

Sheffield Hallam University

*Masculinity and the whoremonger in mid-eighteenth century memoirs does
whoremongering conform to contemporary ideals of masculinity?*

KHAN, Haleema

Available from the Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/18140/>

A Sheffield Hallam University thesis

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Please visit <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/18140/> and <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html> for further details about copyright and re-use permissions.

**Masculinity and the Whoremonger in
Mid-Eighteenth Century Memoirs
Does Whoremongering Conform to Contemporary Ideals of
Masculinity?**

**Haleema Khan
September 2016**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of English by Research (MRes)

Sheffield Hallam University

Abstract

It was Thomas Laqueur who stated that women have commandeered 'gender', whereas masculinity was seen to exist in a 'cultural tradition where no such history was necessary' (1990. 22). Thought to dominate literary and cultural discussion, masculinity became less studied as critics sought to give voice to the female character and experience. Recently however masculinity is coming to the fore of literary and historical criticism, the focus being on understanding masculinity beyond the 'standard', looking at the complexities and contradictions in masculine identity.

Yet despite this recent attention on masculinity there remains a male character type that is overlooked in literary criticism: the whoremonger. Seducers are a regular trope in eighteenth-century literature and have been the subject of extensive study. The notorious Lovelace in Richardson's *Clarissa*; Lothario in *The Fair Penitent* by Nicholas Rowe; and Mr. B, another of Richardson's constructs in *Pamela* are all recognised characters that feature in the genre of the seduction narrative. They are recognised characters and yet little work has been done on the whoremonger as a trope; they are largely looked at within the confines of their text. I however have examined the whoremonger as an archetypal character type.

Through the portrayal of the whoremonger in mid eighteenth-century literature, I have attempted to understand how illicit sexual conduct conformed to or contradicted contemporary ideals of masculinity. In particular, I have focused on how whoremongering was reconciled with the traditionally acceptable facets of masculine identity including work, sociability and marriage, looking at the tension between refined, sociable qualities of male identity and the base, sordid aspect that is sexuality. I have argued that despite cultural discourses that counselled to the contrary, whoremongering was a regular pursuit of the eighteenth-century gentleman. Furthermore, sexuality constructed masculinity and remained on the eighteenth century peripheral conscience as an accepted aspect of male conduct. I have done so through close analysis of three eighteenth-century texts that imitate memoir form; Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748); Boswell's *London Journal* (1762-3); and the anonymously authored *The Histories of Some of the Penitents of the Magdalen House* (1760).

Contents Page

Literature Review	1
Introduction	4
Going to work in Cleland's <i>Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure</i>	10
Acquiring Dignity in Boswell's London Journal	35
The whoremonger takes a wife in <i>The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen House</i>	51
Conclusion	72
Bibliography	79

Literature Review

The topics of masculinity and sexuality are becoming widely discussed in recent literary and historical criticism. Sexuality is defined as 'the quality of being sexual' (OED). It largely refers to sexual activity but also involves sexual 'nature, feelings and instinct' (OED). Masculinity is rather more complex to define yet Phillip Carter usefully charts the development of masculine identities in the eighteenth century in his text, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society* (2001). However, he focuses on the construction of male identity in polite eighteenth century literature and is not therefore concerned with 'references to sexual activity' which, he says, 'were invariably deemed inappropriate and indeed impolite' (Carter, 2001. 9). Yet whilst he largely ignores sexual conduct Carter does state that, 'to argue for manliness as a social category is not to deny the existence of alternative definitions promoting sexuality' (Carter, 2001. 9). He acknowledges that sexual behaviour did contribute to male identity but is deliberately overlooking this impolite aspect of male behaviour. My approach differs in that I want to reconcile the sociable with the sexual and so whilst I will be engaging with the polite I will also be examining the unrefined facets of masculinity.

Other recent studies of masculinity include *English Masculinities* (1999) edited by Michele Cohen and Tim Hitchcock. This is a selection of essays by leading literary and history researchers which examines contradictory forms of masculinity. Cohen and Hitchcock look at social and religious influences on male identity but also give consideration to the sexual. Hitchcock in particular looks at the sexual experience of John Cannon, an excise man, studying how his perception of women and sexuality developed. However, the close analysis of a single journal does not offer an in-depth understanding of whether sexual behaviour was reconcilable with acceptable masculinity. Nor does it detail the effects of sexuality on the construction of overall masculine identity.

Hitchcock, in *English Sexualities* (1997), further examines the issue of male sexual behaviour, focusing on the 'development in social attitudes towards sexuality, reproduction and the body' (Hitchcock, 1997.1). Looking at journals from the period, he considers both aristocratic and plebeian sexual behaviour during the eighteenth century as well as examining the texts that were consumed

as pornography. Yet although Hitchcock tracks changes in the language and practise of sexuality he does not attempt to reconcile the sexual with the social. He does not look at sexuality in relation to acceptable masculinity unless discussing the deviancy of homosexual behaviour. The focus for Hitchcock is sexual behaviour but not how it contributes to acceptable social masculinity.

Faramerz Dabhoiwala in *The Origins of Sex* (2012) also looks at sexual behaviour but with particular emphasis on the social, political and intellectual changes towards sexuality. He examines how enlightenment attitudes evolved and the transformation of sexual morals. Tracing social mores, Christian attitudes and legal approaches, he uncovers the contradictions that surrounded the subject of sexuality. Dabhoiwala is very much concerned with wider prevailing social attitudes and changes towards sexual behaviour. He, however, overlooks individual experience and how male sexuality in particular affected the understanding of masculinity during the period. Furthermore, his engagement with eighteenth century literature is in regards to pamphlets, sermons and ecclesiastical court records, providing detailed context but little literary insight.

Studying some lesser known erotic novels, Karen Harvey in *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century* (2004) does consider the literary. She begins by arguing for the emergence of erotic fiction as a distinct genre in the eighteenth century, removed from pornographic texts and romantic novels. This is slightly problematic in that her definitions are somewhat arbitrary. *Fanny Hill* for example is classed as a pornographic text due to its explicit depictions of sexual activity and lack of metaphor (Harvey, 2004.24). Yet I have found that Cleland does use imagery, pertaining to work and travel, as a metaphor for sexual conduct. Harvey however looks specifically at metaphor in depictions of the body in order to gain an insight into sexual difference and the construction of gender in the eighteenth century. She engages with and challenges prevailing theories on gender and sexuality.

Laqueur's influential theory on the two-sex model of gender which he discusses in *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (1990) is evaluated, with Harvey suggesting that it is much too simple an understanding of the body. Sexuality, she concludes, was a complex and multi-faceted construct in the eighteenth century. That being true, her study is limited as she considers sexual behaviour only within the parameters of erotica. Other genres of literature, as per

her own acknowledgement, differed in the understanding of sexuality but are not examined.

Reading these texts supports my premise that sexual behaviour was becoming more accepted and that masculinity was reliant on more than just a social identity. Yet this existing body of work comes mostly out of historical criticism, not literature. Whilst these texts engage thoroughly with representations of and attitudes towards male sexuality, they do not isolate the character of the whoremonger in literature. I will be providing a uniquely literary approach, looking at literature which engages with both the sociable and the sexual construction of masculinity in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how whoremongering is reconciled with acceptable masculine identity.

Introduction

In his journal from 1762-3, Boswell frequently refers to the 'pleasures of London' (Boswell, 1950. 74) that were the whores, as common to eighteenth-century London as the voracious punters that frequented their services. With Covent Garden acting as a den for an orgy of vice, prostitutes were at the heart of the depravity, leading Sir John Fielding, a magistrate, to dub it 'the great square of Venus' in which 'one would imagine that all the prostitutes in the kingdom had pitched upon this blessed neighborhood for a place of general rendezvous' (White, 2012. 361). These prostitutes featured repeatedly in literature of the period from Drury Lane's *Corinna* and her mangled plight to Roxana whose beauty exalts her to a status equal with a French prince. However, where they were once marginalised from society and literary discourse, they have become recognisable figures in literary criticism as critics have traced their identity, giving voice to the shunned women. Laura Rosenthal, for example, the editor of *Nightwalkers: Prostitute Narratives from the Eighteenth Century* (2008), has constructed the anthology to underline the range of experiences that prostitutes encountered. She examines the complex and evolving cultural attitudes towards the prostitute which she began in her earlier book *Infamous Commerce* (2006). Curiously, in this instance, it is the male counterpart to the illicit relationship that is the object of less critical study, despite masculinity being thought to dominate literary and cultural discussion. The whoremonger, despite being the reason prostitution flourished in the eighteenth century, remains indistinct as a literary figure and so it is this character that I will examine in literature of the mid-eighteenth century.

A whoremonger, according to Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language*, is simply 'one who keeps whores, or converses with a fornicatress' (Johnson, 1755. 1164). It is a rather succinct description when we consider the variety of labels he records concerning women of loose sexual morals. However, it does allow us to deduce that the term was unconstrained by social class and involved illicit sex with a licentious woman. I will examine to what extent this behaviour contradicted or corresponded with contemporary ideals of masculinity but I will overlook the sodomite as dictated by the bounds of Johnson's definition.

The topic of masculinity has been the focus of recent criticism and it has been noted that 'work on eighteenth century men's sexuality tends to remain distinct from work on men's social roles' (Harvey, 2004. 11). There is an implication that the 'social role' which involves the public persona of a man is distinct from his more base nature; that the two are paradoxical. However, I will argue that sexuality actually shaped a man's social façade and that whoremongering formed an integral aspect of burgeoning masculinity; that sexuality is almost a prerequisite for masculinity. It must be considered, however, that masculinity is a fluid, social construct and as such 'debates on masculinity defined their subject by reference to social rather than sexual criteria' (Carter, 1997. 34). Although a whoremonger could refer to a male of any social class, the ideals of masculinity that were ascribed to him were dependant on his social position. The representation of whoremongering may also vary according to narrative form as I will be looking at various types of memoir, including Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748) which has been credited as the first British pornographic novel (Day & Lynch. 2015, 916) and masqueraded as a true tale; Boswell's *London Journal* (1762), a candid log of a gentleman's time in London which was not intended for publication at the time it was written; and *The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen Hospital* (1760), which is explicitly specified to be a work of fiction despite its very accurate and probable portrayal of the fall into ruin.

Before considering whoremongering in regards to masculine ideals, we must first be able to outline a definition of masculinity, understanding the behaviours that were considered deviant or acceptable in male conduct. From the sixteenth and even through to the seventeenth century 'chivalry' was most associated with masculinity. Discussing the period of 1688, David Kutchta succinctly claims 'masculinity was central to the age of chivalry' (2002. 93), and so equally, chivalry was essential to masculinity. Nobility was achieved through codes of chivalrous behaviour and it was bravery and courtliness against which men were measured. In the Victorian era, 'industry' is the term dominating masculine principles. 'In the birth of a new political culture' Kutchta claims, those that were celebrated 'were self-made men, industrious inventors, producers and captains of industry' (Kutchta, 2002. 149). Work and productivity for the progress

of culture were equated with morality and largely began to define manliness. The eighteenth century ideal is more difficult to identify. A finely complete character, according to Boswell, is one that is 'sensible and elegantly learned; with an agreeable moderation of sentiment intermixed' (Boswell, 1950. 257).

Sentimentalism centred on refinement that dealt with sociability and sympathy, stemming from the earlier eighteenth century conduct of politeness (Carter, 2001. 94). After the social upheaval of the Glorious Revolution in 1688, the desire for a harmonious society birthed the idea of polite behaviour which was thought to promote easy social interaction. Politeness was defined by Abel Boyer in *The Gentleman's Magazine* in 1702 as a 'dexterous management of our words and actions, whereby we make other people have better opinions of us and of themselves' (Carter, 2001. 20). However, the 'dexterous management' of polite social interaction faced much criticism and in the mid-eighteenth century Rousseau demonstrates that attitudes towards politeness experienced a volte-face. Rousseau, in his essay *A Discourse on the Moral Effects of the Arts and Sciences* published in 1750 begins with a quote from Horace, '*decipimur specie recti*' which roughly translates to 'misled by the appearance of the right'. It characterises the understanding of politeness in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Polite discourse, which was initially thought to encourage moral integrity, became synonymous with pretence and was recognised as a performance. Rousseau goes on to claim 'we no longer dare seem what we really are' and that deceit, amongst other immoral behaviours were 'constantly concealed under that uniform and deceitful veil of politeness' (Rousseau, 1913. 132). Politeness allowed men to mask depravity behind virtue that served as a socially acceptable veneer. There was a division between nature and art that disguised a man's character and essentially, according to Rousseau, politeness bred corruption.

Born from politeness, sentimentalism also encouraged sociability but whilst politeness had a potential for artificiality, the merits of sentimentalism 'lay in its prioritisation of benevolent spontaneity' (Carter, 2001. 29). Sentimentalism initially encouraged the display of extemporaneous emotion however, with emphasis on emotion and feeling, sentimentalism as a masculine code faced its own criticisms. In the preface to his essay *The Paradox of the Actor*, written in 1773, Diderot claims 'sensibility cripples the intelligence at the very juncture when

a man needs all his self-possession' (Diderot, 1883. IX). Nowhere is the incompetence associated with sentimentality better demonstrated than in Henry Mackenzie's novel, *The Man of Feeling* (1771). Harley, the sentimental protagonist, engages in elevated conversation on virtue whilst being conned by gaming sharks; while in London he visits Bedlam, and taking the hand of an inmate, 'bathed it with his tears' (Mackenzie, 2001. 27). Dissolving into tears of rapture or despair whilst caterwauling into a handkerchief is behaviour traditionally associated with women (Carter, 2001. 95). This overabundance of emotion in a male character suggests that clear masculine identity lay adrift and was bordering on the ridiculous. Adam Smith in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments* which was first published in 1759 agrees that 'extreme sympathy with the misfortunes which we know nothing about seems altogether absurd and unreasonable' (Smith, 2006. 135). Reason came to define the eighteenth century and so sentimental behaviour seems paradoxical to the achievements of the time. It leads us to infer that whilst sympathy was valued to create a harmonious society, it had to be curtailed by emotional control in order to be considered an acceptable male behaviour.

These cultural definitions of the urbane polite gentleman and sympathetic sentimental man belonged very much to a middle-class understanding of masculinity. Middle class however, is perhaps not the most apt term, having only come into usage towards the latter end of the century. Throughout the early and middle period of the eighteenth century those who identified with a commercial, new moneyed character were predominantly known as 'the Middling People of England, the middling sort, men of middling condition and the middle Station of Life, and so on. Only towards the end of the eighteenth century does this become "the middle class"' (Seed, 1992. 115). There was a newly emerging class that was perhaps the most fluid and equivocal of social identities. 'Its constituent elements were distinguished from the landed aristocracy and gentry by their need to generate an income from some kind of active occupation. And they were distinguished from the labouring majority by their possession of property...and by their exemption from manual labour' (Seed, 1992. 115). Falling between the gentry and the labouring sort, this was the populace that was most diverse in terms of occupation and rank. It was also this populace that was closely associated with

upholding morality and sociability through maintaining the polite and sentimental identities.

Inhabiting a separate social sphere, it should be acknowledged that working-class men were held to a different standard of masculinity. By using the label 'working class' I do not mean to enrol to the 'enormous condescension of posterity' (Thompson, 1991. 12) that has obscured the individual working people. Rather I refer to the working class as those who were involved in unskilled or industrial employment under another's authority in order to distinguish between types of work that then defined class. It was only in the years 'between 1780 and 1832' that 'most English working people came to feel an identity of interests as between themselves, and as against their rulers and employers' (Thompson, 1991. 11). Working class as a personal and alternative system of identity developed during these years when there was a consciousness in working people of a self that was of their own making, around the time the newly conceptualised middle class emerged. As opposed to being a fluid social construct in which ideas of acceptable behaviour were socially determined, working-class masculinity, according to historian Hannah Barker, remained 'rooted firmly in home, workplace and church' (Barker, 2008. 13). Concerned with religion and devotion to God, the ideal working-class man was largely occupied with hard work and family. His end was to marry, creating a home of his own to demonstrate his independence and manliness. Another facet that Barker suggests of working-class masculinity but examines to a lesser extent is 'mastery of the self' (2008. 34). It suggests that the working-class man was expected to behave with restraint over the body and mind, governing his passion and refraining from an overabundance of emotion. The aristocracy, for whom work and morality were of little concern, is an altogether different social construct. Liberal expenditure, elaborate dress, profligate sexuality and outrageous self-indulgence characterised this elite class of man who became distinguished by a culture of excess. His conduct was often the target of censure by social moralists, most particularly Samuel Fawconer who, in his *An Essay on Modern Luxury* written in 1765, discussed the pernicious effects that emerged from this elite style of living (Simonton, 2015. 4). Cohen too examines how luxury, libertinism and effeminacy were believed to stem from aristocratic excess and were considered destructive not only to social morality but

masculinity. She succinctly claims that 'excess positioned the gentleman as effeminate, self-control positioned him as manly' (Cohen, 1996. 5) suggesting that excessive luxury and masculinity were opposing concepts.

Primogeniture of title and estate ensured the augmentation of aristocratic wealth irrespective of adherence to work. Possessing wealth and time enough for opulence during a period of increased commerce led to a predilection for luxury. Hume may have defined luxury as 'great refinement in the gratification of the senses' (Hume, 1987. II.II.1) but enjoyed in excess it was thought to have 'negated the self-control and sobriety necessary to act in the interests of society rather than the self' (Carr, 2014.26). Luxury became the means through which the eighteenth century sought to distinguish itself from the uncivility of earlier periods. It signaled the shift from 'rudeness to refinement', the title of Gilbert Stuarts essay written in 1778 in which he examined manners of the eighteenth century (Stuart, 1792. iv). Yet the corrupting influence of excessive luxury became indicative of a self-indulgence that undermined social improvement. The significance of progress in eighteenth-century Britain is expounded by David Spadafora who claims that during this period 'the idea of progress burst forth with new vigour' (Spadafora, 1990. 8). Society, by large, was striving for an improved culture of progress. Valuing self-gratification above the development of wider society alludes to a parallel to the principles of the libertine.

Libertinism as pertaining to specific behaviour is a changeable concept because "'libertine" confounds neat boundaries and enjoys a paradoxical relationship to the social ideals of the "World", shifting with the observer's preoccupations' (Turner, 1988. 78). The nature of libertinism was that it spurned the ideals and norms of the prevailing culture in which it existed. Eighteenth-century ideals largely fixated on social morality which, at least initially, required bodily restraint. The libertine, who deliberately rejected social convention, was unconstrained by these restrictions and came to relish the mores of sexuality. Libertinism, in the period of reason and restraint, was very much condemned as it became a synonym for sexual rapacity and excess. The aristocratic libertine was also disparaged for the possibility of his character deteriorating into the effeminate. One would hardly assume a man renowned for his excessive sexual proclivities to be associated with feminine passivity and yet Jeremy Gregory

asserts that effeminacy was not associated as much with sexuality 'as with vanity, decadence, and luxury, all of which might be seen as self-centered, in contrast with true manliness' (Gregory, 1999. 94). The qualities that were indicative of effeminacy could equally pertain to that of an aristocratic libertine culture. Disregarding his sexual conduct, the egoism of the libertine, according to Gregory, corresponds to that of the effeminate man, leading to the decline of absolute manhood. Clearly even amongst the elite eighteenth-century man there was condemnation of his masculine identity.

Masculine behaviours clearly differed between classes yet there were essential qualities that remained constant in deciding manliness. Control, of himself and over the woman that served as his counterpart; reason, which came to define the eighteenth century as a whole; and independence which was perhaps the definitive step from boyhood to manliness are the traits that unified ideals of masculinity across class distinctions. Sexuality, however, remained a behaviour that was distanced from cultural discourses around acceptable masculinity, despite literature of the period, and contemporary accounts, revealing that illicit sex featured prominently in the lives of the eighteenth-century man. It leads us to question just how whoremongering correlates with a contemporary understanding of masculinity.

Going to work in Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748)

Examining once again Johnson's definition of the term 'whoremonger' we can see that he makes no distinction of rank, making the term applicable to males of all social class. However, 'monger' as a suffix has implications of a specific register. Defined as 'a person engaged in a petty or disreputable trade or traffic' (OED) it seemingly refers to occupation, and work, as we know, was definitive of working-class masculinity. It implies that whoremongering was largely a preoccupation of the lower classes yet whilst it was true that working-class males could afford only the most flagrant of loose women, the prostitute, literature of the period strongly suggests that she was also a commodity of the gentleman. It may be argued however, that the term 'whoremonger' implied a greater slur when applied to a nobleman, suggesting not only his debauchery but his reliance on a trade, thus questioning his rank. And so I will examine literary representations of working-class men and their interaction with prostitution, in comparison to a gentleman's experience of the same. My focus will be on Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748) to examine how representations of whoremongering were affected by class and to what extent this then influenced constructions of masculinity.

