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Abstract & Keywords

In the English socio-cultural landscape of the late eighteenth-century, the concept of kindness inhabited a place of importance for its proponents. For kindness was regarded as actions derived from the capacity of humans to do good. Which resulted in the experience and creation of good qualities, situations, and interactions. Kindness’ dictates allowed for its followers to argue the need to encourage better behavioural qualities in others. The dictates of kindness that allowed for this regulating ability came around due to the tightly entwined religious and social tenets of kindness. In the religious sphere, kindness was tied to being Christian through the ‘Law of Kindness.’ The ‘Law of Kindness’ argued that Christians must show kindness to every human being and creature despite everything. Christian theologians argued that kindness is part of humanity, which must be shown through the correct actions, mannerisms, and feelings of everyday life. Kindness fit neatly into the culture of sensibility and its associated philosophies of moral and sensibilities. In the social sphere proponents argued that kindness acted as a means of reinforcing social hierarchy and behavioural boundaries of English society. This occurred through dictates to people showing kindness and infuse kindness into their behaviour that varied according to social position and gender.
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1. **A Kindness to Achieve: Introduction to Kindness**

“Behave with kindness to your schoolfellows, and everybody you know,”1 said stern schoolmasters across the British Isles to their pupils. From the pulpit came the voices of clergymen proclaiming in one of the many passages on the role of kindness: “Christians are strongly…enjoined to copy after their great Model…patterns of mercy and kindness….”2 Even in the workplace, the working class could not escape messages about the role kindness played in their jobs, including sentences such as, “the discharge of this obligation with candour and justice, may create mutual kindness and regard.”3 These quotes are only a few from a large body of work, that historians have discovered from the literature of the eighteenth-century.

This makes kindness a notion that needs to be explored. The ability to desire the ingrainining of kindness into British behaviour resulted from the culture of sensibility and its by-products. The culture of sensibility could be found in the grand ballrooms of the elites, the suitably serious gentlemen’s clubs, on the streets, throughout the marketplaces and shops, in groupings of gentlewomen networking over tea. In short, the culture of sensibility was found almost everywhere in eighteenth-century British elite and middling life.

The backbone of the culture of sensibility can be found in two intellectual movements formulated and engendered through the Enlightenment: moral philosophy and sensationalist psychology. These two intellectual theories of moral philosophy and sensationalist psychology allowed for the larger concept of culture of sensibility to begin to change the landscape of the British Isles.

Moral philosophy engendered a lively and active atmosphere of debate amongst its thinkers across the Isle in smoky gentlemen’s establishments or saloons; the more influential thinkers included Adam Smith, the Earl of Shaftesbury, David Hume, and Bernard Mandeville. One field of thought, argued that moral ethics is a naturally occurring phenomenon of goodness and social affection which needed to be cultivated through the

---

1 Sarah Trimmer, “The Economy of Charity; Or, an Address to Ladies Concerning Sunday-Schools; the Establishment of Schools of Industry under Female Inspection; and the Distribution of Voluntary Benefactions. To Which Is Added an Appendix, Containing an Account of the Sunday-Schools in Old Brentford. By Mrs. Trimmer” (London, 1787), 172, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
distinction of luxury and refinement; for indulging in the correct behaviour would lead ultimately to the improvement of society. Moral philosophy had cultivated feelings that were associated strongly with the culture of sensibility; through moral philosophy people were told to cultivate certain behaviours and feelings.

Besides the argument of moral philosophy, the intellectuals in the gentlemen’s clubs developed and debated sensational psychology. This debate was undertaken by three main men: John Locke, Isaac Newton, and George Cheyne. Nerves were tied to the brain resulting in the formation of senses or sensation: senses were tastes, smells and the physical, which led to the dissolving of the barrier between thoughts and feelings. These sensations were believed to be both naturally inborn and cultivated which led to the idea of a hierarchy; and led to social and moral status being assigned along hierarchical lines. Through this inborn and cultivated sensation came ties to the culture of sensibility. This idea of inborn-cultivated parts of humanity influenced the concept of kindness, as will be shown later.

The way kindness can be tied to the culture of sensibility, social reform and enlightenment is through its similarity to politeness and other associated behaviour modifiers. These modifiers were among the more visual outcomes of the culture of sensibility which aimed to cultivate members into the correct behaviour that would benefit the public good; the child who did not harm animals, the wife who smiled at their husband’s teachings which were intended towards her with great kindness, or the servants who worked on their own self-improvement for the pleasure of their social superiors.

Cultural Keywords and Abstract Nouns: How a Word Becomes a Concept

Languages are enthralling things that include more than simply the words themselves, even when arranged to create complex structures. There are words, like that of kindness, that contain more than a singular meaning, encompassing a whole complex understanding that needs to be parsed. These words, therefore have been called cultural keywords. Cultural keywords are words like schadenfreude that are specific to one language. These words have a

---


5 Barker-Benfield, *Culture of Sensibility*, 107, 116.

6 Ibid., 3–5.

7 Ibid., 7–8.
common understanding that binds people together, therefore forming a community with its specific words and meanings. Another key part to understanding the linguistics is abstract nouns. Abstract nouns are linkable to cultural keywords in that abstract nouns are the grammatical structure that allow for words to become cultural keywords.

Abstract words are single words that contain a complex discourse behind them. Words are abstract words because the word formation is open-ended, and functionally-defined. The meaning of an abstract word is not as crystallized as non-abstract words, for example like time. These abstract words are tied to meanings that have a specific purpose; such as schadenfreude.

By having the functions of cultural keywords and abstract words, words like kindness were able to have complex meanings tied to them. Hence, the word kindness had the ability to become an ideologically complex word that was understood by the English community of the late eighteenth-century in that context and meaning. Yet, this understanding also allows for the understanding to change to the understanding kindness has in the modern era.

Historiography: What Came Before

The historiography of kindness is scant. There are only three scholarly works on kindness as a concept; one that deals directly with kindness, one that is more of a general history about the idea of kindness and one that deals with kindness as a peripheral issue. Linda Pollock argues in her article, “Practice of Kindness in Early Modern Elite Society,” that kindness acted as an umbrella concept that took associate attributes of goodwill, material aid and courtesy and made them into a template for social relationships. Jon Mee deals with kindness as a form of sociability which was part of culture of the politeness. Mee analyses Robert Merry’s sociability which walked the line between polite sociability and anarchy, became too extreme for his friends and fellow British society members and led him to flee to the United States. The last work is a book entitled, On Kindness, wherein the authors

---

10 Ibid., 34:9–19.
12 Jon Mee, “‘Reciprocal Expressions of Kindness:’ Robert Merry, Della Cruscanism and the Limits of Sociability,” in Romantic Sensibility: Social Networks and Literary Culture in Britain, 1770-1840 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 103–22.
overviews history for examples of kindness, examines how kindness works within the psychology of the human mind, and how kindness is formulated in the modern world.\textsuperscript{13}

Whilst the social reform activities of the eighteenth century have been studied, these scholarly works have not looked at the interplay of kindness and social reform. There is an agreement in the scholarship that a change regarding philanthropy had occurred in the eighteenth century society. Furthermore, there is an agreement that social reform/philanthropic acts were done with intentions of these being for the public good. Donna Andrews argues that the change being talked about in the scholarship occurred when the existence of doing philanthropic acts altered from church-related charity to secularized societies who committed the philanthropy and reform.\textsuperscript{14} Paul Slack argued that the philanthropic change occurred when acts of philanthropy transformed from charity to improvement.\textsuperscript{15} David Owen argues similarly to Andrews, except that he linked these reforming societies with evangelicalism and talked about how people involved viewed their acts of reform in moral terms.\textsuperscript{16} Joanna Innes argued that social reform was connected intricately to religious moral terms, much as Owen argued, but Innes added that this created a reformation of manners which led to the reforming of every possible social ill for the betterment of society.\textsuperscript{17}

There have been many works that deal with culture of sensibility in its various guises, but none of these scholars have dealt with the link to kindness. One of the seminal books on culture of sensibility as a whole is G.J. Barker-Benfield, \textit{The Culture of Sensibility}, which deals thoroughly with the ideology and social actualization of sensibility, in almost every form and function possible.\textsuperscript{18}

Like kindness, there are other behavioural regulators that have been associated with the culture of sensibility, including politeness and civility. These concepts have scores of

\textsuperscript{13} Adam Phillips and Barbara Taylor, \textit{On Kindness} (Picador, 2010).
\textsuperscript{17} Joanna Innes, \textit{Inferior Politics: Social Problems and Social Policies in Eighteenth-Century Britain} (Oxford University Press, 2009).
\textsuperscript{18} Barker-Benfield, \textit{Culture of Sensibility}.
works examining them. Lawrence Klein wrote a book that has been influential helping defined what politeness is. He tied the ideology of Earl of Shaftesbury to politeness by arguing that Shaftesbury is one of the influential figures in shaping what politeness was. Philip Carter wrote a book which tied together politeness, reformation of manners, and the culture of sensibility, in that the reformation of manners meant that men had to reform their manners, leading to politeness which had been a physical result of the ideas behind the culture of sensibility.

Markku Peltonen wrote about civility and politeness’ influence on duels, in which he argues that the entire reason that duelling was sustained throughout the changes of the eighteenth-century was because of duelling’s ties to civility. Steven Shapin argued that civility influenced science because civility linked the idea of being a gentlemen and scientist; which allowed for new scientific finds to be trusted. Anna Bryson wrote about how courtesy changed into civility, which reflected the changing nature of values about how social and political was linked into everyday behaviour; and the superiority of the civil gentleman.

Scholarly works on the culture of sensibility’s do not alone focus on regulation of social behaviour, but additionally focus on the regulation of the body. Lynda Mugglestone has looked at how a person’s accent indicated who they were and where they were socially in the early modern society; which she argues led evermore to the consolidation of accents. Gail Kern Paster looks at how social and cultural changes affect peoples’ internal and external behaviours, and this phenomena can clearly be seen in shame which is the most physically evident.

---

19 In deference to the overwhelming amount of works, only those which have higher volume of traffic and citations are cited here.
25 Again, only the most cited works.
The historiography of kindness is very limited, especially compared to the historiography of the culture of sensibility and its associates. The intention of this thesis is to address the historiographic gap. Studying kindness will change the knowledge of the theology of the Christian faith by complicating the accepted theology. The historiography of culture of sensibility will be changed to acknowledge that kindness had an important role in modifying and regulating the behaviour of those in society. The knowledge about relationships in eighteenth-century England will change to show the role of kindness in keeping relationships strong and building these relationships. The social world of eighteenth-century England will be changed to accommodate the new information about kindness’ role in the various cultural happenings of the time. The impact of these changes to the historiographies includes readjustment of known knowledge. This readjustment means a new direction in historical studies forthwith.

**Thesis Statement: A Step Forward**

Clergymen and moralists argued that kindness was various good qualities associated with humanity which in turn solidified into a concept that had practical use. As a concept, kindness behaved flexibly which allowed it to have the ability to change according to various spaces and places. This flexibility and changeability would allow for kindness to become prominent because of its usefulness all over society. Despite all the changeability according to spaces and places, kindness had two main characteristics. First, in a Christian context it drew attention to how humans act Christian in accordance with the Christian theology of kindness. Second, in a social context it centred attention on regulating behaviour and hierarchy of people. One of the situations in which kindness was used occurred in the performance of social reformation by the elite and upper-middle class reformers.

### 2. Law of Kindness: Kindness and Religion

In the annals of literature that includes kindness from the late eighteenth-century, there is an entire category that can be associated with religion. This is not surprising considering that the moralists believed that their nation and its peoples were becoming morally corrupt. Faced with the question of where does one start fixing a morally corrupt nation, these people turned to religion and its associated concepts. Religion tied intimately into everyday life and was a perfect place to begin to change the character of the nation. As such clergymen who had the stage every Sunday morning, and many other days of the week, addressed their congregants, which included many of the English populace. Other Christians who did not have the pulpit
had the ability to gain the stage through publications meant for public consumption, for example, Hannah More and the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. *Upon High: God’s Characteristics of Kindness*

Upon the pulpit, the clergymen would preach at length about how God’s kindness enjoined upon the religion they all professed belief in. These clergymen and religious writers focused upon kindness because they wanted religious kindness to influence Christianity. The basic underpinning of this theology about Christian kindness is the argument that kindness is divinely ordained. With kindness being divinely ordained, clergymen/writers like Jonas Hanway preached in his religious tract, *Virtue in Humble Life*: “such is the kindness of heaven, in that which is withheld, as well as in that which is bestowed.”\(^{28}\) Having kindness associated with Christianity gave it a way to be associated with all that is good and desirable, especially since Christianity played an important role in an early modern person’s everyday life, be that through listening to sermonizing on kindness in church or in various events encountered on a day to day basis.

With kindness as being divinely ordained, the personhood of God, himself would have had kindness. For God, occupied a place where his personality’s characteristics was weighed heavily and taken with the utmost sincerity by the human population. This sentiment about God’s kindness was expressed by men like Jonas Hanway who wrote commenting that “such a person was most likely to maintain true religion, and to rule with righteousness, gentleness, and kindness to his subjects.”\(^{29}\) Sentences like this bolstered the idea that these clergymen wanted kindness to occupy part of God’s character which is at odds with the previous formulation of God’s personality as cruel, jealous and authoritarian. Theologians wanted Christian reaction to God’s kindness to be for example: “[considered] the loving kindness of the Lord.”\(^{30}\) In this way, Christians reconciled God’s kindness being shown to them with the idea of kindness being a positive and welcome trait. As shown, God’s position over Christians

---


\(^{29}\) John Wesley, “Explanatory Notes upon the Old Testament. By John Wesley, M.A. Late Fellow of Lincoln-College, Oxford...” (Bristol, 1765), 638, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

as a ruler came with expectations; thus God having kindness meant that this sentiment was considered part of the characteristics of God’s personality. Christians then, during Sunday and weekday services, were capable of hoping that God’s kindness would visit them and become a part of their faithful worship. Furthermore, these Christians were able to hope that once they left the church, God’s kindness would follow them.

Despite kindness being argued as a part of God, these clergymen and writers felt the need to justify why God had kindness. These clergymen could have felt that their congregation needed to know why God showed kindness, in order for their congregation to fully appreciate what God had done and will be doing for them. The reason that God had kindness was that God had a moral superiority over humanity. Christopher Wyvill argued in a sermon to his congregation that “God will certainly treat all his creatures with lenity and kindness as far as may consist with the rules of his Moral Government of the Universe.”31 Clergymen argued that kindness was a part of the morals of God, and thence, part of Christianity.

With God’s kindness being argued as an integral part of the concept of kindness within Christianity, these religious writers and/or clergymen focused on what exactly God’s kindness included. One of the major characteristics of God’s kindness was the aspect of his kindness being steadfast. Steadfastness had many variations. At the most basic, these clergymen argued that God’s kindness was always there throughout everyone’s lives. Andrew Kippis wrote in a sermon of “the kindness of the Supreme Being, in feeding us all long unto this day….”32 Philip Doddridge explained in epistolary conversations with a fellow clergyman that “our gracious God vouchsafes to give you such manifestations of his favour and loving kindness.”33 God’s kindness’ steadfastness was seen as towards everyone, as Andrew Kippis preached in a sermon delivered at a Presbyterian meetinghouse; “Hath he not shewn his condescension, kindness, and impartiality towards them, in the whole of the Christian dispensation?”34

---


33 Philip Doddridge and Thomas Stedman, “Letters to and from the Rev. Philip Doddridge, D.D. Late of Northampton: Published from the Originals: With Notes Explanatory and Biographical. By Thomas Stedman, M.A. Vicar of St. Chard’s Shrewsbury” (Shrewsbury, 1790), 228, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

Inside of Christianity, steadfastness to Christians meant those who were sinners or unworthy could hope to receive God’s merciful kindness. With most Christians often being contended as unworthy at this time by men like Granville Sharp who wrote in a tract about a freedmen’s settlement in Africa: “Almighty God...we thine unworthy servants do give thee most humble and hearty thanks for all thy goodness and kindness to us and to all men.” With men and women like Sharp arguing that Christians were not worthy of God’s kindness, it is understandable that such people focused on hope for mercy, as can be seen later in this chapter. Moralists like Sarah Trimmer wrote in tracts aimed at household religious education: “Did our Lord’s kindness melt Judas?” Which showed that for these moralists and clergymen someone could be committing the worst sins, yet God would still behave with steadfastness towards man for he would “continue[s] his marvellous loving kindness to us.” With this steadfast kindness, Christians were able to hope that God would show them kindness. Additionally, Christians were able to know without question where the kindness they were experiencing came from ultimately.

