grey’s tenure as “The Shin of Beef Viceroyalty”.

This story highlights several characteristics of the relationship between the central state and associational philanthropy in Dublin. In particular it demonstrates the significance of Dublin Castle and the Viceroy in the city. The presence of this central administration was one of the key ways through which stateless capital status manifested itself in Dublin, and it had a significant impact on middle-class social interactions in the city. The institutions that defined Edinburgh’s capital status took a different form. Edinburgh lacked a concentration of government departments comparable to Dublin Castle, and though its charities attracted aristocratic patronage, there was no governmental figurehead equivalent to the Lord Lieutenant. Instead individual central state institutions such as law courts and local government bodies helped to define its capital status. By examining interactions between state bodies and charities, this chapter will explore contrasts and similarities in the ways that stateless


2See chapter six.
capital status manifested itself in each city. This will highlight how such interactions shaped not only philanthropic activity but each city as a whole. The central state’s impact on the development and maintenance of civil society was ambiguous, sometimes strengthening it and sometimes inhibiting it. Yet, state intervention often reduced the ability of charities to mediate diversity, particularly in Dublin. Central state intervention made philanthropic organisations appear to be political rivals rather than simply alternative ways of providing relatively similar charitable services, reducing their ability to highlight shared values.

‘Central state’ refers to official governance bodies with a clearly specified jurisdiction at a national level, whether that pertained to the whole UK, or like Dublin Castle or the Scottish Law Courts to Ireland or Scotland. The term central state does not imply that these institutions were monolithic. Tensions often existed among different government personnel; commissions, inquiries, and boards established by one administration might be jealously regarded by the next. Throughout the 1830s, the Whig governments were active in setting up new bodies, some of which, such as the Poor Law Commission and the Commissioners for National Education in Ireland, had a significant impact on charities. These attracted criticism from the Whigs’ political opponents and their long-term fate was not accepted as guaranteed. Examining state-charity relations therefore provides an interesting vantage point from which to assess the impact of political and social change in this eventful period. Central state bodies were not immutable nor did they operate in their own distinct orbit. As Morton argued, central state activity allowed and indeed empowered Scottish local government during the nineteenth century. Westminster provided the legal protections that enabled the local state and voluntary bodies to function. The subtle nature of this central state interference helped to create an impression of local autonomy with urban governance shaped by locally-based organisations including charities.

Traditionally historiography has emphasised the significance of *laissez faire* ideas in restricting nineteenth-century social provision. Yet the central state sometimes intervened directly in charities in Edinburgh and the impact of this has not received
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3 See for example, Boyce, *Nineteenth-century Ireland*, 92-95.
sufficient scholarly attention. State interference in philanthropy in Dublin was more common and overt. An emphasis on earlier and more substantial central state involvement in welfare provision in Ireland compared with the rest of the UK has become a commonplace in Irish social historiography.\(^5\) This contrast was apparent in many areas; for example historians have noted how Ireland developed a centralised system of lunatic asylums long before the rest of the UK.\(^6\) This literature, however, has rarely looked at the effects of state intervention on charitable activity and the wider impact of this on Dublin society. Studies of Irish philanthropy have analysed how charities interacted with the Poor Law or Prison Systems in the later nineteenth century, and Karen Sonnelitter has given some attention to central state intervention in charities in eighteenth-century Ireland.\(^7\) Few studies have investigated the nature of state intervention in charities in the early nineteenth century, a period when the relationship between Irish society and the state was being renegotiated.\(^8\) One exception to this is T.P. O’Neill’s work on the role of the state in poor relief in Ireland between 1815 and 1845, which gave some attention to voluntary charity. However, O’Neill mainly examined short-lived philanthropic funds which were intended to relieve distress in rural Ireland. Interactions between the state and Dublin’s charitable institutions, or the ways in which state-charity relations shaped Dublin society have never been investigated in detail.\(^9\)

In the early nineteenth century, the central state interacted with associational culture in Dublin and Edinburgh in many, often nuanced ways, and as Hilton indicated, such complexity helps to explain the paradox of British social policy in this period. Although there was a general consensus against central state interference, such intervention increased significantly in Britain, albeit not on the same scale as in

---


\(^7\) Sonnelitter, *Charity Movements*, 146-169.

\(^8\) Hoppen, *Governing*, 63, 72-74.

\(^9\) Timothy P. O’Neill, ‘The State, Poverty, and Distress in Ireland, 1815-1845’, Unpublished PhD Thesis (University College Dublin, 1971), for example chapter six on “Philanthropy”. There was also some information on state funding to Dublin’s hospitals elsewhere but this was very limited see 154-158.
Ireland. As Hilton recognised, those who opposed state interference on one issue, particularly intervention in markets, might easily support state intervention in other matters such as prison administration.\(^{10}\) Many commentators, including Chalmers who was an outspoken critic of compulsory poor laws, believed that education should not be left to the market.\(^{11}\) Similarly, the Scotsman, though generally hostile to central state funding of philanthropy, commended some parliamentary efforts to support charitable education.\(^{12}\) Throughout the 1830s, the extent to which the central state should intervene in society, was being widely debated, and this shaped the ways in which charities interacted with the state.

Debates over state intervention in philanthropy were partly shaped by religious difference and disagreement over the appropriate role of established Churches in the post-1832 world. Some reformers criticised Church establishments as religious monopolies, and for many years the reformed Parliament’s continued support for these establishments remained in doubt. Scotland’s religious environment made such matters particularly complex. Non-Intrusionists were in an especially precarious position as they attempted to protect the Church from what they felt was undue interference on the part of the state, while also trying to defend the principle of establishment against Voluntaries who had begun a campaign against the UK’s Church establishments in 1829.\(^{13}\) Throughout the UK, much of the debate on state funding of charities related to whether parliamentary aid for education should be channelled through established Church institutions. The extent to which state funding went to charities that were not directly managed by the Churches reflected the extent to which governments responded to the demands of Catholics, Dissenting Presbyterians, and reformers and how they viewed religious diversity more generally.

Historians have disagreed about the effects of state intervention on voluntary associations’ ability to manage diversity. Some have claimed that state interference

\(^{10}\) Hilton, Mad, 599-611.


\(^{12}\) See chapters five, six, and seven.

\(^{13}\) Brown, National Churches, 190-197, 218-227.
generally weakens civil society, while others have argued that this was not always the case. Carol E. Harrison’s work on nineteenth-century France, for example, suggested that while an interventionist state strongly influences the nature of voluntary activity, this need not prevent the development of a rich associational culture. For Morton, it was the specific nature of state intervention that was important. He argued that the mid-nineteenth-century central state created an environment in which Edinburgh’s middle classes were able to govern themselves. By indirectly supporting the work of voluntary associations, the state promoted the development of civil society. He claimed that, from the 1860s onwards, this relationship changed and increased central state intervention restricted opportunities for the middle classes to be involved in managing their city through voluntary organisations, damaging civil society. Morton, however, did not give significant attention to the processes involved in these changes or the extent to which they might have been specifically Scottish or British phenomena.

Similarly, when discussing differences between the associational cultures of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain, Frank Trentmann argued that while there were more voluntary organisations operating in the latter, its overall associational culture was ‘thinner.’ He claimed that nineteenth-century voluntary organisations looked outward, attempting to influence their whole societies. Their twentieth-century counterparts, on the other hand, tended to be single issue organisations that were more interested in pressing the government to adopt particular policies. Civil society was undermined as a result, as individuals had less control over associational culture and so voluntary associations could not mediate social differences in the ways that they had done in the past. Trentmann’s argument raises useful questions about the relationship between the state and civil society, but in practice the vast differences that existed between nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain, suggests that conclusions based on such comparisons should be made with caution. By discussing the different

---

varieties of state intervention that occurred in early nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh, and exploring the contrasting nature of state-charity interactions in each, this chapter will analyse the role of the state in the development of civil society in a way that allows greater regard for context. Doing so also sheds light on the social impact of the contrasting type of stateless capital that each city represented.

During the early nineteenth century, the central state attempted to indirectly empower philanthropic organisations in both cities. A Board of Charitable Donations and Bequests designed to register and manage posthumous donations, for example, was established at Dublin Castle. Similarly, by granting charters confirming charities’ governance structures, the central state provided them with a level of security and recognition. Heriot’s managers lobbied government to secure legislation to enable them to establish their Foundation Schools in the 1830s. This not only allowed the managers to achieve their goal, but by drawing attention to it, made the new Schools a subject of public debate. Government decisions could also indirectly alter a charity’s financial situation. In 1818, for example, the BFBS were allowed to export their Bibles duty free. The state also supported charities by using their services. Naval authorities, for example, regularly paid the RI for the treatment of sick and wounded seamen.

State influence was also exerted in less obvious ways including through the gathering and production of information. Oz Frankel argued that the significant increase in official publications in Britain and the United States in this period influenced interactions between inhabitants and the state, and shaped residents’ identities. The nineteenth-century UK government frequently commissioned investigations into charities, and in some ways, this was a highly invasive, though subtle, form of state power because it shaped wider debates on welfare provision and, as will

17 Thom’s, 243; Hill, ‘Nationalism and the Catholic Church’, 376.
18 William Steven, History of George Heriot’s Hospital, with a Memoir of the Founder, and an Account of the Heriot Foundation Schools, Revised and Enlarged by Frederick W. Bedford (Edinburgh, 1872), 254-255, Scotsman 5 March 1836, also see chapter two.
19 Scotsman 20 November 1819.
20 See the RI’s frequent correspondence with the Admiralty and the Commissioners for Victualing in Francis Wilson’s Letter Book June 1822-July 1836.
21 Oz Frankel, States of Inquiry Social Investigations and Print Culture in Nineteenth-Century Britain and the United States (Baltimore, Maryland, 2006), 1-19.
be seen, affected philanthropy’s social significance. The state could also potentially intervene through even less formal channels. Government personnel were frequently on charities’ boards of management in each city. This provided an indirect way through which the state might influence philanthropy and helped to entrench central state authorities within a city’s wider power networks. We will first examine some of the most overt ways through which the state influenced voluntary organisations and then consider more subtle methods such as individual influence and reporting.

I.

Educational philanthropy was the primary recipient of state aid in Edinburgh. The SMS received parliamentary grants in the 1830s and 1840s to assist with their educational work in Jamaica, while charity schools operating in Edinburgh also received central state grants. Significant state assistance was also given to Dublin’s educational charities but the central state aided a more varied array of philanthropic organisations in that city. Assistance was given to medical institutions and charities with specialised functions such as the Shelter for Females Discharged from Prison. This kind of wide ranging parliamentary aid was almost unique in the United Kingdom. It continued a tradition of assistance to charities and other ‘public’ institutions begun by the Irish Parliament, and was given as partial compensation for the loss of Dublin’s capital status. Grants to the city’s charities were guaranteed for twenty years under the Union settlement, and despite several attempts to withdraw them during the nineteenth century, they continued in some form for the entire duration of the Union.

Government aid to Edinburgh’s schools was administered by the Privy Council’s Committee on Education, the same body that managed grants to English schools; although not to schools in Ireland. The total assistance given to charitable institutions in Edinburgh was much lower than it was in Dublin. An official report in 1848, for example, indicated that since 1840 the total amount of money granted to
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22 See below.

23 Enclosure 2, in (N.), in 1836 (166-I) (166-II) Papers Presented to Parliament, by His Majesty’s Command in Explanation of the Measures Adopted by His Majesty’s Government, for Giving Effect to the Act for the Abolition of Slavery……Part III. (1.)…..(n.p., 1836), 8.

24 See below.

25 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 4-7.
schools in Edinburgh city and county under the Privy Council scheme, was £7298, whereas between the foundation of the national school system in 1831 and 1837, £8413 was granted to schools in Dublin City and County. Just over £1694 was granted to national schools in Dublin city and county in 1841 alone, by which time the school system was well established and most of this aid therefore, was used to pay teachers’ salaries rather than build schools. Dublin’s hospitals received approximately £10100 annually in the 1840s, and these were not the only charitable institutions aided.

Unlike the annual grants given to many different kinds of philanthropic institutions in Dublin, in Edinburgh educational grants tended to be one-off or short term and generally date from a later period as school provision was considered the established Church’s province until significantly later there.

### Table 9:

**Illustration of the range of grants made by parliament to charities in Dublin (1842):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Annual Grant (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House of Industry</td>
<td>c.15000 (1841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Orphan House</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Lock Hospital</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying-In Hospital (Rotunda)</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Steevens’s Hospital</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork-street Fever Hospital</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meath Hospital</td>
<td>c.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow-Pock Institution</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter for Females Discharged from Prison</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin).
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27 1837-38 (446) Education (Ireland). *Return of the Total Amount of Money, and of the Value of Other Aids, Actually Issued by the Board of National Education to the Several Schools in Ireland, from the Establishment of Said Board to 15th December 1837* (n.p., 1838), 23.


31 These were the charitable institutions investigated in 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), and the table therefore does not include every central-state assisted philanthropic organisation based in the city but it indicates the range of levels of financial assistance provided.
The ways in which parliamentary funding changed over time reflected broader trends in government policy and changing power relations in each city. Care must of course be taken when making conclusions about policy ideas based on final outcomes as grants were not always the result of detailed planning and proposed plans for funding did not always materialise. Attempts to introduce a national educational system in England failed to meet parliamentary approval in the 1830s, but if these measures had been introduced, the British system would have more closely resembled the Irish. Conversely it was anxiety about the morality of newly emancipated slaves in Britain’s West Indian colonies rather than detailed long-term planning that prompted government to aid missionary societies in the late 1830s. Giving grants to missionary charities already operating in Jamaica was more efficient than establishing a new state-aided education system there.

Similarly grants to the Meath Hospital and County of Dublin Infirmary began during an emergency. During the 1826/27 fever epidemic the Chief Secretary Charles Lamb provided state aid to enable the Hospital to open vacant wards in order to accommodate fever patients from the county of Dublin who were excluded from the city’s other hospitals. Though this was granted in response to a specific incident, this aid had long-term consequences as newly opened wards became a permanent ‘Government Fever Department’ for which the Hospital received annual grants for the entire duration of the Union. Dr Steevens’s Hospital originally received assistance because it agreed to take fever patients. It maintained this funding after the epidemic ended because it agreed to accept male venereal disease patients, who had been excluded from the Westmoreland Lock Hospital in 1820. As a result, Dr Steevens’s remained a centre for the treatment of male syphilitic patients for the rest of the
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32 Bone, Inspection, 15-18, 35-41, Hilton, Mad, 587.
33 ‘Enclosure 1, in (N.)’ in 1836 (166-I) (166-II) Papers Presented to Parliament, by His Majesty’s Command, in Explanation of the Measures Adopted by His Majesty’s Government, for Giving Effect to the Act for the Abolition of Slavery throughout the British Colonies. Part III (1.)... (n.p., 1836), 7.
35 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 90.
century. Yet, although such grants often began in emergencies, the provision of state aid was an option much more frequently resorted to in Dublin. This was partly because of the tradition of intervention established by the Irish Parliament. The mere presence of a large administrative centre in the city, however, also played an important role as central state assistance often resulted from the response of a senior Castle figure to a specific urban challenge.

At the start of the period under review, Parliament was giving large annual grants to the Charter Schools and the ADV, charities with strong Anglican connections. The weak position of the Church of Ireland encouraged the state to channel assistance for religious education through voluntary societies rather than the institutional Church. In 1815 the Church of Scotland was still a National Church in practice as well as in theory, with an educational tradition that was widely respected. Initially, therefore, there seemed to be less need to aid voluntary charities in Scotland compared with Ireland, or even with England where the National Society for the Education of the Poor was established in 1811 to assist Anglican schools.

The declining authority of the Church of Ireland was reflected in government policies towards educational charity. From the early nineteenth century Catholics and their supporters increasingly challenged the idea that the Anglican Church should have a monopoly on education. The ostensibly nondenominational KPS received its first grant during the 1814-15 parliamentary session. Although the Society would come to be seen as a proselyting agency, the grant indicated that the state was prepared to fund education that was not based on the tenets of the established Church. As Harold John Hislop argued, this reflected a growing belief among government officials that the state had a responsibility to provide schooling acceptable to Catholics. The growing power of Catholics and the threat of the Catholic Association no doubt made such changes

---

37 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 4-5.
38 Brown, National Churches, 16-18.
39 Brown, National Churches, 76.
increasingly attractive to governments. By the 1820s the Lord Lieutenant, directed funds to aid the building of schools with Catholic connections including one associated with Archbishop Murray in Townsend-street Dublin. Murray’s good relations with the Viceroy Wellesley probably influenced this decision. Nonetheless aiding Catholic schools reflected the desire of some central state authorities to respond to religious diversity. 

The introduction of the national system in Ireland in 1831 was an unambiguous rejection of the view that the established Church should have a monopoly on education provision. The system was of course designed to promote non-sectarian education that would be acceptable to all denominations with separate religious education provided for Catholic and Protestant pupils on the schools’ premises but distinct from other lessons where all children were educated together. It aimed to encourage good relations among philanthropists of different denominations as well as among Protestant and Catholic schoolchildren. The Commissioners claimed that they would favour joint applications for schools by members of both denominations. Initially grant applications from many schools in Dublin included the signatures of ‘respectable’ Catholics and Protestants, although these people were not necessarily involved in the schools’ management. This was a clear attempt by central state authorities to employ charity to tackle religious tensions throughout Ireland by promoting the involvement of both denominations in the management of aspects of Irish society. In practice, these effects were not realised and many of Dublin’s national schools were de facto Catholic schools, but the system’s conciliation of Irish Catholics

---

41 DDA Murray Papers 1824 30/8/71 Communications with ‘The Commissioner of the Parliamentary Grant, in Aid of the Schools established by Voluntary Subscriptions’, see also details on ‘The Lord Lieutenant’s School Fund’, in 1826 (234) Education (Ireland.) Accounts of the Application of all Sums of Money Granted during the Last Session for the Furtherance of Education in Ireland....(n.p., 1820), 4-5, 1824 (179) (286) (Ireland.) Returns in Orders of the Honourable House of Commons, Dated 9th February 1824 (Dublin, 1824), 76-77.


43 Akenson, Education Experiment, 121, 148-149.

44 See for example NAI ED/1/28 Applications for Grants from the Commissioners of National Education ED/1/28 no.5 Female Free School 103 Abbey Street, ED/1/28 no.29 North William Street Infant School, ED/1/28 no. 8 St Michael and St John’s Schools, ED/1/28 no.33 Schools associated with the Presentation Convent George’s Hill.
reflected their growing power. By assisting Catholic philanthropic efforts in Dublin, the central state furthered Catholics’ involvement in urban governance and officially recognised them as a group to which state resources could be legitimately entrusted. Conservative Protestants, however, felt unable to co-operate with the system, limiting its ability to highlight common values among different religious groups.

The power of the established Church was also waning in Edinburgh although this remained less obvious until the Disruption. In the 1830s state funds were provided to nondenominational schools, including one in Slateford on the outskirts of Edinburgh that was partly managed by Dissenters, and to schools associated with established Church kirk sessions. Grants were also given to Free Church schools after the Disruption but it took governments several years to adjust to the split. For example, the Schools of the Northern District of Edinburgh, which mostly catered for Free Church pupils, applied for a building grant in 1844. They were refused because they were not affiliated with the English-based British and Foreign or National School Societies, or with the Church of Scotland. Following the Disruption, it took several years to produce a framework that was acceptable to the Free Church. Central state inertia could restrict philanthropy in a way that limited its ability to respond to the full spectrum of religious diversity.

Since many parliamentary grants arose in an ad hoc manner over a long period of time, there was no clear connection between receipt of funding and the nature of a charity’s administrative structures. The virtual dependence of Dublin’s House of Industry and Westmoreland Lock Hospital on parliamentary funds allowed government to dictate their administrative structures but other state-aided institutions exhibited a variety of management types. Dr Steevens’s Hospital and the Rotunda

---

45 Akenson, *Education Experiment*, 150.
46 See below.
47 See correspondence relating to the Slateford School application in NRS GD314/96 Papers relating to Tranent Subscription School. Letter from W. Thomson, 22 March 1841, *Scotsman* 27 March 1841, 28 June 1843, 1837 (304) Education (Scotland). *A Return of the Application Made from Scotland, for Participation in the Grants of £10,000 Voted in the Estimates of the Years 1835 and 1836, in Aid of Education in that Country* (n.p., 1837), 1844 (309) Schools (Scotland). *A Return of the Number and Locality of Schools in Scotland to which Aid has been Granted by the Educational Committee of the Privy Council—Also, Correspondence Relating to the Application for Aid Towards the Erection of Schools in the Northern District of Edinburgh* (n.p., 1844).
Lying-In Hospital had hybrid structures. The Meath Hospital and the KPS were subscriber democracies. Parliament only significantly affected the management structures of already functioning charities when it had strong control over their funds. An 1842 report into Dublin’s state-aided charities recommended that the Rotunda reduce the subscription required to become a governor, but it was not until after the government launched a further official inquiry into the state funding of Dublin hospitals during the 1850s, that it agreed to these suggestions. Overall state bodies were not greatly interested in making such alterations and when they were it did not reflect any hostility to voluntary management in principle.

This is not surprising, as Ó Ciosáin has pointed out, high-profile parliamentarians and government officials were often members of voluntary organisations and promoted voluntary activity. Whig Henry Brougham, for example, was a member of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. In fact, in the 1850s, Dublin Castle itself actively attempted to promote voluntary philanthropy when it unsuccessfully tried to attract subscriptions to the Lock Hospital and House of Industry by reserving one third of places on their boards of management for subscribers. This was part of a longer term trend whereby the UK government attempted to promote associational activity in Ireland. After the passing of the 1911 National Insurance Act, for example, the state sought to encourage the formation of friendly societies in Ireland as the legislation was to be administered through these bodies. This was unnecessary in Britain, where large numbers of these organisations had long been in existence.

---

49 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 88, see chapter two.
50 See chapter two. 1856 [2063] Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Hospitals of Dublin, 17, Geary, Medicine, 51.
51 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 57, 1859 Session 2 (2520) Second Annual Report of the Board of Superintendence of Dublin Hospitals, with Appendices (Dublin, 1859), 8.
In principle, the national school system provided government with many opportunities to influence charities, through the newly established schools but in practice, intervention was relatively limited. The Commissioners did not enforce the condition that schools be managed jointly by Protestants and Catholics, and they approved aid to schools with a variety of management types.\textsuperscript{55} The Commissioners did try to inject some uniformity into the management structures of national schools in November 1845, when it announced that they would be trustees of all new schools, but this move was largely unsuccessful in practice.\textsuperscript{56} Similarly, assistance was granted to Edinburgh schools with a variety of management rules.\textsuperscript{57} Some of those aided such as Slateford School were subscriber democracies, while others such as Edinburgh St Stephen’s were controlled by Church of Scotland kirk sessions.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55}See Table 10 below, for confirmation of the success of these applications see 1835 (300) \textit{Second Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland; for the Year Ending 31 March 1835} (n.p., 1835), 34-35, 1839 (429) Education (Ireland). A \textit{Return, in Detail, of the Sum of Money Paid to the Irish National Board of Education};... (n.p., 1839), 80-81, 1835 (390) National Education (Ireland) \textit{Returns of Books, Schools, and of Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Children of Other Denominations, under the Superintendence of the Commissioners of National Education};...(n.p., 1835), 6, 8, 10, 27.

\textsuperscript{56}Akenson, \textit{Education Experiment}, 151-153.

\textsuperscript{57}1837 (304) Education (Scotland). A \textit{Return of the Applications made from Scotland}, 1. See also comments in \textit{Scotsman} 28 June 1843 about there being few terms and conditions with regard to the management of grant receiving schools in Edinburgh.

\textsuperscript{58}NRS GD314/96 ‘Constitution of Slateford School’, see for example NRS CH2/607/1 St Stephen’s Kirk Session Minutes 1829-1861, 29 October 1834, 45-46, 6 November 1834, 46-48.
Table 10: School management structures for Irish national schools based in Dublin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant School</th>
<th>Information on Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendicity [1818].</td>
<td>Managed by the Committee of the Mendicity Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Free School 103 Abbey St ['approximately twenty years old' in 1832].</td>
<td>‘A Committee of Ladies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North William Street Infant School [1825].</td>
<td>‘Under the direction of a Committee of Ladies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael &amp; St John’s ['of very distant date indeed'].</td>
<td>‘under the direction of the Parish Priest, his Clergy and a Committee of lay Gentlemen’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘of the Presentation Convent’ ['Established 1766 in Mary’s Lane, removed to George’s Hill 1789'].</td>
<td>‘The only Patrons of those Schools are the Most Revd Doctor Murray The Parish Priest Revd Doctor Coleman and his Coadjutors’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary and St Peter’s Day Evening and Sunday Free Schools for all Denominations without Parochial or Religious distinctions [1802].</td>
<td>‘A Committee’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street Charity Schools [n.d.].</td>
<td>‘A Committee’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Andrew’s Female Free School at Redmond’s Hill [1824].</td>
<td>‘Under the direction of a Committee viz the Misses Healy of Rathmines and the Misses Spratt of Cork St’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female day School of the Catholic Parish of St Andrew’s ['established upwards of fifty years' in 1831].</td>
<td>‘Under the direction of a Committee’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Free Schools of the Parish of Nicholas Without [1819].</td>
<td>‘The Schools are under the immediate direction of the Rev Mr Flanagan of St Nicholas Without’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Christian Schools Richmond Street [1831, Christian Brothers].</td>
<td>‘no Committee but under the Patronage of the Most Rev. Dr. Murray’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Roman Catholic Day and Evening Male and Female Schools of St Catherine’s Parish Meath Street [n.d.].</td>
<td>‘under the Direction of the Rom. Cath. Clergyman of the Parish &amp; not of a Committee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint James’s Free Schools ['Established upwards of half a century' in 1833].</td>
<td>‘under the management of a Committee of Catholic Inhabitants of St James’s Parish’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Female Free Schools of the United Parishes of St Mary St Thomas and St George [n.d.]</td>
<td>‘Patron The Most Rev Dr Murray_Guardians Revd P. Woods_Managing Committee_Parochial Clergy of the Church of the Conception Marlboro’ St, Ladies Committee, a few of the Parishioners’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** NAI ED/1/28/1, ED1/28/5, ED1/28/6, ED1/28/7, ED1/28/8, ED1/28/12, ED1/28/13, ED1/28/18, ED1/28/19, ED1/28/29, ED1/28/33, ED1/28/34, ED1/28/47, ED1/28/50, and Woods, *Dublin Outsiders.*

The schools listed are all of those based in Dublin city who made a successful application for funds to the Commissioners of National Education between 1831 and 1845, see NAI ED/1/28 and NAI ED/1/29.
While the state might not have controlled charities’ administration directly, it potentially affected them in other ways. Lord Lieutenant De Grey commissioned the 1842 report into Dublin charities because he feared that ‘public grants, injudiciously bestowed, have a tendency to check private benevolence’. Some contemporaries claimed that any kind of compulsory assessment caused voluntary donations to dry up. The Dublin Mendicity suffered financially after the Poor Law’s introduction but this was a special case as the new Workhouses appropriated most of the charity’s functions and the numbers it served decreased substantially. Overall the effects of direct parliamentary grants were ambiguous, and sometimes encouraged rather than deterred donations. This was particularly so for Edinburgh’s state-assisted schools where the aid was usually in the form of one-off building grants given on condition that the schools also raised a specific amount of money through voluntary contributions. This may have encouraged donations in areas where there would otherwise have been insufficient funds to cover the full cost of building. Similar conditions also applied when funding was given to external missionary activity. The SMS was required to increase voluntary donations in order to avail of funds for school building in Jamaica. In the first year of the grant, the Society had to raise £750, in order to receive £1500. In the second year they had to raise £500 in order to get £800. It also had to promise that it would not ‘withdraw any portion of its funds now appropriated to negro [sic] education, in consequence of the aid received from the Parliamentary grant.’

By 1844, after several years of receiving parliamentary assistance, the SMS’s financial position was worse than it had been for the previous twenty-five years. Yet it

---

60 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 3.
63 The Committee had some discretion in terms of the amount of voluntary contributions insisted on 1837 (304) Education (Scotland). *A Return of the Applications*, 1.
64 EEC 16 February 1837.
65 Scottish Missionary Register 1 October 1838.
66 Enclosure 2, in (N.), 8.
67 Scottish Missionary Register 1 May 1844.
is not clear that this was caused by receipt of state funds. The grants had begun to diminish at this point and were due to be discontinued in the near future. The SMS had been in financial trouble before they received assistance from the state and had emphasised to their supporters how a lack of funds was hampering their attempts to do more in Jamaica. 68 State aid had allowed them to expand their operations on the island and it was only through significant fundraising effort that the SMS was able to raise the extra money required to avail of the parliamentary grant. 69

One of the conditions of the grants to Dublin’s charities was that it was impossible for the organisations to raise equivalent income from voluntary sources. 70 This was never fully assessed in practice but a corollary of the principle was that charities had to make some effort to show that they were trying to raise funds by other means. The Rotunda’s managers underlined this in their communications with government. They emphasised how they were particularly innovative in their fundraising methods, for example, they noted how they constructed and continuously renovated rooms that were available to hire for public functions. 71 The Hospital initially received very large amounts of money from the state, often over £3000 per year, but its managers pointed out that because of their own intense fundraising, this had declined over time and by 1842 they were only in receipt of £1000 per annum. The managers suggested that if parliamentary aid was continued for a few more years the Hospital might then be able to function permanently without it. 72 It never fully achieved this goal and continued to receive annual state support for the entire duration of the Union. By 1860, however, the Hospital’s annual grant had been set at £700 and was never increased again. The Rotunda continued to attract voluntary contributions

---

69 See for example Scotsman 25 February 1837, 25 March 1837, 3 May 1837.
70 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 5.
71 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 56-57, 63, 73-74, Rotunda Hospital Archive (C/O NAI) PRIV/1/5 Rotunda Lying-In Hospital Minutes November 1833-December 1850, 14 December 1844, 188-192.
72 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 74.
and other income sources. Similarly, the Meath Hospital continued to receive sizable donations and bequests after receiving an annual parliamentary grant from 1827. Apart from the Lock Hospital, all the state-aided Dublin Hospitals received funds from other sources. Voluntary funds also played a role in supporting Dublin’s national schools, charity sermons, in particular, were used extensively.

Despite concerns, state funding did not prevent the foundation of new charities. As in Edinburgh, almanac entries suggest that the number of philanthropic organisations increased significantly between 1815 and 1845. Despite the large subsidies received by some of Dublin’s medical charities, new hospitals funded entirely by voluntary contributions such as the City of Dublin Hospital Baggot-street and St Vincent’s were founded in this period. Likewise, state intervention did not affect the quality of care given to the poor in state-aided philanthropic institutions. Many of the charities that received assistance would have been unable to serve as many people if they had not obtained state funds, indeed some would have ceased to exist without them. Compulsory local systems were often more successful in meeting the needs of the poor than voluntary organisations. The North and South Dublin Union Workhouses, for example, took over many of the Mendicity’s functions and were able to provide for a greater number than the charity ever did. Extreme poverty persisted in Dublin, and both the city’s Workhouses and its charities were severely tested during the Famine. Nevertheless, despite the comparatively lower levels of destitution in Edinburgh, by the 1840s that city’s partially voluntary-funded Poor Law was also increasingly incapable of providing adequate relief.
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74 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 143.
75 See also DDA Hamilton Papers Ordinary 33/6/120 5 December 1836 ‘A long letter signed by seven ladies of the Committee following Dr Hamilton’s decision to discontinue Gloucester Place Poor School.’ See below for examples of advertisements for Charity Sermons for national schools.
76 See chapter one in Geary, Medicine, 18.
77 Woods, Dublin Outsiders, 116-118.
State funding, however, interfered with their ability to mediate social difference. In their own publications, Dublin-based charities made numerous references to assistance that they received from the state, and by doing so presented Dublin Castle and the Westminster Parliament as institutions with benevolent intentions. Aiding charities helped government to improve its reputation. It highlighted that government intervention did not always involve repressive measures, something that was particularly important in Ireland where emergency legislation was common. State aid also improved charities’ reputations which in turn attracted donations. Almanac entries for state-funded charities usually specified that they received a grant from Parliament. The introduction of the national system allowed schools to label themselves as ‘national schools’ in their fundraising advertisements. This indicated to the newspaper-reading public that each individual charity was part of a wider, established, state-approved system.

Highlighting government funding informed the public that the charity had received official approval and was a suitable recipient for donations. In January 1832, the *Freeman’s Journal* published an advertisement for the Hibernian Institution, a non-charity school that was soon to be opened in Dublin. Designed to attract public support, the advertisement claimed that it was likely that the school would receive: ‘a Parliamentary Endowment, for the purpose of employing Professors in the higher departments of Science, such as Astronomy, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, &c, &c.’ By advertising state funding the school was demonstrating that it had received official approval and its activities judged worthy of support. Similarly, in 1832, the Mendicity’s annual report noted that a proposal had been made in Parliament for a ‘compulsory assessment’ to support the organisation. While the report did not express

---


82 See for example fundraising advertisements for various national schools *FJ* 6 February 1838, 1 June 1838, 12 July 1839, 18 June 1841, 16 July 1842.

83 *FJ* 12 January 1832.
an opinion on the bill’s desirability, it argued that it was a sign of confidence in the charity’s work:

Your Committee could not but feel that this recognition of the usefulness of your institution, and of the safety and benevolence of the principles upon which it is conducted, accompanied by the testimony so generally borne in its favour by many Honorable [sic] Members upon the first introduction of the bill into the House.

In 1847 the government attempted to withdraw parliamentary funding from Dublin’s hospitals, but a campaign by the city’s residents prevented this. During the campaign, barrister John Vereker argued that the grants encouraged donations because they made the future of charities in receipt of them appear more secure. Much of the literature on the social value of voluntary organisations has emphasised the advantages of their flexible, ephemeral nature, but for contemporaries, charities that were likely to survive in the long term were attractive. Longevity ensured that the money donated would actually go towards the intended cause.

The prestige of central state funding was not emphasised in Edinburgh to the same extent as it was in Dublin. Edinburgh’s state-aided schools, for example, rarely advertised their receipt of such aid. This was primarily due to differing advertising practices in the two cities rather than radically different attitudes since Edinburgh’s charity schools in general used newspaper notices to a much lesser extent than their Dublin counterparts. The Scotsman, however, praised the Privy Council’s grant to the nondenominational Slateford Schools, and along with the Evening Courant and Caledonian Mercury, contained favourable comment on the government’s decision to aid the SMS. Funding for educational philanthropy remained welcome in both cities.

---

84 Fourteenth Report of the Managing Committee of the Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin for the Year 1831....(Dublin, 1832), 12.
86 For example c.f. Morris, ‘Voluntary Societies’, 106.
87 See chapter three.
88 EEC 29 December 1836, 16 February 1837, Scotsman 28 December 1836, 5 October 1839, 28 June 1843, CM 4 May 1837.
even when, as will be seen, some strongly condemned state aid to other forms of charity.\textsuperscript{89}

Central state funding was sought after and prestigious but its broader social impacts were not always benign. Trentmann has argued that the conversion of voluntary organisations into lobby groups in the twentieth century had a detrimental influence as these associations did not enable a society to manage itself in the same way as its nineteenth-century counterparts had done.\textsuperscript{90} Similarly although Dublin’s philanthropic associational culture closely resembled Edinburgh’s in many ways, the existence of regular state grants partly diverted charities’ attention towards Dublin Castle and away from the wider middle class. Dublin’s newspapers indicate that the city’s charities, whether state-funded or not, invested heavily in communicating with the wider public.\textsuperscript{91} Many of Dublin’s state-aided charities published reports and made use of public meetings to advertise their cause; as did voluntary organisations throughout the UK. Cork-street Fever Hospital and the Shelter for Females Discharged from Prison, for example, produced regular reports informing the public of their activities and emphasising their need for funds.\textsuperscript{92} The Meath Hospital placed newspaper advertisements for its annual meetings and charity sermons and probably engaged with the public to a significantly greater extent than Dun’s Hospital whose state funding was more intermittent.\textsuperscript{93} Yet the availability of state finance and the Castle’s presence affected how Dublin’s charities communicated. Many philanthropic institutions

\textsuperscript{89} See chapter five.
\textsuperscript{90} Trentmann, ‘Introduction. Paradoxes’, 33, though he did not consider the impact of the Welfare State’s more general democratising social potential.
\textsuperscript{91} See chapter three.
\textsuperscript{92} For example Twelfth Report of the Shelter for Females Discharged from Prison, Circular-Road, Harcourt-Street, for the Year 1837-8 (Dublin, 1839), Report of the Managing Committee of the House of Recovery and Fever Hospital in Cork-Street Dublin, for One Year, from 1st April, 1842, to 31st March, 1843... (Dublin, 1843).
\textsuperscript{93} For example references to the Meath’s newspaper advertising in NAI PRIV1271/1/1 Proceedings of the Board of Governors 1805-1827, 7 April 1817, 95-96, PRIV1271/1/9 Proceedings of Hospital Board 1839-1854, 28 March 1842. See also advertisements for meetings \textit{IJ} 28 March 1838, 29 March 1839, 2 April 1840, 31 March 1841, 2 April 1842, Sir Patrick Dun’s Minutes 1822-1838, 25 April 1837, 250-251, 26 December 1837, 271-272, PDH/1/2/1/2 Minute Book, Volume 3, 27 February 1838-27 December 1853, 27 February 1838, 1, evidence of lower levels of advertising at Dun’s are based on searches of the above minutes books for 1824, 1836, 1842, and 1845, and searches for ‘Dun’s Hospital’ in the \textit{Freeman’s Journal} on the Irish News Archive between 1815 and 1845.
sometimes spent significant time applying to the Irish Administration for aid, despite the fact that requests were not always successful. State-aided charities frequently communicated with Dublin Castle, and often with the Office of the Lord Lieutenant. They corresponded several times annually about the provision of the grant itself and they were required to provide detailed estimates of expenditure. The number of communications between charities and Dublin Castle increased significantly during the many official inquiries into poverty, philanthropy, and education that took place in this period.

Developments from the 1830s onwards, including the advent of the national school system, drew the attention of even more charities towards Dublin Castle. An appeal made in 1831, to the Lord Lieutenant on behalf of St Andrew’s Female School by Catholic philanthropist the Rev. John Spratt, along with the Under Secretary’s formulaic reply was published in a newspaper. The letter emphasised the School’s positive qualities, and so communicated these to potential donors, but it also highlighted how the managers’ focus was turned towards the state rather than the wider public. Similarly, the Mendicity’s annual report for 1831 included descriptions of its managers’ recent interactions with Lord Lieutenant Anglesey. Although the charity was unsuccessful in securing state aid, inclusion of Anglesey’s positive comments on the association were used to highlight the institution’s value. The presence of Dublin Castle provided a focus that drew charities’ attention away from the wider middle-class public. There was simply no equivalent source of secular central state funding in Edinburgh to which philanthropic organisations could direct similar attention.

This gravitation towards the central state diminished charities’ ability to ease Dublin’s social tensions. In fact the availability of state funds frequently aggravated social tensions. As they competed for state patronage, charities came to be defined as

---

94 See for example the Meath Hospital Proceedings of the Board of Governors 1805-1827, 2 January 1815, 87-91.
96 NAI ‘Education in Ireland’ newspaper clipping (n.d.) in ED1/28/12 Application for St Andrew’s Female Free School Redmond’s Hill, for Spratt see FJ 29 May 1871.
political and religious rivals rather than as alternative ways of providing the same services. In Dublin, state aid to educational charities was intensely controversial and party political. The CES was established in 1839 as a reaction against the nondenominational national school system. The Tories’ return to government in 1841 saw the CES launch a campaign against the national education system and in 1845 the charity pressed (unsuccessfully) for a government grant. These activities were divisive with frequent public criticisms of the religious ‘errors’ that the national system was believed to be promoting. The CES’s large annual meetings seem to have been designed to cause controversy as their speakers attacked the national system in sectarian terms. At the first annual meeting of the Society the Rev. Robert Daly argued that by providing education acceptable to Catholics, the national schools ‘helped to bind the system of darkness upon the Roman Catholic people of Ireland’ by keeping them under clerical control. He also encouraged the CES to set up a model school in Dublin to train teachers able to ‘compete with the masters of the National Board.’