Despite masquerading as an autobiographical account and depicting only 'truth! Stark naked truth' (1985. 1), a fiction that most eighteenth century texts employed, *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* is a mid-eighteenth century novel. The novel as it is recognised today was a literary form cautiously believed to have been born in the period, largely characterised by its use of realism (Watt, 2000. 11). Formal realism is perhaps a more accurate term, coined by Watt in the 1950s and described as 'a more absolute and impersonal optical accuracy upon the manner in which literature performed its ancient task of holding a mirror up to nature' (Watt, 2000. 118). Formal realism was concerned with the actuality of individual experience; human nature without pretence. For the novel it was 'the ordinary and the specifically and concretely experiential' that came into 'this new world of

narrative to define the absolute boundaries or limits of reality and by extension of moral significance.' (Richetti,1996. 4). The languages, locations and experiences that were recognisable to a contemporary audience were central to constructing the formal realism of the novel. Not only, as Richetti claims, did this 'validate the perspective of the newly conceptualised modern individual' (1996. 5), but critics believed it allowed for a greater degree of moral and social instruction. It became an antidote to the Romance which was 'a multi-layered plot involving obstacles and challenges (giants, enemy knights, dragons, outlaws); it narrates travel in foreign lands...there are women in distress as well as separated husbands and wives' (Stanivukovic, 2009. 94). The novel, set in a recognisable culture of a polite and learned age, could teach applicable moralities which became an influential component of the earlier novels. Samuel Johnson in 1750 in an essay in the *Rambler* states the necessity of moral instruction in the novel, claiming:

The fear of not being approved as just copiers of human manners, is not the most important concern that an author of this sort ought to have before him. These books are written chiefly to the young, the ignorant, and the idle, to whom they serve as lectures of conduct, and introductions into life...the highest degree of reverence should be paid to youth, and that nothing indecent should be suffered to approach their eyes or ears (Johnson, 1973. 68).

Alongside a desire to entertain, instruction was the duty of an eighteenth-century writer, which was achieved through realism, according to Johnson. Yet his argument contradicts the concept of realism in that he is insisting on only the best of human nature being exposed in order to inspire similar moral behaviour in the 'young, the ignorant and the idle'. He is in fact calling for an ideal realism which in itself is a contradiction. There also exists a tension between the types of instruction that existed throughout the era. Johnson states the necessity for 'lectures on conduct' referring to morality and virtue intended to create a principled society. On occasion this contradicted scientific instruction and 'the notion of progress, the collective advancement of humanity' that was 'one of the chief legacies of the Enlightenment' in its desire to cultivate a progressive society (Picon, 2003. 73). This is a conflict that is seen beyond the requirements of the novel in society as a whole.

The contradiction between the moral and the scientific can be observed in the social discourses that existed in regards to sexuality. I have looked at the definitions of masculinity that constructed the sociable man but throughout the eighteenth century there also developed very different, often opposing, ideas of male sexuality. As part of an enlightened era, sex and gender were being reassessed in a moral, medical, and literary capacity. Prostitutes were no longer lust fuelled sirens, but became pitied figures of misfortune (McKeon, 2005. 196); bodies of men and women were no longer considered as two forms of one sex, but were recognised as distinct beings (Laqueur, 1992. 63); novels no longer existed for merely moralistic purposes but could excite the imagination through the gothic and the pornographic. Conventional attitudes towards sexuality were clearly being challenged, a premise that is reinforced by the historian Tim Hitchcock who claims that 'the publication of works such as *Fanny Hill*, and more significantly the novels of De Sade, when combined with the activities of popular sex therapists such as James Graham, are all used to suggest that discourses around sex in general were becoming more widely distributed, more explicit, and most importantly, more modern' (Hitchcock, 1996. 76). This was true to an extent as scientific discussions around sex and sexual behaviour were becoming more open. Cures for venereal diseases were advertised in newspapers and physicians publicly promoted their contraceptive methods and abortifacients. Medical and scientific treatises on sexuality were becoming widely distributed, at least amongst a middling and upper class audience, and were often consumed as erotic matter, all of which reveal that an explicit, enlightened discourse was developing (Wagner, 1987. 46-68). Additionally, in 1779, Graham established a 'Temple of Health', which accommodated his celestial bed, a contraption dedicated to aiding conception. It is interesting to note that sexuality was being associated with health as previously it was thought that repeatedly releasing sperm, particularly through masturbation, led to weaker semen being produced and a feeble constitution. There was an alternative attitude in the eighteenth century however, that claimed men of an amorous disposition should release semen regularly in sexual intercourse to maintain bodily and spiritual health (Stone, 1977). From an informative perspective then, sex was being understood beyond the general parameters of morality and sin.

It should be acknowledged, however, that whilst Graham may have been popular, he was often mocked as a quack and was featured in various satirical caricatures (Porter, 2004. DNB). Cleland did publish *Fanny Hill* but he soon renounced the novel, claiming it was 'a Book I disdain to defend, and wish, from my Soul, buried and forgot' (Foxon, 1965. 54). An edited version of *Memoirs* was later published by Cleland on 8th March 1750, inopportunately on the very same day of the London earthquake. This was seen by many as sign of God's ire to the dissipations of society and so the expurgated version too was reviled (Greene, 2003. 225). It suggests that although discourses around sex were developing, there were still opposing, deep-rooted ideologies that suppressed open engagement with the sexual.

These were religion and morality, which, after the tumult of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, were becoming prominent forces of social governance. Reformist campaigns emerged, demanding stricter morality in order to distinguish a new, virtuous society from the corruption that shadowed the Restoration. The Society for the Reformation of Manners was the first of these campaigns whose singular aim was for a 'general improvement of religious and moral standards in public and private life' (Dabhoiwala, 2007. 290). Blasphemy, slander, gaming and involvement in cock-fighting or the theatre during the Sabbath were all corrupt behaviours that they targeted (Dabhoiwala, 2007. 305), however, 'the first concern was to curb sexual license' (2007. 298). Prostitution was deemed to be the vice most destructive to society.

Whilst James Graham may have believed that 'energetic sexual performance was the secret and the sign of a healthy existence' (Porter, 2004), reformist campaigns offered a very different assessment of active sexual engagement. Given the vehemence with which they sermonised about the effects illicit sex had on healthy British men, one may be forgiven for imagining a whoremonger as a deformed creature sporting an untucked, wine dribbled shirt and pus-filled sores. Indeed, it was the ruined bodies which were an insidious effect of whoremongering that preyed on the anxieties of the campaigners. In the *Antimoixeia: Or, the Honest and Joint-design of the Tower-hamlets for the General Suppression of Bawdy-houses* (1691) it was reported that amongst whores,

Hirelings consume their Wages, that should pay Debts to Tradesmen, and buy Bread for Children, thereby Families are begger'd and Parishes much impoverished; Here 'tis that Bodies are Poxt and Pockets are pickt[.]
(Dabhoiwala, 2007. 300)

Despite aspiring to an absolute moral society, the reformist campaigns largely appeared to besiege the working-class man, which is shown through the emphasis of the proposal on 'hirelings'. It was not the virtue or the health of the women behind the age old trade that concerned reformers but rather they were fearful of the effect whoremongering would have on the bodies and wallets of industrious young men who were engaging in prostitution as a recreational activity, away from the demands of work. Not only was it thought that engagement with prostitution led men to neglect work but, rather more alarmingly, venereal disease ruined the bodies of the workforce which prevented them from being able to work. Sexuality, they believed, was beginning to threaten the very fabric of working -class masculinity, leading reformers to launch a violent campaign against prostitution and houses of ill repute, attempting to stifle the engagement of sexuality.

These opposing discourses demonstrate the tension between enlightened ideals of progression and a desire for greater moral instruction. Whereas the middling and upper classes were exposed to a more learned outlook towards sexuality in which the 'libido was liberated' (Rousseau & Porter, 1987. 4), working-class men remained exposed to a deeply repressive religious attitude. Novelists of the eighteenth century had these various conventions to draw upon for their engagement with the sexual, from the austere discourse of the social reformers to the more instructively explicit. Cleland appears to follow the practice of earlier moral writers when he claims that *Memoirs* was intended as a cautionary tale. However, as critics have observed, and Cleland noted in the novel itself, the caution seems rather a 'tail-piece of morality... to mask a devotee to vice under a rag of a veil' (Cleland, 1985. 187). This description seems to mirror Rousseau's interpretation of the polite gentleman, one who 'concealed under that uniform and deceitful veil of politeness' his vices and immorality (Rousseau, 1913. 132). It suggests that although Cleland is seemingly conforming to a moral discourse, he recognises that the moral is merely a mask to the vice that saturated both society

and his erotic novel. Neither does the novel claim any scientific instruction. Indeed the only apparent education that occurs is from Mrs. Phoebe Ayres, Fanny's 'tuteres elect' (Cleland, 1985. 9) who paves the way to Fanny's willing downfall. Cleland's very attempt at applying the erotic to the relatively new form of the novel shows that he flouted conventional literary tradition. I seek to examine whether he also subverts the conventional understanding of whoremongering.

The exchange between Fanny and the sailor is perhaps one of the most stereotypical of eighteenth-century assumptions of whoremongering; a common labourer seeking respite with a convenient whore in a serviceable tavern. It also seemingly reinforces the expectations of the social reformers who claimed that working-class masculinity was debilitated through engagement with prostitution. Fanny is first presented with the sailor when he brazenly 'seized me as a prize' (140). Mistaking her for a common street-walker, his actions clearly demonstrate his intentions for an illicit rendezvous. Maintaining 'mastery of the self' (Barker, 2008. 34) was a crucial facet of working-class masculinity and suggests that immoderate passions should be restrained. Slaking lust with a prostitute hardly exhibits the self-control that was essential to the construction of masculinity. It suggests that the sailor, by engaging Fanny, is compromising his masculine identity. His manliness is further disparaged through the lack of appellation applied to his character which arguably denotes an absence of individual identity. Autonomy was intrinsic to all contemporary ideals of masculinity and yet the sailor lacks the most basic accoutrement of personal identity: a name. Possessing neither restraint nor identity would imply that he is just another undistinguished working-class man, forsaking his masculinity to the plague that is prostitution.

Yet whilst this exchange is seemingly typical and conforms of the assumptions of eighteenth-century whoring, in the novel it is also the most notable. Trumbach has observed that in *Memoirs* prostitution is a vice 'more or less, of the middle and upper ranks of society' and that this is incongruous with the actual world of eighteenth-century prostitution (Trumbach, 1987. 80). Paradoxically then, Fanny's interaction with the sailor, one of only a few lower class characters that samples her charms, features as a striking anomaly in its conventionality. By limiting the portrayal of lower class consumer and exposing

the upper class patrons of prostitution, Cleland has challenged assumptions of the predominantly low class whoremonger.

Cleland further subverts expectations when he describes the sailor as 'tall, manly carriag'd, handsome of body and face' (1985.140). Fanny, a prostitute fully aware, if not affected, of the symptoms of venereal disease, deliberately notes his 'handsome' body. Despite the pervasive fear of ravaged bodies that were a result of whoremongering, the sailor appears vigorously healthy. He is also recognised as 'manly' even as he allows his lust to slip the restraints of bodily control. It suggests that passion does not invalidate his control. His manliness is further stressed through the use of his profession as his defining characteristic. The lack of appellation is counteracted by the emphasis on his professional standing. It shows that he retains the core of his working-class masculinity which is not compromised by his propositioning Fanny. Cleland is challenging the assumptions of whoremongering, demonstrating that sexuality does not divest a man of his control and nor does it detract from his work.

The sailor's trade, and so his masculinity is in fact emphasised throughout the extract, nautical imagery related to sailing being particularly evident during intercourse. The sailor falling 'directly on board' Fanny (140) describes the beginning of the short journey that is their sexual liaison. Imagery of Fanny as a ship, her life equated to that of a ship's voyage but given sexual connotations runs throughout the novel and is discussed by Peter Naumann in his *Keyhole und Candle*. However, in this instance marine imagery may be ascribed to the sailor, associating the physical demands of his work to his bodily actions with Fanny to demonstrate his absolute virility.

Metaphors of laboring and work in relation to sexual congress in *Memoirs* have been the focus of recent criticism and it has been argued that it may suggest a 'personal transformation demanded by the commodification of sexual labor- a process that, as several critics have noticed, seems in this novel to turn people into mechanized laborers' (Rosenthal, 2006. 121). Rosenthal is signaling the growing commercialisation in the eighteenth century in which workers were likened to machines and prostitution was recognised as a business transaction. Cleland does describe sexual congress as 'work' (140) which suggests a commodification of sex: Fanny as a prostitute is certainly selling her favours. However, he subverts the role

between the client and prostitute when it is the sailor who is described as 'going to work' (140) as he is engaging in sexual congress. It leads us to question whether a man's work constitutes more than just employment, and whether there is a greater significance to sexual congress than mere personal gratification.

Prior to the eighteenth century, Laqueur has influentially argued that there was one recognised body with the prevalent belief being that the 'matrix of the woman is nothing but the penis and scrotum of the man inverted' (Laqueur, 1992. 63). With woman embodying the same as man, there was an authority she had over her sexuality; the general assumption being that she too had to release fluid from her testes and orgasm, in order to conceive (Laqueur, 1992. 66). Laqueur then recognises a two-sex model that developed in the eighteenth century as ideas of the individual emerged. This emphasised the differences in male and female anatomy, with bodies becoming recognised as distinct entities which in turn affected ideas around sexual behaviour. It was understood that female orgasm was no longer necessary for procreation and so progressively the role of the sexually involved women transformed into one of a 'passionless female' (Laqueur 1992. 161). The woman, from being a sexual equal, was seen to exist without sexual needs. She began to embody a more submissive role, chaste and pure which may have paved the foundation of the 'Angel in the House' philosophy which developed in the nineteenth century and became a 'popular phrase for the middle-class Madonna-like wife and mother' (Fuchs, 2005. 64).

The role of the male also experienced a slight shift however, where female sexuality gradually waned, male sexuality became acknowledged as pivotal to procreation as it was his seed that was necessary for conception. With this recognition a stricter sexual identity was imposed upon him. A new heterosexual male identity developed in which men were expected to engage only in penetrative sex with the opposite gender. According to Hitchcock the heterosexual man 'increasingly restricted their behaviour to forms of phallogentric, penetrative sex which could be countenanced as procreative' (Hitchcock, 1997. 111). Validating masculinity was achieved through engaging in heterosexual sex in order to demonstrate and distinguish assertive male behaviour from female passivity. This obligation, or work, of the new heterosexual male may account for the prevalence of prostitutes in the eighteenth century as whoremongering, like employment,

became a way to establish masculine status, and prostitutes in particular were a way through which men could display their heterosexual competency without the risk of commitment.

With sexual congress becoming a responsibility of the eighteenth-century man in order to uphold masculine identity, the sailor's exchange with Fanny is understood beyond the consideration of sin and self-discipline. His whoring becomes a validation of his masculinity, not a threat to it. Conversely, the risk to his masculinity stems from his work. Whilst attempting to penetrate Fanny, she exclaims, 'I [was] feeling pretty sensibly that it was not going by the right door, and knocking desperately at the wrong one, I told him of it:—"Pooh!" says he, "my dear, any port in a storm"' (141). Whilst previously the references to his work would have reinforced his masculinity, in this situation they serve only to threaten the virtue that was associated with work. His actions lead to a suggestion of sodomy, which included anal penetration of a woman, and then to a greater insinuation of homosexuality. After penetrating Fanny, 'things do not jee to his thorough liking' and so he changes her stance to bare her 'naked posteriors to his blind, and furious guide' (141). His repositioning Fanny's body, displaying only her behind to his gaze implies his desire to be 'blind' to the very thing which determines her femininity. And it is only when the object of his lust becomes gender neutral that he can achieve sexual fulfillment. Cleland is drawing on the association between homosexuality and sailors, as naval work was vulnerable to suspicions of illicit sexual interaction between men: 'for men in the navy...normal social experience would bring them into contact with other men and boys, to the exclusion of women and girls. Sleeping arrangements were at best crowded, and it was considered normal for men to share a bed on an almost casual basis' (Hitchcock, 1997. 64). Despite the 'casual' basis in which men could share a bed, the treatment for those caught in homosexual acts was anything but. Illicit heterosexual sex may be permitted and understood scientifically, but homosexuality remained connected to a deep-rooted religious ideology in which sodomy was 'frequently associated with anxiety about religious deviance' and punished harshly (Hitchcock, 1997. 61). The aberrancy of sodomy is further exacerbated by the fact that it is Fanny, a woman of relatively loose sexual morals, who questions the 'right' and 'wrong' of his actions. Not only was homosexuality considered religiously deviant, it also threatened

social binaries between genders and so endangered ideas of distinct masculinity. Hitchcock claims, of the eighteenth-century men who engaged in sex with other men, that they 'did not belong to a subculture, nor did they have a distinctive self-identity' (1997. 63). Whilst they may not have recognised themselves as belonging to anything outside the norm, society did affix upon them an identity that was considered 'other'. Molly became used as a term to refer to the sodomite and was stereotyped by a perverse effeminacy. 'Mollies', O'Driscoll recognises are, 'men who are unambiguously represented as having sex with other men...yet in the narrative of sexual identity, mollies are also assumed to be effeminate' (O'Driscoll, 2013. 146). An effeminate character, the molly, which should not be confused with the figure of the fop, despite Trumbach's insistence, was a threat to dominant masculinity. Trumbach equated effeminacy with homosexuality, but the fops' identity could be 'explained in terms of social, not sexual' transgression (Carter, 2001.139). It was the molly that possessed neither the independence nor assertiveness that was a requirement of a dominant masculine culture and so he undermined and emasculated ideal male identity by deliberately embodying a socially unacceptable reversal of authority. It should be remembered however, that the sailor, although suspect in his sexual inclinations, is engaging in sexual congress with a female companion. By utilising Fanny as an outlet for those desires that were considered deviant to ideal masculinity he is actually demonstrating an acceptable heterosexual masculinity and so he does not suffer for submitting to his desire.

Cleland is demonstrating that whoremongering could correspond with ideas around acceptable working-class masculinity. Maintaining 'mastery of the self' (Barker, 2008. 34) was thought to demand complete self-denial from the sexual. However, the sailor's actions show that sexuality did not compromise bodily discipline; it was only those behaviours that were considered sexually deviant that required curbing. Cleland further questions conventional beliefs around work and sexuality when he shows the possibility for the perverse in what was considered to be a virtue and, paradoxically, virtue in what was considered to be the perverse. The sailor's work, although still intrinsic to his masculinity, is also the source of the threat whilst prostitution, the cause of ruined bodies, became a way to keep men from sodomy and to demonstrate acceptable masculinity. It

shows that whoremongering can correspond with acceptable working-class masculinity, the understanding being that the physical, in terms of both work and sexual congress, is what established dominant masculinity from female docility. Shortly after Fanny's interaction with the sailor, Cleland presents good-natured Dick with his basket of nosegays as another example of a working-class cully seduced by an amorous prostitute. 'On a sudden whim' Louisa determines to 'risque a trial of parts with the idiot' (163). Whereas the sailor was known for his trade, Dick's defining characteristic becomes his mental deficiency. According to Carter, mental strength was indicative of authoritative male identity as 'even the most politest man, while narrowing down the behavioural gap between the genders, preserved his manliness by being essentially more rational and intelligent than the majority of women with whom he socialised' (Carter, 2001. 74). Physical strength, as the sailor exemplified, was not the only trait upon which masculinity was reliant. Carter is implying that irrationality was a feminine affectation whereas rationality belonged in the domain of the man. To distinguish male authority then required man to demonstrate a greater mental competency than the women with whom he associated.

This rather threatens Dick's masculinity who, although 'strong as a horse' has a countenance that is 'void of meaning or expression' (164). Gabbard has noted that 'idiots commonly were believed to have blank faces, but his [Dick's] facial "void" also alludes to his status as a Lockean tabula rasa' (Gabbard, 2008. 382). Locke, in his essay *Concerning Human Understanding* in 1690 begins by claiming, 'let us then suppose the mind to be, as we say, white paper void of all characters, without any ideas' (Locke, 1975. II.I.104). Born as blank slates- tabula rasa- Locke believed that it was only through experience that knowledge is gained. 'Void' as a description of Dick's face is engaging with the idea of the blank state, his countenance reflecting the uncomprehending condition of his mind. His mental state is further belittled when Fanny notes that he can only stammer 'so that there was no understanding even those of his half-dozen animal ideas' (160). Language was the means through which ideas were imparted. Dick's stammer and inability to convey his sentiments serve as an indication of his lack of cognitive capability which leads to his label of 'idiot'. This relates to Locke's understanding of words when he conjectures in his essay that 'he that hath names without ideas,

wants meaning in his words, and speaks only empty sounds' (III.X.506). Dick is without the ideas and the powers of mental reasoning which were necessary for verbal communication. His stammer, the 'empty sounds' that contain no meaning, is representative of his lack of mental ability that was necessary to distinguish rational masculinity from female absurdity. Dick becomes the absurd, the feminine, when he fails to speak, his lack of masculinity being reinforced by the use of the label of 'boy' (163) that is used throughout the extract alongside the slur of 'idiot'. It is this mental deficiency which supersedes the idea of dominant masculinity, allowing Fanny and Louisa to lead the exchange. While Louisa 'culls' his flowers, Fanny aims for his more personal charms and begins 'the attack' on his body (161). Her actions are disturbingly antithetical to his behaviour as he stands 'tame, passive, simpering with his mouth half open, in stupid rapture... and tractably suffered me to do what I pleased with him' (161). Her aggressiveness juxtaposes with his vulnerability, creating a stark reversal of roles as the male becomes an object that is not only gazed upon but whose body is controlled by the female character. Dick comes to embody the female role by displaying a passivity that mirrors eighteenth-century assumptions of model female sexuality; a sexuality which, for an acceptable femininity, seemed not to exist.

