Society, Vice, and Suppression: The Historical Creation of Pornography in England, 1750-1850

Brian Watson

Drew University, 2013

Society, Vice, and Suppression: The Historical Creation of Pornography in England, 1750-1850

> *Truth! stark naked truth, is the word, and I will not so much as take the pains to bestow the strip of a gauze-wrapper on it.*–John Cleland, *Fanny Hill*
>
> *Something must be done, and vigorously, to check the impropriety of a luxurious and dissipated age.*–The London Society for the Suppression of Vice
>
> *Thus, the nature of English erotic fiction is changed.*—Henry Spencer Ashbee

On January 20th, 1674, John Wilmot, the 2nd Earl of Rochester delivered a poem he had promised to King Charles II. In a rather unfortunate moment for the history of poetry however, Rochester accidently delivered into the hands of the King *The Island of Britain,* also known as *A Satyre on Charles II*. Upon discovering his mistake, he was forced to flee the court for his estate in Adderbury. By February, however, the King seemed to forgive him, granting him the title of Ranger of Woodstock Park and allowing him to return to court. Two centuries later, in October of 1869, Daniel Gabriel Rossetti published *Jenny*, in his *Exhumation Proofs*, a poem that had originally been buried with his wife in 1862. This poem also met with considerable controversy, but Rossetti was not as easily forgiven. Even years after the fact, he was accused by Robert Buchanan, the Scottish dramatist, of being "fleshy all over, from the roots of his hair to the tips of his toes …snake-like in [his] eternal wriggling, lipping, munching, slavering and biting," and indeed, responsible for

> decency outraged, history falsified, purity sacrificed, art prostituted, language perverted, religion outraged, in one gibbering attempt to apotheosize vice and demolish art with the implements of blasphemy and passion.[1]

When the texts of the two poems are compared however, it is Rochester's poem that seems to outrage decency and religion, falsify history, prostitute art and so on. The poem begins in earnest with "In th' isle of Britain, long since famous grown / For breeding the best cunts in Christendom, //[lives] the easiest King and best-bred man alive," and goes on to describe both the Kings whoring and 'tarse' in obscene detail, complaining that Charles is "starving his people, hazarding his crown. // ...for he loves fucking much."[2] The language of Rossetti's poem, by contrast, hardly seems to pervert language--it begins with "Lazy laughing languid Jenny, / Fond of a kiss and fond of a guinea, /Whose head upon my knee to-night / Rests for a while," which seems hardly as obscene.[3] The most 'suggestive' the poem gets is to speak of Jenny's "dainties through the dirt" and the only 'action' seen in it is "one kiss."[4]

What changed in the century intervening? Why did Rossetti's poem, so tame in comparison to Rochester's, inspire such a diatribe? Why do our modern eyes immediately peg Rochester's as the 'libertine poet' or 'a profane wit,' as the titles of two 2004 books did? This paper attempts to answer these questions by examining the prehistory of printed 'pornography' in the eighteenth-century from its earliest manifestation as 'obscene libel.' I carry this examination through the eighteenth-century and into the nineteenth, in order to provide context for, and show the effects of the shift in social attitudes towards erotic material. In order to do this, I use the London Society for the Suppression of Vice (1802) as a case study demonstrate and investigate the shift. I also examine how the Society's prosecutorial crusade against 'blasphemous and licentious' literature was intrinsic in laying the groundwork for modern definitions of 'pornography,' particularly in their legal drafting and lobbying. From this I draw three primary conclusions: i) pornography was a creation of class conflict—that is, it was

something that the middle and working classes were prosecuted for, not the upper; ii) the half-century between 1800 and 1850 in England (and mirrored in France) spawned modern understandings of pornography; and iii) the skirmishes between Holywell Street writers and the Society for the Suppression of Vice contributed to the extremes and obscenity of modern pornography.

