

The Garment and the Man: Masculine Desire in  
*Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies*,  
1764–1793

ELIZABETH CAMPBELL DENLINGER

*St. John's University*

Truly My Satan thou art but a Dunce  
And dost not know the Garment from the Man  
Every Harlot was a Virgin once  
Nor canst thou ever change Kate into Nan  
—William Blake, “To the Accuser Who Is the God of This World”

WHAT DO MEN WANT? The question is as jejune as its counterpart asked of women; may not men desire as variously and as perversely as women do? It has never, however, lacked for answers, especially when rephrased, What should men want? *Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies; or, Man of Pleasure's Kalendar*, a series of mid- to late-eighteenth-century guides to London prostitutes, is composed of answers to both versions: they assume that men want whores; that men want to read about whores; that men want to read about themselves successfully visiting whores; and that men ought to do all these things. These are boring answers to barren questions, and yet the guides are nosegays binding together a wide variety of the plastic flowers of rhetoric. In their pages, Kate regularly becomes Nan; she becomes so many other things as well that the women described seem at times to undergo all of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Men, too, are transformed,

I would like to thank James Raven, who started me on the lists; the staff of the Lewis Walpole Library of Yale University, particularly Joan Hall Sussler, for many courtesies extended; Jennifer Lee, formerly of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Division of the New York Public Library, for alerting me to the presence there of post-Revolutionary French lists; Donald H. Reiman, who told me about Stendhal's memoirs; Carol Houlihan Flynn for a useful reading of an earlier version; Kevin Berland for the reference to William Byrd; and, especially, Doucet Devin Fischer and the anonymous first reader for this journal for very close and helpful readings.

*Journal of the History of Sexuality*, Vol. 11, No. 3, July 2002

© 2002 by the University of Texas Press, P.O. Box 7819, Austin, TX 78713-7819

though chiefly by implication. This essay attempts to spell out some of those implications in the context of the London sex trade during the later eighteenth century and the early nineteenth, a time of growing prudery in which, as James Raven puts it, “the blush extended its domain.”<sup>1</sup> I shall, within this context, take into account earlier writing about whores, such as the works of John Dunton and Edward Ward, and later ones, especially Pierce Egan’s novel *Life in London* (1821), in which some of the sexual beliefs and literary practices of *Harris’s List* are taken up and renewed.<sup>2</sup>

The belief on which *Harris’s List* depended fundamentally was that whatever else they might fancy, men ought to be interested in sex with women who had gone upon the town. “Beautifully packaged” little volumes in “the style of the modish twelves” (i.e., duodecimos, measuring roughly six by three inches), they usually cover 120 to 190 prostitutes in fewer than 150 pages.<sup>3</sup> Their writers hit early on a successful formula for their sketches and clung to it for nearly forty years. Consisting of the name by which a woman was known, her exact address, an epigraph, a descriptive vignette, and the price of her services, the entries combined appeals to the imagination of the sedentary reader and directions to the male walker of the streets. Above all, the lists advertise: in them women are “quite a perfect piece!” with “lovely blue eyes, the halcyon’s azure plume” and “kisses fierce and fervent,” who “will *grasp* the *pointed weapon* with genuine female fortitude,” and whose exploits would “fill two pretty novels for Mr. Noble’s Library.”<sup>4</sup> The market strategy of their rhetoric demands that the lists be read in at least two ways, for they have a double structure: names, addresses, and prices all point to their practical use, while the lush descriptions of women also function as soft-core pornography. An initial reading of one striking entry, a sketch of the social situation of prostitutes and their clients in eighteenth-century London, and a brief history of the lists themselves will clarify the rhetorical

<sup>1</sup>James Raven, *Judging New Wealth: Popular Publishing and Responses to Commerce in England, 1750–1800* (Oxford, 1992), 150, writing specifically of the last third of the eighteenth century.

<sup>2</sup>My attention to Pierce Egan, *Life in London; or, the Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq. and His Elegant Friend Corinthian Tom, Accompanied by Bob Logic, the Oxonian, in Their Rambles and Sprees through the Metropolis* (London, 1820–21) was drawn by Deborah Epstein Nord’s *Walking the Victorian Streets: Women, Representation, and the City* (Ithaca, NY, 1995), 30–36.

<sup>3</sup>Raven, 52.

<sup>4</sup>From *Harris’s List of Covent-Garden Ladies; or, New Atalantis for the Year 1764* (London, 1764), 64; *Harris’s List of Covent-Garden Ladies; or, Man of Pleasure’s Kalendar for the Year 1773*, 2nd ed. (London, 1773), 8, 10; *Harris’s List of Covent-Garden Ladies; or, Man of Pleasure’s Kalendar for the Year 1788* (London, 1788; reprint, New York, 1986), 58. Mr. Noble published novels and ran a lending library. In some of the lists I have consulted the missing letters, usually no more than the vowels, of women’s names have been supplied by earlier readers, and when this occurs I have spelled out the names in full; in the other lists, missing letters were occasionally doubtful, and these I have reproduced as they are given.

strategies of the lists and their place in the complex of discourses surrounding prostitution in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Miss Clicamp's entry in the list of 1788 provides an introduction to the historical and literary problems posed by the lists:

*Miss C[licam]p, No. 2, York-Street, Middlesex-Hospital*

Give me a nymph with all her charms,  
A full grown nymph to fill my arms;  
And leave to them that cannot feel,  
The insipid things they call genteel.

Strange it is, but not less strange than true, that Englishmen in general have a great itch for variety; and according to our promissary [*sic*] note in the preface, we here present them with one of the finest, fattest figures as fully finished for fun and frolick as fertile fancy ever formed; fraught with every melting charm that can be found in the field of Venus, fortunate for the true lovers of fat, should fate throw them into the possession of such full grown beauties. Can you conceive the lightest tints of an Italian sky? such then her melting eye; can you figure to your imagination the swelling ripeness of two tempting cherries? such then her lips; though some might be led to imagine if they were a size less, they would be full as tempting. Can you place before your eyes, two beds of down for Cupid to sport on? such then her breasts. Would you wish for an *ambush*, for some of their more wanton brothers to play at *hide and seek* in? show them her Cyprian mounts. Have you a desire to roll in the loose luscious lap of lip-inviting luxury? *spend* an hour in her arms; that is, if Mr. C[o]tt[on] should not be there first; he being so great a favourite, she is always denied when in his company. If not at home, she is to be found at any of the public hops, and in general with her favourite man, who we are told, won her first by virtue of his fiddle-stick, and has, since her first attachment, kept her in very good tune; if any of our readers wishes to try a tune with her, *he* must pay for it; but she is not at all exorbitant in her demands, seldom wishing to turn money away.<sup>5</sup>

Miss Clicamp's entry is not quite typical of the lists: the omission of an exact price for her services is unusual, as is the alliteration in which the writer indulges himself. Mention of a favorite man occurs only rarely, despite a promise that the list will reveal "the histories and some curious anecdotes of the most celebrated Ladies now on the Town, or in keeping [i.e., who were mistresses to one man], and also many of the Keepers."<sup>6</sup> Most singularly, this entry dwells on her size, showing marked ambivalence about fatness. Many elements, however, are repeated elsewhere; the ambivalent awareness of the woman's gentility, the puns and double

<sup>5</sup>Harris's *List* (1788), 104–5.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., title page.

entendres, the puerile tone, the obvious references to classical culture, the exact but stylized description of her body, the flattering assumption that the reader will know the color of an Italian sky are all common devices in the writers' rhetorical arsenal. In entry after entry, images of willing prostitutes were produced. This varied display of women to satisfy the "great itch," an inexhaustible plenitude of female sexual generosity and attractiveness, is a fundamental aspect of the sphere to which *Harris's List* offered British men a *carte d'entrée*. Regardless of the rhetorical strategies used to describe the women, the pleasure of the list qua list contributed to the longevity of the series, implying as it does not only boundless generosity of the women but also endless potency for the men. Both the women's sexual hunger and the men's ability to satisfy it on the level imagined by the writers of the lists can only exist within the precincts of pornotopia, to use Stephen Marcus's term.<sup>7</sup> But the prospect of choice from among a number of women is a sexual desideratum (both fantastic and real) with a long history, to be found as early as the fragmentary text from fourth-century B.C.E. Athens that describes the denizens of a brothel gathered into a semicircle for the prospective client to inspect.<sup>8</sup>

In seventeenth-century London the trope of sexual choice was sometimes figured as a portrait gallery of prostitutes from which a client could make a selection. James Grantham Turner has explored the metaphor of the portrait gallery in ways that throw light, by way of contrast, on *Harris's List* and the sexual world they inhabit. His work concentrates on John Dunton's monthly journal *The Night-Walker; or, Evening Rambles in Search of Lewd Women* (September 1696–March 1697), in which the eponymous first-person protagonist, a puritan reformer, masquerades as a man of fashion to catch prostitutes, only to reveal to them, along with a constable's truncheon and a Bible, his religious intentions. Turner sees Dunton's narrator placed, willy-nilly, within the pictures he describes, thus rendering him "an object of sexual-visual appraisal and exchange."<sup>9</sup> The blazingly confident reformer's self-fashioning as a rake puts him squarely in the sexual marketplace, where he becomes an image as factitious as the prostitutes and adulterers he seizes upon. Dunton's *Night-Walker* does not aim at private reform—his enterprise is the exposure of whores, whoremongers,

<sup>7</sup>Stephen Marcus, *The Other Victorians: A Study of Sexuality and Pornography in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England* (London, 1966), 216.

<sup>8</sup>On the semicircle of prostitutes, see James Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes: The Consuming Passions of Classical Athens* (New York, 1997), 84. For a twenty-first-century instance of the trope, see Rebecca Mead, "Letter from Nevada: American Pimp," *New Yorker*, April 23, 2001, 81–82.

<sup>9</sup>Oddly, Turner does not mention one of the crucial ironies in the naming of Dunton's protagonist and journal, the fact that in London—and only in London—the term *nightwalker* had come, by the time Dunton was writing, to signify a prostitute. In the provinces it continued to be polysemous, with the general sense of someone out late with no clear purpose, making it a very useful term to magistrates. See Paul Griffiths, "Meanings of Nightwalking in Early Modern England," *Seventeenth Century* 13.2 (Fall 1998): 212–38.

and adulterers. *Harris's List*, on the other hand, deploys the same trope quite differently, offering readers a print version of the gallery, making safe what could be a risky and fairly public experience.<sup>10</sup> An understanding of the beauties on paper in *Harris's List*, however, must begin with some discussion of the women, composed of flesh, blood, muscle, fat, and nerve, who were there transformed.

## PROSTITUTION IN LATE-EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY LONDON: A SKETCH

### *Geography and Numbers*

Eighteenth-century Londoners perceived prostitutes to be ubiquitous. "Met 300 whores in the Strand," William Blake's friend John Stedman noted in his diary in August 1795; thirty-three years earlier, James Boswell had walked along the same street, finding himself "surrounded with numbers of free-hearted ladies of all kinds: from the splendid Madam at fifty guineas a night, down to the civil nymph with white-thread stockings who tramps along the Strand and will resign her engaging person to your Honour for a pint of wine and a shilling."<sup>11</sup> (Eighteenth-century New York, on the other hand, then a much smaller city, was relatively poor in prostitutes, who were patronized mainly by "visitors, soldiers, and the poorest transients wandering from city to city.")<sup>12</sup> The trade centered in a fairly small area around the West End of London and the City, the centers of legal and governmental business as well as entertainment, including the major theaters, Covent Garden and Drury Lane.<sup>13</sup> Although the prostitutes were concentrated, it was difficult to count them for many reasons, beginning, of course, with their unwillingness to be identified. Randolph Trumbach, in *Sex and the Gender Revolution*, accepts the magistrate Saunders Welch's fairly conservative estimate of something over 3,000 women working full time as prostitutes in 1758, a time when London's population was about 675,000 and growing more rapidly than anywhere

<sup>10</sup>James Grantham Turner, "Pictorial Prostitution: Visual Culture, Vigilantism, and 'Pornography' in Dunton's *Night-Walker*," in Julie Candler Hayes and Timothy Erwin, eds., *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (Baltimore, MD, 1999), 55, 57.

<sup>11</sup>John Stedman quoted in David Erdman, *Blake: Prophet against Empire*, 3rd ed. (Princeton, NJ, 1977), 291; James Boswell, *The Journals of James Boswell* (New Haven, CT, 1991), 26. The Strand, one of London's busiest streets, runs through the West End from Charing Cross into Fleet Street after St. Clement's Church; Covent Garden is situated just north of its approximate middle.