Effeminacy in his character is further suggested through Fanny's assessment of Louisa as 'not above gathering sweets of so rare a flower, tho she found it planted on a dung-hill' (163). Although the metaphor veers into the repulsive, initially Dick is compared to a flower, a quintessentially feminine object. However, it is his penis that is being objectified and is the target of Louisa's salacious fascination. Whilst specific behaviors, prescribed by society, may have constructed an acceptable masculinity, the penis was the epitome of manliness and it is once Dick becomes cognizant of this that the dominance associated with ideal masculinity is realised. The transformation occurs almost at the exact point of sexual penetration when Louisa 'directed faithfully the point of the battering-piece...to meet and favour the thrust of insertion' (163). From being labelled a 'ductile youth' prior to the 'insertion', Fanny notes his change into 'the man-machine' (163).

L'homme Machine by the French philosopher Julien Offray de La Mettrie was published in England in the same year as *Memoirs*. The 1748 translation bore the

title *Man a Machine* which seems to be the inspiration for Dick's newly acquired appellation. Mettrie essentially argued that man was machine, controversially negating the understanding of the soul. He also, rather damningly, encouraged the pursuit of hedonistic pleasure; to an extent that the critic Fossati reads Mettrie as insisting 'that emotions, impressions, and ideas are generated by bodily activity', namely sex (Fossati, 1999. 49). Forced to flee to Prussia for his radical philosophies, Mettrie was disdained for his hedonistic beliefs, yet, he does share a conceptual understanding with Locke when discussing the attainment of ideas. Locke claimed that sensation is one way in which ideas are conveyed to the mind. 'Our senses, conversant about particular sensible objects, do convey into the mind, several distinct perceptions of things...this great source of most of the ideas we have, depending wholly upon our senses, and derived by them to the understanding' (Locke, II.I.105). It is our senses that create understanding and it is this that Locke refers to as sensation. Whilst both Mettrie and Locke believed sensation to be essential for mental comprehension, Mettrie referred to sex specifically as a means of attaining ideas whereas Locke merely mentions sensation with references to innocuous external objects. However, Locke's thesis can be applied to sex which is an external influence that can lead to a new understanding, as we see through Dick's encounter with carnal knowledge. Dick experiences 'wild rapture' (165) through sensual pleasure, an intense sensation that brings about a mental awareness allowing him to display a dominant masculinity, as it is only then that he is capable of gaining advantage over Louisa. And indeed we see that a shift has occurred in his demeanour when Fanny's observes that Dick's countenance which was once 'so void of meaning, or expression, now grew big with the importance of the act he was upon' (164). No longer 'void' of facial expression, his expression illustrates that both a mental and physical change has occurred. The change in expression reflects his mental state, showing that no longer is he a blank slate. With his 'eyes shooting sparks of fire; his face glowing with ardors that gave another life to it; his teeth churning; his whole frame agitated with a raging ungovernable impetuosity' (164) he shows a vigor, associated with masculinity, that was initially lacking in his 'passive, simpering' nature. It is 'sensual passion' (164) which is the force of the transformation; the sensation of acquiring sexuality and sexual knowledge rousing

not only his mind but also his masculinity, earning him the title of 'man' and allowing him to reclaim the control that Louisa exercised over his body. In the whore biography, which *Memoirs* masquerades as, it has been noted that 'men are reduced to the level of potential clients, helpless pawns in an erotic game controlled by the whore' (Richetti, 1992.36). Despite the dominant social position of man, Richetti recognises that during the erotic game that is prostitution, it is the whore that stages the interaction. Dick was initially presented as very much a pawn for Louisa's enjoyment. However, once he realises his masculinity he becomes the authoritative character. Recognising the dominant role of the penis he seizes control, 'piercing, rending, and breaking open all obstruction'(164). The obstruction is not only sexual, but rather it is the innocence that barred him from claiming his masculine status. Once this is understood, the whore becomes nothing but a 'girl' who 'cries, struggles, invokes me in her rescue' (164) whereas the idiot ascends into his manhood.

Cleland appears to draw a parallel between Dick's awareness and the biblical tale of the fall of man. Initially innocent, it is only through sexual realisation that a transformation occurs. The description of his penis as 'terrible even in its fall' (165) reinforces the idea of Dick transitioning from a stage of innocence to one of knowledge. Yet whilst for Adam and Eve sexual knowledge brought ruin and was repented, Dick's awareness brings an authority that he previously lacked. Even when Dick retransforms into the 'sad repining fool' (165) that he was at the beginning of the encounter, his masculinity cannot be displaced. Mettrie believes that 'those who are men only in body but not in mind do not deserve a special class' (Mettrie, 1996. 18). Dick's return to the idiot cannot negate his display of bodily, masculine appeal nor can his mind retract what has occurred; the genesis of his masculinity.

The wasting diseases suffered by healthy young men, the indiscriminate tossing of funds to practiced whores and the negligence shown to honest labour are the assumptions of lower-class whoremongering by the social reformers which Cleland shows to be erroneous. Both the sailor and Dick are identified closely with their work: the sailor only through his trade whereas Dick is compared to the flowers he sells. Physically, both men are presented as being virile with the sailor serving as an example of robust physical ability whereas Dick's mental deficiency

is more than offset by his possession of a tool that 'surpassed our expectation, and astonished even [Fanny]' (162). Neither are the men shown to lose excessive funds in the pursuit of their pleasure; the sailor is entertained due to a whimsical desire of Fanny's whereas Dick leaves Louisa with a pocket heavier than that he initially possessed. Engaging in sexuality and sensual pleasure, Cleland has shown, can be achieved without compromising masculinity. Moreover, as both characters verified, not only does satiating sexuality lead to a stronger masculine identity but whoremongering can spur the realisation of dominant manliness. However, the construction of masculinity of both the sailor and Dick stemmed from the physical and was concerned with labour and the body. I want to examine how the polite, commercial whoremonger, in his desire for pleasure, compares in the making of his masculinity to these lower class characters.

Belonging to a mercantile middle class, Mr Crofts' intended function in the novel is to initiate Fanny into her role as a prostitute. As a merchant his social position relies on trade and so work remains an integral influence on his masculinity. Yet belonging to the middle class also necessitates an adherence to the rules of polite sensibility in order to establish masculinity. I want to examine to what extent polite male identity was affected by whoremongering, particularly as central tenets of politeness were restraint and refinement whereas whoremongering was considered uncivil and unconstrained. Whoremongering and politeness then are seemingly antithetical concepts and yet, Karen Harvey states that 'the men who participated in erotic culture were of the kind for whom politeness would have been central' (Harvey, 2004. 11). The polite gentleman did engage with the prostitute, an action which 'did not conform to the model of eighteenth century polite masculinity' (Harvey, 2004. 11). However, although their exploits may be considered impolite and illicit sexuality an incongruous aspect of their identity, there is no clear juxtaposition between politeness and whoremongering. As I will show in the course of this thesis, whoring remained a frequent diversion in which a gentleman engaged, seemingly without compromising his identity. I will question how Mr Crofts' polite masculinity is shaped by whoremongering and whether sexuality is reconcilable with his refined masculine identity.

There is little doubt that Mr Crofts exemplifies a failed masculinity. Fanny, when she is first introduced to him, reviles his appearance stating he was 'made as he was thus in mock of man' (15). She implies that he is a mere imitation of a man simply through observing his appearance. 'Short and ill-made, with a yellow cadaverous hue' is how Fanny describes his person, with 'great goggle eyes, that stared as if he was strangled; an out-mouth from two more properly tusks than teeth, livid lips, and breath like a jakes' (15). Not only is he associated with the repulsive and grotesquely likened to the animalistic but the animal physiognomies appear literally superimposed over the human to create a being that is a 'perfectly frightful' (15) mockery of masculinity. The comparison Fanny draws leads to an uncertainty as to whether he is more animal or human, particularly as he is referred to as a 'brute' (19) throughout the exchange. Edmund Burke in his essay *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* which was published in 1757 makes the distinction between human and brute when considering the passions relating to self-preservation and society. He claims that:

The generation of mankind is a great purpose, and it is requisite that men should be animated to the pursuit of it by some great incentive. It is therefore attended with a very high pleasure; but as it is by no means designed to be our constant business, it is not fit that the absence of this pleasure should be attended with any considerable pain. The difference between men and brutes, in this point, seems to be remarkable (Burke, 2004. 88).

Although he is referring specifically to the desire intended for the purposes of procreation, according to Burke sexuality should be a source of pleasure for men and should be undertaken with animation and vigour. However, he does impose limits on the pursuit of the pleasures of love, distinguishing men from brutes by their ability to be 'guided by reason in the time and manner of indulging them' (2004. 88). The man can rationalise pleasure, understanding the need for control and bodily discipline and he can endure, without suffering, the absence of the pleasure of sexual congress. The brute, however, lacks reason and persistently hunts the pleasure of gratification. The character of Crofts is consistently equated to the latter category of the brute. However, in seeking sexual pleasure, he is engaging in behaviour no different to that of the sailor or Dick, the repulsive portrayal of him inconsistent with his misdeeds.

His animal appearance in particular is a peculiarity he shares with Dick in that the question of whether he is more animal or human was an existential debate that Cleland replicated in the character of the simpleton. Christopher Gabbard argues that Dick's 'idiocy renders questionable whether he is more human than animal or vice versa' (2008. 375). Dick too was equated with the animal due to his inability to speak. Cleland, however, used the animal characteristics as symbol to allow for Dick's physical competency to offset his mental deficiency. He was described to be as 'strong as a horse' (164) and the head of his penis was 'not unlike a common sheep's heart' (162). The attributes he gains from the metaphors- strength and potency- emphasise his masculine physicality and eclipse his idiocy. I discussed how Dick became the embodiment of vigorous physical masculinity, and Gabbard too recognises that whilst 'it may seem that Dick's sublimity does not differ from that of the text's other male characters, as the scene proceeds he surpasses them in sublime splendour' (Gabbard, 2008. 383). Dick becomes the epitome of masculinity, his mental deficiency being rendered obsolete when assessed against his animal physicality.

Yet whilst the use of animal metaphor stressed Dick's masculinity, Cleland depicts Croft as unnatural and 'other', using the animalistic qualities to create a being that repulses. When she is left alone with him, Fanny describes being 'so afraid, without a precise notion of why, and what I had to fear, that I sat on the settee, by the fireside, motionless and petrified, without life or spirit' (18). Her reaction to Crofts and the description of her 'motionless' and 'without spirit' resonates with what Edmund Burke will term 'the sublime'. The sublime is an overwhelming spiritual and mental elevation roused by an intensity of emotion triggering astonishment, which is a 'state of the soul, in which all its motions are suspended' (Burke, 2004. 101). Terror, Burke believes, is one source of emotion that is most likely to initiate a sublime response. However, there are lesser passions that can cause a similar reaction. Dick caused Fanny to experience the sublime through reverence, possessing a masculinity that 'awed' (164) her into a stuttering silence. By contrast, Crofts is the source of the terrible, exercising 'fear' (18) over her as the emotion behind the sublime. Yet whilst both characters can provoke the sublime in Fanny, the conditions for the reaction differ and reflect the

contradictory masculinities; Dick arouses delight through the strength of his masculinity whereas Crofts incites horror in his unnaturalness.

This unnaturalness stems not from his propositioning a whore which, whether in a tavern or a brothel, by a sailor or a merchant, reveals the same manly desire for heterosexual pleasure which was essential to acceptable masculinity. However, the inability to temper desire indicates a lack of self-restraint which was indicative of a failed masculinity. We see this lack of restraint when Crofts, 'under the dominion of desires he could not bridle...renews his attack' on Fanny whilst 'snorting and foaming with lust' (19) even as she implored him to stop. Abandoning bodily and spiritual discipline, he exists 'under the dominion' of his passions, the control that was inherent to acceptable masculinity irretrievably lost to his character. The brute is again evident in his nature and shows his male identity is shifting into the animalistic. This inability to govern his actions also acts as a precursor to his failure to master Fanny.

Fanny notes that 'the brute had, it seems, as I afterwards understood, brought on, by his eagerness and struggle, the ultimate period of his hot fit of lust, which his power was too short-lived to carry him through the full execution of; of which my thighs and linen received the effusion' (19). Without penetrating her body, he reaches his peak. It is this undisciplined masculine control that prevents Crofts from claiming Fanny's innocence and demonstrating his male virility. She remains a 'bloom yet unenjoyed' (20) due to his powerlessness in restraining his passion, his failure at initiating Fanny to womanhood raising further concerns about his masculinity.

Premature ejaculation casts doubt on his ability to procreate which, according to Burke, was the 'great purpose' (2004. 88) of man. An inability to breed implies his incompetence at the most basic of human duties: propagation of the species. Premature ejaculation is also, according to Kavanagh, 'a condition analogous to the loss of bankable financial capital, symbolising an impoverished status within the newly masculinised framework of the commercial classes' (Kavanagh, 2014. 88). Although he is referring to John Wilkes and his *Essay on Woman*, a lewd parodic poem published in 1763, his statement can also aptly be applied to the character of Crofts. Kavanagh equates control over the body to control over finances and work. 'Impoverished' then certainly describes Crofts as

both a man and a merchant. Not only does he fail at achieving a polite, controlled masculinity, his work, which remained influential to his social position, also suffers his incompetence. Fanny learns that he was 'arrested at the King's suit, for nearly forty thousand pounds, on account of his driving a certain contraband trade...he was instantly thrown into a prison, which it was not likely he would get out of in haste' (22). A 'contraband trade' echoes the perception of prostitution in the eighteenth century which was also a somewhat forbidden commerce. Whilst 'it had come to be seriously doubted that the law extended even to public prostitution' (Dabhoiwala, 2007. 309), societies were established in order to regulate the practice and so there was an association of the legally forbidden attached to eighteenth-century prostitution. By linking Crofts' disgrace to a prohibited practice, it is suggesting that engaging with prostitution was a factor in his ruin and certainly his financial failings can be traced to whoremongering with his having 'lavished great sums on such wretches as could gain upon themselves to pretend love to his person' (15). An excessive spending on gratifying his sexual proclivities is implied to have interfered with his masculine control and his work, both of which were essential for a successful masculinity.

Yet whilst his ruin can be traced to his illicit sexuality, it is not whoremongering that is the reason for his impoverished state. Rather it is the inability to control his sexuality which leads to his unsuccessful masculine identity. It is his deplorable incompetence at balancing pleasure with work, lust with reason, and passion with temperance that becomes the catalyst to his downfall. Authority and restraint were the crux of dominant masculinity and yet Crofts is incapable of controlling his body or oppressing his passions. He is instead governed by his lust. His label of brute is used to show his undisciplined character but it also becomes a way to distance him from the masculine ideals of the period. This is further suggested by Fanny's refusal to refer to him as a gentleman, using instead general slurs as a means of reference. Dissociating him from the social framework is used to suggest that he does not and should not be classified amongst the strictures of acceptable society. The title of gentleman, when it is applied to him, is used only mockingly and is attributed entirely to his being 'daubed with lace' (16). He is an anathema to the existing modes of masculinity and so he is divested of his identity as a gentleman. Through distancing Crofts from

a polite framework Cleland has suggested that the pursuit of pleasure, to the detriment of work and class, undermines polite masculinity.

Cleland later shows that the middling rank of men can achieve an acceptable masculinity that preserves the social title of gentleman whilst engaging in 'a pleasure merely animal' (64); that politeness and whoremongering can coexist. Mr. H is presented as an exemplary contrast to Mr. Crofts, being a gentleman 'well made, of about forty, dressed in a suit of plain clothes, with a large diamond ring on one of his fingers...with an air of distinction natural to his birth and condition' (59). He appears just as Fanny is in despair over losing Charles and repaying her mounting debt. Appearances in the novel are often the first indication of a man's character and communicate his social and masculine standing. Animalistic in appearance, Crofts personified an unmanly, hedonistic creature that repulsed Fanny. The dress and comportment of Mr. H however reflect his successful commercial masculinity, wealth and politeness evident in the 'diamond ring' and 'air of distinction' that embellish his person. Even as she mourns the loss of the incomparable Charles, Fanny acknowledges that this is a 'comely' (59) gentleman, indicating a grudging awareness of his masculine appeal. This initial description immediately stresses the disparities between him and Crofts. One is clearly a 'man' whereas the other was simply a 'monster' (18). The difference between the men is only emphasised further when Mr. H's gentlemanly status remains unchallenged throughout his exchange with Fanny; on his first entering the room, Fanny assumes him to be a gentleman and soon after he relinquishes her service of seven months she affirms that he is a 'gentleman whom I certainly did not deserve' (86). Yet, like Crofts he is clearly well acquainted with the less honourable commerce of the eighteenth century. The question arises of how Mr. H can maintain an ideal commercial middling masculinity despite his being no stranger to whoremongering.

Polite sensibility, dearly lacking in Crofts' character, is observed in Mr. H when he is 'moved' (59) by the sight of Fanny's tears. Tears were, at least until the latter half of the eighteenth century, a feminine affectation. There was however a growing discourse for 'masculine forms of sensibility in which similar values of compassion, humility, sympathy and tenderness were combined with...more established masculine qualities' (Carter, 2001. 102). Ideal masculinity, during this

period, relied on men adopting traditionally feminine virtues whilst maintaining masculine deportment. Mr. H upholds this equilibrium when his reaction to Fanny's sorrow demonstrates a sympathy that does not overcome rationality. Compassion does not suffer him to fall into a pit of emotion but rather he applies his mind to the issue behind her suffering which is the money owed to her landlady. To that end, 'he drew out his purse and... paid her every farthing of her demand, independent of a liberal gratification' (59). Rescuing Fanny from her financial misfortune, without succumbing to an excess of emotion, signifies not only his masculine pragmatism and decency but also underlines his successful commercial standing. His actions demonstrate the ideal association between commerce and virtue that was prevalent in the eighteenth century. Hume in his essay *Of Refinement in the Arts*, issued in 1742, addresses the concept of ideal commerce when he suggests that 'the ages of refinement are both the happiest and most virtuous' (Hume, 1987. II.II.2). This is on account of 'industry, knowledge, and humanity' being 'linked together by an indissoluble chain' (II.II.5). Commerce, Hume believes, bred morality. Mr. H's actions certainly show how industry can financially accommodate his humanity. His sympathetic desire to help demonstrates a practical sensibility whilst his ability to help stems from his prosperous commercial standing and it is this that appears to be acceptable masculine behaviour of the period; possessing an industry that finances virtue. His benevolence however is not entirely altruistic, despite his reassurance of expecting no 'liberal gratification' for his actions. Fanny identifies the exchange of funds between Mr. H and Mrs. Jones, the landlady, as a transaction, understanding that she has been 'bought' (60). Mr. H's virtuous persona is seemingly compromised as his display of charity is revealed to have stemmed from reasons not entirely selfless. Yet according to Hume, the desire combined with the means of acquiring pleasure is a confirmation of successful commerce and these indulgences 'where they entrench upon no virtue... are entirely innocent' (Hume, 1987. II.II.2). Sexuality as a virtue in Cleland's novel is an intricate notion; it often allows for a stronger masculinity but still opposes a moral discourse. Hume's argument however suggests that Mr. H maintains his social acceptability and commercial standing as he is merely indulging the benefits of his successful labour. His actions serve only to emphasise his notable commercial achievement.

Fanny as the merchandise that is being traded experiences a sense of obligation towards her procurer. He, being 'no novice in affairs of this sort' (60), is aware of the reaction his generosity invokes in Fanny, her acquiescence allowing him to reveal his true objective. 'Under the pretense of comforting me... presently he ventured to kiss me' to which she reacts with 'neither resistance nor compliance' (60). The sexual demands he makes of her are initially veiled behind concern for her wellbeing. Deception, or at least the possibility for duplicity, was the rationale behind the fall of politeness as a social behaviour and yet this manipulation by Mr. H does not compromise his masculine identity. Mr. H, through his management of Fanny's affairs and emotions, has reinforced the acceptable gender roles of the time. Under his dominion, Fanny 'lay passive and innocent' recognising him as her 'master' (60). During her time with Charles she acted as his equal in their shared pleasure, her behaviour incongruous with eighteenth-century expectations of feminine sexuality. With Crofts she fought his control, rejecting his advances and preventing him from procuring her maidenhood. Mr. H however, has obtained her obedience, her submissiveness during the act of sexual congress restoring traditional gender expectations with Fanny demonstrating feminine compliance. Although the character of Fanny could never unequivocally be interpreted as a paragon of eighteenth-century femininity, even against the conventions of the whore narrative, Mr. H has appropriated her bodily compliance. She now inhabits a role that was familiar to eighteenth-century notions of female sexuality; the passive, asexual woman. Through this interaction he too comes to occupy a gender identity that is socially acceptable: that of the controlled, authoritative, sexually potent man.

Through sexuality Mr. H comes to demonstrate an acceptable masculinity and unlike Crofts his sexual conduct does not affect his commercial standing which was also an important facet of his masculine identity. He in fact comes to demonstrate a positive correlation between trade and sexuality as successful industry became a way to demonstrate financial control and acquire sexual pleasure. In this way, whores can be seen to be a symbol of luxury and served as proof of a man's affluence. Hume drew a connection between trade and morality but he also implies a link between commerce and pleasure. He states that during the 'times when industry and the arts flourish, men...enjoy, as their reward, the

occupation itself, as well as those pleasures which are the fruit of their labour' (1987. II.II.3). The greater the commercial success, the more it allows for pleasures that function as a reward, he claims, and these pleasures- or, as he later refers to them, luxuries- should not be considered ruinous. They are instead a confirmation of masculine and commercial success. However, he is careful to state that 'luxury, when excessive, is the source of many ills' (1987. II.II.22).