Other aspects of the characteristics of God’s kindness included that his kindness is a loving kindness. This refrain of loving kindness has been repeatedly used by proponents throughout the various works showing that God’s loving kindness was one of the defining characteristic of God’s kindness. By having a loving kindness, God’s actions, even those unpopular among humanity, were made softer, more palatable because God knew what actions are best for humanity. With humanity receiving loving kindness making the interaction between humans and God easier, these clergymen argued that humanity begged for a continuance of his loving kindness. For example in Philip Doddridge’s religious educational tract he wrote: “have mercy, therefore, upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness...” Loving kindness made the acceptance of God’s kindness easier to bear, but also, made God as an entity better received by his subjects. Loving kindness allowed for the steadfastness of kindness to occur.

35 Granville Sharp, “A Short Sketch of Temporary Regulations (until Better Shall Be Proposed) for the Intended Settlement on the Grain Coast of Africa, near Sierra Leona” (London, 1786), 174, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
36 Sarah Trimmer, “A Scripture Catechism. Part II. Containing a Familiar Explanation of the Lessons Selected from the Writings of the Four Evangelists. For the Use of Schools and Families. By Mrs. Trimmer” (London, 1797), 188, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
38 Philip Doddridge, “The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul Illustrated in a Course of Serious and Practical Addresses, Suited to Persons of Every Character and Circumstance, with a Devout Meditation and Prayer Added to Each Chapter. To Which Is Subjoined, a Sermon, on the Care of the Soul” (Exeter, 1794), 90, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
These clergymen wove steadfast and loving kindness together allowing for one to do the other. God showed his loving kindness not just to humans but to also all creatures, as shown by Philip Doddridge in his question: “and were not they the finite effects of his infinite love and kindness?” Steadfast and loving kindness to all from God, laid the foundation for clergymen to argue that Christians should show kindness to all, as will be shown later. The importance generated from God showing his loving kindness steadfastly lay in that it showed all Christians that they had no excuse for not doing kindness to everyone and everything.

One of God’s other characteristics of kindness is that his kindness created salvation for Christians and all of humanity as written by Jonas Hanway: “who redeemeth thy life from destruction, and crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies.”

God’s salvation and Jesus’ act of salvation showed differently, as examined later in this thesis. God’s salvation occurred through his teaching humans how to show kindness and make lives better.

Another aspect that clergymen used to help create God’s kindness as a cornerstone of Christianity through his kindness being full of the fruit of spirit. Fruit of spirit can be defined in various ways including this description written by Granville Sharp: “love, joy, peace, long suffering (or forbearance), ‘gentleness,’ (or rather kindness), goodness, meekness, temperance against such there is no law.” Fruit of spirit overall is a term used for an assemblage of desired/good qualities, which is found in God, because he had the moral superiority. This characteristic of fruit of spirit highlights that kindness was associated with good qualities or behaviour, and shows how these clergymen built good qualities into the basicness of kindness.

These clergymen were able to imbue God with all of these good qualities because they argued that God himself knew what was best for humanity. Therefore, taking this sentiment and imbuing God with all the good qualities that are wanted to and from humanity is logical. The fruit of spirit of God were filled with many different associated concepts, like those already mentioned, but also others like: “the goodness, mercy and kindness of God.” Good qualities were the defining aspect of God’s kindness, for Christians felt a need to have these

41 Sharp, “A Short Sketch of Temporary Regulations,” 181.
aspects in a benevolent overlord. Also, God’s kindness needed these characteristics in order for the clergymen to argue that Christianity and God knew is best for Christians.

Fruit of spirit is more than the collection of good qualities. It furthermore included how these good qualities were used to perform deeds of kindness to humanity’s response or need. These clergymen by associating an assemblage of good behaviours with both God and the concept of kindness both were entangled within the association of what is good. Which meant that these behaviours were wanted by Christians and society as acceptable, desired for and better for society. Good meant society would hum along pleasantly and happily, as Jonas Hanway wrote: “the people are augmented in great number, and we seem to be invited by the kindness of providence to be a great and happy nation.” The adverse qualities or behaviour meant the breakdown of society and ultimate unhappiness because fruit of spirit “were acts of kindness and compassion as well as of power;” and in this vein the fruit of the spirit would help combat base qualities and breakdown of society.

Christian investment into God’s good qualities, and his fruit of spirit, can be seen in sentences written by Andrew Kippis, such as: “many other circumstances which shew the kindness of our Maker” and sentences written by William Wilberforce such as: “how we delight to tell of his kindness.” In essence, these two sentences showcased the feeling contained by these Christian clergymen that kindness’ spiritual fruit let Christians live lives that were full of good things, many of which they were already accustomed and blessed with.

The fruit of spirit is why God had steadfastness and loving kindness. In that, God continued to steadfastly behave with loving kindness because his fruit of spirit gave him the capabilities to do so. Without qualities as mercy or temperance, God would not have had the capabilities within himself. That is why these clergymen preached that these qualities must be retained by humanity and projected back. Allowing for humanity to “discover the kindness of providence” through living with kindness and other good qualities. The best way to learn and appreciate is to experience it.

These clergymen argued that God’s kindness was an integral part of Christianity. Since God acted as salvation and saviour, God’s kindness was viewed as the life-force behind all things good that happened to and from humanity. Andrew Kippis preached to his

44 Trimmer, “A Scripture Catechism,” 49.
congregation in a sermon: “allured by kindness…by the love of…by the mercies of… what hath been done for the salvation and happiness of the sinful children…”48 Or John Fothergill who wrote in an account of his religious works: “kindness from a tender Father has often reached towards them for their good…”49 For these clergymen God’s good things included what was otherwise might not be regarded as good: “but to make their followers regard the evils of life as blessings and rejoice in them as testimonies of the parental kindness of God.”50 These clergymen by intertwining goodness, kindness and God together argued that these qualities were the moving force behind all the good things that happened to humanity.

God’s kindness was an integral part of Christianity and of being Christian. For his kindness was a steadfast loving kindness full of fruit of spirit allowing for creation of everything good. Throughout these clergymen’s discussion of God’s kindness, small clues about the interaction of his kindness with humans can be seen. Yet, the interaction of humans and God’s kindness is complex and deserves as a discussion solely focused upon it.

To these clergymen, God was the creator of earth and humanity therefore, had morality leading to kindness. These clergymen further argued that God was the creator of kindness in humanity because humanity fell under God’s judgement and rule, and in his universe kindness abounded. Therefore, God showed humanity kindness as a result of being part of his universe. More importantly these clergymen argued that since God knew the best for humanity, he knew what his creations needed therefore gave the capability to show kindness. This led to Christianity being imbued with expectations of the faithful congregants showing kindness. Down from the pulpit came such admonitions from clergymen as what Thomas Clarkson wrote in ‘A Familiar Survey of the Christian Religion’: “any act of kindness shall be rendered…to the lowliest of his followers, from a spirit of Christian charity.”51 Kindness, these clergymen argued, had become intertwined with being a Christian and Christianity itself.

These clergymen and writers employed God as an example to teach about Christian kindness. An example could be found written by John Disney: “but God may permit in very kindness to us, and for our own benefit, either to chastise us for some faults…and to mortify

49 John Fothergill, “An Account of the Life and Travels in the Work of the Ministry, of John Fothergill. To Which Are Added, Divers Epistles to Friends in Great Britain and America, on Various Occasion” (London, 1773), 71, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
These clergymen by using kindness as teaching tool furthermore entwined the concept of kindness with the figure of God leading to kindness becoming coupled more so with religion. Aside from this, the English congregants were raised in an environment where they were taught that they must abide by the lessons taught through Christianity; therefore, these clergymen using God and Christianity to teach the precepts of kindness was logical.

These clergymen argued that those Christians who obeyed the dictates and behaved with kindness as part of their religion could hope to be shown merciful kindness from God. Further, these clergymen argued that if these Christians they step away from God and kindness, God’s kindness was removed. These clergymen argued that kindness was interlocked with Christianity and what it is to be Christian.

Christians hoped God would show kindness to them when they themselves did acts of kindness. An example of which could be found in a sermon by Andrew Kippis: “We cannot pray at all, in any rational signification of the word, without declaring our dependence on the Almighty for the benefits we expect, and our hope in his kindness” Or as Sarah Trimmer wrote in a religious educational book: “Thy kindness call’d us to life.” God doing kindness to Christians, had many declarations of by different authors in different decades; all which show the alluring popularity of these sentiments to people.

For certain clergymen, kindness gave Christianity a unique approach to achieve Christian conversions of non-Christians. As Jonas Hanway argued in a sermon about religion everyday: “What, when he invites ye to come, with all the kindness of a friend, the compassion of a father, and the mercies of your Saviour and your God?” Or more, evocatively written by Sarah Trimmer in a tract: “As our Lord shewed such kindness to them, what have we reason to think he will do in respect to those who are brought to be baptized?” Preaching to convert non-Christians saved souls of non-Christians who were promised abundant gifts from God which was shown through kindness. Clergymen argued that for the purposes of conversion, these promises made it harder for the audience to walk away as not converted.

For these clergymen, one of the primary duties of Christians in regards to God’s kindness is the duty of accepting God’s kindness in a proper manner, as John Wesley wrote: “doth not kindness melt you?”\textsuperscript{57} Furthermore, Christians were to love God’s kindness, as explored by John Wesley: “man we for his kindness love.”\textsuperscript{58} Receiving the acts of God’s kindness allowed for Christians to be able to properly react to God’s kindness.

With God showing kindness steadfastly to all, clergymen such as Kippis maintained that God deserved to be acknowledged by humans: “abundant in expressing their acknowledgement to their Maker for the care he hath taken of them, and the kindness he hath shewn to them.”\textsuperscript{59} These clergymen and others additionally maintained that along with acknowledgement, God should be worshipped as well. As Sarah Trimmer wrote in a prayer book: “…into his courts with praise, or to attend public worship…”\textsuperscript{60} These clergymen argued that worshipping and acknowledging God for his overflowing gifts to Christians was part of the bedrock of why Christians went to church and obeyed God’s dictates. Therefore, a reason why people felt obliged to return kindness reinforcing the reciprocity and obligatory nature of kindness.

Worshipping and acknowledging were not the only way to thank God for his kindness towards Christians. These clergymen further argued that God’s kindness encouraged steadfastness in humans by showing kindness in a similar manner. Hence, God’s dictates that Christians show kindness as Sarah Trimmer wrote in sentences such as: “continual kindness which God shews to his faithful servants, and ought to encourage us to keep steadfast in the ways which are pleasing in his sight.”\textsuperscript{61} This Christian behaviour can include effusive offerings of kindness to both Christians and non-Christians, as Sarah Trimmer argued in this sentence: “he will extend his goodness to all mankind, by making his gospel known in all nations.”\textsuperscript{62} These clergymen argued that kindness is the best repayment of kindness of God, and, continued the cycle of reciprocity and obligation regulating behaviour.

\textsuperscript{58} John Wesley, “A Collection of Hymns, for the Use of the People Called Methodists. By the Rev. John Wesley, A.M. Late Fellow of Lincoln-College, Oxford” (London, 1795), 226, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
\textsuperscript{61} Sarah Trimmer, “Sacred History Selected from the Scriptures, with Annotations and Reflections, Suited to the Comprehension of Young minds...By Mrs. Trimmer...” (London, 1785 1782), 93, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
God’s kindness and interaction with humans argued by these clergymen is not comprehensive of everything. These clergymen also argued that were cases where God and his kindness were not present. As William Wilberforce wrote in his religious tract about the failings of Christians: “we are plainly forewarned…that God will not hold them guiltless who are thus unmindful of his most signal acts of condescension and kindness.” Andrew Kippis acknowledged that God and his kindness could not solve everything: “It proceeds not, O Lord, from a faulty distrust of thy gracious mercy and kindness in their usual channels, that I have recourse to extraordinary methods.” In this way, these ministers showed that the failings of kindness would inevitably happen allowing for when such instances did happen in reality.

These clergymen argued that the complex relationship between Christians and God included God showing kindness by allowing humans to live, be happy and successful. Therefore, Christians must hope to be worthy through properly acknowledging God’s kindness by showing kindness. This leads to what these clergymen argued that God and Christians were interlocked in a relationship that renewed through reciprocity and obligation. This cyclical relationship between God and humanity is the forewarning of how humans were supposed to enact and show kindness with each other.

The moralists tried to show God’s kindness as integral to Christianity. God’s key characteristics of kindness included being steadfast, loving, and full of fruit of spirit. This kindness of God led to regulation of behaviour and created all things good. The way God did his merciful kindness and the way Christians were supposed to receive and reciprocate this hoped for kindness became a key example for how Christians were supposed to both show kindness and receive kindness with each other. This example, furthermore, was hoped to be followed. God’s characteristics was an important base to build the rest of the definition of what kindness consisted of and the basis for Law of Kindness to be built upon. He Giveth Us: Jesus’ Sacrifice

Just like God the father, Jesus was imbued with kindness and its specific characteristics. Yet, each person of God had their own particular roles. In Jesus’ case, part of his kindness was tied inextricably with his sacrifice for humanity. Just like God the father, Jesus was permeated with kindness that supported the rest of Christian theology.

63 Wilberforce, “A Practical View,” 133.
64 Andrew Kippis, “The Library; Or, Moral and Critical Magazine, for the year...By a Society of Gentlemen” (London, 1762 1761), 94. Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
In Christian theology of the time, Jesus’ sacrifice produced the foundation for human salvation. Therefore, as the proponents of kindness would argue, Jesus died as a kindness for humanity. God the father indulged in kindness towards humanity; it would be equally expected that Jesus would show kindness towards humanity. An example of this viewpoint could be found in a works written by Jonas Hanway: “if floods of penitential sorrow do not stream from his eye…in remembrance of the transcendent proof of Christ’s inexpressible mercy and loving kindness…” Jesus’ actions of kindness created a never-ending relationship between himself and Christianity. These clergymen argued that Christians had an obligation to reciprocate and appreciate Jesus’ acts of kindness. Consequently, Christians were tied, henceforth to Christianity, through kindness. Thence, Jesus’ kindness and humanity’s response added to the regulation of Christians in their practice of faith and daily exertions.

These clergymen preached that Jesus’ noteworthy kindness occurred for several reasons, including that Jesus had the moral finesse to do the right actions, namely that of sacrifice. William Wilberforce argued for “the excellence of our Savior’s moral precepts, the kindness…in the hour of death…” These theologians argued that God knew within himself the desirability of good behaviour. Therefore, these theologians argued that God the father would give Jesus the trait of moral superiority within himself. Hence, when Jesus was on earth, he behaved accordingly. As God’s messenger upon earth, Jesus would be the best example of doing the precepts that God wished. Especially since among the many responsibilities God gave Jesus included that of teaching Christians kindness.

An example of Jesus teaching humanity kindness can be found in the work of Jonas Hanway: “loving kindness and compassion…shews by his painful and ignominious death, to learn from this great event…” In this way, Jesus’ sacrifice as a kindness gained another aspect. For these clergymen argued that Jesus’ sacrifice was another act of kindness. Jesus did a kindness to humanity through using his death to teach humanity about Christianity and salvation. Jesus wanted to teach Christians that showing kindness was a Christian act, for several reasons including that kindness was associated with good qualities of behaviour, which could combat the forces of Satan. A good example of this can be found in the work of John Jebb: “and to subdue the hostile spirit of the injurious person, by accumulated acts of

undeserved kindness.” With kindness being tied indissolubly to the ultimate act of goodness by these theologians, therefore, kindness was included in the battle against the dark forces of Satan and darkness.