<sup>12</sup>Timothy J. Gilfoyle, *City of Eros: New York City, Prostitution, and the Commercialization of Sex, 1790-1820* (New York, 1992), 26.

<sup>13</sup>For a map of areas of prostitution, see Randolph Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*, vol. 1, *Heterosexuality and the Third Gender in Enlightenment London* (Chicago, 1998), xvii. A map showing the density of prostitutes according to their addresses given in the list is found in J. L. Wood, "Meaner Beauties of the Night," *Factotum: Newsletter of the XVIIIth Century STC*, no. 30 (December 1989): 13.

else in Britain. (By 1820 it would have risen to 1,274,000.)<sup>14</sup> Welch's estimate lends credibility to the more personal remarks of the lists, given that in those that I have seen, the number of women described is only a fraction of those working, never exceeding 217 in the list for 1773.

It was not simply the number of prostitutes that was particular to London. Because a high proportion of women worked from the streets, squares, theaters, and public drinking places rather than brothels, Londoners walking or riding through the city would have experienced their audible and visible presence more frequently than their European or North American contemporaries did. Prostitution was an entertainment that catered to men of nearly every income level in London, from apprentices on up, as we shall see in more detail below. This contrasts markedly with eighteenth-century Paris, where, soon after the Revolution, a sudden upsurge in the published lists of whores announced a democratization of the trade, which had previously served primarily the aristocracy and the clergy.<sup>15</sup> While there were large numbers of bawdy houses, especially around Drury Lane, St. James's, and Covent Garden, most London prostitutes did not work out of them, or at least did not live in them. (Again, London differed sharply from Paris, where a more vigilant watch was kept on women's movements. In the late nineteenth century most French prostitutes worked out of registered brothels; there was a single guide for these houses covering France, Algeria, Tunisia, and the principal cities of Belgium, Holland, Italy, and Spain. Even in the United Kingdom, an eighteenth-century guide to Edinburgh prostitutes otherwise very similar to *Harris's List* and using the same publisher's pseudonym, Ranger, is organized by the houses to which the women belonged rather than by individual name.)<sup>16</sup> More often, women left the brothel to seek clients, brought them back there, and slept in their own lodgings at the end of the night or made arrangements with landlords or with tavern keepers to rent lodgings where they both slept and brought customers. Publicans "presumably welcomed the custom of prostitutes, both on account of the money they themselves spent on drink and because they attracted male customers."<sup>17</sup>

The geographic concentration of the business as well as the number of

<sup>14</sup>Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*, 1:112.

<sup>15</sup>Kathryn Norberg, "The Libertine Whore," in Lynn Hunt, ed., *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500–1800* (New York, 1993), 244.

<sup>16</sup>On Paris, see Alain Corbin, *Women for Hire: Prostitution and Sexuality in France after 1850* (Cambridge, MA, 1990), 80; the title of this guide is *Annuaire veirum: Indicateur des maisons de société (dites de tolérance) de France, Algérie, et Tunisie, et des principales villes de Suisse, Belgique, Hollande, Italie, et Espagne*. The Scottish guide is *Ranger's Impartial List of the Ladies of Pleasure in Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1775; reprint, Edinburgh, 1978).

<sup>17</sup>Tony Henderson, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London: Prostitution and Control in the Metropolis* (London, 1999), 46.

its practitioners meant that whores had to be flashily dressed for easy visibility.<sup>18</sup> For the same reasons, prostitution would have been inherently stressful: to troll for customers in practice meant standing or walking around one relatively small section of a street or square until someone took up the offer. Many women worked in pairs or in small groups, which would have provided a measure of safety and company. Constables and beadles were often easy to pay off but could be difficult, or honest, or require payment in kind.<sup>19</sup>

Whores, like many other groups of London laborers, may have relaxed in drinking clubs or groups, although it is difficult to obtain reliable information. The spurious *Memoirs of the Celebrated Miss Fanny M[urray]* (1759) describes a Whores' Club administered by Harris himself whose members were the women on the list. In *The Secret History of London Clubs* (1709) the journalist Edward Ward reports, colorfully if not credibly, on a "Bawds' Initiating Club" in which a prostitute who has just lost her virginity was "to drink the first Cup, toss the empty Vehicle over her unmaiden'd Head, and to cry *Farewell Modesty*."<sup>20</sup> Whether or not such clubs existed, the practice of drinking and socializing in taverns with one's workmates was so well established that it is impossible to believe that prostitutes did not sometimes gather to drink and talk, and these meetings, formal or informal, must have been occasions of solace, mirth, and exchange of information.

### *Lives and Narratives*

By the second decade of the eighteenth century a pitiful and largely fictitious story of how prostitutes entered the trade by being seduced and abandoned and left it only by a miserable death had gained credence among the British middling classes, if not among the poorer sort from whom most prostitutes actually came. Hogarth's 1732 print series depicting the progress of the harlot Moll Hackabout, inveigled into the trade by the famous bawd Mother Needham at the moment the girl stepped off the wagon from York, is the best-known version. Along with the more traditional vilification of whores, the story is already discernible in Ward's account of the Bawds' Initiating Club:

[W]hen they are met together in one of their Brothel Sanctuaries . . . they lay aside that Effeminacy that should be part of their Nature, and without disguise, let loose the very Devil that to their Shame, possesses them, till wrinkl'd Age, a painful Decay, the Sights

<sup>18</sup>On prostitutes' dress in the late eighteenth century, see Francis Place, *The Autobiography of Francis Place (1771-1854)*, ed. Mary Thale (Cambridge, 1972), 77-78.

<sup>19</sup>I am drawing here on material from Henderson, chaps. 2 and 3.

<sup>20</sup>Edward Ward, *The Secret History of London Clubs* (London, 1709), 302.

of the World, and all the other miserable Consequences of a wicked Life, either hurry them to Despair, or bring them to Repentance; to the last of which, before it be too late, I most heartily recommend them.<sup>21</sup>

Another instance, not so famous as Hogarth's but whose outlines were thought so typical by midcentury that it was used in a 1748 sermon, "Persuasive to Chastity," as "a warning to one sex, and a remonstrance against t'other," is inset in Tobias Smollett's novel of the same year, *Roderick Random*.<sup>22</sup> Told in part by Miss Williams, herself a prostitute recounting her history to Roderick Random, it portrays the whore as victim, shown at her most abject.

The most fashionable woman of the town is as liable to contagion as one in a much humbler sphere: she infects her admirers, her situation is public; she is avoided, neglected, unable to support her usual appearance, which, however, she strives to maintain as long as possible; her credit fails, she is obliged to retrench, and become a night-walker; her malady gains ground, she tampers with her constitution, and ruins it; her complexion fades, she grows nauseous to every body, finds herself reduced to a starving condition, is tempted to pick pockets, is detected, committed to Newgate, where she remains in a miserable condition, till she is discharged because the plaintiff will not appear to prosecute her. Nobody will afford her lodgings, the symptoms of her distemper are grown outrageous, she sues to be admitted into an hospital, where she is cured at the expense of her nose; she is turned out into the streets, depends upon the addresses of the lowest class, is fain to allay the rage of hunger and cold with gin, degenerates into a brutal insensibility, rots and dies upon a dunghill.<sup>23</sup>

Smollett, a physician himself, emphasizes the medical hazards of the life, but its general downward drift was, by the time he was writing, so "easily conceived" as to seem inevitable. The historical situation diverged from the fictional and was not so indebted to gravity for its narrative trajectory. London prostitutes in the latter half of the eighteenth century, unlike Smollett's Miss Williams, rarely began life as the daughters of genteel families and probably did not end on the dunghill. When not working as prostitutes, these young women most likely labored as servants, as laundresses, as maids of all work, in slop shops (stores where cheap, ready-made clothing was

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 306.

<sup>22</sup>Edward Cobden, "Extract from a Famed Sermon, Preached before the King at St James's, on Dec. 11, 1748 . . . Persuasive to Chastity," *Gentleman's Magazine* 19 (March 1749): 126.

<sup>23</sup>Tobias Smollett, *The Adventures of Roderick Random* (London, 1748; reprint, London, 1930), 174–75.

sold), or perhaps as vendors in the streets or markets. Many were native Londoners, although prostitutes came from throughout the United Kingdom.<sup>24</sup> Most left the trade long before death, staying in five or six years, and many did not follow it as a full-time occupation. (Probably, however, most of the women listed in *Harris's List* were full-time prostitutes, since their prices are at the high end of the scale—often as much as a guinea or two—and imply considerable success.) The chances were good, however, of their having spent some time in Bridewell (where stays were usually short, as opposed to those at Newgate), especially if they remained in the trade for more than a few months, as were the odds that they had contracted venereal disease, to which Smollett's hypothetical whore loses her nose.<sup>25</sup>

The social situation of prostitutes was considerably more ambiguous than represented by either the older image of the wanton led by her own desires or the newer one of the pale dupe. These women had a certain place in working-class London life and were in one historian's view "perhaps as much an accepted part of plebeian London as any other identifiable group."<sup>26</sup> The importance of sexual reputation has perhaps been overstated, at least by literary critics. Although it is certainly true that in novels women cannot survive long once their honor has been violated (whether by seduction or rape), as Anna Clark has observed, in London's "plebeian culture chastity was not necessarily the most important female virtue; whatever their sexual situation, women could be valued as industrious workers, affectionate mothers, kind friends and good neighbors."<sup>27</sup> The (relative) integration of prostitutes into the public (and semipublic) sphere can be seen in a description by Edward Ward in *The London Spy*, an urban-espionage work of the first decade of the eighteenth century. As the narrator banters with the mistress of the house, two women descend from

<sup>24</sup>On geographical origins of prostitutes, see Henderson, 18–20.

<sup>25</sup>Stays at the Bridewell (a London jail but also a generic name for a "house of correction") were typically thirty days and often much shorter. Newgate was used primarily for prisoners awaiting trial, execution, or transportation. See Gerald Newman, ed., *Britain in the Hanoverian Age: An Encyclopedia* (New York, 1997), s.v., Prisons and Prison Reform. On the material circumstances of prostitutes, see the table in Henderson, which shows that approximately 60 percent of prostitutes in Southwark from 1814 to 1829 were born outside London, and 40 percent were native (19). See also Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*, vol. 1, pt. 2; regarding ages, especially, see the tables on 116–18, where one set of numbers is taken from *Harris's List* for 1788. Trumbach's range of evidence is wider than Henderson's, and he has looked at more sources, but the same general conclusion applies, that prostitution was largely a young woman's trade. On shame and reputation, see Anna Clark, *The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class* (Berkeley, 1995), esp. chap. 4. See also theses by Stanley Nash, "Social Attitudes toward Prostitution in London, from 1752–1829" (New York University, 1980) and Anthony Simpson, "Masculinity and Control: The Prosecution of Sex Offenses in Eighteenth-Century London" (New York University, 1984).

<sup>26</sup>Henderson, 44.

<sup>27</sup>Clark, 49. See also Henderson, 43–47.

the upper floor of a coffeehouse/brothel:

[W]ho should bolt downstairs from fool's paradise above but a couple of mortal angels as nimble as squirrels, with looks as sharp and eyes as piercing as a tiger's, who, I suppose, after rumpling their feathers in a hot engagement, had stayed to rectify their disordered plumes. . . .

By help of paint, and powder, and patches, they were of a waxwork complexion, and thus dressed: their under-petticoats were white dimity, flourished like a turkey-work chair, or a fool's doublet, with red, green, blue and yellow. Their pin-up coats of Scotch plaids were adorned with bugle lace, and their gowns were of printed calico, but their heads were dressed up to best advantage, like a vintner's bar-keeper, or a churchwarden's daughter upon an Easter Sunday.<sup>28</sup>

Ward's addiction to simile and metonymy creates a world in which nothing is separate from anything else; but the charm of these women, the utterly matter-of-fact tone, the greater interest in their dress than in their profession, and above all the double vision of prostitutes as women pasted over with false complexions and yet not entirely cut off from other kinds of women by their trade became literarily impossible later in the century, as the narrative of the prostitute as victim took hold. These women are not victims, they have been abandoned by no one, and they are not haunted (as women of the later narratives are) by the loss of a father. In the earlier extract from *The Secret History of London Clubs* Ward chides the women for their shamelessness, but in both what comes through most clearly is that they have an accepted, if not a respectable, place in the life of London.