Mr. H is clearly affluent and possesses the income to finance a generous, commercial class lifestyle, with all the pleasure that entails, namely whoremongering. Fanny notes that he had a 'liberal liking' which led him to 'make his court to the usual vanity of our sex. Silks, laces, ear rings, pearl necklace, gold watch, in sort, all the trinkets and articles of dress were lavishly heaped upon me' (66). Wealth becomes a tool through which his sexuality can be satisfied, and bestowing these lavish gifts on Fanny accentuates the extent of his wealth. Yet whilst Crofts was also liberal with the capital he expended on whores, his indulgence became a folly. He struggled to maintain his commercial standing, his trade suffering his negligence. Whoremongering for Crofts became a vice, which according to Hume occurs 'when for them [luxuries] a man ruins his fortune, and reduces himself to want and beggary' (Hume, 1987.II.II.1). Pleasure can only be procured in correlation with wealth and successful commerce. Losing wealth to the pleasures that accompany it is a sign of diminished masculine control over both the body and commercial standing. Crofts was excessive in his pursuit of luxury and lost both bodily and commercial control whereas Mr. H's commercial standing is sufficiently prosperous to support his luxuries.

Mr. H's successful commercial status is repeatedly expounded upon by Cleland and appears to underpin his sexuality and his virtue, both of which were necessary for a comprehensive masculine identity. Yet there are also shades of the libertine that can be observed in his character. His desire for women is seen as 'no more strange than hunger' and his justification for propositioning various women accredited to his 'whimsical appetite' (69). The desire for pleasure is equated to a need for food suggesting that survival, of life and masculinity, relied on both being satisfied. As food was necessary for the survival of the individual and sexuality was compulsory for the proliferation of the species, the comparison Cleland draws suggests the necessity of engaging male sexuality, with women seen as various

types to be sampled and enjoyed. This rather libertine approach is contradictory to the polite, commercial identity of Mr. H. Yet his character does appear to sway between a middling eighteenth-century masculinity and an antiquated libertine sort.

Fanny describes him as possessing a:

system of manliness, that might pass for no bad image of our ancient sturdy barons, whose race is now so thoroughly refined and frittered away into the more delicate and modern built frame of our pap-nerved softlings, who are as pale, as pretty, and almost as masculine as their sisters (64).

'Ancient sturdy barons' is an allusion to an antiquated construction of masculinity, which was an anti-commercial, anti-polite identity. Mr. H's character appears to suffer a dichotomy between refined masculinity and an outdated boorish masculine identity. However, it is not a duality in his character but a coexisting balance that creates a coherent masculine identity, acceptable to eighteenth-century notions of manliness. Gentlemanliness in the eighteenth century may have involved assuming traditional female qualities, but this created a tension concerning the fine line between polite manliness and 'pap-nerved' effeminate men. There was an anxiety that polite refinement would decline into effeminacy, spurring the decline of absolute manhood (Carter, 2001. 130). Although Mr. H may be refined, he retains an identity that is purely masculine. He demonstrates an adherence to an archaic 'system of manliness' which, though defunct, maintained a clear distinction between gender appropriate behaviour. His 'constant generosity, politeness, and tender attention to please [Fanny]' (67) show that he can achieve a polite sensibility; however, his likeness to the Barons of a past age show that the purely masculine qualities remain integral to his nature. Whoremongering does not detract from his masculine character but rather reinforces his masculinity by giving him essential male qualities such as control and vigor.

Maintaining finances, control and reason, Cleland has shown, are the deciding marks of whoremongering that does not compromise commercial class masculinity. Crofts struggled to preserve these traits, his rationality and control lost to lust which then interfered with his work. It is Mr. H's ability to retain these qualities that allows him to dominate Fanny and achieve his pleasure whist

maintaining and enforcing his masculinity. Cleland has also shown, in the character of Mr. H, that politeness and whoremongering are not antithetical concepts. A whoremonger is not necessarily impolite in his dealings with women nor is politeness reliant on the absence of a vigorous sexual drive.

Overall, Cleland has challenged assumptions around whoremongering. The lower class man can engage with prostitution without compromising his work or health whereas the middle-class whoremonger can retain his finances, rationality and control, but more importantly, a polite sensibility whilst dealing in the forbidden commerce of the eighteenth century. Yet, sexuality is not just allowable in Cleland's novel but 'under the right circumstances' Elfenbein states 'sex virtually substitutes for salvation: it guarantees health, endless profit, and the most rigorous ethical and bodily discipline' (Elfenbein, 2003. 28). Having no infectious diseases that risked life, the sailor embodies robust physical health; Mr. H appears to have a boundless supply of wealth to support his sexual proclivities; and Dick possesses a rigorous bodily splendor that astonishes even two experienced whores. But, in some cases, possessing the masculine qualities is not what allows for a successful engagement of sexuality. Conversely, it is through sexuality that these characters acquire the traits that will determine an acceptable masculinity. The sailor gains a conventional heterosexual identity; Dick gains a forceful physicality and mental awareness; and Mr. H comes to possess a likeness to a past age of masculinity that highlights his potency. Sexuality has given these men the qualities necessary to achieve a socially acceptable masculinity and becomes the basis on which masculine identity is constructed.

Yet the novel has often been characterised as a 'man's fantasy of the life of a harlot' (Rousseau, 1987. 9). It is a salacious tale written by a male author for the amusement of a male reader. As such, its accepting and encouraging portrayal of whoremongering should hardly be considered entirely reflective of conventional eighteenth-century attitudes to the indulgence of sexuality. And so I will examine Boswell's London journal to understand how representations of the whoremonger differ between texts.

Acquiring dignity in Boswell's *London Journal* (1762-3)

Prostitution in Boswell's London journal, although not as focused in description as in Cleland's *Memoirs*, is certainly visible and accounts for many of Boswell's engagements. Clearly no neophyte at propositioning the common streetwalkers of London, it is perhaps not surprising that Boswell contracted venereal disease at least seventeen times in the course of his life and died in 1795 as a result of the disease (Trumbach, 1998. 167). However, his time in London during 1762-3 was not dedicated entirely to the pursuit of hedonistic pleasure. Rather he sought to cultivate a social identity befitting an acceptable eighteenth-century masculine role. London, for Boswell, gained a reputation as not only the province of iniquity but 'undoubtedly a place where men and manners can be seen to the greatest advantage' (Boswell, 1950. 68). The men and manners he seeks to emulate are 'Mr. Addison's character in sentiment, mixed with a little of the gaiety of Sir Richard Steele and the manners of Mr. Digges' (62). Addison and Steele were the editors of the *Spectator*, a regular periodical from 1711 to 1712 which was concerned with social improvement and ranged in discussion from 'the follies of contemporary fashion to the more serious problems of religion and ethics' (Addison, 1970. IX). West Digges was a leading actor of the Edinburgh Theatre whom Boswell admired for his social elegance and ease. Boswell's desire to fashion himself on these men shows his consciousness to change and develop an identity that conforms to, what he recognises as, conventional standards of masculinity. Unfortunately for Boswell, a singular model of behaviour appears impossible to imitate and so he experiences conflicts of identity. He labels Stewart, a fellow travelling companion to London, as 'effeminate as I am' (43), revealing his own sensibility as an imitation of a feminine standard. He also advocates that 'the great art of living easy and happy in society is to study proper behaviour, and even with our most intimate friends to observe politeness' (63). Sensibility and politeness were often contradictory philosophies. Sensibility relied on 'authenticity rather than show; spontaneous feeling rather than artifice; private retreat rather than urban sociability; the virtues of humble rank rather than high station' (Brewer,

1997. 114). Boswell is often open with his tears and occasionally prefers solitude to sociability. However, he also enjoys exercising his calculating wit and seeks to become polished in both dress and manners showing sensibility and politeness to coincide. After a particularly animated amorous interlude Boswell boasts, 'I must surely be styled a Man of Pleasure' (140). He becomes a gallant, reminiscent of 'one of the wits of King Charles the Second's time' (140). These various masculine types of different times and styles create some confusion as to the behaviours that are acceptable for masculinity, but there is also a freedom that comes from being able to don different forms of manliness. Boswell certainly appears to delight and exploit in his discovery that 'we may be in some degree whatever character we choose' (47). This perplexity and layering of self is reflected in the indeterminate literary form of the text. Boswell promises in the opening of his journal that 'truth shall ever be observed' (40), an echo of Cleland's assurance that the following tale would be 'stark naked truth' (1985. 1). However, despite its title of journal and Boswell's reassurance of truth, there remains some doubt as to its form and purpose.

Truth will only be observed, he then claims, insofar as it does not harm or humiliate. Then there are those 'things that require the gloss of falsehood' and 'shall be passed by in silence' (40). It is notable that Boswell subtly expurgates his journal despite his insistence that the text was never intended for publication. It implies that social acceptability maintained a hold on him and dictated the subjects appropriate for authorship even in his journal. It may also suggest however that Boswell's text does not conform purely to journal criteria and has significance beyond that of a personal log. The publication and intent behind the journal is further complicated when Boswell, in his introduction, claims that the purpose of his writing is to 'lay up a store of entertainment for my after life' and hopes that for his friend Johnston 'while he laments my personal absence, this journal may in some measure supply that defect and make him happy' (40). John Johnston, for whom he is writing, is a friend of Boswell's as both men studied, to some degree, law in Scotland and both suffered from recurring bouts of depression. Private not public is a central aspect of a journal. Particularly during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was recognised that 'journals focused on self-improvement, as the journal keeper scrutinized his or her life in light of a personal, religious or

cultural ideal' (Chevalier, 1997.437). Journals were generally focused on self-introspection which Boswell seemingly does as he strives for a moral, sociable ideal. Yet his focus is not directed entirely at himself. The privacy of the journal is neglected in his desire to entertain Johnstone, although he exposes no designs to publish for a wider audience. Indeed it was only in the 1920s, when Boswell's private papers were discovered at Malahide Castle in Ireland, that discussions began about publishing the manuscripts: the journal was first officially printed in 1950. Nevertheless by consciously writing for Johnstone, Boswell is conscious of an audience and so is believed to have given the journal 'not by misstatement of fact but by selection- a prevailing tone of zest and confidence which, during most of his time, he was far from feeling' (15). The journal is less a reflection of Boswell as he is, than the manly identity to which he aspires; it an improved version of himself contrived to entertain Johnstone. Although this is revealing, it does jeopardise accuracy and leads us to question whether the text may be classed solely as a journal or whether it becomes more an amalgam of an epistolary diary.

The literary form of the text faces further ambiguity when Frederick Pottle, in his introduction to Boswell, acknowledges that he 'did not write his journal in daily instalments as the events occurred' but would fall behind and then 'catch up in a sitting' (12). Boswell was reminiscing about the events he was depicting: the text becoming more of a life history than a methodical documentation of his activities. Pottle also recognises that Boswell had occasion to 'plan' his writings' (12) as he was posting his entries to Johnstone only at intermittent intervals. To plan a journal is incongruous and allowed Boswell fluidity in his writing as well as control over the narrative. It shows Boswell treading a fine balance between history and the literary. This balance is recognised by Pottle who states that 'Boswell generally knows his story, something as a novelist does' (12). Boswell did harbour intentions for a literary career after failing to achieve distinction in the legal profession, the style of the journal demonstrating his early ambitions. Writing upon reflection, but presenting in the here and now, allows Boswell to give his diary a literary flair, distinct from the customary utilitarian, unliterary journalistic style. Leo Damrosch too recognises a style in Boswell's writing that is unusual for a journal. He understands that 'Boswell has the very rare gift of transforming circumstantial experience into art, giving imaginative form to the quotidian' (Damrosch, 1989.

67). Damrosch may be admiring of Boswell's literary style, yet art and reality are largely opposing philosophies, there being a 'necessary and unbridgeable gap between discourse and reality' (Doležel, 2010. 28). Boswell's artistic style of discourse, the way in which he presents the quotidian, negates the idea of the commonplace, reality being overshadowed by the creative. History, being a cultural discourse, can arguably give us no access to reality as there are no clear distinction between literature and truth; history becomes another genre of writing. Boswell is deliberately further restricting access to reality by overlaying a veneer of creativity to his experiences. It blurs the genre of a journal and again aligns him with the literary.

With this blurring between history and literary, private and public, entertainment and autobiography, Boswell's journal could certainly be considered an epistolary text as he seeks to amuse Johnston through a series of documents. It may also be thought of as a bildungsroman as he navigates through the changing eighteenth-century modes of masculinity, fashioning a self that he believes to be appropriately manly. These various forms his writing acquires reflect the changing facades of masculinity that Boswell appropriated during his time in London which involve the polite, the libertine and the Anglican.

From the beginning of his journey to London in 1762 Boswell was determined 'upon a plan of studying polite behaviour, which is the only way to keep up dignity of character' (62). His attitude towards refinement is noticeably altered from his first foray into London in 1760 which ended disastrously when he was forced back to Scotland by his father in disgrace. Upon reflection on the previous excursion, he admits to being a 'heedless, dissipated, rattling fellow who might say or do every ridiculous thing' (63). Acknowledging his lack of control and decorum, he understands his behaviour to be outside the parameters of eighteenth century polite masculinity. Presently determined to become a paragon of masculinity, Boswell acutely recognises politeness as the social comportment necessary to accomplish his task of fashioning a respectable identity. Implementing polite behaviour however proved to be more challenging. The finely complete, refined character he seeks to adopt is at odds with 'the complexion, as physicians say, exceedingly amorous' (164) he claims to possess. Sexuality and his warm constitution seemingly compromise his ability to be polite although he does

endeavour to become a man capable of dexterously managing his emotions and actions. To do this he frequently consults the *Spectator* which becomes a handbook, guiding him through life as a London gentleman.

Coffee houses were advocated in the *Spectator* as a judicious space for male amusement and learning. Child's Coffee House in St. Paul's Churchyard becomes the primary location of Boswell's more well-mannered interactions. As Philip Carter states,

By the early eighteenth century, coffee-houses were seen to have a more positive role in the development of a sociable, yet virtuous, urban culture, as new social arenas in which men from diverse backgrounds could participate equally in critical discussion and civilised recreation (Carter, 1997. 44).

The coffee house was an environment for intellectual and social discourse and facilitated the increasing commercialisation in the eighteenth century as well as being an alternative male space for polite, moral conversation outside the tavern. Boswell describes Child's as 'dusky, comfortable and warm, with a society of citizens and physicians who talk politics very fully and are very sagacious and sometimes jocular' (74). The home of liberal discussion, the coffee house accommodated civilised sociability and conversation which Boswell considers 'the traffic of the mind; for by exchanging ideas, we enrich one another' (76). It became the social sphere in which masculine politeness was observed, an ideal place for Boswell to witness and cultivate his refined male identity. However, it is peculiar that Boswell chose a coffee house whose typical clientele were 'physicians' and not the more popular establishments patronised by a more literary sort. Particular coffee houses became affiliated with specific disciplines. Will's Coffee House at Covent Garden gained a reputation as the meeting place of wits, and was, towards the end of the seventeenth century, notably frequented by the poet John Dryden. Towards the beginning of the century, 'according to *The Guardian*, Button's Coffee House was the preferred forum, made fashionable by Addison' (Griffin, 2005. 52). Boswell's literary leanings would suggest Button's as a better match for his interests, providing environs that have significance to those he came to esteem and emulate, as well as appealing to his ambitions to be a writer. Child's instead becomes his chosen haunt for the simple reason that 'the *Spectator* mentions his being seen at Child's, which makes me have an affection for it. I think myself like

him and am serenely happy there' (76). His attachment to Child's develops from having read that an indeterminate 'he', relating to the periodical, was seen at the establishment. Boswell has appropriated a persona that is a reflection of the *Spectator*; a literary construct that is Addison's guise in his writings. The *Spectator*, for Boswell, becomes all that is polite and by imagining himself as this fictitious being, he too comes to personify the masculine ideal. Yet, by fashioning himself on a literary construct, he implies that the polite, fluent man of Child's is merely a pretence and not a representation of his actual nature which was often far more concerned with less polite female companionship, in which he indulged against the guidance of the *Spectator*.

The *Spectator* was seen to stand against the 'gallantry', a polite euphemism for whoring, of past ages and the decadence of the aristocracy. Rather it advised on morals and manners largely levelled at the newly emerging commercial class. John Hughes, an intermittent contributor to the periodical, wrote on Saturday 1st November in 1712,

I have other Letters on this Subject [gallantry] which say that I am attempting to make a Revolution in the World of Gallantry, and that the Consequence of it will be, that a great deal of the sprightliest Wit and Satyr of the last Age will be lost ("Untitled item" 1712. 1052).

Aristocratic excess and libertinism was the norm regarding the indulgence of sexuality prior to the eighteenth century, although the Glorious Revolution instigated changing perceptions towards dissipation. The *Spectator* is one driving force for this change, seemingly preoccupied with ending the reign of the aristocratic philanderer. Hughes seems to also confront upper class sexual immorality when he goes on to describe illicit sex as a 'spring of a thousand fopperies, silly artifices, falsehoods and perhaps barbarities: [which] at best arises no higher than to a dancing school breeding' (1712. 1052). 'Dancing school breeding' is a disparaging reference to upper class education, associating illicit sexual intercourse with an aristocratic culture. Clearly in opposition to these dissolute values, the magazine appears to be advocating a more moral discourse. Yet although Boswell often defers to the periodical in matters relating to correct masculine comportment, he appears unable to follow the counsel against whoremongering. With Louisa, whom Boswell procures as a mistress towards the beginning of his time in London, he boasts, 'I had no occasion to doubt my

qualifications as a gallant' (138). Clearly well-versed in exploring his sexuality, he delights in his supposed proficiency at pleasuring women, and proudly identifies as a gallant. Displaying a perverse pleasure in flouting polite convention in regards to sexuality implies that there is something of the libertine in Boswell's character. Conversely though, throughout his time in London, Boswell displays a constant desire to improve and cultivate a polite identity. He seeks to refine his character through noble company, respectable conversation and intellectual pursuits, attempting to bury the libertine beneath the man of dignity. At times he achieves the sociability and respectability of character that is the essence of a polite gentleman. Boswell in the company of Temple and a distant acquaintance, Mr. Nicholls, notes himself to be 'rational and composed, yet lively and entertaining' before adding wistfully, 'could I but fix myself in such a character and preserve it uniformly, I should be exceedingly happy' (258). Politeness, for all that it was intended to foster social harmony, was a performance, a meticulous composure of words and actions set to precise rules. Boswell shows he is capable of demonstrating this pretence in particular company such as the coffee house and amongst the well-bred of his acquaintances, although he struggles to maintain the semblance of politeness. His actions certainly lend irony to his later words, 'there is indeed a kind of character perfectly disguised, a perfect made dish, which is often found, in both male and female, in London. This is most disgusting: plain nature is infinitely better' (177). His critique of contrived behaviour is rather hypocritical when we consider the perversity of his own character. The qualities that he describes and admires in himself- rationality, sociability and composure- are a façade, a mask that Boswell can choose to adopt but struggles to sustain. The difficulty in upholding this appearance is that it requires his 'course of dissipation' to be renounced in order for him 'to attain dignity of character' (265). Dissipation, which for Boswell involves whoring, is obstructing his character from the dignity to which he aspires. Sexuality, he implies, is antithetical to the polite identity that involved restraint and civility and so he repeatedly vows to abstain from sexual congress so as not to compromise his acceptable social identity. However, Boswell often struggles to preserve the sociably polite veneer when swayed by the sexually primitive: a conflict he is seen to experience throughout the journal.

With his friend Erskine Boswell envisions a fruitful prose career, the literary considered civilising as well as a distraction from the alternative amusements found in London.

We talked with relish on publishing and on the profits made by books and pamphlets. We both agreed that if we could get something worthwhile by our works, we would be very glad...it is very agreeable to look forward and imagine that we shall probably write much, get much fame and much gold (179).

Undeniably Boswell does write much but his fame largely stems from the very journal he writes these aspirations in and the biographical *Life of Samuel Johnson* that he writes in 1791 after the death of his friend. When he attempts to review a production of *Macbeth* at the Drury Lane theatre however, he suffers a tension between a polite, learned mentality and a preoccupation with sexuality. He and Temple 'endeavoured to work our minds into the frame of the *Spectators*', but we could not. We were both too dissipated'. His focus instead is on the 'monstrous big whore in the Strand, whom I had a great curiosity to lubricate' (240). Striving for a cultured outlook that would lend his writing the sophistication of the *Spectators*' he is instead distracted by thoughts of a more base nature. This irregularity is seen in his character throughout his time in London, refinement conflicting with the coarse. After visiting with Lady Northumberland he is pleased that he has 'the honour to be with this noble countess and excellent woman, for whom I have the highest regard and gratitude' (112). It is an elegant sentiment conveying his pleasure at a civilised exchange with a Lady. The elegance of his character is perhaps diminished when immediately after this proclamation he visits the actress-cum-prostitute, Louisa, and expresses feelings not so honourable.