Lastly these theologians argued that Jesus did his kindness of sacrifice because he loved humanity. As Andrew Kippis wrote in a sermon to schoolchildren: “…his heart burned with the same flame of kindness, generosity and compassion which afterwards broke out with such astonishing ardour.” This love of humanity is a recurring theme throughout the bible. Kindness was infused with love as a result. In this instance, love motivated sacrifice which resulted in doing humanity a kindness. Hence, Jesus’ biggest act was viewed as a loving kindness.

Furthermore, these theologians also argued that Jesus’ other teachings included the works he did upon the earth. As Thomas Gisborne wrote in ‘A Familiar Survey of the Christian Religion’: “during his abode upon earth, he was continually occupied in works of kindness and compassion.” Jesus’ continual kindness to humanity had not been limited to virtuous people but extended to sinners as well, as Sarah Trimmer wrote in ‘A Scripture Catechism’: “the kindness of our Saviour to the penitent thief encourages sinners to call upon Christ, in their last moments, if their penitence be sincere.” Jesus’ other non-sacrificial acts of kindness continued after his death, when he became like God the father and continued his actions from heaven. An example could be found in a sentence written by Sarah Trimmer: “though our Saviour is no longer on earth, there is no reason to think his kindness for children is lessened…” Jesus, by committing acts of kindness both grand --- sacrifice--- and small ---the everyday—he taught humans that no act would be too small or too large. Additionally, He showed that kindness should not be restricted to certain acts, places, or sizes but instead done everywhere.

As with God the father, these clergymen discussed Jesus’ acts of kindness and the proper response Christians should have towards Jesus for his kindness. One way to respond, these clergymen argued, included the appreciation of what Jesus had done for humanity. In an
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example written by William Wilberforce in his religious tract: “the kindness and humanity and self-denial and patience in suffering…had been exerted towards ourselves…endured for our deliverance?”

Another Christian response to Jesus’ various forms of kindness, as argued by these clergymen, was that Christians should be devoted to Jesus and Christianity, or as Philip Doddridge said: “…the apostle John, for whom our Lord had a particular kindness,… said to him, Lord who is he that will betray thee?”

Jesus’ actions were from knowing the best for humanity, like that of God the father. Therefore, it was viewed that Jesus’ actions were deserving of Christian’s love and appreciation. Hence, humanity giving devotion, worship and acknowledgement of Jesus and God was expected.

These clergymen argued that Jesus’ most important acclamation of kindness was his sacrifice of his own life for the salvation of humanity. This action of sacrifice done by Jesus tied Christians to Christianity and showing kindness themselves. These clergymen argued that Jesus furthermore did kindness outside his act of sacrifice when he visited earth and in heaven. Hence, Jesus used kindness both on a large and on a small scale to teach Christians that kindness must be shown in all sort of circumstances with all sort of different sizes of kindness. Thereby these clergymen were able to argue that Jesus’ kindness created a relationship of obligation and reciprocity on the part of Christians.

Preached: Doctrine of Faith

For these clergymen, Christian doctrine had to fundamentally include the idea of kindness in order for kindness to be infused with ideology of God the father and Jesus the son. Without a doubt, God and Jesus’ characteristics of kindness were important to the Christian doctrine of kindness, but let’s look at how that could come to be. The bible began as a starting place throughout Christianity’s theological history, and it is not a different story in the case of kindness. Clergymen, writers and theologians of the eighteenth century who were proponents of kindness found plenty of evidence throughout the Old and New Testaments to argue for the fundamental validity of kindness in Christianity.

The use of kindness throughout the bible is varied and complex as the types of kindness. The rehashing by theologians of the idea that all people receive kindness occurs because this is where the idea is fundamentally shown. Many different groups of people in the bible appealed to God’s merciful kindness, including servants: “and he said, O Lord God…I

pray thee send me good speed this day, and shew kindness unto my master…”’75 Other groups of people who received kindness included sinners: “Our Lord’s presenting Judas with a sop was an act of kindness and friendship but he was not disposed to receive it as such.”76 Additionally, Jesus visited everyone no matter the situation, such as whether they be in jail: “confined in a doleful prison, which must have been very uncomfortable, notwithstanding the kindness of the keeper.”77 By avowing God will visit all, these preachers tried to ensure that their congregations would not wander away from the church if they were sinners or in a bad situation because they could hope that God would still show kindness. Theologians argued that kindness was a lure to Christianity. Additionally, by showing that God visits and uses his kindness towards all, Christians could hope for God to show his merciful kindness to them personally.

These clergymen used biblical examples of how to respond to the kindness of God the father and Jesus. By using the bible as examples, these clergymen were able to strengthen the argument that kindness is part of Christianity indelibly. In the bible, Jesus and God the father’s kindness must be acknowledged, for example: “and thereby shall I know that thou hast the kindness unto my master.”78 For these clergymen, the bible showed what is acceptable behaviour of Christians after receiving heavenly kindness, such as being filled with gratitude. For example Sarah Trimmer wrote in ‘A Companion to the Book of Common Prayer’: “the victories he obtained for them, and the ill returns they made for his loving kindness…learn to trust in his goodness and power, to be thankful…proofs of our gratitude.”79 Furthermore, Clergymen were exhorted to look to the bible for examples of how to behave with kindness. Sarah Trimmer wrote in a tract about a prayer: “…enabling them [clergymen] to follow the example of…in all humility, patience, diligence, and kindness—”80 Disciples were noteworthy examples, in the bible, of how to follow heavenly kindness, with instances such as: “in the name of Jesus…arise and walk…was proper enough for him to use an action…[or] token of kindness.”81

These clergymen by teaching their congregants the expectations of kindness using the bible were able to set in motion the arguments of obligatory and reciprocal nature of kindness.
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Hereby, teaching and ensuring that when congregations went to their daily lives, they would take the knowledge that doing kindness created an obligatory and reciprocal relationship between parties. The congregants knew that kindness and obeying the dictates of kindness was expected because the foundation of their religion encouraged them to believe that.

The acts of Jesus and God the father’s kindness were not the only examples found in the bible, for people also showed kindness and unkindness to each other. Some examples exhibited the usage of both kindness and unkindness. According to Trimmer:

“At first you find Laban treated him with great kindness, but when Jacob expected to receive the reward of his industry and fidelity, he imposed upon him and insisted upon marrying his elder daughter, and so secured his services for seven years longer…”

Examples of unkindness included, for example: “…when one of their own nation collected it [taxes], the Jews…would not shew such a one the least brotherly kindness.”

The clergymen through showing Godly men and women in the bible who showed kindness hoped that humanity would find a connection to themselves creating inspiration. Furthermore, these clergymen used the bible as an example of what was acceptable and what was unacceptable from humanity. More importantly, by showing humans within the bible, the clergymen were able to argue that if they could do it, why not their human congregants?

Aside from the clergymen using humans in bible as a microcosm example of humanity, the bible also provided a beginning place for the theology peddled to Christians about kindness. The bible gave clergymen evidence to underline their arguments to their congregation about what their own behaviour was to be modelled after; or, in other words, how to be a good Christian.

These clergymen used the various theological arguments to argue for an overall concept of the Law of Kindness. Those who preached the virtues of the Law of Kindness, argued that this law was viewed as part of Christianity because it came from the bible. An example written by Sarah Trimmer argued: “the Law of Kindness [was] brought to Light by the Gospel.” With having the Law of Kindness come from the bible, there came an immutable theology that the congregation was ensured to follow, as they followed everything else theologically part of Christianity.

A question that arises from looking at the Law of Kindness is what exactly is the Law of Kindness? Kindness, as shown earlier, was defined by these clergymen in the late
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eighteenth century as actions found from goodness of character creating good qualities, situations and interactions. As shown earlier, God had kindness in himself and he showed his kindness to all humans and creatures helping create Christianity and humanity. From this beginning, God’s followers, his Christians, were expected as part of being Christian to show kindness, themselves. This culminated in the formation of the Law of Kindness. Christians were expected to show kindness to every person and creature on earth, like how God does kindness to every creature, hence Law of Kindness.

By adhering to the Law of Kindness, the clergymen promised that society would be bettered. John Wesley argued in a sermon that kindness helped control behaviour of people through for example, curbing the tongue away from lies or creation of strife.\(^\text{85}\) These strategies that these clergymen employed were used to keep their Christian congregants in adherence with Christianity. Kindness promised a world that would be better, and, promised interactions that were affable, which was the ultimate lure of kindness. Hence, the dictates to follow the Law of Kindness.

Law of Kindness is not the only theological expectation about kindness that is preached repeatedly by the proponents of Christian kindness to their Christian congregations. There are other theological ideas about kindness that clergymen incessantly preached, which could be called Christian Principles. When discussing God the father and Jesus’ kindness and the previous theological aspects, the discussion has so far been shown mostly separate from each other. This discussion about the various theologies needs to be coalesced into overarching theory.

One of the first Christian Principles argued by these clergymen was that of kindness being inherent in mankind. God gave humanity inherent kindness with the desire for humans to show kindness. These clergymen further argued that kindness was given to humanity in order for people to use it against original sin which all humanity inherited. Kindness helped people to create a better society and thereby showing their worthiness to a merciful God. For example Richard Price wrote about God’s desiring kindness in humanity: “…[to] see its genuine effects among mankind, we should see nothing but peace and hope and justice and kindness…[and] regard to God and his will…”\(^\text{86}\) These clergymen further argued that kindness was a part of Christian souls. An example by Andrew Kippis argues that “…in a

---

\(^{85}\) John Wesley, “Scriptural Christianity. A Sermon Preached August 24, 1744, at St. Mary’s Church in Oxford, before the University” (London, 1797), 16, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

soul that is raised above distress, in the harmony and kindness of our affections…”⁸⁷ Or that kindness was a part of humanity’s hearts as Jonas Hanway wrote: “and when the heart is cheered…courting the kindness…”⁸⁸

These clergymen argued Christians wanted kindness done to each other as well, as Sarah Trimmer wrote: “every person, for instance, likes to be treated with kindness, civility, and truth.”⁸⁹ Like doing charity and saving children from horrible existence. For example, John Wesley wrote in a tract about children that an adult could take in a beggar-child from the streets: “he [beggar-child] was very thankful to his master, and very sensible of his great kindness, in taking him out of the streets, when he was begging.”⁹⁰ But in contrast the clergymen also decided who should expect kindness, which can be found in an example written by Sarah Trimmer who argued that kindness should be shown to the deserving: “from a sincere desire to promote honour…resolution to extend their kindness and charity to none who will not attend Public Worship.”⁹¹ Though this may seem counter-intuitive, since it was clergymen and others who were proponents of mainstreaming kindness, therefore they would decide who deserved kindness. People wanted kindness, therefore they must deserve kindness. In order deserve kindness, people had to follow the dictates of what it meant to deserve kindness; observing dictates of Christianity, showing kindness, and, the proper response to kindness. Hence, regulation of behaviour of people occurred.

Other Christian principles argued by these clergymen included positive actions and feelings that emerged, created or related intimately with kindness. These associated principles, included feelings such as love, which could take various forms. An example can be found in Thomas Gisborne’s work: “the Christian principles of love and forbearance and kindness…”⁹² or in Philip Doddridge’s works: “and to this brotherly kindness, love”⁹³ Other principle feelings included that of brotherly-ness, an example of which can be found in John
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Disney’s work: “and to brotherly kindness charity.”

These Christian principles were interconnecting, which gives an idea of the fluidity of the concept of kindness and all of its associated good qualities.

Kindness’ fluidity allowed for all types of different people to be able to tailor kindness to suit their personalities or preferences. Likewise, for the moralists to change how kindness is shown to suit certain situations, as will be shown later in this thesis. In this way, by having kindness associated with good qualities and fluidity clergymen were able to assure people that the concept of kindness should be avowed. These Christian principles tied into theology of kindness where it started in the bible and the Law of Kindness where it deepened understanding.

Since kindness at its root was tied by clergymen to various qualities of goodness, kindness would be opposite to those qualities that are not desired. As John Wesley wrote in a religious epistolary to another clergyman:

“kindness, tender-heartedness…opposite to bitterness, wrath, anger, clamour, evil-speaking…in all righteousness, rendering unto all their dues, opposite to stealing…and in all truth veracity, sincerity, opposite to lying…”

For clergymen kindness was also the opposite of cruelty, as Jonas Hanway’s states:

“kindness and cruelty, like light and darkness, are set one against the other” And: “if we mean to shoot the evil as it rises, we must pay our offerings at the shrine of our great parent the Earth, as the instrument of the kindness of heaven.”

Kindness was associated in a more concrete way with all things good, by the very fact that these theologians and clergymen positioned the concept, like God the father, opposite to evil. By having God the father and kindness, as opposite to evil, these clergymen were essentially showing their Christian followers which behaviours were helpful to being a Christian. Christians were taught by these clergymen that by personally participating in showing kindness they were able to join in the fight against evil. Hence, by showing kindness, Christians were able to consider themselves better people and society.

---
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Whilst, for these clergymen kindness was opposite to everything debauched, this did not mean that kindness could always defeat those qualities or Satan. Of course, Satan did not always directly engage in the pursuit of defeating kindness. Rather, Satan could also have used human themselves to defeat the kindness of their own and of God’s. Philip Doddridge’s example shows that it could be anyone: “and the cruel kindness of friends and physicians, as if they were in league with Satan to make the destruction of your soul…”98 In this vein, it is not only others who defeat kindness through unkindness, but comparably themselves through committing sins, as John Wesley wrote: “and of his kindness and faithfulness to his people, which was eclipsed by thy wickedness.”99 The solution that these clergymen and moralists created was telling their followers to not let unkind thought and actions into their heart: “do not therefor suffer any dictate or unkindness, no, not any, shyness or coldness in your heart.”100 This is another instance in which, kindness is tied closer with Christianity with its association with good qualities and beings like God the father.

These clergymen and religious writers acknowledged that acts of kindness could be defeated, and, they acknowledged that humans were far from perfect and were bound to make mistakes and commit sins. That led to questions like that of Sarah Trimmer: “what should you do to deserve their kindness?”101 Questions about deserving kindness, led these clergymen to make statements about how Christians should consider if they were unworthy of said kindness. Like the question asked by Jonas Hanway: “will you plead unworthiness, when he invites you, in the tenderness of his friendship…the kindness of his compassion…?”102 Knowing that Christians are human, these clergymen accommodated the fact that eventually everyone will sin. By acknowledging that, and arguing to their congregants that they must avoid sin in order to deserve kindness, because sin will negate any kindness shown, the clergymen were using kindness as a tool to keep their congregants from sinning. Furthermore, doing Satan’s work meant defeat of kindness, hence showing kindness meant fighting Satan and being a warrior of God.

For these clergymen, Christians having the ability to defeat kindness, was a partial answer to the existence of sins and dark forces, but was useless unless Christians could respond. Response could occur in the Christians who have been given the ability to show and

100 John Wesley, “The Lord Our Righteousness. A Sermon Preached at the Chapel in West-Street, Seven-Dials, on Sunday, Nov. 24, 1765” (London, 1766), 35, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
101 Sarah Trimmer, “The Sunday-School Catechist; Consisting of Familiar Lectures, with Questions, for the Use of Visitors [Sic] and Teachers. By Mrs. Trimmer” (London, 1788), 4, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
deserve kindness, and therefore clergymen provided a template for how to show kindness and be a Christian. From the pulpit and in the religious writings of these proponents a discussion grew up about what a Christian should look like when they were showing kindness. As has been previously discussed, part of being Christian is to have God want his people to show kindness, and therefore these theologians invented the Law of Kindness. Despite this, there has been limited discussion on what exactly was Christian kindness as argued by these proponents.

First, Christian kindness meant being full of kindness towards others. There is the expectation of being filled with and showing kindness towards other Christians, as Andrew Kippis had wrote in a religious tract about the New Testament: “have I such a regard to all Christians, that I wish to behave towards them, with that candour, harmony and kindness…”103 Showing kindness meant that Christians in their hearts held the traits associated with kindness, which influenced the character of kindness.

