

not to mention the fiscal consequences of reducing a considerable source of state revenue.

Although Prestwich acknowledges the (relative) popularity of the temperance message in periods of social crisis, specifically in the context of the discourse on degeneration after the military defeat of 1870 and in the labelling of alcoholism as “the enemy within” during two world wars, she eschews a simple social control model. Thus, she denies that the early associations’ focus on the working class implies bourgeois moralizers imposing their values. Instead, she argues that they were opportunists who sought scientific evidence, which happened to be biased because workers were statistically visible. She insists upon the reality of the problem, citing the high incidence of alcoholism in certain occupations, the centrality of the cafe in working-class culture and politics, and the efforts of working-class temperance organizations. Since she does not explore individual reformers’ motivations, readers may disagree with her position on opportunism. It is difficult to fault her assessment of the problem.

Mary Lynn Stewart  
Simon Fraser University

\*\*\*

Joan Sherwood — *Poverty in Eighteenth-Century Spain. The Women and Children of the Inclusa*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988. Pp. xv, 239.

Joan Sherwood, in her well-researched book, uses the records of the *Inclusa* of Madrid as an index for examining poverty in eighteenth-century Spain. In 1572, a home for infirm priests was expanded to take in foundlings; thus, the *Inclusa* of Madrid was born. Originally, a confraternity dedicated to Our Lady of Sorrows administered the institution, but in 1615, the *Inclusa* fell under royal protection and became one of six royal hospitals in Madrid. After 1651, the *Inclusa* dedicated itself exclusively to accepting foundlings and placing them in homes with wet-nurses.

In the first section of her book, Sherwood looks at the institution of the *Inclusa*, specifically at its finances and its personnel. Sherwood shows that the *Inclusa* was dependent upon the outside community for support. Necessary supplies were donated by individuals, provided by the government, or bought at a reduced cost. The financial health of the *Inclusa*, therefore, rose and fell with that of Spain itself in the eighteenth century. Thus, in the 1790s, Spain’s general economic difficulties affected the *Inclusa* as well.

Three priests ran the *Inclusa*, but they employed a clerk, a doctor, a matron, wet-nurses and various part-time workers. Although the main purpose behind the *Inclusa* was to take in foundlings, the institution also helped the poor (such as the wet-nurses and the workmen) by giving them jobs. Yet, as Sherwood points out, the *Inclusa*’s limited resources prevented the institution from raising the wages of most of its employees. The wet-nurses, the temporary workers and the staff as a whole were overworked and underpaid. Thus, according to Sherwood, an institution created to help the poor survived only by exploiting a segment of the poor population. In her analysis of the *Inclusa*, Sherwood provides information on the wages paid to the employees of the institution. She does not, however, give comparable information on wages paid to laborers, particularly women, in other jobs. This information would bolster her claims

that “Jobs were done by the poor who had come to Madrid to find work at wages that only the very poor would accept” (45); and “Wet-nurses’ salaries were inadequate to attract any but the most desperately poor and unhealthy women” (48).

The second section of Sherwood’s book examines the social background of the wet-nurses. These women, like the foundlings, belonged to the poorer segments of Spanish society. Sherwood finds a definite shift in the occupations of the rural wet-nurses’ husbands; in the course of the eighteenth century, “daylaborer” [*jornalero*] increasingly replaced “farmer” [*labrador*] as the principal rural occupation of the husbands. The *Inclusa* records, therefore, document the gradual process by which small farmers lost their lands, became tenant workers or migrated to the city. The wives of these impoverished farmers took in a foundling for the small salary paid by the *Inclusa*. In addition, wet-nurses came from Madrid itself. These urban women were usually the wives of artisans. Here, too, Sherwood observes a change in husbands’ occupation. The number of skilled artisans, such as masons and shoemakers, increased toward the end of the century. Sherwood argues that poverty was spreading in late eighteenth-century Madrid and was engulfing even those artisans who had previously been able to survive on their earnings.

In the last section of her book, Sherwood concentrates on the foundlings [*expósitos*]. All of the infants were abandoned, but not all were illegitimate. From 1700 until 1730, about 80 percent of all the children were illegitimate. The ratios began to change in 1730 and, in the period 1750 to 1780, one half of the *expósitos* were legitimate. Sherwood uses the data from 1780 to 1805 to characterize the poverty in Madrid. The number of both legitimate and illegitimate infants increased dramatically, particularly from 1800 to 1805.