Prostitutes continued to arouse a good deal of hostility, however, as they always had, perhaps not so much among their fellow plebeian Londoners as among the middling classes. In 1792, long after the prostitute had come to be generally perceived as an innocent victim, for instance, we find one reformer who described whores as presenting "a shocking picture of moral deformity, . . . laying snares to rob and ruin the man, who, instigated by impure desires, seeks after such unfortunate connections." As late as the second decade of the nineteenth century another reformer could define a harlot as "a woman who, from principles of lust, idleness, or avarice, promiscuously bestows or sells her disgusting embraces," although the writer knew that he was going against what was by then received opinion.<sup>29</sup> Adopting the narrative of victimization did not entail letting women off the moral hook entirely; as the preface to "The Life of a Lady of the Town, who afterwards became a Penitent in the Magdalen

<sup>28</sup>Edward Ward, *The London Spy*, ed. Paul Hyland (East Lansing, MI, 1993, from the 4th ed. of 1709), 32.

<sup>29</sup>"The Evils of Adultery and Prostitution; with an Inquiry into the Causes of Their Present Alarming Increase . . ." (London, 1792), 14; William Hale, "Considerations on the

House” (in which the victimization narrative is indeed followed) puts it, “Idleness, luxury, and a dreadful habit of using language the most shocking and odious . . . with a contemptuous disregard for every being in the world, prevents the kind concern of the pitying virtuous heart, from endeavouring to persuade any such unfortunate to the paths of virtue.”<sup>30</sup> Seeing prostitutes as victims did not prevent their being perceived as general nuisances; this was the one view of the women that the lists were unable to absorb.

Perhaps the most important aspects of the context in which *Harris’s List* would have been read in the eighteenth century are these: first, commercial sex was a heterosexual, primarily masculine, activity. The arithmetical fact that women could make a living at the trade means no matter how large the number of whores, the number of customers was greater. Second, going to prostitutes would have reassured men that they were not sodomites: without entirely accepting Randolph Trumbach’s contention that the main purpose of eighteenth-century prostitution was to assure men of their sexual orientation to women, one can certainly see that it would have that effect and that for young unmarried men (in the abeyance and decline, in Trumbach’s view, of a socially acceptable homosexual alternative) this effect would be important.<sup>31</sup> The writers of the lists do, certainly, assume an unproblematic heterosexuality on the part of their readers (presumed to be male), with birching the only unusual interest addressed, and that only cursorily in the 1793 list. Finally, the ubiquity of prostitution in London seems to have meant that for some men who visited whores (especially young men, unencumbered by families), the line between respectable and unrespectable life, though clear, was no barrier; and, as the sample of young men’s recollections below shows, crossing it was not necessarily a source of anxiety or even worth much notice.

Eighteenth-century prostitution should be seen, for its male participants, as a pastime, one of the many urban leisure activities London had to offer. For these men, whoring fell in the same broad category as the

---

Causes and the Prevalence of Female Prostitution; and on the Most Practicable and Efficient Means of Abating and Preventing That, and Other Crimes against the Virtue and Safety of the Community” (London, 1812), 4.

<sup>30</sup>“The Life of a Lady of the Town, who afterwards Became a Penitent in the Magdalen House. In Beautiful Poetry. With the History of Ann & Mary Woodfield, Two Unfortunate Sisters of Kent” (Portsea, n.d.), first (unnumbered) page of the preface. Though undated, the pamphlet includes a poetic epistle by Samuel Jackson Pratt (1749–1814), whose greatest period of literary activity was the 1770s and 1780s.

<sup>31</sup>On the idea that the emergence of male heterosexuality depended on prostitution, see Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution*, vol. 1, chap. 1; the idea is fundamental to the book, however, and is found throughout. It should be noted that the acceptable homosexual alternative was only possible for wealthy men like John Wilmot, earl of Rochester, who in the late seventeenth century could write (now famously) of “a sweet, soft page of mine / Does the trick worth forty wenches” (“Song”: [“Love a woman? You’re an ass!”], ll. 15–16).

theater, the masquerade, the pleasure gardens at Ranelagh and Vauxhall, and, especially, the tavern and the public house. These venues provided, in short, sources of carnivalesque pleasure characterized by thorough mixing of social classes. All of these places were themselves intimately connected with the trade. (In Frances Burney's novel *Evelina* [1778], the heroine is mistaken for a prostitute at Vauxhall and pursued through its arbor-covered walks.) Moreover, whoring was an entertainment in which the greater portion of the hours that participants spent together might well not have been occupied by sex. Two examples from different ends of the social ladder illustrate the situation: Francis Place (1771–1854), the self-made tailor and radical politician, remembered that as an apprentice he occasionally spent evenings in the fellowship of other apprentices, older and tougher than he:

[M]ost of them were "fine men" to some of the prostitutes who walked Fleet Street, spending their money with them in debauchery and occasionally receiving money from them. It may seem strange but on no occasion did I ever hear one of these women urge any of the youths to bring her more money than he seemed willing to part from, and what he gave they generally spent, the women were generally as willing as the lads to spend money when they were *flush*. With these youths and women I SOMETIMES spent the evening eating and drinking at a public house generally in a room to which none but ourselves were admitted and to which few but such as ourselves would wish to be admitted.<sup>32</sup>

Place's anxiety about his own ethical development was apparent from his use of small capitals, but he tried to be fair to the women he remembered as generous and as eager for pleasure as their companions. Elsewhere he recalled attending cock and hen clubs, more organized tavern meetings at which prostitutes and apprentices congregated for "drinking and flash songs," usually choosing one man and one woman from the group to be elevated, their chairs placed on the table itself. One such club in 1774 consisted of "servants, journeymen, and apprentices. On these evenings every member laid down fourpence, for which he had music and a female gratis, anything else to be paid separately."<sup>33</sup> Place's emphasis on the nonsexual aspects of the meetings was perhaps self-serving, but these were clearly social as well as sexual occasions.

Unlike Place, the attorney William Hickey (1749–1830) spent a wealthy

<sup>32</sup>Place, 75.

<sup>33</sup>Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, *Lichtenberg's Visits to England*, quoted in M. Dorothy George, *Hogarth to Cruikshank: Social Change in Graphic Satire* (New York, 1967), 74. On this page George also quotes Francis Place's experiences of the clubs and on the preceding one reproduces a 1798 print depicting *A Row at a Cock and Hen Club* by R. Newton.

and luxurious youth in larking, drinking, whoring, and stealing from his father's till, surrounded by forgiving patrons and parents. Although he had a great deal more than Place for which to be forgiven, Hickey suffered from few moral compunctions, nor did he resort to defensiveness or see the economic differences between himself and the prostitutes with whom he associated as being important in their relations. (The women, of course, may have felt the difference more acutely.) Writing in the 1820s, Hickey recalled his years as a law student, when he and his friends frequented three brothels of Bow Street, Covent Garden, "which we took in rotation." Again, the time spent in drinking seems to have outweighed time spent in sex: "In these houses we usually spent from three to four hours, drinking arrack punch . . . and romping and playing all sorts of tricks with the girls. At a late, or rather early hour in the morning, we separated, retiring to the private respective lodgings of the girls, there being only two that resided in the house, or to our homes, as fancy led, or according to the state of our finances."<sup>34</sup> When *Harris's List*, then, praises a woman as being "a good companion" and "not of a mercenary disposition," the writer may only be telling the truth about her: youth, companionability, and the ability to drink hard without becoming too intoxicated were perhaps the most important requirements for successful whoring.

#### LIST OF PROSTITUTES AND *Harris's List*

If we are to trust their last publisher, the lists in 1795 had "been published regularly every year, like a Court Calendar, for the last forty years," a claim that would make them one of the more durable series in eighteenth-century British publishing. They were by no means the first of the genre, since British lists survive from the years just after the Restoration. John Garfield's *Wandering Whore*, a periodical that ran for five numbers in 1660–61, lists laborers in the sex trade at the end of each issue under such headings as "Crafty Bawds," "Common Whores," "Hectors, Trepanners, and Decoys" (i.e., pimps), but these are simply columns of names. The bulk of the journal borrows the dialogue form of Nicolas Chorier's *Aloisiae Sigaeae Toletanae Satyra Sotadica* (1660), in which a prostitute, a bawd, a pimp, and a client discuss in detail the customs and manners of prostitution, providing informative and satiric entertainment of a low kind.<sup>35</sup> At least some of Garfield's names are accurate; however, even if these lists were published for the sake of

<sup>34</sup>William Hickey, *Memoirs of William Hickey*, ed. Peter Quennell (London, 1960), 56–57. Hickey also speaks of the generosity of prostitutes, saying that one of the bawds of the three Covent Garden brothels offered him money if he needed it. "In short," he writes, "it was my peculiar good fortune to meet with uncommonly disinterested whores and rogues" (52).

<sup>35</sup>On the *Satyra Sotadica*, pornographic dialogues covering most sexual acts carried out by one, two, three, or more parties and to which, as James Turner rightly remarks, "modern

advertising (shaming the persons listed seems more likely to me, but proof in any direction is probably not forthcoming), there are none of the personal descriptions that are found in *Harris's List*.

The history of those lists is as full of half-credible assertions as the texts it describes. They may have been started around 1747 by a Jack Harris, a waiter at the Shakespeare Tavern in Covent Garden; according to this narrative, the lists were comprised of the names of women who paid Harris to make them known to potential customers.<sup>36</sup> If the *Memoirs of the Celebrated Miss Fanny M[urray]* can be trusted, Harris extracted five shillings in the pound, or 25 percent of a woman's earnings for her listing, and another sixpence at each meeting of the Whores' Club.<sup>37</sup> This cut, although very high, is not incredible: having no recourse to legal protection, prostitutes could be gouged by everyone with whom they were concerned. Whether Harris actually did act as a pimp is impossible to determine. He turns up as a go-between (though not necessarily as a pimp) for Oxford boys on the town for ten guineas' worth of amusement in the April 11, 1754, issue of the *Connoisseur*, but another prostitute-narrative from 1779 denies that he existed at all.<sup>38</sup> *The Midnight Spy* (1766) describes a waiter (probably fictitious) as having procurative skills "not inferior to that of H—r—s [sic] himself; he always kept as regular a list, and could suit the taste of a cully [i.e., client] to as great a nicety, provided he was well paid."<sup>39</sup> The evidence is not entirely convincing, but it is at least clear that Harris was generally believed to exist in the 1750s and that women were believed to pay him for their listings. After the original Harris's death in 1766, however, the issue of pimping was dropped, and from the addresses of the women throughout the years it is clear that most of them were working for themselves.<sup>40</sup>

---

sexuality could be understood as a footnote," see James Grantham Turner, "'Aloisa Sigea' in France and England: Female Authorship and the Reception of Chorer's Erotica," *Oeuvres & Critiques* 20.3 (1995): 281–94; and Roger Thompson, *Unfit for Modest Ears: A Study of Pornographic, Obscene and Bawdy Works Written or Published in England in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century* (Totowa, NJ, 1979), 28–34.

<sup>36</sup>E. J. Burford, *Wits, Wenchers and Wantons: London's Low Life: Covent Garden in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1986), 103, citing Horace Walpole in a letter to Henry Fox from July 19, 1746 (vol. 30, p. 100 and note in the Lewis edition of Walpole's correspondence [New Haven, CT, 1961]). The letter in which lists of whores are mentioned, however, does not name Harris or the Shakespeare Head, merely "Covent Garden editions." Burford's work is not written for scholars, and his assertions must be taken with a great deal of caution.

<sup>37</sup>*Memoirs of the Celebrated Miss Fanny M[urray]* (London, 1759), 1:109, 111.

<sup>38</sup>Burford asserts that Harris was a pimp based on the circulation of his handwritten lists and on the fact that Harris claims to be one. For the scene with the Oxford students, see *Connoisseur* 11 (1754): 62–63. Harris's existence is denied in *Nocturnal Revels, or the History of King's Place and Other Nunneries* (London, 1779), cited in Wood, 12.

<sup>39</sup>*The Midnight Spy; or, a View of the Transactions of London and Westminster from the Hours of Ten in the Evening, till Five in the Morning* (London, 1766; reprint, London, n.d.), 71.

Boswell's acquaintance Samuel Derrick may have written the list from 1766 until his death in 1769.<sup>41</sup> The stylistic change in the list of 1793 indicates yet another hand at work. There were probably, then, at least four and perhaps more writers. But it is unlikely that the facts of the lists' authorship can be known with any certainty.