Second, was the expectation that Christians showed kindness towards all other human beings on the planet. As Sarah Trimmer wrote: “We must remember that every human creature to whom we have opportunities of shewing kindness and compassion is to be considered our neighbour.”104 As God did kindness to all, his Christian followers should show kindness to all including non-Christians. One of the basic reasons that kindness should be shown to non-Christians is as a conversion tool. As Sarah Trimmer had written: “instead of bearing personal enmity against any for differing in articles of faith, we should treat them, on all occasions, with kindness and humanity, and earnestly beseech God to bring them into the way of truth…”105 God initially gained followers by using kindness to draw in non-Christians to Christianity, hence, his continual stream of Christians. Christians should also show kindness towards those who were not socially desirable or who were on the bottom of the social hierarchy; as Sarah Trimmer wrote: “by our Lord’s benevolence to the Samaritan lepers, we are instructed to be kind to strangers, and not to confine our kindness to relations, friends, and acquaintances.”106 In this instance, kindness was tied by these clergymen to another important Christian duty; that of caring for those in need. Kindness helped with this Christian duty and others.
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Third, Christian kindness meant feeling emotions that contained good qualities. One of the good emotional qualities that kindness provoked was gratitude, especially to God the father. As Thomas Gisborne argued, Christians must be aware that a part of their duties was the maintaining of kindness because it came from God’s redeeming and merciful love which therefore caused gratitude. Another good emotional quality linked to kindness was that of mercy. Jonas Hanway argued in an essay on religion that the precepts of kindness allowed for man to be merciful. A further good quality adduced would be love: “I am sensible that without kindness and compassion towards my own kind, it is impossible for me to express my love for God.” These associated good qualities, are like God the father having the fruit of the spirit. As previously discussed, good qualities helped maintain ease in society. The clergymen by having other good qualities associated with kindness, kindness was evermore entwined with the idea of goodness. The qualities of good virtues were interdependent and had no way of splitting apart.

Fourthly, Christian kindness had a deeply reciprocal nature. Kindness was supposed to operate as an ideology that creates and responds to kindness. Every Christian has an obligation to return the kindness of God to God and to fellow humans, as John Wesley wrote: “but according to the kindness that I have done unto thee, thou shalt do unto me, and to the land wherein thou hast sojourned.” Showing kindness meant that kindness will be returned to the doer, as Jonas Hanway declared: “if we indulge ourselves, in the exercise of mercy, kindness, and true benevolence, it will return into our own bosoms.” Most simply, kindness begets kindness, as Sarah Trimmer argued: “and whoever does so receives an abundant return of kindness and good offices.” The reciprocal nature of kindness was supposed to ensure that kindness never stops because all Christians are aware of the need to be reciprocal and the need to show kindness to be Christian.

Fifthly, Christian kindness was a necessary part of people’s relationships with their family and friends. Kindness is in friendship, as Jonas Hanway showed: “he left behind him an avenger against his enemies, and shall requite kindness to his friends.” Kindness is in one’s relationship with one’s own godparents, as Sarah Trimmer argued: “your godfathers

and godmothers did you a great favour and kindness in answering for you.”

Kindness could be shown to enemies, as Sarah Trimmer also argued: “[Christians must] relive the necessities of any enemy, as that would shew their own charitable temper, and be likely to melt him into repentance and kindness.” Clergymen must show kindness to their congregants: “if any minister does any act of kindness to others, let him not do it ostentatiously, but humbly acknowledging that the ability he has is the gift of God…” The clergymen by having kindness being involved in all the various relationships obtained ability to be a regulatory agency of behaviour, as will be discussed further in the latter part of the thesis.

For the proponents of Christian kindness, being a Christian at this time period meant adhering to the ideology of kindness. Doing Christian kindness for these clergymen meant that a person would in deepest parts of their heart and soul be full of kindness and show kindness to all; kindness was bound together with other good qualities much like the fruit of spirit of God. Kindness had a deeply reciprocal nature; and, kindness as a necessary part of people’s relationships with family, friends and associates. All of the theological matters these clergymen associated with kindness created a complex interweaving of kindness, humanity, universal good and Christianity. This entwining, made kindness for the moralists and clergymen a crucial and necessary part of performing Christianity.

*On the Pews and In the Streets: How people are taught this*

Theology about kindness in religion as argued by these clergymen would not have any impact on the outer world unless the ideology was imparted in a way that was taken seriously. Part of the attention that these exponents gained occurred not only in the way of their delivery method, but rather, the position in society these people occupied. By this, it is meant that all of the authors/clergymen occupied a position, generally that of gentlefolk or the nobility; and in these grouping of peoples they were given an amount of trust. Like the scientists of their contemporary world, these people gained trust from their audience based on their socio-cultural position. Yet, their socio-cultural position did not mean that they were always listened to without question because many people were critical and may not have listened. Hence, why these proponents of kindness felt the need to argue strongly.

These proponents of kindness correspondingly had to have a platform for the audience to hear them through; the platforms they had were through sermons and/or the printed word.

---
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Clergymen were able to occupy a special social space because they were given the task of maintaining morality. Sermons therefore granted clergymen a dedicated audience, because people picked the congregations that they belonged to. People picked those congregations because that reverend taught theology of Christianity that would be in line with their beliefs. From this, the congregants would listen to their reverend’s arguments which allowed for the clergymen to maintain the morality of their congregants. Most of the clergymen, used here, published their sermons as literary tracts available to all and likewise published other religious tracts. In these works, clergymen used literary methods as a way to keep the audience attention and remembrance of the material being taught.

Non-clergymen used the literary word, through items such as broadsheets, letters and so forth. The reason to look at how non-clergymen taught kindness is that the concept of religious kindness is the foundation for the social usage of kindness. Therefore, many of these moralists used to varying degrees religious kindness alongside social kindness. Even in the few cases of deists like Mary Wollstonecraft, David Hume or Adam Smith, the means of teaching remained similar with the usage of identical literary methods. These lay people used their socio-cultural position as a foundation to place their literary tracts upon, and, gain the attention of the audience. Authors had to use literary methods to retain the attention of the audience.

One of the most common literary devices used in religious tracts was heavy use of the collective pronoun. By that, it is meant that collective pronouns were words that created a God the father/Jesus and Humanity(Christianity) dichotomy. When referring to the whole of humanity, it is usually through words, ‘us’ ‘our’ ‘we.’ For this collectivization of humanity to work, the authors made a fundamental assumption of the audience being largely Christian.

By stressing a common identity as Christians the authors and clergymen created a sense of communal belonging. Communal belonging allowed for no one to escape the dictates of kindness. In this way, a solution occurred for the clergymen who occupied a problematic liminal space in social standing; for, as part of the clergy, these men would have found themselves in a place of prominence that would have separated themselves from their congregations by the virtue of their profession. Therefore, through collectivization, clergymen sought to gain admission to the community of their congregations.

The stress on a community of believers had another result. The creation of a feeling of communal belonging created a cyclical pressure to conform to what the community thought people should do. Especially since the clergymen themselves were able to reiterate that they were conforming to communal actions, even if they did set up views on correct behaviour.
The literary form of collective pronoun is not the only literary device used. Some of the authors, like Hannah More, used examples. Examples concretely situate what is being argued in the everyday world of the congregants or within the bible through familiar examples. In this way, the authors, gave the audience a way to relate to the arguments of kindness to their daily lives, thereby making kindness a more relatable ideology. By being able to relate to kindness, people in the congregation would find themselves thinking, ‘I have done this!’ or ‘I could do that!’ which allowed for people to be able to put the lessons into motion because they had examples of how to do so. Additionally, this put everyone in the audience on a similar footing in that they all shared the ability to connect to the concept of kindness through the familiar of everyday lives. Another way that authors and clergymen got the attention of their audience was through the frequency of usage of kindness in their works. Most people would not pay attention to a one-off exhortation, but, if someone referred to the concept of kindness constantly, sooner or later the argument will be heard and remembered by the congregants.

For the clergymen who were proponents of kindness, kindness was an integral part of a Christian theology that the whole of English Protestant Christianity relied upon. Kindness was an essential characteristic of God and defined his relationship with Christians. Jesus’ sacrifice for humanity became linked with kindness. Kindness was viewed as being found within humanity. Kindness was part of the good qualities and associated with all things good. Kindness came to have a large role in the way Christians could beat back Satan and evil. Kindness was a teaching tool for both God and the clergymen. Showing kindness was part of the behaviour of Christians, through concepts like Law of Kindness and expectation of God. Theoretically, for these clergymen, kindness came outside the church walls to govern daily relationships and social interactions that a person had.

3. Guiding Hands: Kindness in Social Reform

Now that the religious context and importance of kindness for these clergymen has been discussed, it is time to move onto the social context of kindness. Social reform is one way in which kindness’ social context can be seen and evaluated. In social reform, the moralists argued that kindness’ importance was in its ability to regulate behaviour. This regulation of behaviour was important because one of the aims of social reform was to change behaviour of society for the better. Many social reformers were devoted in their faith which
increased their desire and need to participate in social reforms. Especially since bettering society was a way that people were able to show their worthiness to God.

_Saving Thee: Anti-slavery/abolitionist movement_

Anti-slavery and abolitionist movements were the defining social reforms of the eighteenth century in which many men and women had become involved. It is not the aim to look at the entirety of anti-slavery and abolitionist movement, but rather, to look at how kindness was used in association with these movements.

The concept of kindness was used in a variety of different ways by abolitionists throughout the abolition movement. Some people like, Granville Sharp argued in a tract about freed slaves who were to live in colony in Africa that was set up purposely for them that they especially deserved kindness from the British. This is in accordance to what the religious proponents of kindness argued about God wanting all to be shown kindness, and ex-slaves are after all people.

Furthermore, for moralists kindness not only meant that slaves were to be treated with kindness but that kindness came in unexpected ways, such as a merciful death. William Roscoe wrote in a poem about the moral implications of wealth predicated on slavery, and that those slaves were treated horrendously every day. For the slaves having such treatment throughout their daily lives meant that finally upon death, the slaves were able to feel freedom. This freedom Roscoe argued was a kindness. Death was a kindness for the slaves because their situation immediately bettered. As moralists argued, kindness was supposed to better a person’s life. Or as Thomas Clarkson wrote in a tract detailing all the unacceptable aspects of the slave trade which included a slave’s everyday life: “by an act of kindness relieve him for a situation, to which death was to be preferred.” Death was kindness for those in that situation because it freed them from a dreadful existence. Others, like John Wesley, argued a person could do a kindness by removing slaves from slavery, though a true kindness included not having put them there in the first place, as he questioned: “is it [Africa] so remarkably horrid, dear and barren, that it is a kindness to deliver them out of it?” By acknowledging that slaves should be warranted kindness by bare fact that they are humans;
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these abolitionists are forcing people to acknowledge that slaves are human. Therefore, the slaves should not be enslaved and instead should be shown kindness that the moralists argued that the English should do to all other people.

Showing kindness included not treating the slaves the way that the British had been treating them, as William Roscoe argued fiercely in another poem, ‘The Wrongs of Africa.’ This poem argued that the Atlantic slave trade was morally bereft with slaves being treated horribly. Instead Roscoe argued to “let kindness beam [towards the slaves], and sordid interest [the slave traders] wear the mask of mercy.” As Thomas Clarkson would suggest, the British believed they were doing their slaves a kindness by first owning them and then secondly setting them free. Yet, as Clarkson would argue in a tract against slavery, that is not an act of kindness: “the last act of humanity or kindness…shewn to a negro after he has been worn out…is to give him freedom too often when he can scarcely crawl or speak.” For the British firstly degraded the soon-to-be slaves, as Clarkson would argue in a tract against slavery that the British were not sufficiently pleased with simply owning slaves, but they felt the need to also destroy their character. By doing this, Clarkson argued, slaves were unable to comprehend kindness. These are examples that the abolitionists used to argue that slavery and kindness were incompatible, therefore, in order for people to show kindness they must not be slave owners or supporters of the slave industry.

Of course, the slave owners would defend their positions by saying they treated the slaves better than what the slaves were treated like in their freedom, but Thomas Gisborne refuted this saying: “no tyrant of Persia or of Morocco ever treated his subjects with more unrelenting barbarity, more bitter unkindness, than British slave captains have…” Slave-owners used kindness to rationalize a dehumanizing practice into actions that were noble and just, but this was not true kindness.

Moreover, others in the abolitionist movement, like John Wesley, argued in a pamphlet: “…that the Negroes in Africa were once a civilized polished people, enjoying laws and regulations…civility, kindness, and obliging deportment for which these Africans were so
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While the slave-owners used kindness to legitimize their actions, the anti-slavery people used kindness to argue otherwise. In this case, Wesley argued that Africans had kindness. By saying that Africans had kindness, Wesley was arguing that they should not be enslaved. For Wesley having kindness meant that the Africans were part of the community. Kindness, in this case, became used to break down inhumane practices that were fundamentally opposed to the ideologies associated with kindness.

Therefore, people like John Wesley argued, if the slaves themselves revolted, the British cannot blame them because they were oppressed because the slaves were never treated “…in the kindness of their friends.” Which led to the argument that, if someone had slaves, treat them better than previously, as Thomas Gisborne wrote in a tract about slavery: “to [Englishmen] treat him [slaves] on all occasions with kindness and forbearance…” Correcting one’s bad behaviour of abusing kindness by using kindness, a situation would be immediately improved.

Kindness in the context of anti-slavery and abolitionist movements showcases how kindness was used and abused. Kindness was abused by the pro-slavery people to justify, legitimize and rationalize what the slave owners and sellers were doing to those slaves as being morally sound and appropriate. Abolitionists used kindness as a way to help those enslaved through breaking down the legitimizing arguments of pro-slavers so as to achieve a better living status for slaves and eventually freedom of slaves through stopping slave-selling practice, by treating slaves better, and ultimately freeing the slaves.

Keep Us Safe: Prison Reform/Penology

Prison reform, like the plight of slaves, began to occupy the minds of socially minded reformers like John Howard. Prison reformers wanted to improve the situation inside the jails. Much like those who worked to improve mental asylum conditions. With improvement in mind, kindness came into use.

Kindness used by moralists in relation to prison reform focused on the prison, the prisoners and the wardens, and sometimes even higher powers like that of a Lord. One way social reformers underlined the need for reformation to the current prison system, occurred by using kindness to show that the prisoners did not get kindness from the prison but from
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outside. For example, John Howard in a tract about situations of jails in the Oxford region wrote:

“some [prisoners] would here perish for want, if it were not for the kindness of Mr. Milson a maltster, who lives near, and sends them [prisoners] provisions, and procures collections in the neighbouring towns for their [prisoners] release.”

The person who gave assistance to the prisoners could be as humble as an alderman all the way up to a Lord. Kindness could be as basic as providing food to the prisoners. For example, in John Howard’s tract about jails in the Western region of Britain: “by the kindness of Mr. Alderman Walker, the prisoners’ allowance now is 1 ½ pound of bread.” Or it could be a grand gesture, like that of setting prisoners free. As John Howard wrote in a tract about the jails in Northern England: “four of the convicts experienced Lord Loughborough’s kindness by a pardon at the summer circuit, 1787.” Separating the prison system from those people who were in a socially superior position, was a way to argue that the system needed fixing. Moreover, by showing outside people doing kindness to the prisoners, the lesson that Christians were taught of showing kindness even to sinners was enforced, especially those of a higher social position showing kindness.

Another way that kindness could be shown to those in prison occurred through helping those who were part of the reformation movement. John Howard, an influential reformer who wrote in a tract about his travels to prisons outside of England described the help he received: “I was there [Hamburg, Germany] near a week, and visited all the Prisons with every advantage, through the kindness of my friend, Senator Voght.” By helping the social reformers, in essence, these people were helping the prisoners because the reformers aimed to

improve the situation. In this way, the lesson from Jesus that kindness should be done always and in any size is reinforced.