The *Spectator* and affiliation with polite company symbolise the refined aspects of Boswell's masculinity; those are the qualities and connections that he seeks to emulate and cultivate. Yet these facets of polite masculinity are seemingly threatened by the encroaching sexuality of Boswell's character that he cannot entirely suppress. Boswell's concentration on a classical literary pursuit is diverted by thoughts of a monstrous whore; his engagement with Lady Northumberland is eclipsed by an altogether more licentious rendezvous with an actress intent on providing a private entertainment. His desire for the illicit company of loose women is in opposition to the polite masculinity advocated by the *Spectator* and

social rubric of the period. However, though Boswell acknowledges illicit sexual congress as ill-advised, he engages with prostitution, acting in opposition to polite discourse which, towards the latter half of the eighteenth century 'clearly promulgates feminization's ideal of a polite masculinity based in respect for specifically female virtue' (Braunschneider, 2014. 108). Braunschneider, after reading Old Bailey records, recognises that polite discourses demanded respect for female virtue, not the ruin of.

Yet soon after relinquishing the services of Louisa and recovering from the memento of their affair, Boswell regains his desire for amorous play and propositions a prostitute. 'At night I strolled into the park and took the first whore I met, whom I without many words copulated with free from danger' (231). He indiscriminately chooses a prostitute and sates his lust. The whore remains nameless and Boswell too lacks a distinct identity during this tryst. He describes it with clinical detachment, the emotion and detail that is characteristic of his writing style conspicuous in its absence. The lack reflects the uncertain masculine status he holds, the exchange leaving him bereft of an identity either as a polite gentleman or a gallant that implies fashionable gaiety. Instead the exchange is completed furtively and crudely, outside the values of civility. Once it is over he claims to have 'a low opinion of this gross practise and resolved to do it no more' (231). He recognises the encounter as a deviation from acceptable masculine conduct yet his amorous complexion proves too fierce to suppress. His actions with the whore become a sequence that recurs throughout the journal, his resolve to 'do it no more' failing when confronted with his sexuality. Several comparable encounters follow, once:

at the bottom of the Haymarket I picked up a strong, jolly young damsel, and taking her under the arm I conducted her to Westminster bridge, and then in armour complete did I engage her upon this noble edifice...Yet after the brutish appetite was sated, I could not but despise myself (255).

This is an echo of his previous assignation, the whore chosen at whim and the regret following his actions obvious. Sex in Boswell's journal is not salvation nor is it a celebration of manly vigour. His 'brutish appetite' suggests a base, uncivilised desire that is the antithesis to the control and restraint that, in *Memoirs*, signalled a successful masculinity through sexuality. Sexual appetite, with the

means to satisfy it, was celebrated in *Memoirs*. Sex in this text is a sordid engagement that threatens male identity and is to be deplored.

However, there appears a contradiction in Boswell's interpretation of acceptable masculinity and sexuality when, during an amorous dalliance with Louisa, he expresses pride at his 'godlike vigour' as he engages in the 'noble game' (139). On this occasion, the sexual interludes feature as an advantage to his masculinity. Sexuality here is not a disreputable rub in a darkened lane that will threaten Boswell's identity. It is instead ascribed with a reverence that allows him to demonstrate a vitality that is not just manly but divine.

Sexuality and religion were not necessarily opposing discourses in the eighteenth century, despite the edict of the reformers. The idea of natural law, which re-emerged during the eighteenth century, claimed that Christianity and morality were divided concepts. It was a philosophy that considered conventional morality and organised religion to be a human invention. True morality, it argued, was drawn from reason and radical deists believed religion to be a simple concept, relying only on natural instinct and self-governance. 'The moral law laid down in scripture hence became only a secondary exemplification of what followed from rational inquiry' (Dabhoiwala, 2012. 99). It implies that reason, in this deistical movement, became the authority on morality, superseding moral law laid down in the bible (Dabhoiwala, 2012. 98). It was an incredibly seditious theory that not only disdained established religion but also reproved established secular regime. Locke, in his *Two Treatises of Government* anonymously published in 1689, engages with the idea of natural law claiming that 'the natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but to have only the law of nature for his rule' (Locke, 1821. 205). Under the doctrine of natural law, man was free from the restraints of religion and secular law, leaving only nature to dictate his actions. Reverend Charles de Guiffardiere also endorsed the precept that 'our hearts' morality is the only morality we have to lead us' (Dabhoiwala, 2012. 102) leading to changing attitudes towards sexuality. No longer vilified and shunned, sexuality could be considered a part of the natural order. There was the paradoxical understanding that 'sexual *laissez-faire* was normal, the rules of chastity artificial' and a tenet of natural law was its 'increasing valuation of carnal appetite over restraint'

(Dabhoiwala, 2012. 102). Advocating liberty over repression, sexuality over abstinence, natural law was an extremely subversive philosophy that shared an underlying parallel with libertinism.

At the ideological core of libertinism was 'the insistence that...sexual libertinism was mandated by a deified nature, whose ends were always benign and decorous' (Sainsbury, 2006. 94). Sainsbury is referring specifically to John Wilkes and his contemporaries who luxuriated in their rakehell lifestyle. Supposedly, these men rationalised their behaviour by claiming to conform to the dictates of nature, which served as an alternative understanding of religion. Nature, in the ideologies of both natural law and libertinism functioned as the governing deity that could and did sanction sexuality. Of course, libertinism valued luxury and the material, a quality that disconnects it from the traditional dictums of natural law yet, in the understanding of sexuality and sexual practise, both philosophies are in accord that not only is it acceptable, but also that it is natural and should not be suppressed. Boswell has seemingly engaged with these philosophies and has challenged austere attitudes towards sexuality by attributing it with religious virtue. Claiming to demonstrate 'godlike vigour' (139) after engaging in the sordid shows that he is engaging more with natural law than Christian. In conforming to the sexual liberty that comes from observing natural law and libertine culture, he comes to prize his sexual appetite which comes to affect his social persona at Lady Northumberland's assembly:

I strutted up and down, considering myself as a valiant man who could gratify a lady's loving desires five times in a night; and I satisfied my pride by considering that if this and all my other great qualities were known, all the women almost in the room would be making love to me (142).

His sexuality becomes a worthy feature of his character, no longer a trait to censure and conceal, reconciling the sexual and social facets of male identity. Initially, Lady Northumberland and Louisa represented conflicting components of identity that constructed Boswell's character: the public and the private. Now the sexual lends self-assurance to shape his social competency that ironically allows Boswell to navigate eighteenth-century polite culture. In this instance Boswell is not acting on a whim as he did with the nameless streetwalkers but is rather demonstrating a commendable performance that outlines his control and virility.

Sexuality has improved, not degenerated, the moral and social values that form an accomplished masculinity. Boswell is presenting a libertine argument, reminiscent of *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*, in which he has subverted presumptions about sexuality. Cleland too showed, through the portrayal of Mr. H, how whoremongering could elevate man's sensibility, not diminish it.

The libertine discourse that faintly runs throughout the journal, alongside the polite and the Anglican, is particularly observed when Boswell questions conventional notions about the malignant result of sexuality that is venereal disease. In an anonymously published pamphlet titled *Satan's Harvest Home* (1749), the author notes,

Our gentlemen of the army...are hereby weakened and enervated, and rendered unfit to undergo such hardships, as are necessary for defending and supporting the honour of their country...And our gentry in general, seem to distinguish themselves by an ill state of health; in all probability, the effect of this pernicious distemper (Anon, 1749. 31).

Attitudes towards the disease are seen to be reliant on the social ideology of class. Fear of the bodies of sailors and soldiers being affected by the disease were particularly pervasive during the Seven Years' War. Disease was supposedly 'a result of intemperance: too much alcohol, rich foods [including exotic fruits]', and the high climate of a foreign land (Charters, 2014. 13). Fear of sexual disease during this period reflected the unease at declining standards of national strength with soldiers being thought 'weakened and enervated' by foreign adversity. The effect of sexual disease on the aristocracy is seemingly more insidious. The British aristocracy, the author claims, are identifiable by their symptoms of venereal disease, signalling the degeneration of British politeness and civility. Yet despite the grave concerns of the author, amongst the aristocracy venereal disease was treated with almost cavalier bravado. In a letter from Mr. William Cochrane, Judge Advocate for Scotland, when Boswell is afflicted with the disease, he writes, 'who in the performance of a manly part would not wish to get claps? The brave only are wounded in front, and heroes are not ashamed of such scars' (198). It is a facetious response, particularly in view of the emphatic censure of whoring from social moralists of the period. Venereal disease, as opposed to ruining Boswell's body and masculinity, marks him as a man. It suggests that the disease is a physical validation of manliness, a proof that he has been engaging in a masculine

behaviour. Whoremongering, in the journal, becomes a devout ritual, a benediction of masculinity through sin. Venereal disease, the hazard of whoring, becomes a heroic mark of a manly crusade.

Boswell however, despite showing whoremongering to be an endorsement of masculinity, occasionally displays an aversion to sex, not regret after copulating but an unwillingness to engage in the act. The first time he proposes an arrangement with Louisa he describes feeling a 'melancholy plight' at the thought of amorous play and admits to 'have given a good deal to be out of the room' (101). As well as his reputation as biographer and diarist, Boswell is almost as renowned for his amorous complexion which Lawrence Stone recognises as 'overwhelmingly powerful...-crude, unrefined and urgent' (Stone, 1997. 574). Feeling constricted at the thought of having to engage with Louisa, particularly after urging her for the rendezvous, is an unfamiliar facet of his identity. Later he does claim to have become invigorated and asserts that his 'powers were excited' (101), but does not engage in sexual congress. Boswell's reluctance may be dismissed as an aberration owing to nerves if it did not recur at their following assignation:

For here I was, a young man full of vigour and vivacity, the favourite lover of a handsome actress and going to enjoy the full possession of my warmest wishes. And yet melancholy threw a cloud over my mind. I could relish nothing. I felt dispirited and languish. I approached Louisa with a kind of uneasy tremor (117).

An ardent young man in the private chambers of an attractive woman; the implications should be evident. However, Boswell experiences clear trepidation at approaching the object of his lust. The description of himself as the 'favourite lover of a handsome actress' seems a woven fantasy of what Boswell imagines should be. Instead he is 'melancholy', an echo of his previous unease, signifying a sorrow that is a mental disquiet, not physical impotence. Overcoming his reluctance, Boswell does approach Louisa and endeavours to engage in intercourse before they are interrupted. By compelling himself to dominate his reluctance into readiness Boswell is demonstrating an internal conflict in regards to his understanding of sexuality.

Illicit sexuality, as shown by *Spectator* articles and Boswell's reproaches after engaging in debauchery, was initially in contradiction of a polite masculinity. Yet for Boswell, politeness was a mask to be adopted when in the company of

those who occupied the sphere of refined sociability. He displays little hesitation at casting off the mask to expose the animal passions of his character when the necessity for polite sociability is over and in fact shows sexuality to benefit the polite aspect of his character. Sexuality also worked to reinforce the alternative understanding of masculinity that existed in the eighteenth century which relied on a primitive demonstration of physicality in order to distinguish robust manliness from female delicacy. This was a visceral interpretation of manliness which was valued not only in past ages but carried import through into the eighteenth century. Cleland advocated this archaic interpretation of manliness and depicted Mr. H as an exemplar of this antiquated standard. Carter believes that Boswell too was capable of displaying this 'alternative understanding of manhood defined in terms of boorishness as opposed to gentility, hardiness rather than delicacy and sexual rapacity not sensibility' (Carter, 2001. 196). Boswell often describes himself as possessing an uncommonly amorous nature (168) which is essential to this alternative masculinity Carter describes. Demonstrating sexual virility was acceptable, indeed commended, according to the values of polite conduct and visceral masculinity. And so Boswell's reluctance suggests that there was an alternative cause for him to be uneasy at pursuing his sexuality. In the libertine fantasy of *Memoirs*, the lives of the male characters were presented in a fleeting fragment, their sexual proclivities detached from their social and moral self. Boswell however must astutely cultivate a polite persona whilst being able to validate his masculinity through sexuality as he attempts to observe Christian piety. Having to balance these divergent identities-the social, sexual and spiritual-causes the conflict that is seen when he masterfully propositions Louisa but is unable to pursue their exchange to the natural end. Sexuality is a way to conform to the alternative masculinity Carter describes as establishing basic male identity and Boswell is able to reconcile this with his polite identity by way of Louisa who provided Boswell with a visceral validation of manliness as well as the self-assurance that was necessary to his social façade. However, his reluctance to engage in fornication stems from his obligation to the contradicting moral responsibilities of his masculinity.

The eighteenth century, Ingram describes, was 'post-confessional and increasingly secular' (Ingram, 2007. 4). As religion was shunted for modernity,

contemporary critics instead focused through the lens of the social and the sexual. Novels of the period too concentrated on secular morality in relation to social decency, but a facet of Boswell's identity remained focused on conventional religion. Despite his libertine inclinations and the allusion to natural law, Boswell firmly distinguishes himself as 'a very strict Christian' (283) and conventional religion was firmly decided on sexuality. 'In strict morality,' Boswell notes, 'illicit sex is always wrong' (333). The unequivocal declarative is firm in stating that illicit sex was resolutely outside the bounds of conventional religion which can account for Boswell's unwillingness to engage in it. This contradiction between religion and sexuality can be observed when Boswell attends a service at St. George's Church. He feels 'upon honour much disposed to be a Christian. Yet I was rather cold in my devotion. The Duchess of Grafton attracted my eyes rather too much' (68). Although disposed to religion, his devotion is diverted by a woman. His sexuality proves ruinous to his devoutness.

Yet even scripture for Boswell can later be flexibly interpreted. In a conversation with Samuel Johnson, which he relates in the biography *The Life of Samuel Johnson* (1791), he discusses the degree to which sexuality is a sin:

BOSWELL. Hence a question arose, whether fornication was a sin of a heinous nature; and that I had maintained, that it did not deserve that epithet, in as much as it was not one of those sins which argue a very great depravity of heart; in short, was not, in the general acceptance of mankind, a heinous sin. JOHNSON. No, sir, it is not a heinous sin. A heinous sin is that for which a man is punished with death or banishment. BOSWELL. But, sire, after I had argued that it was not a heinous sin, an old clergyman rose up, and repeating the text of scripture denouncing judgement against whoremongers, asked, whether, considering this, there could be any doubt of fornication being a heinous sin. JOHNSON. Why, sire, observe the word *whoremonger*. Every sin, if persisted in, will become heinous. Whoremonger is a dealer in whores, as ironmonger is a dealer in iron. But as you don't call a man an ironmonger for buying and selling a penknife; so you don't call a man a whoremonger for getting one wench with child (Boswell, 1992. 426).

Fornication may be religiously forbidden but secular acceptance has reduced the sin in severity. It is a wrongdoing that stems not from a 'depravity of heart' but of the body which, according to Boswell, lessens the gravity of whoremongering. Johnson appears to take a similar vein as Boswell as he artfully ripostes that only by persisting in a sin does it become truly reprehensible. It leads

us to infer that whilst impregnating a whore is deemed somewhat acceptable, accomplishing the same with several may be taken exception to.

Boswell has theoretically reconciled religion with sexuality and this resolve is exhibited during a sermon at St. James's Church. 'In the midst of divine service I was laying plans for having women, and yet I had the most sincere feelings of religion' (54). Again, thoughts of sex intrude on his time of devotion, however, he retains his feelings of reverence. Religion, his actions imply, may not sanctify illicit sex but it does allow sexuality to be expressed to an extent. Boswell later recognises that his religious devotion and his amorous complexion both stem from his possessing a 'warm heart and a vivacious fancy. I am therefore given to love, and also to piety or gratitude to God' (54). The emotions that fuel his lust are the same that inspire his religious devotion. It implies that were he to renounce his sexuality, he would, paradoxically, also be disavowing his religious piety. Not only does religion allow for sexuality but Boswell implies that the two are intrinsically linked.

However, sexuality in the journal, from a religious stance, can never simply be understood as acceptable or deviant to male conduct. Towards the end of his time in London Boswell visits St. Paul's where he claims to be 'very devout and very happy' (331). Then days later he 'could not resist indulging myself with the enjoyment' of an officer's daughter. Initially Boswell attempts to 'resist' the temptation of the 'fine fresh lass' (332) which is peculiar as he seems to have reconciled the religious with the sexual. Perceiving his actions as a 'crime' (333) suggests that the concepts are not irrevocably linked but that tension, despite Boswell's reasoning, exists between secular acceptance and spiritual taboo. That Boswell ends with this contradiction shows that, like the indeterminate literary form of the text, ideals of masculinity, particularly relating to sexuality, cannot be definitively decided. From the beginning of his time in London Boswell was absolute in denouncing sexuality as an obstacle to a polite identity. Over the nine months, Boswell grew to realise that sexuality is not necessarily in opposition to politeness or morality but can strengthen those facets of male identity.

Arguably, sexuality can be compatible with the socially acceptable qualities that determine masculinity. However, despite Boswell's reasoning that allows for the triumvirate facets of his identity- the social, moral and sexual- to be

compatible, there is still a tension between sexuality and the refined aspects that construct Boswell's character. In his final entry on 4th August he concludes 'I am now upon a less pleasurable but a more rational and lasting plan. Let me pursue it with steadiness that I may be a man of dignity' (333). Less pleasurable but more rational is the plan to leave London and travel abroad to acquire the dignity of character that for Boswell signals an ideal masculinity. The implication is that Boswell's time in London did not equip him with the qualities necessary for acceptable masculinity. The pleasure that he experienced negated the dignity that he sought to cultivate. Whoremongering, for Boswell, eventually proved the antithesis to acceptable masculinity.

The Whoremonger takes a Wife in *The Histories of the Penitents of the Magdalen House*

Whether considered a heinous sin or a simple amusement, whoremongering in Cleland and Boswell's memoirs was presented from the narrow perspective of the male author and female characters fabricated from a male imagination. Fanny, the voice through which we are exposed to the artful world of eighteenth-century whoring, is a figure contrived of Cleland's fantasy. Boswell's engagements with whoremongering, whether exulted in or lamented, were engineered by his actions and expressed through his words. The lives of the whores barely signify to Boswell who, even after recovering from venereal disease, persists in his iniquitous diversions. Cleland rarely inconveniences his readers with the typical repercussions that arise from whoremongering, either for the whore or her patrons. His male characters attain pleasure in a glimpse and withdraw to an existence that bars further intrusion from the reader whilst the whore is neatly given a fanciful end that defies social expectation. *The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen House* (1760) however, vastly differs in its consideration of the female perspective and the consequences of whoremongering. *The Histories* was originally published anonymously in 1760, two years after the opening of the Magdalen Hospital which was officially founded in Goodman Fields on August 10th, 1758 (Binhammer, 2009. 41). The novel was variously attributed, but never conclusively, to Sarah Fielding and Sarah Scott, both of whom were novelists and members of the Bluestocking society at the time of publication. Samuel Richardson also has an undeniable connection to the text in regards to both literary focus and publication history. Lady Barbara Montagu presented the manuscript to Richardson in January 1759, on the behalf of an acquaintance. It was he who agreed to print the novel after suggesting the need for a preface (Bachelor & Hiatt, 2007. xx). Not only is Richardson bound to the provenance of the novel, he also exerts literary influence over the narrative subject.

The shifting perception of the prostitute as a sentimental creature of misfortune rather than a rapacious harlot was an opinion greatly fostered by Richardson and features as a central tenet of *Histories*. According to Katherine Binhammer,

Samuel Richardson's vindication of female virtue through his emplotment of seduction in *Clarissa* participates in the same movement to redefine sexual difference that gives rise to the new image of the penitent prostitute as a victim of seduction in mid-eighteenth century Britain (40).

Richardson was an influential advocate, through his literature, of a compassionate understanding of the fallen woman, setting the practise for later sentimental novels in which the prostitute was depicted as a victim of circumstance and prejudice. His view is one that is echoed in *Histories* in which the penitent, whilst she may be vain, arrogant or naïve, maintains her innocence and for whom redemption remains within reach. Following the conventions of a seduction narrative, *Histories* may also be seen to be influenced by Richardson's earlier novel *Pamela* (1740) which is arguably the most influential and critically studied novel of the same genre. Ian Watt has examined it as setting the tradition of the novel form (Watt, 2000. 135) and so it is the focus of much critical discussion in regards to epistolary form and genre. *Pamela* is understood to encapsulate the 'great reform goal characterising the culture of sensibility' (Barker-Benfield, 1992. 251). The reformulation of masculine identity, particularly the transformation from a rake to a husband was at the core of Richardson's novel. This theme can similarly be observed in *Histories* which also engages with the shifting role of the seducer as well as the seduced. My interest in *Histories* lies in its depictions of the seducer whilst giving prominence to the female authors and characters.