The mortality rate for foundlings remained quite high throughout the eighteenth century; 72 percent of the *expósitos* died before reaching age seven. The death rate was especially high (88.4 percent) for those infants who were under one month when admitted to the *Inclusa*. The author’s focus on the *Inclusa* documents causes her to give the mortality rates only of *expósitos*; she provides no similar data on infants in eighteenth-century Spanish society in general. This prevents the reader from fully gauging whether the *Inclusa*’s mortality figures were atypical.

In explaining the high mortality rates, Sherwood considers the responsibility of the official protectors of the *expósitos*: the government, the church and the administration of the *Inclusa*. The government of Charles IV, influenced by the Enlightenment, attempted to improve the status of *expósitos*. In 1794, the government passed a law which gave all *expósitos* legitimate status. A law of 1796 required bishops to provide houses where infants could rest on their way to *inclusas*. With these and other laws, the government demonstrated a definite concern for foundlings. The implementation of these decrees, however, was left to the Catholic church.

With regard to the *Inclusa*, the salvation of souls and the performance of charitable work were the twin goals of the church. The church, in its opinion, met the needs of the infants’ souls by ensuring that all the children were baptized. As Sherwood explains, the church relied on the financial assistance of wealthy individuals and the government. This assistance waned toward the end of the eighteenth century. Moreover, the Spanish government, in the 1790s, required all charitable institutions to place a certain portion of their wealth at the state’s disposal. Sherwood maintains that this action eroded traditional systems of poor relief, among them the *Inclusa*.

In 1798, the *Inclusa* passed into the hands of the *Junta de damas*, a society of noblewomen concerned with social and economic reform. The *Junta* reorganized the *Inclusa* by adding a second doctor and a second surgeon, doubling the staff and separating the sick from the healthy infants. Yet, the mortality rates continued to rise and, in 1804, despite the reforms, all the infants admitted that year to the *Inclusa* died. Sherwood concludes that the mortality rates declined only with the advent of medical advances at the end of the nineteenth century. In describing the reforms, Sherwood has shown the “medicalization” of charity institutions in Spain, and the growing influence of male doctors in a world which had been heavily populated by female nurses and midwives. Sherwood has also given an interesting sketch of the *Inclusa* gradually changing from a foundling institution to its present state — a pediatric hospital.

Sherwood relies heavily on statistical evidence gathered from the records of the *Inclusa*. Consequently, the book lacks a detailed discussion of the day-to-day functioning of the institution. It would be interesting to learn more about what contemporaries (including government officials, nobles and church leaders) thought about the *Inclusa*. This might help Sherwood match her statistical analysis to general trends in the 1700s. Nevertheless, the book is a welcome study of the major foundling institution and of poverty in eighteenth-century Spain. Sherwood has effectively used the *Inclusa* to illustrate the conditions of the poor in Madrid during the eighteenth century.

Magdalena S. Sánchez  
Texas Christian University

\*\*\*

Morag Shiach — *Discourse on Popular Culture: Class, Gender and History in Cultural Analysis, 1730 to the Present*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989. Pp. 238.

Once in a great while, a book comes along that is not only informative and provocative, but genuinely exciting; when the field is one as glutted with “discourse” as that of popular culture, the excitement doubles. Indeed, the consistent fascination with the topic since the early eighteenth century is at the heart of Shiach’s treatment, which might be more aptly titled, “Discourse on Discourses on Popular Culture”.

Far from another history of popular culture itself, this book instead delineates an ongoing dynamic between a “dominant” culture — that of Great Britain, in this case —, which the dominant has defined as “popular”. Central to understanding this dynamic is a realization that the power to define is also the power not only to mediate, but also to marginalize, repress and ignore (5). The ways that this power has been utilized is Shiach’s topic, the changes in the dominant social, political and economic structure provide the context. The underlying continuity of power relations expressed in cultural debate is the thesis. Utilizing an impressive array of primary and secondary sources (fluid categories, since the latter become the former in this kind of analysis), Shiach supports her thesis well by moving chronologically through an intriguing variety of genres, each with a specific point to illustrate.

Appropriately, Shiach begins with the term “popular” itself and demonstrates clearly the relationship between change and continuity that unites this study. “Basically”, she states, “‘the popular’ has always been ‘the other’” (31), but within this