Alternatively, another way that highlighted that the prison system needed to be reformed occurred through comparing the system to others outside of England. John Howard, a sheriff of his local magistracy, travelled outside of England to see how other prisons were like, and he wrote in an account of hospitals and jails abroad: “and they [prisoners] were treated [by the warden and jailers] with all the humanity and kindness that could be expected.”

The usefulness of comparing prison systems is that, it could have been argued that other western civilizations were doing prison system differently, nay, better. Therefore, it behoved the British to reform their system so as to be competitive with the rest of the western world.

Along with previously expressed opinions of kindness helping prisoners through indirect ways, there included straightforward usages about how much the reform of prisons benefited the prisoners. As Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about how prisoners should be treated: “we [non-prisoners] must consult the human heart, and consider the power of solitude, though compelled, exercising a due portion of kindness, and meeting the offender half-way in the great business for which he [prisoner] is committed to his prison-room [jail].”

The helping of prisoners through kindness showed a supreme example of putting the lesson that Christianity taught these men and women; that of behaving with the Law of Kindness.

By discharging the duty of reforming the prison system, kindness for moralists was used to underline the need for the prison system to be reformed. This came by showing how much kindness came from those in a socially high position towards the prisoners, by comparing the British prison system to other systems outside Britain, and by underscoring how much the prisoners benefitted from said reform. Kindness in this social reform was used by the reformers to help the prisoners directly and to highlight the need for actions that were of a good natured sort. All this without sorting blame onto any particular individual therefore not alienating anyone who could help with the reformation process.

*Guide Thee: government reform*
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In the face of wide-sweeping social reform of many different aspects of society, reformation of part of the government, especially parliament, was embraced by many men and women in society. Social reform was fashionable amongst those in high society, and in due course, among men and women especially engaged within debates of politics and the woes of the day.

A popular problem of parliamentary politics included one of the two main controversial topics of the end of the eighteenth century: The American Revolution. American Revolution to some moralists was seen as the ultimate symbol of world out of control and by others as an event that had to happen. People had assorted reactions to the revolution. Some people offered opinions on how to bring the Americans back into the colonial fold. Richard Price wrote in a political tract about the American Revolution that the British should use kindness as a way to please the colonists in order to end the revolution and retain the colony. Others blamed the American Revolution on how shabbily the British government treated its colonies, as John Fothergill wrote in a political treatise on the revolution: “enquire into the conduct of the wisest states to their distant colonies… treat them [the colonies] with kindness…to look back at mother country with duty and affection.” Yet, others argued that the colonies were to be treated like children, and should therefore not complain, as Capel Lofft wrote in a letter to a fellow politician about how the colonies actions should be treated by England like a mother addressing her children’s wayward actions. The American Revolution and the treatment of the government to said revolution, is complex as, as the way kindness used therein. Kindness was alternatively an ally of the revolution or an ally of the parliament by virtue that kindness validated and legitimized behaviour of the group of people. Kindness operated as a mediator between dissimilar groups of people; for kindness was a talking and relationship tool. By binding people in a relationship that honourably must be adhered to, people would inevitably have to talk.

Other parliamentary reformers called for a decrease in the display of military power. Some people exhorted others to remember the common man as Granville Sharp argued in a
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treatise on political governmental reform: “I say a gradual decrease...because I wish the reduction of our armies to be made without injury...to whom are certainly due all the kindness...”

Kindness was exhorted as a policy that worked for the benefit of others, especially, if the others were certain groups who wanted or needed the action to change.

The parliament and the various political problems that it faced throughout and specifically at the end of the eighteenth century, attracted those who were socially reform minded. Social reformation was seen as an activity engaged in for the betterment of society. For moralists kindness created a bond between different groups of people, but correspondingly kindness could act as a mediator between these groups. The American Revolution engaged the social reformers because it formed a series of events that had and would have a high degree of influence upon society and was an activity that most needed mediation to end.

*Raise Us: educational reform*

Educational reform falls into the realm of social reformation through reformation of manners, in that these reformers needed and wanted to teach others a way of being that fought moral degeneration. Therefore, social reformers viewed a reform of the education system as paramount. In this whirlwind of educational reforming, kindness occupied a prominent place in the teaching repertoire.

Kindness, people like John Wesley argued, should be taught as a quality that young persons should aspire to emulate after the fashion of their parents and religion: “and he hath now put on bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering.”

Additionally according to Philip Doddridge: “children should be trained up in the way of benevolence and kindness to all,” and it was the duty of parents and teachers to teach children those qualities. By having this expectation of nurturing kindness within children, it was easier to expect kindness from the rest of society, because it could be argued that it was
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socially ingrained since childhood. Adding to this argument, by having children exhibiting
kindness, it was easier for the proponents of kindness to argue that kindness is inherent in
humans: children have to have found that kindness somewhere within themselves.

Kindness was taught and ingrained in children through by moralists through various
teaching methods: dictionary, histories, prayers, sermons, plays, serious literature, and so on.
By having a variety of ways to teach children, a concept that was viewed as important, the
different types of children and their different types of learning could absorb the lessons and
begin to reflect back the concept.

*The Complete English Dictionary,* written by John Wesley, defines kindness as:
“humanity, human nature: kindness, courtesy.” This viewpoint of kindness intertwined with
humanity and human nature, reflecting the Christian ideology previously discussed and
society’s view of the essential nature of doing kindness. Part of the essential nature of
kindness was tied to courtesy and therefore associated with culture of sensibility.

One of the main ways of being taught the morals and lessons that the educational
reformers wanted to impart to children, was through other everyday educational pursuits, such
as learning kindness through history. Putting kindness into historical situations could make
the concept of kindness seem natural to humans; because children could see that kindness
occurred throughout history, and it is, therefore, acceptable for children to be expected to do
kindness. Kindness was pointed out throughout the history books from the Romans to early
modern contemporary times.

In his ‘Short Roman History’ John Wesley wrote about Nero, a roman emperor who
found himself declared an enemy of Rome by the senate: “…not having courage enough to
hasten death with his [Nero’s] own hand…he desire[d] Epaphroditus…to kill him, who broke
his poniard as he endeavoured to do him that kindness…” Even though this is not a positive
example, this example shows the variability of kindness. Sarah Trimmer wrote about the
treatment of King of Macedonia, Perseus, who was imprisoned by the Romans after he was
defeated in battle: “he was afterwards removed from thence, and treated with kindness.”
Having shown that kindness existed since the time of the Romans, whom the British revered,
the children were told that it was required of them to show kindness.
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There likewise, existed many histories written by moralists that focused on British history. By having British history showcasing the use of kindness, children were shown that kindness could be viewed as a part of the fabric of being British. There were examples of people throughout the social hierarchy, from the King of England to lowliest man or woman. David Hume’s ‘History of England’ contained the phrase about Henry VIII and his interaction with a former court favourite: “…he [Henry VIII] received him, if not with all his former kindness, at least with the appearance of trust and regard.”

There were group histories, such as that written by David Hume. In his ‘History of England,’ Hume wrote about how during Charles I’s reign there was an Irish rebellion where they killed their English neighbours: “without provocation, without opposition, the astonished English, living in profound peace and full security, were massacred by their nearest neighbours [the Irish rebels] with whom they had long upheld a continual intercourse of kindness and good offices.”

To keep things entertaining, there additionally are mentions of those who were executed. As Sarah Trimmer wrote about the execution of Duke of Somerset and cohorts during the reign of Edward VI: “…[the crowd watching the execution] bore him [the Duke of Somerset] sincere kindness, and expected his pardon, till the fatal stroke put an end to their hopes.”

British history would arguably have caught the attention of children because it was eminently relatable to themselves. Hence, the argument that children should show kindness because their ancestors had shown kindness themselves. Thence, the cycle should be kept going, becoming an obligation of children.

Stories or essays by moralists also taught children how to show kindness. By having children learning through this written form, children were able to both be entertained and taught at the same time. It could be through scenarios like that written by Priscilla Wakefield. In her ‘Juvenile Anecdotes,’ she wrote about a baby bird becoming the pet of several little girls: “he [the bird] became more and more attached to the little girls, and frequently rewarded their [the little girls’] kindness with a melodious song.”

It could be through kindness in household behaviour. In ‘Mental Improvement’ Priscilla Wakefield wrote about how a little girl was expected to behave towards those in the household and has one little girl say: “my
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governess forbids me ever to speak to the servants, therefore I cannot shew them any kindness without disobeying her."\textsuperscript{148} Hannah More wrote in a tract aimed at educating girls about how to keep the heart proper in behaviour: "it [the heart] must be admonished by reproof, and allured by kindness."\textsuperscript{149} Shrouding concepts in a friendly cover was intended to make the teaching syllabuses easier to retain. With the concept of kindness taught through friendly stories, children would find it easier to relate themselves into the situation instead of as a vague overarching concept.

A large educational category written by moralists included religious tracts that were aimed at children. Having religious education for children is understandable considering the fact that a large part of social reform and culture of later eighteenth century included the preoccupation with making society a better place, especially in relation to morals. Children were taught by people like John Wesley about how God’s kindness existed and humans should be drawn to his kindness: “therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee.”\textsuperscript{150} Children were taught how to pray: “cast me not away from thy presence, neither withdraw thy loving kindness from me”\textsuperscript{151} or “give thy blessing to me, and with thy favourable kindness defend me, as with a shield.”\textsuperscript{152} Most simply, children were taught how to show kindness, from all sorts of people including Sarah Trimmer: “…learn to behave with kindness and condescension to the industrious…”\textsuperscript{153} or “and those who asked him what kind of good works he meant, he told to practice all the kindness in their power to their fellow-creatures.”\textsuperscript{154} Religious instruction in children’s education, completed and reinforced what had begun inside the church walls by clergymen. Religious education for children brought the concept of religious kindness further into the social sphere.

An alternative way moralists found of teaching children how to show kindness, was through plays and other enjoyable pursuits. This could be through music such as songs, psalms, or hymns. An example of this method can be found in a song titled, ‘On Friendship’
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written by Jonas Hanway which contained the lines: “their kindness to offer, an friendship, sincere!”

The topic of kindness also turned up in other enjoyable pursuits such as plays. With characters mouthing lines from a play about a Babylonian King in Hannah More’s ‘Sacred Dramas’: “pour’d in his wounds the lenient balm of kindness and bless’d his settling hour of life with peace.” These methods used by the moralists were supposed to make it easier for children to remember what been taught about kindness for children’s attentions would be caught completely.

Outside of determining what the education to the children about kindness includes, educational reformers focused on how the teaching of kindness should be done, to who and how well. Sarah Trimmer wrote in a tract about Charity Schools how poor children of respectable parentage were to be treated in hard times:

“If there be among the poor children of a parish who have been born to good prospects, who have enjoyed in their earliest years the comforts of affluence, and who still have respectable connections. It will be an act of particular kindness to place them in Charity Schools, where they will receive such an education as may hereafter prove a means of restoring them to their former station.”

It is clear that reformers like Sarah Trimmer, decided and declared which children were worthy of being educated, and why. Much like the system of patronage, which will be discussed at length later, social reformers like that of Hannah More showed kindness by lending themselves to help and aid those who were in social positions below them. By doing these acts of kindness reformers like Jonas Hanway felt that they had the prerogative to decide who should deserve and receive their works. Through this, social reformers and moralists attempted to gained a measure of control over the behaviour of the English people who were at the receiving end of social reform and acts of kindness. This sentiment can be applied to any other form of social reform examined here because many social reformers were preoccupied with who deserved what.

Educational reformers aimed at educating people they deemed worthy of or in great need of education. Deciding who would receive education was a way to attempt control of the
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behaviour of those being educated. The overall aim of education was to correct perceived faults, including the moral failings that these reformers viewed as being corruptive to the whole of society. Moralists argued that kindness, as befitting an important concept to Christians and to society, needed to be taught to schoolchildren in various ways including songs, drama, dictionaries, religious tracts, histories and so forth.

_Harm None: Animal Rights_

Alongside other social reform movements, came the cause of animal rights. Animal rights ascended to a place of importance alongside ideas of moral sentiment. People like Sarah Trimmer supported the animal rights cause by writing tracts meant for children so as to educate them that hurting animals was unacceptable. One of the reasons given by Sarah Trimmer for the legitimacy of animal rights is that animals are at the mercy of humans. In ‘Fabulous Histories’ Trimmer wrote about animals position in relation to humans: “that they [animals] are in the power of man, and subservient to his use and pleasure, gives them a sufficient claim to our compassion and kindness.”

Christians were taught that all beings were included in the kindness of humanity. Therefore, humans should use kindness to the benefit of animals because animals were part of the God’s creation. Additionally, the power deferential between humans and animals, meant that it behoved humans to show kindness to animals, much like in the patronage system.

Some animal rights activists argued that children did not fully understand the effects of their behaviour upon animals, because often the children think they are doing a kindness to the animals, whereas adults viewed such behaviour as cruel. For example Priscilla Wakefield wrote about a mother educating her daughter about how to properly take care of a bird that the daughter found: “that you [the daughter] do not torment him [the bird] from a false idea of kindness, but suffer him to be managed properly, without meddling with him too often”

Sarah Trimmer wrote about an instance where Mrs. Benson educated her neighbour, a Mrs. Addis about how Mrs. Addis’ behaviour to her animals was uneven. Mrs. Benson exclaimed that Mrs. Addis treated some animals with no kindness, and others with too much kindness. Moralists argued that this is another instance of examples for why children should be taught what kindness is because even though kindness is found within humanity, people are not born with the knowledge of how to properly show kindness. For moralists that was why they needed Christianity to teach Christians and parents/educators to teach children.

---

158 Sarah Trimmer, “Fabulous Histories, Designed for the Instruction of Children, Respecting Their Treatment of Animals. By Mrs. Trimmer” (Dublin, 1794), 68, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
Animal rights activists argued that treating animals with kindness was the responsibility of humanity because animals were at the mercy of humanity. The moralists also argued that God dictated that all beings were to be treated with kindness, including animals. Reformers and moralists equally argued that children tended to treat animals with what they thought was kindness, but in actuality was not. For children were born with kindness but needed to be taught the way of showing kindness. Sarah Trimmer and other moralists tried to educate children as to what kindness they should lavish upon animals.

**Overall Themes**

Kindness in social reform was used in various ways by the reformers and moralists, according to the needs of the situation. Kindness in social reform was one of the ways the concept of kindness was tied to the socio-cultural landscape of Britain. Reform movements like abolition/anti-slave trade, prison reform, and animal rights argued that every living being deserved kindness from humans. These reforms and reformers also argued that every living being were to receive mercy from another, which included being shown kindness. Reforms such as anti-slave trade/abolition, animal rights, and educational reform worked on the premise that kindness by people in these instances used the wrong type of kindness, and the reformers aimed to teach people the right use of kindness. Reformers in movements such as education, and, government reform decided who should receive their acts of kindness and reform. The social reformers and moralists like the system of patronage attempted to assert a level of control over the behaviour of those who were receiving the acts of social reform.

Moralists and clergymen wanted kindness to become an ideology that people followed consistently by. Social reform for moralists became the practicable implementation of Law of Kindness. These reformers worked under the assumption that it took acts of kindness to better the world. Moralists wanted social reform and kindness to work together to show how kindness could better the world.

4. **Spheres of Kindness: Public & Private**

When going through the sources, another category comes up: that of public and the private. There existed a lot of conversation among the moralists about how kindness occurred in public and in private. By private sphere, authors meant events that occurred at home in the household. The household hierarchy included husband, wife, children and servants; sometimes tenants, or people in a similar relationship such as officers and their subordinates.
The public, the authors argued, were relationships outside the household; patronage, friendship, neighbours, acquaintances, and strangers.

By looking at the public and private social use of kindness by moralists, another aspect of the concept and practical application of the concept will emerge. The proponents of kindness aimed to control behaviour of those throughout society towards behaviour that would lead to a better place. By showing the effects throughout society, the proponents were able to argue, that indeed kindness made society better. Thereby, strengthening the argument that people should do kindness in reality.