Individual women in later lists may well have paid for their entries since the majority of them are highly eulogistic. The reproachful entries—for example, reporting in 1773 of Miss Grafton that “*Self* alone engrosses all her thoughts and little I, the heroine of the tale, is sure eternally to be her table talk” or, in the same year, of Miss Berry, who is said to be “almost rotten, and her breath cadaverous” from venereal disease—might represent punitive measures taken against women who had refused to pay or who had somehow annoyed the writers.<sup>42</sup> Most often, critical sketches are directed at women who (unless the writer is lying outright) would now be identified as alcoholic and who were thus not in a position to defend themselves by resort to the law (unlikely for a prostitute anyway, although the self-defensive writings of Constantia Phillips show that women who were high-end kept mistresses might do so) or otherwise.<sup>43</sup>

Published editions of the lists began to appear after 1756, timed to the Christmas season, when London was at its most crowded.<sup>44</sup> Sold in Covent Garden and in booksellers' stalls, advertised on the front pages of newspapers, they would have been almost as familiar to Londoners who knew to look for them as prostitutes themselves; at two shillings sixpence, the price of the 1788 edition, they were cheaper than most of the women they described and probably easier for a shy man to approach. The cost was high enough to put them out of the ready purchase of a working man, though they might easily have been shared among two or three. For middle-class men the price would not have been a hardship, and the lists reached a considerable circulation by subscription with “H. Ranger,” the named publisher.<sup>45</sup> Earlier editions were advertised in the front matter as long as a decade after their initial appearance. The publisher thus probably

<sup>40</sup>Tim Hitchcock, *English Sexualities 1700–1800* (New York, 1997), 95. See also *Ranger's Impartial List of the Ladies of Pleasure in Edinburgh*.

<sup>41</sup>Burford, 106. But see also Wood, who points out that Horace Bleackley, the original of this assertion, gives no evidence for it, “which is most unusual for him” (12).

<sup>42</sup>*Harris's List* (1764), 4 and in the appendix, 13.

<sup>43</sup>On these, see, besides the works of Phillips herself, Vivien Jones, “Eighteenth-Century Prostitution: Feminist Debates and the Writing of Histories,” in Avril Horner and Angela Keane, eds., *Body Matters: Feminism, Textuality, Corporeality* (Manchester, 2000).

<sup>44</sup>For the timing of the lists, see *Harris's List* (1788), [xi] (an unnumbered page immediately after x and before 14): “Again the coral berry'd holly glads the eye / The ivy green again each window decks, / And mistletoe, kind friend to *Bassia's* cause, / Under each merry roof invites the kiss.”

<sup>45</sup>Burford claims a circulation of eight thousand, a number too high to be credible (106). “Ranger” itself is almost certainly a bawdy pseudonym and had been in use as a

aimed from the first at a mixed readership of men who used the lists to find whores and others who simply wanted to read about them. His first desideratum would have been simply to sell as many copies as possible.

As objects, copies of *Harris's List* were made for immediate use, not posterity. Despite being “beautifully packaged” (and the lists, partaking of the fashion that began in the second half of the century for pocketbooks, do have a certain charm simply as physical objects),<sup>46</sup> the paper is surprisingly thin and flimsy, especially considering that they were produced before the addition of wood pulp to the papermaking process. These little volumes were made by men who were aware of the attractions of books as commodities but who were not going to spend a great deal on the physical quality of a publication that was wholly unsuitable for display on the shelves of a private library. In 1795 their last publisher, James Roach, was brought up on libel charges by the Proclamation Society, founded in 1787 to enforce George III's proclamation in favor of piety and virtue and against, among other things, “loose and licentious Prints, Books, and Publications, dispersing Poison to the minds of the young and unwary.”<sup>47</sup> Despite Roach's protest as to the longevity of the lists and his assertion that “nobody had ever been prosecuted” for their publication, his defense was unsuccessful. He was committed to Newgate for a year and ordered to give security for his good behavior for three years in the amount of £150. Lord Chief Justice Kenyon recalled that despite James Roach's claim, a John Roach had previously been convicted for selling the lists. Lord Justice Ashurst found fault with *Harris's List* on the grounds that it was “a most indecent and immoral publication. An offence of greater enormity could hardly be committed. A care of the growing morals of the present generation ought to be uppermost in every man's heart.”<sup>48</sup> The trial of 1795 was in fact the second in two years, and it put the publishers out of the business that London prostitutes had afforded them.

---

synonym for “rake” since the late sixteenth century. The “Ranger” most familiar to an eighteenth-century London readership might have been the character of that name in William Wycherley's *Love in a Wood, or St. James's Park* (1672).

<sup>46</sup>Raven, 52.

<sup>47</sup>Donald Thomas, *A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England* (New York, 1969), 113.

<sup>48</sup>“The King v. Roach for a Libel,” *Times* of London, February 10, 1795. See, for a very brief account of the 1794 trial, Thomas, 120. The history of James or John Roach (they may of course have been brothers or otherwise related) remains shadowy. The *Dictionary of National Biography* lists John Roach as a bookseller and compiler of such works as *Roach's Beauties of the Poets of Great Britain* (1794), *Beautiful Extracts of Prosaic Writers, Carefully Selected, for the Young and Rising Generation*, by J.R. (1795), *Roach's London Pocket Pilot; or, Strangers' Guide through the Metropolis* (1796), and *Roach's New and Complete History of the Stage* (1796). With such a respectable list of works it is not surprising that *Harris's List* should have been published under a pseudonym. The *Pocket Pilot* devotes most of its space to minute descriptions of Ranelagh and Vauxhall, with some admonitory stories for

THE CONSTRUCTION OF MASCULINE SEXUALITY IN *Harris's List*

*Earlier Lists: Roles and Role Models*

The immorality against which Lord Justice Ashurst warned might be understood either as that inculcated by reading pornography or that implied in the act of seeking a prostitute. And certainly, beyond street use, the most obvious way to read the lists would have been as pornography, in the sense of making them instruments of sexual arousal. However, in the sense of being composed of extended narrative description of sexual acts, the lists are only rarely pornographic. (The ever-slippery meaning of “pornography” is apparent here, and these uses are not intended to be definitive.) A few entries, mainly from earlier editions of the lists, break this rule, and an examination of one will allow some preliminary observations on the rhetorical strategies by which the lists transform political and (at least implicitly) pornographic material into sites of fantasy about the first and strongest of all loves, self, and its representation as a rake.

The entry for Miss Wilmot in 1764 recounts in glowing detail her first sexual encounter with the duke of York after their glances met at the Drury Lane Theater. The duke (Edward Augustus [1739–67], brother of George III) escorted Miss Wilmot home and then called on her the next morning, where he found her still in bed:

He gazed on her a while with eyes of transport and fondness, and gave her a world of kisses; at the close of which, in a pretended struggle, she contrived matters so artfully, that the bed-cloaths having fallen off, her naked beauties lay exposed at full length. The snowy orbs on her breast, by their frequent rising and falling, beat Cupid's alarm-drum to storm instantly, in case an immediate surrender should be refused. The coral-lipped mouth of love seemed with kind movements to invite, nay, to provoke an attack; while her sighs, and eyes half-closed, denoted that no farther resistance was intended. What followed, may be better imagined than described; but if we may credit Miss Wilmot's account, she never experienced a more extensive prostitution in any amorous conflict either before or since.<sup>49</sup>

---

the foreign traveler and a brief list of recommended inns. Roach continued to publish British plays (in imitation, probably, of the extremely successful Bell's British Theatre series) until at least 1814. The *DNB* identifies him with the Roach who was sent to prison but does not identify the “immoral work” for the publication of which he was convicted. Ian Maxted's *London Book Trades 1775–1800: A Preliminary Checklist of Members* (Folkestone, Kent, 1977) lists Roach as “James or John” and cites publishing activity by him (or them) as late as 1817. I do not know if there is a relation between Roach the publisher and the Mrs. Roach whom Francis Place describes as willing to show pornographic prints to young people entering her shop (51), although Place's childhood and youth in the 1770s and 1780s make this at least chronologically possible.

<sup>49</sup>*Harris's List* (1764).

Although the extended narration of the scene is unusual, the periphrasis of this entry—"snowy orbs," "naked beauties," "extensive protrusion"—is characteristic of the lists as a whole. Indeed, periphrasis and the extended metaphor (here, as often, a military one: Miss Wilmot's breasts, with splendid agility, beat a tattoo, while an immediate attack is provoked by the most unlikely movements of her vagina) are their primary rhetorical strategies. Like the most famous example of eighteenth-century British pornography, John Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1747), the lists do not use obscene language. Insofar as they can be read as pornography, they are naturalist in the sense that Margaret Jacob uses the word: sexual desire is part of nature, "the result of the fire that powers the great virile engines," and its written forms are dominated by description rather than narration of sexual acts.<sup>50</sup> Sex most often enters the lists with periphrastic labels such as "the mysteries of Venus," "the joys of love," "love-transport," or "the amorous encounter"; the women's bodies, as we will see, are liable to much more elaborate description.<sup>51</sup>

Although it would have been possible to include it, there is nothing of political satire about Miss Wilmot's entry. "Noble Yorkiana" (as he is called earlier), on the contrary, is complimented on the size of his equipment.<sup>52</sup> In France, where pornography was linked with antimonarchical politics almost from its beginning, such a conjunction of royal sex and apparently sincere flattery would have been most unlikely.<sup>53</sup> Here the royalty of one of the actors in the scenario only adds to the level of titillation: Miss Wilmot, the mistress of the king's brother, was perfectly available to the reader with a guinea to spare. (Her surprising cheapness is explained by the unnerving warning that her teeth have been "greatly impaired by the too frequent use of mercury," the only effective treatment in the eighteenth century for venereal disease.)<sup>54</sup> As with the mention of Miss Clicamp's keeper, Mr. Cotton, the writer assumes that, at least to some degree, the reader's sexual interests are formed by comparison with those of other men: the trade of whoring involves the circulation not only of women's bodies but of men's sexual knowledge of each other. The attention given

<sup>50</sup>Margaret C. Jacob, "The Materialist World of Pornography," in Hunt, ed., 164.

<sup>51</sup>*Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies; or, Man of Pleasure's Kalender for the Year 1793* (London, 1793), 35, 72; *Harris's List* (1764), 64; *Harris's List* (1788), 34.

<sup>52</sup>Three years later, his title would be used as a selling point for the third edition of *An Account of the Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity: To which Are Added the Rev. Dr. Dodd's Sermons, Preached before the President, Vice-Presidents, and Governors, etc. His Sermon Preached before His Royal Highness the Duke of York, etc., and the Advice to the Magdalens* (London, 1767). This edition is cited in Ann Jessie Van Sant, *Eighteenth-Century Sensibility and the Novel: The Senses in Social Context* (Cambridge, 1993), 31.

<sup>53</sup>See Joan DeJean, "The Politics of Pornography: *L'Ecole des Filles*," in Hunt, ed., 109–24.

<sup>54</sup>*Harris's List* (1764), 65. On venereal disease in the eighteenth century, see Linda Merians, ed., *The Secret Malady: Venereal Disease in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France* (Lexington, KY, 1996).

here to the male partner is rare in the lists, but here as elsewhere the homosocial element is turned to the purposes of encouraging the reader's vanity and promoting the woman.

One highly theatrical and politicized listing, found in the edition for 1773, turns on the entrance of a celebrated prostitute, Betsy Cox, at a public gathering of polite society at the Pantheon in January 1772. (The Pantheon was a major venue for public, nondramatic entertainment in the later part of the century, housing opera, concerts, and, famously, subscription balls and masquerades. In January 1772 it had just opened.) Refused by the master of ceremonies, she was said to have been aided by, among others, the duke of Fife, who drew his sword to enforce her entry: "Mrs. Cox is the first female Champion for English liberty, Mrs. Macaulay not excepted, the historian being only an advocate in Theory, whilst Mrs. Cox has stood forth in person and compelled the martial master of ceremonies at the Pantheon to yield to the rights of beauty and the British Fair."<sup>55</sup> ("Mrs. Macaulay" is of course Catharine Macaulay, whose *History of England* [1763–83] was "considered the Whig answer to David Hume's" Tory version [1759–62] for its "defense of liberty and republican principles.")<sup>56</sup> In 1776 the *Town and Country Magazine* reported an almost identical story describing the actress Sophia Baddeley's entrance to the same venue, escorted by young noblemen, again with swords drawn, past the disapproving master of ceremonies.<sup>57</sup> The display of masculine weapons is the most salient aspect of both stories, but *Harris's* writer emphasizes Betsy Cox's championing of liberty. The reader is left free to imagine his own weapon drawn as the champion's champion in a gesture both sexual and theatrical.