Conservative Protestants’ harsh criticism of the national system made it difficult to present parliamentary-assisted Catholic philanthropy as just one valid alternative among many, decreasing the system’s ability to mediate social conflict.

Even medical charity, which was often less controversial than educational charity in Britain, provoked conflict in Dublin. Despite their best efforts, most of Dublin’s medical hospitals were suspected of demonstrating religious or political bias at some point during this period. For example, hospitals were often accused of allowing proselytising missionaries to visit vulnerable patients. Parliamentary funding further exacerbated these tensions as charities in receipt of it were said to be subject to political pressure. One example of this was the 1844 ‘button war’ which was part of the fallout from O’Connell’s imprisonment in that year. State-aided institutions including
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99 Akenson, Education Experiment, 199-200, for example DEM 11 February 1842, 28 March 1845.
100 Authentic Report of the First Annual Meeting of the Church Education Society for Ireland held in the Rotundo [sic], Dublin on Thursday 24 April, 1840.....(Dublin, 1840), 11.
102 See for example accusation of Protestant proselytism at the Meath Hospital, Proceedings of Hospital Board 1839-1854, 13 June 1842, 112, see also chapter six for the complaints of the Adelaide Hospital in this regard.
the Talbot Dispensary (part of the House of Industry) were accused of refusing entry to those wearing badges in support of repeal. The issue was raised at repeal meetings in Dublin, where it was implied that this was the result of government pressure.103

State funding of education increased religious conflict in Edinburgh, even though there was consensus among the city’s main Presbyterian groups about the kind of religious education that children should have. A letter from W. Thomson advising the managers of Slateford Nondenominational School about their application for Privy Council funds claimed that most grants had been given to: ‘the greedy mace of the Church, to be expanded in the Erection of Edifices placed under her exclusive controul [sic], so as to serve for hotbeds of Churchism & intolerance.’104 Since central state funding, however, was fairly rare in Edinburgh, its opportunity to cause such problems remained limited. As a result, such aid, while not insignificant, had less impact on the ability of Edinburgh’s charities to mediate middle-class diversity.

Catholic educational charities resembled many of their UK counterparts in their desire for state aid and this may have promoted a basic sense of understanding across sectarian divides. Yet state funding also heavily politicised charity in Dublin and helped to emphasise the issues that divided the city’s religious groups. The conflict promoted the development of new charities such as the CES that were purposely designed to combat existing institutions and this further enhanced division. It presented different philanthropic organisations as enemies rather than equally legitimate alternatives. Central state assistance had ambiguous effects, it was sought after and prestigious, and could improve the reputation of charities and the state, but it was divisive. From the point of view of the middle classes (though not necessarily the poor) it also decreased the legitimacy of philanthropic activity by making it appear less locally managed and less in their control.

II.

Resolved—That the sincere and marked thanks of this meeting are pre-eminently due to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, for his condescension in becoming Patron of the Roomkeeper’s [sic] Society.

FJ 7 February 1831.

103 FJ 16 January 1844.
104 NRS GD314/96 Letter W. Thomson 22 March 1841.
An invitation to participate in the government of a prestigious philanthropic organisation was not easily refused. The participation of a state officeholder in a charity enhanced the reputations of the charity and the official whereas refusal could damage both. A brief glance at contemporary almanacs informed readers that holders of national-level offices were involved in the management of many charities. In some cases, the office was listed, though in others their name rather than their government position was given, perhaps indicating involvement in a personal capacity. Some charities specified that the officeholder was a manager by virtue of their government office, making a very public link between the charity and state authority. In 1845 at least nine Edinburgh charities included a central officeholder on their boards of management.\textsuperscript{105} These were usually prominent legal officials such as the Lord Advocate, the Lord President of the Court of Session and the Lord Justice Clerk. They were involved in a range of charities including medical institutions such as the RI and the Royal Public Dispensary and poor relief organisations such as the House of Refuge and Night Refuge at Queensberry House. They were also involved in educational charities such as the Edinburgh Infant School Society and the Edinburgh Education (Lancasterian School) Society.

\textsuperscript{105} Figures from 1845 Oliver and Boyd.
Table 11:
The involvement of central state officeholders in the management of Edinburgh’s charities (1845).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Officeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Bible Society.</td>
<td>Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Advocate, Solicitor General, the Procurator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Education (Lancasterian School)</td>
<td>The Lord President of the Court of Session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution for Deaf and Dumb.</td>
<td>Lord Justice General.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Refuge &amp; Night Refuge Queensberry</td>
<td>Lord Justice General, Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Advocate, Solicitor General,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Public Dispensary, Established in 1776.</td>
<td>Lord Justice General, Lord Advocate, Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port-Hopetoun and General Public Dispensary</td>
<td>Lord Justice Clerk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Humane Society 161 Fountainbridge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Town Dispensary Instituted in 1815.</td>
<td>Lord President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *1845 Oliver and Boyd.*

By contrast central state officeholders were rarely involved in Edinburgh’s missionary societies. This probably reflects the prominence of Church of Scotland Moderates and Episcopalians among Edinburgh’s senior legal officeholders. One of the few exceptions was the more conservative Church-linked SBS in which the Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Advocate, and Solicitor General were all Vice-Presidents in 1845. The reputation of Edinburgh’s missionary charities may have benefited from high levels of clerical involvement, but the absence of senior central state figures made these charities appear less prestigious than other voluntary organisations. By contrast legal officeholders were involved in several of Dublin’s Protestant missionary associations, for example the Lord Chief Justice was on the Committee of the Scriptures Readers’ Society for Ireland. Ireland’s very different religious composition meant that lay conservative elites were more active in missionary charities, and, in the face of an

---

106 This lists all of the central state officeholders that could be identified by office (rather than personal name) in *1845 Oliver and Boyd.*


increasingly vocal Catholicism, were somewhat less concerned about promoting Protestant ‘enthusiasm’ than their peers in Scotland.

Overall a range of central state officeholders were involved in Dublin’s charities as they were in Edinburgh, but the central position of the Lord Lieutenant created a fundamental difference between the cities. Patrick Maume argued that a ‘Welfare Viceroyalty’ in which philanthropic patronage was used to strengthen the office, developed during the tenure of Lord Aberdeen in the late nineteenth century. In practice, Viceroyals acted as patrons or presidents of many Dublin charities from the early nineteenth century at least. In 1824 Lord Lieutenant Wellesley was patron or president of eleven charities, by 1845 Baron Heytesbury was patron or president of fifteen (see Table 12 below). Despite a high level of aristocratic involvement in Edinburgh’s charities, there was no equivalent to the Lord Lieutenant’s role. The only person who came close was the Duke of Buccleuch, prominent Tory landowner and Lord Privy Seal in Peel’s government between 1842 and January 1846. According to 1845 Oliver and Boyd, Buccleuch was a senior officeholder in ten Edinburgh-based charities. As a major Scottish landowner and Lord Lieutenant of the County of Edinburgh, his role in philanthropy helped to enhance Edinburgh’s position as capital of Scotland. Yet Buccleuch lacked the very explicit governance links of the Irish Lord Lieutenant, nor was his role in Edinburgh society as well

111 See chapter six.
114 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 467.
developed in this period as it would be from the 1850s. Similarly in earlier years, Melville (Dundas) did not play as prominent role in philanthropy as the Irish Viceroy despite acting as Scotland’s political ‘manager’.

The absence of a similarly dominant central government figure in philanthropy in Edinburgh made power relations there appear more diffuse. As in many nineteenth-century British towns, central state intervention in Edinburgh was often ‘hidden’. Prominent officeholders may have exerted more influence behind the scenes than they did in Dublin but their actions were less visible. Edinburgh, therefore, appeared more autonomous, its middle classes seemed to be governing their city according to their own (and Scotland’s) interests rather than those of central government. The Lord Lieutenant shaped philanthropy in Dublin in a wide variety of ways. He technically controlled most of the funds voted by Parliament for charitable education in Ireland. The full title of the National Education Commissioners were: Commissioners appointed for administering the Funds placed at the disposal of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant for the Education of the Poor in Ireland. The Lord Lieutenant even had his own personal fund, the Concordatum Fund, some of which was used to aid charitable institutions. Several hospitals founded in this period adopted the name of the current holder of the office reflecting its prestige and charities’ newspaper advertisements emphasised his probable attendance at their fundraising events.

The prestige of the office was a valuable asset for charities associated with it. During his Viceroyalty the Duke of Northumberland agreed to donate £1000 to the

---

115 Reynolds, ‘Scott, Walter, Francis Montagu Douglas’, see also Morton, Unionist Nationalism, 100.
118 1845 Thom’s, 242.
120 This included most of the constituent parts of the House of Industry (the Richmond, the Whitworth and the Hardwicke Hospitals, the Talbot Dispensary, and the Bedford Asylum), the Westmoreland Lock Hospital, the Anglesey Maternity Hospital and the Whitworth Hospital Drumcondra.
121 See for example, J 28 April 1821, 4 April 1830, 3 January 1837, 9 March 1840, 26 June 1840, see also the Meath’s request for his presence at their sermon: NAI PRIV1271/1/7 Meath Hospital Proceedings of Hospital Board 1824-1830, 23 March 1829, 509.
Dublin Mendicity on condition that the same amount be raised privately.\textsuperscript{122} Northumberland’s action attracted many donations from aristocrats and other prominent individuals further improving the organisation’s reputation. Viceroy’s influence on philanthropy was further enhanced by their wives’ involvement in the city’s charities. Several institutions remained connected with individual Viceroy or Vicereines after they had served their terms of office. The Duke of Northumberland remained a vice-president of the Mendicity for many years.\textsuperscript{123} The Marchioness Wellesley was still patroness of the Institution for Lying-In Women and Diseases of Females, Mercer-street in 1845, even though the Marquis’s term as Lord Lieutenant ended in 1834.\textsuperscript{124}

As Peter Gray and Olwen Purdue pointed out, the Lord Lieutenant was supposed to be a neutral figure and representative of the monarch in Ireland, but there was a tension between this symbolic role and the political nature of an appointment dependent on the government of the day. Most nineteenth-century Lord Lieutenants had well-known political connections.\textsuperscript{125} This tension made his role within charities ambiguous. On the surface, philanthropic patronage was a way of exercising the symbolic role of the office and overall there was not much change in Viceregal patronage between 1815 and 1845 (see Table 12). Despite major changes in government education policy, the Lord Lieutenant remained president of both the ADV and the Charter Schools for the entire period under review. Even during the reforming Mulgrave administration, Dublin Castle continued to be associated with charities that had been a source of grievance to Catholics. In some cases it would have been legally difficult for the Lord Lieutenant to disconnect himself from a charity: the Rotunda Lying-in Hospital’s charter, for example, named him as a governor.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{123}1845 Thom’s, 660, Woods, Dublin Outsiders, 92-93.
\textsuperscript{124}1845 Thom’s, 673.
\textsuperscript{126}1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 64.
when this was not the case, regularly abandoning charities and transferring patronage to new ones would not have maintained the reputation of the office. In some ways then, despite their best intentions, reforming Dublin Castle administrations could be a source of inertia when it came to improving Catholics’ position.

Yet there was some change and it revealed and reinforced the party-political nature of philanthropy in Dublin. Mulgrave and his wife became patrons of the Female Penitent Asylum Little James’s-street along with ‘His Grace the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the Vicars General, Parish Priests, and the Clergy, Secular and Regular, of this City.’¹²⁷ Viceregal patronage had ceased by 1841, but although Mulgrave was no longer Lord Lieutenant, his wife remained the institution’s ‘Chief Patroness’ until 1845 at least. Mulgrave and his wife were sometimes able to employ philanthropy to further their reputation for improving opportunities for Catholics. By contrast, Tory Lord Lieutenant De Grey became patron of the Protestant Orphan Society during his tenure, a charity that had not received Viceregal patronage before despite being in existence for over ten years. The charity was no more sectarian than contemporary Catholic orphan societies but this new patronage decision publicly associated the Lord Lieutenant with an organisation that was clearly designed to benefit one confessional group. Viceregal patronage of Protestant Orphan Society continued under De Grey’s Tory successor Lord Heytesbury but stopped when the Whigs returned to power in 1847. De Grey became the institution’s patron again from 1848 even though he was no longer Lord Lieutenant.¹²⁸ O’Connell’s caricaturing of De Grey as a sort of pantomime villain after his unfortunate donation to the Mendicity allowed the Tory administration to be collectively condemned and further associated philanthropy with party politics. De Grey’s name was frequently greeted with the refrain ‘shin of beef’ when it was mentioned at O’Connellite meetings showing how charitable activity could strongly shape the image of the Lord Lieutenant and how closely philanthropy was entwined with politics in Dublin. As charities became

¹²⁷ *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...* 1836 (Dublin, 1836), 313, *Dublin General Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...* 1841, 342, *1845 Thom’s*, 668.

¹²⁸ *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...* 1847 (Dublin, 1847), 330, *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...* 1848 (Dublin, 1848), 370.
politically it became more difficult to present them as opportunities for respectful co-

existence.

**Table 12:**

The Lord Lieutenant and philanthropy in Dublin: Charities of which the Lord Lieutenant was either Patron or President.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1815</th>
<th>1824</th>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hibernian Society, for the care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
<td>The Hibernian Society, for the care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
<td>The Hibernian Society, for the care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
<td>The Hibernian Society, for the care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
<td>The Hibernian Society, for the care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association Incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.</td>
<td>The Association Incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.</td>
<td>The Association Incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.</td>
<td>The Association Incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.</td>
<td>The Association Incorporated for Discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Female Orphan House, Circular Road, for Destitute Female Children.</td>
<td>The Female Orphan House, Circular Road, for Destitute Female Children.</td>
<td>The Female Orphan House, Circular Road, for Destitute Female Children.</td>
<td>The Female Orphan House, Circular Road, for Destitute Female Children.</td>
<td>The Female Orphan House, Circular Road, for Destitute Female Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, (Rotunda).</td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, (Rotunda).</td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, (Rotunda).</td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, (Rotunda).</td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, (Rotunda).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almanac entries which specifically refer to his office, or ‘His Excellency’ rather than his personal name/title.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1815</th>
<th>1824</th>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>St George's Dispensary and Fever Hospital.</strong></td>
<td>Cow-Pock Institution, Sackville-Street.</td>
<td>Cow-Pock Institution, Sackville-Street.</td>
<td>Cow-Pock Institution, Sackville-Street.</td>
<td>Cow-Pock Institution, Sackville-Street.</td>
<td>Cow-Pock Institution, Sackville-Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street.</strong></td>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street.</td>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street.</td>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street.</td>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street.</td>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</strong></td>
<td>Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</td>
<td>Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</td>
<td>Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</td>
<td>Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</td>
<td>Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** 1815 Treble Almanack, 1824 Treble Almanack, Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...1832 (Dublin, 1832), 1836 Dublin Almanac, 1845 Thom’s.

### III.

Frankel and Ó Ciosoáin have highlighted the growing importance of state investigation and publication in many jurisdictions in this period.\(^{130}\) There was an increasing desire to know, to centrally collate information, and to present it to the public. Parliament and other government bodies investigated a wide range of social issues throughout the

UK and charities in Dublin and Edinburgh were often reported on as a consequence. Some official inquiries specifically focused on philanthropic institutions such as the 1829 and 1842 reports into Dublin’s state-aided charities, but investigations with a wider remit such as the 1830s *Reports of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction in Scotland* also shed light on philanthropy. These enquiries allowed the state to subtly extend its authority over voluntary relief provision. From the 1830s onwards UK governments became increasingly interested in publicising their inquiries. These reports were sold rather than provided gratis but they were brought to the attention of a large section of public opinion through the production of abridged editions, newspaper reproduction of parts of them, and media discussion of their contents.\(^{131}\) By using the same methods to investigate institutions in various places and by reporting on them together, state inquiries linked the local to the national and reinforced their readers’ affiliation with Ireland, Scotland, or the UK.\(^{132}\)

There was a significant increase in the number of official publications that provided information on charity in Edinburgh during this period. Inquiries into church accommodation and the provision of education, in particular, became more common and a substantial Scottish Poor Inquiry was also carried out in 1845. There was only one entry under ‘Education (Scotland)’ in Cockton’s *Subject Catalogue of the House of Commons Parliamentary Papers* for the years before 1837 but there were five between 1837 and 1845.\(^{133}\) Most other investigations relevant to Scottish philanthropy date from after 1835. Reporting on Scottish society was certainly not a new phenomenon. John Sinclair’s *(Old) Statistical Account of Scotland* was completed in the 1790s based on information supplied by established Church ministers and the Church of Scotland itself conducted inquiries into education and pauperism.\(^{134}\)

---

\(^{131}\) Ó Ciosáin, *Ireland in Official*, 12-14, Frankel, *States of Inquiry*, 57, see for example comment on the *First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction Scotland* in EEC 23 March 1837.

\(^{132}\) This is similar to Benedict Anderson’s argument about newspapers see Marcus Funk, ‘Imagined Commodities? Analyzing Local Identity and Place in American Community Newspaper Website Banners’, *New Media and Society*, 15 (No.4) (2012), 574-575, see chapter seven.


the 1830s however the central state was much more heavily involved in these processes than it had been in the past. Historians had long presented nineteenth-century Ireland as an unusually heavily investigated society, but Ó Ciosáin demonstrated that, adjusting for population, other parts of the UK received as much attention. Yet while the state showed a similar level of interest in philanthropy in Ireland and Scotland by 1845, the increase in inquiries happened earlier in Ireland with regular parliamentary investigations into charities already common by 1815. This was a response to Ireland’s weak Church establishment and it again highlights how central state intervention was a well-established feature of Dublin life.

Governments’ increasing interest in providing information altered the environment in which charities operated and affected managers’ efforts to shape the public image of their institutions. The state’s production of ‘authoritative’ reports relating to philanthropic work challenged charities’ ability to control this image and had the potential to adversely affect their reputations. Sustained public discussion of a report, even when critical, added authority to that report. Repeated government investigations into the same issue sometimes had a cumulative effect. Reference to an earlier inquiry in a later investigation could increase the earlier inquiry’s standing, something particularly significant in Dublin given the long history of state investigation there. The 1842 inquiry into Dublin charities used the 1829 report as its benchmark, even though the latter did not examine all of the charities considered in the former. The commissioners who wrote the 1843 report seem to have accepted all of the 1829 report’s conclusions without question. In turn, the managers of the charities

---


136 For an early example see [No paper number] *A Report upon certain Charitable Establishments in the City of Dublin, which Receive Aid from Parliament* (Dublin, 1809). Cockton’s catalogue indicated that while new types of inquiry began in Dublin during the period considered here such as the reports of the National Education Commissioners, these did not greatly increase the number or overall volume of reports, Peter Cockton, *Subject Catalogue of the House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1801-1900* using interactive browsing interface on House of Commons Parliamentary Papers (old format) http://parlpapers.chadwyck.co.uk.ezproxy.is.ed.ac.uk/subjectCatalogue.do accessed 6 October 2015.

137 See below and chapters five and seven.

138 Curran, ‘Funding’, 22.

139 Frankel, *States of Inquiry*, 56.
investigated in 1842 used the positive judgements made about their institutions in the
1829 to demonstrate the charities’ value and entitlement to state funding.\textsuperscript{140}

The increasing investigatory role adopted by the secular state was part of the
contemporary trend towards professionalisation and bureaucratisation of state
administration identified by David Eastwood.\textsuperscript{141} Eastwood argued that this change
reflected a reduction in the value associated with authority based on social status, with
the opinion of the ‘professional’ becoming increasingly favoured over that of the
gentleman. While the state had long bypassed the established Church when
investigating Ireland, the growth in parliamentary-sponsored publications in the 1830s
and 1840s challenged the Church of Scotland’s position as National Church, even
when some official inquiries continued to rely on the Church for information.\textsuperscript{142} The
publications’ aims also reflected changing power relations in Edinburgh and the rest of
Scotland. As in Dublin, the state began to recognise those outside of the established
Church. \textit{The First Report on Religious Instruction} publicly acknowledged social
difference in Edinburgh by investigating many of the city’s denominations.\textsuperscript{143} The
inquiry however proved controversial. Its main task was to assess the sufficiency of
church accommodation and it took evidence from Dissenting clergymen as well as the
Church of Scotland. By including Dissenting chapels in the report’s calculations, it
implied that the state valued the religious instruction provided by all the
denominations equally.\textsuperscript{144}

The Church of Scotland’s General Assembly thought the inquiry a threat to the
establishment and such views were repeated at local level. The New Town kirk session
of St Stephen’s agreed to answer the investigation’s queries but they protested against
its methods, arguing that:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{140} For example 1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 32, 36, 47, 53, 74, 77, 117.
  \item \textsuperscript{141} Eastwood, “Amplifying”, 287, 293-294.
  \item \textsuperscript{142} For example an education enquiry published in 1837 relied on returns from Church of Scotland
Presbyteries see 1837 (133) Education Enquiry. \textit{Abstract of the Answers and Returns made Pursuant to
an Address of the House of Commons, Dated 9th July 1834, Scotland} (n.p., 1837), 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{143} See chapter three.
  \item \textsuperscript{144} Brown, ‘Religion and the Rise’, 78-91.
\end{itemize}
any system or course of procedure, having for its foundation the assumptions that the State is entitled to regard any other religious instruction than what is dispensed by the Established Church, or that it is immaterial by what sect or description of teachers such instruction is communicated, involves a principle at variance with the doctrines of the Church of Scotland, and with the very first principles of religious Establishments. And they do therefore, for themselves, solemnly renew the Protest made by the Commission of the General Assembly, that their resolution to answer these Queries shall in no wise imply the least abandonment or dereliction of those principles on this subject which they hold sacred.\footnote{St Stephen’s Kirk Session Minutes, 2 December 1835, 64-65.}

They also recognised that handing powers of inquiry to someone else could potentially damage their church’s reputation. They objected to the suggestion that their minister should give evidence at a public meeting as this might ‘expose…[him] to hostilities and insult from inimical or disreputable individuals.’\footnote{St Stephen’s Kirk Session Minutes, 2 December 1835, 64-65.} The Church of Scotland had long performed an information-gathering role and the appropriation of such work by others presented a significant challenge to the Church’s authority.

An official survey of Scottish schools conducted in 1838 took evidence from a wide variety of institutions. It indicated that many Edinburgh schools had some kind of association with the Church of Scotland, but it did not limit its inquiries to these. Unlike some other official reports into Scottish schools, it received its information directly from schoolmasters rather than through Church personnel.\footnote{1841 Session 1 (64) Answers made by Schoolmasters in Scotland to Queries Circulated in 1838, by Order of the Select Committee on Education in Scotland (n.p., 1841).} These schoolmasters were sometimes employees of Church of Scotland kirk sessions but directing questions at them indicated that the report prioritised their professional authority as educators.\footnote{Also see chapter six.}

A similar trend was seen when it came to state inspection of schools. In 1840 the Privy Council’s Education Committee appointed John Gibson, English Master at Madras College St Andrew’s, as inspector of Scottish schools. Although the Committee’s inspection scheme was designed for schools in receipt of state funding, other schools were encouraged to participate. The Committee emphasised that the inspector’s role was simply to advise and that school managers would be free to
disregard his recommendations. The Church of Scotland’s General Assembly was even given a veto over choice of inspector. These changes were unpopular among many of Edinburgh’s religious groups. Dissenters criticised the apparent deference to the established Church. At a public meeting in support of Dissenters’ rights in 1840, the Rev. Mr Harper argued:

In their laudable zeal for education, Government had instituted an inspectorship of schools, the appointment of the individual being contingent on the approval of the General Assembly. The inspector is thus in effect the nominee of the Church; and as he is empowered to visit all schools built by Government assistance, the arrangement is in fact an extension of the Church’s control over the education of the country.

Yet, as Stewart Brown argued, even with a veto, the fact that an established Church allowed another body to inspect its schools was significant. This was particularly so in Scotland where the Church had the right to inspect all schools and according to the 1838 School Survey many Edinburgh schools were inspected by their local Church of Scotland clergyman or kirk session, even when the school had no official Church connections. Unsurprisingly, the Disruption also undermined the Church’s position and in 1848 the government appointed a Free Church-approved inspector for Free Church-affiliated schools who worked in parallel to his Church of Scotland counterpart. As with other forms of government intervention in Edinburgh, school inspection was more influential than it appeared. Although the school inspectors’ powers seemed limited, by investigating schools not in receipt of state funding the system had a very significant reach. The governors of the prestigious George Heriot’s Trust invited the inspector to visit their growing network of Foundation Schools, an arrangement of at least as much benefit to the reputation of the inspectors as of Heriot’s. Gibson also addressed new classes of teachers provided by the Edinburgh

149 Bone, Inspection, 18-26, 1841 Session 1 (392) Inspectors of Schools (Scotland). Return to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons (n.p., 1841), instructions to the inspectors were publicised in newspapers see for example Scotsman 29 April 1840.
150 Scotsman 19 December 1840.
152 1841 Session 1 (64) Answers Made by Schoolmasters, 285, 290, 296-297, 301-302.
154 Bedford, Heriot’s, 260.
Sabbath School Association, something which was advertised in the newspaper press, publicising the work of the inspection system and perhaps augmenting the system’s reputation.155

Reactions within the Church of Scotland to the new school inspection system were mixed. Some commentators saw it as a threat to Church authority. They conceded that acceptance of state funds required some form of accountability to the state and argued that Church authorities owed obedience to the ‘civil magistrate’ in certain matters.156 They claimed, however, that government had been forced to give veto powers to the Church. They noted that the Privy Council’s Education Committee had proposed the establishment of nondenominational teacher training schools and had only abandoned this plan because of opposition from the Church of England. That Church’s protest secured them a veto over the choice of inspector for its schools and as a result the Church of Scotland received a similar concession.157 Many in the Scottish Church feared that the government would revive its original plans for nondenominational training schools when it got the chance and opposed the inspection scheme because of this.158 These fears reflected a wider concern that the Church of Scotland was increasingly under threat within a reformed polity.159 Critics feared that allowing secular authorities to supervise the Church would further diminish the ability of the Church to be the central institution in Scottish society that they believed it should be. At a debate on education at the 1840 General Assembly, Sir Charles Fergusson argued that there was no need for the new state sanctioned school inspectors since, by law, the Church was the inspector of all schools.160 Responding to the concerns of Dissenters or protecting religious diversity does not seem to have been a major concern for Fergusson.

155 The Witness 27 March 1841, 31 March 1841.
156 See the debate at the Presbytery of Edinburgh on the issue reported in The Witness 31 October 1840 see also The Witness’s own comments on School Inspection in the same issue. See also The Witness 3 June 1840.
158 The Witness 3 June 1840.
159 The way in which the established Churches adjusted to post-1832 reformed polity is a central theme in Brown, National Churches, see for example 242.
160 The Witness 3 June 1840.
Many established Church clerics and elders, however, supported the inspection scheme, and in the face of strong opposition from some members, the Presbytery of Edinburgh passed a resolution inviting the state inspector to visit the Church of Scotland schools within its bounds. The individual schools retained the final decision on the inspector’s admission but the Presbytery was clearly publicly endorsing the inspection system.¹⁶¹ Many Non-Intrusionists supported state school inspection and they mocked Moderates’ qualms about working with an inspector of the Church’s own choosing while at the same time allowing the state to undermine the Church’s spiritual independence.¹⁶² Non-Intrusionists’ support for the scheme was pragmatic. They argued that the invitation to visit schools could be withdrawn should the government introduce unpalatable policies. Most hoped that state inspection would improve standards in parochial schools and help to revive the Church of Scotland.¹⁶³ They argued that the prestige that accompanied state inspection would invigorate their own schools, granting power to other religious groups was not their priority.

Unsurprisingly state school inspection in Ireland was influenced by an earlier and more pronounced decline in the position of the established Church. In the early nineteenth century, investigation into Irish educational charity often involved Anglican clerics reporting on schools with Church of Ireland connections. In the 1800s and 1810s, the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland¹⁶⁴ which included the Archbishop of Armagh, the Provost of TCD, the Dean of St Patrick’s, and the Vicar of the Dublin parish of St Catherine’s, reported on such Anglican charities as the Charter Schools, the Dublin Foundling Hospital, and the schools of the ADV.¹⁶⁵ By the 1820s education inquiries sought the opinion of senior Catholic clerics. By the 1830s both Catholic and Anglican Archbishops of Dublin had been appointed as Commissioners of National Education and the reports of these Commissioners provided regular

¹⁶¹ The Witness 31 October 1840.
¹⁶² The Witness 31 October 1840.
¹⁶³ The Witness 3 June 1840.
¹⁶⁴ Although the terminology is confusingly similar, this body differed significantly from the Commissioners that managed the national education system from the 1830s onwards.
¹⁶⁵ 1809 (142) (Ireland.) Reports, Presented to the House of Commons, from the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland, 1810 (193) (Ireland.) Eight Report from the Commissioners of the Board of Education, in Ireland. Foundling Hospital (n.p., 1810).
information on many schools with Catholic connections. By 1845 Dublin-based state bodies that dealt with charitable institutions were expected to include Catholic representatives, though they were rarely in proportion to their presence in the city's population.

Unlike in Scotland, the National Education Commission provided a permanent, visible body that did not require the approval of the established Church. Archbishop Richard Whatley was an active Commissioner but most of the Anglican hierarchy did not share his opinions and promoted the CES as an alternative. Anglican clerics often publicly criticised the national system for endorsing ‘error’ by allowing Catholics to use ‘mutilated Bibles.’ However, the Commission was also seen as a threat to the broader social authority of the established Church. In 1842, J.C. Martin told the Evening Mail that it would be demeaning for Church of Ireland schools to be brought under the Commissioners’ supervision:

if the present national system were now so modified as to aid our church schools....then, in the processes of receiving aid, the recognition of the entire system by our clergy must be clear, and multiplied, and various. It would be necessary, for example, for our clergy to solicit aid from the board, to state their circumstances, and submit their claims-to represent and remonstrate, supplicate and remonstrate with the board-to bear their refusals, and acknowledge their favours-to obey their orders, answer their queries, set up their placards, admit their inspectors, and subscribe their reports-we should join the priest and Socinian in calling our places of education “national schools,” and be, in fact, the supporter, subjects, and servants of the board-recognising its existence, extending its authority, and enrolled upon its books; or, in a word, be vitally incorporated with the system, and reported as a part and parcel of it in its periodical returns to Parliament, and as claimants with the National Board in their yearly applications for a grant.

Martin argued that the Church had an obligation to obey ‘civil authority’ but this did not extend to participation in the national system. He claimed that if the Church became affiliated with the system, this would erroneously declare to the world that they

166 O Ciosáin, Ireland in Official, 115-117, 1825 (400) First Report of the Commissioners on Education in Ireland, 97.
167 A letter to the DEM 11 February 1842 referred to a CES petition which claimed: “That your petitioners CANNOT AVAIL THEMSELVES OF ANY SYSTEM, in which instruction in the Holy Scriptures is not recognised as the fundamental principle of Christian education.” (emphasis in original). For the Anglican hierarchy’s involvement in the CES see Second Annual Report of the Church Education Society for Ireland.....(Dublin, 1841), 3-4.
168 DEM 11 February 1842.
169 The comments also indicate that collective references to charities in official reports could be used to highlight similarities and perhaps even affiliations between them, see below and chapter seven.
held the same values as non-Anglican educationalists. In Edinburgh, state school inspection appeared limited enough for it to be acceptable to Non-Intrusionists who were normally jealous of secular state interference in the Church’s sphere. Yet though less restrictive and less obvious, the Scottish system permeated society to a greater extent than the Irish.

State reporting also provoked political controversy. The 1842 report on charities also highlighted Dublin’s ongoing political and religious controversies. Although Dublin commentators of all political hues agreed with the report’s recommendations that the grants be retained, the investigation still exacerbated party-political tensions. For the liberal Morning Register and Freeman’s Journal, the investigation was a Tory plot to damage Dublin by removing the charities’ assistance. They argued that De Grey had handpicked three Tory commissioners whom he mistakenly thought would tell him what he wanted to hear.170 The Evening Mail also welcomed the report’s recommendations but argued that De Grey’s motives were reasonable and that it was to the commissioners’ credit that they reached the correct conclusions even if these appeared to undermine the case for Union.171 The newspapers were less interested in the report’s content and more interested in using it to support their own political positions.

Politics also influenced debates on state involvement in Edinburgh. Presbyterian Dissenters became increasingly frustrated with the failure of the 1830s Whig administrations to respond to their concerns by failing to appoint prison chaplains from dissenting denominations and by only choosing members of the Church of Scotland for a recently established ‘Bible Board’ charged with revising the official version of the Bible.172 As in Dublin, government efforts never completely satisfied demands for full religious equality. Nor was politics absent from the General Assembly’s debates on school inspection and fears about the Whigs’ interest in nondenominational schooling were alluded to. Speakers, however, tended to avoid obviously party-political language. For example, D.M. Makgill Crichton Esq. of

170 Morning Register thereafter MR, 15 July 1842, FJ 15 July 1842. DEM claimed that La Touche was a Whig ‘though not a repealer’, DEM 18 July 1842.
171 DEM 18 July 1842.
Rankeilloir argued that although he was prepared to accept the government’s proposal regarding inspection, he was still wary of those ‘who lately showed a desire of exercising...interference’ in parochial schools’ management. Unlike many of their Dublin counterparts who were prepared to clearly link philanthropy with party politics, the speakers at least claimed that they wished to avoid such connections. Sir Charles Fergusson, who strongly opposed the inspection scheme, told the Assembly that he was advised against voicing his concerns ‘because it would imply jealousy of a particular Government’, and while he ignored this advice he felt it necessary to strongly deny any partisan motivation. Sir G. Clerk Bart. too prefaced his opposition to the school supervision scheme by emphasising his desire to avoid ‘political utterances.’ Such positions were partly facilitated by the existence of more clear-cut Whig-Tory differences on Irish religious policies than on Scottish ones, but while state reporting on charity exacerbated political conflict in both cities, it did so to a greater extent in Dublin.

J.C. Martin’s comments about the demeaning nature of the Irish national education system raised an important point. Being part of the same system of funding, inspection, and reporting emphasised similarities between the institutions involved. Having the name of one’s institutions in such a report was prestigious but it also publicly indicated that one endorsed the system. Newspapers are said to have helped associations create a sense of common identity by providing information on many organisations in one place, sometimes on the same page, which highlighted similarities between the associations and between their managers. Official reports sometimes did the same thing and the effects of these reports on identity creation will be considered in chapter seven.

---

173 *The Witness* 3 June 1840.
174 *The Witness* 3 June 1840.
Conclusion:

Dublin city was partly defined by the presence of Dublin Castle. The administrative complex helped to proclaim to the world that Dublin was still the capital of Ireland. Even repealers opposed repeated attempts to abolish the Lord Lieutenancy during the nineteenth century. This was partly for economic reasons as the Viceregal Court was an important market for the city’s goods and services, but the presence of the Lord Lieutenant also enhanced Dublin’s image and his role in charitable patronage was a significant part of this. Viceregal patronage added prestige to voluntary activity, while also politicising charity. This created a significant contrast with Edinburgh whose position as stateless capital was defined by a different set of power structures. In some ways, the central state interfered in a more invasive manner in Edinburgh so that by 1845 some charities had become part of a school inspection system that would become increasingly influential in the following decades. Yet in the mid-nineteenth-century the nature of the interference still allowed Edinburgh’s philanthropy to appear to be managed by the city’s middle classes to a much greater extent than Dublin’s. The high level of central state intervention in philanthropy in early nineteenth-century Dublin was part of a longer term trend building on the Irish Parliament’s interference in the eighteenth-century, and continuing into the twentieth century when the Republic of Ireland became one of the most centralised countries in Europe.

Dublin Castle’s intervention in philanthropy brought prestige to Dublin, yet it also allowed those based at Westminster and Whitehall to exert control over the city at the expense of its aspirant middle classes. At first glance Dublin Castle appeared to provide the kind of overt national power centre that one might expect to find in a capital city. Yet rather than being a source through which the city exerted authority on itself and the rest of Ireland, Dublin Castle appeared to sometimes simply be an intermediary through which Westminster and Whitehall exerted their will on the city and the nation. By contrast Edinburgh appeared to be able to both manage itself and


177 Bone, Inspection, 52-73.

178 Potter, Municipal Revolution, 382-384.
influence the rest of Scotland. The interfering role of the central state in Dublin raises questions about the legitimacy of governance in that city, but to fully explore these concerns the relations between voluntary organisations and local government must also be considered and the next chapter will examine such interactions in detail.
Chapter Five.
Local Government, Lords Provost, and Legitimacy.

"[In] the present Infirmary the Magistrates have no influence, and it is really a prevalent opinion that the nomination of them as extraordinary managers secures them no respect."1

This criticism came from an appeal made by a group of medics and lay philanthropists to the Lord Provost of Edinburgh for his support for a new hospital that they were attempting to establish in the city. While the language was no doubt intended to flatter, it also revealed that the group thought that local government officeholders should play a role in Edinburgh’s charities and this was a view shared by many of the city’s middle-class inhabitants. This chapter explores the relationship between charities and local government in each city. As well as investigating how specific local government actions affected individual charities, it examines the ways in which the broader environment consisting of both local and central state structures shaped philanthropy’s effects on wider society. It shows that the contrasting nature of state-charity relations associated with the differing structures that defined stateless capital status in each city, explains significant differences between them. A higher level of local state intervention in Edinburgh allowed charities to reduce social conflict there, and therefore, to mediate difference to a greater extent than in Dublin where the central state authorities played a greater role in philanthropy.

Local government in early nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh was made up of a patchwork of bodies, often with overlapping jurisdictions, dating from different times.2 In some cases local authorities’ powers applied only to a small portion of the city. Individual Liberties operated their own courts in Dublin until the 1850s while in Edinburgh the subordinate district of the Canongate had its own local government until 1856.3 Edinburgh had separate Poor Law jurisdictions for ‘the City’, the Canongate, and St Cuthbert’s (West Kirk) parish, and from 1839 the river Liffey

---

1 Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh Archive (hereafter RCPEd.A) Poole Papers POR/3/12/17 ‘Copy Letter to the Lord Provost. Edin: 30 April 1825’.
divided Dublin city into two Poor Law Unions. Other bodies were designed to serve the whole city: in Edinburgh, these included the corporate governance body: the Town Council, and the Commissioners of Police. The Commissioners were established in 1805 to serve a broad metropolitan area that extended beyond the city’s ancient and extended royalty. Some Commissioners held their positions *ex-officio* but many were elected on a property franchise. Dublin had a corporate governance body, Dublin Corporation, as well as boards, such as the Wide Streets Commissioners established in 1757, that dealt with the kinds of infrastructural issues managed by police commissioners in Scottish cities. In Dublin however these boards were nominated by central government, and law and order policing was also closely connected with the central rather than the local state, especially after the formation of the Dublin Metropolitan Police in 1836. These bodies indicate that, to a much greater extent than in Edinburgh, Dublin’s position as a stateless capital fuelled the appropriation of significant urban governance functions by the central state. The city of Dublin also had its own Grand Jury that controlled some of the city’s prisons, and had the power to make presentments for a variety of purposes including road maintenance, coroners’ salaries, and medical charities. It was impanelled by the Sheriff who in turn was appointed by central government. Like grand juries throughout Ireland, the City of
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3. Dublin Corporation rather than Dublin City Council is employed here because it was the commonly-used term in this period, Dublin City Library and Archive, ‘Appendix 1. Dublin’s Mayors from 1500 to 2012’, in *Leaders of the City, Dublin’s First Citizens, 1500-1950*, Ruth McManus and Lisa-Marie Griffith eds (Dublin and Portland, Oregon, 2013), 186.
Dublin Grand Jury was an exclusive body with few Catholics serving on it before its dissolution in 1851, further limiting the diversity of the city’s governance.  