Outside Views: Public Sphere

The public was an arena of people’s lives outside the household which occupied a great deal of time. Every time someone stepped out of their household, a person encountered the public sphere and the people there. With people encountering a lot of people from different classes and in different scenarios, the moralists felt that there needed to be a regulatory pattern of people’s behaviour. For moralists, kindness stepped in to regulate behaviour towards those qualities that were desired and positive, and to keep relationships affable and society functioning fruitfully.

In the public, the most essential relationship regulated by kindness, was between the King of England and his subjects. The concept of kindness helped regulate how the Kings’ subjects would behave towards him both secularly and religiously; an example can be found in the works of Christopher Wyvill. Christopher Wyvill in a sermon to his parishioners about the King of England argued that they pray to God to show kindness to the King of England: “...though we [the parishioners] cheerfully assist him [the King] with our fortunes and our lives...yet if we do not add our prayers to the King of Kings [God the father] to crown him with his favour and loving kindness, in vain may all our endeavours be...”161 With the king being at the second on the top of the social hierarchy, behind only God, the tone of his relationship with his people was of utmost consequence. The moralists by highlighting that the King of England received kindness from God, showed him to be human. By shown to be human, the subjects were told that their duty to the King included praying for God to show him kindness as well. For as the moralists argued, kindness meant the bettering of society, and by showing the King of England kindness, society would be bettered.
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161 Christopher Wyvill, “Preached at Richmond in Yorkshire. The Duty of Honouring the King, and the Obligations We Have Hereto: Delivered in a Sermon on the 6th of February, 1685-6...By Christopher Wyvill” (London, 1793), 27, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
Social hierarchy, a pervading ideological construct, went beyond the relationship of the King and his subjects. Other social hierarchical constructs would be that of the clergy and their parishioners. Clergymen had a particular role to play in their interactions with their parishioners. Usually these clergymen were exhorted to bring kindness to their interactions with parishioners. As Thomas Gisborne wrote in a moral manual aimed at men that clergymen had to treat their parishioners with kindness: “but kindness on the part of clergyman is consulting, even at some loss to himself, the convenience of his parishioners in the management of his tithes.”

Moralists argued that clergymen were supposed to show kindness to their parishioners because they were the representatives of God, and therefore, were expected to be the first to uphold the teachings of God in regards to kindness. Additionally, by showing their parishioners kindness, clergymen were able to better relations within the parish. A microcosm of what would occur throughout society, as the moralists would maintain, therefore an example of why kindness should be enacted.

Clergymen were supposed to show kindness, and were able to expect their own congregants to show kindness to them, by virtue of them being servants of God. As Andrew Kippis argued in a sermon that clergymen’s living situations were in flux, and the kindness of their congregants would lessen the burden: “…such of my brethren [fellow clergymen] as are most scantily provided for have often much consolation and enjoyment in the respect and affection of their congregations, in the esteem of their neighbours and the kindness of their friends.”

In this way, the relationship between clergymen and their parishioners remained affable, and workable. At the same time, the argument by moralists that one must show kindness as payment for God’s kindness to his Christians was reinforced.

Merchants/bankers and their customers are an alternative example of social hierarchy, since both of these players are locked into their position by virtue of the situation. In the case of bankers, they were told to behave kindly to their customers as these people were probably already embarrassed by their situation. Thomas Gisborne wrote in ‘An Enquiry into the Duties of Men’ about the feelings a bankers must engender to their customers: “[kindly businessmen]…studiously endeavour by the simplicity and kindness of manner…abstinence from all symptoms or arrogance…to remove every unpleasant emotion from…[the person]

---
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who solicits his aid.” Bankers would most often find themselves in a position of superiority because they have money that their customers would like to borrow. In this example, that would mean bankers who lent money to nobles. At times this could invert the power hierarchy, causing discomfort on both sides. Kindness ensured that until the power hierarchy reasserted itself, those who were in power would remain in the good graces of those who were not.

Merchants, on the other hand, were told by the moralists that they had to be careful about whom they entered into business with, no matter how full of kindness they were. As Hannah More counselled in a *Cheap Repository* tract about the dangers of being a lazy man: “he [the merchant] had a kindness for Brown [the lazy man], but would on no account enter into business with him.” Although kindness was valued, sometimes plain common sense entered; business was business no matter how much people wanted to or needed to show kindness.

A further way the moralists argued that the social fabric of hierarchy was influenced by kindness, occurred in the system of patronage. Both the patrons and the receivers of patronage had different roles to play within the relationship, according to the different situational markers. Kindness played different parts within the relationship according to the person’s power position. The different patronage relationships could include poor and the rich, political leaders and their citizens, and so forth. Whilst each type of patronage has its own overtones, there are overarching similarities.

The first overarching similarity is that in all the different types of patronage relationships, the patron was viewed by moralists as doing a service to the receiver of their patronage. For example, in the patronage relationship, some patrons used money as a way to help others. Richard Price wrote in the ‘The Nature and Dignity of the Human Soul’ about how doing patronage through money is in service of God because it will better society: “it is certain that our [rich people’s] money never does us so much service as when we part with it in acts of kindness and generosity.” A different example, written by Hannah More in ‘The Apprentice Turned Master’ about an master shoemaker who owed patrons for giving him money: “he [the master] knew he owed his present happy situation to the kindness of his

165 Hannah More, “The History of Idle Jack Brown Containing the Merry Story of the Mountebank, with Some Account of the Bay Mare Smiler. Being the Third Part of The Two Shoemakers.” (London, 1796), 4, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
For moralists being a patron for those who found themselves in a state of need was the best way of fulfilling the Law of Kindness.

Secondly, the patronage system was supposed to be one way to start the cyclical and reciprocal nature of kindness; patronage created a perfect obligatory state resulting in a reciprocation of kindness. This expectation, can be seen in precepts such as, the writing of Andrew Kippis where he wrote: “there cannot be a stronger proof a little and a base mind, than to be forgetful of those who have followed us with kindness, or to repay them with injury.” An example of the receiver of patronage fulfilling the duties of reciprocity can be found in one of Hannah More’s Cheap Repository tracts about the life of a criminal: “and he [Jack Brown, the man who went to prison] requited their kindness [that of some men who helped him], by reading a good book to them whenever they would call in, or teaching their children to sing Psalms or say the catechism.” By helping create a relationship between two unequal people through acts of kindness, patronage could supposedly operate indefinitely through the reciprocal and obligatory nature of kindness. Through this, people from different groupings in society were able to interact on a positive note that may not have been possible without either kindness or patronage.

Thirdly, moralists argued that those patrons despite their grand acts of kindness, had a personal need that lay behind showing kindness and patronage, which could be meet through kindness’s regulatory nature. Thomas Gisborne explained in an morals manual that a clergyman who shows kindness to his parishioners will benefit both parties. The parishioners will receive the actual kindness, and the clergymen will receive respect and esteem from others. For example, kindness could turn an enemy into an ally. As William Roscoe wrote in a biography about Lorenzo de Medici when he faced people who were attempting to overthrow his power: “but the kindness of Lorenzo [de Medici] allayed the apprehensions of the greater part of the conspirators, and rendered them in future favourable to his interest.” An intriguing example from Hannah More shows both this self-serving principle and how
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wide kindness through patronage should be. In a Cheap Repository tract about a market girl, More wrote about how a woman used kindness to create the image that she was a kind lady in order to be respected by the neighbours: “O, no madam” answered a poor market girl to a neighbour’s inquiry “that good gentlewoman does the same kindness to ten or twelve other poor friendless creatures like me.” This self-serving principle behind the motive for patrons to do kindness, does not negate the kindness done, but rather, shows that positive acts do not always come from altruistic intentions. Yet, moralists would argue that these actions work and have the same effects as those positive acts that come from altruistic intentions.

Nonetheless, this characteristic shows how kindness for the moralists functioned as a form of social control. This control must have originated out of a fear that moralists had of what people would behave like without measures of control towards desired good behaviours. The moralists would have argued that if these people used kindness as a way to achieve their personal aims, imagine then, what these people would have done without social constraints toward certain types of behaviour.

Fourthly, despite the obligatory duty of reciprocity, moralists argued that the receivers had to show their acknowledgement of their patron’s kindness. For the moralists a good way to acknowledge their patron and their patron’s kindness was to talk about it to everyone. In his biography of Lorenzo di Medici, William Roscoe describes a poet who paid homage to his patron through his poems: “…in which he hesitates not to represent his patron as surpassing the example of his father, in his attention to the cause of literature, and in his kindness to its professors.” An alternative way of acknowledging kindness was to acknowledge one’s thankfulness in writing to their patron. As found in a political tract on reform by Christopher Wyvill in the back section with letters and ephemera: “I [a patron of Wyvill’s] cannot help adding my best acknowledgments to you [Wyvill], for your obliging attention and kindness to me.” By acknowledging the kindness done to them by the patrons, those receiving the acts are further cementing the obligatory nature of the relationship. Therefore, ensuring that future kindness would come to the patronized. Additionally, the moralists would argue that by
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publicly acknowledging their patron’s kindness, these receivers of patronage ensured that the social fabric of patronage and showing kindness were reinforced.

Fifthly, the moralists argued that the receivers of patronage had to be perceived as being worthy of kindness by their patrons. The moralists reserved the right for patrons to judge to whom they should show kindness. Hannah More wrote in ‘Black Giles the Poacher’ about the dangers of earning a living dishonestly which displeases patrons. These patrons then withdraw their patronage and kindness. Whereas living honestly and cleanly pleases patrons who will then give patronage and kindness. Since the patrons were showing kindness for those less well off, patrons therefore asserted the right to decide who would receive their kindness, reinforcing hierarchy by reinforcing where people considered themselves. For moralists, by deciding who deserved the patronage the patrons were able to assert a level of control over those who received their patronage much like the way social reformers achieved a level of control over their subjects of reform.

For moralists, patronage was a social system that adopted the idea of kindness and integrated the concept fully into its practise. This came about due to the fact that kindness reinforced the basic consequences of patronage which is the reinforcing the social hierarchy. Those who had money and social position were able to show kindness which both fulfilled their obligations to show kindness and created a relationship with those in a lower social positions with them in the power position. Those in the other position used the patronage system differently. Since they could not be the one showing kindness those people were in the position of accepting kindness. As a result of accepting kindness, these people had to obey the aforementioned expectations including that of reciprocity and obligation. The reason these people accepted kindness was because they often needed was what was offered: money, food, charity, jobs etc. Moralists were able to show that both patrons and receivers had their behaviour regulated according to dictates of kindness.

Another relationship that moralists argued included public kindness was that of neighbours. Neighbours are the first public interactions a person has when they leave the doorstep of their house. Neighbours, additionally, were among those who formed the first impressions of a person and they were among those who could lead society’s understanding of a person. Neighbours were in a special place of not being part of the household, but able to see into the household. Therefore, to moralists kindness was of utmost importance towards
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one’s neighbours. By showing kindness, a person created a situation of affableness which meant that the relationship would be friendly.

Kindness could include a neighbour giving another neighbour the benefit of the doubt. As Hannah More wrote of two characters in her Cheap Repository tracts who ran into each other: “yet he [the neighbour] was very unwilling to believe the worst [she was dressed rather shabbily], and immediately raised her [Mary Wood] with kindness from the ground.”

The kindness could have been as simple as kind words or a kind look. An example can be found in Hannah More’s work ‘Sunday Reading’ about helping others: “while I observed in others that so cheap a kindness as a mild word, or even affectionate look made a poor burthened wretched move on cheerily.” Through kindness moralists argued, people could smooth over all sorts of problems in society. For through kindness’ regulation of behaviour, it allowed for harmony to reign in the neighbourhood. Therefore, moralists wanted it to become expected and needed for people to act towards their neighbours with kindness.

Relationship of friendship, is a bridge relationship between the public and private. It can be called that because a friend is not part of one’s household. Yet, the friend might be the most frequent person allowed within the personal space of the household. By gaining admission to the household, friendship allowed for a person outside of a household to get an intimate look at the dynamics and relationships inside a house. Like many relationships friendship had different shades.

Since friendship and kindness together are dealt with to a great extent by the moralists, it is of more use to look at the underlying characteristics of kindness in friendship. First, all types of friendship were based upon using kindness as a bond between people, due to kindness’ good qualities. Thomas Gisborne wrote about how a person can become a true friend through instances of kindness and compassion, and the opposite qualities destroy or prevent friendships.

Most often, the moralists argued that by using kindness to build a relationship, people would find themselves feeling friendly and positive towards a person thereby allowing for a friendship to be created or made closer. The reciprocal and obligatory nature of kindness would create in friendship continual instances of friends showing kindness towards another; thereby, further regulating personal behaviour towards qualities of a positive nature.
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Furthermore, moralists argued that since kindness was associated strongly with good qualities was essential to building good relationships. As Jonas Hanway wrote in ‘Virtue in Humble Life’: “kindness and affection being so essential to friendship, it seems to be an indispensable duty, to avoid words or gestures, which have an air of petulancy.”\textsuperscript{179} With all these different aspects of kindness, came the reinforcement of kindness creating the ability to build a bridge between disparate people, and keep the relationship on a positive friendly note thereby keeping the friendship.

Secondly, for moralists a friendship with kindness has become a special type of friendship that was deeply held and remarked on by the person. As John Disney suggested in a memoir about a friend that his friend was a close and valued friend by all because “his counsel, on any and every occasion, was founded in judgment and communication with discretion, sincerity, and kindness.”\textsuperscript{180} Having mutual acts of kindness in friendship for both parties meant “mutual acknowledgements of kindness have been received returned, between us.”\textsuperscript{181} For moralists acts of kindness were expected within a friendship, and receiving the actual kindness was perceived as special because of the feelings resulting from kindness, such as the feelings are that someone else cares. Feeling cared about creates a bond all on its own. From all this, moralists hoped for people in society to be regulated towards having positive relationships and using positive behaviour with each other which created overall a better society to live in.

Thirdly, even in friendship, people pass judgement upon whether the persons involved deserve that friendship. For example, John Wesley asked rhetorically why one of his acquaintances “…lives in foolish friendship and fondness for particular persons, that neither want nor deserve any particular kindness?”\textsuperscript{182} Adam Smith wrote more generally: “…provided he always treats his weak friend with kindness and humanity, we are willing to excuse him from many attentions and regards which we should demand to a worthier patron.”\textsuperscript{183} The moralists by adding a caveat to how friendship with kindness existed in a relationship and
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how one responded to kindness, regulated their friendship and behaviour further. By moralists attempting to regulate behaviour in friendship, people were shown that kindness made a relationship between people better and that good friendship included kindness. Additionally, for moralists if people were taught to show kindness they would be shown that by not adhering to it they would lose out on a relationship that arguably would have benefited them and was desired by them.

For moralists, kindness in friendship helped create a tighter bond between people because the results of kindness included obligation, regulation of behaviour, and creation of feelings of being cared for. Kindness took friendship to a deeper level. Yet despite the fact that moralists wanted people in the public sphere to expect good behaviour from other persons, this did not mean that moralists were not realists and knew that people would not use the concept of kindness or practical implementation of kindness to their own benefit. This self-serving behaviour can be seen as well in friendships where moralists argued that people expected that parties involved deserved the kindness.

All of these public relationships discussed were wanted by the moralists to be regulated through kindness. The overall aim that moralists had of kindness being in public relationships was to keep the public sphere working through regulation of behaviour of people for the betterment of society. By having people regulated towards the good qualities that kindness had, society gained a patina of well-mannered behaviour. Therefore, society would run smoothly and positively in the public sphere allowing for different groups of people to have positive relationships with each other creating a society that had predominant good qualities. Though the regulation of behaviour towards good behaviour would not eliminate immoral behaviour; instead moralists wanted kindness to create the expectation of people coming into contact with good qualities in one’s everyday lives which would make society less tolerant of unscrupulous behaviour. Moralists public relationships usage of kindness, can be tied back to the religious usage in that, kindness in these relationships would have regulated behaviour towards good behavioural qualities.