As suggested by the very definition of the word—"the explicit description or exhibition of sexual subjects or activity in literature, painting, films, etc., in a manner intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic feelings"—an aesthetic judgment is inseparable from the thing itself.[1] As such, I am aware that my individual judgment of what is 'extreme and obscene' may be different from another's—this definitional issue is prevalent throughout the field—but I have attempted to compensate for my judgment by measuring the earlier works against the later ones. The eighteenth-century and the Society for the Suppression of Vice were essential in creating a formal aesthetic judgment and its associated frameworks by catalyzing the larger shift in morality into hardened legal definitions of obscenity. In order to demonstrate this—and to avoid my own aesthetic judgment—I will examine two eighteenth and two nineteenth-century works that were targeted or prosecuted for their supposed obscenity. Intervening between these four works is an examination of the origins and agendas of the English moral societies that sprung up to enforce King George III's 1787 *Proclamation* against vice,

[1] I would like to note that I have attempted to use the three words for the material—erotica, obscenity, and pornography—to refer to three distinct phases in the development of pornography. Generally speaking, I use the word *erotica* or *erotic literature* to refer to pre-Curll publications that combined the erotic with social, religious and political criticism. *Obscene literature* and its formulations refers, generally, to the period of time between Curll to the passing of the Obscene Publications Act in 1857. I have tried to use the word *pornography* where I am injecting modern judgment or in describing post-Act works.

profaneness, and immorality. I will finish by discussing the legal creation of the category of 'pornography' in the Obscene Publications Act of 1857 and its attendant effects.

Over the past three decades, several historians have engaged with erotica/pornography as a field: in manuscript form (Ian Fredrick Moulton, *Before Pornography*), in the events of the eighteenth-century that created obscene libel (Karen Harvey, *Reading Sex*; Bradford Mudge, *The Whore's Story*), or by focusing on the events after the creation of the Obscene Publications Act of 1857 (more than can be named here). None, however, have engaged with the first half of the nineteenth-century that led up to the Obscene Publications Act, or with the role that the Society played in its creation.[5] This is likely because historians have tended to either begin their histories in the eighteenth-century and end them in the nineteenth, or they have begun their stories with the passing of the 1857 Act. Although a few historians (such as Mudge or Siegel), have pointed out that the Society for the Suppression of Vice no doubt played a very important role in public and governmental perception of obscenity, its role has gone largely unexamined by historians of pornography, of the book, and of sexuality, the three categories they can be said to have affected.

Indeed, the Society for the Suppression of Vice's role in the intellectual and cultural debate in the early nineteenth-century has gone largely unexamined by historians of any field, with the exception of MJD Robert's studies in moral change.[6] This is partially due to a lack of extant sources, as there is no major archive or collection of the Society's papers, publications or paraphernalia: even though the Society was operational from 1802 to mid-1880, only a half-dozen of its publications remain extant. Furthermore, as described below, the society became

increasingly reclusive and financially strained after 1820, but continued in its ability to sway politicians and lobby for new laws. However, I believe the remaining material and trials are more than sufficient for my purposes here, as I am proposing that the Society was both a product and an instigator of the nineteenth-century shift in attitudes. It is a product of the shift in the sense that its membership and funds were drawn from the reformers of the era, and it is an instigator in the sense that their drafting of laws and insistent lobbying for reform had a measurable impact.

I would like to elaborate on point 'i' above, that pornography is 'a creation of class conflict, an attempt by the upper class to assert control,' as it is important for our discussion of pornography as a genre. The easiest way of illustrating this is to discuss the history of the word and the issues surrounding its coining. Although it is a Greek word literally meaning "writers about prostitutes," it is only found once in surviving Ancient Greek writing, where Arthenaeus comments on an artist that painted portraits of whores or courtesans.[7] The word seemed to fall more or less out of use for fifteen hundred years until the first modern usage of the word (1857) to describe erotic wall paintings uncovered at Pompeii.[8] Walter Kendrick in *The Secret Museum* discusses how the uncovering of the ruins at Pompeii inspired the creation of 'secret museums' to house the discoveries. According to Kendrick, these museums (the first of which was the Borbonico museum in Naples) were only accessible to highly educated upper-class men, who could understand Latin and Greek and pay the admission price.[9] As literacy rose and a marketplace of print developed in England and it began to seem possible that anything might be shown to anyone without control, then the 'shadowy zone' of pornography was 'invented,' regulating the "consumption of the obscene, so as to exclude the lower classes and women."[10]

Even more so than 'refined' literature, it is difficult, if not impossible in most cases to determine who the producers and consumers of erotic or obscene literature were and what their attitudes and reactions towards it were. The most famous surviving reaction, or at least most-cited one, is Samuel Pepys' purchasing of a bawdy book, *L'école des filles* for his wife to practice her French. Glancing over it he saw that it was "the most bawdy, lewd book that ever I saw" and decided to purchase it for himself.[11] Reviewing it at home, he commented, in coded language, that he had read it "for informations sake (but it did hazer my prick para stand all the while, and unavez to dechager); and after I had done it, I burned it, that it might not be among my books to my shame." Commenting on this, Ian Moulton notes that "what gives resonance to Pepys' encounter with *L'ecole des filles* is not that it is necessarily representative of seventeenth-century practice, but that it prefigures later, modern practices."[12] Moulton provides many examples of erotic manuscripts that circulated among the upper classes without this sense of shame. What is known about the audiences of early obscene literature and pornography then, is that it was seen as acceptable for upper-class gentlemen to possess and obtain them, but it became a completely different issue when they became available on the general market.