This chapter focuses on interactions between charities and local government institutions with a city-wide jurisdiction. Town councils had much wider influence in this period than their relatively limited functions might suggest, as they were the establishments through which the town was represented to the wider world. In 1815 Edinburgh Town Council and Dublin Corporation were closed institutions composed of the representatives of guilds or trade bodies but by 1845 they were chosen by property-based electorates that could be roughly defined as middle-class. The path to municipal reform, however, was not the same in each city. Edinburgh Town Council was reformed in 1833 whereas legislation to reform Dublin Corporation did not pass until 1840 after six unsuccessful bills. Even the pre-reform situation was different in the two cities, the presence of partly-elected Police Commissioners enabled middle-class involvement in local government in Edinburgh from 1805, there was no equivalent to this in Dublin. Despite being a stateless capital, members of Edinburgh’s middle classes were allowed to exercise, and to be seen to be exercising, significant authority in the city.

Dublin Corporation, Edinburgh Town Council, Edinburgh Police Commissioners, and the City of Dublin Grand Jury all interacted with charities in their respective cities and this chapter examines these interactions to shed light on social relations within each city and the cities’ ability to cope with difference, as well as to consider what they reveal about contemporary views of urban governance. It also examines the relationship between charities and the cities’ chief magistrates: the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, both of whom were sources of philanthropic patronage. Scottish Lords Provost were more powerful than their Irish counterparts. The position of the Lord Provost of Edinburgh was particularly
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12 Compare the descriptions of the Town Council or Corporation in 1824 Edinburgh Almanack, 1824 Treble Almanack, 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 1845 Thom’s.

13 Milne, Liberties, 46.
prestigious as they had a national as well as a civic role as chief magistrate of the Scottish capital and president of the Convention of Royal Burghs, a group representing certain Scottish towns.\(^{14}\) Local rather than central government institutions helped to define Edinburgh’s national leadership position within Scotland making it a different kind of stateless capital from Dublin. The contrasting nature of stateless capital status in each city, was reflected in different kinds of relations between local government and philanthropy in each, which in turn produced contrasts in each city’s ability to cope with difference.

The establishment of police commissioners in Scottish towns and cities from the late eighteenth century onwards reflected a strong tradition of collectivism at local level in Scotland.\(^{15}\) Edinburgh Town Council, like several Scottish towns, had long had a common good fund, a non-rate-generated income reserved for projects of benefit to the whole community.\(^{16}\) By contrast, the existence of centrally-appointed magistrates and the Irish Constabulary has been used to argue that there was a weak tradition of local government in Ireland. Much of this work, however, had a rural focus and considered administrative actions rather than attitudes towards local government.\(^{17}\) More recent studies of Irish cities have examined both government structures and attitudes towards them, and have provided a more mixed picture. Potter suggested that overall local government was weaker in Ireland. He argued that for many, particularly Irish Protestants, central government intervention in local affairs was often the least objectionable form of administration.\(^{18}\) On the other hand, Stefanie Jones’s study of the first twenty years of Dublin’s reformed Corporation revealed that the city’s middle
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\(^{16}\) Rodger, “common good”, 158, 176-177.

\(^{17}\) MacDonagh, ‘Ideas and Institutions’, 206-207, Daly, ‘Irish Urban’, 64-65, however argued that Dublin’s government-nominated boards provided evidence of a weak local government tradition there.

\(^{18}\) Potter, ‘Urban Local’, 117-118.
classes, like their peers in Britain, were interested in self-governance and wanted to improve the efficiency of urban government.\textsuperscript{19}

Active local government has been seen as central to the formation of civil society. It has been said to have played a crucial role in promoting the diverse associational culture necessary to support civil society, and Edinburgh’s local government structures have been seen as particularly successful in this regard. Rodger argued that Edinburgh Town Council tried to promote civil society in the later nineteenth century by working with and financially aiding voluntary organisations.\textsuperscript{20} For Morton the 1805 Police Act was the key event in the formation of Edinburgh’s civil society because it allowed the middle classes their first official role in the governance of their city.\textsuperscript{21} It will be seen that the Police Commissioners that this Act established made efforts to support the work of voluntary organisations, and by doing so, promoted common values. Wallace, drawing on Morton and Norton Long, presented an ‘ideal’ reciprocal relationship between the state and a city’s associational culture in which each enhanced the authority of the other. The state ‘empowered’ voluntary associations by appointing their members to official local bodies such as library committees, and in return members of voluntary organisations enhanced the legitimacy of the state by participating in public ceremonies and other state-run events.\textsuperscript{22} This chapter explores such issues in more detail by considering how interactions between charities and the local state affected social relations including the ability of such interactions to promote common values, a fundamentally important process through which civil society is strengthened.

For urban residents, changes in municipal governance were some of the most tangible effects of reform. English Corporations had often been trustees of charitable institutions and so municipal reform threatened to transfer the control of these institutions to a new and more diverse group of people. Interactions between local government and charities in England were heavily politicised from Leeds to Bristol where the improved administration of charities became part of the contemporary
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reform agenda. In principle the higher the number of charities connected with local government, the greater the ability of municipal reform to open many aspects of urban life to middle-class control. This chapter considers the significance of such issues in Dublin and Edinburgh. It indicates that because government intervention in charity in Edinburgh came more frequently through the local rather than the central state, such interference appeared more legitimate and hence more likely to reduce conflict, than in Dublin.

I.

Long claimed that to work effectively local and central government must reflect the values of the local community. One does not have to fully accept Long’s argument to recognise that urban governance might prove difficult if a town council had different moral priorities to most of the town’s inhabitants. The promotion of values was both an aim and effect of many types of philanthropy, not least educational charities, and charitable institutions therefore provided a potential vehicle through which government could articulate values. The ways in which local government participated in charity, and the extent to which philanthropy promoted shared values shaped both how that government’s authority and the charity itself were viewed. By examining these issues, this chapter will analyse contemporary ideas to a greater extent than some of its predecessors, shedding light on attitudes towards local and central state activity.

It is not difficult to find examples of central state funding provoking political and religious controversy. Yet, the higher level and longer tradition of such interference in charity in Dublin made commentators there more favourable towards parliamentary funding than their Edinburgh counterparts. The Dublin residents who
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24 For Bristol see Gorsky, Patterns, 64-77, for Leeds Morris, Class, Sect, 171.
26 Morris, Class, Sect, 164-165, 254, Joyce, Rule, 115-118.
27 See chapter four.
carried out the 1842 inquiry into state funding of charities, concluded that Dublin’s peculiar situation as a poor but metropolitan city justified state funding and other residents adopted this argument to defend the grants. Attitudes in Edinburgh were less favourable. This was of course partly because that city’s charities received little money from Parliament but this in itself helped to reinforce differences in attitudes between the cities by fueling a pride in Edinburgh’s apparent autonomy. The Scotsman, though generally sympathetic to Irish causes, condemned Dublin’s parliamentary grants, asking why that metropolitan city did not support its own charities. In a long article entitled ‘Irish Jobs’, the Scotsman criticised the parliamentary aid given to a range of Dublin institutions, particularly the House of Industry:

London and Edinburgh pay for the maintenance of their own poor; but the Government kindly stands foster-father to the paupers of Dublin, and has granted L29,000 per annum, or L800,000 since the Union, to do that for shewy [sic] city what it should have done for itself! It needs no conjuror to tell, that a Charity Workhouse administered by government must be a scene of jobbing and extravagance, and this is plainly intimated by the hints dropped about the governor’s emoluments.

The desire to prevent corruption reflected the newspaper’s general reforming outlook but this was not its only concern. In fact, it conceded that some of the government-aided institutions were well-managed but it maintained that there was no reason why Dublin should not support them itself. The newspaper argued that some of the charities aided, such as the Female Orphan House ‘should be left to private contributions’ but it also distinguished central and local government funding and claimed the latter was much more acceptable. When criticising the amount of money given to the Royal Dublin Society, an association for the ‘improvement’ of science, agriculture, and education, it argued that granting money to Scottish Schools of Arts would be a more efficient way to improve knowledge of science. The newspaper envisioned this money would come from local government with central government playing an enabling role:
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28 For example MR 15 July 1842, DEM 18 July 1842, FJ 15 July 1842, see also chapter four.
29 Scotsman 15 August 1829.
30 1836 (445) Report from the Select Committee of the Royal Dublin Society; Together with Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix (n.p., 1836), iii.
Now, how much more rational would it be in [sic] Government to authorize the Lieutenants of Counties to subscribe an annual sum of L50 or L100 to such of them [Schools of Arts] as were well conducted, stopping the allowance when proofs of mismanagement presented themselves than to throw away so much upon one? By L1000 or L2000 expended in this way, ten times more would be done to promote scientific education, than by the present grant to the Dublin Society.31

The newspaper considered local government funding to be more acceptable than central government finance because it operated at a level closer to the local community.

Although the Scotsman was more favourable to central state funding for education in Ireland, it continued to complain about grants to other philanthropic institutions.32 In 1842 it claimed:

If Ireland has been hardly treated and stinted in justice, she has, in recompense, been pampered with immunities and grants of public money. It is wonderful how many institutions in Dublin are supported by Government, which the inhabitants of other towns provide for by local assessment.33

Criticism of the grants was partly fuelled by anger at the governments’ apparent neglect of Edinburgh, but inter-city jealousy was not the main motivation behind condemnations of central state funding. In 1836 the Edinburgh Police Commissioners applied for parliamentary funds, arguing that as the ‘northern metropolis’, Edinburgh attracted and had to support poor people from throughout Scotland, often through charitable institutions. They highlighted that Parliament not only aided Dublin’s police but that ‘£40,000 was granted to the House of Industry, and Foundling and other Hospitals of Dublin.’34 They were not asking for parliamentary funding for Edinburgh’s charities, they simply wanted assistance for their own body. They implied that a portion of any grant that they received might be spent on charity as they told the government that they played a central role ‘in maintaining a House of Refuge on a
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31 Scotsman 15 August 1829.
32 For positive comments on the Irish national educational system see Scotsman 26 May 1832, 27 June 1849, Cowan, Newspaper, 124-125, and chapter seven.
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34 ECA, ED009/1/8 Minute Books of the General Commissioners 1834-1838, Police Commissioners Minutes ‘Minute of Committee appointed to Memorialize His Majesty’s Government for a Grant to the Police of the City Edinburgh 10th August 1836’, 10 August 1836, 320-322. Thanks to John McGowan for highlighting these applications.
proper footing for the reception of Strangers and others in a state of destitution.’ They thought it appropriate for local government to intervene in philanthropy but that central government funding for charities should be channelled through local government rather than given directly to the charitable institutions themselves.

As this chapter’s opening quotation indicated, there was a general expectation in Edinburgh that local government would play some role in charity. Those trying to establish the new hospital argued that the Town Council was entitled to a greater input in hospital administration than the RI allowed. Even this group, who wanted their new charity to be primarily managed by subscribers, thought local government should be involved.\(^{35}\) In fact they insisted that ‘It is a duty of magistracy and police to prevent, as much as possible, the extension of contagious…disorders’, again suggesting that local government should interact with subscriber-funded medical charities.\(^{36}\) By contrast, in Dublin central government played an active public health role, aiding fever hospitals and occasionally providing funds for the House of Industry to employ street cleaners during epidemics.\(^ {37}\)

The Edinburgh Lock Hospital which treated poor syphilitic patients, was a partial exception as some argued that it was more appropriate for central rather than local government to fund this charity. This, however, was a special case. Lock hospitals were controversial because they were believed to encourage ‘vice’.\(^{38}\) Central funding was seen as preferable partly because of contemporary associations between national military strength, prostitution, and venereal disease, partly because central government had aided lock hospitals elsewhere in Britain, and partly because it lessened local involvement in a form of medical care that many found distasteful.\(^{39}\) However this did not completely prevent local government involvement in Edinburgh. A Treasury grant of £50 per year was made to the Lock Hospital, but in the face of objections from within their own body, the Edinburgh Police Commissioners also gave an annual grant
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of £100 to the charity.\textsuperscript{40} Not everyone in Edinburgh favoured local government funding of philanthropy. Chalmers and his many supporters were critical of the use of assessment in the Scottish Poor Law and campaigned to have it replaced with a parish-based system funded by personal donations.\textsuperscript{41} Yet in general local government intervention was considered more acceptable than central state interference.

Commentators in Dublin were more comfortable with parliamentary funding of charity than their Edinburgh counterparts but this did not mean that they saw central government intervention as more appropriate than local government interference. In general, they saw local government intervention as more acceptable in principle, even if for practical reasons they argued that central state involvement should be preferred. In 1849, in response to attempts to remove parliamentary grants from Dublin’s hospitals, prominent surgeon John MacDonnell wrote a pamphlet defending such assistance. Yet in it MacDonnell conceded that ‘the grant in question is at complete variance with the sound principle that each locality should support its own charities’, and he claimed that the funding was only justified because of Dublin’s unique characteristics as a poor but metropolitan city.\textsuperscript{42} When discussing hospital finance, MacDonnell coupled voluntary donations and local taxation together and distinguished them from parliamentary grants as more acceptable forms of funding.\textsuperscript{43}

Both liberals and conservatives agreed that Dublin Corporation should play a role in philanthropy. In 1839, in a last-ditch effort to prevent the opening of the municipal franchise to Catholics, the unreformed Corporation sent an address ‘to the Protestants of the United Kingdom’ presenting the case against reform. In it they argued that if Catholics were admitted to the Corporation:

The Lord Mayor of Dublin will be President of Popish Schools—will be the Chairman at the meetings of Popish religious societies—will lay the first stone of Popish Chapels—will throw the weight of his influence—that is to say the weight of the influence of a British

\textsuperscript{40}Scotsman, 1 March 1837, 30 November 1839, ‘Memorial for the Managers of the Lock Hospital to the Commissioners of Police’, in Police Commissioners Minutes 1834-1838, 24 February 1837, 469-475, 2 March 1837, 481-483.

\textsuperscript{41}Brown, Thomas Chalmers, 99-102, 153-155.


\textsuperscript{43}McDonnell, A Letter to...The Earl of Carlisle, 7-11.
Magistrate into the scale with whatever is *Popish*, and therefore ‘idolatrous and damnable’.\(^{44}\)

While this highlighted the Corporation’s anti-Catholic prejudices, it also revealed that they believed philanthropic patronage was a normal part of the chief magistrate’s duties. Their predictions reflect the ability of local government intervention in charity to provoke political and religious controversy, but they did not see local government interference as problematic in principle, quite the opposite, and this was a view shared by members of the reformed Corporation. In 1846 the Corporation lobbied to have its powers increased to match those of their English counterparts, and it listed its loss of the King’s Hospital as a grievance. Members clearly thought that charitable activity should be part of their functions.\(^{45}\) The desire to regain the King’s Hospital, demonstrated that the reformed Corporation, a majority liberal and Catholic body, identified to some extent with Dublin’s civic traditions. The loss of the school was a lost opportunity for strengthening upwardly mobile social groups’ sense of connection with the city’s corporate history.

Attitudes towards central state intervention in Dublin were ambiguous. Some features, such as Viceregal patronage were prestigious and enhanced the city’s capital status.\(^{46}\) This was aided by the presence of Dublin Castle which made such patronage readily accessible. The later advent of municipal reform in Dublin was also significant, it made central government intervention more acceptable in practice during the 1830s when Dublin Castle was making substantial attempts to improve the position of Irish Catholics.\(^{47}\) This, however, was a reaction to delayed municipal reform, rather than a belief that central government intervention was more acceptable in principle. As Jones indicated, attitudes towards local government were generally similar in Dublin to those in the rest of the UK, and this became more apparent once reform occurred.\(^{48}\)


\(^{45}\) Dublin City Library and Archive (hereafter DCA) Dublin City Council Minutes C2/A1/13 May 1844-January 1847, 15 October 1846, 450-452.

\(^{46}\) See chapter four.

\(^{47}\) Boyce, *Nineteenth-Century Ireland*, 71-75.

\(^{48}\) For example Jones, ‘Dublin Reformed’, Vol. II., 438.
II.

Local government intervened in charity in both cities but such intervention was more significant in Edinburgh. This involvement can be roughly classified into three categories: financial assistance, intervention in management, and softer forms of interaction each of which will be examined in turn.

While parliamentary grants to Dublin’s hospitals were sometimes very substantial, the amount of money given to charities by local government in either city was much lower. The funds sometimes came directly from local rates. Edinburgh Charity Workhouse received income from a poor rate as well as from voluntary collections at the doors of churches and chapels and demonstrates how blurred the boundaries between local government and voluntary activity in Edinburgh could be.

The City of Dublin Grand Jury gave half-yearly grants to medical charities including the Charitable Infirmary, Jervis-street, Mercer’s Hospital, and the Hospital for Incurables. The County of Dublin Grand Jury also aided medical charities, but with the exception of the Meath Hospital, these were located outside the metropolitan area.

Table 13:
Presentments made by the City of Dublin Grand Jury to charities (for half year ending November 1840).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Infirmary Jervis-Street.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital Baggot-Street.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital for Incurables</td>
<td>100(^{31})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital for the Diseases of Children.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer’s Hospital.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FJ 9 November 1840.
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\(^{49}\) See Table IX in the appendix.
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Table 1
Amount granted by the Edinburgh Police Commissioners to charities (for the year 1840-1841).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Lock Hospital</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Fever Board</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: General Account of the Revenue and Expenditure of the Edinburgh Police Establishment. For the Year Ended Whitsunday 1841 (Edinburgh, 1841).

Less direct forms of financial assistance were also granted. The RI had long-term financial connections with the Town Council as the Council continued to pay interest on a loan it had received from the hospital in the eighteenth century. In 1819:

the sum of L. 11,000 still remained in the hands of the City of Edinburgh, at an interest of 4½ per cent., secured by an appropriation, recognised in an act of Parliament, of the duty of two pennies on the pint of ale and beer imported into the City.  

54

Up to 1817 the King’s Hospital received £250 per year from a tax on grain entering Dublin. 55 The school continued to have financial connections with the Corporation until reform, with each Alderman donating one hundred guineas on their appointment to office. 56

Even when they did not provide financial assistance, local government bodies sometimes played a part in the management of charities. In some cases this was a symbolic patronage role that provided prestigious official recognition to the charity and also helped to legitimise the local state. Both cities’ chief magistrates were actively involved in the management of philanthropic organisations. The Lord Mayor, for example, was president of the Dublin Mendicity and regularly chaired its general meetings. 57 The Lord Provost was ex-officio chair of the RI’s board of management and often presided over general meetings of the Court of Contributors. 58 Both chief magistrates also used their authority to form temporary relief funds for the

54 Scotsman 13 February 1819.
56 CARD Vol. XIX, 288, 308, 310, Whiteside, King’s, 48.
57 For example NLI MS 32,599 (4) Mendicity Minute Book April 1830-February 1832, 26 April 1830, 41, 11 June 1830, 70-71, Woods, Dublin Outsiders, 22, 83, IF 29 April 1834, 10 October 1839.
58 Logan-Turner, Great Hospital, 202, for example LHSA LHB1 1 12 Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh Managers’ Minutes January 1838-January 1842, 6 January 1840, 281, 4 January 1841, 389-406.
unemployed. Yet overall the Lord Provost was more influential than his Dublin counterpart. According to city almanacs, he was involved in the management of more than three times as many charities. (See Tables 15 and 16 below). Other local government officeholders were also heavily involved in Edinburgh’s charitable institutions. Sometimes all or a significant part of the Town Council helped to administer a charity. Trinity Hospital, a poor relief institution established in 1461, was managed solely by the Council. The Council and the city’s Church of Scotland ministers managed Heriot’s. The Council also administered more recently founded charities including the Edinburgh City Free School, Niddry-street and the Institution for Relief of Incurables founded in 1805.

Table 15: Charities in which the Lord Mayor of Dublin was a manager (1845).

| Association for the Suppression of Street Begging in Dublin, 9, Usher’s-Island, (Formerly Moira House) Instituted 1818. |
| Charitable Musical Loan. |
| Charitable Society for the Relief of Sick and Indigent Room-Keepers of all Religious Persuasions-founded 1790. |
| City of Dublin Hospital, Upper Baggot-street. |
| Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, Established by Royal Charter Governors and Guardians Limited by Charter to Sixty. |
| Meath-street Savings’ Bank-Established February 11th, 1818. |
| Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor of Ireland. |

Source: 1845 Thom’s.

---

59 For example Scotsman 28 December 1836, 26 October 1842, FJ 15 January 1830.
60 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 1845 Thom’s.
63 As with other tables the charities’ names are as they appeared in the source.
Table 16: Charities in which the Lord Provost of Edinburgh was a manager (1845).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Bible Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary to the London Missionary Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts for the Instruction of Mechanics founded 1821.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canongate Burgh School, Established in 1837.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Bell’s Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Education (Lancasterian School).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Heriot’s Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauvin’s Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Branch of the Scottish Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution for Deaf and Dumb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Promoting Education among Workmen, Apprentices, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene Asylum 1797.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Relief of the Destitute Sick, instituted 1785.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Refuge &amp; Night Refuge, Queensberry House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Asylum for the Houseless Poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution for Relief of Incurables, Founded by the Late Mrs Elizabeth Keir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society in Edinburgh for Clothing the Industrious Poor, Dickson’s Court, 18 Bristo-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Charity Workhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Fever Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Infirmary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Public Dispensary Established in 1776.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canongate Public Dispensary No. 178 Canongate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Eye Infirmary, 1 Elder Street, York Place Instituted 1834.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Town Dispensary instituted in 1815.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Maternity Hospital-Instituted 1843.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Edinburgh Lunatic Asylum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Edinburgh Infant School Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1845 Oliver and Boyd.

Spaces were reserved on the boards of some Dublin charities for specific local government officers such as the Recorder or Sheriff, but it was rare for most or all of the Corporation to be listed as ex-officio managers and the King’s Hospital was the only significant exception to this.64 The Corporation administered several alms houses but these were generally on a small scale and it even sold its interest in one of them, St Bridget’s Widows’ House to the Wide Streets Commissioners in 1843.65 The City Grand Jury occasionally exerted influence on the medical charities that it aided. In

64 1845 Thom’s, 674.
April 1833, for example, it requested that the Charitable Infirmary investigate a claim that a patient had been expelled and the hospital’s managers felt obliged to write to the Jury explaining why the patient had been discharged. Overall though interactions between the Grand Jury and the Infirmary were limited to receipt of the annual grant and no formal role in management was reserved for the Jury in any of the institutions it aided.

Edinburgh’s local government bodies helped to establish several philanthropic institutions. The Town Council and Police Commissioners secured the return of charitably-funded treatment for syphilitic patients after the RI closed its Lock Ward in the early 1830s. They held a public meeting to investigate the issue and later, when it became clear that the RI would not reopen the Ward, the Commissioners helped to establish the Edinburgh Lock Hospital and controversially secured changes to police legislation that enabled them to make an annual contribution of £100 to it. The Commissioners always elected a representative to the Hospital’s board of management. It also helped to found the House of Refuge, a poor relief charity in the former Barracks at Queensberry House and annually elected a representative to this charity’s board as well. Edinburgh’s local government was often more proactive in promoting philanthropy than the central state was in Dublin.

Dublin was the medical capital of Ireland and home to numerous charitable hospitals, yet overall local government was more involved in medical philanthropy in Edinburgh, a distinction that emphasises the significance of local government in the latter. The contrast was even more striking when it came to educational charity. The City of Dublin Grand Jury allowed the Sunday School Society for Ireland to manage a

---

66 CICT/PRO/02, 11 April 1833, 312-313.
67 Based on an analysis of RCSI CICT/PRO/01 April 1819-April 1826 Charitable Infirmary Jervis-street, Minutes of the Management Board and of the Board of Governors and Guardians of the Charitable Infirmary, CICT/PRO/02, and CICT/PRO/03.
68 Joint Meeting of the Committee of the Police Commissioners and Magistrates of Edinburgh respecting the Lock ward being re-opened in the Royal Infirmary or one established in the City 3rd May 1834', in ECA ED009/1/7 Minute Books of the General Commissioners 1832-1834, Police Commissioners Minutes, 3 May 1834, 697. LHSA LHB1 1 11 Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh Managers’ Minutes November 1831-December 1837, 26 March 1832, 42. Police Commissioners Minutes 1834-1838, 19 November 1834, 123, 22 December 1834, 146.
school in the Richmond Bridewell, one of its prisons, but in general it was not involved in educational philanthropy. Apart from their role in the King’s Hospital, the pre-reform Corporation claimed to facilitate Protestant educational charities. In an effort to prevent reform they told Protestants:

*Heretofore the Court House and the Corporation Hall have afforded open doors to the preaching of the Gospel—they have been appropriated when not otherwise occupied...to the useful purposes of Protestant Sunday Schools and Protestant Associations.*

Yet, unlike central state officeholders or senior Anglican clerics, Dublin’s local government officeholders rarely held *ex-officio* positions in the city’s missionary charities and the Corporation was not heavily involved in educational charity. Edinburgh’s local government officeholders were also rarely involved in classic missionary organisations such as Bible societies, although the Town Council had connections with religious education through its role as patron of the city’s Church of Scotland churches while Heriot’s had a Church of Scotland ethos. The Council, however, became increasingly involved in education more generally. The opening of Heriot’s Foundation Schools from the late 1830s onwards expanded the Council’s role as did their administration of Edinburgh’s Bell’s Fund, a share of money bequeathed by prominent educationalist Andrew Bell (d.1832) to promote his Madras (monitorial) system of schooling. By 1835 the Council had used part of the Fund to convert its own City Free School, Niddry-street, into a ‘Dr. Bell’s School’, and it also opened another Bell’s School in Greenside. In fact the Bell’s Schools greatly enhanced the

---

70 *1845 Thom’s.*  
72 See chapter three and 1837 (31) *First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction Scotland.*  
Council’s educational role as they were used to train pupils as apprentice teachers. Edinburgh Town Council aimed to be a major educational provider.

Local government also intervened in less overt ways that further shaped the public images of both charities and state institutions. In Edinburgh the local state sometimes confirmed or enhanced the authority of charities, for example in 1813 the Edinburgh Society for the Relief of the Destitute Sick received a Seal of Cause from the Town Council to enable it to hold large amounts of money. Charities’ requests for such recognition in turn improved the Council’s reputation and reinforced its authority. Local government empowered charities in other subtle ways. In the early 1840s, the RI made increased fundraising efforts in response to serious financial difficulties. The Police Commissioners became involved and according to the RI’s managers:

The Police Commissioners of Edinburgh and Leith came forward in a very handsome manner and offered their Services in making a General Collection throughout the whole bounds of Police, and the result was...the appointment of a large Committee of the Inhabitants divided according to the Wards of Police into small Committees along with the Commissioners for the purpose of raising funds for the Institution and of pressing upon the public the necessity of Contributing by annual subscriptions.

The RI’s managers maintained control over this fundraising with the actual collection carried out by members of a special committee which they themselves appointed, but the process involved the substantial employment of local government apparatus. The appeal used police wards as its collection areas and collection sheets were initially sent to the relevant Police Commissioner for further distribution. The appropriation of an infrastructure normally employed to collect a compulsory rate for the solicitation of voluntary contributions, highlights just how closely connected private philanthropy and local government sometimes were in Edinburgh.

---

75 CM 22 August 1836, *The Edinburgh Almanack, and Universal Scots and Imperial Register for 1840* (Edinburgh, 1840), 482. Town Council Minutes September 1837-January 1838, 26 September 1837, 38-45.

76 LHSA GD 10/1 Society for the Relief of Destitute Sick in Edinburgh ‘Copy. Seal of Cause by The Magistrates and Council of Edinburgh in Favour of the Society for Relief of Destitute Sick at Edinburgh 1813. 1924’.

77 General Meeting of the Incorporation Council Chambers 3 January 1842’, 3 January 1842, RI Minutes 1838-1842, 526-527.

78 Police Commissioners Minutes 1838-1842, 8 February 1841, 263-265.
The RI’s managers also involved the Town Council in their fundraising activities. They always sought the Council’s permission before holding their annual church door collections as they thought that the city’s ministers would be wary of proceeding without the Council’s approval.\textsuperscript{79} Dublin Corporation was responsible for the administration of a small number of Church of Ireland parishes but the position of Edinburgh Town Council as patron of the city’s Church of Scotland churches allowed it to permeate charitable activity, and hence wider social life to a much greater extent.\textsuperscript{80} The Council’s interventions were not conflict-free but they furthered the connections between philanthropy and Edinburgh’s governance networks. Some efforts were made to improve coordination between charities and Dublin Corporation. In October 1823, the \textit{Freeman’s Journal} encouraged philanthropic organisations to apply to the Mansion House to receive ‘such portion of provisions and fuel as may be seized, from time to time, for deficiency in weight, measure, and other public nuisances.’\textsuperscript{81} The Lord Mayor distributed large quantities of loaves and other items to a diverse range of charities at Christmas and New Year. In fact, some charity schools managed by Catholic religious orders were aided, providing one of the few examples of the pre-reform Corporation assisting Catholic organisations, which indicated that even this body had to make some concessions to growing Catholic power, albeit limited ones.

\textsuperscript{79}LHSA LHB1 74 1 Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh Clerk’s Letter Book December 1836-November 1841 1867-1871, 4 January 1837, 3.

\textsuperscript{80}See examples in C2/A1/11 Dublin City Council Minutes November 1841-November 1842, 1 April 1842, 96, 20 September 1842, 225, Dublin City Council Minutes December 1842-May 1844, 14 February 1843, 118, 27 December 1843, 399. For more on Dublin Corporation’s role in Anglican churches see Crawford, \textit{Church of Ireland}, 31-33.

\textsuperscript{81}\textit{FJ} 21 October 1823.
Table 17: Charities in Dublin that received loaves or other donations of food from the Lord Mayor of the city (January 1824).\textsuperscript{82}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charities in Dublin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendicity Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Asylum for the Shelter of Females discharged from Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dorset Nourishment Dispensary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor School 102 Abbey-Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Orphan School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum Bow Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Schools of Saint Michael and Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Schools of Saint Mark’s Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Duke Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan School Townsend Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemason’s Female Orphan School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Penitent Asylum Mecklenburgh Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters of Charity, North William-street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Sources:} FJ for 1824 up to 7 January 1824.

Overall, though, such activity was rare and lacked the coordination seen in Edinburgh. Although the \textit{Freeman's Journal} thought their suggestion would ‘meet with the concurrence of the Lord Mayor’ their efforts revealed local government ignorance of the city’s philanthropy. The newspaper argued that ‘there are many asylums, for want of being known by his Lordship, receive no aid’.\textsuperscript{83} Being a smaller city probably aided coordination in Edinburgh, but the contrasts also reflected the greater legitimacy of its local government institutions.

‘Softer’ forms of local government intervention were not always viewed favourably by charities’ managers as they sometimes constrained the managers’ activities. The discussion of a charity by local government institutions affected that charity’s public image in ways that it could not control. In 1837 Edinburgh Town Council published a report on the RI attacking the hospital’s closed management structures.\textsuperscript{84} The RI’s managers claimed that the Council had no right to investigate their institution, but they still felt it necessary to publish a response to the Council’s report to publicly refute its criticism. They argued that ‘there are some points [of the Council’s report] upon which

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{82} Based on list of charities acknowledging such Christmas donations in issues of the \textit{FJ} for 1824 up to 7 January 1824.
\item \textsuperscript{83} \textit{FJ} 21 October 1823.
\item \textsuperscript{84} \textit{Scotsman} 24 October 1838, \textit{Report by the Lord Provost’s Committee, to the Town Council Regarding the Royal Infirmary}, 4-6.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
the Managers cannot be silent." The Managers strongly defended their institution’s medical record and argued that the relatively low number of subscriptions they received was not a reflection of unease with the Infirmary’s management structures, rather, they claimed it was because subscription did not guarantee patient recommendation rights as it did elsewhere. The RI’s requests for church collections also provided opportunities for the Town Council to discuss the hospital’s management and their comments were often published in newspapers. In December 1839, the RI’s treasurer reported to the hospital’s managers that he had attended a meeting of the Town Council at which the Infirmary’s annual request for a church door collection was made. As a result of a discussion he heard at that meeting the treasurer told the managers that they would have to change:

considering the feeling which existed among a number of the citizens, he [the treasurer] thought it would be advantageous for the Infirmary, if some mode, were adopted which would give the Contributors some voice in the election of Managers.

The resulting changes were relatively minor: Contributors were permitted to choose their six representatives on the Board of Management, three of whom would then act as ordinary managers. What is significant is that it took the Town Council’s intervention to secure even this change, despite ongoing criticism of the Infirmary’s management structures for over twenty years. The central position that the Council occupied in Edinburgh society encouraged even the city’s most prestigious charities to make unwelcome changes in their management.

Discussions about the investigation of charities revealed that Edinburgh Town Council was considered to be an appropriate body for communicating about the city’s charitable institutions. In January 1833, advocate and philanthropist John Shank More suggested that Thomas Chalmers conduct an investigation into all of the city’s
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85 Remarks by the Managers of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, upon Report Approved of and Circulated by the Magistrates and Council of the City of Edinburgh, 1.
86 Remarks by the Managers of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, upon Report Approved of and Circulated by the Magistrates and Council of the City of Edinburgh, 3-5.
87 Remarks by the Managers of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, upon Report Approved of and Circulated by the Magistrates and Council of the City of Edinburgh, 3-5.
88 See for example Scotsman 7 December 1833.
89 RI Minutes 1838-1842, 30 December 1839, 276-278.
90 See chapter two.
He argued that the request should come from the Town Council who were ‘the natural and proper organs through which any such communications respecting our Edinburgh institutions should find its way to the public’. It is not clear if the inquiry ever took place, but More’s language reflected an expectation that the Council support and guide philanthropy.

Again newspapers helped to amplify the Council’s impact on charities. Sometimes newspaper reports of Council meetings included subsections dedicated to the Council’s discussions of one specific charity, drawing readers’ attention to it. The generation of publicity that the charities could not control threatened their reputations.

Newspaper comment on the Council’s administration of Bell’s Fund, for example, publicised Council members’ criticisms of St Mary’s Parish School. The School’s application for a share in the Fund was unsuccessful and drew censure from Bailie Duncan McLaren who claimed that the fees charged by St Mary’s prevented the poorest children attending and that other schools provided education in a more economical manner. The discussion was published in the Caledonian Mercury potentially damaging the School’s reputation. Members of the Council also assumed that dispensing money entitled it to specify changes that applicant schools should make in order to receive aid. A report commissioned by the Council recommended that a grant be given to St Mary’s on condition that it reduce its fees, although, ultimately the Council decided not to offer a grant at all.

Dublin Corporation’s role in investigating charities was more limited. In 1830, it appointed a committee to investigate ‘provision made or to be made for foundlings or deserted children’ in Dublin. In reality, it only inquired into the Dublin Foundling Hospital because the Corporation believed that the Hospital had been ‘founded upon

---

90 John Shank More, esq. advocate, 19 Great King-street The Post-Office Annual Directory, for 1833-34 (Edinburgh, 1833), 64. More seems to have been involved in the management of the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among Poor, Society for Relief of the Destitute Sick, Edinburgh Society for Promoting the Religious Interests of Scottish Settlers in British North America and the SSPCK, 1833 Edinburgh Almanack, 363, 373-374, 376.

91 The Council said that they would ‘assure Dr Chalmers of every encouragement and support which they could afford to him’, Scotsman 12 January 1833, ECA SL1/1/218 Edinburgh Town Council Minutes December 1832-May 1833, 9 January 1833, 68.

92 See for Scotsman 25 August 1832, 8 October 1836, 1 March 1843, 25 December 1844, 8 June 1836, see also Scotsman 29 June 1842, 27 July 1842.

93 CM 22 October 1835.
a donation of considerable property from this Corporation made about the year 1703’ and they wanted to clarify this, they were not interested in coordinating charitable responses to deserted children. In 1833 the Corporation commissioned an investigation into its own charities but even this was only initiated at the request of Under Secretary Sir William Gossett.  

Grand Jury meetings provided greater opportunities for influencing charities’ reputations as their discussions about funding medical charities were reported on in newspapers. In November 1839, for example, attendees at a Grand Jury meeting criticised young medics for establishing hospitals in order to aid their own careers rather than the poor. St Mary’s Dispensary was singled out for censure as an institution: ‘got up for the benefit of a young practitioner directly against the wishes of the parishioners, who all considered Jervis-street Hospital as being quite sufficient in that parish.’ The Grand Jury’s financial decisions were discussed at other public meetings in the city such as a gathering of citizens concerned about local taxation in November 1840. Attendees argued that the valuable work of Jervis-street, Mercer’s Hospital, and the Hospital for Incurables entitled them to Grand Jury funding. Yet they too criticised St Mary’s Dispensary as an attempt to aid a medical practitioner rather than the poor. It was not just medics being censured here, but the enclosed nature of the Grand Jury. It was implied that medics could use Grand Jury funds to support unpopular institutions that attracted few donations and, as elsewhere in Ireland, the City of Dublin Grand Jury was seen as unresponsive to opinions of middle-class Catholics. Such complaints were also voiced at a meeting of St Mary’s Parish in July 1839 when a Mr Coyne claimed that Grand Jury grants had allowed Jervis-street to raise the minimum donation that it would receive from 5s. to 1l. denying ‘industrious parishioners’ an opportunity to influence the Hospital.  

95 CARD Vol. XIX, 92.
96 FJ 11 November 1839.
97 FJ 13 November 1840.
98 FJ 13 November 1840.
99 FJ 31 July 1839.
did not have a problem with local government funding in principle, his concern was the way in which the Grand Jury worked, in fact he was optimistic about the Poor Law institutions soon to be founded in the city and claimed: ‘The workhouse system would provide medical inspectors for the poor, and there would be no money wanted from the grand jury.’

The longer persistence of enclosed forms of local administration made local government intervention in charity unpopular in practice in Dublin, but not in principle, and there was some change after municipal reform. Dublin Corporation assumed the Grand Jury’s powers in 1851 providing a greater level of middle-class control over presentments and this resulted in the Corporation becoming more involved in the hospitals that it funded over the next few decades. In 1867 it even asked for representation on the hospitals’ boards of management. It never became as closely involved with medical charities as the central state, but by the later nineteenth century the Corporation had become an established commentator on the city’s medical hospitals. Overall the more invasive involvement of local government in Edinburgh allowed those bodies to publicly investigate and discuss charities much earlier than their counterparts in Dublin. Therefore, along with the high level of central government reporting on both cities, there was more investigation into philanthropy happening at a level closer to Edinburgh’s middle classes. This made such inquiry more legitimate as the city appeared to be investigating itself rather than being surveyed by an outside body, again connecting charity with a sense of local autonomy.

III.