*In The House: Private Sphere*

The private sphere in the early modern period was the household. The household traditionally meant the husband, wife, children, servants, apprentices, tenants, and any other relatives living with them. A household meant that people were organized around and living together in one place of residence or on land that the householder owned. In the private sphere, much like the public sphere, moralists wanted kindness to become involved in the relationships. For moralists, kindness regulated the behaviour of the participants within the
relationships in order to create or help maintain relationships that were positive in nature, thereby, keeping the peace of the household.

The first relationship of the household examined by moralists was that of the husband and wife. For moralists, one of the ways that kindness played into the husband’s relationship with his wife, was that a husband’s kindness to his wife acted as a prelude to how the husband behaved to the others within the household. As Thomas Gisborne explained to men in a tract about their duties as householder: “the general kindness and attention due from the master of a family to his near relations, who are members of it, has already been implied in the observations respecting the proper behaviour of the husband to his wife, and of the parent to his children.”\(^{184}\) How the husband treats his wife is an opener for the husband is the head of the household, and from this position expectations towards him of setting the best example for his household through his own behaviour.

For moralists, the largest role the husband played was that of teaching his wife how to show kindness correctly. The husband was charged with educating his wife about kindness. For at that time, it was believed that women did not have the ability to guard and keep their kindness, even if they did have kindness within. By marrying someone, the husband agreed to teach and show his new wife the correct way to show kindness and respond to kindness. However, it was a difficult task. As Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about a father teaching his daughter good behaviour: “if there be kindness, meekness, and comfort in her [the wife] tongue, then is not her husband like other men.”\(^{185}\) By teaching his wife the propriety of kindness, and by marrying her, the moralists argued the husband was doing his wife a kindness. Thus, for example, it was his duty to make sure that his wife understood the implications of his kindness to her and teach her the danger that other people could do to her understanding of his kindness. For example, Thomas Gisborne wrote in a tract about the duties of females and the men in their lives that men were “…to guard the wife against the effect of emotion and impressions, which might prevent her from reaping the benefit of similar extensions of duty and kindness on the part of her husband.”\(^{186}\) The husband, additionally, had the ability to make the wife better person in other areas through using both kindness and manly qualities which a woman lacked: “and the wife, by the force of the manly courage which reflection is capable of producing, assisting by the kindness of nature, in

---

\(^{185}\) Hanway, “Advice from a Farmer to His Daughter, in a Series of Discourses, Calculated to Promote the Welfare and True Interests of Servants,” 409.
keeping death always at a distance, overcome their fears and banish them.”¹⁸⁷ Moralists argued that through these qualities, the woman would become better people, leading to congeniality which created a better society.

Moralists argued that despite the husband’s best efforts sometimes, the wife would behave unkindly, and hence, badly. Sarah Trimmer gives an example in an educational tract: “and I am told, [a man of my acquaintance] frequently reproaches his wife for urging him to behave ill to a father, who deserved all the kindness that it was in the power of a son to show”¹⁸⁸ which created a heavier burden for the husband; “there needs not the addition of unkindness to make the burden heavier.”¹⁸⁹ Yet there is no talk about how the husband could have abused his kindness towards his wife. Most moralists focused on how the wife could abuse kindness and how her misuse burdens her husbands, which showed the general feeling of the wife having the female weakness of character. At the same time, this shows the moralists’ belief in the superiority of the male character, and his unwavering good usage of kindness.

For the moralists the husband retained the power quotient in the relationship. His wife showed kindness to her husband which was would make his day better. As Jonas Hanway wrote about a wife explaining how she showed kindness: “…that if kindness can soften my husband’s toils, and render his hours sweet, when he retires from his labour, this shall not be wanting on my part.”¹⁹⁰ Moralists argued that outside the wife’s ability and inevitability of her misusing kindness, when the wife then did kindness in the relationship with her husband, it was predicated upon her making her husband feel better.

The moralists framed the husband as the person with the power to show kindness towards his wife. From there the moralists further argued that it was the husband who wielded kindness as a regulatory mechanism. It was assumed by moralists that within this relationship, the husband had better knowledge than the wife of appropriate and unacceptable behaviour. The husband was expected to make his wife’s behaviour better through kindness, thereby, reinforcing the husband’s position of power over his wife, like that in the law. For the wife, she was expected to use her kindness to make her husband’s day better. The moralists wanted the husband to use kindness as a power tool for manipulation whilst they wanted the wife to only have the option of using kindness to better her husband’s day.

¹⁸⁸ Sarah Trimmer, “The Family Magazine; Or, a Repository of Religious Instruction, and Rational amusement...By Mrs. Trimmer” (London, 1789 1788), 533, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
¹⁸⁹ John Wesley, “The Beauties of Methodism, Selected from the Works of the Reverend John Wesley...To Which Is Prefixed, the Life of the Author” (London, 1785), 228, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.
The husband and wife relationship is at the top of the household, followed by the parents and children’s relationship. For the rest of the household is built around the husband, his wife and then their children. The parental duties were to raise their children in a way that the children would go on to become socially accepted adults. One of the main duties of a parent is to instruct their children in the morals of society, and for moralists included teaching children kindness. Philip Doddridge wrote in ‘Sermons on the Religious Education of Children’: “children should be trained up in the way of benevolence and kindness to all.”\(^{191}\) By instructing their children in showing kindness, parents were charged with getting their children ready for being adults in the world. Furthermore, moralists argued that people should trust that other parents were doing the same teaching resulting in kindness abounding in society. Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about the problems in the lower classes and how to solve these problems saying that parents must trust the kindness and civility of society towards their children.\(^{192}\)

Moralists argued that the parent’s teaching their children kindness had a multi-layered effect that was supposed to be felt throughout society and a person’s life. Teaching children was a base that would ensure that kindness would be found within society. This social hierarchy can be viewed in the simple idea that parents were above their children, and society viewed children being taken care of by parental-like figures as a kindness. For moralists argued most parents and parent-like figures, like a husband, were supposed to have the knowledge of kindness and how to properly implement it. For example, Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about the importance of children for the future of society, and of keeping children with their parental figures: “if these have few or no children of their own, or have put them into the world, and are in decent condition, in such cases to remove an orphan from a place where there is a fair chance of gaining a parent, though it be a poor one, is defeating the kindness of providence.”\(^{193}\) Glancing throughout the social hierarchy, it can be clearly seen
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that there will always be someone who knows less about kindness, but the who changes according to the relationship.

As shown before, there existed a firm belief among moralists that wives did not know how to show kindness properly and that idea seems to be at odds with the idea of teaching children kindness for a good base to life. Yet, this can be so, because as shown by moralists’ women could and probably would stray from the lessons taught about kindness. Which means that women in particular were told by moralists to be taught as children, the propriety of kindness, but would have needed it reinforced throughout their lives. According to moralists, men did not or not the same degree.

Mothers specifically were charged by moralists with taking care of her children through deeds of kindness that were specifically associated with motherhood. For example, Thomas Gisborne wrote in ‘An Enquiry into the Duties of the Female Sex’: “let her [the mother] behave to them [her children] with the kindness of a friend, and watch over their principles and moral behaviour with the solicitude of a mother.” Mothers were seen by moralists to have a crop of characteristics specifically tied to motherhood. In this vein, women who became mothers gained motherly characteristics and therefore showed kindness tied to motherhood specifically. The reason why moralists gave mothers a specific kindness is that mothers would and should have boys, and that, children had to have been taught how to show kindness. Kindness was necessary for a mother.

Accordingly, this motherly kindness was the primary reason for drawing her children to associate kindness with benevolence which was desirable. For example, Thomas Gisborne wrote about the influence of kindness in a mother-child relationship: “let the mother exert herself during her life to draw closer the links of benevolence and kindness [with her children].” With mothers embodying a specific type of kindness in order to teach her children, children were drawn to this motherly kindness. The moralists argued that by having both parties in this relationship drawn to each other resulted in children being well trained for their adulthoods, especially the boys. Additionally, by having qualities that would draw their children closer, mothers and children were able to have a closer relationship than without kindness.
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Well-off mothers of children were supposed to teach their children kindness in order to provide a future generation of people who would involve themselves in doing patronage and social kindness. As Hannah More wrote: “[the mothers] by carefully training up their children to supply by individual kindness those cases of hardship which laws cannot reach, by such means every lesson of politics may be converted into a lesson of piety.”\(^{196}\) Parents of the rich were imagined by the moralists to have an easier time treating their children with kindness because they probably had more extra time and money to do so. This tie with money also linked it to the patronage relationship. Money leveraged kindness.

The moralists believed that not all parents were able to show kindness towards their children. Much like the wife of a husband, the parents of the poor were not ideal to teach their children because of the power differential. The poor were viewed as unable to show kindness to their children whilst some parents of the rich were viewed as treating their children with an overabundance of kindness. An example can be found in Jonas Hanway’s work: “if this lesson were learnt, and the utility and the duty of it understood, we should soon find that the children of the poor would live, as well as the children of the rich, who are often killed with kindness.”\(^{197}\) By this thinking, it hardens the idea of what kindness was to the moralists. If the rich were able to do too much kindness to their children but not the poor, then, kindness’ proportion and impact was attached to money, time and the social hierarchy.

Children’s kindness to their parents on the other hand, had a lot more to do with duty and thankfulness. Children, were expected by moralists out of duty to do everything in kindness towards their parents. As John Wesley wrote about how a child was to love their parents: “…bear them [their parents] a deep, real kindness, an earnest tender good-will, heartily desiring all manner of good to them…”\(^{198}\) Kindness’ nature of reciprocity and obligation is shown, by the parent’s showing their children kindness and teaching them kindness, it was the obligation of children to show kindness back to their parents. For example Jonas Hanway wrote that children were expected to defend their parents and use kindness towards all other family members: “those [children] who defend not their parents, must be cowards indeed, and not sensible of kindness to any other relation.”\(^{199}\) Essentially, children were expected to behave towards their parents, towards others and in everyday life with the kindness that the parents were supposed to have taught them.
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In the moralists’ discourse about kindness, the parent-child relationship had dynamics that were influenced by kindness. Parents were to prepare their children for acceptance in society through teaching them how to do kindness. Children exemplify the obligatory and reciprocal nature of kindness by being expected to return kindness to their parents out of a filial duty. Women in this case, gained the ability to know how society demands that kindness be acted out, when they became mothers. Mothers having kindness was for the benefit of their boys, who needed the base of how to show kindness so that later in life they could teach their wives and children.

Another dynamic of the household, was between the householder and his apprentices. An apprentice became part of the household whilst they were learning the trade, whatever it may be. These child apprentices would have had to move away from their parents’ household and into the master craftsman’s household for the duration of their apprenticeship.

To the moralists the apprentice-master relationship had a similarity to the husband-wife relationship. Hannah More wrote that it was the master who had to educate his apprentice about his expected duties: “…being obedient to his master in singleness of heart as unto Christ.’ And explained to him [to the apprentice by the master] with so much kindness what it was…”200 Much like the husband doing his wife a kindness by marrying her, the master by engaging an apprentice, did the apprentice a favour. The master acted as the appropriate person to teach a young adult how to show kindness. The master-apprentice relationship was another relationship would benefit from having the teaching of kindness built into it as a way to ready a person for living in the British social world, and to keep the social world running smoothly.

Moralists argued that the master’s kindness was to encourage obedience and a cheerful work ethic in the apprentice. One of Hannah More’s stories showed an instance between a master and his apprentice where the master did his apprentice a kindness by making a third party tell the truth. The kindness of the master encouraged his apprentice to declare that he was going to work harder for his master.201 Obedience and the work ethic seem at odds as response to a kindness done, but, a large part of kindness’ results is the reinforcing of the social hierarchy. By masters showing kindness to their apprentices, the apprentices were obligated to show their thankfulness by completing the requirements of their station in life. This therefore, reinforces the social hierarchy.
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Though apprentices were charged by moralists with showing kindness and earning kindness from their masters, it did not mean apprentices would always be shown kindness by their masters. One of the reasons the moralists argued that kindness needed to be taught was that not every master-apprentice relationship was characterized by good qualities. As Jonas Hanway wrote in ‘The Defects of Police the Cause of Immorality’ about how there are masters who do not treat their apprentices properly according to situation and age.\textsuperscript{202} Given that the worry was relevant enough to have been written about by moralists there must have been a number of masters who mistreated their apprentices. In this way the moralists hoped that the kindness of the master towards his apprentices would be regulated. By regulating how a master did his kindness to his apprentice the moralists wanted a relationship that allowed for apprentices to be safe. This is an example of the situations the moralists were attempting to regulate in order to better society.

According to moralists, kindness in the relationship of apprentice and master was supposed to encourage both parties towards behaviour which encouraged a pleasant working relationship and reinforced the social hierarchy. The master in this relationship, were the people who had the power deferential, and kindness worked mainly for their benefit. What the apprentice got from the regulation of behaviour through kindness was a kinder master and easier working atmosphere.

Just like the relationship between master and apprentice was to be regulated through kindness, the master and his servants were supposed to be regulated through kindness. As seen earlier, those people who were less well-off were assumed by the moralists to not understand or have the ability to show kindness properly. Therefore, servants were thought not to be trained or educated in the proper ways of showing kindness.

Hence, it was the duty of the master of the household to maintain the servant’s knowledge and usage of kindness in a way that society demanded. For example, Sarah Trimmer explained in a tract about the education of servants that the masters had a duty of continual teaching: “[when a servant took his leave of the household]… thanking his master for his kindness and good instruction took his leave.”\textsuperscript{203} For all those who were part of the

\textsuperscript{202} Jonas Hanway, “The Defects of Police the Cause of Immorality, and the Continual Robberies Committed, Particularly in and about the Metropolis: With Various Proposals for Preventing Hanging and Transportation: Likewise [Sic] for the Establishment of Several Plans of Police on a Permanent Basis... Observations on the Rev. Mr. Hetherington’s charity...In Twenty-Nine Letters to a Member of Parliament. By Jonas Hanway, Esq.” (London, 1775), 95, Eighteenth Century Collections Online.

household, their behaviour reflected back onto the householder. Which meant that according to the moralists the householder had a vested interest in making sure his household, especially the servants, acted with kindness in the way society wanted. Servants could, in theory, learn from their masters to show the sort of kindness as sought by society; especially since they were taught the type of kindness viewed as proper to their station.

One of the more unusual dictates of the moralists to the husband and wife about their behaviour towards their servants may be this line by Thomas Gisborne: “while you have recourse to it [actions of servants], receive it as an act of kindness, not as the constrained obedience of an upper servant.” One would think that the couple would be charged by moralists with teaching and ensuring that servants show kindness; but additionally to be urged to view the couple’s servants daily activities as kindness is different. This is one way of kindness potentially regulating the behaviour of both parties, in that it was supposed to create a positive and contented relationship between master and servants. Or, by this urging, masters were encouraged to have this belief for it created a tighter bond between partakers, because showing kindness was thought to create bonds, through means of obedience and reciprocity.

Mistresses were told that through kindness they would endear their servants to their household. As Mary Wollstonecraft claimed in a tract about female conduct: “yet kindness must be shewn [by the mistresses], if we are desirous that our domestics should be attached to our interest and persons.” These instances show that moralists claimed that kindness was supposed to create a deeper and reciprocal bond in the relationship than basic discharge of duties. By treating their servants with kindness, it was supposed to be easier for the master to keep within his house servants who served over the long term instead of constantly hiring new servants. Moralists argued that kindness helped create ties of community with people not naturally part of the family. The wife of the master was expected to show kindness to servants, which reinforced the earlier supposition that wives had to be taught by their husband how to show kindness. The wife needed kindness to interact with her staff.

Both servants and their masters were urged by moralists that by doing the promised services in their contract, kindness would create a deeper bond between them, as Jonas Hanway argued: “the connection between master and servant ought to be considered as a solemn contract for mutual services, and the discharge of it should create mutual kindness and
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Moreover, by tying the servant and their duties to the concept of kindness, it was supposed to become virtually impossible for servant to not show kindness. For otherwise, the servants were viewed as being in dereliction of duty.