The novel has been studied to a lesser extent than Richardson's works, only recently 'coming to prominence in a growing body of literary and historical scholarship, which has demonstrated the decisive shifts in attitudes towards prostitution and female sexuality' (Batchelor, 2010. 117). It has only come to the forefront of literary discussion as ideas around the prostitute have developed. It is presented in two volumes, each further divided into two supposedly autobiographical stories depicting the fall of a penitent and her subsequent

admittance to the Magdalen Hospital. Despite being grounded in an all too common reality, *Histories* maintains its position as a fiction, the author firmly stating in the preface 'I do not pretend the following stories to be actual facts' (Bachelor, 2007. 3). It is in direct contrast to Cleland's *Memoirs* in which the recognisably fictional narrative was professed to be absolute truth. *Histories* is also unequivocally decided in stating that the imparting of morality through literature is the utmost obligation of the author, whereas Cleland, it can be argued, included extemporary morality in his novel only to appease literary convention of the period and indeed his moral justification has been described as 'partly parodic' (Hammond & Regan, 2006. 129). The author of *Histories* echoes Johnson's *Rambler* article when claiming, 'to instruct, as well as to amuse, should be the highest ambition of the species of writers, amongst whom, by this attempt, I have ranked myself' (Bachelor & Hiatt, 2007.7). Cleland was far less concerned with moral erudition and indeed recognised his moral contribution as merely a 'tailpiece' of instruction (Cleland, 1985. 187). It shows that both texts were written to very different effect; *Memoirs* sought to titillate a male audience whereas *Histories* was attempting to instruct a female readership, particularly in, as the author delicately expresses, 'giving way to the emotion of vanity' (Bachelor, 2007. 8). Although clearly differing in literary convention as well as function, both texts are alike in type: belonging to the whore narrative which emerged in the eighteenth century. I will examine how a novel, belonging to the same genre as *Memoirs* but differing in perspective, portrays whoremongering. In this chapter I particularly want to examine whether the whoremonger engaged in a purely mercenary relationship or whether whoremongering could exemplify a more companionate union. These were terms largely used to describe types of marital unions during the period but I want to examine whether they also held true for the illicit relationships that were conducted in the eighteenth century.

There was a 'strongly commercial attitude' (Stone, 1977. 137) towards marriage that was prevalent prior to the eighteenth century, particularly amongst the aristocracy. Marriage was decided not by affection but rather by money and status with matrimonial unions becoming a way to cultivate wealth or acquire further property. Given this dispassionate approach to marriage it is hardly surprising that couples sought illicit pleasure beyond the pragmatism of the

marriage bed. *The Fifteen Comforts of Matrimony* written by various male authors in 1706 is a satirical bawdy poem which exposes the sexual underworld of marriage. It laments the forlorn state of a married man who must face the injustices of having a wife who withholds her favours, dealing the stigma of a cuckold and having to raise another man's children that are coolly passed off as his own. The poem, exaggerated and satirical though it may be, is exposing the illegitimate sexual liaisons that pervaded eighteenth-century society. Extra-marital affairs in fact occurred with such regularity that they became almost an accepted aspect of matrimonial life. Wagner states that 'given the frequency of extra-marital relations, a word like adultery almost lost its former connotation with sin' (Wagner, 1982. 135). Traditional associations with adultery were replaced by more accepting attitudes. Infidelity became removed from sin and was instead recognised as 'gallantry' (Wagner, 1982. 135); from being morally forbidden, it became a fashionable social more. This was very much a mercenary approach to marriage, oddly reflective of the transaction between a whore and her client, fuelled by money. However, it became a dying tradition of the aristocracy and was being superseded by the concept of the companionate marriage.

Born from Protestant moral theology was the idea of Holy Matrimony; the premise of which was that by encouraging unity between couples, the pursuit of pleasure outside of marriage would be curtailed (Stone, 1977. 190). This moral attitude towards matrimony gave rise to the companionate marriage which rested on affection and chastity as the bedrock of a marital union. Defoe was an ardent advocate of this sentimental marriage. In his *Conjugal Lewdness*, an essay on the sanctity of the marriage bed written in 1727, Defoe strongly argued that marriage should be a source of domestic felicity and not a cause for discontent as it is portrayed in *The Fifteen Comforts*. In order to achieve this state of marital harmony he encouraged affection and warned that 'without affection, without a serious, preingaged soul, without mutual and unfeigned compliance and delight [in one] another' (Defoe, 1727. 122) marriage will be unhappy and the consequences severe, with couples living in, what he termed, matrimonial whoredom; a legal and yet immoral state of being. Marriage, through Defoe's understanding, is a holy ordinance and should not be sullied with 'criminal excesses of any kind' (1727. 21).

The excesses that Defoe refers to are the extramarital dalliances which he strongly condemns as being all too common in the eighteenth century.

Lawrence Stone also discusses the companionate marriage, suggesting that 'spiritual intimacy' and harmony between couples was integral to the sentimental relationship (Stone, 1977. 136). He takes a romantic view of the companionate marriage, concluding that love, not profit was at the heart of this sentimental union; chastity not infidelity. Yet Stone's understanding of the companionate marriage has been argued to be uncompromisingly idealistic. Ruth Perry argues that marriage, even one which may have been considered companionate, was the 'linchpin of a system that transferred the sexual, social, productive, and reproductive services of women....from their consanguineal families to their new conjugal families; matrimonial bliss was supposed to provide the glue to make the transfer stick' (Perry, 2004.196). She suggests that the concept of marital affection was a veneer which concealed the business-like nature of the exchange. Yet whether true regard or merely a comforting lie, companionate marriage was expected to curb the rise of whoremongering.

Whether the mercenary marriage led to an increase in whoremongering or whether the companionate marriage restricted the illicit practice, whoremongering was considered the antithesis of marriage. However, I want to examine whether the wife and the whore occupied different spheres of male identity or whether there was some parallel between the two.

In *Histories* Mr. Senwill is one of two male protagonists that feature in the story of the second penitent, who identifies herself as the daughter of a successful tradesman, but deliberately neglects to disclose her name throughout the telling of her story. Although he is initially an acquaintance of her former paramour's, Senwill becomes a confidante for the penitent whilst she is recovering from the heartbreak of a dalliance into which she was manipulated. She notes that:

'Mr. Senwill had obtained permission to see me as soon as I was able to bear conversation; and from his I found some relief, for it was filled with all the tokens of compassion; he wept with me when I wept; he joined in my rage' (71).

Sentimentalism, at its ideal, was emotion and empathy tempered by reason. Excessive emotion and unrestrained weeping however suffered the stigma of

absurdity and ineptitude, particularly towards the latter half of the eighteenth century. Senwill's ability to identify with the penitent's misfortune speaks of his compassion which was at the heart of sentimental behaviour, demonstrating his emotional refinement. He also however serves as an example of how emotion can overwhelm efficiency. After consulting him on various practical concerns, the penitent notes that he 'had done little more than increase the difficulties which presented themselves to my view' (72). Senwill, although emotionally refined, seemingly demonstrates an endearing incompetence at providing practical advice. As a character he personifies the virtues and demerits of sentimental behaviour; emotional refinement and a deplorable lack of practicality.

However, Senwill proves that he is not entirely without expediency when he is able to aid the penitent as she confronts her newly acquired status as a fallen woman with depleting funds, whilst ensuring his own gratification. He offers her an income suitable to the life to which she had been accustomed but recognises that 'since a too delicate generosity made me [the penitent] obstinately reject his offers, he would shew me how to render him under eternal obligations to me, and at the same time free myself from all my difficulties' (72). From friendship he seeks to promote a more intimate relationship by proposing to act as her protector, supposedly to ease her distress. In his desire to ease her difficulties Senwill subverts gender roles by claiming it is to the destitute penitent to whom he will be indebted, placing himself in a position of subservience. By forfeiting control that was necessary to the construction of acceptable manliness, Senwill is verging on the docile effeminate. And yet whilst the proposal is uttered with genteel eloquence, showing his benevolence towards the penitent and allowing her a semblance of power, it also ensures his own recompense and masculinity. By acquiring her consent to the proposition he gains a willing mistress and so a heterosexual masculine identity, refuting effeminate conduct. Senwill, despite his hapless, passive front, proves adept at securing his desires and his masculinity whilst maintaining acceptable sentimental conduct.

The penitent agrees to his proposal when he further assures her that,

he would do all that was in his power to raise my blasted reputation, by treating me as his wife, and consenting to my assuming his name. All this he urged with a sincerity of love, which affected me, who was full of esteem for him (72).

They engage in whoremongering that is decorous, demonstrating an illicit relationship that is realised, not only on lust, but on the virtues of kindness. Senwill is affording her the respect denied a fallen woman and in return earns her admiration. Yet whilst she appreciates that 'he never performed an action which was not directed by honour and virtue' (75) her love for him remains bound by reason. She confesses that 'I did not love with all the heights of romantic passion, yet I esteemed with tenderness which was more rational' (73). Passion is emotion that neglects the dictates of reason whereas tenderness is built on admiration and constrained by judgement. As opposed to excessive and fleeting tempestuous emotion, her attachment to Senwill is built on enduring regard for his character. Bound by integrity, affection and reason they exemplify a companionate relationship which leads them to occupy the role of virtuous spouses; Senwill the providing husband, and the penitent as the adoring wife. Theirs becomes a domestic arrangement which is further implied when the penitent claims that even 'my servants seemed to believe me really married' (75).

The whore and the wife are traditionally antithetical roles yet in *Histories* they become one, a subversive concept particularly when featured in a novel that identifies as a moral text. However it is a noted trope, Binhammer having observed that 'the seduced woman who is forced into prostitution, at times, provides a better model for a love divorced from commerce than the chaste wife' (Binhammer, 2009.43). The penitent lacks the traditional association with commerce that was attached to the fallen woman. As such she becomes a virtuous companion and, although she does not exceed the wife in virtue, she does come to occupy the role of wife. It suggests that whoremongering and morality may be congruent concepts; Senwill and the penitent are engaging in a whoremongering that stems from morality and so the companionate whoremonger and the virtuous harlot are permitted to live 'in great tranquillity, full of confidence in [their] love' (75).

After passing a year in felicity however, reality intrudes in the form of Senwill's father who hears of his son's uncommon attachment to a whore. It is clear that Senwill inherits from his father the characteristics that endear him to the penitent. The older Mr Senwill is described as a 'man of uncommon integrity; of manners as

gentle as his son's; tenderly affectionate, wisely indulgent to his children, mild to their frailties, but rigid to their vices' (76). And yet he does not share Senwill's concern for the penitent whom he perceives to be one such vice that requires exorcising from his son's routine. In their intimate bubble, isolated from external curiosity, the penitent and Senwill could create an illusion of a virtuous union. The older Mr. Senwill's perspective of their arrangement wildly differs as he is 'disturbed with the fear that we were really married' (76). Whoremongering is not the vice of which he disapproves; it is his son's excessive fondness for a whore which is considered inappropriate. The implication is that affection and compassion should be reserved for a moral union whereas theirs, despite possessing the qualities of virtue, remains an illicit liaison.

Filial duty and fidelity to his paramour create a conflict in Senwill as he must decide which role to honour; the dutiful son or the honourable protector. Initially he, with difficulty, rebels against the dictates of his father. He hesitates in his constancy to the penitent only when he is reminded of his betrothal which was arranged by his father who did not 'suppose it possible his son should be averse to a union with a woman so infinitely desirable' (78). Her merits stem from her possessing a 'large fortune' and a 'perfectly amiable' disposition (78). From a companionate relationship, Senwill is expected to value a mercenary union in which emphasis is on wealth and rank. Subversively, commerce becomes associated with marriage whereas virtue is found with a whore. This is oddly reminiscent of Cleland's libertine manipulation of the perception of work which became a threat to morality in *Memoirs*. In both instances virtue is obtained with the immoral. It suggests that whoremongering can be reconciled with acceptable morality and the whore can be a source of integrity.

Senwill however eventually capitulates to filial pressure and social expectation by coming to honour the mercenary, marital union. He 'at length determined...to sacrifice his own inclination to the will of his father' (79). Acceding to his father's wishes may be understood as a desertion of male independence. However, it is Anja Müller who quotes from the *Fifteen Sermons upon Social Duties* written by Patrick Delany in 1744 on the importance of filial responsibility. He claims that:

[A]ll our other duties to mankind begin and are founded here [that is, in filial duty]. It is from a right deference to the authority and institutions of parents, that we learn to become good men, good neighbours, good friends, and good subjects, as well as good sons' (Müller, 2009. 122)

The upholding of filial duty begets a man that is a worthy son and in time becomes an eminent member of the state. Senwill's sacrifice for his father is an execution of his masculine duty. He proves to be a model son which comes to reflect admirably on his overall masculine identity.

Upon accepting he must marry, Senwill resolutely determines to honour his husbandly duty by refusing to further solicit the penitent. He grimly confronts 'the solemn ceremony' accepting that it 'would oblige him never to see me more' (81). At a time when extra-marital faithlessness was all too common, Senwill demonstrates the virtuous shift to fidelity. Renouncing his illicit conduct, despite it being founded on virtue, displays a self-denial and restraint that was crucial to all eighteenth-century ideals of manly conduct. Somewhat surprisingly, releasing the services of the whore upon marriage is an undertaking that is also advocated in the more libertine text of *Memoirs*. Mr. H, for whom Fanny acted as mistress, relinquished her services and later 'married a lady of birth and fortune, to whom...he proved an irreproachable husband' (Cleland, 1985. 87). Fanny is never importuned by him again and the implication is that he also propositioned no other whore, being committed to his wife. Another of Fanny's paramours is obliged to leave her to travel to Ireland at the mandate of his father and whilst there he meets 'with an agreeable and advantageous match' after which he 'forbore sending for me' (Cleland, 1985. 126). Again, acquiring a wife ends further involvement with a whore. The libertinism of *Memoirs* was cloaked by a veneer of sentimentalism which could account for the sudden integrity of these male characters and yet, by showcasing these examples, Cleland too is implying this to be the honourable course of action. For Senwill in particular, releasing the penitent proves advantageous to his masculine identity. After relinquishing the companionship of the penitent Senwill is rewarded with his father's paternal tenderness as well as his lover's respect. The penitent develops a deeper regard at his decision to renounce her, claiming 'I loved him better for thus being forsaken by him' (82). His integrity, which first endeared him to the penitent, is that which compels him to

abandon her, encouraging her greater affection and respect. Senwill comes to epitomise the sentimental whoremonger, dutiful son and devoted husband, capable of dexterously managing these often conflicting masculine identities.

Mr. Monkerton is another male protagonist featured in the story of the second penitent who inducted this unwitting merchant's daughter to life as a fallen woman. As a young woman eminently beautiful and relatively wealthy although not socially elevated, the penitent is inundated by admirers, largely students from a nearby university, for whom she in return feels little admiration. Monkerton becomes distinguished from his contemporaries by his 'easiness and gentility of air and manner' (57). Despite being yet another young student, Monkerton is noted for his sophistication of manners that characterise a more self-assured, decorous man. He has, the penitent has shown, undergone the shift from adolescence to manhood and now comes to represent the refined persona to which young men aspired. His refinement however is not an emotional maturing that signals sentimental behaviour as Senwill demonstrated but rather he adopts a social sophistication that characterises polite conduct. The understanding of politeness during this period experienced a volte-face, becoming less indicative of civility than of duplicity. In the mid-eighteenth century 'politeness is a euphemism for something more insidious; politeness means tact, and tact equals lying; politeness means gallantry, and gallantry equals adultery' (Davidson, 2004. 46). It suggests that Monkerton's refined manners are born from deceit and licentiousness. His experience with sexual debauchery accounts for his being 'void of that awkward bashfulness which I saw in most of his age' (58). Naïvely the penitent values this self-assurance without reconciling his being fluent around women with sexual familiarity. Yet his urbane masculine identity, that which attracts her admiration, is revealed to have stemmed from whoremongering.

Monkerton's masculine elegance is emphasised by the contrast that is drawn between him and the other suitors whom the penitent scathingly refers to as 'boys' (55). In contempt of their poor attempts to flatter her vanity, their comprehensive academic education is no barrier to her scorn as she claims the 'seminary of learning, as it is generally called, is much more certainly a nursery of dangles' (55). She implies not only their immaturity, but acknowledges that they fruitlessly engage in an adolescent sport that is hovering over beautiful women in

the interest of employing their 'vacant minds and unemployed eyes' (55). Her attitude towards these aspiring suitors suggests that a fully developed character is one whose academic education is supplemented by a worldly knowledge. They have not, as yet, mastered the urbane quality that characterises a refined masculinity and lack the necessary experience, acquired by Monkerton, to lend their character the manly quality of confidence that appeals to the penitent. Instead they resemble foppishly dressed sheep, mindlessly engaging in the customary pastime of trotting after women, and are suitably rebuffed. Monkerton's courtship is received altogether differently as she observes, 'he did not follow me merely from idleness or fashion, but because he could not bear my absence' (57). She clearly feels that his attentions stem not from frivolity or fashion but from a sincerity of sentiment which she returns. She comes to harbour aspirations for a companionate marriage to which emotion between individuals was the foundation. Yet, as in most sentimental novels that engaged with this idealistic union, of which perhaps Pamela is the most comparable, as I will later discuss, there are secular obstacles and considerations in the way of marital bliss.

Social rank was a pivotal consideration for the economically driven marriage which would hardly sanction the union of a tradesman's daughter who 'has no dower but her personal charms' and a gentleman of 'good estate' (57). And yet affection, the cornerstone of a companionate relationship, can seemingly circumvent these concerns. The penitent believes herself 'of too much importance to be thoroughly sensible of the superiority which rank and fortune gave him over me' (58). Their social divide is seemingly bridged by mutual regard. Virtuous accord was also a way in which equality could be achieved beyond the secular. Literary critic Laura Thomason, after studying the letters of Mary Delany, concludes that companionate unions endorsed equality whilst maintaining traditional values by demanding 'better conduct from men rather than allowing amoral conduct in women' (Thomason, 2014. 106). Equality stemmed from moral agreement and it was strength of character that determined worth as opposed to degree of prosperity. The penitent, despite her vanity acknowledges, 'I had virtue, and its necessary companion, decorum; both of which were offended with the thoughts of an assignation' (58). Despite her growing infatuation with Monkerton she preserves her virtue when he, with questionable intent, requests a private

interview. She is soon rewarded for her prudence when Monkerton proposes marriage. His desire for an unscrupulous rendezvous casts a disreputable quality to his character. However, by coming to value the penitent's integrity and proposing marriage, he demonstrates an improved morality that is concerned with a lawful union as opposed to an illicit tryst:

Declaring himself charmed with a virtue which had baffled all his hopes, he assured me he could find nothing in an everlasting union with me, that would not be the most ardent wish of his heart, if it was in his power to proclaim me for his wife (59).

In a recognisable parallel to Richardson's *Pamela* and the character of Mr. B, Monkerton from initially being irked by the penitent's refusal, becomes enamoured with the very virtue that prevented him from fulfilling his illicit designs. It spurs him to proffer a companionate marriage stemming from sentiment and morality. As he made the transition from adolescence to manhood, his changing estimation of virtue implies that he is now transitioning from promiscuous whoremonger to an earnest suitor. It suggests that whilst whoremongering could obtain man the immaterial qualities that were necessary to a masculine identity such as self-assurance, it is only by adhering to virtue that he acquires that which became a physical symbol of masculinity: a wife. Whilst *Memoirs* allowed masculinity to flourish through sexuality and whilst *Histories* shows that whoremongering did contribute to a masculine identity, it is only through the realisation of virtue that Monkerton becomes worthy of claiming a wife and it is only then that the penitent accepts his proposal.

Legal hindrances, however, prevent them from marrying openly. Monkerton is as yet a minor under the authority of legal guardians from whom he requires consent before marrying. Claiming that they are unlikely to bestow their approval, he proposes a private marriage, quelling the penitent's protestations with the claim that her reputation, 'by marriage became his; it could receive no blemish that would not be reflected on him' (59). He is invoking the spiritual understanding of marriage in which the husband and wife 'became one person...and that person was the husband' (Stone, 1977. 195). Yet he exploits this sacred interpretation of a marital union in order to compel a clandestine marriage

and indeed his use of rakish logic forestalls further argument and they soon escape to be married.

Appearances show them to be a respectful, devoted married couple. The penitent appears content, declaring 'the house we lived in was very elegant, and my clothes expensive...in every particular our appearance was genteel' (62). It is seemingly an idyllic relationship, however, there is a shadow of disquiet when she adds, 'but few were witnesses of it' (62). It implies a lingering discontent at their furtive way of living. The discontent blooms to fury when the penitent learns that upon reaching the age of majority Monkerton does not intend to openly sanction the marriage. Founded on deception and conceived from purely immoral motives, their romantic union was a sham which leads the penitent to experience 'resentment, despair, and contempt for the man who had stooped so low to deceive me' (66). Theirs is not a sentimental union, but a libertine manipulation; she is not the virtuous wife, but a well-kept mistress. Their relationship, which in appearance was virtuous and yet in reality proved corrupt, serves as a reflection of Monkerton's character; his sophisticated manners are merely a mask to the duplicity that became synonymous with refinement.

As Monkerton's true character is revealed, their established roles change. From being thwarted young lovers, enduring harsh guardians and striving for genteel living, the penitent now labels Monkerton a 'villain' (70) and identifies herself as his 'prey' (69). In early modern England hunting arguably 'made men strong and lusty' (Foyster, 2014. 36). Into the eighteenth century it still signified an aristocratic amusement of past ages that was associated with male virility. By characterising herself as his quarry, there is the implication that whoremongering for Monkerton becomes a similarly libertine way of demonstrating his potency. This likeness to libertinism in his character is made clear when, being confronted by the penitent, he 'called what he had done excess of love, and promised every indulgence' (70). 'Excess' and 'indulgence' were the governing dictums of a libertine culture and show that Monkerton's actions sprang from duplicity not civility, lust not affection, libertinism not sentimentalism. Yet despite his immoral practise, Monkerton is excused his conduct. In a further comparison with hunting it is the object of his amusement, the penitent, who must shoulder the consequences of his sport. Whilst the penitent must endure the permanent stain of

a fallen woman, Monkerton remains irreproachable. The shame that she is made to suffer for her unwitting role in the illicit relationship alienates the penitent from her family and the civilised whereas Monkerton remains an accepted member of society even as he 'determined to go abroad' (71). Travelling to France is not a form of self-castigation for his actions but merely alternative hunting ground for his libertine amusement. Monkerton remains that which he was at the beginning of the tale; a refined whoremonger, undergoing no virtuous epiphany or suffering his libertine actions. The relative impunity with which his sexual peccadilloes are accepted suggests that whoremongering and sexuality are an accepted, almost expected, aspect of eighteenth-century male maturity, at least for the males involved in the exchange, the women being subjected to a more severe repressive discourse.