The contrasting nature of state intervention in each city had a cumulative effect. It not only reflected existing distinctions between their wider societies but created new ones. This section considers reasons for the differing nature of intervention between the cities and the social effects of the distinctions.
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100 FJ 31 July 1839.
101 The Corporation had no power to enforce this request and in some cases a Corporation member had to subscribe to the hospital in order to sit on its board of management, Curran, ‘Funding’, 23.
Historical decisions partly explain the more substantial level of local government involvement in Edinburgh. The decision of an individual philanthropist could shape the character of charity in a city for centuries. By gaining partial control of Heriot’s Trust, Edinburgh Town Council became involved in what would become an extremely influential charity. As Alexander Law argued, Heriot’s success ensured that residential forms of educational charity remained popular in Edinburgh long after they had fallen out of favour elsewhere.\textsuperscript{103} The Council’s long association with such a prominent institution probably encouraged others to see local government officeholders as appropriate managers for their charities and made such involvement less controversial than it was in other British towns. As seen, the more recently-formed Institution for Relief of Incurables included representatives of local government on its managing committee. By contrast endowed charities in Dublin were usually entrusted to central government officeholders or Anglican clerics.\textsuperscript{104}

Unlike Dublin Corporation, Edinburgh Town Council had a long tradition of involvement in education at many levels including as an active patron of Edinburgh University and Edinburgh High School, the city’s grammar school.\textsuperscript{105} In fact the Council used the same committee, the College Committee to administer matters connected with Bell’s Fund, that it used to manage the University, and the High School, associating charity schools with the city’s reputation for educational excellence.\textsuperscript{106} The Council’s long interest in science and education was also reflected in its members’ involvement in a range of ‘learned’ societies. In 1845 the Lord Provost was one of the directors of the Astronomical Institution of Edinburgh, while he and the Magistrates were patrons of the Associated Societies of the University.\textsuperscript{107} This interest, and contemporary pride in Edinburgh’s reputation as a city of Enlightenment, encouraged local government involvement in education.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{103} Law, \textit{Education}, 105-109, 143.
\textsuperscript{104} See chapter two, Poorer Ireland C, 46.
\textsuperscript{105} Mary Cosh, \textit{Edinburgh, The Golden Age} (Edinburgh, 2003), 41-47.
\textsuperscript{106} For example Edinburgh Town Council Minutes August 1839-December 1839, 24 September 1839, 116-121, 8 October 1839, 211-212, 4 November 1839, 293-294.
\textsuperscript{107} 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 507.
\textsuperscript{108} Shepherd and Britton, \textit{Modern Athens!}, 39-41, see chapter six.
The differing nature of state power structures in each city also explains contrasts between them. Central state intervention in Dublin explains the surprisingly limited role of local government in medical philanthropy in a city with so many hospitals. Debates over the Grand Jury’s assistance to medical charities indicated that attention was not completely diverted towards Dublin Castle but even Anglican elites probably considered the patronage of the Lord Lieutenant more desirable than that of the city’s unreformed local government institutions. This was especially true of the 1820s before the repeal movement had alienated many liberal Anglican elites. Although Dublin Corporation would engage more with medical philanthropy later in the century, many of the hospital patronage patterns set in the 1820s continued for the century, cementing their connection with Dublin Castle and reducing the need for local involvement.

Later in the century charities began to advertise the Lord Mayor’s expected presence at their events in the same way as for the Lord Lieutenant. This was partly due to the increasing number of Catholic chief magistrates after reform. Catholic Lord Mayors were more likely to attend charity sermons in Catholic chapels than Protestant Lord Lieutenants, but it also demonstrated the increasing legitimacy of the Lord Mayor’s office to the Catholic middle classes. Overall, though, the presence of Dublin Castle ensured that the Lord Mayor’s status never rivalled that of the Lord Provost. The Lord Provost’s standing was reflected in the position he occupied in Edinburgh’s medical charities. When the Royal Public Dispensary controversially introduced three ex-officio managers in 1818, the Lord Provost was one of them, the others were the Presidents of the Colleges of Surgeons and Physicians representing medical expertise. Other state officeholders, such as the Lord Justice Clerk and the Lord

---


110 In some cases these were charity sermons held in Catholic chapels for example the sermon for St Mary’s Asylum and Reformatory, High Park, Drumcondra, IF 24 July 1862 and the sermon for St Vincent’s Hospital and Dispensary, IF 19 April 1866, but this was not exclusively the case see Irish Times 18 March 1876 (charity sermon for St Werburgh’s (Church of Ireland) School).

111 Dalgleish, ‘Voluntary’, 64, Royal Warrant and Regulations of the Royal Public Dispensary.
Advocate were involved in the charity but only the Lord Provost held his position by virtue of his office.\textsuperscript{112}

The involvement of central government in educational charity in Dublin limited local government intervention, especially after the establishment of the national system in 1831. Not only did the system fund schools within the city, it also encouraged its opponents, such as the CES, to form their own school systems at national level, making city-level initiatives increasingly less desirable. The loss of the King’s Hospital prevented the Corporation from developing an equivalent to Heriot’s. The Corporation clearly lamented their loss and later in the century they funded reformatory schools, demonstrating that they maintained some interest in education.\textsuperscript{113} Yet it is significant that they did not become more heavily involved in educational charity as access to education had been a major issue during the 1820s Emancipation campaigns.\textsuperscript{114} The growth of other forms of educational charity, even if insufficient in practice, made such efforts appear unnecessary. This was partly because of the growing involvement of Catholic religious orders in education, but the existence of the national system also played a role.

Unsurprisingly the cities’ different religious environments also partly account for the contrasts between them, especially with regard to educational charity. The national system failed in its interdenominational aims, but for many Catholics in the 1830s it was a less dangerous alternative than leaving education to local government bodies. By the time that Dublin Corporation admitted Catholic members, there appeared to be less need for it to be involved in educational philanthropy. Central state interference sometimes provided ways of coping with middle-class social difference when other ways were not available, this helped to contain conflict but it also prevented the development of what would have ultimately been a more acceptable method.

\textsuperscript{112} 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 518.
\textsuperscript{113} FJ 29 October 1864, ‘Schedule of Applications for Presentment...September, 1869...’, in Reports and Printed Documents of the Corporation of Dublin, From September to December 1869, Volume1 (Dublin, 1870).
\textsuperscript{114} 2. The ‘Catholic Rent I from Dublin Evening Post 19 February 1824’, in Ireland, 1815-70 Emancipation, Famine and Religions, Donnchadh O Corráin & Tomás O’Riordan eds (Dublin and Portland, Oregon, 2011), 144-145.
The reformed Edinburgh Town Council was the scene of severe religious tensions. In fact, in 1840 *The Witness* argued that, because he was the patron of the city’s Church of Scotland churches, it was not appropriate for the Lord Provost to be a Dissenter.\(^\text{115}\) It is therefore not surprising that there was some religious conflict in charities managed by the Town Council. When Heriot’s (Church of Scotland) chapel was being refurbished, for example, there were debates among the Hospital’s governors about how ornate it should be given that it was a Presbyterian place of worship.\(^\text{116}\) Such issues were taken seriously but it is worth noting that despite the prominence of Presbyterian Dissenters on the reformed Council, the Act of Parliament that Heriot’s governors secured to establish the Foundation Schools confirmed the charity’s Church of Scotland ethos.\(^\text{117}\) The permanent presence of established Church ministers on the Trust’s board of governors probably prevented much change in this regard, but the maintenance of this religious ethos does not seem to have been controversial. Similarly, although the RI’s management always included one of the city’s Church of Scotland ministers, appointing a UAS cleric as chaplain does not seem to have caused problems.\(^\text{118}\) In spite of Episcopal-Presbyterian tensions in Scotland in this period, sometimes simply a common Protestantism allowed charities to be a unifying force in Edinburgh such as when the Town Council, patron of the city’s Church of Scotland churches, was given the power to administer Bell’s Fund, the bequest of an Anglican cleric.\(^\text{119}\) There were divisive religious conflicts in Edinburgh in the 1830s and 1840s and the Town Council often exacerbated these, but unlike its other activities, the Council’s role in charity helped to lessen sectarian tensions. Even in pre-reform Dublin the Lord Mayor’s role in the Mendicity may have reduced tensions, overall however, the paradoxical situation where even the lower levels of local government involvement seen in Dublin proved much more divisive than local

\(^{115}\) *The Witness* 24 October 1840.

\(^{116}\) *Scotsman* 28 October 1835, *CM* 15 October 1835.


\(^{118}\) *Scotsman* 10 July 1844.

government intervention in Edinburgh, further reinforced differences between the cities.

**IV.**
The ability of Edinburgh’s local authorities to intervene in educational charity in a relatively problem-free manner reflected greater agreement on core values in the first place, but it had a cumulative effect not simply mirroring wider society but further shaping it. Educational charity was about the inculcation of values and its potential for reinforcing common identities was high. Charity schools may have been particularly successful in promoting shared values to a broad group in Edinburgh, where mixing of children of different social classes, even in schools with a charitable element, was not uncommon. The ability of Edinburgh’s local authorities to intervene in educational charity in a relatively problem-free manner reflected greater agreement on core values in the first place, but it had a cumulative effect not simply mirroring wider society but further shaping it. Educational charity was about the inculcation of values and its potential for reinforcing common identities was high. Charity schools may have been particularly successful in promoting shared values to a broad group in Edinburgh, where mixing of children of different social classes, even in schools with a charitable element, was not uncommon. Educational philanthropy also brought philanthropists together to promote such values and when charity schools held meetings or published reports, they publicly associated their managers and benefactors with these values.

The charities supported by the Edinburgh Police Commissioners had similar effects even though the Commissioners initially got involved in response to specific inconveniences. After the RI closed its Lock Ward, syphilitic prostitutes began committing petty crimes in order to receive treatment when in police custody, and establishing a Lock Hospital removed this obligation from the Commissioners. Similarly the House of Refuge was intended to provide aid to those who would otherwise beg, relieving the Police of their duty of removing beggars from the streets. Yet both charities helped to promote and reinforce shared moral values. The Lock Hospital employed a chaplain to improve inmates’ moral health. The House of Refuge attempted to promote industriousness and the Scotsman told its readers that the inmates were ‘fully employed, and their moral and religious interests sedulously
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121 Police Commissioners Minutes 1832-1834, 23 April 1834, 653-658.


123 Police Commissioners Minutes 1838-1842, 14 March 1842, 515.
attended to." It was not simply the values of the poor that were affected, these charities reinforced a sense of shared values among their middle-class supporters by publicly advertising their moral aims. The involvement of local state authority operating at a level close to Edinburgh’s middle classes increased the sense of common purpose among those classes. Intervention came from within Edinburgh from bodies supposed to represent the city as a whole. By contrast, when the central state intervened in Dublin’s charities, it seemed as though values were being imposed from the outside.

In Edinburgh, the Town Council’s use of philanthropy to promote shared values may have also strengthened civic identity. Heriot’s was a city-focused initiative and while there were several nationally-focused educational charities based in Edinburgh, the prominent involvement of local government in such a prestigious educational initiative as Heriot’s may have fuelled a particularly strong sense of civic affiliation. The opening of Heriot’s Foundation Schools reinforced this. The construction of a series of school buildings in a common style, displayed how a charity managed by local authorities was extending its reach in the city. Schools associated with different national networks operated in Dublin including those connected with the Charter Schools, Erasmus Smith’s Charities, and the national system itself, but there was no equivalent city-focused educational network that compared with Heriot’s.
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124 Scotsman 9 July 1836.
125 Even though in practice institutions such as national schools had a lot of autonomy, Akenson, Education Experiment, 3-4, 121-127, 149-151, 163, 190.
126 Also see chapter seven.
127 Rodger, Transformation, 470.
George Heriot’s Hospital James and John Johnstone, *Historical and Descriptive Account of George Heriot’s Hospital* (Edinburgh, 1827) (Courtesy of Wellcome Library, London).

**Figure 8: Heriot’s Foundation School.**

Former Heriot’s Foundation School Cowgate (now the Salvation Army Hostel) (images: (i) Stephen Dickson (2014). (ii) Diane King (courtesy of RCHAMS)). The Foundation Schools incorporated features of the original Hospital School building visually reminding Edinburgh’s inhabitants of their connection with the Trust.⁹⁸

Other forms of public display, such as processions by charity schools’ pupils also promoted co-operation among Edinburgh’s city-focused institutions. Local government officeholders participated in the ceremonies celebrating George Heriot’s birthday (George Heriot’s Day) along with the pupils of the city’s other hospital schools.\(^{129}\) The presence of local officials at such events publicly displayed local government’s approval of the charities while also enhancing the legitimacy of the Town Council. By highlighting the connection between Heriot’s and the Council this may have also strengthened civic identity. Religious differences made the situation in Dublin more complex. The ADV held annual Catechetical examinations for the pupils of charity schools in prominent city churches.\(^{130}\) The King’s Hospital’s pupils usually participated but the Corporation expressed concerns about their involvement. In particular, they felt it was demeaning for the King’s boys to march with other charity school children in the processions that preceded the examinations. In 1828 they argued:

> as the King’s Hospital...is a Royal Foundation possessing ample estates and independent property.-It is the opinion of the Sheriffs and Commons, that it is derogatory to the respectability of that establishment to allow the Boys educated therein to join in processions made by the children of Charity Establishments. And therefore we request an order to prohibit their attendances in any future processions of Charity children.’\(^{131}\)

Indeed, the School’s managers had already decided that ‘the Boys of this House shall not join the other children in procession, but merely that they should proceed to the Cathedral where they would have a separate Gallery to themselves, during Divine service’ where the Lord Mayor was to be present with them.\(^{132}\) This partial distinction from other charities highlighted the ambiguous position of the King’s Hospital in Dublin. In Edinburgh, there were several hospital schools of similar status that could participate in ceremonies together without it damaging any of their reputations.\(^{133}\)

\(^{129}\) *CM* 9 June 1831, 8 June 1837, 6 June 1844. Law, *Education*, 141-143.

\(^{130}\) *FJ* 12 August 1824.

\(^{131}\) *CARD* Vol. XVIII, 236-237, 548-549.

\(^{132}\) King’s Hospital Archive (hereafter KHA) MS 11 K.H. Board Minute Book 1802-1829, 24 April 1828, 242-243, 10 June 1829, 237.

Dublin, there were no charities of similar status to the King’s Hospital and participating in the ADV’s events meant associating with the city’s lowest status charities such as the House of Industry that accepted the beggars that many other institutions excluded.\textsuperscript{134} Yet, the ADV examinations were a way of promoting the established Church and so it was in the interests of the pre-reform Corporation to support them and the compromise solution reached reflected these contrasting affiliations. The Edinburgh ceremonies reinforced civic identity first and foremost whereas participation in the ADV’s events connected the King’s Hospital with the Protestant nation. The removal of the King’s Hospital from the Corporation’s control gradually reduced its connection with the city. Appointment to its board of governors was vested in the Lord Chancellor, the Anglican Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, and the Bishop of Meath.\textsuperscript{135} By the 1870s the School had removed the requirement that pupils be from Dublin and the city school was transformed into a charity for the children of Irish Anglicans.\textsuperscript{136}

The fact that most state intervention in Edinburgh came through more acceptable local forms, reduced its chances of fomenting conflict. Political and religious differences remained significant but the city promoted mechanisms for coping with them. Official secular intervention in Edinburgh appeared connected with self-government to a much greater extent than in Dublin. There was truth in the claim that many in nineteenth-century Ireland saw central state intervention as ‘the least bad option’. Central state intervention in Irish educational charity provoked serious religious controversy but it may have prevented worse conflicts by limiting the role of unrepresentative local government bodies. Yet central state intervention was also thought to undermine local independence and could never be viewed in a completely positive light.

Municipal reform made local state intervention more acceptable in both cities. In Edinburgh, the pro-reform Scotsman celebrated how the change had opened up

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{I}J 3 June 1817, 17 June 1819, RCB Ms. 174.1.1.11 Association for Discountenancing Vice Minutes 1825-1827, 8 June 1825, 6 October 1825 (unpaginated), Woods, \textit{Dublin Outsiders}, 191 Poorer Ireland C, 1.

\textsuperscript{135} Whiteside, \textit{King’s}, 95.

\textsuperscript{136} Whiteside, \textit{King’s}, 118-119.
Heriot’s by removing the Trade Incorporations’ role in it. It argued that before reform: ‘The Trades’ part of the Town Council...[were] accustomed to appropriate all the advantages of the Hospital to their own constituents, and to render it a convenient engine for electioneering and jobbing purposes.’ The last comment indicated how altering charities was part of a broader reform agenda. For contemporaries, opening up charity to wider middle-class approval was not just achieved by giving subscribers a greater role, it could be attained by publicising information on the charities and preventing ‘jobbery’ within them. Hence earlier reform, coupled with the existence of elected Police Commissioners, further improved the acceptability of secular state intervention in charity in Edinburgh relative to Dublin. This was compounded by the fact that municipal reform legislation was less far reaching in Dublin. Reform also meant that Edinburgh’s Trade Incorporations, while remaining powerful, lost their role in Heriot’s and Trinity Hospitals, whereas in Dublin the guilds retained a role in the King’s Hospital. Many of those displaced from Dublin Corporation retained some power through the charity as the board of governors to which the Hospital was entrusted after reform included most of its previous managers (see Table X in appendix).

The interaction between charities and local government reinforced existing trends and had a cumulative effect on the image of state authorities. Higher levels of local state intervention in Edinburgh’s charities further enhanced the legitimacy of that local state, especially as its role in charitable education expanded after municipal reform. In Dublin, the involvement of the central state in philanthropy probably enhanced the legitimacy of that central state. At the very least it provided an alternative to the coercive methods often used to rule Ireland. Yet Dublin’s middle-class residents never considered central state intervention in the city’s charities to be completely acceptable. The central state appeared to respect the autonomy of Edinburgh’s local state and associational culture to a greater extent, and hence state intervention
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137 Scotsman 7 May 1834.

occurred there in a way that seemed to reflect existing values. In Dublin it appeared as though values were being imposed from outside. It was of course more difficult for the central state to respect shared values in Dublin as religious tensions among the city’s middle classes meant that they shared fewer values to begin with, yet the nature of state intervention also reinforced such divisions.

**Conclusion:**

The patterns of state interference in charity in Dublin and Edinburgh were almost the mirror-images of each other. The central state intervened heavily in Dublin and the local state, while not inactive, was much less influential. In Edinburgh the local state was much more heavily involved in charity, affecting both the everyday activities of philanthropic institutions and their interactions with the wider public. Central state intervention was not completely absent, but it was limited and often operated behind the scenes, allowing charities to at least appear to be managed by middle-class inhabitants. In some ways this contrast supports the claim that Scotland had a much stronger tradition of local government than Ireland. Intervention in charity extended the role of Edinburgh’s local government and linked it much more closely with the city’s associational culture than was the case in Dublin. It indicates that Edinburgh Town Council continued to play a substantial social role even after its bankruptcy in the 1830s. Yet the contrast between the cities was not the result of completely different attitudes towards intervention, in principle commentators in both cities tended to see local government involvement in charity as more acceptable than that of central government. It was other circumstances, including the severity of religious tensions in Dublin that made local state intervention less desirable there. However, even Catholics identified to some extent with the city’s civic traditions and the Corporation lost an opportunity for enhancing such identification when they lost the King’s Hospital. Local government involvement in charity had the potential to promote common values among a city’s middle classes and transferring charities from a reformed Corporation to an appointed board weakened civil society.

Although both were forms of non-voluntary state involvement, local government intervention in charities was seen as fundamentally different from central
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139 Williams, ‘Edinburgh Politics’, 51 suggested that the reformed Town Council did little more than restructure debt and act as patron to the churches and University.
state interference. Local intervention was considered much more comparable to voluntary activity especially when it came through an authority chosen by an electorate that at least appeared to be middle-class. Hence the kind of state intervention seen in Edinburgh was perceived as much more legitimate than that in Dublin. This helped to strengthen civil society to a greater extent as local people were perceived to be promoting common values among themselves, rather than having such values imposed upon them. The earlier advent of municipal reform allowed a greater number of Edinburgh’s middle-class residents to participate in the management of prestigious but enclosed charities.

Pre-existing social and religious differences partly account for the contrasting nature of state-charity interactions between the cities, yet there was a cumulative effect as contrasts in state-charity relations themselves further amplified the impact of existing differences. This can only be revealed by examining change over time and in particular by considering the impact of later municipal reform in Dublin. On the surface, the contrasts between the cities appear to have been relatively short-lived. Central state intervention in Edinburgh’s charitable organisations increased in the later nineteenth century, while Dublin Corporation got more heavily involved in philanthropy. This reflected the fact that there were greater similarities in attitudes towards local government in both cities than has often been recognised. Dublin-based nationalists did not simply see the Corporation as a way of airing nationalist concerns, they were genuinely interested in improving municipal services. Yet the broad trends in relation to state intervention set in this period continued to have influence throughout the century and had contrasting impacts on the image of each city. The effects of such contrasts on how each city was perceived will be explored in chapter seven. Official local government institutions, however, were not the only governance bodies functioning in each city, and the interaction between charities and other institutions such occupational and professional authorities also needs to be considered. These issues will be explored in the next chapter.
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140 For example the state school inspection system became more powerful in Edinburgh later in the century.
141 See chapter seven.
Chapter Six.
*Status, Profession, and Personal Ambition.*
Looking back at his career as a surgeon in early nineteenth-century Dublin, John Kirby criticised those whom he believed had hindered it. He referred to elite surgeon Abraham Colles as his ‘bitter enemy’ whom he claimed had refused:

me in consultation whenever and wherever he could, to my great injury in my professional progress. He also showed himself my enemy in the College [of Surgeons]. I opened St. Peter’s and St. Bridget’s Hospital in Peter-street, the house which is now the Anglesey Hospital. I had in it twelve surgical beds....Mr. C did not think this enough. He proposed and carried the motion in the College that they would not recognise any hospital which did not contain twenty-four beds. I was the only speaker in opposition to such an ungenerous measure. I showed that I performed more operations in the year it had existed than were performed in all the hospitals in Dublin in the same period. They also made it necessary that there should be a Board of Governors as guarantee for the sound working of the hospital.¹

Kirby’s comments illustrate how efforts to codify and standardise medical practice affected early nineteenth-century charities. Hospitals were places of medical education as well as shelters for the sick poor. The RCSI or ‘College’ required applicants for its Licentiate to have attended approved training hospitals, to receive College’s approval these hospitals had to contain a specified minimum number of beds.² Maintaining such conditions imposed extra obligations on voluntary hospitals beyond caring for the sick and this affected how they interacted with the wider public. Kirby’s story also indicated that the College of Surgeons, a medical professional body, favoured some non-medical involvement in hospital management, and Kirby responded to this demand by appointing a Board of Governors headed by Lord Trimleston.³ Even medics could sometimes appreciate the benefits of having non-medics associated with their institution, if the non-medics were of sufficiently high social status.

²See for example RCSIH RCSI/LET/02 Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland Copy Letter Book, 14 May 1834-4 November 1848, 10 May 1837, 72, 17 May 1837, 72, 4 November 1842, 239.
³John Timothy Kirby, President in 1823⁷.
This chapter explores interactions between professional authority and charities as part of a wider analysis of the connections between occupation and philanthropy. The presence of medical schools, a university, national law courts, and numerous professional associations made the professions conspicuous in each city. Although Edinburgh’s economy was diverse, contemporaries presented it as a city dominated by the professions. In Dublin by contrast, there was more focus on the gentry’s ‘desertion’ of the city after the Union, than on the rise of its professional classes. Yet, as Dickson pointed out, in practice the professions played an increasingly conspicuous role in Dublin’s voluntary associations from the early nineteenth century onwards.

Class, occupation, and status have frequently received attention in the historiography of philanthropy. The study of class is a vast subject and it is not possible to examine every interaction between charities and class-related issues in this chapter. Instead the chapter focuses mainly on the relationships between philanthropy and professional issues as a way of providing a window on matters of class and status. After a general discussion of the relationship between charity and occupational authority, we will consider two case studies: the first examines the role of medical practitioners in charities and the second explores how philanthropy affected the status of schoolteachers. The chapter ends with an analysis of the wider social impact of these issues including a discussion of the interaction between occupation, gender, and charity.

This chapter continues to use ‘middle classes’ in a broad sense to include a wide range of non-aristocratic property-owning groups encompassing advocates and barristers, shopkeeping apothecaries and druggists, hoteliers and publicans, and some business-owning tradespeople and artisans. It generally includes, though is not limited to, those able to vote after the franchise reforms of the 1830s and 1840s. It gives attention to the times when such groups used the language of class to describe themselves but it is worth noting that contemporaries employed a wide variety of terms for status and occupation. Class was just one of many labels, and descriptions such as
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‘opulent’, ‘respectable’, ‘leading inhabitants’ or the ‘public’ were often more frequently used.  

‘Profession’ and ‘professionals’ are also contested concepts whose meaning has changed over time. Rigidly applying twentieth-century definitions of the professions as self-regulating occupations that maintain expertise-based objective standards to the early nineteenth century, is likely to overlook much activity in law, ‘physic’, and the Church that had long been described as professional. Brown argued that, to avoid anachronism, it is best to understand the sense of being a professional as the feeling that one belongs to an ‘imagined community’ in a similar way to national identity. This study roughly follows this approach but it is important to recognise that even this sense of being a professional included a belief that one possessed some sort of ‘expert’ occupational knowledge. This chapter gives attention to the established professions of law and medicine because they occupied a conspicuous place in society in both cities, but it also examines the position of schoolteachers in order to consider claims that schoolteaching became professionalised during the nineteenth century. Corfield argued that a teaching professional identity was not present in this period but this chapter will demonstrate that it was at least developing. The chapter ends by considering some of the wider social consequences of emerging professionalisation of philanthropic activities.

I.

A glance at subscription lists, reports, and almanac entries reveals that occupation was often recorded alongside contributors’ or governors’ names demonstrating that it was an acceptable social marker providing information on social status, wealth, and perceived trustworthiness. Other social characteristics such as religion were probably well-known in practice, but religious affiliations were generally not listed in charities’
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7Brown, ‘Medicine, Reform’, 1357-1360; Corfield, Power, 19-37 see chapter three for the Church.
8Brown, ‘Medicine, Reform’, 1358-1360.
9Corfield, Power, 180-188.
publicity material. There were, of course, more occupations than religions in Dublin or Edinburgh and listing them helped charities to play a uniting role by demonstrating the wide range of occupational groups brought together by the organisations.

While religious tensions dominated much of the headlines in both cities, class tensions sometimes also caused problems for charities. As seen, ‘middling’ groups complained that they were not properly represented in the RI’s management. They employed the language of class in their complaints and revealed that, for the purposes of their argument at least, they did not consider the high-profile legal and medical professionals that dominated the hospital’s management to be middle-class. The Scotsman unfavourably contrasted the ‘aristocratic’ nature of the Edinburgh RI with its more ‘meritocratic’ Glasgow counterpart. A letter to the newspaper in 1823 argued:

In the compliments which your correspondent...pays to the Directors of the Glasgow infirmary, I heartily agreed. The contrast which their conduct—though that of merchants chiefly—form with that of the titled and respectable Managers of our Infirmary, is striking enough; and proves that the spirit generated by self-election and close corporations, is exceedingly different from that which accompanies open elections, and a dependence on constituents.

Class tensions also affected charities in Dublin, including the Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers’ Society, though they were generally not expressed so openly. Most active members of the Roomkeepers’ Society were usually tradespeople, or increasingly, retailers. T.J. Delahunt, a carpenter and builder, and one of the charity’s divisional presidents told the Irish Poor Inquiry:

I think the higher orders would not take the office of inspector; I never knew an instance...I never knew any of the higher orders attend our weekly meetings, except two Protestant clergymen, and some Catholic clergy attend sometimes.

There was an underlying sense of resentment that these ‘higher orders’ were not contributing as much as those in more humble circumstances. Of course, by setting a low minimum subscription, the Society was designed to allow those with relatively low incomes to participate. Overall, however, the organisation’s managers tried to present their charity as governed by a broad mix of social groups. Clerics of all denominations
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11 See chapters two and five.
12 Scotsman 29 January 1823, emphasis in original.
13 Lindsay, ‘Sick and Indigent’, 145.
14 Poorer Ireland C, 197.
and all physicians and surgeons were entitled to be members *ex-officio* and the Society appointed an increasing number of high-status honorary trustees: ‘distinguished for their respectability and active attention to the interests of the Institution’, including the Lord Mayor, the Lord Chancellor, the Provost of Trinity College, and several senior Catholic and Anglican clerics.¹⁵

Indeed charities in both cities generally tried to present themselves as managed by a broad range of social groups even when this was not really true in practice. The Dublin Mendicity’s management was dominated by high-status individuals. In 1845, of thirty-three members of its managing committee that could be identified, nineteen had very high-status occupations including eight barristers, and this did not include clergy or those simply designated ‘esq.’.¹⁶ Yet, the charity tried to demonstrate the involvement of a much wider variety of individuals in its day-to-day activities. Its annual meetings acknowledged many different occupational groups, for example the 1831 AGM thanked:

> the several Ladies who have so long and so efficiently given their valuable attention to the Female Schools of the Mendicity Asylum, thus conferring upon the Poor, advantages which no pecuniary resources of the Institution could procure for them—the improving intercourse and the unaffected sympathy of their own sex.

> Reverend Clergymen of all persuasions...[who served] the spiritual wants of the Poor in the Institution.

> Medical Gentlemen, who have, by their gratuitous attendance at the Mendicity Dispensary, contributed in so important a degree to the comfort of the Poor relieved there, and to the general healthiness of the City.

> the Gentlemen connected with the public Press of Dublin...[who gave] their efficient and liberal support whenever the cause of the charity called for the aid of their powerful advocacy on behalf of this Institution.¹⁷

In practice, many Edinburgh charities also attempted to appear to be providing opportunities for different occupational groups to participate in their work. Although desire for reform was central to criticisms of the RI, those attempting to establish a new infirmary in the mid-1820s tried to increase the number of Tories on their committee

¹⁵ Lindsay, ‘Sick and Indigent’, 136-137.
¹⁶ Identified using the A-Z directory in 1845 Thom’s.
to make it appear more representative of potential subscribers.\textsuperscript{18} They also endeavoured to attract the support of the ‘Deacons of all Trades’, officeholders in the city’s trade bodies, and they were particularly interested in involving more shopkeepers whose premises could then be used as collection points to receive subscriptions.\textsuperscript{19} Even the \textit{Scotsman}, which invoked class tensions to criticise the RI, thought that the hospital could be reformed to involve a broad range of status groups. It tried to reassure those concerned about changes to the RI’s management by noting that English infirmaries with open administrative structures still included high-status individuals, including Anglican bishops, in their management.\textsuperscript{20} Despite the persistence of its enclosed administration structure, some limited efforts were made to make the institution appear more inclusive. For example fundraising efforts by lower-status groups such as workmen were singled out for public praise.\textsuperscript{21} Emphasising the involvement of different groups was probably as much an attempt to deal with tensions as a reflection of social harmony but it showed that contemporaries believed that charities had the potential to mediate occupational-based social divisions.

In Dublin, there was a confessional element to some efforts to promote cross-status philanthropic activity. The Protestant-only charities founded from the 1820s onwards attempted to encourage cross-status solidarity among Protestants. Membership of St Patrick’s Deanery Christian Fellowship Society, an association for the support of the sick poor, was open to all Protestant residents of the deanery (a non-parochial area associated with St Patrick’s Anglican Cathedral) who paid an entrance fee of sixpence and a subscription of a penny-a-week, they could then seek aid from the organisation when ill. The Association also used charity sermons to appeal to wealthier Dubliners as its members’ contributions did not cover all expenses.\textsuperscript{22} It functioned not simply as an organisation serving the deanery but as a wider effort at building cross-class confessional solidarity across the city. As well as seeking the contributions of the wealthy, the Adelaide Hospital also gave all Protestants who

\textsuperscript{18} See chapter five, Poole Papers [POR/3/12/10 1:2] [POR/3/12/10 2:2] correspondence with Mr Lizars.
\textsuperscript{19} Poole Papers [POR/3/12/9 3:3] [POR/3/12/10 1:2] [POR/3/12/10 2:2].
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Scotsman} 16 January 1819.
\textsuperscript{21} For example \textit{EEC} 13 January 1845, 20 February 1845, \textit{The Witness} 15 January 1845.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{DEM} 19 March 1845.
regularly subscribed one penny per week or more, the right to ‘admission for themselves and their families, in case of sickness; or, should they prefer it, to the attendance of a Physician or Surgeon at their homes.” The Protestant Orphan Society was managed by two committees: one composed of clergymen and lay gentlemen and the other composed of lower status collectors. The approval of both bodies was required for any ‘business of importance.” Few other Dublin charities had these kinds of dual-management structures and they indicate that a strong desire to unite the city’s Protestants dampened any qualms about different status groups working together.

Both cities were also home to registration societies, organisations that matched unemployed people, often servants, with employers. In Dublin, however, there were Protestant-only versions of these societies such as ‘The Protestant Register for Ireland, in connexion with the Church’ founded in 1844. It operated from the offices of the Religious Book and Tract Depository for Ireland on Sackville-street and sought employment for a range of occupational groups including servants, clerks, gardeners, medical apprentices, medical assistants, parish clerks, schoolmasters, schoolmistresses, and stewards.

These Protestant-only organisations were established as a response to the loss of Protestant privilege and the slow adjustment of other charities to the improving legal and social status of Irish Catholics. They provided a way of maintaining Protestant identity and discouraging poor Protestants and Catholics from combining through campaigns such as the repeal movement, which might have threatened their more privileged neighbours. They were also an attempt to maintain some of the social advantages that even Dublin’s poorest Protestants had possessed over Catholics in the pre-Reform era. This charity involved the provision of spiritual as well as material services. The Adelaide Hospital was a reaction to the increasing respect which

23 Annual Report of the Adelaide Hospital for the Year 1843 (Dublin, 1844), 4.
24 Second Annual Report of the Protestant Orphan Society; Founded A.D. 1828... (Dublin, 1831).
25 For Edinburgh see for example ‘Registry for Servants, 36 Frederick Street, Under the Supervision of a Committee of Ladies’, 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 513.
26 1845 Thom’s, 690.
Dublin’s other hospitals showed to the beliefs of their Catholic patients. The Adelaide’s annual report for 1843 claimed:

Those who are acquainted with the internal management of our public hospitals, are well aware of the painful and embarrassing circumstances under which the humble yet conscientious Protestant is frequently placed in reference to the exercise of his religion. In the midst of his bodily suffering he oftentimes compelled to hear and witness the celebration of those rites which are connected with a creed in every way opposed to his religious feelings and opinions; and his minister is constantly obliged by the regulations of certain of these institutions to convey his instruction so guardedly and so secretly—lest he should give offence to others, and in the face of surrounding scoffs and contempt—as to experience the most distressing obstacles to the free and unreserved teaching of the Gospel.  

Dublin’s other hospitals, even those with formal Anglican connections, were increasingly allowing Catholic priests and nuns to visit Catholic patients and made efforts to prevent any semblance of Protestant proselytism within their walls. In 1835, for example, the managers of Dun’s Hospital decided that a patient could request a visit from a clergyman of their own denomination at any time. Such efforts were also made in some non-medical charities including the Richmond National Institution, a residential school for blind boys. To prevent allegations of proselytising the Institution’s managers decided that it was best to commit the boys’ religious education ‘to the care of clergy of their respective communions’ rather than have a resident chaplain. Although as earlier chapters indicated, much of Dublin’s non-medical charity remained divided on religious lines.

The Adelaide’s establishment showed that Dublin’s philanthropic associational culture was able to cope with difference up to a point; hospitals that were associated with Anglican elites, such as Dun’s, began to respond to the wishes of Catholic patients and their supporters. Those who did not agree with these changes could form their own hospital rather than disrupting existing institutions, providing options for donors (and patients) with a range of views. Yet introducing a confessional element in efforts to promote cross-class co-operation, restricted charities’ uniting potential by invoking a

28 Adelaide Hospital Report for 1843, 5-6.
29 Sir Patrick Dun’s Minutes 1822-1838, 31 March 1835, 180, Poorer Ireland C, 75.
30 Poorer Ireland C, 51.
shared identity based on religion. This partly undermined the institutions’ ability to help Dublin to manage its religious differences and the conflict that emanated from it.

Although Catholic philanthropic organisations usually avoided blatantly sectarian language, they also promoted the development of a broad-based Catholic identity rather than a cross-confessional one. Dublin’s other hospitals tried to adjust to Catholics’ changing social position but this did not prevent the foundation of St Vincent’s Hospital in 1834. The Catholic connections of such charities would be emphasised much more overtly from the 1850s onwards. In 1857 speakers at a fundraising meeting for the construction of the Mater Misercordiae Hospital, an institution established by the Sisters of Mercy, discussed occupation in confessional terms. They praised not just the contributions of the ‘middle classes’ but also the work of artisan members of the Catholic ‘Christian Doctrine Confraternity’ who acted as collectors.\footnote{31} This was an attempt to build an inter-class identity, but it was a specifically Catholic attempt and a speaker at a fundraising meeting stressed that the Hospital would be ‘a permanent monument to the benevolence of the Catholics of Dublin.’\footnote{32} Status and philanthropy interacted in other ways in each city. As Morris stated, like London but unlike many English provincial centres, Edinburgh’s charities frequently appointed aristocrats as patrons.\footnote{33} Perhaps surprisingly given contemporary despondency about aristocrats’ ‘desertion’ of Dublin, large numbers of titled individuals were also involved in that city’s charities.\footnote{34} As in London, appointment of aristocrats with national titles to charities’ boards of management enhanced the capital status of Dublin and Edinburgh and reinforced their claims to national leadership. Even when many of the aristocrats were not permanently resident in Dublin, the presence of such charities made the city a node connecting Irish philanthropists, and added a further national element to its associational culture. In Edinburgh, the Duke of Buccleuch’s involvement connected the city with the immediate county of

\footnote{31}{\textit{EJ} 4 August 1857.}
\footnote{32}{\textit{EJ} 4 August 1857.}
\footnote{33}{Morris, ‘Voluntary Societies’, 96.}
\footnote{34}{According to 1845 \textit{Oliver and Boyd} titled individuals were involved as officeholders/governors in the administration of forty-nine charities, according to 1847 \textit{Thom’s} titled individuals were involved as officeholders/governors in sixty charities. Compare with Gunn on Leeds and Manchester, Gunn ‘Class, Identity’, 35-37. Sheffield may have been an exception see Gunn, Public Culture, 23.}
Edinburgh whereas his counterpart the Duke of Leinster played a less significant role in philanthropy in Dublin. Unsurprisingly there was a confessional element to Irish aristocrats’ philanthropic involvement and the presence of ultra-Protestant aristocrats such as the Earl of Roden and Viscount Lorton on the managing committees of Dublin’s missionary societies reinforced Catholic-Protestant divisions. Titled individuals were rarely involved in charities with strong Catholic connections which instead appointed Catholic clerics as their patrons or presidents. Of course, conspicuous clerical involvement was common in Dublin, whether the clerics were Anglican or Catholic. Yet the absence of nobility highlighted status differences between Catholic charities and other associations, further reinforcing the confessional divide. Connections were often made between Protestant missionary work and national identity in Scotland but given the composition of Edinburgh’s middle classes this, acted as a uniting force.