Yet, servants were forewarned by moralists that they must earn the kindness from their master through their actions of dutifulness and obedience. Jonas Hanway complained that: “as to meriting the kindness of patronage of the Master, by long and faithful series, that is not so much as thought of by the generality of servants.” Hanway also told a salutary tale “…of a servant who robbed his former master, after being discharged from prison by the kindness of his benefactor.” This kindness exists throughout the concept of kindness’ exposition with many different people; earning kindness from God, and earning kindness from patrons and so forth. Earning kindness, as shown through the preoccupation, was a well discussed idea by the moralists because of social hierarchy. Moralists liked to be reassured of people’s position in the hierarchy. Social superiors making a person earn their kindness kept them in their socially inferior position. Kindness was supposed to have acted as a way of reinforcing the social hierarchy.

In order to earn said kindness, servants were expected to treat the kindness from their masters with appropriate thankfulness, and obedience. Sarah Trimmer dramatized this in one of her tracts when she has a servant declare to her master: “so, wishing them for their own sakes all happiness to us, I humbly take amendment, and thanking you, Madam, for your kindness to us, I humbly take my leave and am your very obedient servant.” As previously shown, moralists argued that people had to be sensible of the kindness performed, and to be thankful because it was God’s will for humanity to show and receive kindness. Social hierarchy played a role in a servant’s being thankful and having obedience. Those lower on the social hierarchy were supposed to act with obedience and thankfulness towards those higher on the social hierarchy. Especially, since those higher on the social scale demanded and expected such behaviour. This in part, was how people earned the right to get kindness
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from someone higher on the scale. The idea that one must earn kindness occurs often in the writings of social reformers.

Much like how some servants took advantage of their master’s kindness, servants were taken advantage of by their masters. For example, Hannah More criticized: “… the selfish kindness of masters, who, not daring to set their servants about any public work…refuse them a little indulgence and a reasonable holiday in the working part of the week…” Even with all the kindness in the world moralists knew that people were people and the practicality of using kindness in reality, could change the concept itself. In this instance, the masters used the concept of kindness for their own personal interests. Moralists were aware of self-motivated masters, and therefore wrote about instances like this, to provide example and a way to counter this scenario. When moralists argued that masters should not take advantage of their servants, they were suggesting that all people deserve kindness even those who were servants, and regulated the behaviour of both people involved. Moralists sought to regulate the behaviour of both parties in a hierarchical relationship.

Outside the relationship of the master and mistress and their servants, moralists argued that servants also had a relationship guided by kindness with their other fellow servants. Sarah Trimmer argued in a tract aimed at servants that “…if you are kind to your fellow-servants, you will have a claim to kindness from them.” Moralists argued that people had to show kindness to all, including those one would not think of to show kindness to. By behaving with kindness to fellow servants, there was created an atmosphere of affableness and community spirit that would make the workplace pleasant. Moralists aimed to regulate servant behaviour and thereby making them better servants and the working situation congenial.

The relationship between the master and mistress and their servants was a relationship tied together initially with a contract of services and duties on both parts. Kindness was supposed to bring together the two contrasting groups of people more closely than being bound by ties of service, making them more like a family. Kindness was supposed to be used to smooth the relationship between the two groups, but moralists were also aware that kindness could at times be used as a means by individuals to achieve their own private agendas. The reciprocity and supposedly obligatory nature of kindness served a function of continuing the relationship on good terms. Additionally, kindness was supposed to serve as a
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means to reinforce the social hierarchy of the household and society overall through its reciprocal and obligatory nature.

Some moralists also considered tenants to fall within the domestic sphere. The reason that tenants fall into strictures of the household is that tenants were on the land owned by the householder which could be considered part of his household. Tenants hoped that their landlords would behave towards them with kindness and protection. Hannah More wrote about how the tenants were dependent on the householder for protection. The householder also had duties towards the tenants which included educating about and showing kindness. Tenants were part of the household, which meant the moralists argued the householder had similar duties that the householder held with everyone else in his household. Therefore, it was reasonable for the tenant to expect this kindness from their landowners.

Showing kindness towards the tenants on the part of the landowners allowed for a working relationship predicated on good qualities. Or at least that is what Sarah Trimmer claimed in ‘The Family Magazine’ when a young man was looking to keep renting his place from his current landlord who he thought of as a good landlord. This young man considered him a good landlord because he previously showed him kindness. Kindness was supposed to keep relationships between people, like that of tenant-landowner working on a note of affableness. This allowed for the creation of a long-term relationship between these two people that was settled and without interruptions according to the moralists. Kindness was supposed to keep people happy.

As hinted throughout the discussion of the household, the master of the household, or the householder, was given by the moralists the charge of teaching socially acceptable kindness. This is not entirely unexpected, for as shown in the relationship between the husband and wife, the husbands were supposed to be in charge of the moral teachings and enforcement in their wives. The wives were assumed not to have the moral fortitude to retain the kindness taught to them earlier in life and thus had to be retaught periodically. With this expectation for the wife, all others who fall under the householder’s household, would have additionally been treated the same way.

While all household members were supposed to be taught kindness by the householder, moralists particularly worried about the female members of the household. As with the wives, the reason that there existed a heightened worry was that it was believed that women lacked moral fibre. Thus, it was up to the men of the household, and more specifically the

householder whose reputation was most often associated with the house, to support female morality. Men were charged with these worries, which is why moralists wanted them prepared early on in life to assume this responsibility when they married and set up a household. This preparation was supposed to start with mothers and their special kindness, and, then with the education system. Men was the person charged by moralists with making females in society conform with the beliefs of was acceptable kindness.

Men were warned by moralists that the task of creating kindness within the women they were charged with would not be easy. Women were used to different expectations for their actions and would have a problem switching their behaviour toward kindness. As Hannah More wrote about unacceptable female behaviour: “esteem and kindness become but cold substitutes to her who has been fed with plaudits and acclamations.” Men were supposed to have the ability to effect these changes into reality, otherwise, there was no point for men having to teach their household. Women despite everything, were assumed by moralists to be able to learn about kindness, otherwise men would have not been charged with the duty of reinforcing the lessons of kindness.

These men were warned by moralists of the dangerous outcome if they disregarded their warnings about what women would be like without regulation. As Thomas Gisborne wrote about what behaviour men should correct in women: “let her not be abandoned in her outset in life to the giddiness and mistaken kindness of fashionable acquaintance in the metropolis.” Moralists’ concern about the dangers of not teaching women how to show kindness, spoke of the fear that society held about women behaving outside of the constraints of acceptable behaviour. Whether or not women actually behaved outside the constraints of acceptable acts of kindness, cannot be answered. By scaring men with tales of misfortune that befell men who did not teach his female household members, these tales reinforced the notion that men must teach women how to show kindness, and therefore, tried to regulate the behaviour of both women and men.

An alternative reason men were told to teach women and reinforce women’s actions in this regard, is that men believed that once women acted with kindness they could actually become quite good at it. As Thomas Gisborne wrote in a manual about female behaviour: “in the discharge of the domestic officers of kindness, and in the exercise of charitable and friendly regard to the neighbouring poor, women in general are exemplary.” Moralists
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suggested that women had the ability to do great kindness, but were often unable to, because they had not the moral fibre to retain what they were taught about acceptable kindness.

Moralists argued that women had to gain several positive qualities that allowed them to show kindness. As Thomas Gisborne argued in a tract about female conduct that “[women need] the unrestrained communication of sentiment, the concern of genuine sympathy, the manifestation of kindness affections by deeds of kindness, require time, and calmness and deliberation and retirement.” It had been argued by moralists that men had to teach and reinforce kindness in women. Therefore, by telling men that women needed these positive qualities, the men were able to strive towards inculcating those qualities in their womenfolk.

Other ways men were told by moralists how to teach their female household members acceptable kindness, was to use verbal admonitions to drive the women away from unacceptable behaviour and to use kindness to get women to show kindness. As Hannah More wrote in a tract about female education that “…the heart must now be admonished by reproof, and now allured by kindness.” The arguments of kindness being reciprocal and obligatory show up here, for it was argued by moralists that showing kindness towards women would result in women doing kindness in turn. Another way men were exhorted by moralists to teach kindness, was to praise those women who acted with kindness. As Hannah More wrote about how men were to act: “the kindness of the intention, and the sagacity of the contrivance, merit praise.”

Women were tied more so to the ways of teaching that were less rational and more tied with emotions, such as, using praise.

Men were told by moralists that they should tie the female arena to the idea of kindness. Associating kindness with the domestic, as Hannah More wrote: “would it not be better to make them [females] combine the delightful idea of home, with the gratification of the social affections, the fondness of maternal love, the kindness and warmth and confidence of the sweet domestic attachments…?” As moralists believed, tying the idea of kindness to the domestic, allowed for women to have an easier time showing kindness, for women lived in the domestic sphere daily. By being in the domestic sphere, women’s appropriate use of kindness in their sphere of being was reinforced.

After men were directed by moralists to teach the females of their household, they were told that once a woman leaves the household, the householder should continue to act towards these women in the same way of teaching them kindness. As Hannah More wrote about
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household conduct: “let not your [men’s] kindness to the meritorious terminate when they [females] leave your house.”

Women were continually told by the moralists that men would always be the ones who taught them how to show the right sort of kindness.

The outcome men were promised by the moralists, included that the women would have qualities within them that would strengthen her relationships with everyone around her. As Hannah More wrote in a tract about female conduct: “endear then yourself [a female] to all around you by cheerful good-humour, by benevolence, by affectionate kindness, by patience, and resignation.”

Despite moralists’ promised outcome, men were warned that teaching kindness to women would not solve every difficulty. As Hannah More wrote in a tract about female education that “yet in spite of the kindness and ability with which he [a man] would soothe every obstruction, it is probably, among the wise institutions of providence that great difficulties should still remain.”

Kindness was supposed to make relationships easier, and the household to operate affably. Yet moralists knew that kindness could not solve everything, and kindness might become a crutch. Therefore, men were warned by moralists of this so to teach those in the household about not expecting kindness to solve everything.

The relationship of an officer and his subordinates does not properly belong in the household, but it does not fully belong in the private sphere. Like the household, this relationship is only seen in the public sphere intermittently. In a way, this relationship could be argued as a replacement household because the officer would hold place of the householder, and his subordinates would be all the different members of the household. Like, the household, there existed a series of literature by moralists that covered the acceptable behaviour in a relationship like this.

Overall in this relationship there are a number of similarities that the moralists argued. First, the officers of all different ranks were expected by the moralists to treat their subordinates with kindness. For example as Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about a seaman’s expected behaviour aboard a ship: “the officers would treat those under them with kindness and humanity.”

The subordinates likewise were told by moralists that they should act with
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kindness. As Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about a soldier’s duties: “[subordinates] be not perverse or insolent, unjust or cruel, but exercise mercy and kindness to all the sons of men.”

Like that of the relationship between tenant and landowner, officers were supposed to treat their subordinates with kindness as a way to create a peaceful and amicable relationship in a situation that would bind people together for a long time. For moralists’ social hierarchy was reinforced, allowing for those higher on the social scale to retain their position, and reminded those lower on the social scale their position and duties.

Second, the moralists argued that kindness made the necessary duties of a military man agreeable. Officers, sailors and soldiers all had to complete duties that coordinated with their position, and all were not necessarily pleasant or desired. Therefore, according to moralists’ kindness acted as a way to make these duties congenial. As Jonas Hanway wrote in a tract about sailor’s duties: “though pressing is a severe duty to the officer who abounds in the milk of human kindness, such a man is the best qualified to render the king’s service agreeable.”

Moralists argued that by easing the unpleasant duties of a person with kindness, people had no excuse to not show kindness. Additionally, the moralists by tying the supposedly obligatory nature of kindness to an enlisted man’s daily duties were telling these men that they had no recourse but to do the duties expected of them.

In the relationship of officers and subordinates, kindness was supposed to act as a bonding agent of people of different stations; making pleasant relationships and situation for those involved; through making kindness associated with doing the duties required of their military station these men helped to reinforce social hierarchy and to reinforce people’s stations. Social hierarchy was reinforced, and, relationships affable. It must be remembered that what the moralists argued about kindness and military duty is not what happened in everyday life. Most often, those in the military faced punishment instead of kindness.

Public & Private: Overall

There were many common features to the way moralists saw the role of kindness in the private and public sphere. First, kindness was supposed to act as a bonding agent for all different types of people. It helped to create and maintain all the different social faces and relationships a person has throughout the different spheres and situations in everyday life. Second, kindness supposedly had the ability in all these relationships to encourage affable, easier, and more long-lasting relationships. Third, the supposed reciprocal nature of kindness kept relationships going. Fourth, kindness could be used to the advantage of people in
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dominant position, such as officers and patrons. With patrons using kindness to create obligation to them, or officers who used kindness to keep subordinates in line. This ties to the fifth point; that those in a place of lower position were told that the kindness they had to embody by those who occupied a higher social position on the social hierarchy. Sixth, there always was someone who had to work to deserve kindness; be it a servant or a poor person. Seventh, men knew more about kindness than women did, and therefore it was up to men to teach women about kindness continually throughout their lifetimes. Eighth, despite the controlling nature of kindness, there always existed individuals from all different social hierarchical positions who either disobeyed kindness dictates or misused kindness for personal gain and motivation. Ninth, people of all social positions were encouraged to expect kindness from others in society.

5. Conclusion

Moralists and clergymen were preoccupied with the idea that society was descending into degeneration. These moralists wanted to engender in people behaviour that would better society. Some of the moralists thought that the answer lay in the concept of kindness. Kindness, the moralists argued was supposed to regulate behaviour. By regulating behaviour, the moralists hoped to help people behave in ways that would benefit society. In order to bolster their claims about the importance of kindness, the moralists and clergymen tied it to religion and several other social phenomena.

The claims about kindness that the moralists and clergymen were putting forth were formulated into the ‘Law of Kindness.’ The moralists argued that the ‘Law of Kindness’ must be followed by all, and was supposed to make people show kindness to everyone and every-being. Further, the moralists argued that the kindness shown to others came from good qualities found within humans.

In the practicalities of everyday, the moralists argued that kindness was a complex concept that changed according to space, place and people involved. The moralists devoted much time to detailing these different scenarios. A consistency throughout is that kindness had many attributes that helped further regulate behaviour and reinforce hierarchy.

For the moralists social reform was a perfect place to practice kindness. Social reform intended to better society. Kindness was supposed to be able to help people behave better. Moralists and some reformers believed in the synchronicity of the two. By using social reform
as a showcase for the abilities of kindness, the moralists were hoping to push kindness into everyday usage.

The results of this thesis will revise several historiographies. Scholars need to pay more attention to the importance of theology of kindness. Knowledge about the culture of sensibility is widened by adding kindness’ position and showing new ways culture of sensibility could be practically implemented in society. Additionally, the thesis shows how kindness affected social relationships and kindness’ relatability to the most studied behaviour, that of politeness. It needs to be acknowledged that kindness and the ‘Law of Kindness’ influenced ideas about morals regulation and implementation in society. Social reform historiography should better reflect the influence of kindness on the practical implementation of reforming and regulation of behaviour.

By acknowledging the placement of kindness within social reform, kindness links the reform and the culture of sensibility together. Kindness existed as an important concept that heretofore has been neglected, but through study, kindness changes many different historical knowledge as has been shown.

Aspects of this thesis could be taken further and studied more at length. This thesis does not study every way in which kindness existed at this time period. There are a multitude of questions and intriguing facets of kindness that could still be addressed. Situations that could be studied could be what role did the Reformation have on the formulation of the theology of kindness. Socially, kindness being tied to culture of sensibility could lead to other questions such as how does kindness interact with other behavioural modifiers such as politeness. The interplay of kindness and gender could also be further studied to look at how the regulatory nature of kindness affected the enactment of gender. Other tangential British social life situations that had kindness that could be studied could be the interaction of men in the House of Parliament/Lords, how the British used and understood kindness abroad, diplomatic use of kindness, sailor and soldier usage of kindness, usages of kindness in dramas or plays, and so forth.
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