In their brief editorial matter one finds some of the lists indulging in conscious political commentary, and indeed Margaret Jacob quotes from the preface of the 1789 edition as proof of their status as political and philosophical works: "[W]hy should the victims [i.e., prostitutes] of this natural propensity [i.e., sexual desire] . . . be hunted like outcasts from society, perpetually gripped by the hand of petty tyranny? . . . Is not the minister of state who sacrifices his country's honour to his private interest . . . more guilty than her?"<sup>58</sup> Earlier, the preface to the 1764 list had deployed standard libertine and Enlightenment defenses of prostitution, arguments that might have been familiar to *Harris's* readers from Bernard

<sup>55</sup>*Harris's List* (1773), 138–39. The story of Betsy Cox's entry at the Pantheon is related in Burford, who draws on the *Middlesex Journal* of February 6, 1772 (201).

<sup>56</sup>Doucet Devin Fischer, commentary on an exchange of letters between Mary Wollstonecraft and Catharine Macaulay, December 1790, forthcoming in Doucet Devin Fischer and Donald H. Reiman, eds., *Shelley and His Circle*, vol. 10 (Cambridge, MA, 2002).

<sup>57</sup>John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1997), 345–46.

<sup>58</sup>Quoted in Jacob, 198.

Mandeville's *Defence of Publick Stews* (1724): the trade prevented seduction of marriageable girls, provided an outlet for the frustrated drives of married men, and saved young men from sodomy, mentionable in the list only in French as "le péche [*sic*] que la Nature désavoue" [the sin that Nature repudiates].<sup>59</sup> The list for 1788 ends with these lines: "We likewise take leave of the ladies, and are particularly happy to think that what was formerly seen in the eyes of *our* world a disgrace, is now considered pleasing, delightful, and honourable."<sup>60</sup> To the respectable London reading public prostitution was anything but honorable or pleasing. The writers revel in the libertine archness of these lines and aim to create a sense of knowingness in their readers, seeming to say, "*You* know we're teasing; but you also must know—since you are reading our little guide—the true pleasures offered by the ladies of the town."

For the production of knowingness, the trope of theater was even more useful to the writers of the lists, who assumed that their readers knew that they were watching a performance, that the woman they had in bed could "so well counterfeit the passions of love and lust, that many of the most knowing rakes of the town would be easily deceived."<sup>61</sup> By the eighteenth century the equation of actress and whore had long been hackneyed. Earlier writings on prostitutes describe courtesans who study plays as sources of witty remarks for their customers or even of tips on what to do with them: John Dunton's 1696 *Night-Walker* imagines (or quotes) a courtesan who describes posttheatrical pleasures: "[A]fter we had drunk plentifully, then my Gallant and I used to fancy our selves the Lovers in the Play: he would damn himself if I was not as amiable an Object in his sight as ever *Cassandra* was in the eyes of her *Orondates*. . . . [T]his gave our Pleasures high Gust and Relish."<sup>62</sup> The counterpart of the assumption that the whore fakes passion is that the customer might enjoy the opportunity to perform theatrically as well as sexually. Any cully who had properly prepared, then (through even the briefest reading of *Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies*), would not be taken in by the prostitute but would have had the added pleasure of seeing the whore become the dupe of her own pretense. The pleasure of being deceived by a theatrical performance is thus transformed into the pleasure of rhetoric, of observing linguistic as well as physical events. But while the lists positioned the reader as knowing, as unduped, they also introduced him into domains that were lushly and confusingly mapped.

<sup>59</sup> *Harris's List* (1764), viii.

<sup>60</sup> *Harris's List* (1788), 146.

<sup>61</sup> *Harris's List* (1793), 2.

<sup>62</sup> John Dunton, *The Night-Walker; or, Evening Rambles after Lewd Women, with the Conferences Held with Them, &c* (London, 1696; reprint, New York, 1985), November 1696, 7. Catherine Gallagher briefly discusses the theatricality of prostitution in *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace 1670–1820* (Berkeley, 1994), 29.

THE PORNOGRAPHIC PICTURESQUE: LANDSCAPES AND SHOPS  
IN THE LIST OF 1788

The leading vices of the present age . . . are a looseness of principle, a rage for sensual pleasure, and a contempt for marriage: these introduce prostitution and adultery, with all their train of woes. The youth, strangers to wedded love and domestic comforts, range at large on the common of prostitution.

—*The Evils of Adultery and Prostitution; with an Inquiry into the Causes of Their Present Alarming Increase, and Some Means Recommended for Checking Their Progress* (1792)

Half a guinea is the price of admission for any of our readers to *enter* such *premises* as will not cause a moment's regret.

—Entry for Miss L—the, No. 12, Castle-Street, Oxford-market, 1793

Prostitution in the eighteenth century, as now, is usually defined as the act of selling one's sexual services to another. But the extracts from Francis Place's and William Hickey's memoirs quoted above make clear that to "range at large on the common of prostitution" was to spend time in a zone of sexual freedom in which one would indeed, like Dunton's Night-Walker, have been both the object and subject of a gaze that was more direct and demanding than any in the sphere of home or work. It is important to notice this essentially *geographic* aspect of prostitution. It is a place as much as an activity, and for young London men who participated in the trade, the brothel or the prostitute's lodgings constituted a space between the public and private spheres. For Hickey and Place the prostitutes' rooms were an indoor pleasure ground on a smaller scale than the public pleasure gardens and more intimate than the theater or the masquerade but sharing some of their possibilities of imaginative release. On paper, however, the directions given to the reader's imagination frequently transform the woman herself, Kate or Nan, into a landscape, a country house, or a garden, appealing to a masculine heterosexuality that ranged on an urban common more densely grown and accommodating than its rural counterpart. In the edition for 1788, especially, the vision encouraged by the lists might be called the pornographic picturesque. Here, at some length, are two examples:

*Mrs. Dodd, No. 6, Hind-court, Fleet Street*

[W]e may conclude, from Mrs. Dodd, that a woman in years may be perfectly alluring; she is, indeed, turned of forty, rather fat and short, yet she looks well, dresses neat, and can divide as smartly covered, and as neat a leg and foot as ever beat time to the *silent flute*; her temper and behaviour are good, and if you are not soon disposed for the attack, she will shew you such a set of pictures, that very seldom fails

to alarm the sleeping *member*. Then may you behold the *lovely fount* of delight, reared on two pillars of monumental alabaster; the symmetry of its parts, its *borders* enriched with *wavering tendrils*, its *ruby portals*, and the *tufted grove*, that crowns the summit of the mount, all join to invite the guest to enter. The cordial reception he meets with therein, with the tide of *flowing bliss*, more delicious than the boasted nectar of the gods, engulph the enraptured soul, and set the lovely owner of the premisses, above nine tenths of the green gewgaws that flutter about the town. If discipline firms the soldier in the wars of Mars, experience finishes the female combatant in the skirmishes of Venus. That experience this lady has, and is perfectly skilled in every delightful manoeuvre, knowing how to keep time, when to advance and retreat, to face to the right or the left, and when to *shower* down a whole *volley* of love; so that those who are vanquished by her glory in their defeat, pant only for returning vigour to renew the combat; she is perfectly mistress in the art of restoring life, and performs the tender friction with a hand as soft as turtles [turtledove's] down. Keeps the house, and after giving you a whole night's entertainment, is perfectly satisfied, and will give you a comfortable cup of tea in the morning, for one pound one.<sup>63</sup>

*Miss Davenport, No. 14, Lisle-street, Leicester-fields*

. . . Her eyes are of that colour, which the celebrated Fielding has given the heroine of his most admirable work, and which dart a lustre peculiar to themselves. From such an eye each look has power to raise

“The loosest wishes in the chastest heart,”

and melt the soul to all the thrillings of unasked desire, till quite overpowered with the transporting gaze, the senses faint, and hasten to enjoyment. Her hair is also black, of which great ornament, nature has been lavishly bountiful, for when loose, it flows in unlimited tresses down to her waist; nor are the *tendrills* of the *moss covered grotto* thinner distributed, but though not yet *bushy*, might truly be stiled *Black Heath*; how early this thicket of her maidenhead *was penetrated* through, by the natural *invader* of *Middlesex*, we cannot pretend to say; most probably when it was only a small brake; for from its present state, and the extraordinary warmth of the soil, it must have began to shoot very early, and the mother of all things must have opened the sanguinary sluices in this delightful *Channel*, at an early period. The mount above, has a most delicious swell, as ambitious to receive on its downy bed, its *swelling rival* and *antagonist*, and it is so well clothed, that it may be justly called the Cyprian Grove; whilst her breasts are so fine and so fully shaped, as to entitle her to be stiled *en bon point*, in the richest sense of the words, and they have a springiness that defies

<sup>63</sup>*Harris's List* (1788), 53–54.

any weight whatever, or amorous pressure. Here the voluptuary might revel in pleasure, better imagined than described, in

“Soft silent rapture and extatic bliss.”

Her teeth are remarkably fine; she is tall, and so well proportioned (when you examine her whole naked figure, which she will permit you to do, if you perform the Cytherean Rites like an able priest) that she might be taken for a fourth Grace, or a breathing animated Venus de Medicis. Her disposition and temper is remarkably good, so sweet, that it is your own fault if it be soured; for she is possessed of an uncommon share of politeness, nothing rude or uncourteous in her manner, but abounding with civility and good breeding; her connections are good, and she has a keeper (a Mr. Hannah) both kind and liberal; notwithstanding which, she has no objection to two supernumerary guineas.<sup>64</sup>

There is a wide variety of appeals to the reader in both of these entries, such a variety indeed that it forms one of its own. In both, the writer describes the women’s bodies primarily in terms of picturesque landscapes. The prose is tinted by periphrasis as by a Claude glass, an eighteenth-century optical apparatus through which landscapes appeared in shades of blue or purple and in miniaturized perspective meant to remind the viewer of the landscapes of Claude Lorraine. They provided, like the lists themselves, a “portable means of realizing the efforts of the idealizing imagination.”<sup>65</sup> Although the tinting may be new, geographic metaphorization is at least as old as the Song of Solomon and was relied on by Shakespeare and Donne. As Paul Gabriel Boucé observes, popular allegorical geographies of the female body such as Charles Cotton’s *Erotopolis: The Present State of Betty-Land* (1684) and Thomas Stretser’s *New Description of Merry-Land* (1740) made the use of geographic and topographic tropes “widespread and quasi automatic” in eighteenth-century British erotic writing, including the list of 1788. Boucé points to reflections found in the geographies of Merry-Land and Betty-Land of eighteenth-century medical and scientific developments. Very occasionally one finds such reflections in the lists as well, although (as in the earlier geographies) they simply mine those discoveries for new double entendres: of Miss Dowson in 1779, for instance, we read: “During her stay at *Leyden* she contracted an *intimate acquaintance* with all the young students, giving them all *lectures* on the *natural* effects of *motion*, in which she was very successful; for as she was such an able *professor*, her doctrines were universally approved.”<sup>66</sup>

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., 39–41. The eyes of Fielding’s heroine, Sophia Western in *Tom Jones*, are black.

<sup>65</sup>Malcolm Andrews, *The Search for the Picturesque: Landscape Aesthetics and Tourism in Britain, 1760–1800* (Stanford, 1989), 68–69.