Other historically privileged groups also shaped charities in both cities including bodies that nominally represented trade or mercantile groups: the trades guilds in Dublin, and the trades incorporations and Company of Merchants in Edinburgh who were involved in the management of high-status hospital schools. Their role was sometimes related to their positions in pre-reform urban governance and was therefore affected by the political changes that took place in the 1830s and 1840s. In Edinburgh they lost their position in Trinity Hospital and Heriot’s after municipal reform, although they continued to be involved in the Merchant Maiden, Trades Maiden, and George Watson’s Hospitals, where their involvement was not related to the composition of the pre-reform Town Council. The trades bodies’ diminishing authority reflected the broadening of urban governance and by becoming more inclusive of a range of occupational groups, the charities could better help the

37 Only three of the Catholic charities listed in 1845 Thom’s had titled individuals involved in their management.
38 Breitenbach, Empire, 19-21.
39 1845 Oliver and Boyd.
cities to cope with status-based difference than they could before reform. The development of Heriot’s Foundation Schools by the post-reform Hospital administration allowed a much greater number of pupils to be assisted by the Trust as the Schools accepted children from families with no connections to the trade incorporations. Yet the ability of trades’ bodies to retain some power within charities in both cities after reform, indicated that many social divisions and privileges remained and philanthropic institutions sometimes perpetuated them.

The reform agenda was multifaceted and went beyond attempting to secure narrowly defined political change. Some groups and individuals supported certain aspects of reform and not others, and their positions were not always consistent. The incorporated trades had campaigned in favour of municipal reform, and after reform was achieved the Scotsman highlighted the trades’ hypocrisy in supporting the opening of the Town Council but attempting to restrict entry to Heriot’s and Trinity Hospitals to the families of the trades. The trades bodies received petitions for admission to the charities associated with them, even the RCSEd. received many applications for admission to the Trades Maiden Hospital because it was connected with the Guild of Barber Surgeons. This no doubt improved the reputation of the trades bodies among successful petitioners, but overall these bodies attempted to restrict entry to charities to a small group connected with themselves and so the involvement of these bodies in philanthropy commanded significantly less legitimacy among a city’s broader middle classes (if not necessarily their poor) than the involvement of reformed local government. In Dublin this was compounded by the religious exclusiveness of some of the institutions associated with the trades guilds, particularly the King’s Hospital. This lack of legitimacy decreased such charities’ ability to mediate social diversity through philanthropy.

Edinburgh’s charities were also strongly shaped by long-established legal professional organisations such as the Faculty of Advocates and the Society of Writers
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to the Signet. The Keepers and Commissioners of the Signet were Trustees of John Watson’s Institution, a charitable boarding school whose endowment fund was established in 1750. More recently-founded charities were also entrusted to legal bodies even when the donor was not a member of the profession. The Faculty of Advocates, for example, managed the funds of Chalmers’s Hospital, a medical charity established by the will of plumber George Chalmers (d.1836) and opened in 1864.\textsuperscript{43} These actions reflected significant confidence in Edinburgh’s legal professionals but attitudes towards this occupational group were ambiguous and this was highlighted in their interactions with charities. As members of the ‘College of Justice’ legal professionals were exempt from paying poor rates, yet until the Town Council took over the Edinburgh Charity Workhouse, places on the management of that institution were reserved for representatives of legal professional groups.\textsuperscript{44} This was a source of resentment among Edinburgh’s ratepayers who claimed that they had to pay rate increases because of the extravagance of managers who did not share their burden.\textsuperscript{45}

Legal professionals were conspicuously involved in many of Edinburgh’s charities and the frequent occurrence of suffixes such as ‘Advocate’, ‘WS’ (Writer to the Signet), and ‘SSC’ (Solicitor in the Supreme Courts) in almanacs’ lists of the managers of the city’s philanthropic organisations made this clear even to a stranger to the city. Yet this was not so much a reflection of respect for lawyers and their social position, it was their occupational skills that were valued and it explains their appointment as secretaries to charities. Including a legal signifier after a secretary’s name was probably an attempt to increase confidence in the institution’s management. Fifty-seven of the charities listed in 1845 \textit{Oliver and Boyd} had at least one officeholder with a legal occupational signifier and in twenty-five of these organisations the secretary or treasury was a legal professional. According to 1845 \textit{Thom’s} there were forty charities in Dublin with conspicuous legal professionals in their management and several charities had ‘law agents’, but only two had a legal professional as their secretary and none as treasurer. The difference partly reflected the absence in Dublin of the

\textsuperscript{43} 1896 \textit{Oliver and Boyd}, 1103.
\textsuperscript{45} EEC 16 January 1836, 15 February 1845, \textit{The Witness} 24 October 1840, \textit{Scotsman} 17 October 1840.
kind of short-hand designation for legal professionals used in Edinburgh, but this itself was a reflection of the greater prominence of groups such as Writers to the Signet in Edinburgh. The conspicuous involvement of legal professions in philanthropy no doubt furthered Edinburgh’s reputation as a ‘professional city.’

II.

‘Conspicuous medics’, those whose titles or other nominal designations publicly indicated that they were medical practitioners, played a significant role in charities in both cities. Focusing on conspicuous medics underestimates the role of surgeons and apothecaries, but it allows examination of the ways in which medical involvement in philanthropy was publicly presented. *1845 Oliver and Boyd* listed forty-five charities in Edinburgh in which conspicuous medics were involved in some way. *1845 Thom’s* listed sixty-eight charities in Dublin in which such practitioners participated, often in substantial numbers. The difference was partly related to the high number of medical charities in Dublin which provided a greater number of occupational opportunities for medical practitioners. In thirty-two of the forty-five Edinburgh charities with conspicuous medics, some of these medics were involved in an occupational capacity as medical officers, in Dublin the figure was fifty-four. The nature of medical practitioners’ involvement in philanthropy was frequently more closely connected with their occupations than legal professionals. The latter might be present because of their professional skills but the involvement of the former was often clearly defined and circumscribed by their occupation. They were more obviously servants of the institutions even though they usually acted gratuitously.⁴⁶

Historians have identified an ‘age of medical reform’ in Britain extending from the late eighteenth century to the Medical Registration Act of 1858. In practice, much of this scholarship has focused on England and has emphasised how traditional barriers were breaking down between elite physicians, certain groups of prominent surgeons, and a surgeon-apothecary group of ambiguous status.⁴⁷ Developments in Ireland and Scotland were, however, not exactly the same as in England. Jacqueline


Jenkinson indicated that divisions between physicians and surgeons had long been less significant in Edinburgh than they were in England. The membership of several of the city’s medical associations had been open to both groups since the early eighteenth century, reflecting and reinforcing common affiliations among them.\(^48\) The traditional divisions persisted to a greater extent in Dublin where the very top of the profession remained dominated by physicians, but the situation was complex there for other reasons.\(^49\) Michael Brown highlighted links between *The Lancet*’s reforming editors and political reform in England and beyond. The *Dublin Medical Press* championed medical reform with the same vigour as *The Lancet* but otherwise its editors generally held conservative opinions, especially regarding Catholic rights.\(^50\) The issue of medical reform was more complex than Brown described. He was correct to highlight how medical reform often resembled other types of contemporary reform. Its aims of promoting openness, good governance, and an end to the unfair monopolies of *ancien régime* bodies were shared by many other reformers. London’s Royal Colleges could be presented as selfish, corrupt, antiquated institutions that like other traditional monopolies unfairly restricted the participation of well-qualified individuals. For some, allowing medical practitioners to have a place in the management of medical charities could be seen as an adequate way of introducing the expertise required to promote good governance but not all reformers saw it this way.

According to Brown, reformers became increasingly hostile to the role played by subscribers in the election of charities’ medical officers. Candidates for medical positions frequently paid for their friends to become subscribers, who could then vote for them, leading to complaints that this favoured the appointment of the wealthiest rather than the best-qualified medics.\(^51\) This was not a view articulated by all those working to reform charities. The *Scotsman*, for example argued for increased rather than decreased subscriber involvement in philanthropy. Its position was nuanced,


\(^{49}\)Dickson, *Dublin*, 312-313.


when discussing the new Surgical Hospital established in Edinburgh in 1829, the newspaper welcomed the initial appropriation of the institution’s management by its chief medic James Syme: ‘From having the fullest confidence in the science and integrity of the individual, we shall most willingly contribute our mite, with the view of enabling him to commence and proceed with confidence.’ The newspaper clearly valued Syme’s expert knowledge but it also urged that after its initial establishment the management of the Hospital should be handed over to subscribers. It believed that giving control to a large number of contributors provided the publicity required to prevent corruption and ensure performance of duty, something that granting control to medical professional interests, however competent, could not do. As seen in its coverage of the RI, this was also a matter of principle for the Scotsman, subscribers’ contributions entitled them to manage such institutions.

Opinions about the extent to which medical professionals should control charities in Dublin also varied. The Meath Hospital was criticised by the Dublin-based assistant commissioners that investigated the city for the Irish Poor Inquiry, for allowing its medical officers to choose their own successors. The assistant commissioners argued that this self-selection not only violated the Hospital’s charter but was also bad practice as it could lead to corruption. Such issues also arose at the Charitable Infirmary Jervis-street where there was a long history of tensions between medical practitioners and non-medical managers. The non-medical governors secured a change in the Infirmary’s charter in 1820 in order to transfer the power of selecting medical officers from hospital’s medics to themselves because most of the medics’ previous elections had been invalid. Medical officers were also hitherto prevented from serving on the Managing Committee, even though they contributed the qualifying amount required for a role in management.

Conflict between Jervis-street’s medics and non-medical managers continued into the 1840s with the selection of hospital managers becoming a contentious issue. In
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a letter to the *Morning Register* in 1842 Catholic Archdeacon Hamilton complained that medics were circulating incomplete lists of candidates for the Managing Committee elections to subscribers, and that he himself was one of the names left off the list. Hamilton’s letter argued strongly for a subscriber-controlled system.\[^{56}\] Although such systems were vulnerable to manipulation by candidates for medical office, some of Dublin’s Catholics valued them for their openness.\[^{57}\] Corrigan told an 1843 parliamentary inquiry that he had spent over £100 creating governors at Jervis-street in 1830 to secure a position there. He defended this system as the only way in which Catholic medics could break into voluntary hospitals that were otherwise dominated by Dublin’s Protestant medical elites.\[^{58}\] Indeed, according to Corrigan four of the thirteen Catholics medics employed in Dublin’s voluntary hospitals in 1843 worked at the relatively small Jervis-street.\[^{59}\] The hospital’s ballot system provided a limited way of coping with religious difference among the city’s medics. Another was the foundation of St Vincent’s Hospital which was established partly to broaden the professional opportunities available to Catholic doctors who found it difficult to secure positions at Dublin’s other voluntary hospitals.\[^{60}\] Almanac entries emphasised the hospital’s educational role. *1845 Thom’s*, for example, noted that: ‘Clinical lectures are delivered in this Hospital, and certificates of attendance on its practice are recognised by the College of Surgeons in Dublin and London, the London University, &c.’\[^{61}\]

Advertisements for medical training and lectures at St Vincent’s also appeared in the

\[^{56}\] For Hamilton see Purcell, ‘Dublin Diocesan Archives-Hamilton Papers (1)’, 31, *MR* 28 January 1842, 6 February 1842.

\[^{57}\] The very high attendances at elections for medical officers indicates a strong interest in such matters. These were even higher than at elections for governors. See numbers for yearly (January) ballots for the latter in CICT/PRO/01, CICT/PRO/02, CICT/PRO/03 and compare with for example CICT/PRO/02 26 February 1835, 1-2, 20 August 1829, 6-7, 1 March 1830, 10-11, *Poorer Ireland C*, 98.


\[^{61}\] *1845 Thom’s*, 697.
Freeman’s Journal emphasising its importance as a centre of the medical profession as well as of philanthropy.\textsuperscript{62}

Debates on the future management of the grand-jury funded ‘Irish Medical Charities’\textsuperscript{63} in the 1840s also demonstrated how confessional divisions made philanthropic and medical reform particularly complex issues in Ireland. One of the main sources of conflict was whether the Charities should remain under the control of the Grand Jury and subscribers, or whether they should be incorporated into the new Poor Law system. Conservatives complained that Catholics and liberals thought Poor Law intervention would help Catholic medics gain employment in the Charities.\textsuperscript{64} While conservatives may have overstated their case, the ability of the Irish Poor Law to command significant support among Irish medics at this time when there was deep concern among English medics about the conditions offered to medical employees under the English Poor Law, reflected the persistence of confessional divisions in Dublin.\textsuperscript{65} In 1848 the Dublin Medical Press hinted that religious tensions also affected medical appointments in Edinburgh. They claimed that Syme had abandoned the Episcopal Church for the Church of Scotland in order to secure a professorship at Edinburgh University. This however appears to have related primarily to the increased religious tensions that followed the Disruption as Syme was being reappointed to a position that he had already held.\textsuperscript{66}

Examining the role of medics within charities provides an insight into contemporary beliefs about what philanthropy was for and why people participated in it. Small specialist hospitals that were primarily managed by medics, such as the Edinburgh Eye Infirmary, were established in both cities and were particularly common in Dublin.\textsuperscript{67} Specialist hospitals were frequently criticised as attempts to serve
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\textsuperscript{67} 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 518, First Report of the Edinburgh Eye Infirmary, from the Time of its Opening on the 1st of July, to 20th November 1834 (Edinburgh, [1834?]), 2, see also 1845 Thom’s.
medics’ professional interests and lay contributors’ vanity rather than the poor. The institutions certainly provided their medical officers with professional experience, publicity, and income in the form of pupils’ fees but such advantages were not always presented in a negative light. An advertisement appeared in the Freeman’s Journal in November 1836 for the sale of the property of bankrupt medical practitioner Bryan Richard Shananan. The items being sold included a Lying-In Hospital on Townsend-street and the advertisement noted that:

The Hospital is so well circumstanced and situate [sic] in such an excellent part of the City, that any recommendation of it would be superfluous; the Rent is very low, and from its having been many years established it can, at small expense, be made very lucrative to professional gentleman [sic].

The charity was presented as a business opportunity for a medical practitioner willing to take over its operation. Similarly, the Evening Mail contained at least one advertisement in which a medical practitioner sought a dispensary position in which employment at the dispensary was openly presented as a business transaction.

Charities could be used to enhance medics’ professional status in other ways and there was a symbiotic relationship between hospitals, their doctors, and medical publications. Medical journals, for example, including articles in which doctors described patient cases and these generally noted the hospitals at which the treatment occurred. A meeting of the Edinburgh Surgical Hospital announced to the public that the institution’s quarterly patient statistics were published in the Medical and Surgical Journal. Connection with such a publication gave the charities legitimacy, and in turn citing cases from an established hospital enhanced a journal’s reputation. Similarly, connections with specific hospitals were used to add authority to other medical publications. Advertisements for Robert Collins’s *A Practical Treatise on Midwifery*

---

68 See chapter five, Granshaw, “Fame and Fortune”, 200, 206.
69 FJ 3 November 1836.
70 DEM 16 May 1836.
71 Interestingly the conservative Dublin Medical Press included coverage of research and educational activity at St. Vincent’s see for example ‘Lectures upon the Human Intestinal Worms, Delivered at St. Vincent’s Hospital during the Winter Session, 1841-2….’, Dublin Medical Press, Vol. 8 (No.187) 3 August 1842, 65-68.
72 Scotsman 18 June 1831.
noted the many cases from the Rotunda Hospital on which the study was based in order to increase confidence in its content.\textsuperscript{73}

Medical charities advertised courses of medical and surgical lectures in newspapers in both cities and it was particularly common in Dublin whose many training hospitals reflected the existence of a large medical educational marketplace.\textsuperscript{74} These advertisements were part of a developing trend in which hospitals were increasingly presented to the public as institutions whose primary functions were training and research. The provision of parliamentary grants to Dublin’s hospitals, further enhanced this trend. As well as citing Dublin’s position as a poor but metropolitan city, those defending the grants emphasised the educational and research value of the hospitals.\textsuperscript{75} By the 1850s, after the government had attempted to remove the grants, funding was being almost completely justified based on the hospitals’ educational functions. This further promoted the hospitals’ scientific functions over their other roles and it limited how future parliamentary funds could be used. By the 1880s the connection between parliamentary funding and education had become so close that it was considered the only justification for such aid.\textsuperscript{76}

III.

As Gorsky argued for England, philanthropy helped to improve the professional status of teachers. He indicated that local charity schools’ connections with large philanthropic organisations such as the British and Foreign School Society and the National School Society encouraged common standards and practices to spread throughout the country.\textsuperscript{77} Philanthropic education had similar standardising effects in Ireland and Scotland. Overall, despite status differences among medical practitioners they were more likely to be seen as professionals than were schoolteachers, especially
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those teaching at charity schools. Yet this lower status meant that philanthropy had the potential to produce a greater relative improvement in teachers’ social position. Differences in educational traditions and practices ensured that Edinburgh’s schoolteachers generally remained of higher status than those in Dublin, something perhaps aided by the long tradition of unemployed established Church clerics working as teachers in Scotland. Philanthropic activity, however, did enhance how schoolteaching was perceived in both cities.

A letter to the *Freeman’s Journal* in 1845 urged the improvement of working conditions for teachers in Irish national schools. It presented them as a neglected group:

> From whatever caused arising there exists, unfortunately, a feeling of disrespect (approaching in some instances to contempt) against persons employed in the education of the humbler classes of society, and as there is no circumstances so calculated to destroy their efficiency as that, it ought to be a leading object...to raise the masters in the scale of the respectability.

Although the author argued that the social position of these schoolteachers was not what it should be, the letter at least indicated that some commentators were interested in improving their conditions and greatly valued their work. The letter also claimed that the central management of the KPS had empowered the teachers of charity schools by negotiating directly with them about salary levels rather than with the schools’ patrons. Concerns about the status of teachers were common in Edinburgh where the position of parochial teachers received significant attention. As in Dublin, there were many complaints about the insufficiency of teachers’ remuneration, but the discussions also revealed respect for teachers’ work. One of the reasons why state school inspection into Church of Scotland schools was controversial was uncertainty about how it would impact on teachers. Some argued that it would improve teachers’ status and the quality of teaching by highlighting the important work already being done in Scottish schools. Others however, claimed that acceptance of school
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inspection was simply the thin end of the wedge for the Church of Scotland and that teachers in Church schools would soon be paid by the state which would then put them under pressure to act against the Church.\textsuperscript{82}

All of these debates emphasised that teachers were a specific occupational group and may have aided the development of a ‘teaching professional identity’. Other changes in associational culture may have also enhanced this trend especially in Edinburgh. By 1845 there were at least two teachers’ organisations in Edinburgh: the Society of Burgh and Parochial Schoolmasters (1807) and the Edinburgh Society of Teachers (1737), the latter was open to all “Teachers, public or private, resident in any part of Scotland.”\textsuperscript{83} The Literary Teachers Society was established in Dublin in 1789. It seems to have been primarily a charitable fund for distressed teachers and had several high-profile patrons. It may, however have been an indication of the existence of some kind of teaching identity in Ireland.\textsuperscript{84} Some of Dublin's schoolteachers had significant negotiating power in Dublin. As well as running their own schools, the Christian Brothers were employed as teachers by charities such as the Educational Society of the United Parishes. In 1831, the Brothers withdrew their services from the Education Society for unspecified reasons, demonstrating how this group of teachers were independent of, and could dictate to the charity’s managers.\textsuperscript{85} This however was because of their membership of a religious order rather than their position as schoolteachers.

As in England, the educational systems promoted by large national charities improved the professional reputations of teachers in Ireland and Scotland by encouraging the standardisation of teaching practices. In fact, as Akenson pointed out, the KPS was the UK’s pedagogical pioneer. The Society established model training schools and a well-functioning inspection system that helped to promote and maintain
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\textsuperscript{85}Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes 1826-1833, 31 May 1827, 7 June 1827, 19 July 1827, 8 August 1827, 15 April 1831. The reasons for leaving were not given in the minutes but it is too early for anything related to Christian Brothers’ withdrawal from the national system, Denis McLaughlin, ‘The Irish Christian Brothers and the National Board of Education: Challenging the Myths’, History of Education, 37 (No.1) (2008), 49.
common standards. Publication of its own textbooks ensured that similar subjects were not only taught in its own schools but in the many others that also employed them. Some other schools adopted the KPS’s teaching methods which they publicly highlighted to inspire confidence in their work and gain donations. A fundraising advertisement for the Chancery-Lane Sunday and Daily Schools noted that the teachers at the Daily School ‘pursue a model of Instruction, substantially similar to that of the Education Society’s Model School in Kildare-place.’ Charities on both sides of Dublin’s confessional divide adopted comparable methods. As Sean Griffin indicated, the CBS’s distribution of large numbers of school textbooks also promoted common standards. The CES, though having very different religious aims, also used similar methods. The national system was influenced by the KPS and the CBS and adopted many of their practices, and the long-term and often simultaneous operation of all of these analogous systems helped to promote some sense of shared educational values however limited. In fact, the national system also extended its common standards beyond Ireland as its textbooks were used elsewhere in the UK including by many of Edinburgh’s schools, reflecting and helping to reinforce a sense of shared basic educational values across the British Isles.

Philanthropic activity also prompted the development of educational systems in Edinburgh. Lawyer John Wood developed the ‘intellectual system’ of instruction at the city’s Sessional School and by the late 1830s many schools in Edinburgh and elsewhere in Scotland had adopted variants of it. The Sessional School further extended its reach by becoming a model school for training teachers.
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developments in Edinburgh’s charities also promoted the growth of common educational standards such as the Town Council’s Bell’s Schools which began to train apprentice teachers in the 1830s. Heriot’s Foundation Schools all used common methods and had their own central inspectorate spreading common standards throughout the city as the network developed. By inviting the Scottish state school inspectors to visit their Schools, Heriot’s linked them to a system promoting a further reaching, if looser form of standardisation. As well as reinforcing a sense of common affiliation among philanthropists, this affected how teaching was viewed. Increasing standardisation of school teaching publicly advertised that it was a professional occupation based on definable methods and expert knowledge. Charities’ publicity material also helped to present teachers as a professional group. Almanac entries often included the names of charities’ teachers alongside other officeholders. Like medics, teachers used their connections with charities to enhance reputations and further their occupational interests. This was probably most common for teachers at higher status educational charities such as Edinburgh’s hospital schools. An advertisement for French language textbooks written by Gabriel Surenne in 1845 Oliver and Boyd, indicated that Surenne was ‘French Master in the Merchant Maiden Seminary.’

Charity schools’ want advertisements highlighted the qualifications that their teachers had to possess. ‘Expert knowledge’ was not always the focus, for example, when a male and female teacher were sought it was sometimes stated that a married couple would be preferred. Professional qualifications were frequently demanded, and given that these advertisements tended to take a common form, they helped to create expectations about the skills teachers should have. The advertisements often referred to specific teaching systems. In January 1845, Edinburgh’s Free St Andrew’s School placed an advertisement for a male teacher who had to be ‘qualified to Teach, on the modern and improved system, all the usual branches of Education.’ Teachers seeking work also placed advertisements in Dublin newspapers. They emphasised that
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they were qualified to a recognisable standard, often noting that they had received training in a model school or that they were at least familiar with a particular charity’s education system. This again promoted the idea that teachers should possess certain qualifications and that appropriately qualified teachers should be seen as a professional group. In highlighting shared standards, this reminded each city’s philanthropists that they shared some of the same basic values. This had its limits however, particularly in Dublin where educational charity remained primarily linked with religious controversy.

Dublin’s teacher training schools had strong religious connections, as the newspaper-reading public were well aware, and this was reflected in teachers’ own advertisements. In January 1845 a schoolmaster placed an advertisement in the Evening Mail, among his qualifications he stated that he had ‘taught school for some years under the superintendence of the Church Education Society’, an association that the newspaper frequently praised.96 Similarly a schoolmistress looking for a situation through the same newspaper indicated that ‘she understands the System practised in the Schools belonging to the Church Education Society.’97 Those who perhaps could not boast such a favourable education produced more ambiguous advertisements such as one placed by a teacher in the Evening Mail in 1836 that indicated he had been ‘educated in one of the Training Schools.’98 Indeed, association with a large national charity was sometimes a disadvantage. In 1841, when reviewing applicants for the post of assistant schoolmaster at their Workhouse school, some North Dublin Union Poor Law guardians argued against a candidate who had previously taught for the KPS, since in their eyes he had worked for a proselytising agency.99

The KPS and national system used common professional methods but their religious affiliations were sometimes perceived as more important, and meant that, despite their similarities, they increased tensions between different confessional groups rather than decreased them. Religious conflicts were not as severe in Edinburgh yet even there teachers’ positions sometimes depended more on their religious affiliations than their professional qualifications. In 1843 the managers of St Stephen’s Church of
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Scotland School fired two teachers who joined the Free Church, while controversy ensued when most of the Gaelic School Society’s teachers ‘came out’ at the Disruption (see below). 100

Overall though teachers seem to have occupied a relatively high social position in Edinburgh by the 1840s, probably partly due to pride in the city’s reputation as a centre of education. Individual charity schoolteachers were sometimes thought worthy of newspaper comment. In March 1844 The Witness included a detailed obituary for Mr Thomas Gordon Bothwell, A.M., who had been a teacher at one of Heriot’s Foundation Schools for three years. 101 Heriot’s was of course a prestigious charity but teachers associated with lower status schools also received attention. In 1838 the Scotsman praised the appointment of the ‘Rev. Thomas Dewar of St Mary’s Parish’, former teacher of St Mary’s Parish School, as Minister of Roxburgh Church. 102

Unemployed ministers had long taken jobs as schoolmasters when waiting for a position but in this case Dewar had studied divinity during his time as a teacher at St Mary’s, suggesting that a teaching position could be used as a route to upward social mobility. 103 After the death of Mr Alexander Robertson, who was also working as a teacher at St Mary’s School, the managers noted that he had started to study medicine. The managers did not think it inappropriate for their schoolteacher to be aspiring towards a career in medicine, rather they claimed that ‘from his Ardent mind and Studious habits there can be no doubt he would have succeeded’ with his studies. 104

Positive public comment further enhanced the status of teachers. In 1840 when setting the salary for female teachers at the new Foundation Schools, several of Heriot’s managers commented on the value of such teachers and the necessity of granting a relatively high salary to attract good candidates. A committee of governors had recommended a salary of L.30 a year, but some attendees at a subsequent meeting of governors disagreed:
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Bailie Grieve, Mr Bennie, and Bailie Thomson, urged that £.50 was not too much for this useful but hitherto ill-paid class; and £.45 was ultimately fixed upon for the first year, as the only inducement for well-qualified candidates to offer themselves. These meetings were reported on in the newspaper press, further publicising the managers’ high opinion of well-qualified teachers. The Witness also argued that the favourable conditions under which Heriot’s male teachers worked would improve the position of teachers more generally:

The Heriot schools form the noble beginning of a better system. The teachers of them are respectably endowed, receiving £150 a-year each. This will raise the status of our Scottish teachers, and ought to be imitated throughout the country. Many teachers are scarcely better paid than day labourers.

The newspaper pointed to ambiguous attitudes towards teachers in Scotland: ‘while many extol their services, few speak of adding to their very narrow incomes. Thus the office of the teacher is degraded, but we trust a better day is dawning now.’ Although they highlighted the inconsistency between the praise teachers received and their monetary remuneration, The Witness’s comments also revealed a high and growing regard for schoolteachers in Edinburgh society.

At first glance, the position of teachers at the Gaelic School Society makes them appear an exception to the overall trend towards professionalisation. The Society’s teachers were migratory, alternating between different parts of the Highlands and Islands in order to spread the organisation’s thin resources as widely as possible. The charity stressed the ‘frontier’ nature of their work, the teachers were spreading the gospel among scattered isolated uneducated people in a harsh physical environment where ministers were few. The Society not only recognised their teachers’ humble status, they celebrated it. They argued that it was necessary that the teachers be of a similar background to those that they were educating:

It is difficult for friends not acquainted with the Highlands and the Highland population, to divest themselves of unfavourable impressions as to the spiritual services of uneducated men, and men in such humble circumstances in life, as your Teachers generally are, even though satisfied with their judgement and piety.
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They stressed the importance of teacher and pupil having a common background: ‘To be an effective Highland orator, one must be a Highlander—must feel as they do—and be affected as they are.’ The Society was claiming that professional training alone was not enough, but not that it was unimportant. In fact the Society’s managers emphasised the professional approach of their teachers as well as their religious devotion and Highland character:

The teachers of your schools, too, have earned, by their faithfulness and efficiency, the same commendation bestowed on them in former years. Apart altogether from their professional skill and industry your Committee have satisfaction in the thought, that by the maintenance of these men, so godly and so devoted, a Christian agency, is established, to the unspeakable advantage of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland.

Most of the Society’s teachers joined the Free Church at the Disruption, and the Society’s managers made significant efforts to protect them as a group in the face of criticism from Church of Scotland clergy. These efforts usually involved defending the teachers’ moral character but discussing them as a group helped to emphasise the significance of their occupation and perhaps aided the development of a professional identity among them.

State intervention in philanthropy also furthered the standardisation of educational provision, and the idea that it should be provided by those with specialist knowledge, and this sometimes improved the status of teachers. State inspection of schools also emphasised the expert nature of teaching as an activity. Scottish school inspectors were warned not to dictate to teachers and managers but only to offer them advice, yet simply making inquiries and providing the same kind of information to many schools created common expectations about what educational provision should consist of. Filling out the standardised forms necessary to apply for educational grants may have also aided the process. Even the debate on school inspection in
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Edinburgh enhanced schoolteachers’ status as both sides presented themselves as guardians of the teachers’ interests. The voluntary nature of the Scottish school inspection system, while primarily designed to avoid religious controversy, also reflected a greater respect for the independence of the teacher than shown in Ireland. Similarly, by relying on schoolmasters for information the 1838 School Survey indicated that they were trusted as a source of information. Publishing their opinions further added weight to these opinions and made them more widely known. The intervention of the local state in educational philanthropy in Edinburgh also improved the status of charity schoolteachers. By using the same College committee in its interactions with charity schools, Edinburgh Town Council associated their schoolteachers’ work with the high-status University and High School and with Edinburgh’s reputation as a city of Enlightenment.

The effects of the Irish national system were more ambiguous. The establishment of model training schools emphasised that teachers were doing a specialised, knowledge-based job that could and should reflect specific objective standards. However, by providing a proportion of their salaries, the national system also made its teachers appear like servants of the state rather than independent professionals. A national schoolteacher receiving most of their income from the state appeared less in control of their school than a teacher whose income came from pupils’ fees, a contrast more likely to be welcomed by the parents of poor pupils, than by teachers.

IV.
Charities did not always publicly articulate issues pertaining to gender in this period, but investigating the institutions’ relationships with gender remains crucial for understanding the ways in which philanthropic organisations interacted with wider society. Gender has rightly been a central concern for historians of charity and analysis of its place within charitable activity sheds light on where philanthropists thought the boundaries of urban governance should lie and the extent to which women should be included within them. Ideas about gender underpinned many assumptions about how charities should work, who should be involved in managing them, and how they should interact with wider society, all of which helped to determine the limits of charities’ ability to cope with difference.
Philanthropy occupied an ambiguous position between public and private. It sometimes dealt with private matters in a very public way. Charities interfered deeply in the domestic concerns of those that they aided. Poor relief, public health, and missionary charities all used home visits to both provide relief and to assess the circumstances of claimants. At the same time, residential institutions such as orphan houses were supposed to perform all of the functions of a family home and the RI described its staff as ‘family.’ Yet in other ways charities’ activities were more like those of businesses, government, or public administration and these were often the aspects that were most visible to the public as charities placed newspaper advertisements for employees or for provisions that highlighted their administrative concerns. These concerns were also displayed in charities’ annual reports which often contained detailed financial accounts.

Women were sometimes part of the public face of charity. Newspapers noted when there were high female attendances at charities’ public meetings and advertisements for some public meetings encouraged ‘ladies’ to attend. Discussing a meeting for ‘Destitute Imprisoned Debtors’ held in January 1824 the Scotsman noted that “The meeting was highly respectable, and attended rather numerously by ladies, many of them well known for their active benevolence.” An advertisement for the annual meeting of the Edinburgh Society for Relief of Poor Married Women of Respectable Character when in Child-bed indicated that ‘Ladies friendly to the object of the Society are invited to attend.” Women’s presence might sometimes have been highlighted because it allowed the charities to emphasise the compassionate nature of their work. Yet the fact that it was thought necessary to encourage women to attend suggests that, despite their prominence in anti-slavery movements since the late eighteenth century, women’s presence at charities’ public meetings was still quite
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unusual. Women seem to have done much of the behind-the-scenes caring activities for which they were believed to be naturally suited, and this was sometimes stated publicly.

The public face of charity, however, remained predominately masculine in this period. Even ‘Ladies Societies’ and other charities whose names suggested that they were managed by women often had male secretaries and other offices. One of the more extreme examples was the Scottish Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India which was auxiliary to the General Assembly’s Committee on Foreign Missions. The treasurer, secretary, and all its presidents were men, and women were relegated to a sub-committee. This was not simply a legal convenience to secure property. Jane Rendall indicated that female friendly societies could manage their property by allowing property-related issues to be dealt with informally through a male friend rather than requiring he be a formal officeholder in the charity.

Historians have argued convincingly that, later in the nineteenth century, women were able to use their increasing professional role in philanthropy to claim a greater role in public life more generally. By contrast, historians have argued that the increasing institutionalisation of charity in the eighteenth century diminished women’s traditional philanthropic roles. The impact of charitable activity on women’s social position in the early nineteenth century was ambiguous. As Michael Brown indicated, the medical professional identity that was developing in this period was a strongly masculine one. The growing authority of medics, albeit still relatively limited, decreased women’s ability to wield authority within voluntary hospitals. Women did
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not enter the medical profession until much later. The professionalisation of nursing was also primarily a later phenomenon and for the most part nursing remained a low status occupation in this period. One of the few exceptions to the almost total male control of medical philanthropy was St Vincent’s Hospital in Dublin which was primarily managed by the Sisters of Charity. As with the Christian Brothers, it was the Sisters’ existence as an organised group possessing religious authority that enhanced their occupational autonomy and perhaps their professional identities. The position of most lay women in medical philanthropy was very different.

By contrast, the effects of charity on the occupational status of women schoolteachers were complex. Female teachers were more common in England than in either Scotland or Ireland, but women had long been involved in teaching throughout the UK. In both cities, the status of women teachers was enhanced by the existence of female-managed private seminaries for middle-class girls, but philanthropy also played a significant role. The example above indicated how Heriot’s provided a forum for the discussion of the work of women teachers in a way that enhanced their status. Want advertisements whether placed by charity schools seeking teachers, or by teachers stressing connection with a specific charity, also improved the relative position of women teachers compared with their male counterparts. The advertisements emphasised the same kind of qualifications as those required for male teachers and so highlighted similarities between both groups. The model schools of the KPS and national system trained both men and women, publicly demonstrating the belief that both needed to reach some sort of professional standard to be teachers.

Similarly, the 1838 School Survey included some responses from female teachers, giving official status to their opinions. Yet the report’s language indicated that they assumed that all information gathered would come from schoolmasters. The
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report also highlighted significant differences in the education that male and female teachers in Edinburgh had received. Many of the schoolmasters had attended university, an option not available to women. In fact, many of the examples discussed underline the limits to the trends towards professionalisation and equality for female teachers. Women teachers were consistently paid less than men. Women were sometimes employed to teach practical skills like sewing and straw-plaiting, but men were hired by the more elite girls’ charity schools to teach subjects such as French.

Educational activity was often described using highly gendered language. A discussion of the Gaelic School Society in The Witness referred to the ‘masculine character of the men who were...[the] first framers’ of clerical education. Thomas Gordon Bothwell’s obituary lamented ‘his removal, whilst in the vigour of manhood.’ Even those arguing for more openness in charity used gendered language, ironically demonstrating the limits to their ideas of inclusiveness. When discussing efforts to make the management of the RI more open the Scotsman argued that reformers acted in a ‘manly and honourable’ way. Philanthropic activity sometimes allowed early nineteenth-century UK society to cope with occupational and religious divisions, but overall it tended to augment rather than challenge the connections made between masculinity and public activity, reducing its ability to mediate gender-based difference, a major limit to the ability of philanthropy to cope with diversity in this period.

Professionalisation has been considered a characteristic of modernity and the process was fuelled by many factors in nineteenth-century Dublin and Edinburgh. Charity was just one of these influences but it played a significant role in defining the position of medics and schoolteachers and allowed other occupational groups, such as lawyers to enhance their social position. It was a trend that affected official state
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authority and urban social life. As David Eastwood indicated, government entrusted their inquiries increasingly to experts and bureaucrats from the early nineteenth century onwards, whereas previously, ‘gentlemanly’ status had been the primary qualification for such work.\textsuperscript{137} Similarly, granting professionals a role in charities based on their occupational qualifications could challenge the dominance of managers chosen because of their social status or family connections, potentially making the management of the charities more representative of a city’s occupational diversity.

The growing importance of expert knowledge in charities, and in society in general, provided a way of uniting philanthropists that were otherwise divided. Certification bodies such as the royal colleges of medicine set common standards to which the managers of many different hospitals aspired. As would be expected, given its many medical charities, this had a significant influence in Dublin, where hospitals with a wide range of affiliations applied to and were approved of by the RCSI. Advertising this highlighted that these medical institutions had something in common with each other. Despite differences in their administration, the managers of all these hospitals subscribed to the same basic professional values, even St Vincent’s applied for recognition to the RCSI, an institution dominated by Protestant conservatives, and was accepted.\textsuperscript{138} As seen, this approval and the Hospital’s other professional connections were detailed in its entry in 1845 Thom’s, highlighting similarities with hospitals managed by Dublin’s Anglican elites and with teaching hospitals across the UK.

Yet the effects of this trend towards professionalisation were not clear-cut. Improvements in the status of professionals within charities also threatened to undermine the institutions’ ability to unite a wide range of social groups in the longer term. Increasing popular acceptance of the idea that expert knowledge was a vital qualification for making management decisions, closed off opportunities for non-professionals in the management of hospitals, decreasing the charities’ ability to be ways through which diverse groups could participate in urban governance. As seen, openings for women in the administration of medical charities remained limited.

\textsuperscript{137} Eastwood, “Amplifying”, 294.
\textsuperscript{138} For the RCSI see Geary, Medicine, 160-163.
Respect for professional knowledge was increasing in the early nineteenth century, but professional appropriation of charities’ management did not have the same legitimacy as granting a role to ordinary subscribers or to reformed local government. The latter theoretically represented all of the middle classes, the former did not. Middle-class philanthropists who did not possess relevant professional knowledge may have found it increasingly difficult to justify their position within the management of charities.

The impact of professionalisation developed slowly over time and its effects by 1845 should not be exaggerated. There were conflicts between medics and lay managers in all of the hospitals considered here and lay managers frequently prevailed. Professionals’ suggestions were questioned and medical opinion was not simply accepted as fact and adopted as policy. Medical practitioners themselves were divided on major questions including on the origin of diseases such as cholera. Increasing interest in professional knowledge introduced some limits on the role of non-professional philanthropists but the effects of this remained relatively mild until much later.

**Conclusion:**

Professional interests and other occupational matters affected philanthropy and shaped charity’s wider social impact in both Dublin and Edinburgh. In 1845 medical professionalisation was only just beginning to have the effects identified here, and it would be beneficial to trace them over a longer time period. Similarly the ways in which ideas about gender and philanthropy changed would be worth investigating over a much longer time. This would need to include a detailed analysis of language. As many comments in this thesis indicated, from its opening quotation to Bishop Doyle’s mocking of older women’s interpretations of the Bible, early nineteenth-century male commentators on charity thought the public face of philanthropy should be predominantly masculine. Profession and gender as well as religion shaped society in Dublin and Edinburgh in the early nineteenth century, yet they themselves were also affected by religion. Membership of the Sisters of Charity for example, gave the female
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managers of St Vincent’s Hospital a status that they would not otherwise have had. Similarly educational charity remained closely connected with sectarian conflict, especially in Dublin. The similar and increasingly standardised methods used by educational charities provided mechanisms for highlighting shared values across the UK, but there were limits to this. In Dublin, most commentators focused on what divided the city’s educational charities, not what united them. Even comment on the common methods that these charities employed, such as model schools, usually championed one particular charity’s system based on its religious affiliation, and argued that this should be promoted in opposition to other systems.