In London, any person could walk down to the Strand, and onto Holywell Street, the epicenter of London's book and, therefore, its pornography trade. With the money, they could purchase literature of any kind—obscene, atheist, or traitorous, all libels—without any sort of oversight. Holywell Street, where all of the characters and works in this paper were based or originated, was an old Elizabethan thoroughfare that linked the "financial centers in the City of London with the commercial West End and with government at Whitehall."[13] In fact, Lynda

Nead observes that, for "Victorian London, Holywell Street and obscenity were synonymous" and she observes that in 1849, a guide to London described the street as "'A narrow, dirty lane… occupied chiefly by old clothesmen and the vendors of low publications.'"[14] As such, it would become the ultimate target of moral reformers in the nineteenth-century, and the Society for the Suppression of Vice would declare outright war on it. To understand how a street named after holy well that Canterbury pilgrims stopped at became (in the words of a nineteenth-century writer) "a fountain of impurity… among the vilest places I have ever seen," I propose to examine the figures associated with it, and their works.[15]

Critics and moralists responded to the growing market, rising literacy, and the developing public sphere by expressing a deep anxiety over the impact and influences of erotic works. Erotic discourse began to be inextricably linked to a 'type' of work that supposedly had undesirous effects upon the English public. In Lynn Hunt's words then, "pornography as a regulatory category was invented in response to the perceived menace of the democraticization of culture."[16] As a category, then, it has a relatively short, modern history of about a century and a half. This is not to say that titillating works did not exist or were not understood as such—a claim that would be ahistorical, as the history of human perversity is as long as the history of the species. Instead, as illustrated by Rochester's poetry, erotic works were not solely focused on sexual arousal at the expense of all else: erotic discourse was exactly that, a method of discourse, and was usually linked with social, political, and religious criticism. One obvious example of this would be the anti-Catholic caricatures of Louis Cranach in support of Martin Luther, which often depicted—graphically—the Pope as the 'Great Whore,' or the Whore of Babylon. But one does not need to go that far afield to discover this—

Rochester's poetry provides a superb example of how early erotic discourse was used for political causes. Between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, European culture underwent a major cultural shift that would invent privacy. In the words of Ian Moulton, but supported throughout the literature:

> Bedchambers—and the beds themselves—slowly shifted from being common living areas (in lower-class homes) or sites for social gatherings (in upper-class ones) to being what they are today—private space for the single person or couple who sleep in them. Reading became dominantly private and silent rather than spoken and communal.[17]

The rise of privacy and the shift of cultural norms was the first step towards the creation of the modern conception of pornography. The second half, which will be discussed later, was the 'rise' of manners and accompanying state and societal enforcement of public behavior. Nonetheless, erotic discourse and its use for social, religious, and political critique, would collide headlong with the shifting norms of the eighteenth-century.

The earliest comprehensive attempt by the English government to control the press and printing trades was the 1662 Licensing of the Press Act.[18] Although the Act forbade anything "contrary to good life or good manners," it was much more specifically targeted at "heretical, schismatical, blasphemous, seditious, and treasonable books, pamphlets, and papers," not obscenity, as later regulations were.[19] It was renewed in 1685, and finally expired in 1692 when the House of Commons refused to renew it. The result of the refusal was to create a situation in which there existed no copyright or control method for the book trade. The business of publishing and the profits to be made exploded instantaneously as various publishers vied to turn profits on anything they could—previously published works, private letters, or erotic literature. If these "pyratical publishers" (in the words of Alexander Pope) had a pirate-king, it

was the publisher Edmund Curll, also known as the 'unspeakable Curll' by his contemporaries. Curll was unabashedly capitalistic and opportunist, profiting off of scandal and misfortune, and using every chance at publicity. In his forty years of publishing (1706-1746) Curll would run into an absurd series of misadventures:

> He was beaten by Westminster schoolboys, he was several times imprisoned, and once he stood in the pillory. Actions were brought against him in the Courts, he was almost annually lampooned, and word was even coined from his name to describe the regrettable methods of business. Pachydermatously, Curll continued to exist.[20]

The most important of Curll's misadventures for our purposes here is his imprisonment and trial before the Kings Bench in 1725.