<sup>66</sup>P. G. Boucé, “Chthonic and Pelagic Metaphorization in Eighteenth-Century English Erotica,” in Robert Maccubbin, ed., *Tis Nature’s Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality during the*

On another level, however, the language of this landscape reflects the development of sexual shame. It is a coincidence but not an accident that the writer of "The Evils of Adultery and Prostitution" saw prostitution as a common, while the writers of *Harris's List* describe it as an erotic version of the country estate. As the "cultural threshold of shame and embarrassment" rose,<sup>67</sup> sexuality was fenced off from polite conversation and transformed for some Britons by that process into a place rather than a variety of human activity. We have already seen in the memoirs of Hickey and Place that this development was uneven, both between men and women and among different social classes. The last section of this essay will discuss the growing importance of shamefacedness in narratives of the female victims of seduction, but here I want to look briefly at the effects of shame on the mental landscape of the implied reader of *Harris's List*. The printing style as well as the metaphors employed point to the change: even in a time when printers indulged in the liberal deployment of italics, their insistent presence in the lists is extraordinary and amounts to a constant typographical nudging and winking. These visual elbows in the ribs might assuage shame, but they also lend strength to the belief that there is something of which to be ashamed. The writers of the lists presume that their readers take a positive pleasure in reading around sex rather than about it; the double entendres and extended metaphors resemble most closely, among other minor genres, the bawdy riddles that circulated widely throughout the eighteenth century, for example, "There is a thing both long and stiff, / And at the end there is a cliff; / Soft moisture from it doth flow, / And makes fair ladies pleasant grow," to which the answer is "a pen."<sup>68</sup> Such riddles might themselves evoke a fleeting reaction of shame, since they seem to be about sex and yet are not (and thus, of course, are). While the lists work on a shorter chain of logic (their metaphors *are* all about sex), they have in common with the riddles the relatively new assumption that sex is not to be spoken of openly, except (as Foucault's paradigm-changing apperception showed) under the eyes of medical or religious practitioners.

Unlike jest books, the lists provide no answers, and their bawdy idiolect assumes a fairly extensive knowledge of both male and female anatomy. In the entry on Mrs. Dodd, for instance, readers (here assumed male) who had never seen a naked woman (something that a good many of them

---

*Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1988), 208; *Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies; or, Man of Pleasure's Kalendar for the Year 1779* (London, 1779), 2.

<sup>67</sup>Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, NY, 1986), 85.

<sup>68</sup>From *The Trial of Wit, or, a New Riddle-Book* (Glasgow, 1782), reproduced in part in Leonard de Vries and Peter Fryer, eds., *Venus Unmasked; or, an Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of the Passion of Love . . . A Collection of Eighteenth-Century Bawdry* (New York, 1967), 100.

would not have) might have been puzzled by the distinctions made between the *mons veneris* (simply “the mount”) and *labia* (“*ruby portals*”). There were, of course, other means of sexual education available, including the maps mentioned above, and also didactic works on sex and reproduction, such as *Aristotle’s Master-Piece* or Nicolas Venette’s *Tableau de l’amour conjugale*, both predating *Harris’s List* by many years.<sup>69</sup> But the lists are not designed to educate, and in fact their overblown rhetoric leads, as in the entry for Miss Wilmot (she of the eloquent mouth of love), to the description of physical impossibilities.

The confusing luxuriance, the entry into the thickets and woods of unexplained or inexplicable double meanings, forces a response on the level of fantasy. The reader’s penis itself, fetishistically separated from its owner, becomes part of the rhetorical plenitude, figured as the silent flute, the arbor vitae, the pointed weapon, the champion of the ring, the natural invader of Middlesex. Even the sexually ignorant reader sees himself transformed by the lists into a knowing libertine: not Kate into Nan but, rather, say, Jack into Roger, Squire Roger, to whom the lists address such judgments as “This humble girl is thankful for a crown, and will testify her gratitude in whatever way you chuse.”<sup>70</sup> The puritan Night-Walker exhibits a very different sense of shame: he rages not against sex per se but against unlawful sex, asking prostitutes how they can live “in defiance of those dreadful threats which he [God] hast denounc’d against Fornication and Adultery”; and even “regardless of those things,” he demands of the malefactors, “[H]ow dare you with so much impudence violate the known Laws of the Land?”<sup>71</sup> The shame that Dunton seeks to arouse in his reader comes from sin, from the unlawfulness of the reader’s desires; but transforming the object of one’s wishes into a landscape implies, among other things, that one wants to lie in the dirt. The fact that the dirt is cultivated into a picturesque landscape—pretty, tamed, and, indeed, genteel—constitutes an essential contradiction of the lists’ rhetoric: they simultaneously elevate and degrade their objects.

If the metaphors of landscape appealed, however ambiguously, to the reader’s wish to be one of the gentry, *Harris’s List* deploys another range of spatial figures more accessible to the London reader: those in which the women are figured in terms of domestic architecture. Below are two examples, quoted in their entirety, both from 1788:

*Miss Harriet Lloyd, at a Toy Shop, German-Street*  
 —Born with every grace,  
 Ev’n envy must applaud so fair a face;

<sup>69</sup>There has been much work on the subject; as a starting point on sexual education in eighteenth-century Britain, see Roy Porter and Lesley Hall, *The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Britain, 1650–1950* (New Haven, CT, 1995) and its bibliography.

<sup>70</sup>*Harris’s List* (1788), 71; the subject is Miss Cowper.

<sup>71</sup>Dunton, January 1697, 25.

Such is her form as painters when they show  
 Their utmost art, on naked limbs bestow.

This pretty little smart girl, this true lover of the sport, is at present in keeping by a member of P——t, not far from St. James's, but not being sufficiently *membered* for her *lower house*, she appropriates the greatest part of the member's hard coin to support and keep in good humour two favourites of her own. The one a tender sprig of the law, the other a jolly hearty looking butcher; but still in spite of these three, she has her *best apartment* ready for any one that is master of five guineas, and will make her mistress of the same; it is neatly ornamented with chestnut coloured fringe, is snug and warm, when not *too warm* (which we are told is sometimes the case) very comfortable; she is now only seventeen, her dark eyes have much lustre and more meaning; her limbs, tho' small, are well shaped, covered with a skin fair as the swan's neck, and soft as its down, they are perfectly pliable, and form a thousand true lovers knots, first to facilitate the entrance into her *apartment*, and then to keep the enraptured lodger there as long as possible. Indeed, she never lets one depart till he has paid his *rent*, but to shew she is not avaricious, she generally returns as much as she receives, in the like *metal*, tho' not in the same coin.<sup>72</sup>

*Mrs. Sutton, No. 31, Tavistock-street*

When will the dear man come, that I may hold him  
 Fast as my love can make him, hug him close  
 As my fond soul can wish; give all my breath  
 In sighs and kisses, tell [*sic*] I swoon with rapture.

All this she seems to say to each admirer; it cannot be true to all. But no matter. Vanity whispers to each, *this is for thee alone*, and the self-deceived dolt believes it. Miss Sutton, indeed, can give pleasure; her agreeable person, her animated eyes, and lively manner, promise pleasing enjoyment, and in that she does not deceive; she artfully prolongs the pleasure to its utmost limits, and even then repines it is so short. She is of a comfortable size, genteelly form'd, with a pretty round face, a little pimpled, very pretty orient teeth, and now just entered her twenty-second year; her lodgings are neat and elegant, for the use of which, and a *little black apartment*, she always carries about her; she expects, at least 3 guineas; if not at home, in the evening, is generally to be met with in the green boxes.<sup>73</sup>

There is some genuine humor in Miss Lloyd's lower house, and the writer is well enough disposed toward her to describe her favorably despite recurrent venereal disease, signaled by her becoming at times "too warm."

<sup>72</sup>*Harris's List* (1788), 82–83.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*, 69–70. The green boxes were of course at one of the theaters.

Miss Sutton's entry leaves no reader a self-deceived dolt. In both, though, the coziness of the apartments (as with Mrs. Dodd, who "will give you a comfortable cup of tea in the morning") would have reminded readers from the middling classes of their own dwellings and the servants who took care of them there and might have aroused in readers who had no servants the desire for them—class envy joining neatly with sexual ambitions.

Randolph Trumbach has called the bagnios and expensive houses of prostitution "domesticated brothels" and the women who worked in them "second-class wives."<sup>74</sup> These brothels, according to his reading, sprang up after 1750 in order to allow a place for "safe affectionate sex" outside marriage that would reassure men of their exclusive heterosexuality at the same time that they provided an ersatz version of the newly domesticated home. To varying degrees, many of the venues in which customers met prostitutes—public gardens, taverns, cider cellars, subscription balls and cheap "hops," as well as high-end brothels and bagnios—were domesticated spaces: they provided bodily comforts—food, drink, warmth, and sex—and allowed that sense of physical autonomy only possible in spaces to which, or in which, one feels entitled or welcomed. But they were not private spaces. Except (usually) for sex, in the domestic sphere the comforts mentioned above would have been provided by servants rather than by one's wife. William Byrd, the Virginia plantation owner, saw no great difference in the roles of servant and mistress, writing in his London diary for June 23, 1718: "About nine I went to the Union in Longacre where my mistress met me and I rogered her. I ate some veal for supper. I agreed to give her twenty pounds a year to take care of my linen, &c."<sup>75</sup> Byrd was wealthier than the men for whom *Harris's List* was most likely written, who could not afford a mistress, still less one to do their laundry. Nor would a mistress have been someone like "Miss Cowper, at a China shop, Russell Court," from the list of 1788, who was "neither handsome, nor well-lodg'd nor well bred" but nonetheless would "give more delight, than most of the finical dames, who think they do their gallants a favour to admit their embraces at a high price."<sup>76</sup> Whether or not Miss Cowper sold china when she was not selling the use of her body cannot be ascertained, although it would certainly have reminded play readers of the famous equation of china and sex in Wycherley's 1675 *Country-Wife*. However, her placement in a china shop should not be understood to indicate that she too was merchandise; the wares of even the cheapest prostitute consisted of experiences, not objects.

The crucial element in common among these places of amusement is that they offered men female company in semienclosed, semipublic spaces

<sup>74</sup>Randolph Trumbach, "Erotic Fantasy and Male Libertinism in Enlightenment England," in Hunt, ed., 265.

<sup>75</sup>William Byrd, *The London Diary (1717–1721) and Other Writings*, ed. Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinning (New York, 1958), 139.

<sup>76</sup>*Harris's List* (1788), 70–71.

that were paid for in money, not in ethical or emotional obligations. James Turner has observed that in a number of late-seventeenth-century obscene pamphlets (though the point can be made more broadly) all economic activity by women is tantamount to prostitution. The pamphlets he describes satirize as prostitutes women who kept booths at the New Exchange, “a luxury shopping mall in London’s Strand.”<sup>77</sup> But his general point is that the “growth of new institutions like London girls’ schools or the New Exchange, largely reserved for small ‘female’ businesses . . . prompted a hostile and belittling response: independent female enterprises—schools, lodging-houses, catering services, and luxury shops—must be covers for prostitution, and the only ‘commodity’ a woman can sell is herself.”<sup>78</sup> However, by the mid- and late eighteenth century the observation can be turned around: the spaces prostitutes occupied, their lodgings or the brothels in which they worked, acquired a new respectability and gentility because they were inviting commercial spaces situated between the domestic and the public: brothels and women’s lodgings alike may be seen as small, comfortable shops in which one bought indulgence and amusement as well as sex. So much had expectations changed by the early nineteenth century that when Jerry, the country cousin in Pierce Egan’s *Life in London*, finds himself surrounded by “gay Cyprians” during an intermission at Covent Garden theater, all of whom hand him their cards, he is “rather puzzled” and “astonished that such dashing females should keep *shops*.”<sup>79</sup> And so, in a sense, they did. The rise in shame at sexuality itself would have been palliated in part by the representation of whores as landlords or shopkeepers in what was slowly becoming a nation of shopkeepers. Along with the passive pleasure of being taken care of (recall Mrs. Dodd’s arousing set of pictures and the tender friction of her hand), the reader would have experienced the greedy, slightly anxious, fantasy-overlaid pleasure of the shopper dazed by the variety of objects from which to choose and the many ways in which to think of them.

SEDUCTION, SLUMMING, AND THE HARLOT’S CURSE:  
THE LIST FOR 1793

For the whole day I thought only of the good, calm, quiet evening (*so snug!*) that awaited me.

—Henri Beyle (Stendhal), *Memoirs of an Egotist*

<sup>77</sup>James Grantham Turner, “News from the New Exchange: Commodity, Erotic Fantasy, and the Female Entrepreneur,” in Ann Bermingham and John Brewer, eds., *The Consumption of Culture 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text* (London, 1995), 419.

<sup>78</sup>*Ibid.*, 419–20.

<sup>79</sup>Egan, 139.

But most thro' midnight streets I hear  
How the youthful harlot's curse  
Blasts the new-born infant's tear  
And blights with plagues the marriage hearse.

—William Blake, "London"

Damn ye to Hell! Ye sons of bitches! Ye live by us girls' misfortunes!