Interaction between charities and the professions was a key feature of social relations in these stateless capitals, but it also shaped the broader image of each city. In 1845 the Lord Mayor toasted the Dublin medical profession at a dinner at the Mansion House. In response, Dr Graves, then president of the College of Physicians argued that the activities of medics had long helped to cement Dublin’s reputation as a charitable city. Indeed the images of Dublin and Edinburgh were strongly shaped by philanthropic activity. It affected how the cities were perceived by the outside world, as well as reinforcing inhabitants’ sense of identification with locality, city, and nation, issues that will be explored in detail in the final chapter.
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Chapter Seven.
Magnificence and Misery: Philanthropy, Identity and City Image.

When Queen Victoria first visited Dublin in 1849, the civic authorities welcomed her to 'the second city of...[her] vast empire.' While the inhabitants of nineteenth-century Dublin often used this epithet for their city, others did not always perceive it in this way. Critics in Edinburgh denounced Dublin as a ‘shewy city’ and visitors emphasised the contrast between the city’s splendour and its squalor, highlighting the presence of many mendicants on its wide streets. Indeed the civic authorities were welcoming the Queen during the Great Famine when Dublin was hosting an even larger destitute population than usual. Contemporaries were aware of similar disparities in Edinburgh but accounts of that city tended to focus on its striking topography or the architecture of its New Town, not its social contrasts.

The image of a nineteenth-century city was influenced by many factors including the nature of its economy, local politics, religious conflicts, its architecture and its public monuments. It was also shaped by the ways in which the town appeared to be dealing with its social problems. The extent to which it fulfilled its obligations towards the destitute was an important measure of a town’s success or failure. Therefore analysing the effects of charitable activity on the image of Dublin and Edinburgh engages with contemporary ideas about how urban centres should function.

As noted historians have claimed to identify a Scottish tradition of urban governance in which ‘collective’ interests were prioritised to a greater extent than in England. By contrast it was claimed that inhabitants of nineteenth-century Ireland were hostile to urbanisation and they considered only rural living to be authentically ‘Irish’. However, as Declan Kiberd argued, the situation was more complex than this, much of the ideological tension in Ireland between rural and urban, was a product of the late nineteenth century, and earlier attitudes need to receive more attention.
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has already indicated that while Edinburgh might have had stronger local government in practice, attitudes towards local administration were similar in both cities.

Issues of city image and civic identity may have been particularly complex in the early nineteenth century. Much has been written about how local government rituals aided the development of civic pride in UK towns after 1850, but their use in this earlier time period needs to be explored in more detail. Simon Gunn has indicated that urban middle-class reformers had an ambiguous relationship with civic ceremony in the immediate post-reform years. They felt closely connected to their towns but disliked the pomp and display of traditional urban rituals.6 Charitable ceremony, being associated with practical benevolent activity, might however have provided an acceptable outlet through which reformers (as well as conservatives) could promote their town.

This chapter considers the relationship between charity and geographical identity, it discusses whether charity promoted civic affiliation in Dublin and Edinburgh, but also examines the relationship between urban philanthropy and national and parochial identities. We then discuss the mechanisms through which charities shaped city image by considering both how inhabitants used philanthropy to present a particular image of their city and how charity shaped non-residents’ perceptions of Dublin and Edinburgh.

I.

Historians have emphasised the increasing significance of civic identity for the British middle classes during the nineteenth century and have argued that charities played an important role in this change. As Morris indicated, voluntary organisations began to describe themselves as serving the town in which they were based, rather than the county, which had been the norm in the eighteenth century.7 Similarly, Dalgleish argued that between 1780 and 1820, Edinburgh’s charities began to focus increasingly on the city rather than parish or the nation, and that they demonstrated this by
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including ‘Edinburgh’ in their associations’ names. For Dalgleish, voluntary organisations provided a way of creating a more inclusive middle-class community than was possible to develop through official institutions. Municipal reform occurred in Edinburgh in 1833, hence Dalgleish was writing about the period when many middle-class groups were excluded from the Town Council. Joining voluntary organisations provided an alternative mechanism through which they could identify with the city.

While the situation after 1820 was complex, some of the trends that Dalgleish has identified were also apparent for these later decades. Almanac lists for 1824 and 1845 show that many charities continued to use ‘Edinburgh’ in their names and in the descriptions of the areas that they served, indicating an ongoing connection with the city. A similar trend can be seen in Dublin almanacs where many charities included a reference to that city in their names, articulating an urban affiliation that still has not received sufficient attention in Irish historiography despite recent work on Dublin. Choosing to concentrate on Dublin and Edinburgh, even if only for practical administrative purposes meant that the city as a unit took centre stage at the charities’ public meetings. The listing of a charity in a city almanac or directory, associated it with that town, even if the charity claimed a remit that extended beyond the town’s boundaries.

City identities, however, were not the only geographical connections that charities reinforced. Indeed, being stateless capitals, questions of place-based identity were particularly complex in Dublin and Edinburgh. Charities played a much stronger role in shaping national affiliations in Edinburgh than Dalgleish claimed. As noted, Edinburgh was frequently referred to as the Scottish metropolis and Dublin as the Irish metropolis. It is true that Edinburgh-residents sometimes referred to their city’s Scottish rival Glasgow as ‘the metropolis of the west’, but the use of ‘Irish’ and ‘Scottish’ indicated that Dublin and Edinburgh were expected to be national service centres and philanthropy was part of this. Being home to philanthropic institutions
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that were designed to serve all of Ireland or all of Scotland, as well as the city itself, and helped to enhance the capital status of Dublin and Edinburgh. Missionary charities were particularly good at reflecting multiple identities. Several Edinburgh-based missionary societies represented Scotland as a whole and received donations from auxiliary societies located in other Scottish towns. These Edinburgh missionary organisations dedicated much of the income that they collected to activities in Edinburgh itself, but they were sometimes also associated with British-focused London-based parent societies and donated some funds to them.\(^{11}\) Many of the associations were also active in other parts of the British Empire and this potentially enhanced a sense of imperial identity as well.\(^{12}\)

Several historians have emphasised the importance of ‘concentric’ identities within the multinational United Kingdom, they stressed that individuals can identify with one ‘geographical layer’ without it lessening their affiliation with another.\(^{13}\) Feeling British, for example, need not make one feel less Scottish. This was also the case even where we might have expected the affiliations to be at odds. In Dublin, the pre-reform Corporation claimed that:

> The Municipal Corporations of Ireland are British in their origin, and exclusively Protestant in their constitution, and we consider that their exclusively Protestant character is essential to the maintenance of British connection [sic].\(^{14}\)

The Corporation, however, also articulated an Irish affiliation, arguing that it was working for ‘the welfare of Ireland.’\(^{15}\)

Similarly Dublin-based Protestant missionary charities strongly articulated a sense of Irishness.\(^{16}\) Even members of the HBS, an organisation affiliated with the
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London-based BFBS, emphasised their connection with Ireland. Speaking at the HBS AGM in 1824, prominent Evangelical the Rev. Benjamin William Mathias argued that Irish affiliations should be a fundamental motivation for Protestant missionary activity. He said:

If the Irish pity the Irish-if the Irish love Ireland-if they feel for their fellow countrymen-if the Irish do all this, they will discountenance vice, they will circulate the Bible....and by doing so the Irish will hold up their Country to the world’s admiration. 17

The concept of concentric identities sheds important light on the complexity of national affiliation within the nineteenth-century UK, but one must go beyond seeing identities as non-interacting concentric layers to fully understand the connection between philanthropic association and geographical affiliation. Morton indicated that the character of mid-nineteenth-century Scottish nationalism was influenced by the nature of Scottish urban associational cultures. The autonomy that Scotland’s voluntary organisations enjoyed, satisfied Scottish desire for local self-government. As a result a devolved governing body was not a major demand at this time.18

This argument rightly occupies an importance place in the historiography of nineteenth-century Scottish nationalism, but the fact that much of Morton’s research was based on Edinburgh raises questions about the situation elsewhere in Scotland and indeed within Edinburgh itself. As W. Hamish Fraser argued, the type of Scottish national identity that Morton identified in Edinburgh may have been unique to that city, rather than typical of Scotland as a whole.19 Individuals possessed a range of local, city-based, or national affiliations but these identities interacted with and shaped each other. The types of city identity articulated in Dublin and Edinburgh were influenced by their positions as national capitals. Furthermore, the kinds of national identity seen in each were partly city-specific and shaped by the nature of each city’s associational cultures.

The Edinburgh Society for the Education of the Poor of Ireland demonstrated affiliation with Scotland, Britain, and the wider UK when describing its work:

17 DEM 9 April 1824, Whelan, Bible, 18-19, 117-122.
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In supporting the Edinburgh Society, you co-operate with the wise and the good in both the other divisions of the United Kingdom; and it is not too much to expect, that this city, the metropolis of a country pre-eminent in the universal diffusion of the blessings of education, should stand forward, in the first rank, in extending these blessings to the inhabitants of Ireland.\textsuperscript{20}

The Society saw its work as typically Scottish but also as the kind of activity at which Edinburgh excelled. Edinburgh was partly defined in its role as capital of Scotland through the provision of charitable education which linked the city’s pedagogical institutions to Scotland’s reputation as a pioneer in educational provision. The character of Edinburgh as a city was shaped by its Scottishness, and the nature of Scottish identity in Edinburgh was affected by the type of institutions operating in the city. Similarly, the supporters of the Edinburgh School of Arts, an organisation whose work focused on the city, emphasised the Scottishness of their activities and presented their work as part of a long national educational tradition.\textsuperscript{21} Again the kind of Scottishness with which they identified was partly shaped by the character of Edinburgh’s associational culture.

Associational philanthropy also affected national identity in Dublin and shaped how its inhabitants understood their city’s capital status. The week of Protestant missionary society meetings held annually in Dublin’s Rotunda rooms,\textsuperscript{22} emphasised the city’s connection with the rest of Ireland as these organisations operated throughout the country. This allowed Dublin to be defined as a capital of charity. According to the \textit{Dublin Evening Mail}, the annual week of meetings altered the character of the city. It allowed Dublin to become a centre of national religious service, and temporarily replaced the less desirable activities of ‘seditious meetings’ and ‘meetings of Stock Jobbing Companies’ that the newspaper claimed usually characterised the city.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{The First Report of the Edinburgh Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland, With an Appendix} (Edinburgh, 1815), 17.
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The presence of large educational charities in Dublin, including the KPS and the CBS, made the city a national producer of pedagogical material. Similarly Edinburgh created educational resources that were adopted elsewhere as Wood’s teaching system and associated schoolbooks were used in many parts of Scotland. Dublin’s KPS produced books that were widely used throughout Ireland. Indeed the Scotsman commented approvingly on the Society’s work arguing that it:

places not merely a little agreeable reading, but a library, and an excellent one too, within the reach of every schoolboy, and of the humblest being that has two hands to earn a sixpence. As the compilers have evidently paid a strict regard to the interests of religion, the work may be put into the hands of old and young. For the itinerating libraries about to be established in the Highlands, it supplies materials of the choicest description, and at a price which puts it in our power to work wonders with a sum absolutely trifling. If £1000 will purchase 40,000 volumes...why should the pleasures and benefits of knowledge be beyond the reach of any human being in the empire?

The newspaper, however, lamented that the Society’s work was less well known than they expected it would be given its value: ‘We are surprised that such a publication should have gone so far without being known in this city.’ The Irish national system’s books on the other hand were widely used in Edinburgh, as they were throughout Ireland. Dublin may not have had Edinburgh’s Enlightenment reputation but philanthropic activity meant that the city was seen as a producer of educational material in this period to a greater extent than has been realised. It was difficult, however, for the city to claim complete ownership of this production, since both the national system and the KPS were heavily aided by the UK exchequer.

As well as promoting affiliations with the city or nation, charities in Dublin and Edinburgh promoted affiliations with smaller areas. Dalgleish’s conclusions about the
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diminishing significance of the parish in Edinburgh may have accurately described
trends up until about 1820. From then on, under the influence of the Rev. Thomas
Chalmers, there were increasing attempts to establish the rural parish in the city.
Urbanisation was a problem for these commentators. As towns grew, religious
authorities were less able to exert direct influence over their flocks. This, it was argued,
sometimes led to the neglect of the material needs of the poor. Of more concern, was
that any relief that was given was increasingly supplied through large scale impersonal
methods, restricting the opportunities for safeguarding moral as well as physical welfare
that had accompanied traditional paternalistic philanthropy.\textsuperscript{31} Chalmers did not
condemn all cities equally, and thought Edinburgh less objectionable than Glasgow.
He argued that since production in Edinburgh was primarily workshop-based and
designed to serve the resident population, it created a greater sense of mutual
dependence between rich and poor than in Glasgow where production was dominated
by large factories. Yet even in Edinburgh, Chalmers and his supporters tried to
establish their idealised vision of rural social relations by encouraging charity centred
on the parish kirk session.\textsuperscript{32}

Such parishes were not to be completely isolated. They were to be the unit that
regenerated the National Church, and in principle, activity within them would reflect
and shape national affiliations.\textsuperscript{33} Yet it was to be on the small stage of the parish that the
improved social interactions of ‘community’ were to be acted out. While such activity
was occurring in an urban environment, ultimately this was a vision that rejected the
pluralism of urban civil society. Persecution of nonconformists would not be
condoned, but the kirk was to infiltrate all aspects of life and accommodating religious
difference was not a major concern, instead the aim was to bring as many people as
possible back to the Church of Scotland.\textsuperscript{34} This vision was reflected in new
philanthropic ventures as several new parish schools were founded in the city from the
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1820s onwards. In 1834 Chalmers attempted to establish a model parish on his own system in the Water of Leith area outside the Town Council’s jurisdiction. The parish arguably became even more significant in Edinburgh after the Disruption when a series of Free Church parochial charities were founded. This aim of creating tight-knit kirk-focused communities reflected the Free Church’s claim to be the true National Church. Overall these developments indicated a strong desire to promote parochial (and national) rather than civic affiliations.

Attempts to re-establish parish-level authority were however challenged in both theory and practice. Practical difficulties meant that Edinburgh’s charities could never focus completely on a single parish. Contemporaries complained that many of the Old Town’s Church of Scotland churches were primarily attended by New Town residents. Even New Town churches such as St Mary’s drew some of their congregations from outside their parish boundaries. Hence when parish charities used church infrastructure to make fundraising appeals they reached non-resident attendees, encouraging a sense of affiliation with the parish that extended beyond its borders. Similarly, government reports on religious instruction in Scotland commented on all of Edinburgh’s parish-based educational charities. By highlighting parallels between these charities, such reports might have indirectly encouraged affiliation with the city or with Scotland as a whole, as well as with the parish.

The parish’s champions within the Church of Scotland were aware that they had to sometimes engage with the city, but they made strong efforts to prioritise the parish. They tried to regain poor parishioners by establishing Mission Stations which, unlike the parish church, did not require payment of seat rents or the wearing of ‘suitable’ clothing. Parochial charities tended to use locally-focused communication methods such as handbills and appeals from the pulpit, and the institutions received
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35 See chapter three.
36 See chapter three.
37 See chapter three.
38 See in particular 1837 (31) First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction.
39 See examples of mission stations in Edinburgh’s Church of Scotland parishes 1837 (31) First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction, 95.
little newspaper attention that would have connected them with a citywide audience.\(^{40}\) Even a relatively big event such as the opening of St Mary’s Parish School was not reported on in the *Scotsman*, the *Evening Courant*, or the *Caledonian Mercury*.

For Chalmers and his followers, the parish and the nation were the proper focus of geographical affiliation. While they did not ignore the city’s existence they thought ultimately it should only be a collection of parishes. Not everyone shared this view. Edinburgh Town Council remained patron of the city’s Church of Scotland churches for the entire period under review and so the city’s established Church parishes were always connected with a city-wide authority. This represented a fundamentally different type of parish-city relationship. Here the parish was the means through which the town was administered, it was a useful part of a wider whole rather than fundamental in itself.

This view was reflected in and further enhanced by the Edinburgh Charity Workhouse, up until the early 1840s Edinburgh’s parishes contributed collections and elected representatives to the workhouse’s management and were therefore part of a city-focused enterprise.\(^{41}\) The RI’s use of citywide church door collections, though technically requiring the approval of each individual parish, also reflected this view, each parish was just used as a unit to finance a city-focused (and nationally-focused) venture.\(^{42}\)

Some Dissenting Presbyterian denominations did not use parish structures at all. The charities of the UAS congregations at Bristo-street and Rose-street collected funds on a city-wide congregational basis not a parochial one.\(^{43}\) Such a focus may have originally been a response to the difficulties of serving a geographically scattered congregation but by the 1830s and 1840s it represented something more. As Stewart J. Brown has argued, some Dissenting Presbyterians began to develop a fundamentally different view of society from their established Church counterparts. They became Voluntaries opposed to the existence of state Churches. They did not consider all denominations to be spiritually equal but they preferred to see society as a series of
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\(^{40}\)See chapter three.

\(^{41}\)For example Tron Kirk Session Minutes 1840-1869 2 August 1840.

\(^{42}\)See chapters one and two for the charity workhouse and RI.

\(^{43}\)See chapter three.
competing religious groups to which individuals could associate depending on their beliefs. As Brown has also indicated, there was a spatial element to this. The idea of a territorial parish in which the vast majority would adhere to one Church did not appeal to Voluntaries. Instead, having a series of city-focused congregations was attractive. This position represented a greater ease with urban life than demonstrated by Chalmers and his supporters. The UAS congregational charities reflected and reinforced this. They used chapel infrastructures to promote their activities but they occasionally also used newspapers to publicise their work. By placing their advertisements alongside those for other Edinburgh-based organisations, they further highlighted their connection with the city. This also demonstrated a desire to appeal to the whole of Edinburgh for funds and the Scotsman’s favourable comment on such charities commended their work to a large audience. These congregations’ actions were consistent with Dalgleish’s claims about the growing importance of the city, but they only represented one view of Edinburgh. The emergence of the Free Church in 1843 with its intense efforts to establish a parish infrastructure showed that, at least in principle, the parish unit remained a significant focus for many.

The situation in Dublin was similar, though there was greater attachment to the parish ideal in principle and less adherence to it in practice. Both the Church of Ireland and the Catholic Church were parochial denominations, and both had founded parish charities long before 1815. St Catherine’s Anglican Boarding School for Female Orphans, for example, was established in 1728 and St Audeon’s Roman Catholic Free Schools were founded in 1756. This continued use of the parish system demonstrated the claims of each to be the National Church even if these claims were becoming increasingly hollow for the Church of Ireland. Catholics sometimes cooperated with Protestant Nonconformists on a UK-wide basis during the 1830s and 1840s campaigns for civil rights and religious freedom. This encouraged Catholics to

47 DEM 1 January 1845, NAI ED/1/28 Applications for Grants from the Commissioners of National Education. no.47 St. James’s Free Schools.
present themselves as one legitimate denomination among the United Kingdom’s competing religious groups. The position seems to have affected the ways in which charities represented themselves to the public as some Catholic parochial schools claimed that they accepted pupils without making ‘religious or parochial distinctions.’ Overall though the continued use of the parish indicated that neither denomination had completely accepted the Edinburgh Voluntaries’ view of society. Indeed, Conchubhair Ó Fearghail argued that parish identity became increasingly important for Catholics over the course of the nineteenth century. In practice, the unusual position of the Church of Ireland as a minority Church and the relative weakness of the Catholic Church meant that few if any of Dublin’s parochial charities could rely solely on their parishes for their financial needs. Advertisements for fundraising sermons for Catholic and Protestant parochial schools stressed the poverty of their parishes and implied that donations were needed from those living beyond their boundaries. In some cases they specifically requested this. An appeal on behalf of St Catherine’s (Church of Ireland) Parochial Schools in the Evening Mail in January 1845 argued that:

> The Male and Female Sunday Schools have a peculiar claim upon the public sympathy; they were the first Sunday Schools opened within Dublin. The managers earnestly appeal for assistance to their wealthier neighbours; more especially to that large class whose families have laid the foundations of their worldly prosperity within the Parish of St. Catherine.

Dublin’s parochial schools’ frequent use of newspaper advertisements indicated their desire to appeal beyond their immediate locality and further enhanced connections between parish and city. This greater use of newspaper advertising in Dublin was aided and encouraged by the fact that several of the city’s newspapers, including the Freeman’s Journal and Saunders’s News-Letter, were dailies. Daily newspapers would not appear in Edinburgh until the 1850s.

The individual newspaper advertisements did not exist in isolation and readers’ interpretation of them was influenced by the contents of the rest of the page, and of
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49 See for example the schools of the Parish of St. Nicholas Without, *FJ* 18 January 1834.
50 Ó Fearghail, ‘Evolution’, 245.
51 *DEM* 1 January 1845.
other issues of the same (and other) newspapers. As noted, most advertisements for parochial schools’ charity sermons adopted a common form and several often appeared alongside each other on the same page. They also shared the newspaper with advertisements for city or nationally-focused charities that used similar language and visual forms. This connection between parish and city was enhanced by the appearance of several of Dublin’s parochial charities in *Thom’s Almanac*. These charities embraced the semi-anonymous methods of the city to a greater extent than their Edinburgh counterparts, and although they also reflected a connection with the parish, they were presented to the public in a way that said the city was made up of a series of parochial units, rather than the parish being the fundamental focus in its own right.

As noted in chapter three, there were striking similarities between the administrative methods used by parochial or congregational charities of different denominations across both cities. In Dublin the language used in parish charities’ fundraising advertisements indicated that they all had similar aims, and may have promoted a sense of common identity. There was a cross-confessional element to this as Protestant and Catholic parochial schools often articulated similar values, though as usual this was limited and it decreased over time as the denominations began to advertise in different newspapers. It was also impeded by advertisements for several Church of Ireland schools that emphasised that they educated Protestants only.

The labels that charities gave themselves helped these organisations to reinforce geographical identities, but it is also necessary to look beyond these labels. Dublin’s parochial charities employed methods that promoted connections with the city as a whole. In fact, the parish was used as a unit to coordinate activity related to philanthropy throughout Dublin. Meetings in opposition to the Charitable Bequests Act of 1844 took place at the level of the Catholic parish, each parochial meeting then
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54 See chapter three.
55 See chapter one.
56 See for example *DEM* 1 January 1845.
advertised their proceedings in the newspaper press, highlighting their shared views.\textsuperscript{37}

The meetings led to a further: ‘Meeting of the Gentlemen who have taken part as Chairman, Secretaries, Movers, and Seconders of Resolutions at the Several Metropolitan Parochial Meetings held in petition against the above Act.’\textsuperscript{58} They clearly felt it necessary to come together at the level of the city to protest on this issue.

Sometimes parochial attachments took precedence over city or national ones. Collections for the O’Connell Tribute took place annually in Dublin’s Catholic chapels.\textsuperscript{39} Yet in 1835, when it was realised the collection for the Tribute would clash with the charity sermon for St Michael and John’s Parish Schools, a meeting of parishioners expressed their regret but announced that the sermon for the Schools would not be rearranged.\textsuperscript{60} Even this decision reflected the view that the parish was an administrative unit rather than the embodiment of national community. Providing a school service to the immediate local area was thought more important than publicly associating with the nationalist, and increasingly Catholic O’Connellite movement.

Generally charities in Dublin and Edinburgh, even when focused on a parish or on the whole nation, shaped how the city was viewed. The actual means through which philanthropy influenced a city’s image however, were complex, and their effects were sometimes ambiguous.

II.

James Johnson, an American medic who visited Dublin in 1844 described the city as: ‘rent and split-worm-eaten, mouldering, patched, and plastered-unsightly to the eye, unsavoury to the taste, and not very grateful to the olfactories—here there is but one step from magnificence to misery.’\textsuperscript{61} At around the same time German geographer and travel-writer J.G. Kohl discussed the closes of Edinburgh’s Old Town:

\textsuperscript{37}This Act, which aimed to regulate charitable legacies, was unpopular with a sizable portion of Irish Catholics, Hill, ‘Nationalism and the Catholic Church’, 376, see for example \textit{EF} 9 December 1844, 18 December 1844, 18 January 1845.

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{EF} 23 January 1845.

\textsuperscript{39}The O’Connell Tribute was a voluntary collection raised for the support of barrister, politician and Catholic rights’ activist Daniel O’Connell, Gearóid Ó Tuathaigh, ‘O’Connell, Daniel (1775-1847)’, DIB (Online Edition) accessed 16 February 2017.

\textsuperscript{40}Michael and John’s School Minutes, 30 October 1835.

The “closes” of the Old Town are probably the narrow streets in the world....Formerly
the houses...were inhabited by wealthy nobles, and many of them still bear the names
of distinguished old families....In Blythe’s Close is still shown the palace of the Queen
Regent, Mary of Guise. It is now a very ruinous condition, and is inhabited from top to
bottom, by numbers of poor families. In Bakehouse Close stand the old houses of the
Earls of Gosford and Moray, and of the Dukes of Queensberry; the latter is now a
beggar’s [sic] lodging-house. Such once distinguished and now degraded houses are
found in every part of the Old Town.62

By highlighting the decaying glory of the ancient royalty, Kohl indicated that some
areas of Edinburgh were becoming increasingly less desirable to wealthy residents.63
Similar observations were made about specific areas of Dublin, particularly the
Liberties in the southwest of the city. Yet, despite the development of high status
housing in the southeast, in Dublin the whole city was frequently described as
degraded. Contemporaries continuously emphasised how Dublin had been damaged
by an exodus of resident aristocrats following the Union.64 Edinburgh appeared better
able to accommodate metropolitan elites even if in practice the New Town was
increasingly resident to advocates not aristocrats.65

Kohl was unusual among travel writers in giving attention to Edinburgh’s
poverty and he said that he only examined this subject because he was encouraged to
do so by a ‘German settled in Edinburgh’ who said visitors always neglected the issue.66
Kohl also claimed that Dublin had fewer beggars than he had expected given Ireland’s
poverty, and he was clearly prepared to challenge contemporary views of both cities.67
Other visitors may have been more likely to report what they expected to see.
However, even if their accounts did not reflect ‘real’ situations, these visitors’ writings

63G. Gordon, ‘The Status Areas of Edinburgh in 1914’, in Scottish Urban History, George Gordon and
Brian Dicks eds (Aberdeen, 1983), 169-173.
64Dickson, ‘Death’, 115, 117-118.
65Charles McKean, ‘Twinning Cities: Modernisation versus Improvement in the Two Towns of
Edinburgh’, in Edinburgh, the Making of a Capital City, Brian Edwards and Paul Jenkins eds
(Edinburgh, 2005), 50-54.
still reinforced the public image of each city, and charity and welfare issues played a central role in this.  

Dublin was presented as a city where splendour and squalor existed side-by-side. In practice, of course, such contrasts were characteristic of many nineteenth-century towns, and charity was a key mechanism in emphasising both aspects. When appealing for funds, charities had to underline the need for their services. This might require describing a rotting physical environment, emphasising public health risks, or highlighting the parsimony of wealthier inhabitants, and so presenting a generally unappealing picture of the town. Yet charity was also often a prestigious activity. Guidebooks for Dublin and Edinburgh, as for other UK urban centres, described the towns’ charities alongside their other ‘public institutions’ and prominent visitors often included a tour of one of the more esteemed charities in their itinerary.

Medical charities were frequently prominent features in the nineteenth-century urban landscape. Hospitals’ ornate exteriors, spacious entrance halls, and elaborate boardrooms were not necessary for treating patients or training medical students, and this attracted some contemporary criticism. ‘Erinensis’, The Lancet’s correspondent in Dublin condemned the Meath’s managers for the attention they gave to their Hospital’s external appearance. He derided the Hospital’s “pompous pile of steps” and was appalled by the building’s luxurious furnishings. As Geary argued “Erineses”, could not help reflecting that such expenditure was injudicious at best and at worst ‘a fraud committed on the natural rights of the wretched.’ For the managers, however, such efforts had a practical aim. Discussing the elaborate architecture and interior
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70 The Lancet, 26 Nov. 1825’, quoted in Geary, Medicine, 22.
design of the Rotunda Hospital complex, Maurice Craig was correct to indicate that the managers considered it an acceptable use of their funds as they wanted to ‘harness social ambition,...[to their] humane purpose’ and hence secure further donations.  

These buildings became part of each city’s public architecture and therefore had a cumulative effect on the image of each. They displayed to the world that Dublin and Edinburgh had the charitable infrastructure required in a great city. It was a way of demonstrating that each city was still performing many of the functions of a national capital. 

**Figure 9: The Rotunda Lying-In Hospital Dublin (exterior).**

Owen, engraving after W.H. Bartlett, Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, Rotunda, Dublin (1837). (Image Courtesy of the NLI).
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Figure 10: Rotunda Lying-In Hospital Dublin (interior).

Prestigious charitable institutions were built in each city both before and after their respective Unions. Morris argued that from the 1830s onwards new charitable institutions in Edinburgh, such as Donaldson’s Hospital, adopted a more ornate style that reflected an increased desire to publicly demonstrate Scottish national distinctiveness. This further advertised the position of the city as national capital. Some large charitable institutions were built in Dublin in the early nineteenth century including Dun’s, the teaching hospital of the K&QCPI. Yet those who wanted to emphasise the detrimental effects of the Union on Dublin could point out that many large purpose-built charitable structures including the Rotunda Hospital, Dr Steevens’s Hospital, the Hibernian Marine School, Swift’s Hospital, and Mercer’s Hospital had been constructed before the Union. This added to the sense that early nineteenth-century Dublin was a decaying remnant of the eighteenth-century city.
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74 See chapter two.
75 Craig, Dublin, 136.
An increasingly confident Catholicism would alter the physical appearance of Dublin in the later nineteenth century. As Daly has convincingly demonstrated, the building of a Catholic infrastructure of churches and philanthropic institutions during Paul Cullen’s episcopate was part of an effort to visibly demonstrate that Dublin, once controlled by Protestants, had become a Catholic city. There was significant Catholic chapel building in the first half of the nineteenth century but much of the Catholic philanthropic architecture of this period remained understated. The external appearance of St Vincent’s Hospital, for example, which was housed in a townhouse, was much more discreet than that of the purpose-built Mater Hospital opened in 1861.
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76 Daly, ‘Catholic Dublin’, 130-145.
77 Craig, Dublin, 291-294.
Figure 11: St Vincent’s Hospital Dublin.

St Vincent’s Hospital, St. Stephen’s Green, Dublin (image courtesy of DubhEire (2010)).

Figure 12: The Mater Misericordiæ Hospital Dublin.

The Mater Misericordiæ Hospital, Eccles-street, Dublin (image courtesy of DubhEire (2010)).
In some ways, charities’ appropriation of townhouses was symbolic of how Dublin was viewed in the early nineteenth century. Townhouses were adapted for institutional uses in both cities, and some other charities were constructed to look like townhouses.78 Yet, in Dublin, there was a sense that the changing use of the built environment reflected and reinforced the city’s degradation. Some of the most prestigious residences began to be used as charities. St Vincent’s was established in the Earl of Meath’s Townhouse on St. Stephen’s Green.79 As David Dickson noted ‘the transformation of Moira House, the old centre of Whig intrigue, into a new asylum for beggars (the Mendicity Institute) [in 1824] was a powerful metaphor’ for the declining status of the post-war city.80 This appropriation of buildings alone did not alter attitudes, in practice similar trends were seen in both cities. Instead, the changes helped to reinforce existing perceptions and seemed to confirm that Dublin was in decline.

Charities’ public and semi-public events such as processions, laying of foundation stones, anniversary celebrations, fundraising balls, and promenades shaped the public image of their institutions and also enhanced the image of each city. They demonstrated that a town was successfully providing for some of its poor. They also enabled the charities to demonstrate that they had high-status supporters as their expected presence was included in newspaper advertisements for the events and their attendance reported on after in the press. Celebrations for George Heriot’s day highlighted the connection between charity and civic authority in Edinburgh, while the unreformed Dublin Corporation used the King’s Hospital to advertise the Corporation’s Protestant affiliations.81 In 1828, for example, the Corporation resolved that ‘on the usual public days the [King’s Hospital] Boys do appear decorated with

78 Morris, ‘Philanthropy and Poor Relief’, 377-378, several Dublin hospitals were located in townhouses including the Adelaide, the City of Dublin Hospital, Baggot-street (Baggot-street’s present facade was added later and it originally looked like a townhouse from the outside) and the Charitable Infirmary, Jervis-street, for other institutional uses in Dublin see Craig, Dublin, 233-234, Dickson, ‘Death’, 117.
79 Meehan, Vincent’s Hospital, 15-16, 23-26.
80 Dickson ‘Death’, 125, for the details of move to Moira House see Woods, Dublin Outsiders, 47-48.
81 See chapter five.
Orange Ribbons." This was not a gesture that would have endeared the School to its Catholic neighbours but it allowed the Corporation to celebrate its connections with historical civic traditions.

Charity promenades were another semi-public activity that could enhance the reputation of a city. They were held by charities in both Dublin and Edinburgh, sometimes as part of a wider series of events involving a ball, despite concerns raised by some about the morality of the latter. The Rotunda Gardens and Rooms provided a purpose-built promenading environment in which to raise money for the Lying-In Hospital, although the Hospital abandoned its lucrative Sunday promenades when the ADV complained that they violated the Sabbath.

Edinburgh’s charities held promenades in various venues including the Waterloo Rooms, the Royal Institution, and St Andrew’s Square. These events were designed to emphasise that prominent individuals supported the charities. According to the Scotsman, a promenade held in the Royal Institution in aid of the Destitute Sick Society and the House of Refuge in March 1839 was ‘on a very splendid scale, between seven and eight hundred ladies and gentlemen having been present.’ In 1834, a promenade was held in St Andrew’s Square ‘during the week of the scientific meeting, for behoof of several of the most deserving charities in the city.’ In promoting it, the Scotsman linked charity with social prestige and public display: ‘The excellent band of the Scot’s Greys are to enliven the promenade by their attendance,
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82 CARD XVIII, 548-549.
84 For moral objections see Woods, Dublin Outsiders, 94, EEC 5 March 1836. Charities and others made efforts to emphasise the difference between a fancy dress or fancy ball, and a masque ball where people’s identities were obscured, FJ 8 February 1839: an advertisement for ‘the Annual Grand Fancy and Full Dress Ball, for the Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers’ Charity’ said: ‘No masks admitted.’ See in particular Scotsman 9 March 1836 where a letter from ‘Martha’ to her ‘Cousin’ described a fancy ball in detail and distinguished it from ‘masquerade’.
85 FJ 28 May 1825, 30 January 1837, 10 May 1837, Boyd, Dublin 1745-1922, 142-143, 1830 (7) Charitable Institutions, Dublin, 10.
86 Scotsman 2 March 1831. See also Scotsman 7 July 1832, 26 January 1833, 6 September 1834, 23 July 1836, 27 May 1839.
87 Scotsman 27 May 1839.
88 Scotsman 27 August 1834.
and as the funds are destined to assist...laudable charities, we anticipate a splendid turn-out of beauty and fashion." In March 1841, a ‘Grand Dress Promenade’ was held for the benefit of several prominent Edinburgh charities at the Royal Scottish Academy. The *Scotsman* noted that: ‘There could not, we think, be fewer than four hundred present, including a liberal sprinkling of our local aristocracy.’

Fancy balls were reported on in great detail in both cities, and newspapers gave significant attention to the individual costumes worn by named participants. Appearing in fancy dress allowed status and gender conventions to be mildly subverted. For example, one charity ball in the Rotunda in 1828 featured:

Among the merry tribe of ‘Moll Flaggons’, ‘Moll Roes’, ‘Molly Mullowneys,’ &c. &c. Mr French of Blessington-street, in the first these characters, was distinguished for the tact he exhibited in ‘hooking in’ customers to taste a drop of the calamity water. His knowledge of business could only be rivalled by that displayed by Mr Atkinson, Werburgh-street, as Molly Mullowney, in inviting her customers, ‘nothing loath,’ to warm their stomachs with a sup of the ‘mountain dew,’ and had the honour of healths [sic] a piece’ with his Excellency and Lord George Hill, who, to the infinite amusement and gratification of all around, condescended to pledge Molly in her favourite beverage.

However, the attention given to high-status attendees in newspaper coverage and advertisements for the balls meant that such events remained prestigious. Dublin’s Catholic charities also began to use balls and promenades further enhancing the respectability of middle-class Catholics, and again shows how charity allowed this rising group to demonstrate their acceptance of existing social conventions.

Sometimes, however, public display reinforced the idea that Dublin was in decline. The ADV’s annual processions presented the city as an active capital of charity, but they also included children from some of Dublin’s lowest status charitable
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89 *Scotsman* 6 September 1834, 24 September 1834.
90 *Scotsman* 17 March 1841.
91 See for example the descriptions of attendees at the Grand Fancy Ball for the RI and House of Refuge in *Scotsman* 8 March 1834 and the long description of the RI Fancy Ball, *EEC* 1 February 1845, see also description of The Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers’ Annual Fancy Ball *FJ* 27 September 1838, and the fancy balls described in *FJ* 21 May 1819, 23 February 1842.
92 *FJ* 12 May 1828 emphasis in original.
93 For example a Ball for the Franciscan Orphan Institution, *FJ* 23 February 1842 and the event for the House of Refuge, Stanhope-street *FJ* 10 May 1837.
institutions. These events produced a dilemma for the managers of the King’s Hospital who wanted to support the ADV because of its Anglican ethos, but did not want their pupils to be publicly linked with those of the other charities.

The Mendicity’s processions were also damaging to the city’s reputation. In 1819, and again following severe financial problems in 1828, the institution paraded its mendicants through the streets of the city. Rather than providing an opportunity for inhabitants to take pride in the city’s charitable efforts, the processions publicly highlighted Dublin’s social problems and the city’s failure to solve them. The charity held a fundraising ball patronised by the Lord Lieutenant and other aristocrats within a week of the mendicants’ parade in 1828, indicating that the charity also organised events that enhanced the image of the city. The processions were also a way of indicating the improvement that the Mendicity had made since its foundation.

Discussing the display the Freeman’s Journal noted:

that Institution which gives such benefit to this city, by keeping hordes of beggars from our shop doors, which are yet even in our recollection, it was the exhibition made on Saturday of these beings, who, in place of exhibiting their misery in the street, are there treated one and all indiscriminately, according to their several necessities, as they ought to be.