Nameless and caught between two opposing male protagonists, the fourth penitent in *Histories* shares some similarity to the second hapless victim of vanity. Born to impoverished and neglectful genteel parents, the penitent grows up in the country, the lack of education and attention birthing an artless young woman. Turnham is the first male character with whom she becomes acquainted, he being a neighbour that is close in age and yet far removed in affluence. The first we learn of Turnham is that he absconded from school after being caught in some 'juvenile excesses' (130); he then attempted to apply himself to law but that became too 'laborious a profession for so volatile a genius' (130); and he failed under the tuition of the curate of his parish, his mind too absorbed in thoughts of the military. Eventually his indulgent father capitulated to buy him an army commission. It is at this point that the penitent is first introduced to him. She is in her 'full bloom of youth' when he, at eighteen, had 'just acquired the title of captain, and a red coat...; two distinguishing circumstances that made me look on him as a very fine gentleman' (130). His youth and whimsy are overlooked in favour of his title and uniform which account for his label of 'gentleman'. Her focus on the material aspects of his person suggests that the reference to him as a gentleman is less a reflection of his masculine character than it is of her naivety. Yet her admiration for him as well as living within accessible distance prove adequate reasons for pursuing a courtship.

Anticipating their parents' disapproval, their encounters are furtive and yet incongruously chaste. In the woods near their home they 'exchanged a thousand vows of eternal love, with all that profuseness wherewith they are lavished by boys and girls, who neither know the nature of their own hearts, nor the passion they profess' (131). A clandestine rendezvous in an undomesticated environment has conventional implications of the forbidden. Yet the passion they experience is an artless yearning that is expressed with youthful innocence. Turnham is likened to a 'boy' showing that beneath the red coat of an officer he remains a young man who as of yet has not acquired a masculine identity. Naturally, as they identify as children they come to consider their dalliance a game:

We found so much pleasure in secrecy that we took great care to preserve it; whilst we continually complained of the constraint we were under as the heaviest misfortune, and of the distant prospect of our marriage, which we really felt very severely, in the language of despairing lovers (132).

The pleasure they find in their relationship stems from the secrecy through which it is carried out. Circumventing their parents and cautiously arranging assignations become welcome hardships which allow them to fulfil the roles of thwarted young lovers. Born of virtue but forced to face secular opposition is very much in concert with the concept of the sentimental marriage, which is a narrative they are seemingly imitating. Yet despite their desire for tribulation theirs is almost a pastoral love, an idealised and unconsummated passion. Although discussing the poems of Jonathan Swift, David Fairer describes eighteenth-century pastoral as 'intimate encounters free of the constraints of the social world [which] could naturalise sexual feeling by returning it to a prelapsarian innocence' (Fairer, 2003. 88). This certainly describes their relationship as they remain free from the rigidity of society and yet do not lose their sexual innocence.

However, that innocence and idealism is soon shattered when the exaggerated plight that is their parents' displeasure is superseded by a very real threat in the form of Mr. Merton. The penitent exclaims that 'if the necessity for concealment helped to raise our passion..., what addition did it not receive from the open opposition that broke out in the second year of its existence' (133). The need for secrecy may have been perceived as an ordeal however, it was an amusement that showed their love to flourish in the face of adversity, to conform

to the popular narrative of the sentimental union. They are only confronted by true opposition with the arrival of Mr. Merton, an acquaintance of the penitent's father, who is immediately cast into the role of villain.

Mr. Merton is encapsulated as being 'in short, a battered rake, whose body was worn out, but his mind unreformed' (133). Refined in neither body nor mind, he is the 'most contemptible, as well as the most nauseous, of mankind' (133). In a parallel to Crofts in *Memoirs*, the excessive libertinism of Merton's character is manifest on his person, marking him as repulsive. It compromises his masculinity on a visceral level, provoking revulsion from the opposite gender. It also demonstrates his lack of discipline as even at his advanced age he shows an inability to govern his lust. Undeterred by the penitent's disgust at his shrewd overtures, he uses marriage, the sacred institution that was slowly becoming romanticised, as a convenient means through which his passion can be satiated and proves 'weak enough to fancy a girl of seventeen a proper person for a wife' (133). Masculinity, at its ideal, was strength and discipline, qualities which Merton is shown to disregard in his hunt for sexual gratification. A jaded whoremonger, he allows his passion to overwhelm his self-control and is subsequently recognised as weak. This undisciplined sexual desire was shown in Cleland and Boswell to act as a precursor to a declining or failed masculinity. Merton's dissolute masculine identity then should, according to literary and moral convention, be rebuked. Yet although he is certainly spurned by the penitent, her parents prove biddable to Merton's guile. The penitent listened to his impassioned advances with 'little complacency' whereas her father receives the proposal for his daughter's hand with 'pleasure' and her mother with 'joy' (134). They accept his offer with alacrity, particularly after learning that he does not require 'any fortune with her' (134). Her body is the focus of his desire, not her meagre wealth.

The differences between Turnham and Merton are well-defined. Beneath his imposing uniform, Turnham remains a young man, under the dominion of his parents whereas Merton is near 'fifty years of age' (133) and appears only constrained by his lusts; Turnham's actions and views are described as 'wholly innocent' (131) whereas Merton's experience can only be described as overly well developed; Turnham is considered 'most agreeable' (130) and is looked upon with admiration by the penitent whereas Merton is described as 'odious' (134) and

inspires only revulsion. Yet despite his advanced age, his corrupt sexuality and his physical abhorrence, it is Merton who secures the hand of the penitent. In a parallel to Monkerton in the story of the second penitent, Merton's masculine identity is not diminished by his whoremongering but rather stems from his worldly experience. Turnham lacks the sexual and urbane knowledge that is necessary for a fully comprehensive masculine identity and so he is incapable of taking a wife, the ultimate material symbol for an accomplished masculinity. Merton however is rewarded with the penitent's hand and, in a further comparison to Monkerton, displays an indication of being redeemed through a union to a virtuous woman. He claims to 'admire' the penitent's 'virgin modesty' (135) indicating that he may come to learn the merits of virtue over vice. However, this is an illusion that is soon dissolved when the virgin modesty he was so humbled by he later 'wish[es] to dissipate' (135). His desire to profane that which is innocent shows the irredeemably corrupt nature of his character. Yet it is to this man that the penitent is compelled to be joined in matrimony. It is once again the whoremonger in *Histories* who is capable of securing a wife.

Upon her marriage the penitent's tale veers into a tragic account, still in keeping with the sentimental tradition. The penitent likens her role as a wife to that of a captive, referring to her married state as 'splendid slavery' (136). Merton's country estate, which she recognised as being rather 'magnificent and indeed beautiful', becomes 'no better than a gaudy prison' (135). Her perception is clouded by the literary romances which she is shown to consume. It is her:

romantic imagination [that] found a melancholy pleasure in showing my discontent. I formed my conduct on some of the romances I had read; and fancied I acted a noble part (135).

Calculating her role to suit novel convention leads her to act as the suffering heroine, Turnham the pining hero and Merton the villain. The fanciful influence of the novel on her perception of her own reality serves as an example of the anxieties that were attached to the reading of novels, particularly for women. 'Throughout the eighteenth century, the novel remained relatively suspect' (Pawlowisz, 1995. 43). Pawlowisz reasons that the danger posed by the novel stemmed from 'imitation' (1995. 43). Whilst Johnson advocated the imitation of moral practice, the fanciful nature of romances was considered a threat to the

impressionable female mind and imitation became a danger. The penitent clearly demonstrates this compliance to romantic literary convention particularly in her description of Merton as the villain, an established character that appears in the established gothic tradition. The Gothic villain was often the product of 'thwarted love and sexual desire' (Punter, 2012. 49). His desire for the penitent is the reason for her discontent and so he comes to embody this canonical character.

The faults of his character however, are not limited to his whoremongering but rather the penitent finds that his undesirability stems from his mere presence. Various circumstances in which she could find pleasure are dampened by his company. She acknowledges that 'the house was elegant, but *he* inhabited it: The park was fine, but *he* always accompanied me there' (135). He inhabits the role of jailor, his constancy received as being stifling as opposed to demonstrating his fidelity. With Merton presented as a gaoler the penitent in response experiences a sense of imprisonment which prefigures her later physical confinement in Merton's garret. She comes to identify as a treasured captive, claiming 'Mr. Merton had ornamented his victim with many family jewels and fine clothes' (138). Material possessions including the home and garden, the clothes and jewels do not redeem Merton's character nor do they endear him to the penitent. She obdurately enacts her part as the suffering heroine and continues to resent her role as his spousal 'victim'.

Yet despite her animosity towards Merton, the penitent is reconciled to living with him as his wife, demonstrating a morality that reinforces her role as a model heroine who retains her virtue in the face of depravity. She claims that 'tho' Mr. Merton had no share of my affections, I was determined to keep what I called my conjugal fidelity' (142). The author appears to be advocating and alluding to Defoe's treaty on *Conjugal Lewdness*. Although Defoe argued that marriage should be born of mutual attachment, he also suggests that 'if not, then reason, modesty, and virtue ought to be listened to, and the cravings of nature...should be governed' (Defoe, 1727. 85). Whilst hers is not a companionate marriage, the penitent continues to display the virtue and devotion that Defoe counselled to a man she clearly loathes. Yet though her intentions are pure, temptation proves challenging. During an evening rout which she was compelled to attend, the penitent unexpectedly encounters her former paramour, Turnham, and faints in shock. As

she is revived she notes that Turnham possessed 'a countenance that expressed real concern, while those of others only spoke the language of civility' (140). Civility was a pretence that became a social more whereas Turnham reveals a sincerity which speaks of his very real affection for the penitent. His concern leads her to experience a conflict between passion and duty. Desire for Turnham however proves more enticing than upholding an unwanted spousal virtue and so their romantic love is soon rekindled. With their newly acquired understanding of physical desire, they embark on an affair consummating their unrealised childhood passion.

In an echo of their youthful encounters, their rendezvous are conducted furtively with the penitent expressing 'satisfaction' at 'continuing our course unsuspected' (144). Her pleasure however soon becomes apprehension when she is caught leaving Turnham's lodgings. Upon learning that her affair has been exposed the penitent comes to 'anticipate the punishment of my crime' (144). She attributes the 'crime' entirely to herself, no blame being cast at Turnham for his transgression in conducting an affair with a married woman. As she identifies as the instigator of the crime, it is Merton, who she previously likened to her jailor, who becomes a victim. She recognises that she can expect little 'favour from a man I had so cruelly injured' (145). Whilst engaging in pre- or extra- marital congress for a man could signify a virile masculinity, to be cuckolded was to be a symbol of ridicule. Foyster discusses how 'women's chastity was of fundamental importance to men's reputations, and that cuckold was the worst sexual insult which could be directed against men' (Foyster, 2014. 86). Although she is discussing the slightly earlier period of the late seventeenth century, the stigma of being a cuckold carried into the eighteenth century and was associated with a failed masculinity. And so by forsaking Merton for Turnham, the penitent is insulting Merton's masculinity, implying that he is inadequate as a man.

Merton however is able to regain his masculine dominance through his punishment of the penitent which involves locking her in a garret, heedless of her protests. She recognises that 'all I could urge was in vain: I addressed unwilling ears' (146). Existing in a counterpart, her weakness facilitates the reinstatement of his strength. It shows that masculine authority was reliant on female passivity which Merton, by the taking away of her freedom, has engineered. His treatment of

the penitent is not permitted to continue however, as Turnham assumes the role of a romantic hero. He contrives to deliver a letter to the penitent in which he 'in the most tender and importunate manner beseeched me to suffer him to deliver me from this horrid tyranny' (147). Merton is restored to the role of tyrant and Turnham is once again presented as the hero, both of them donning established masculine roles. In accordance with his role, Turnham's daring rescue is accomplished with little difficulty, allowing the penitent to finally live with her paramour although they must do so in secrecy.

The reality of living with Turnham however proves not as idyllic as imagined. The penitent claims that 'tho' Captain Turnham's passion for me was unabated, and I loved him to distraction, yet I was not happy' (154). The absence of virtue renders their relationship unsatisfying. The moral nature of the novel is asserting that love deprived of morality leads to discontent. However, it is the female character who must suffer the emotional turmoil of their illicit relationship whereas Turnham is spared the unease, his passions remaining unaffected at their adulterous circumstances. Not only is the penitent plagued by emotional anxiety that does not distress Turnham, it is she who must endure the social condemnation for their conduct. Her divorce is executed relatively effortlessly; no confession or defence required by the penitent, it being evident she has eloped. Yet whilst it gives her a measure of 'liberty of living where I pleased, no one now having power over me' it also makes her feel an 'outcast of the world' (167). She is a pariah to polite society, her actions leading to her exclusion; she is granted freedom but at the price of her reputation. Turnham however is spared blame despite his part in the affair and the elopement. The penitent recognises that 'tho' no one doubted of the person' with whom she absconded 'yet the law could not charge him' (167). He is absolved for his part in the indiscretion, maintaining an untarnished social persona. The penitent too remains admiring of his character whilst referring to herself as a 'forlorn and wretched being' (167). Whoremongering it seems was socially prohibited only for women. Emotionally, legally and socially, Turnham's whoremongering is accepted without reproach.

Finding themselves now unfettered by Merton, the penitent and Turnham relocate to Scotland to pursue a relationship which 'bore all the appearance of matrimony; we were established in a settled menage; and as we were unknown in

Scotland, we assumed the same name' (167). Whilst they may assume the 'appearance' of a virtuous union theirs remains an illicit liaison. As such, they must be punished for their indiscretion in accordance with the moral vein of the text. And indeed their idyll is soon shattered when Turnham is relocated to Gibraltar, the penitent opting to accompany him. Their misfortune strikes in the form of a fever, 'not violent, but tedious' (172), which afflicts Turnham whilst in Gibraltar. Dying as result of the ailment he leaves the penitent alone and penniless, her only course being to turn to the Magdalen House.

Turnham's death resonates with an earlier fictional whoremonger, Lovelace, the most 'notorious woman-eater' (Richardson, 2006. 359), constructed by Richardson in his novel *Clarissa* (1748). Zigarovich quotes Runte who claims that Lovelace's death 'is less well described [than Clarissa's] and comes, as the rape did, as an anti-climax' (Zigarovich, 2013. 97). He draws a parallel between the rape of Clarissa and Lovelace's death which implies that the two events are intrinsically connected. Lovelace's death then can simply be interpreted as a direct consequence of his whoremongering; his wounds proving fatal after a duel fought over his violation of Clarissa. Lovelace's punishment for the rape was death. Turnham's death by comparison arguably serves as a punishment for the penitent as opposed to a repercussion for his own whoremongering. His death lacks the connection to sexual infamy that has become almost synonymous with Lovelace. Rather it functions as an expedient method of isolating the penitent and ensuring that she and the reader learn the consequences of sexual impropriety. It is the penitent who is thrust into a 'dreadful situation' with 'no redress in my power' (176) in the aftermath of his death. Destitute and disdained she is made to undergo the disgrace that must befall the eighteenth-century fallen woman. Turnham's transgressions by contrast largely go unaddressed, and his sexual indiscretions are not directly linked his death.

Despite its stance as a moral novel, the treatment of the whoremonger in *The Histories* seems relatively lax. Senwill is presented as a model gentleman whose actions are above reproach even as he is keeping a mistress; Monkerton is able to entice the second penitent into an illicit relationship, evading punishment for his actions; Merton who is primarily identified as a rake is capable of taking a wife; and Turnham is sentimentalised until his death despite his role in eloping

with a married woman. At different ages and exemplifying different forms of masculinity, their singular similarity is their involvement in illicit sexual conduct for which they receive no repercussions. It is in this detail that *Histories* greatly differs from Richardson. 'In Richardson's interpretation of the penitent prostitute's plot, the victim of seduction and rape will inevitably either die or be forced into prostitution and thus, culpability for her actions rests entirely with the man who first preyed on her virtue' (Binhammer, 2009. 40). And so, as seen in Lovelace's death, the seducer is very clearly condemned for his crime. Culpability is rather more difficult to assign in *Histories*. Bachelor notes that 'although some of the Magdalen narrators are vain or ignorant, not one of the women is held accountable for her fall' (Bachelor, 2007. XVI). The penitents may have surrendered their maidenhood but they remain fundamentally innocent. Yet neither is the seducer the target of condemnation as he escapes blame for his involvement in the all too familiar relationship that rests on satiating sexuality. He does not merely escape blame but his sexuality is often rewarded in the novel, as is implied when the whoremonger is shown to triumph over the inexperienced man. Both Merton and Monkerton secure the objects of their lusts over rivals who lack the urbane quality stemming from worldly knowledge. *Histories* is seemingly suggesting that whoremongering was, if not entirely encouraged, then an acceptable aspect of male conduct and development. Furthermore, it shows that whoremongering was not merely a mercenary transaction but could be undertaken with morality.

Conclusion

Sexuality and sensual pleasure, in Cleland's *Memoirs* and Boswell's journal, remain behaviours that cannot unequivocally be considered acceptable or deviant to male conduct. Whoremongering certainly can be shown to correlate with control, reason and health, traits necessary for an ideal masculinity. Yet equally the same act can symbolise an uncivilised, coarse identity that is incapable of the restraint that dictated male behaviour.

Whoremongering was in direct contrast to polite discourse, which was at the heart of the eighteenth-century determination to cultivate social harmony. Politeness was conducted through refinement and restraint whilst sexuality was the antithesis to these values, considered base and sordid. Engagement with the opposite sex, in accord with polite values but contradictory to whoremongering, was limited to the directives of sociability, not sexuality; imitation not intercourse. The indulgence of lust was very much perceived as indicative of a lack of self-discipline. Underlying the polite understanding of masculinity however, was the archaic interpretation of manliness. Virility through sexuality was the ideology that preceded a polite doctrine but remained on the eighteenth-century peripheral conscious as a masculine comportment. It allowed for sexuality as an expression of dominance over the passive female, delineating gender-appropriate behaviour. This boorish sexuality dissolved the fear of effeminacy that pervaded eighteenth-century society as imitation of feminine standards led to a disintegration of absolute masculine behaviour. It also brought an awareness of governing masculinity, signalling an innate transformation from boyhood to manliness, becoming a way through which the most rudimentary awareness of masculinity could be achieved.

Yet this rudimentary demonstration of manliness was at threat by social moralists, who sought to restore virtue in the face of increasing secularity. Reason, which became the hallmark of the eighteenth century, led to increasingly accepting attitudes towards sexuality. Moral discourses strived to curb this fall into depravity, empathising the horrors of bodily decay that signalled wider moral and social ruin. Sexuality, as opposed to exhibiting masculine potency, was purported to ruin the male body. Pleasure was equated to decaying masculinity, passion in

opposition to virtue. However, in this age of the newly conceptualised middle class, the significance of morality was waylaid by commerce. Although this commercial man was associated most with social morality, whoremongering too was an integral aspect of his identity. With his status came increasingly more leisure time and wealth. Purchasing pleasure was a way to signal ascension in rank and display his commercial success which was the core of his masculine and social identity. Sexuality came to denote a social eminence and financial security.

Whoremongering was clearly the focus of many contradictions and debates. Cleland and Boswell, whether challenging or complying with these concepts, are engaging with the evolving and opposing eighteenth-century cultural discourses towards sexuality. However although both texts acknowledge these debates they do so through very different lenses.

Boswell's journal is his attempt at illustrating a fair and undisguised life of a London gentleman. As such it attempts to candidly reflect the society in which it was written, a society that, in its attitude towards sexuality, can be described as cyclic which serves as an apt characterisation of Boswell's own perspective of whoremongering. Born from the turmoil of the Glorious Revolution, the eighteenth century sought to cultivate social harmony through morality. Reformist societies worked to systematically end working-class corruption wrought by prostitution whilst polite discourses from periodicals such as the *Spectator* focused on repudiating the aristocratic stylised philanderer. Boswell similarly begins his journey claiming a desire for dignity and sociability which he attempts to achieve through compliance with morality in an attempt to escape the disgrace of his past. He marks his epoch to London with a vow to renounce the dissoluteness of his previous lifestyle in order to cultivate a refined identity. Sexuality was very much condemned and forsaken; whoremongering a mark of former depravity that should, in this new age, be repudiated.