—A prostitute quoted in the *Drury Lane Journal*, 1762

The number of ways in which a man could think of prostitutes diminished during the second half of the eighteenth century. While the author of the 1788 edition presents women in elaborate guises, that of 1793 employs a more austere rhetoric. Although addresses continue to be listed, the entries cease, for the most part, to include prices. Above all, the metaphorical descriptions nearly disappear. In this edition a tacit and occasionally explicit acknowledgment of the shameful nature of prostitution appears in the writer's adoption of the seduction narrative, accompanied by ambivalence toward prostitutes' cursing, which had by the 1790s become a common complaint about their street presence. If the earlier writers had answered the question "what do men want?" by appealing to the reader's knowledge of sexual geography and his pleasure in analogies and double entendres, the writer of 1793 tries to engage his reader with the same narrative used by the reformers. This list represents the prostitute as shop proprietor from the buyer's side of the counter; while its tone of cool appraisal is a return to the earlier editions, the deployment of the by-then conventional seduction narrative is new. In this section I will first examine *Harris's* versions of the story and then consider the harlot's curse and what it says (however rudely) about the emotional shading of British social stratification in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Two entries, Miss Davis's and Miss Charlton's, quoted in full, serve to illustrate the list's deployment of the seduction story:

*Miss Davis, No. 38, Margaret-street, Oxford-market*

Is a fine tall young woman, of about eighteen, has a fair complexion, and excellent features; her mouth is small, and when closed, like a rose when it begins to bud; her eyes, however, are no great advantage to her, as they are small and gray. She has the character of a spirited, spitefully-fond bed-fellow that will keep her spark to the *mark* of business as long as he has the strength to follow his *labour* with any pleasure or ability. She is seldom guilty of those vices which we have so frequently censured, and which defile the sex more than any other; we mean drinking and swearing. This, however, is not to be wondered at, when it is known, (which her company will easily discover,) that she has been excellently educated, and notwithstanding the unfortunate bent which she has taken, yet there are some of the stamina

of the original virtues planted in her mind to be discovered, and no practices will so eradicate as to render her vulgar or disagreeable.

Miss Charlton, *same house as the last lady* [a Miss Townsend at No. 12, Gress-Street].

Heaven in her eye,

In every motion ectacy [*sic*] and love.

This is an old observation, but certainly a true one, that some of the finest women in England are those, who go under the denomination ladies of easy virtue. Miss C—— is a particular instance of the assertion; she came of reputable parents, bred delicately, and her education far superior to the vulgar; yet the address of a designing villain, too soon found means to ruin her; forsaken by her friends, pursued by shame and necessity; she had no other alternative, than to turn—let the reader guess what. —She was long a favourite among the great, but some misconduct of hers, not to be accounted for, reduced her to the servile and detestable state of turning common. She is a fine figure, tall and genteel, has a fair round face, with a faint tinge of that bloom it once possessed, is rather melancholy, till inspired with a glass, and then is very entertaining company.

She lodges on the first floor, however, with the assistance of the last lady, who lives in the parlour, they sport a chariot, but some times the wheels get off, owing, we suppose, to the cash being low.<sup>80</sup>

Perhaps the most striking aspect of these entries—and they have many counterparts throughout this list—is their similarity to the narratives retailed by those who saw prostitutes as victims of male lust and scheming. While Miss Williams’s narrative in *Roderick Random* is a good deal more brutal in its details than Miss Charlton’s, others are not: Samuel Johnson’s account of “Misella, a Prostitute” (1751), for instance, reports: “At last the wretch took advantage of the familiarity which he enjoyed as my relation . . . to complete the ruin of an orphan whom his own promises had made indigent, whom his indulgence had melted, and his authority subdued.”<sup>81</sup> The reader of 1793 is expected not just to be sorry for Miss Charlton’s descent into prostitution but to be too squeamish to read the word “whore” in print. In 1821 Pierce Egan would ironically confirm this delicacy in a doggerel description of Corinthian Tom’s willingness to spend money: “Money’s a rattling sinner, to be sure: / Like the sweet Cyprian (we won’t say wh——e,) / Is happy to be frequently employed.”<sup>82</sup>

Earlier lists emphasize the appeal to men of women’s pleasure in sexuality (recall, for instance, Miss Sutton, who “artfully prolongs the pleasure

<sup>80</sup>*Harris’s List* (1793), 8–9, 27.

<sup>81</sup>Samuel Johnson, *Rambler*, November 2, 1751. Misella’s story is continued in number 171 of November 5. Quoted from the Everyman edition (London, 1953), 259.

<sup>82</sup>Egan, 41.

to its utmost limits, and even then repines it is so short”), but in the 1793 entry for Miss Charlton, women’s enjoyment has ceased to be of interest. Aside from her entertaining qualities, once tipsy, her allure lies in the effects of her fall, her melancholy aspect and fair round face with the “faint tinge of that bloom it once possessed.” The reader’s newly delicate ears (or eyes) cannot bear the burden of shame, which is shifted entirely to the woman and her “servile and detestable state.” Separate from and superior to Miss Charlton, he can pity and roger her at the same time.

The seduction narrative has its own kind of sexiness, derived in part from sensibility (a habit of mind, fashionable from the 1720s or so onward, attaching ethical value to highly emotional responses to pitiful, picturesque, sublime, beautiful, or otherwise moving situations). The narrative also depends on the genteel origins of its fallen subjects, the belief in which had become so firmly entrenched by 1785 that a writer in the *Times* of London was able to assert that “nine out of ten streetwalkers were the daughters of half-pay officers and poor clergymen.”<sup>83</sup> It was not the only available narrative. Women’s moral failures in the later years of the century might still be attributed to their own uncontained lusts; George Alexander Stevens’s *Adventures of a Speculist; or, a Journey through London* (1788) gives the “Authentic Life of a Woman of the Town” who as a young girl was filled with a “sudden glow of desire” not in spite of but because of the “melancholy and dismal accounts” she heard of “how wretchedly a poor street-walker had died upon a bulk, or was sent to Bridewell half-naked to be whipped.”<sup>84</sup> Stevens writes double-edged satire mocking both London and the modes of its description. The seduction narrative had become fashionable enough that he can mock it even as he makes use of it, for his heroine suffers nearly as much as *Roderick Random*’s Miss Williams.

Pity for prostitutes is a social impulse with a long history, exemplified most significantly in Christian cultures by Jesus’ treatment of Mary Magdalene. But in late-eighteenth-century narratives that pity was often generated by a specific event: the death or financial failure of the future prostitute’s father. The half-pay officers and poor clergymen unable to support their darling girls—like their counterparts, the cruel uncles and designing guardians—are the effects of a sentimentalization of fatherhood.<sup>85</sup> Part of this change is the presumption that fathers should support their children financially and that children need not expect to earn a living. Genteel prostitutes acquired additional sexual attraction and emotional

<sup>83</sup>Henderson, 188, citing the *Times* of London, November 10, 1785.

<sup>84</sup>George Alexander Stevens, *Adventures of a Speculist* (London, 1788), 136. “Bulks” were benches placed outside shops and then as now were refuges for the homeless.

<sup>85</sup>On fathers and sentimentality, see Susan Staves, “British Seduced Maidens,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 14.2 (1980): 109–34; see also Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Their Fathers’ Daughters: Maria Edgeworth, Hannah More, and Patriarchal Complicity* (Oxford, 1991).

value from their fathers' love and money that remained with them even after these were gone and the prostitutes had entered into their own narratives. When Hogarth's Moll Hackabout arrives in London expecting to earn her own bread, she is failed not by her father but by her extended family: the freshly killed goose accompanying (and symbolizing) her is addressed to her "loving Cosen in Tems Street."<sup>86</sup>

The loving but defunct father had little basis in the reality of working-class London prostitutes' lives, as should be clear from the earlier discussion, and some seduction narratives get along without him. Nor did the new seduction narrative put an end to more traditional views, especially regarding the moral effects of whoring on both clients and prostitutes. But when introduced into the narrative, such a father gave a new shape to the character of the prostitute and a slightly different direction to the trajectory of her life as imagined by those outside it. The writer of the 1793 *Harris's List* clearly found this new story a welcome change.<sup>87</sup>

When a genteel young woman fell, she became a genteel whore, and the list for 1793 makes use of this character in a number of ways. In the entries above, for instance, Miss Charlton's chariot should be noted: at times she has pretensions to some of the more expensive accessories of gentility. The list features a greater number of women who are in (supposedly monogamous) keeping, as well as many who are fussy in their choice of men: Miss Fraser, for instance, who "does not much care to give her company to any body whose person is not in some measure pleasing to her," and Miss Williams, who is "rather delicate in her choice of customers."<sup>88</sup>

Associated with gentility in the formulaic seduction story is an enhanced emphasis on shame. A century earlier Dunton's Night-Walker had frequently chastised women and men of his own social group, berating not only prostitutes but also would-be adulterers and even his own acquaintances. In the new seduction story, the fundamental shame becomes overriding, even though the narrative allows the fiction of similar social origins for both the whore and her customer. But at the same time that Miss Charlton's work became more shameful, the story's constant circulation and recirculation made it easier for other prostitutes to pretend to gentility, giving them a ready-made narrative as "unfortunate women." As Tony Henderson notes, "[F]rom the middle years of the eighteenth century, a growing number of prostitutes accused of theft at the Old Bailey described themselves in [this] way."<sup>89</sup>

Both the wish for and ambivalence toward genteel prostitutes that the 1793 list imputes to its readers surface when the writer comes to the subject of the women's drinking. Although drinking was indispensable

<sup>86</sup>William Hogarth, *The Harlot's Progress*, pl. 1, 1732.

<sup>87</sup>For more on the history of the seduction narrative, see Henderson, 179–90.

<sup>88</sup>*Harris's List* (1793), 13, 29.

<sup>89</sup>Henderson, 189.

to the business of prostitution in eighteenth-century London, the lists, on the whole, oppose it. A few entries acknowledge the importance of alcohol to the trade and its practitioners: Miss Charlton is very entertaining company once she has taken a glass, and though Mrs. Harvey will “often toss off a sparkling bumper,” she is still “a lady of great sensibility” and “not a little clever in the performance of the act of friction.”<sup>90</sup> However, Miss Davis wins praise (as do other women in this list) for her abstinence from liquor. In earlier lists the voice is neither so distant nor so polite as it is here, though it is equally confident in its judgments: in 1773, for instance, the writer is “sorry to say” of a Mrs. Williams that he has “often seen her come home so intoxicated as not to be able to stand, to the no small amusement of her neighbors,” while another woman occasions the remark that “[s]o callous are some of these girls, that they would rather drink a bumper of brandy or rum, than enjoy the finest young fellow in the kingdom.”<sup>91</sup> Miss Jenny Kirbeard, in 1788, has a “violent attachment to drinking” and “generally contrives to pin her basket by nine o’clock.”<sup>92</sup> Miss St—es of 1793, by contrast, is “an object well worthy of the pursuit of a *man of pleasure*; yet in that pursuit, if he wishes the true pleasure resulting from the society of a desirable woman, he must prevent her from drinking too much.”<sup>93</sup> Here the *man of pleasure* as connoisseur is melded slightly uneasily with the thrifty customer who wants to be sure that the money he has laid out in sexual pleasure is not wasted in drunkenness.

By the early nineteenth century the combination of pitiableness and gentility had set into a sexual taste dependent on class distinctions clear enough to be discernibly sexy in themselves, as evidenced in Stendhal’s recollections of the 1820s: the three women inhabiting the tiny, barely genteel brothel of the *Memoirs of an Egotist* are “very shy, very anxious to please, very pale,” and their narrator finds that “[t]heir poverty, all the little bits of furniture, very clean and old, had touched me.”<sup>94</sup> The pity of the situation, seen in the faded bloom of Miss Charlton as well as in the pang evoked by the snug house of Stendhal’s memoir, is not new. The novelty, rather, lies in the way that the luxuries of Stendhal’s life move the women and, in doing so, move him: “We left them the wine and the cold viands, whose splendour seemed to surprise those poor girls.” And later: “When the girls saw the bottles of claret and champagne unpacked, their eyes opened wide. I well believe they had never confronted a bottle of champagne, *real champagne*, not already broached.”<sup>95</sup> The drama of class difference is invoked not as a stand-in for

<sup>90</sup>Harris’s *List* (1793), 55.

<sup>91</sup>Harris’s *List* (1773), 12, 32.

<sup>92</sup>Harris’s *List* (1788), 138.

<sup>93</sup>Harris’s *List* (1793), 20.

<sup>94</sup>Stendhal, *Memoirs of an Egotist* (London, 1949), 77–78. The *Memoirs* were written in 1832 and first published in 1892.