Yet the Association’s processions of beggars inverted the normal prestige of ceremony. Instead, they threatened potential donors and in doing so stressed the precarious position of Dublin. In 1830, after virtually running out of funds, the Association proposed holding another parade but they abandoned these plans after opposition from Dublin Castle and the Lord Mayor, indicating the threat such processions presented to the city’s reputation. Indeed, the Mendicity was constantly emphasising what Dublin was not doing for itself rather than what it was doing. In efforts to gain funds and improved legal support for their anti-begging agenda, the charity’s publicity
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94 See chapter five.
96 FJ 3 May 1828.
97 See also FJ 21 May 1819.
98 FJ 5 May 1828.
material repeatedly argued that the city’s ‘mendicancy problem’ remained largely unsolved.\textsuperscript{100}

William J. Jackson noted that while annual reports appeared to be methods through which charities were held accountable to the public, they were also ways through which charities held the public to account. Subscription lists highlighted who was and was not donating, and how much they were giving.\textsuperscript{101} The Mendicity’s methods were designed to shame residents into subscribing. Their reports listed all the streets in Dublin, noting the number of houses on each street that did not contribute. This focus on specific streets and districts shaped the image of the whole city. The reports highlighted how substantial portions of Dublin did not support one of the city’s largest charities, suggesting that Dublin’s charitable endeavours were failing and raising questions about the city’s autonomy. The Mendicity’s Annual Report for 1824 claimed:

\begin{quote}
The cost of supporting the whole body of Paupers entitled to your aid, has been shewn to amount to a sum so small that it would hardly be felt by persons of the most limited income, if fairly divided among the Householders of Dublin, (on whom, in fact, the burden ought in justice to lie); yet it is but too melancholy a truth, that the Subscriptions, which the most strenuous exertions of your Committee, and their repeated and earnest appeals to public benevolence have succeeded in producing, have fallen very short of the actual expenditure.\textsuperscript{102}
\end{quote}

Some of Edinburgh’s charities, including the RI, took a similar approach, arranging subscription lists by street, threatening that city’s reputation by highlighting the many houses that did not donate.\textsuperscript{103} Yet overall the Mendicity’s approach to philanthropy: its use of Moira House, its parading of mendicants through the streets, and its emphasis on the parts of the city that did not donate, strongly enhanced Dublin’s image as a degraded city in a way that did not occur in Edinburgh, particularly since it was such a prominent charity that received much media attention.

Public meetings discussing philanthropic activity in each city also had ambiguous effects: they promoted civic pride by demonstrating how citizens came

\textsuperscript{100} Poorer Ireland C, 40, Seventh Report of the General Committee of the Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin for the Year 1824 (Dublin, 1825), 11-12.

\textsuperscript{101} Jackson, “The Collector”, 60-68.

\textsuperscript{102} Seventh Report of the...Association for the Suppression of Mendicity, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{103} Jackson, “The Collector”, 60.
together to tackle social problems but such meetings could also damage the towns’ reputations. Debates at Edinburgh Town Council about the administration of the City Charity Workhouse highlighted how that city often struggled to provide for its destitute population. Similarly, fundraising meetings for the RI and the Fever Board highlighted Edinburgh’s public health problems.\footnote{104}

In Dublin, public discussion of charities again reinforced the commonly-held picture of the city as degraded. The members of the pre-reform Dublin Corporation for example argued that Ireland was in need of increased Protestant missionary activity and by emphasising this necessity they presented the country as almost totally ruined by Catholicism.\footnote{105} Both unionists and repealers emphasised Dublin’s degraded state, both agreed that the Union had damaged Dublin’s economy, the difference between them was that unionists believed that charities could help in Dublin’s recovery, especially if the parliamentary aid was continued.\footnote{106} Repealers also wanted to keep the grants but they believed that philanthropy just provided minor relief for Dublin’s symptoms, cure of the city’s problems could only come through repeal of the Union.\footnote{107} Discussing charities allowed repealers lament the problems that they believed were caused by Ireland’s lack of autonomy and by doing so re-emphasise the capital’s degraded state.

Discussing the 1844 button war\footnote{108} provided an opportunity to criticise the effects of the Union. Prominent repealer and medic Dr Nagle discussed claims that doctors at the Talbot Dispensary refused treatment to those wearing the badges at a public meeting of the meeting of the Repeal Association.\footnote{109} Nagle described the button-wearing patients as: ‘the unfortunate and heart-broken creatures who happen to bear about on their persons that external mark of their internal woe and their fallen

\footnote{104}{For example Scotsman 5 August 1840, 21 September 1842. For growing concern about sanitary conditions in Edinburgh from the 1840s see Laxton and Rodger, Insanitary City, 23-34.}
\footnote{105}{‘Address of the Ancient, Loyal and Protestant Corporation of Dublin’, 353-354.}
\footnote{106}{See chapter four.}
\footnote{107}{DEM 18 July 1842, FJ 15 July 1842, MR 15 July 1842.}
\footnote{108}{See chapter four.}
\footnote{109}{For Nagle’s role in the Repeal Association see FJ 19 March 1844, 28 May 1844, 22 October 1844, 29 May 1845.}
condition.\textsuperscript{110} The fact that they needed to use a charitable dispensary was itself seen as partly resulting from Ireland’s lack of autonomy. The Talbot Dispensary was heavily dependent on parliamentary grants, hence discussing it further highlighted how post-Union Dublin appeared unable to look after its own problems.

Repealers even used charities’ own public events to condemn the Union. O’Connell frequently chaired meetings of Dublin’s Catholic Orphan Societies, which allowed him to both praise the specific charities and to lament Ireland’s condition. Toasting Ireland at the annual dinner of St Bridget’s Female Orphan Charity in 1838, O’Connell said it was a country: ‘for which God has done the most that he has done for any of the other nations of Europe, and which man has done all in his power to render the most wretched country in the world.’\textsuperscript{111} He also emphasised how Dublin’s trade was decreasing. At the annual dinner for the same charity in January 1844 his condemnation of the Union was particularly strong: ‘He defied any man to tell him that there yet was a measure so destructive as the Union was to Ireland? Her trade extinguished; her manufactures destroyed.’\textsuperscript{112} O’Connell admitted that he was ‘indulging’ his political interests by raising this at a charity meeting but he argued that it was relevant to the discussion of welfare matters, as he asked how any country could ‘be prosperous that did not govern herself.’ Commenting on charity allowed repealers to emphasise Dublin’s social problems and in the process further damage the city’s reputation.

Philanthropic activity also created impressions about the character of a town’s inhabitants and how they interacted with each other. Dublin residents often argued that their city was particularly charitable and visitors too emphasised Dublin’s reputation for kindness even when they thought the city was not actually dealing with its problems. The author of \textit{London to Dublin}, a travel account of Ireland and parts of England, referred to charities as ‘those excellent institutions which are so numerous in Dublin.’ The author gave significant attention to Swift’s Hospital and Steevens’s Hospital, and noted that while a lack of space prevented discussion of the city’s other charities, there

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{IF} 16 July 1844.
\textsuperscript{111} \textit{IF} 27 November 1838.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{IF} 10 January 1844.
were very many: ‘The charity of the inhabitants of Dublin has always been munificent; and it exercised as well privately as through public institutions.’\textsuperscript{113} It was not just the prestige of these institutions that was noted but also the kindness of the population. This reputation for benevolence was sometimes used to enhance Dublin’s image in spite of its poverty. Ulster army surgeon John Gamble brought this out in a comparison of London and Dublin:

\begin{quote}
The waters of the Liffey do not bear, like the waves of the Thames, the riches of the two hemispheres; the inhabitants of its banks have no Eastern mines of gold; but they have what is better still-they have humane and benevolent hearts.\textsuperscript{111}
\end{quote}

A reputation for compassion provided some small compensation for poverty and degradation.

\textbf{III.}

The Edinburgh Police Commissioners and the \textit{Scotsman} heavily criticised Dublin for its receipt of parliamentary grants.\textsuperscript{115} While commentators in Edinburgh gave significant attention to Dublin, those in Dublin gave much less space to Edinburgh. Edinburgh’s cultural production clearly influenced Dublin as Edinburgh-based publications were widely read there, and individual charities in Dublin communicated with their counterparts in Edinburgh. Yet there was little general comment on Edinburgh’s charitable associational culture.\textsuperscript{116} One of the few exceptions was the \textit{Freeman’s Journal’s} coverage of the beginnings of Catholic philanthropic activity in Edinburgh, which the newspaper included in its reports on the Catholic Church’s work around the world.\textsuperscript{117} The newspaper, however, was reporting on it because it was Catholic activity not because it was happening in Edinburgh. This contrast was partly a matter of practicalities. It could be beneficial for Edinburgh commentators to complain about Dublin’s special treatment and the fact that their city, which shared

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{London to Dublin: With a Trip to the Irish Lakes and the Mountains of Connemara [sic]….\ldots\ldots.(London and Dublin, [1853]), 162.}


\textsuperscript{115} See chapter five.

\textsuperscript{116} As well as examining material from other newspaper searches used in this thesis this conclusion was based on a search for ‘Edinburgh’ AND ‘charity’ in the \textit{Freeman’s Journal} (Irish News Archive) between 1815 and 1845. While there were a lot of advertisements for publications produced in Edinburgh there was little discussion of the city’s philanthropy especially in terms of the city as a whole.

\textsuperscript{117} See for example \textit{IJ} 27 September 1836, 7 December 1840.
many of Dublin’s metropolitan problems, was relatively neglected. It did not make sense for Dublin residents to highlight how charities survived in another stateless capital with little parliamentary aid. Yet Edinburgh’s commentators were also making a moral distinction between the cities, arguing that Dublin was not trying to look after its social problems. The claims were being made at a time when there were increasing complaints about the inadequacy of poor relief in Edinburgh, but according to the *Scotsman*, the city was at least attempting to manage its problems through its own resources whether these were voluntary or local government rates. The newspaper implied that Dublin was failing as a city because it did not provide the kind of institutions for itself that a town should. Edinburgh, by contrast, was at least attempting to do this. This indirect praise of Edinburgh may have also enhanced civic pride there.

Commentators in Dublin’s Irish rival Belfast made similar complaints. They criticised ‘beggarly’ Dublin for getting grants for public buildings. 118 Alice Johnson indicated that during the Famine the Belfast elite emphasised how their town supported its poor while the rest of Ireland sought government aid. She argued that: ‘The possibility exists...[that] Belfast’s middle classes were ignoring their own poor,...for the sake of civic pride.’ 119 Unlike Belfast, discussions about charity allowed Dublin to be portrayed as dependent and therefore sharing in the problems of mendicancy and degradation that were thought to characterise nineteenth-century Ireland. In practice, many of Dublin’s charities did not receive any parliamentary assistance. The number of non-aided charities in Dublin probably exceeded the total number of charities in Edinburgh, yet the grants’ existence added to Dublin’s image as a failed city.

Official investigations into the grants enhanced residents’ identification with Dublin, but this was identification with a dependent city. The authors of the 1842 report, all Dublin-based unionists, stressed the difference between Dublin and English towns. Dublin, they argued, was not capable of fully sustaining appropriate philanthropic provision in the way that the other urban centres were we respectfully urge that, because in London, and the other large towns in England, private charity may have been found amply sufficient for the support of their public charitable institutions, it by no means follows that in Dublin, where the poor are so

118 Johnson, ‘Middle-class Culture’, 269-270.
119 Johnson, ‘Middle-class Culture’, 228-230.
numerous, and the rich comparatively so few, it would be reasonable or just to expect from her citizens an extent of liberality which neither their numbers nor circumstances could fairly warrant.\textsuperscript{120}

English towns, were however, seen as laudable examples for Dublin to emulate. This was why the report urged that the grants be continued and the grant-assisted charities remain under voluntary management. Otherwise:

\begin{quote}
Dublin would...be prevented, under any circumstances....from being placed in the same creditable position as the great towns in England, where the hospitals, being unconnected with the poor-law system, are amply supported by the liberality and charity of the inhabitants.\textsuperscript{121}
\end{quote}

These English towns were believed to set a standard of self-management towards which Dublin should strive.

\textbf{Conclusion:}

Examining charitable activity provides a productive way of exploring and delineating the multifaceted nature of geographical identity in the stateless capitals of Dublin and Edinburgh. Philanthropic activity at the parochial or congregational level helped to define Dublin and Edinburgh as cities, while charities designed to serve the Irish or Scottish nation also promoted affiliation with the cities. Similarly identifying the ‘nationality’ of towns in Ireland and Scotland was not always a clear-cut issue.

Edinburgh and Glasgow, were sometimes, it appears, unthinkingly, referred to by visitors as ‘English cities’.\textsuperscript{122} Kohl argued that Dublin looked like an English city, though in this case he was deliberately emphasising that he thought Dublin was not Irish:

\begin{quote}
the loyal citizens of Dublin under their provosts and lord mayors, and the English armies under their lords deputies and their lords lieutenant, and episcopal excommunications, and royal letters of menace, have...kept pouring forth from the city upon the rest of the country, which, through the agency of Dublin has continued to become more and more dependent and more and more English.\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{120}1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 6.\textsuperscript{121}1842 (337) Charitable Institutions (Dublin), 8.\textsuperscript{122}Kohl ‘Ireland’, 39, 102, Kohl, ‘Scotland’, 17.\textsuperscript{123}Kohl ‘Ireland’, 2.
\end{flushright}
Some of Dublin’s inhabitants, including members of the pre-reform Corporation, emphasised that the city was in some ways British.

Philanthropy played a significant role in these processes. The mechanisms through which Dublin’s charities were designed to work: their rules and functions, and many of their aims, were very similar to those used by British charities, making Dublin’s associational culture familiar to the British middle classes. Subscriber-governed charities made an early appearance by European standards in Dublin in the same way as they did in Edinburgh, and in many parts of England. Similar practices meant that charity could highlight shared values between Dublin and Britain, potentially promoting some sense of affinity between Dublin’s inhabitants and those elsewhere in the UK.

Yet these cities were multifaceted places, and philanthropy had a variety of sometimes contradictory effects on their societies. As well as emphasising British connections, charity also highlighted the distinctively ‘Irish’ or ‘Scottish’ nature of Dublin and Edinburgh. In Dublin, discussing charity provided opportunities to emphasise begging and destitution, characteristics frequently associated with Ireland as a whole. In Edinburgh discussion of philanthropy sometimes damaged the reputation of that city. Yet it also provided ample opportunity to talk about Edinburgh’s reputation as a place of Enlightenment and education. Public discussion of philanthropy in Dublin portrayed that city as dependent. As dependency was stereotypically associated with Ireland in this period, Dublin was therefore seen as Irish, and hence, in some ways marked out as ‘other’ to British audiences.

---

Conclusion.

Dublin and Edinburgh were both home to many charitable organisations and the study of such institutions reveals much about the societies in which they were based. As well as providing a productive way of exploring the contrasting impact of stateless-capital status on society in both cities, it charts interactions among those that can be roughly defined as middle-class and how they attempted to cope with divisions amongst themselves during a period of extensive reform. In particular, analysis of charities allowed the impact of religious differences on each city to be explored. The significance of Dublin’s sectarian divisions is a central theme of this thesis and the two cities’ contrasting religious compositions explains major differences between them. Yet it is worth considering some events in 1840s Edinburgh that on the surface seem to challenge this argument.

On the 1 February 1845 the Edinburgh Evening Courant reported on the annual festival of the Holy Guild of St Joseph’s Friendly Society, an early example of an Edinburgh-based Catholic organisation. The conservative newspaper praised the Society and especially the Gild’s award of prizes ‘to individuals of humble station, for the cleanest and best kept houses.’\(^1\) Not surprisingly, the Scotsman also commended the organisation and had reported on the Gild’s first annual festival in October 1842 in a highly complementary manner.\(^2\) The United Industrial School was founded in Edinburgh in 1847 and using a similar approach to the Irish national school system, aimed to provide religious education acceptable to the Catholic poor and included Catholics among its management.\(^3\) S. Karly Kehoe’s work has also suggested that Catholics’ experiences in later nineteenth-century Scotland, were, all things considered, relatively problem-free, and that this can be explained by middle-class Catholics’ adoption of a strong associational culture based on the practices that their Protestant

---

\(^1\) *EEC* 1 February 1845, see also *A Report of the First Annual Festival of the Holy Guild of St Joseph and of St Andrew’s Mortuary Guild* (Edinburgh 1843).

\(^2\) *Scotsman* 26 October 1842.

\(^3\) Peter Mackie, ‘The Foundation of the United Industrial School of Edinburgh: ‘A Bold Experiment’, *Innes Review*, 39 (No.2) (1988), 144-146, see also *Public Education: The Original Ragged School and the United Industrial School of Edinburgh; Being a Comparative View of their Recorded Results* (Edinburgh, 1855).
neighbours also employed. The values that St Joseph’s Gild wanted to instil appealed to the middle classes, regardless of denomination.

Writing about the United Industrial School, Peter Mackie suggested that Protestants and Catholics were able to work together because of the persistence of Enlightenment values of toleration among Edinburgh’s Moderates. On the surface it might seem that Edinburgh’s middle classes were simply more comfortable with religious diversity than Dublin’s, even when that diversity included Catholics. The United Industrial School was said to be based on the principle ‘that no amount of religious difference need interfere with the co-operation of honest men and good citizens in the common business of life.’ Greater experience of how charity could ease social tensions, coupled with ongoing respect for Enlightenment traditions, might have promoted a reverence for tolerance among Edinburgh’s middle classes that even extended to Catholics. Yet overall these examples support this thesis’s arguments about the importance of the contrasting religious compositions of Dublin and Edinburgh, and that intra-Presbyterian conflicts were significantly less divisive than Catholic-Protestant disputes. The United Industrial School was promoted by liberal Protestants, but its formation was sparked by Catholic dissatisfaction with the religious education provided by the recently-founded Edinburgh Ragged School. This was the same kind of dissatisfaction that Catholics had often expressed in relation to educational charity in Dublin, and it should be remembered that some liberal Protestants supported Catholic philanthropy in Dublin during at least some of the period considered here.

By the late nineteenth century, the position of Catholics in Dublin was very different from their position in British urban centres. Catholics were not in a majority in any town or city in Britain, and even where Catholic numbers were high, there was rarely a substantial Catholic middle class with the resources to participate extensively in

---

1. S. Karly Keogh, *Creating a Scottish Church Catholicism, Gender and Ethnicity in Nineteenth-century Scotland* (Manchester and New York, 2010), especially chapter five.
associational culture. Indeed this distinguished Dublin from Belfast for many years, despite the rapid growth of the latter’s Catholic population.\(^8\) Resentment about the rising status of Dublin’s Catholics, along with the growth of the repeal movement in the 1830s and 1840s, encouraged an increasing number of Protestants to turn towards a fiercely anti-Catholic conservatism. This was not solely about numbers; more Catholics did not automatically generate a proportional increase in charity-related conflict—it was about the city’s changing power dynamics. In Dublin, Catholics were challenging privileges claimed by even the poorest Protestants. This made doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants more difficult to ignore.

In fact, this thesis broadly supports Keogh’s argument about the similarities between Catholicism and other denominations. The methods and values articulated by Dublin’s Catholic philanthropists in the early nineteenth century, closely resembled those of the Protestant middle classes throughout the UK. This not only challenges the idea that Catholicism by its nature discouraged public interaction, it also suggests that historians have exaggerated the role that participatory Presbyterian traditions played in nurturing associational activity in Scotland.\(^9\) While philanthropy did not reduce social tensions in Dublin to the same extent as in Edinburgh, middle-class Catholics valued associational activity just as much as their Presbyterian counterparts.

Severe as Dublin’s religious tensions were, they rarely produced serious physical violence. The increasing confessionalisation of philanthropy, while to some extent reflecting a failure of toleration, helped to at least contain religious conflict. The Catholic Church increased control over charities as the nineteenth century progressed but it was not unique in this regard and the common values that philanthropy reinforced before 1845 had some longer-term significance. A power-sharing agreement at Dublin Corporation, for example, in which the Mayoralty alternated between Catholics and Protestants was initiated in 1850 and lasted into the 1870s.\(^10\)

This is not to deny that Irish Catholicism had its illiberal features in this period as positive responses to the Pastorini prophecies about the imminent destruction of

---


\(^{9}\) Morton and Morris, ‘Civil Society, Governance’, 358-359.

\(^{10}\) Daly, ‘Catholic Dublin’, 133-134, Dickson, *Dublin*, 341-342.
Protestantism showed.\textsuperscript{11} Nor were most of Dublin’s Catholics Voluntaries, they accepted state assistance, such as the Maynooth Grant, when it did not threaten the independence of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{12} Yet many of the positions that Dublin’s middle-class Catholics articulated were within the mainstream of contemporary British reform thinking. The connections between British liberalism and Irish Catholicism would become increasingly difficult to maintain as the nineteenth century progressed, but some of the links forged in this period survived for the entire duration of the Union. The early nineteenth century was a time of possibility for reformers, radicals, and members of non-established denominations in both cities. Catholicism and Dissenting Presbyterianism were invoked to defend individual religious choice. This became less feasible later in the nineteenth century as the Irish Catholic Church became more powerful, and most of Edinburgh’s Dissenting Presbyterian denominations were absorbed in the parochial structures of the Free Church and later the Church of Scotland.\textsuperscript{13}

This thesis has also indicated that there were other forces reflecting and reinforcing common values in each city. A growing respect for medical expertise increased a sense that the managers of charities, though otherwise divided still agreed on some basic principles. Prioritising these values, however, also further excluded some middle-class groups, not least middle-class women. Professional values did not exist as pure standards unsullied by wider social conflicts, issues of medical professionalisation were strongly shaped by the cultural environments of the towns in which they were debated and such interactions are worth giving more attention to. The significance of medical professionalisation was only just beginning to be felt in both cities by 1845, and more work is needed on its slowly unfolding effects over the course of the nineteenth century.

Commentators in Edinburgh were correct to underline the role of the central state in distinguishing the stateless capitals, as annual parliamentary subsidy of Dublin’s


\textsuperscript{12} Though some Dublin Catholics invoked voluntary principles to object to the Charitable Bequests Act see Hill, ‘Nationalism and the Catholic Church’, 380.

charities did indeed produce significant differences between the cities. Yet the contrasts were not exactly those that the critics had expected. State assistance did not prevent voluntary fundraising, in fact the associated prestige and sense of security may have attracted donations. Nor did state funding damage the quality of charities’ services. By 1845, the inadequacy of poor relief provided in Edinburgh was becoming increasingly apparent. Dublin too struggled to accommodate its large destitute population, but charities that were in receipt of state funds could better respond to the needs of the poor than those that were more dependent on donors. The state funding of treatment for syphilitic women was a good example. Of course, the extent to which patients’ wishes were respected in such cases should not be exaggerated. Lock hospitals ultimately aimed to reform the behaviour of all of the women treated except the small number of ‘innocent’ married patients infected by their husbands. Yet these institutions at least provided a service that voluntary donors disdained.

Reforming governments were interested in protecting the religious rights of pupils and patients and they tried to use state aid to philanthropic organisations to reduce sectarian tensions in wider society. This provided some recognition of Catholics’ rising social position, the absence of which might have caused major conflict. Overall, however, central state intervention politicised charity and competition for state patronage among warring religious factions intensified the conflicts between them. Dublin’s Catholic-Protestant disputes were already more severe by their nature than Edinburgh’s intra-Presbyterian conflicts, but high levels of state intervention further exacerbated the city’s sectarian strife. Civil society did not fail in Ireland but voluntary organisations were not able to reduce conflict to the same extent as they did in Edinburgh.

State intervention in charity also shaped the cities in other ways. Official reporting on charities presented a picture of philanthropic activity to the outside world that the charities could not control. Like newspapers, such reporting connected individual organisations with the wider world, and so promoted affiliation to city and nation. By 1845 Parliament was reporting in detail on philanthropic activity in Edinburgh. Hoppen has argued that government increasingly tried to integrate Ireland

into the United Kingdom from the 1830s onwards and state investigations were one way through which basic similarities across the UK were highlighted, and through which the integration of both Scotland and Ireland was promoted. Such reporting also indicated that the central state did intervene in philanthropy in Scotland. In fact, as the example of school inspection indicated, the central state’s impact on Edinburgh society could be quite invasive. On the surface, however, it appeared much less significant than in Dublin, and this shaped the character and the wider image of each city.

Dublin’s residents were more accepting of central-state intervention than Edinburgh’s, but even association with prestigious Lord Lieutenants could not remove the sense that the parliamentary grants were far from ideal. Commentators in Dublin agreed that local intervention was ultimately more legitimate. The local state played a major role in Edinburgh’s charities. Indeed the Town Council’s role in the influential Heriot’s allowed it to continue shaping the city after the Council’s bankruptcy in 1833, something missed by historians that have taken a narrower view of the Council’s activities. Dublin’s inhabitants were also proud of their city’s past. Despite the sectarian animosity caused by the pre-reform Corporation, Dublin’s Catholics and liberals identified with some Corporation traditions and tried to make them their own. The removal of the King’s Hospital from the Corporation’s management in 1840 was a lost opportunity. Although the School was impoverished, allowing the Corporation to retain a role would have enabled them to demonstrate an ongoing connection with Dublin’s past.

Edinburgh had many social problems but it appeared to be trying to alleviate them itself. Charitable activity in Edinburgh not only fuelled a sense of civic and national autonomy but it also associated the city with an Enlightenment interest in education. Local government intervention in charity created the impression that Edinburgh had a past to be proud of and a future to look forward to. In practice, philanthropic activity expanded significantly in Dublin in this period, and most of the

15 Hoppen, Governing, 63-65, 72-76.
16 Williams, ‘Edinburgh Politics’, 51.
new charities did not receive state funds. Yet the existence of parliamentary grants meant that in some ways Dublin appeared to be a very different place from Edinburgh.

Many Irish nationalists saw merit in the persistence of the Lord Lieutenancy and of Dublin Castle. These institutions marked Ireland out as a separate nation within the United Kingdom, and they marked Dublin out as a national metropolis among the UK’s cities. Central state intervention in Dublin’s charities also enhanced the prestige of the city. Yet even Dublin’s inhabitants thought that the grants could be morally damaging and they recognised that this aid made the city appear dependent on outside forces. Even unionists argued that Dublin society was not as it should be. They thought that the city should only rely on parliamentary grants in the short term and that it needed to emulate large English towns that they believed were successfully providing for their own poor. It is significant that some of Dublin’s inhabitants were celebrating the philanthropic success of English towns at a time when many were extremely anxious about these towns’ moral and physical condition.  

It indicated that unionists believed Dublin was partly failing as a city, they also believed, however, that charities could play a role in securing a better future for Dublin. Repealers on the other hand, conveniently ignoring the sectarian nature of Grattan’s Parliament, could agree that they lived in a city with a glorious past. They did not, however, think that charitable activity would help to produce a bright future, instead only repeal would put the city back in its rightful place.

The activities of charities in Dublin and Edinburgh were very similar to those elsewhere in the UK. Conflicts about philanthropy often differed between the cities, but some disputes, such as the struggles of reformers to alter older charitable structures and practices, would have been familiar to inhabitants of many towns. Dublin and Edinburgh helped to integrate Ireland and Scotland more closely into the UK and charities were part of this process both because of the methods they adopted and because they were a target for state reports.

Yet Dublin and Edinburgh occupied paradoxical positions within the UK, both unique as stateless capitals while also exhibiting many features of a typical UK city. The presence of nationally-focused charities operating from these cities helped to

---

17Joyce, *Rule*, 150, 154-156.
demonstrate that Ireland and Scotland were separate nations within the UK. Edinburgh’s status as a self-confident national capital has frequently been emphasised but Dublin too was recognised as the capital of Ireland, even if its inhabitants seemed less confident about their city. They were proud of their city’s capital status, in fact they frequently ignored Edinburgh and compared their city to London. Yet they were also aware of Dublin’s reputation as a dependent city. Dublin’s middle classes adopted many of the same associational methods as its counterparts in British cities, but they needed state support to do this. This helped to emphasise the Irishness of Dublin. To British commentators it seemed that Dublin did not quite possess the autonomy of a British town and instead it was linked with the negative characteristics that they associated with Ireland more generally. The procedures, structures, and even some of the values articulated by Dublin’s charities made the city very familiar to British audiences, yet the city remained in their eyes capital of an Ireland that was different, sometimes frightening, and often unattractive. Such paradoxes would persist into the later nineteenth century and beyond as British visitors and Irish nationalists continued to be confused by Dublin as a place simultaneously familiar and alien.

Charities provide a sharp lens through which the complexities of geographical identity in the nineteenth-century United Kingdom can be delineated and better understood. Individuals might feel a connection to a particular street or locality, to a parish, to the city itself, to the wider Irish or Scottish nation(s), to Britain, to the UK, or the British Empire. These identities were not mutually exclusive nor should they be considered concentric layers unaffected by each other. National affiliations were felt throughout Ireland and Scotland but the kind of national identity articulated in Dublin or Edinburgh was unique to those cities and shaped by them. This was partly related to the unusual position of Dublin and Edinburgh within the UK, but it also highlights the complexity of identity more generally, and that more attention should be given to the value of using voluntary organisations as a way of exploring the articulation between local and global affiliations.

Studying philanthropy is a particularly productive way of exploring issues of identity and wider social relations in nineteenth-century urban centres. Most philanthropic publications were ephemeral. Many may have gone unread, and charities’ newspaper notices may have only received cursory attention. Yet
philanthropy was ubiquitous in large towns in the nineteenth century and information on it pervaded the atmosphere which the vast majority of inhabitants imbibed. Members of the middle classes were constantly made aware of charitable activity in almanacs, city directories, official reports, and newspapers. This thesis has indicated that examining the management structures of philanthropic organisations, analysing charities’ connection with a range of authorities, and considering philanthropic institutions’ interactions with the wider public sheds much light on a city’s power dynamics. Charitable activity provided opportunities for comment on specific political issues as well as on abstract questions of urban governance and geographical affiliation. By doing so, philanthropy not only reflected but actively shaped the complex social relations and identities of inhabitants and helps to explain why middle-class people in Dublin and Edinburgh lived in what were simultaneously very similar and very different worlds.
Appendix.