Throughout the age of enlightenment however, scientific discovery and a move towards secular society allowed for more progressive attitudes towards sexuality. 'Rejecting Calvinist notions of original sin and the corruption of the flesh, they [enlightenment writers] argued that nature was good, and that proper behaviour should seek to realise human nature, rather than to deny, fight and conquer it' (Porter, 1982. 4). From advocating a highly restrictive attitude towards

sex, the enlightenment came to accept sexuality as an inherent aspect of human nature. They further argued that 'if Nature was good, then desire, far from being sinful, became desirable' (Porter, 19082. 4). Religious suppositions were contested and discarded by more modern theories, as pleasure was understood through science, not sin. Although Boswell remains mindful of conventional religion and social morality that was demanded by a polite tradition, he too comes to argue for sexuality to be reconciled with these long-standing concepts. His formidable performance with Louisa lends Boswell's character a vigour and authority, inspiring his social insecurity to a sureness that leads to a successful handling of Lady Northumberland's rout. It demonstrates that although sexuality does not conform to polite rubric, neither does it compromise his social persona. Moreover, the emotions that rouse his lust are those that motivate his spiritual devotion and the pleasure he derives from both imply an accord between religion and sexuality. Not without some doubt, male sexuality, for Boswell, becomes a way through which he can maintain his dissolute base identity with the social and spiritual character that is demanded by eighteenth-century expectations. Sexuality became an expected facet of masculinity, divided from but not devastating to politeness or morality.

However, by the end of the eighteenth century there was a return to repressive ideologies which Schulkins attributes to the social tumult of the French Revolution of 1789. According to Schulkins, 'personal autonomy and permissiveness reached a full circle towards the end of the eighteenth century with a step towards repression, leading to a reinforcement of paternal authority and sexual suppression aimed at a moral reform' (Schulkins, 2014. 66). She argues that the French Revolution led to fear about the degree of social permissiveness and a call for greater authority. So whilst the eighteenth century was a refuge for the newly conceptualised individual, allowing for some autonomy from rigidly enforced morality, the upheaval prompted by the revolution led to a reinstatement of moral discourses and so sexuality was again repressed. Boswell experiences his own discontent towards the end of his time in London stemming from his inability to attain that sorely coveted label of dignity that, to Boswell, signalled masculine success. His understanding of sexuality as corresponding with sociability appeared flawed. In response, he again pledges to renounce pleasure and pacify his

'strangely agitated' mind by adopting a course of 'steadiness' (333). He plans upon a way to combat his distress and foster his social persona without the distraction of pleasure. Sexuality again became synonymous with and signalled social ruin. Boswell through this cycle of contradictions is unconsciously mirroring wider eighteenth-century attitudes to sexuality. Sexuality, which could elevate a man to divine status and serve as a necessity to his masculinity was paradoxically the characteristic that could restrict him from attaining moral sanction and an acceptable masculine identity.

Constructing a fantasy centred on the fictional Fanny, however, has allowed for Cleland's treatment of whoremongering to differ widely from Boswell's representation of the same. Sexuality in the novel becomes an expectation, a behavioural norm that is enjoyed equally by Fanny and the men who solicit her company. Cleland is depicting an alternative reality in which sexuality is accepted with libertine impunity. Yet to describe *Memoirs* simply as a libertine fantasy is inaccurate. The text cannot so easily be consigned as a fanciful homage to a long past period of debauchery, particularly as the libertinism affixed to the novel is questionable.

Rosenthal's definition of the libertine whore novel focuses on the characterisation of the prostitute. 'Libertine narratives', she claims 'generally tell the story of a woman from humble origins/or improvised circumstances who reaches the heights of luxury through infamous commerce' (Rosenthal, 2006. 98). This is certainly true for Fanny, who from a small village near Liverpool born to poor but honest parents traverses London to become 'the head of so large a fortune, as it would have been even the height of impudence in me to have raised my wishes' (Cleland, 1985. 176). Her marriage to the impoverished but genteel Charles further attests to the conventions of libertine narrative in which 'writers implicitly represent spectacular forms of mobility available through prostitution' (Rosenthal, 2006. 100). Whilst *Memoirs* imitates these conventions of libertine literature for the whore, the libertinism of the male characters is somewhat checked by eighteenth-century scruples. As I have shown, whoremongering amongst the working class was to be tempered by a commitment to industry and a robust physicality that signalled healthy masculinity. Amongst the middling sort, there was a necessity for bodily control and reason when pursuing pleasure as well

as the balance between work and leisure. The indiscriminate whoremongering of libertinism is clearly not shown to flourish in Cleland's fantasy; there were restrictions placed on the way in which sexuality was allowed to be expressed. Libertinism in eighteenth century England was less a defiance of organised religion, as it was considered in the early seventeenth century, than a general synonym for sexual rapacity and excess. It implied a single-minded debauched reverence for sexual pleasure. Although *Memoirs* does depict male characters that revel in sensual excess, these are the characters that are subsequently shown to suffer their overindulgence. Excess of pleasure in Cleland's *Memoirs* is shown to be recompensed only with an absence of vigour, funds and independence. Whilst it is certain that the world Cleland depicts is a distorted likeness of an eighteenth-century society in which sexuality is painted with uncommonly explicit detail, it is set in a recognised reality and engages with contemporary ideologies. The more sedate values of the eighteenth century are given precedence over absolute libertinism in Cleland's *Memoirs*. Piety, refinement, work and restraint are shown to dictate over the hedonistic pursuit of base desires. Cleland is clearly not advocating a libertine regime in which pleasure was pursued with little concern for productivity. Rather, he is showing the libertine to exist amongst prevailing eighteenth-century ideological assumptions around masculinity. He attempts to amalgamate the sexual with the socially acceptable, permitting sexuality to become another facet of identity that strengthens masculinity whilst denying the free reign of libertinism.

In order to integrate sexuality amongst eighteenth-century values Cleland subverts conventional narrative formulae. According to Rosenthal, 'Cleland creates a pornographic fantasy version of a popular story about the eighteenth-century economy: that extensive commerce produces refinement, wealth, happiness, and even bliss' (Rosenthal, 2006. 128). Professional commerce generating wealth and happiness was a recurring theme in the eighteenth century, one that was reflected in novels of the period, yet Cleland has somewhat undermined the established association. Rosenthal has suggested that in its place it is sexual commerce that allows for wealth, authority and a heterosexual identity; qualities of acceptable masculinity are acquired through sexual congress whilst the adverse effects such as effeminacy and ill health remain distant anxieties. Sexuality comes to signify

refinement as opposed to the standard whore narrative in which it was merely a prelude to bodily and social ruin. In this way Cleland is rejecting the socially established practise of conventional narrative to create a fanciful yet familiar reality so as to reconcile whoremongering with eighteenth-century ideals around refinement and reason. He is able, through narrative form, to do that which Boswell, through an adherence to reality, could not; fully resolve the conflict between sexuality and acceptable masculinity.

Although a morally instructive sentimental novel, *Histories* arguably demonstrates a more accepting attitude towards the whoremonger than either Cleland or Boswell. Boswell fluctuated in his understanding of sensual pleasure and its influence on acceptable masculinity whilst Cleland was only able to reconcile sexuality with masculinity by constructing a fantasy that was cloaked in sentimentalism. In contrast, *Histories*, which is set in a recognisable time and place, appears to depict the indulgence of sexuality as a masculine norm and allows the whoremonger carte blanche to engage in illicit sexual behaviour.

Rarely in *Histories* is the whoremonger seen to suffer his indiscretions, which can be read as a sanction of his exploits. Engaging in decorous whoremongering may account for the lack of blame attached to Senwill and Turnham. Despite being involved in an illicit engagement, both men are often mistaken to be in a lawful union. Senwill is believed to be 'really married' (75) to the second penitent and in the story of the fourth penitent she and Turnham 'bore all the appearance of matrimony' (167). This is whoremongering that lacks the conventional association with the sordid being founded instead on affection. That these men are made to forsake their lovers- either through marriage or death- may be understood as condemnation of their relationship. And yet being made to desert the penitent appears less a punishment for the seducer than a means of instructing the penitent on the pitfalls of her position. Being released from her protector leaves both penitents with no recourse but the Magdalen Hospital in which she seeks redemption, in keeping with the sentimental tradition of the fallen woman. The seducers however are spared the social condemnation for their role in the age-old transaction, perhaps by virtue of having ensnared the penitent through affection and not deceit.

Yet Monkerton and Merton, the whoremongers that engage in the immoral practise of preying on the innocent are also afforded pardon. Monkerton acquires the second penitent through duplicity whereas Merton's dissipation is overlooked in favour of his wealth allowing him to secure the hand of the fourth penitent. This underhand approach to whoremongering in a sentimental tradition owes its literary origin to Lovelace who lured Clarissa away from her family before forcibly entrapping her. *Histories* however soon veers from literary convention; where Lovelace met his infamous end during a duel, neither Monkerton nor Merton suffers a similar fate. They undergo no virtuous epiphany, nor does their conduct lead to their ruin. Essentially, they remain free to resume their licentious activities. *Histories* has shown that whether he be an aging rake, a young gallant, a sentimental benefactor or a polite manipulator, whoremongering was an integral amusement for the eighteenth-century man. Furthermore, and somewhat more insidious, is the suggestion that whoremongering leads to no consequences for the male characters. Whether engaging in whoremongering born from sin or from affection, all the male characters are absolved of their actions. Whereas even in Cleland's somewhat libertine text there were constraints placed on his character, *Histories* allows the whoremonger to exercise his sexuality with impunity. The novel may be demonstrating that despite the social discourses that repudiated the philanderer, there was an expectation on men to exercise their sexuality and so they were spared any sincere social condemnation. It is a veiled criticism of the artificiality and duplicity in a society which was more concerned with appearance than actuality; a society in which sexuality may have been openly reviled and yet unconsciously admired.

Studying these texts has shown the complexities and contradictions that surrounded the topic of male sexuality. What they each reveal however is that whoremongering was not entirely destructive to eighteenth-century ideals of masculinity. Whilst he may be a whoremonger, he may also embody a labourer or a merchant; a youthful idealist or an ageing libertine; a polite gentleman or a sentimental patron. Sexual identity does not compromise a social or professional character that he may also adopt. Indeed, demonstrating heterosexual sexuality often reinforced masculinity. It shows that whilst it was perfunctorily disparaged, sexuality remained on the peripheral conscious as a masculine behaviour. As such,

whoremongering, if not overtly encouraged, was an expected and often accepted, aspect of male conduct.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Bachelor, J & Hiatt, M. (2007). *The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen House*. [Anon]. London: Pickering & Chatto

Boswell, J. (1950). *London Journal 1762-3*. Edited by Pottle, F.A. London: Yale University Press

Cleland, J. (1985). *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Secondary Sources

"Untitled item" (1712) *The Spectator*, no. 525, pp. 1052 [Online ProQuest]. London, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery: New York Public Library

Addison, J, Bond, D, & Steele, R. (1970). *Critical Essays from The Spectator: With four Essays by Richard Steele*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Anon. (1749). *Satan's Harvest Home: or the Present State of Whorecraft, Adultery, Fornication, Procuring, Pimping, Sodomy, and the Game at Flatts*. [Online] London: Dodd

Barker, H. (2008). Soul, purse and family: middling and lower-class masculinity in eighteenth-century Manchester. *Social History*, **33** (1), 12-35

Barker, H. (2017). Gender and Business during the Industrial Revolution. In: Simonton, D. *The Routledge History Handbook of Gender and the Urban Experience*. New York: Routledge,

Barker-Benfield, G.J. (1992). *The Culture of Sensibility*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

Batchelor, J. (2010). The limits of sympathy: the Histories of Some of the Penitent of the Magdalen-House. In, Waldron, M. *Woman to Woman: Female Negotiations During the Long Eighteenth Century*. Newark: University of Delaware Press. 117-136

Binhammer, K. (2009). *The Seduction Narrative in Britain, 1747-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Black, J. (1992). *The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Alan Sutton

Boswell, J. (1992). *The Life of Samuel Johnson*. London: Random House

- Braunschneider, T. (2014). Monstrous Gallantry: Protective masculinity in the 1790s. In, Boe, A.D.F & Coykendall, A. *Heteronormativity in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture*. London: Routledge. 95-110
- Brewer, J. (1997). *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Harper Collins
- Burke, E. (1998). *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and Beautiful*. Edited by Womersley, D. London: Penguin Classics
- Carr, R. (2014). *Gender and Enlightenment Culture in Eighteenth Century Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Carter, P. (1997). Men about town: representations of foppery and masculinity in early eighteenth century urban society. In: Barker, H & Chalus, E. *Gender in Eighteenth Century England*. New York: Addison Wesley, 31-57
- Carter, P. (1999). James Boswell's manliness. In: Cohen, M & Hitchcock, T. *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. London: Routledge, 111-130
- Carter, P. (2001). *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800*. London: Pearson Education
- Charters, E. (2014). *Disease, War, and the Imperial State: The Welfare of the British Armed Forces during the Seven Years' War*. London: University of Chicago Press
- Chevalier, T. (1997). *The Encyclopedia of the Essay*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn
- Cohen, M. (1996). *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Routledge
- Dabhoiwala, F. (2007). Sex and Societies for Moral Reform, 1688-1800. *Journal of British studies*, **46** (2), 290-319
- Dabhoiwala, F. (2012). *The Origins of Sex: A History of the First Sexual Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Damrosch, L. (1989). *Fictions of Reality in the Age of Hume and Johnson*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press
- Davidson, J. (2004). *Hypocrisy and the Politics of Politeness: Manners and Morals from Locke to Austen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Day, G & Lynch, J. (2015). *The Encyclopaedia of British Literature 1660 – 1789*. Chichester: John Wiley
- Defoe, D. (1727). *Conjugal Lewdness or Matrimonial Whoredom*. [Online] ECCO Historical Texts. London: T. Warner

- Diderot, D. (1883). *The Paradox of Acting*. Translated by W.H. Pollock. [Online] London: Chatto & Windus
- Doležel, L. (2010). *Possible Worlds of Fiction and History*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Elfenbein, A. (2003). The Management of Desire in *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*. In: Fowler, P & Jackson, A. *Launching Fanny Hill: Essays on the Novel and its Influence*. New York: AMS Press, 27-49
- Fairer, D. (2003). *English poetry of the Eighteenth Century, 1700-1789*. London: Routledge.
- Forster, G. (2005). *John Locke's Politics of Moral Consensus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Fossati, W. (1999). Maximum influence from minimum abilities: La Mettrie and Radical Materialism. In: Sweetman, B. *The Failure of Modernism, the Cartesian Legacy and Contemporary Pluralism*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 45-57
- Foxon, D. (1965). *Libertine Literature in England 1660-1745*. New York: University Books
- Foyster, E.A. (2014). *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage*. London: Routledge
- Fuchs, R.G. (2005). *Gender and Poverty in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Gabbard, C. (2008). From Idiot Beast to Idiot Sublime: Mental Disability in John Cleland's *Fanny Hill*. *PMLA*, **123** (2), 375-389
- Greene, J. (2003). Arbitrary tastes and commonsense pleasures. In: Fowler, P & Jackson, A. *Launching Fanny Hill: Essays on the Novel and its Influence*. New York: AMS Press, 231-253
- Gregory, J. (1999). *Homo Religiosus: masculinity and religion in the long eighteenth century*. In: Cohen, M & Hitchcock, T. *English Masculinities, 1660-1800*. London: Routledge, 85-110
- Griffin, D. (2005). The social world of authorship. In: Richetti, J. *The Cambridge History of English Literature, 1660-1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 37-60
- Hammond, B & Reagn, S. (2006). *Making the Novel: Fiction and Society in Britain, 1660-1789*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

- Harvey, K. (2004). *Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hitchcock, T. (1996). Redefining Sex in Eighteenth-Century England. *History Workshop Journal*, 41 (1), 79-90
- Hitchcock, T. (1997). *English Sexualities, 1700-1800*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press
- Hume, D. (1987). *Essays, Moral, Political, and Literary*. Edited by Eugene F. M. [online] Library of Economics and Liberty
- Ingram, R. (2007). *Religion, Reform and Modernity in the Eighteenth Century: Thomas Sekker and the Church of England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press
- Johnson, S. (1755). *Dictionary of the English Language*. [Online] London: ECCO Historical Texts
- Johnson, S. (1973). *Johnson as Critic*. Edited by Wain, J. London: Routledge
- Kavanagh, D.C. (2014). Hetero privacy and the annotation of desire in *An Essay on Woman*. In: Boe, A & Coykendall, A. *Heteronormativity in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture*. Surry: Ashgate
- Kuchta, D. (2002). *The Three-Piece Suit and Masculinity: England, 1550-1850*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Langland, E. (1995). *Nobody's Angels: Middle-class Women and Domestic Ideology in Victorian Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- La Mettrie, J.O. (1996). *Machine Man and Other Writings*. Edited by Thompson, A. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Laqueur, T. (1992). *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. London: Harvard University Press
- Lewis, A & Ellis, M. (2012). *Prostitution and Eighteenth Century Culture*. London: Pickering & Chatto
- Locke, J. (1975). *Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Nidditch, P.H. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mackenzie, H. (2001). *The Man of Feeling*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- McKeon, M. (2005). *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Mudge, B.K. (2000). *The Whore's Story: Women, Pornography, and the British Novel, 1684-1830*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Müller, A. (2009). *Framing Childhood in Eighteenth-century English Periodicals and Prints, 1689-1789*. Surry: Ashgate
- O'Driscoll, S. (2013). The Molly and the Fop: untangling effeminacy in the eighteenth century. In, Mounsey, C. *Developments in the Histories of Sexualities: In Search of the Normal, 1600–1800*. Plymouth: Bucknell University Press. 145-172
- Outhwaite, R.B. (2007). *The Rise and Fall of the English Ecclesiastical Courts, 1500–1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Perry, R. (2004). *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture 1748-1818*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Picon, A. (2003). The Enlightenment Legacy. In Porter, R & Ross, D. *The Cambridge History of Science: Volume 7, The Modern Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 72-82
- Porter, R. (2004). "Graham, James (1745–1794)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Edited by Goldman, L. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11199>>.
- Porter, R. (1982). Mixed feelings: the Enlightenment and sexuality in eighteenth-century Britain. In, Boucé, G.P. *Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1-27
- Powlowicz, P.H. (1995). Reading women: Text and image in eighteenth century England. In: Bermingham, A &, Brewer, J. *The Consumption of Culture, 1600-1800: Image, Object, Text*. London: Routledge, 42-53
- Punter, D. (2012). *A New Companion to the Gothic*. Chichester: Blackwell Publishing
- Richardson, S. (2006). *Clarissa, or The history of a young lady*. [online]. London: Rivington
- Richetti, J. (1992). *Fiction before Richardson: Narrative Patterns, 1700-1739*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Richetti, J. (1996). *The Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth Century Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Rizzo, B. (1996). Decorums. In: Merians, L.E. *The Secret Malady: Venereal Disease in Eighteenth-century Britain and France*. Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 149-167
- Rosenthal, L.J. (2006). *Infamous Commerce: Prostitution in Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Rosenthal, L. (2008). *Nightwalkers: Prostitute Narratives from the Eighteenth Century*. Peterborough: Broadview press

- Rousseau, G.S & Porter, R. (1987). *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Rousseau, J.J. (1913). *The Social Contract and Discourses*. [Online] London: J.M Dent & Sons
- Sainsbury, J. (2006). *John Wilkes: The Lives of a Libertine*. Aldershot: Ashgate
- Schulkins, R. (2014). *Keats, Modesty and Masturbation*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing
- Seed, J. (1992). From middling sort to middle class in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth- century England. In: Bush, M.L. *Social Orders and the Social Classes in Europe since 1500*. London: Routledge, 114-135
- Simonton, D et al. (2015). *Luxury and Gender in European Towns, 1700-1914*. New York: Routledge
- Smith, A. (2006). *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. New York: Dover Publications
- Sol, A.M. (2002). *Textual Promiscuities: Eighteenth Century Critical Rewriting*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press
- Spadafora, D. (1990). *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Stanivukovic, G. (2009). Hamlet and Eurodanus. In, Lamb, M.E & Wayne, V. *Staging Early Modern Romance: Prose Fiction, Dramatic Romance, and Shakespeare*. New York: Routledge. 91-106
- Staves, S. (1980). British Seduced Maidens. *Eighteenth Century Studies*, **14** (2), 109-134
- Stone, L. (1977). *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. London: Penguin Books
- Stuart, G. (1792). *A View of Society in Europe in its Progress from Rudeness to Refinement; or, Inquiries concerning the History of Law, Government, and Manners*. [Online] London: J. Robertson
- Thomason, L.E. (2014). *The Matrimonial Trap Eighteenth-Century Women Writers Redefine Marriage*. [e-book]. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press
- Thompson, E.P. (1991). *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Penguin Books
- Trumbach, R. (1987). Modern prostitution and gender in *Fanny Hill*: libertine and domesticated fantasy. In: Rousseau, G.S & Porter, R. *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 69-85

- Trumbach, R. (1996). Erotic fantasy and male libertinism in Enlightenment England. In: Hunt, L. *The Invention of Pornography*. New York: Zone Books, 253-282
- Trumbach, R. (1998). *Sex and the Gender Revolution: Heterosexuality and the Third Gender in Enlightenment England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Turner, J.G. (1988). The properties of libertinism. In: Maccubbin, R. *'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorised Sexuality during the Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Wagner, P. (1982). The pornographer in the courtroom. In: Boucé, P.G. *Sexuality in Eighteenth Century Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 120-140
- Wagner, P. (1987). The discourse on sex or sex as discourse: eighteenth century medical and paramedical literature. In: Rousseau, G.S & Porter, R. *Sexual Underworlds of the Enlightenment*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 46-68
- Watt, I. (2000). *The Rise of the Novel*. California: University of California Press
- White, J. (2012). *A Great and Monstrous Thing: London in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Bodley Head
- Zigarovich, J. (2013). Courting death. In, Zigarovich, J. *Sex and Death in Eighteenth-Century Literature*. New York: Routledge