<sup>95</sup>*Ibid.*, 79.

that of sexuality but as a spur to it. Pangs of this sort are rare in the list: Stendhal had a more finely developed sense of pity than Harris's imagined reader. There is, however, in the edition of 1793 a newly libidinated awareness on the writer's part of the readers' and subjects' class positions that at once partakes of the older mixing of social groups in eighteenth-century amusements like the cider cellar and the masquerade and of early-nineteenth-century slumming in which Cousin Jerry and Corinthian Tom revel in Pierce Egan's *Life in London*.

In *Harris's List*, this interest in social differences for their own sake is most visible in the list's self-contradictory stance on prostitutes' swearing. The writer of 1793 "mean[s] swearing and drinking" when he speaks of the vices "which defile the sex more than any other." Although no entry considers drunkenness in a woman to be positively attractive, there are a few entries that do so for women who swear. Listening to the harlot's curse seems to have given sexual pleasure to a small number of men.

A brief look at contemporary attitudes toward public speech in the metropolis will clarify the significance of these entries. Earlier in this essay, one reformer's undated objection to prostitutes' using "language the most shocking and odious" was noted; he was not alone. In the summer of 1795, for instance, the *Times* complained of the shame to the "Police of this Metropolis" that "the streets should be every night infested by a number of impudent though unfortunate Women, who not only assail the ears of the passengers with the most blasphemous and obscene language, but even go to the length of assaulting their persons."<sup>96</sup> Such pronouncements might seem more appropriate to the Victorian period than the eighteenth century, and to a degree this is true. As Robert Shoemaker has shown, the uses and meanings of aggressive public speech changed considerably in London over the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as lawsuits for public insult declined.<sup>97</sup> Two points Shoemaker makes are particularly relevant here: first, the growing importance of print culture deprived the spoken insult of the weight it once carried; vituperative speech became less personally injurious, especially among the middling classes.<sup>98</sup> Second, women were no longer perceived as inherently loquacious (and prone to defaming their neighbors), a change that Shoemaker attributes in part to the waning of humoral theory.<sup>99</sup> This alteration helps to explain why the great majority of defamation cases that *were* brought in the eighteenth century involved women whose sexual reputations had been impugned. By implication, it means that the expectation of decorousness in women's speech in public became stronger as the century continued.

<sup>96</sup>*Times* of London, August 27, 1795.

<sup>97</sup>Robert B. Shoemaker, "The Decline of Public Insult in London, 1660–1800," *Past and Present* 169 (November 2000): 97–131.

<sup>98</sup>Robert B. Shoemaker, *Gender in English Society, 1650–1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?* (London, 1998), 110–13.

<sup>99</sup>*Ibid.*, 115, 119–21.

Certainly, the midcentury founders of institutions for the reclamation of prostitutes believed that women's language needed to be cleansed along with their souls. Well into the nineteenth century the ministers of those institutions urged silence on the residents, especially on the subject of their former lives. Concern about rude whores persisted into the Victorian period: a purely hypothetical wealthy father of 1857, for instance, "is disturbed in his night-slumbers by the drunken screams and foul oaths of prostitutes reeling home with daylight," and their "loud, ribald talk" forces him to keep his windows shut.<sup>100</sup> And indeed, prostitutes on the streets had to make noise to draw attention to themselves; as the writers of the list were well aware, "a certain forwardness" was "required in those who would make a figure as women of pleasure, which is as useful to them as beauty"; and the energetic disposition of one's voice is one of the easiest ways of putting oneself forward.<sup>101</sup> While there is no direct connection with late-eighteenth-century London, it is worth recalling that in another urban area with a dense population of prostitutes, the Storyville of early-twentieth-century New Orleans, women sang (often extremely bawdy) blues "as a way of touting for business."<sup>102</sup> Given Shoemaker's observations, the oaths of prostitutes over the course of the eighteenth century would have been taken less seriously *as speech*, that is, as meaningful (if highly aggressive) personal communication. At the same time, they would have signaled ever more clearly that the women uttering them had no pretensions to gentility or respectability.<sup>103</sup>

The *Harris's List* of 1793 takes a far more equivocal view toward women's cursing than the reformers did. On the whole, as we have seen, the lists looked on a woman's abstention from profanity with approval. The entry for Mrs. Cornish, however, makes allowances: "Her behaviour is very genteel when she has mind, but can upon occasion let fly a volley of small shot; but who, when they have been provoked, have an absolute

<sup>100</sup>There is a large literature on the Magdalen Hospital, founded in 1758; see, among others, Sarah Lloyd, "'Pleasure's Golden Bait': Poverty, Prostitution, and the Magdalen Hospital in Eighteenth-Century London," *History Workshop Journal* 41 (1996): 51–70; Stanley Nash, "Prostitution and Charity: The Magdalen Hospital, a Case Study," *Journal of Social History* 17.4 (1984): 617–28; Donna Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ, 1989). On nineteenth-century policies of institutions for reforming, reclaiming, and otherwise making over prostitutes, see Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Social Attitudes* (New York, 1994), 82–115. The Victorian paterfamilias is quoted from the *Lancet* (1857), in Stallybrass and White, 137.

<sup>101</sup>*Harris's List* (1764), 33.

<sup>102</sup>See Marybeth Hamilton's outstanding article, "Sexuality, Authenticity and the Making of the Blues," *Past and Present* 169 (November 2000): 143, citing the recollections of Jellyroll Morton.

<sup>103</sup>The growing quiet on the part of women of the moneyed classes should not be taken to imply silence on the part of all women, however; Nicholas Rogers has described the importance of political speech (and political shouting), especially by women of the laboring classes, throughout the long eighteenth century; see chapter 7 of his *Crowds, Culture, and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford, 1998).

command of their tongue?”<sup>104</sup> That for Miss Johnson spells out the positive attractions of swearing: “[A]s there are people who admire a vulgarity of expression and a coarseness of manner which they prefer to the polish [*sic*] education . . . it is no wonder if she always has a few customers, tho’ her clothes are always at the pawnbrokers.”<sup>105</sup> Mrs. Russell’s entry brings together the themes of swearing, suspicion, slumming, and the formation of the bourgeois man:

This lady has been some years in the service, in London, where she was much in vogue with the bucks and bloods of the town, who admired her for her vulgarity more than any thing else, she being extremely expert at uncommon oaths, and, at her first commencing a lady of pleasure, she threw off all restraint, so that her modesty was never offended: her readiness to reveal all the secrets, which the delicate part of her sex think proper to conceal, brought her a number of clients among the youth, who are fond of beholding that mouth of the devil from whence all corruption issueth. These she took care to fleece sufficiently; so that by her economy, she is now enabled to keep her country house and receives visits from only a few, and has in some degree left off her habit of swearing. This lady being a very good pen-woman, and much out of town, has a good opportunity of displaying her talents in that line to her lovers.

Mrs. Russell’s mouth, skilled at uncommon oaths, and her genitals, “that mouth of the devil,” are not quite conflated into one entity, but it is difficult to say which is which. The human mouth has powers of attraction and repulsion peculiar to itself, and their (implicit) application to the genitals is perhaps the most perverse moment in the whole of the list. Her primary role is that of sex educator: unlike the women who are depicted in terms of geographic metaphor, she speaks plainly and readily reveals “all the secrets.” While the writer finds those revelations disgusting, he nonetheless sees that they form the attractions that her customers seek. The reader at home is wary, knowing, allowed to imagine the pleasures of Mrs. Russell’s company without having to pay as the “young bucks and bloods of the town” have. However, the wealthy youths who are her particular audience (poor apprentices such as Francis Place would have been useless to her purpose) do not pay with their own moral corruption, nor is it hinted that they are infected with venereal disease; they simply lose their money. They are not bad gentlemen, but they are bad bourgeois, not simply because they have been fleeced—a time-honored convention of a trade in immaterial goods—but because, precisely, of what they want: to lie with someone whose filthy language promises knowledge otherwise barred to them. As for Mrs. Russell herself, she has quietly succeeded in business by breaking the rules of sexual

<sup>104</sup>*Harris’s List* (1793), 37.

<sup>105</sup>*Ibid.*, 73.

decorum. When she no longer needs to keep shop, she retires to the country, shifts linguistic modes, and remakes herself as a writer.

The pastime of slumming with the likes of Mrs. Russell or Miss Jones was of limited historical duration for young London men, but the late eighteenth century marks its beginning rather than its end. Pierce Egan's *Life in London*, promising to make every reader a "knowing kiddy," had enormous success in the 1820s and 1830s, during which time it was "common . . . for young bloods, sometimes protected by detectives, to visit Ratcliffe Highway ('a Babel of Blasphemy') to gaze at the sailors and prostitutes."<sup>106</sup> During the nineteenth century, as Peter Stallybrass and Allon White point out, "whilst the 'low' of the bourgeois body becomes unmentionable we hear an ever increasing garrulity about the *city's* 'low'—the slum, the rag-picker, the prostitute, the sewer. . . . In other words, the axis of the body is transcoded through the axis of the city, and whilst the bodily 'low' is forgotten, the city's low becomes a site of obsessive preoccupation."<sup>107</sup> Of course, this transcoding is legible primarily to those who possessed bourgeois bodies. The transcoding in the entry for Mrs. Russell and for the other women deemed desirable because of their swearing or vulgarity moves in precisely the opposite way, from the dirt of the city to that of the upper, supposedly more rational, part of the body. Moreover, the barriers between her vulgar body and the genteel bodies of her customers are precisely what the customers want to erase or at least (as they gaze on, or listen to, her mouth of corruption) what they want to see through.

The implied reader/client of these entries might be described as a bourgeois rake, an almost-oxymoronic label introduced here to distinguish him from the later nineteenth-century flâneur, the solitary, anonymous, aimless stroller, Poe's "Man of the Crowd," who has acquired such a strong presence in literary criticism in the last thirty years or so.<sup>108</sup> The flâneur, though he lives in and through his sense of the urban crowd, is never part of it and remains essentially unknowable. The bourgeois rake, by contrast and by definition, is *known* and *knowing*: the geography and populations of the city are all at his command, and he happily takes part in the amusements of all.

*Life in London* presents the type in its fullest development. Egan preserves to a surprising degree the verbal conventions of *Harris's List*: the double entendres, the excessive italics, the doggerel, the elaborate metaphors all are found in its pages, and in the figure of Corinthian Tom he creates a character who would have been the ideal reader or ideal writer of the lists (if forced to dirty his hands with labor for money). Tom, his

<sup>106</sup>Stallybrass and White, 139, drawing on P. J. Keating, "Fact and Fiction in the East End," in H. J. Dyos and M. Wolff, eds., *The Victorian City* (London, 1973), 2:587–88.

<sup>107</sup>Stallybrass and White, 145.

<sup>108</sup>His *locus classicus*, of course, Walter Benjamin's chapter "The Flâneur" in his *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism* (London, 1973).

fortune secured by his father in trade, is a good bourgeois in all senses of the word, displaying both theatrical expertise and a deep understanding of all kinds of shops, including little black apartments; he is the personification of knowingness. (If the father who has been unsuccessful in the new bourgeois life of the city is often called upon to die memorably, leaving his daughter unprotected, his opposite, the successful merchant possessed of a son, is also called upon to be absent at the important moments in the story.)

For its first readers, *Life in London* could have served as a working script for these rakes *in potentia*, enabling them to go into the streets and play their parts in the scene. Life might have imitated theater in a far broader way than do the Night-Walker's Cassandra and Orondates (the whore and her cully who liked to imitate in bed what they had seen on the stage). The amusements that attract Corinthian Tom, Bob Logic, and Cousin Jerry and the places they visit were all accessible to moneyed male readers in London. And because they wore their class credentials in the most material ways (on their backs, in their eating and drinking and whoring), Egan's characters were deeply susceptible to imitation by shoppers. The garment was, after all, the man.

Egan's *Life in London* offered many of the pleasures of *Harris's List*, including a catalog of prostitutes. However, it scanted detail and omitted the addresses that distinguish the lists: Egan's reader would have to find his own way about the city. *Harris's List*, on the other hand, provided few hints for the would-be bourgeois rake as to how he should appear when he knocked at a door and what he should feel in a woman's arms. The value of these lists came instead from letting men know where to go and whom they could expect to find. If a young man discovered that the rake's clothes were not transforming or that sensation fell far short of expectation (as common sense in the eighteenth century believed it always did), that was no fault of the writers of *Harris's List*.