Table I: Dublin's Charitable Institutions: 'The Almanac Record'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dublin 1824 (Dublin's charities as listed in 1824 Treble Almanack)</th>
<th>Dublin 1845 (Dublin's charities as listed in 1845 Thom's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Hibernian Society for the Care of Soldiers’ Children (opened January 1, 1765).</td>
<td>(1) Hibernian Society for the Care of Soldiers’ Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Incorporated Musical Fund Society, For the Relief of Distressed Musicians and their Widows &amp; Orphans, was founded in 1787, and incorporated by Act of Parliament in 1794.</td>
<td>(2) The Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting Knowledge of the Christian Religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Hibernian Bible Society (instituted in Dublin in the year 1806).</td>
<td>(5) Hibernian Bible Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland. (Kildare-Place Society).</td>
<td>(8) Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland. (Kildare-Place Society).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Irish Society for Promoting the Education of the Native Irish, through the Medium of their Own Language.</td>
<td>(10) Irish Society For Promoting the Education of the Native Irish, through the Medium of their Own Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) The Hospital and Free-School of King Charles the Second, Oxmantown, Commonly called the Blue-Coat Hospital.</td>
<td>(11) The Hospital and Free-School of King Charles the Second, Oxmantown. (Incorporated by Charter from King Charles II, dated 5th December, 1670).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin 1824 continued (Dublin’s charities as listed in <em>1824 Treble Almanack</em>)</td>
<td>Dublin 1845 continued (Dublin’s charities as listed in <em>1845 Thom’s</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) The Sunday and Daily Schools, North Strand, were established in the Year 1786.</td>
<td>(16) North Strand Episcopal Chapel &amp; Sunday Daily Schools (1786).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) The Female Orphan House, Circular Road for Destitute Female Children was instituted 1st of January 1791.</td>
<td>(17) Orphan House, for Destitute Females, Circular Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Freemason Female Orphan School, No. 4, Gloucester Place, Mecklenburgh-street.</td>
<td>(18) Freemason’s Female Orphan School, 7 South Richmond-st. Under the Patronage of the Grand Masonic Lodge of Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Pleasant’s Asylum, 67 Camden-Street, opened in 1818, for Female Orphans, pursuant to the Will of the Founder, of the late Thomas Pleasants, esq.</td>
<td>(19) Pleasant’s Asylum, 67 Camden-street, Founded in 1818.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Methodists Female Orphan Asylum, Connected with the Established Church. Instituted in the Year 1804.</td>
<td>(20) Methodist Female Orphan School, Whitefriar-street (Founded 1804).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Saint Patrick’s Hospital, for Lunatics and Idiots, was founded in 1745, pursuant to the Will of Dr. Jonathan Swift, Dean of St. Patrick’s and incorporated by Charter, 6th August, 1746.</td>
<td>(21) St. Patrick’s Hospital, For Lunatics and Idiots, was founded in 1745, pursuant to the Will of Doctor Jonathan Swift, Dean of St. Patrick’s, and incorporated by Charter, 6th August, 1746.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) The House of Industry, Dublin was opened on the 8th of November, 1773 (including the Richmond, Hardwicke, and Whitworth Chronic Hospitals).</td>
<td>(22) House of Industry, North Brunswick-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) Dr. Stevens’s [sic] Hospital 1730.</td>
<td>(24) Dr. Stevens’s Hospital, Founded 1730.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Hospital for Incurables, Donnybrook-Road.</td>
<td>(26) Hospital for Incurables, Donnybrook-Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) The Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women. [Rotunda]</td>
<td>(27) The Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women, established by Royal Charter [Rotunda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) The Meath Hospital, and County of Dublin Infirmary, Long-lane, Kevin-street.</td>
<td>(28) The Meath Hospital, and County of Dublin Infirmary, Long-lane, Stamer-st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Simpson’s Hospital in Great Britain-street, for the Reception of Poor, Decayed, Blind and Gouty Men, was opened in Nov. 1781.</td>
<td>(29) Simpson’s Hospital in Great Britain-street, for the Reception of Poor, Decayed, Blind and Gouty Men, was opened in Nov. 1781.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Westmorland Lock Hospital, Townsend-street, originally established 20th November, 1792.</td>
<td>(30) Westmorland Lock Hospital, Townsend-street, originally established 20th November, 1792.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) Fever Hospital, and House of Recovery, Cork-street.</td>
<td>(31) Fever Hospital, and House of Recovery, Cork-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) The Hospital of Sir P. Dun, M.D. Grand Canal-street, for the Instruction of Students in Medicine.</td>
<td>(32) Hospital of Sir P. Dun, M.D. Grand Canal-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) Dispensary for the Parishes of St, Mary and St. Tomas, Cole’s-lane, Henry-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin 1824 continued.</td>
<td>Dublin 1845 continued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) The Sick Poor Institution, No. 25, Meath-street opened 3d of November, 1794.</td>
<td>(34) Sick Poor Institution, New Buildings, Meath-street (opened 1794).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38) Asylum for the Recovery of Health, and for the Cure of Diseases of the Skin. St. George’s Place, Circular Road, near Dorset-street [AKA Maison de Sante].</td>
<td>(35) Maison de Sante of Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41) Institution for the Cure of Diseases of the Eye, Kildare-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42) Whitworth Hospital, Drumcondra. Erected A.D. 1818.</td>
<td>(38) Whitworth Hospital, Drumcondra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43) The Dublin Infirmary, for Diseases of the Skin, Moore-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44) St. Mary’s Hospital, and Dublin Eye Infirmary, Lower Ormond-quay. Was opened 14th June, 1819.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46) The Lock Penitentiary, Dorset-street....Was opened 19th of March, 1794, for Reception and Employment of Women leaving the Lock Hospital....The Charity has been endowed by the late W. Smith, Esq. with a Chapel and other Buildings.</td>
<td>(40) The Lock Penitentiary, Dorset-street....Was opened 19th of March, 1794, for Reception and Employment of Women leaving the Lock Hospital....The Charity has been endowed by the late W. Smith, Esq. with a Chapel and other Buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47) The Dublin Female Penitentiary, Circular Road, North. ‘This Institution is under the direction of Committee of Ladies, whose exertions are directed to the Religious and Moral Improvement of the Women, and the advance of Habits of Order and Industry.’</td>
<td>(41) The Dublin Female Penitentiary, Circular Road, North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48) The Richmond National Institution, 37, Sackville-st. was established by Subscription, for the Instruction of the Industrious Blind.</td>
<td>(42) The Richmond National Institution, 41 Upper, Sackville-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49) Molyneux Asylum for Blind Females, Peter-street....This Institution was opened the 1st of June, 1815, for the Reception of Destitute Blind Females of Every Persuasion.</td>
<td>(43) Molyneux Asylum for Blind Females, Peter-street (Opened 1815).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50) The House of Refuge, Baggot-street. [sic] Was opened in February, 1802, for the Reception of Young Women out of Employment, brought up in Charity Schools in the vicinity of Dublin.</td>
<td>(44) The House of Refuge, Baggot-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51) The Charitable Society, For the Relief of Sick and Indigent Room-keepers, was Instituted in the Year 1790.</td>
<td>(45) The Charitable Society, For the Relief of Sick and Indigent Room-keepers of all Religious Persuasions. Founded 1790.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin 1824 continued</td>
<td>Dublin 1845 continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dublin’s charities as listed in <em>1824 Treble Almanack</em>).</td>
<td>(Dublin’s charities as listed in <em>1845 Thom’s</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) The Old Men’s Asylum, Russell-place, Circular Road, North, was instituted in 1810 for the Indigent Men, of Good Character, above 60 years of age who were once in Respectable Situations in life.</td>
<td>(16) Old Men’s Asylum Russell-place, North Circular Road. This Asylum, instituted in 1810, provides a comfortable home for twenty-four Protestant old men of good character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) The Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin.</td>
<td>(47) The Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin, 9, Usher’s-Island (Formerly Moira House) Instituted 1818.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) The National Institution for the Education of Deaf and Dumb Children of the Poor in Ireland, Established in Dublin, May 18, 1816, situated at Claremont, near Glasnevin, Dublin.</td>
<td>(48) The National Institution for the Education of Deaf and Dumb Children of the Poor in Ireland, Established in Dublin, May 18, 1816.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57) St. Peter’s Parish Saving’s Bank, Or Provident Institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) School-street Saving’s Bank.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60) The Association for the Improvement of Prisons and Prison Discipline in Ireland; Formed 9th Dec. 1818.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61) Shelter for Females Discharged from Prison, Circular Road, Harcourt-street. ‘The Ladies’ Association for bettering the condition of Female Prisoners in the City and Co. of Dublin, have opened the above Asylum.’</td>
<td>(52) Shelter for Females Discharged from Prison, Circular Road, Harcourt-street (opened 1821).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62) Coombe Hospital, Re-opened by John Kirby, Michael Daniell, Thomas Rumley, and Richard R. Gregory, Esqrs. in October 1823’.</td>
<td>(53) Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63) Asylums for Aged Female Servants, 67, Summer-hill, and Bow-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64) Dispensaries, 28, Temple-bar, and Meath-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65) Dispens. Infant Poor 17, Clarend.-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67) Dublin Infirmary for Diseases of the Skin Jervis-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(68) Magdalen Asylum Townsend-st.</td>
<td>(55) General Magdalen Asylum, Donnybrook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69) Orphan House, Male, Prussia-str.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70) Vintners’ Asylum, Charlemont st.</td>
<td>(56) Vintners’ Asylum and Orphan School, Charlemont-street. (1818).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(57) Asylum for Aged and Infirm Female Servants of Good Character, 21, Lower Dorset-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin 1824 continued (Dublin’s charities as listed in <em>1824 Treble Almanack</em>).</td>
<td>Dublin 1845 continued (Dublin’s charities as listed in <em>1845 Thom’s</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58)Adelaide Hospital, 38, Bride-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59)Additional Curates’ Fund Society for Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60)Aged and Infirm Carpenters’ Asylum, Lower Gloucester-st.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61)Anglesey Lying-In Hospital and Dispensary, Peter-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62)Association for the Relief of Distressed Protestants (Founded Oct. 1836).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63)Asylum for Penitent Females, Upper Baggot-street (Founded 1809).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64)Benevolent Strangers’ Friends Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65)Cambrian Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(66)Catholic Book Society, 5 Essex-bridge -Founded 1827.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67)Charitable Association, Established 1806.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69)Charitable Protestant Orphan Union, or Orphan Refuge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70)Church Education Society for Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71)City of Dublin Hospital, Baggot-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(72)Continental Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(73)Debtors’ Friend Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74)Dublin Providence Home for Young Females of Good Character, Charlemont-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)Dublin South-Eastern Loan Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)Female Penitent Asylum, 77, Marlborough-street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(77)Female Penitents’ Retreat, 106, Lower Mecklenburgh-street. (1822).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(78)General Female Orphan House, Harold’s-cross.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80)Hibernian Temperance Society (1830).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81)Hibernian Wesleyan Missionary Society, In connexion with the Wesleyan Methodist Home and Foreign Missionary Society, Centenary Hall, Bishopsgate-street Within, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82)Hospital for Lying-In Women, and the Diseases of Females, Mercer-street, and York-street, opened 1827.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(83)House of Refuge, Stanhope-street, Founded 1811.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(84)House of the Good Shepherd (1822). [‘has been united to the General Magdalen Asylum Donnybrook’.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dublin 1824 continued  
(Dublin’s charities as listed in 1824 Treble Almanack) | Dublin 1845 continued  
(Dublin’s charities as listed in 1845 Thom’s). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(86)Irish Auxiliary to the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews, Upper Sackville-street.</td>
<td>(86)Irish Auxiliary to the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews, Upper Sackville-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(89)Irish Temperance Union (May 1839).</td>
<td>(89)Irish Temperance Union (May 1839).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91)Irish Unitarian Christian Society (founded 1830)</td>
<td>(91)Irish Unitarian Christian Society (founded 1830)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92)Juvenile Association for Promoting the Education of the Deaf and Dumb Poor of Ireland.</td>
<td>(92)Juvenile Association for Promoting the Education of the Deaf and Dumb Poor of Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93)Kingstown Lying-In Institution, Clarence-street (1842).</td>
<td>(93)Kingstown Lying-In Institution, Clarence-street (1842).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(94)Ladies’ Hibernian Female School Society.</td>
<td>(94)Ladies’ Hibernian Female School Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95)London Irish Society. [1806]</td>
<td>(95)London Irish Society. [1806]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99)Netterville Charities.</td>
<td>(99)Netterville Charities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100)Netterville General Dispensary (August 1834).</td>
<td>(100)Netterville General Dispensary (August 1834).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(107)St. Bridget’s Female Orphan Society, Tullow School.</td>
<td>(107)St. Bridget’s Female Orphan Society, Tullow School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(108)St Bridget’s House of Reception 9, Usher-street.</td>
<td>(108)St Bridget’s House of Reception 9, Usher-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110)St. Joseph’s Asylum, 7 Portland-row, Summerhill.</td>
<td>(110)St. Joseph’s Asylum, 7 Portland-row, Summerhill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dublin 1824 continued  
(Dublin’s charities as listed in *1824 Treble Almanack*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>St. Mark’s Ophthalmic Hospital and Dispensary for Diseases of the Eye and Ear, Mark-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112)</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Asylum, Drumcondra Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(113)</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Parish Dispensary, 176, Great Britain-street [1836].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Parochial Dispensary, 26, Upper Abbey-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115)</td>
<td>St. Mary’s Parochial Female Orphan House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>St. Michael’s and St. John’s National Free Schools, West Essex-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>St. Patrick’s Deanery School and Dorcas Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>St. Peter’s Orphan Society, Whitefriar-street. (1817).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>St. Peter’s Parochial Dispensary 49, Aungier-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120)</td>
<td>St. Thomas’s Dispensary, Marlborough-green (Opened 1825-previously connected with St Mary’s Parish).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121)</td>
<td>St. Vincent’s Hospital and Dispensary, Stephen’s-green, East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>Scottish Benevolent Society of St. Andrew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123)</td>
<td>Scripture Readers’ Society for Ireland (Founded 1822).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor of Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>South-Eastern General Dispensary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(127)</td>
<td>South-Eastern Lying-In Hospital and Dispensary, Cumberland-street, Merrion-Square (1834).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(128)</td>
<td>Victoria Asylum Charlemont-street. (1839).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>Western Lying-In Hospital and Dispensary, No. 24, Arran-quay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(130)</td>
<td>Widow’s Asylum Clarendon-Street. (1799).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>Dublin Mechanics’ Institution Royal Exchange (Founded 1837).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>Dublin Catholic Institution, 13, Anglesea-street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: *1824 Treble Almanack, 1845 Thom’s*, for information on the frequent changes of location of Dublin’s eye hospitals see Gearoid Crookes, *Dublin’s Eye and Ear: the Making of a Monument* (Dublin, 1993).
### Table II:
Edinburgh’s Charitable Institutions ‘The Almanac Record’.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edinburgh 1824 (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in <em>1824 Edinburgh Almanack</em>).</th>
<th>Edinburgh 1845 (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in <em>1845 Oliver and Boyd</em>).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) School of Arts, for the Instruction of Mechanics.</td>
<td>(2) School of Arts, for the Instruction of Mechanics - Founded 1821.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Trinity Hospital 1461.</td>
<td>(4) Trinity Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) George Heriot’s Hospital - Founded 1628.</td>
<td>(5) Heriot’s Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Watson’s Hospital - 1741.</td>
<td>(6) George Watson’s Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) John Watson’s Trust and Hospital.</td>
<td>(7) John Watson’s Institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Trades Maiden Hospital - 1704.</td>
<td>(8) The Maiden Hospital Founded by the Craftsmen of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Merchant Maiden Hospital - 1707.</td>
<td>(9) The Maiden Hospital, Founded by the Company of Merchants of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Orphan Hospital - 1733.</td>
<td>(10) Orphan Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) James Gillespie’s Hospital - 1802.</td>
<td>(11) James Gillespie’s Hospital and Free School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Royal Infirmary - 1736.</td>
<td>(12) Royal Infirmary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Edinburgh Lying-In Hospital.</td>
<td>(14) Midwifery Dispensary and Lying-In Hospital, High School Yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Edinburgh City Free School, Niddry Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Edinburgh Western Dispensary for Diseases of the Eye and Ear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Charity Work-House. (This entry also included Canongate Charity Workhouse see below).</td>
<td>(17) City Charity Workhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Magdalen Asylum - 1797.</td>
<td>(18) Magdalen Asylum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Edinburgh Association for Behoof [sic] of Widows and Orphans. Instituted January 20, 1820.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Deaf and Dumb Institution.</td>
<td>(22) Institution for Deaf and Dumb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) Society for Suppression of Begging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh 1824 continued</strong> (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in 1824 <em>Edinburgh Almanack</em>).</td>
<td><strong>Edinburgh 1845 continued</strong> (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in 1845 Oliver and Boyd).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31) Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor. 1786.</td>
<td>(27) Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor. Instituted in 1786.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37) Episcopal Free School. 1817.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39) Institution for Relief of Incurables.</td>
<td>(34) Institution for Relief of Incurables Founded by the Late Mrs Elizabeth Keir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40) Parochial Institutions, for the Religious Education of the Children of the Poor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41) Sabbath School Union for Scotland.</td>
<td>(35) Sabbath School Union for Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42) Edinburgh Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45) Scottish Missionary Society.</td>
<td>(38) Scottish Missionary Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49) Craigcrook Mortification.</td>
<td>(40) Craigcrook Mortification. ‘For Assisting Old Men and Women who have been reduced in their Circumstances, and for Orphans.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50) The Education Society for Promoting the Mitigation and Ultimate Abolition of Negro Slavery. 1823.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51) Managers of Hospital at Preston, in the Parish of Prestonpans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) George Steele’s Hospital, Tranent, East Lothian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) Society for Relief of the Destitute Sick Leith.</td>
<td>(41) Society for Relief of the Destitute Sick Leith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) Leith Female Society for Relieving Aged and Indigent Women.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55) Leith Female Charity School of Industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56) Leith Boy’s Charity School. 1805.</td>
<td>(42) Leith Boy’s Charity School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh 1824 continued</td>
<td>Edinburgh 1845 continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Edinburgh’s charities as listed in 1824 <em>Edinburgh Almanack</em>)</td>
<td>(Edinburgh’s charities as listed in 1845 <em>Oliver and Boyd</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57) Leith Auxiliary Missionary Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) Leith Auxiliary Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews and in Aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59) Leith Juvenile Auxiliary Bible and Missionary Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45) House of Refuge and Night Refuge, Queensberry House.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46) Cauvin’s Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47) Night Asylum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48) West Church Charity Workhouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49) Canongate Charity Workhouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50) Edinburgh Maternity Hospital (1843).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51) Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) Edinburgh Auxiliary Bible Society in Connexion with the British and Foreign Bible Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) Edinburgh Auxiliary Naval and Military Bible Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54) Edinburgh City Mission Instituted 1832.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56) Edinburgh Female Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, Instituted October 1810.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57) Sessional School of Canongate, Established 1829.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) Canongate Burgh School, Established in 1837.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59) Dr. Bell’s Schools (at Niddry-street and Greenside).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60) University Missionary Association, Instituted in 1825.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61) Edinburgh Mechanics’ Subscription Library, 7 James’s Court, Instituted 1825.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62) Donaldson’s Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63) Fettes’ Endowment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64) Chalmers’ Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65) Edinburgh Branch of the Scottish Hospital, London.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(66) Edinburgh School for the Blind, 10 Hunter Square.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(68) Association for Promoting Education among Workmen, Apprentices, &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh 1824 continued (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in 1824 <em>Edinburgh Almanack</em>)</td>
<td>Edinburgh 1845 continued (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in 1845 Oliver and Boyd).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(69) Senior Female Society, for the Relief of Age and Indigent Women. Instituted 1791.</td>
<td>(70) Charitable or Junior Female Society for the Relief of Indigent Old Women. 1797.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(71) Mortification by the Late Joseph Thomson of Nortonhall of Edinlon.</td>
<td>(72) Society in Edinburgh for Clothing the Industrious Poor, Dickson’s Court, 18 Bristo-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(77) Edinburgh Caithness Association. Instituted 1838. For the Establishment of a Friendly Intercourse among the Natives of the County of Caithness Resident in or near Edinburgh; and for the Improvement of Education in the Schools, and the Encouragement of Literary Emulation among the Youth of the County.</td>
<td>(78) Edinburgh Upper-Ward of Lanarkshire Association. Instituted 1840, for the Establishment of a Friendly Intercourse among the Natives of the County of Lanark Resident in or near Edinburgh, especially for the Improvement of Education in the Schools, and the Encouragement of Literary Emulation among the Youth of the Upper-Ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh 1824 continued (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in <em>Edinburgh Almanack</em>).</td>
<td>Edinburgh 1845 continued (Edinburgh’s charities as listed in <em>1845 Oliver and Boyd</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuation of charities from 1824.</td>
<td>continuation of charities from 1845.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(83) Minto House Hospital and Dispensary Argyle Square.</td>
<td>(83) Minto House Hospital and Dispensary Argyle Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85) Edinburgh Lying-In Institution, Instituted in 1824.</td>
<td>(85) Edinburgh Lying-In Institution, Instituted in 1824.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86) Society for Relief of Poor Married Women of Respectable Character when in Childbed.</td>
<td>(86) Society for Relief of Poor Married Women of Respectable Character when in Childbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87) Edinburgh Lock Hospital, Surgeon-square.</td>
<td>(87) Edinburgh Lock Hospital, Surgeon-square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88) Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge Edinburgh District Committee (Episcopal).</td>
<td>(88) Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge Edinburgh District Committee (Episcopal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(89) Scottish Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India.</td>
<td>(89) Scottish Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90) Female Society of Free Church of Scotland for Promoting Christian Education among the Females of India.</td>
<td>(90) Female Society of Free Church of Scotland for Promoting Christian Education among the Females of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91) Baptist Home Missionary Society for Scotland.</td>
<td>(91) Baptist Home Missionary Society for Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93) Prison Discipline Society of Scotland.</td>
<td>(93) Prison Discipline Society of Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95) Edinburgh Fever Board.</td>
<td>(95) Edinburgh Fever Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** *1824 Edinburgh Almanack, 1845 Oliver and Boyd.*
Table III:
Illustration of the variety of management structures operating in Dublin in the 1820s.¹⁸

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation.</th>
<th>Function.</th>
<th>Management Structure</th>
<th>Date Founded</th>
<th>Minimum Membership Subscription (Subscriber Democracies only”).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospital of King Charles II Oxmantown (Blue Coat Hospital).</td>
<td>Educational.</td>
<td>Closed system of administration initially under the control of Dublin Corporation. After municipal reform appointment of governors was vested in the Church of Ireland Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, Bishop of Meath and the Lord Chancellor.</td>
<td>Charter 1670 Opened 1675.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Steevens’s Hospital.</td>
<td>Medical.</td>
<td>Endowed Charity (though in receipt of subscriptions and a large government grant). (10 <em>ex-officio</em> governors, 9 others).</td>
<td>1783 (Opened).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁸Table III and Table IV just provide a sample illustration of the types of management structures operating in each city. The number of examples given is higher for Dublin than Edinburgh in order to indicate: (i) that there were some subscriber democracies operating in Dublin in the early eighteenth century, (ii) but that in spite of this and the existence of some state-nominated management structures in Dublin, overall the trend towards increasingly open management structures was similar in both cities.

¹⁹Currency is taken to be in British Pounds Sterling unless otherwise stated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s (Swift's) Hospital.</td>
<td>Medical (Lunatic Asylum).</td>
<td>Endowed Charity.</td>
<td>1740 (Charter 1746).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Lock Hospital.</td>
<td>Medical.</td>
<td>State-appointed. [Initially under voluntary management, from 1792 managed by a board appointed by Dublin Castle.]</td>
<td>1755.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin House of Industry.</td>
<td>Poor Relief (with some anti-begging aims) and Medical.</td>
<td>State-appointed. [Initially under voluntary management, from 1798 managed by board appointed by Dublin Castle and/or a governor appointed directly by government.]</td>
<td>1773.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday and Daily School North Strand.</td>
<td>Educational/Missionary.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy but with parish clergy given a significant role by virtue of their office.</td>
<td>1786.</td>
<td>Annual Governor: 1 guinea. (or contributors of useful goods worth 2 guineas or more) Life Governor: 10 guineas (or contributors of useful goods worth 12 guineas or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers' Friend Society.</td>
<td>Poor Relief.</td>
<td>Enclosed, controlled by 40 Methodist 'gentlemen'. By 1835 members were not required to be subscribers.</td>
<td>1790.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Society for Relief of Sick and Indigent Room-Keepers of All Religious Persuasions in the City of Dublin.</td>
<td>Poor Relief.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy (with ex-officio role for clergy of all denominations and for Dublin-based Physicians and Surgeons).</td>
<td>1790.</td>
<td>Annual Member: 8s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Discourteasing Vice, and Promoting Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.</td>
<td>Educational/Missionary.</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation; Members' veto on new members; proposers and seconders of new members had to fill out a form. New members elected by ballot; fifteen members required for a valid election, one rejection in seven excluded.</td>
<td>1792 (Incorporated by Act of Parliament 1800).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Association.</td>
<td>Poor Relief (included a lending fund).</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy.</td>
<td>1806.</td>
<td>Annual Member: 4s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Patrick Dun’s Hospital.</td>
<td>Medical.</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation; Subscribers held 12 out of 22 places on Managing Committee, all the rest held their positions ex-officio. Ex-officio managers elected the next year's managing committee.</td>
<td>1808.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Function.</td>
<td>Management Structure.</td>
<td>Date Founded.</td>
<td>Minimum Membership Subscription (Subscriber Democracies only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sunday School Society for Ireland.         | Educational/Missionary.    | Subscriber Democracy. | 1809.         | Annual Member: 1 Guinea  
Life Member: £10  
Life Governor: 50 Guineas.                                    |
Life Member: £10  
‘late currency.’                                                  |
| Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Kildare Place Society). | Educational.              | Subscriber Democracy. | 1811.         | Annual Member: 1 Guinea.  
Life Member: 10 Guineas.  
Guardians: £50 subscription or executors of a £50 legacy.     |
| St Peter’s Charitable Loan.                | Poor Relief (Loan Society).| Subscriber Democracy but parish officials were given a role in governance. | 1813.         | Annual Member: £1  
Life Member: £10.                                                |
| National Institution for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb Children of the Poor in Ireland. | Educational.              | Subscriber Democracy. | 1816.         | Annual Member: 1 guinea or collectors of 1 guinea ‘by weekly or other subscription’.  
Life Member: 10 guineas ‘or Collector of that sum from friends; and every Executor paying a legacy of 50l.’  
Guardians: 50l  
Donors of 200l could have either 24 votes at election of children or have 1 ‘indigent child always in the Institution’. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benevolent Strangers’ Friend Society.</th>
<th>Poor Relief.</th>
<th>Enclosed type of management Structure: Similar to Strangers’ Friend Society but managed by Wesleyans who did not leave the established Church.</th>
<th>1817.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association for the Suppression of Mendicity in Dublin.</td>
<td>Poor Relief (Anti-Street Begging).</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy (high number of ex-officio governors).</td>
<td>1818.</td>
<td>Annual Member: £3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Lying-In Hospital.</td>
<td>Medical.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For Maternity Hospital): Annual Governor: £2 2s Life Governor: £10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Book Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge throughout Ireland.</td>
<td>Educational/Missionary.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy but with ex-officio role for the Catholic hierarchy.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Annual Member: £1 Member for 7 Years: £5 Life Member: £10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV:
Illustration of the variety of management structures operating in Edinburgh in the 1820s.\textsuperscript{20}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Management Structure</th>
<th>Date Founded</th>
<th>Minimum Membership Subscription (Subscriber Democracies Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Hospital.</td>
<td>Poor Relief</td>
<td>Endowed Charity.</td>
<td>1461.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Heriot’s Hospital.</td>
<td>Educational.</td>
<td>Endowed Charity.</td>
<td>1628.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades’ Maiden Hospital.</td>
<td>Educational.</td>
<td>Endowed Charity (also received annual rents from Trade Incorporations).</td>
<td>1704.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge.</td>
<td>Educational/Missionary.</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation: members elected by ballot, members had to be Protestant as well as subscribers.</td>
<td>1709 (First Patent 1709 being collected, Second Patent 1738).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Infirmary.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation: restriction on subscribers’ access to management.</td>
<td>1729 (Charter 1736).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan Hospital and Workhouse at Edinburgh.</td>
<td>Poor Relief/Education.</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation: members elected.</td>
<td>1733 (Patent 1742).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Edinburgh Public Dispensary (Royal Public Dispensary). | Medical. | Subscriber Democracy. | 1776 (Charter 1818). | 1777 rules: Governor for 2 Years: 1 guinea. Life Governor: 5 guineas. 1818 charter: Governor of Corporation: £5. |}

\textsuperscript{20}Table III and Table IV just provide a sample illustration of the types of management structures operating in each city. The number of examples given is higher for Dublin than Edinburgh in order to indicate: (i) that there were some subscriber democracies operating in Dublin in the early eighteenth century, (ii) but that in spite of this and the existence of some state-nominated management structures in Dublin, overall the trend towards increasingly open management structures was similar in both cities.

\textsuperscript{21}Currency is taken to be in British Pounds Sterling unless otherwise stated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Management Structure</th>
<th>Date Founded</th>
<th>Minimum Membership Subscription (Subscriber Democracies Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Relief of the Destitute Sick</td>
<td>Poor Relief/Medical (also some religious functions).</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation: Many features of a subscriber democracy though members had to be approved by general meetings.</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>Seal of Cause from Town Council: 1813.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene Asylum</td>
<td>Overt Reform.</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation: members elected. Approval of three quarters of members present at general meeting needed for members to be accepted. A ballot could be called at the request of one member.</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gillespie’s Hospital and Free School.</td>
<td>Educational.</td>
<td>Endowed Charity.</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Bible Society.</td>
<td>Missionary/Bible Society.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy (ministers who were members were entitled to attend and vote at meetings of the committee of management).</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Annual Member: ½ guinea. Member for Life: 10 guineas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution for the Education of Deaf and Dumb Children.</td>
<td>Educational.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy.</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Annual Governor: 1 guinea. Life Governor: 10 guineas. £200 could have 'one child always on the foundation'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools.</td>
<td>Educational/ Missionary.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy.</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Annual Member: ½ guinea. Life Member: 10 guineas Governor: Annual Subscriber of 3 guineas or a Donor of 20 guineas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Management Structure</td>
<td>Date Founded</td>
<td>Minimum Membership Subscription (Subscriber Democracies Only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Town Dispensary.</td>
<td>Medical.</td>
<td>Subscriber Democracy.</td>
<td>1815.</td>
<td>Annual Governor: 10 shillings Governor for Life: 5 guineas (Every 5s entitled one to recommend a patient).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney and Zetland Charitable Society.</td>
<td>Poor Relief (for those originally from Orkney or Shetland).</td>
<td>Hybrid Organisation (membership by subscription but the treasurer, secretary and managing committee had to come from Orkney or Shetland).</td>
<td>1822.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V:
Illustration of parochial and congregational activity in Edinburgh (1837).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish/Congregation</th>
<th>Activity/Functions</th>
<th>Funding Method</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Church of Scotland**  
(connected with parish church unless otherwise stated) | | | |
| High Church. | Missionary (Mr Dalziel, Church of Scotland licentiate). | Subscription. | |
| Old Church. | Mission Station. | Paid for by Parish Minister. | |
| Tolbooth. | Wightman’s Charity Schools. | Bequest. Church collections. Penny-a-week subscriptions by pupils. Interest on funds. | ‘Of the children attending Wightman’s charity school, from 35 to 40 belong to the parish. Children from the parish have no preference’. |
| Tolbooth. | Female Day and Sabbath School. | Subscriptions of congregation members. | ‘All the scholars attending this school do or did belong to the parish.’ |
| Tron. | Parochial Visitation by licentiates of Church of Scotland. | Done free of charge. | Focused on parish although ‘the parishioners and the congregation are far from being identical’.

---

22 This table lists activities associated with Edinburgh’s Church of Scotland parish churches taken from 1837 (31) First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction Scotland, up to page 155. The aim of the table is to illustrate the variety of activities and funding types that existed. To minimise repetition the table omits activities associated with the following parishes: New North, Gaelic Church, Lady Yester’s, St Andrew’s, St Stephen’s, Canongate, and New Street. For comparison across denominations, examples of similar activities from UAS have been taken from the same pages of the Report or from the minute books of the UAS charities used for this chapter’s case studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish/Congregation</th>
<th>Activity/Functions</th>
<th>Funding Method</th>
<th>Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Greyfriars.</td>
<td>Parish Missionary Mr Cochrane.</td>
<td>Church collections and contributions by minister.</td>
<td>Preached at a rented preaching station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Greyfriars.</td>
<td>Parish Missionary Mr D. Melvin (Baptist).</td>
<td>Voluntary contributions 'without distinction of denomination'</td>
<td>Concentrated solely on parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George.</td>
<td>Parochial School.</td>
<td>Not stated but possibly the same system as that of Edinburgh St Mary's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George.</td>
<td>Parochial Sabbath Evening School.</td>
<td>Received services of the masters of parochial school and voluntary teachers.</td>
<td>No pupil fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George.</td>
<td>Young-street Preaching Station.</td>
<td>Contributions from kirk session and congregation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary.</td>
<td>Parochial Sabbath Schools.</td>
<td>Receives services of parochial day school teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Wynd.</td>
<td>Evening Schools.</td>
<td>Collections at services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Wynd.</td>
<td>Missionary.</td>
<td>Salary paid 'by a benevolent Lady in the New Town'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Associated Synod Congregations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-street.</td>
<td>Sabbath Classes for 'young persons'.</td>
<td>Carried out free of charge by ministers and elders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Congregation</td>
<td>Activity/Functions</td>
<td>Funding Method</td>
<td>Other Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street.</td>
<td>Free School.</td>
<td>Collections at services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street.</td>
<td>Congregational Missionary Society.</td>
<td>Collections at services.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** 1837 (31) *First Report of the Commissioners of Religious Instruction Scotland*, St Mary’s Kirk Session Minutes, St Mary’s Parochial School Minutes, Rose-street Missionary Society Minutes, *Reports of the Religious Societies.*

---

### Table VI:

**Active clerical philanthropists in Edinburgh (1845)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Charities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh City Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Benevolent &amp; Strangers’ Friend Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House of Refuge and Queensberry House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society in Edinburgh Clothing the Industrious Poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwifery Dispens. &amp; Lying-In Hospital, High School Yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Maternity Hospital_Instituted 1843.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Muir D.D.</td>
<td>Church of Scotland.</td>
<td>Edinburgh Association in Aid of the Moravian Missions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Education (Lancasterian School) Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Gillespie’s Hospital and Free School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution for Deaf and Dumb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House of Refuge and Queensberry House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society in Edinburgh Clothing the Industrious Poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwifery Dispens. &amp; Lying-In Hospital, High School Yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India. Auxiliary to the General Assembly’s Committee on Foreign Missions. Sabbath School Union for Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School of Arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Maiden Hospital, founded by the Company of Merchants of Edinburgh and Mary Erskine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh School for the Blind, 10 Hunter Square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Night Asylum for the Houseless Poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society in Edinburgh Clothing the Industrious Poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Eye Infirmary 1 Elder Street, York Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary to the Irish Evangelical Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary to the London Missionary Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Magdalen[e] Asylum. 1791.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Maternity Hospital_Instituted 1843.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scot. Sailors’ &amp; Soldiers’ Bethel Flag Union_Instit. 1835.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 This table lists the clerics whose names appeared most frequently in lists of charities’ officeholders in 1845 *Oliver and Boyd* (i.e. those who names appeared in 5 or more charities).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Charities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. John Paul continued</td>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Scottish Ladies’ Association for the Advancement of Female Education in India. Auxiliary to the General Assembly’s Committee on Foreign Missions. Scottish Bible Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev G. Johnston</td>
<td>UAS</td>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary to the Irish Evangelical Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary to the London Missionary Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Education (Lancasterian School) Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society for the Support of Gaelic Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scot. Sailors’ &amp; Soldiers’ Bethel Flag Union Instit. 1835.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lee</td>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary Naval and Military Bible Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cauvin's Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution for Deaf and Dumb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edinburgh Maternity Hospital Instituted 1843.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish Bible Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** 1845 Oliver and Boyd, 1845-46 PO Directory.
Table VII:  
Active clerical philanthropists in Dublin (1845).\textsuperscript{21}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Charities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop of Dublin.</td>
<td>Church of Ireland</td>
<td>Charitable Musical Loan. City of Dublin Hospital Baggot-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Steevens's Hospital. Female Orphan House for Destitute Female Children Circular Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibernian Marine Society in Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibernian Society for Care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital and Free School of King Charles II, Oxmantown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital for Incurables, Donnybrook Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women (Rotunda).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercer's Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Institution for the Education of Deaf and Dumb Children of the Poor in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nourishment and Clothing Society, Grand Canal-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Patrick's Hospital (Swift’s). St Peter's Savings' Bank, or Provident Institution, 49 Cuffe street, Stephen's-green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South-Eastern General Dispensary. Westmoreland Lock Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Townsend-street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21}This table lists the clerics who appeared most frequently (i.e. in 5 or more charities) in the lists of charities’ officeholders in the data used for the analysis of interdenominational clerical involvement in Dublin’s charities as referenced in page 117n75. It is less comprehensive than Table VI as it does not include all charities listed in 1845 Thom’s. The sample used omitted Protestant missionary and other overtly Protestant charities in order to avoid a repetitive listing of the vast numbers of senior clerical officeholders involved in these organisations. The sample also omitted the Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers and Mendicity because the high-profile interdenominational clerical participation that these attracted was well known. Unlike Table VI which gives the clerics’ names, those in this table are mostly identified by office as this was how they were listed in 1845 Thom’s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Charities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord Primate</td>
<td>Church of Ireland.</td>
<td>Charitable Musical Loan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Steevens's Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governors of the School Founded by Erasmus Smith, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibernian Marine Society in Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibernian Society for Care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital and Free School of King Charles II Oxmantown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women (Rotunda).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercers' Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Patrick's Hospital (Swift’s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustees of the Charities of the Late Dr Sterne, Bishop of Clogher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Rev. Dr Murray</td>
<td>Roman Catholic.</td>
<td>Charitable Infirmary Jervis-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female Penitent Asylum, 77, Marlborough-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female Penitents' Retreat, 106, Lower Mecklenburgh-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House of the Good Shepard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malachian Orphan Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meath-Street Savings' Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Bridget's House of Reception, 9, Usher-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Joseph's Asylum, 7, Portland-row, Summer-hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary's Asylum Drumcondra Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Mary's Parochial Female Orphan House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor of Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacon of Dublin</td>
<td>Church of Ireland.</td>
<td>City of Dublin Hospital Baggot-street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Steevens's Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foundling Hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governors of the School Founded by Erasmus Smith, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibernian Marine Society in Dublin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hibernian Society for Care of Soldiers' Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women (Rotunda).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Patrick's Hospital (Swift’s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Peter's Savings' Bank, or Provident Institution, 49 Cuffe-street, Stephen's-green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean of St Patrick’s.</strong></td>
<td>Church of Ireland.</td>
<td>Adelaide Hospital. Coombe Lying-In Hospital and Dublin Ophthalmic Infirmary. Dr Steeven's Hospital. Foundling Hospital. Governors of the School Founded by Erasmus Smith, Esq. Hibernian Society for Care of Soldiers' Children. Hospital for the Relief of Poor Lying-In Women. St Patrick's Deanery School and Dorcas Association. St Patrick's Hospital (Swift's).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rev. Thomas Kingston</strong></td>
<td>Church of Ireland.</td>
<td>Foundling Hospital. Hibernian Temperance Society. Meath Loan. St Patrick's Hospital (Swift's). Western Lying-In Hospital and Dispensary, No. 24, Arran-quay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Thom's 1845, Dublin Almanac and General Register 1845.
### Table VIII:
The management and funding of congregational and parochial charities in Dublin and Edinburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded (where known)</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Management type</th>
<th>Income sources</th>
<th>Min. Subscription (where known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Society of the United Parishes of SS Mary, Thomas, and George (Dublin).</td>
<td>1826.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Many features of a subscriber democracy. Managed by a patron, president, 2 vice-presidents and a committee (53 of which 8 were the parochial clergy).</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations. Grant from Catholic Association. An agreement made with Catholic Female Schools in the parish meant that the Education Society did not usually use charity sermons to raise funds.</td>
<td>£1 minimum required to be a member of the managing committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 These charities are the case studies examined in chapter three.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded (where known)</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Management type</th>
<th>Income sources</th>
<th>Min. Subscription (where known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Missionary Society (Edinburgh).</td>
<td>1834.</td>
<td>Missionary.</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Managed by a Missionary Committee (3 including president the Rev. Dr William Peddie) and directors (18). All of the Committee and directors appeared in the subscription lists for either the Missionary Society or its Junior Auxiliary.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations (including ‘Missionary boxes’). Collections at missionary and annual meetings. Collections at services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first reference to charity schools in the parish’s records occurred in 1774, MacSorely, *Our Parish*, 26.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded (where known)</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Management type</th>
<th>Income sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Christian Instruction Society, (Edinburgh).</td>
<td>1837.</td>
<td>Missionary /Education.</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Governed by a president (the Rev. Dr Peddie), vice-president, treasurer, secretary, and committee (6). Hybrid organisation: Features of a subscriber democracy but to join one had to be a member of the congregation and proposed and seconded by Society members.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations from Juvenile Missionary Society. Proceeds of soirees. Collections at Sermons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Juvenile Female Missionary Society, (Edinburgh).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionary.</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Managed by a president, treasurer, secretary and committee (8). Management rules unknown. Most but not all managers were subscribers.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Congregational Young Men's Association for Mutual Improvement, (Edinburgh).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Education/ Personal Improvement.</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Members had to be young men, members of Congregation and be 'proposed and seconded'.</td>
<td>'Voluntary contributions of members’. Collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Congregational Day School. (Edinburgh).</td>
<td>1837.</td>
<td>Education.</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Managed by a president (the Rev. Dr Peddie), treasurer, secretary, committee (8) All managers were subscribers.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations. Fees. Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Founded (where known)</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>Management type</td>
<td>Income sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Congregational Sewing School. (Edinburgh).</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Managed by a president, treasurer, secretary, and committee (10). All but one of the managers were subscribers.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations. Fees. Work done at School. Donations from Benevolent Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristo-street Ladies’ Benevolent Society. (Edinburgh).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor Relief (Clothing)</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Managed by a president, vice-presidents (2), treasurer, secretary, committee (12). 10 of the managers were subscribers.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose-street Congregational Missionary Society. (Edinburgh).</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>United Associate Synod.</td>
<td>Hybrid organisation. Features of a subscriber democracy but membership only open to ‘members and ordinary hearers in the Congregation’.</td>
<td>Subscriptions and donations. (Missionaries also received financial aid from United Associate Synod Presbytery of Edinburgh and the Synod’s Foreign Missions Committee).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Education Society of the United Parishes Minutes, *EJ*, Michael and John’s Minutes, 1845 Thom’s, MacSorely, *Our Parish*, St Peter’s Schools Minute Books 1841-58, St Peter’s Parish Female School Minutes, *DEM*, *Report of the St. Peter’s Parochial*, St Mary’s Kirk Session Minutes, St Mary’s School Minutes, CH2/139/126 St. Mary’s Kirk Session- Reports on St Mary’s School, with Subscription List of 1827, and Other Papers (1827-1838), CH2/139/183 St. Mary’s Kirk Session Papers relating to St Mary’s Parochial School, including a List of Governors (1826-1844). Caldwell, *St Mary’s, Reports of the Religious Societies*, Bristo-street Missionary Society Minutes, Rose-street Missionary Society Minutes.
### Table IX:
Local government involvement in Edinburgh’s charities.\(^{37}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1824</th>
<th>1845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts For the Instruction of Mechanics [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>School of Arts for the Instruction of Mechanics founded 1821 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Education Society [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>Edinburgh Education (Lancasterian School) Society [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Hospital, 1461 Founded by Mary of Guelders, Consort to King James II [The entire Town Council were ‘Governors’].</td>
<td>Trinity Hospital [The entire Town Council were ‘Governors’].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Heriot’s Hospital founded 1628 [The entire Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>George Heriot’s Hospital [The entire Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson’s Hospital [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>George Watson’s Hospital [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades Maiden Hospital-1704 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Maiden Hospital 1707 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gillespie’s Hospital-1802 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>James Gillespie’s Hospital and Free School [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>Royal Infirmary [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Public Dispensary-1776 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>Royal Public Dispensary established in 1776 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh City Free School, Niddry Street [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>Dr Bell’s Schools [incorporating Edinburgh City Free School, Niddry Street] [Members of Town Council were involved in management and were trustees of the Schools’ endowment fund].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Town Dispensary-1815. [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td>New Town Dispensary instituted in 1815 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Dispensary of Edinburgh [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Western Dispensary for Diseases of the Eye and Ear [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Charity Work-House [Members of Town Council were involved in management and in raising the poor rate].</td>
<td>Edinburgh Charity Workhouse [Members of Town Council were involved in management and in raising the poor rate].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\)Examples of charities in which some or all of an official local government body played a role. Officials have been identified by the name of the office rather than their own names.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1824 continued</th>
<th>1845 continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene Asylum 1797 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunatic Asylum [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and Dumb Institution [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Suppression of Begging [Members of Town Council and the Sheriff of the County were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Bible Society [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial Institutions, For Religions Education of the Poor Directors [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh and Leith Seaman’s Friend Society-Instituted March 1820 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canongate Burgh School, Established in 1837 [The ‘resident Bailies and Treasurer of Canongate’ involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Auxiliary to the London Missionary Society Scot. [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauvin’s Hospital [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Branch of the Scottish Hospital, London [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Promoting Education among Workmen, Apprentices, &amp;c. [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Relief of the Destitute Sick, instituted 1785 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Refuge &amp; Night Refuge, Queensberry House [Members of Town Council and Police Commissioners were involved in management, as were the Sheriff of the County and the Provost of Leith, the Police Commissioners also provided an annual grant].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Asylum for the Houseless Poor [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution for Relief of Incurables, Founded by the Late Mrs Elizabeth Keir [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 continued</td>
<td>1845 continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society in Edinburgh for Clothing the Industrious Poor, Dickson’s Court, 18 Bristo Street [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canongate Charity Workhouse [Several magistrates of the Burgh of Canongate involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Fever Board [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canongate Public Dispensary No. 178 Canongate [Members of Town Council and several magistrates of the Burgh of Canongate were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Eye Infirmary, 1 Elder Street, York Place Instituted 1834 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minto House Hospital &amp; Dispensary Argyle Square [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Maternity Hospital-Instituted 1843 [Members of Town Council were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Edinburgh Infant School Society [Members of Town Council and the Sheriff of the County were involved in management].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Lock Hospital, Surgeon Square Members of Police Commissioners were involved in management and the Commissioners provided annual grants].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** *1824 Edinburgh Almanack, 1845 Oliver and Boyd*, except for the details of the Royal Infirmary’s management which comes from Logan Turner, *Great Hospital*, and for Police Commissioners’ involvement in Edinburgh Lock Hospital and House of Refuge which is detailed in chapter five.
Table X:
Governors of the King’s Hospital, Dublin (1840 and 1842 compared). 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1842</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor: The Right Hon. Sir Nicholas William Brady, Mansion House Dawson Street.</td>
<td>Sir N.W. Brady.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aldermen:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hoyte, esq.</td>
<td>George Hoyte, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Darley, esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Claudius Beresford, esq.</td>
<td>John C. Beresford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Kingston James, baronet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Smyth, esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam. Wilkinson Tyndall, esq.</td>
<td>Sam W. Tyndall, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Montgomery, esq.</td>
<td>A. Montgomery, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob West, esq.</td>
<td>Jacob West, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Thomas Whelan, knight.</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Whelan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Palmer Archer, esq.</td>
<td>C.P. Archer, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir George Whiteford, knt.</td>
<td>Sir George Whiteford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hodges, esq.</td>
<td>Wm. Hodges, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Drummond, esq.</td>
<td>John Drummond, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Carolin esq.</td>
<td>Charles Carolin, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Elliott Hyndman, esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheriffs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Falkner, esq.</td>
<td>Francis Falkner, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheriffs’ Peers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Semple, esq. sen.</td>
<td>John Semple, esq. [not clear if this is John Semple Junior or Senior].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountiford J. Hay, esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tudor esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Charles Sirr, esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 1841 has been omitted as the Almanac for that year listed it as still partly under Corporation management, *Dublin General Almanac and General Register of Ireland...1841* (Dublin, 1841).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheriffs’ Peers continued:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonad Ogilby, esq.</td>
<td>Hickman Kearney, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman Kearney, esq.</td>
<td>Hickman Kearney, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Studdert, esq.</td>
<td>George Studdert, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thorp, esq.</td>
<td>Charles Thorp., esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Moore, esq.</td>
<td>James Moore, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Alley, esq.</td>
<td>John Alley, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bunn, esq.</td>
<td>Henry Bunn, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponsonby Shaw, esq.</td>
<td>Ponsonby Shaw, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Flood, esq.</td>
<td>Patrick Flood, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Scott, esq.</td>
<td>Wm. Scott, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Halahan, esq.</td>
<td>George Halahan, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir George Preston, knight.</td>
<td>Sir George Preston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Wm. Wainwright Lynar, knight.</td>
<td>Sir W.W. Lynar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Drury Jones Dickinson, knight.</td>
<td>Sir D.J. Dickinson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Wall, esq.</td>
<td>Garret Wall, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Veevers, esq.</td>
<td>John Veevers, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loftus A. Bryan, esq.</td>
<td>L.A. Bryan, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas James Quinton, esq.</td>
<td>Thomas Quinton, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George B. Grant, esq.</td>
<td>G.B. Grant, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despard Taylor, esq.</td>
<td>Despard Taylor, esq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Recorder:**

The Right Hon. Frederick Shaw, MP.

**Other Governors:**

- Bishop of Ossory.
- The Primate.
- Archbishop of Dublin.
- Doctor Wm. Harty.
- Alexander Read, esq.
- Rev. Charles Elrington.

**Sources:** *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland...1840* (Dublin, 1840), *Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland for...1842* (Dublin, 1842).
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