On October 24th of 1724, the *Whitehall Evening Post* reported that "the Printers and Publishers of several obscene Books and Pamphlets, tending to encourage Vice and Immorality have been taken into Custody by Warrants."[21] Curll was among their number, and he was accused of the printing of *A Treatise of Flogging* and *Venus in the Cloister*. Upset at being accused of "vice," Curll responded in *The Humble Representation of Edmund Curll, Bookseller and Stationer of London, concerning Five Books, complained to of the Secretary of State*. His response was to note that the *Treatise* was of course a "*medical* work, translated from the Latin—a really learned dissertation which… should not be criticized by a layman."[22] The *Treatise* is a work of patent medicine and anatomy, and is borderline pornographic in describing the supposed medical use of flogging. The other book that Curll was accused of publishing was *Venus in the Cloister*, a much more infamous work which is frequently considered representative of eighteenth-century pornography. It is also, as we shall see, an example of how older forms of erotic discourse merged with the developing pornographic genre.

Venus in the Cloister or *A Nun in Her Smock* was translated by a "Person of Honour" from the French original by the pseudonymic 'Abbe du Prat.' The English version published by Curll (1724?) contains five dialogues between an elder nun, Sister Angelica, and a 16-year-old novice nun, Sister Agnes.[23] The dialogues begin when Sister Angelica, failing to seduce Agnes, decides she is ignorant and decides change her entire system of metaphysics, replacing it with the wise teachings of a 'Jesuit.' Discoursing, Angelica essentially makes the argument that Religion is comprised of "two Bodies, one of which is purely celestial and supernatural, the other terrestrial and corruptible, which is only the invention of Men."[24] In order to truly commune with God, Agnes should "dispense with the Laws, Customs, and Manners to which [she] submitted [her]self at [her] Entrance into the Monastery,"and explore her sexuality.[25] The text is deeply concerned with philosophy and moralizing, nearly to the expense of all else, though there is a good deal of bawdy humor (such as one particularly hilarious scene where a nun uses a chamber pot that a lobster had crept into, much to the dismay of the lobster and her genitals).[26] The rest of the story continues this dialogic seduction of Agnes by Angelica until Agnes is finally comfortable revealing her naked body to Angelica and kissing her '*a la Florentine*.'[27]

Or at least, that's how it happened in the 1682 French version. Curll's 1702 version was a little bit different: it attached two additional dialogues, one of which was lifted out of another whore dialogue, *Noveau Contes* by Jean de La Fontaine, and another which seemed to be directly inspired by the *Treatise* discussed above.[28] Additionally, Curll's English version came with additional paratext and a new introduction. The writer of the introduction is very much aware that the text will be placed before the public and emphasized it as much in italics: "*he*

that rightly comprehends the Morality of this Discourse shall never repent the reading of it [and it is] *full of Sharpness and Morality*."[29] What is more, the included paratext, which generally attempts to present a moralistic and academic reading of the text through footnotes and annotations, briefly founders when Angelica refers to an Italian book on kissing. This book, according to the footnotes, has (handily enough!) "been translated into English and printed for Mr. Curll over against Catherine-Street in the Strand."[30]

My evidence for this is in Curll's addition to the original text, and in the anxiety expressed by the introduction. The fact that the genre of pornography *was* just beginning to take shape proved to be the key argument that saved Curll from a worse fate in the hands of the Kings Bench. After arguing that the *Treatise* was a medical text and therefore not subject to usual standards of propriety, and that no evidence had been given that Curll had published *Venus in the Cloister* (as Curll's name did not appear on the title page—an argument that was likely not convincing) he plead 'not guilty.'[31] Furthermore, Curll's lawyer argued that as there was "no Law prohibiting the Translations of Books either out of Latin or French or any other Language, neither we can presume such Transactions be deemed Libels."[32] The lawyer was correct, as obscenity was not prosecutable as libel before his client went on trial—the creation of obscene libel was (unluckily for Curll) a result of his trial.[33] The Lord Chief Justice determined that Curll's book *was* a libel punishable by the Temporal and not Spiritual courts, as peace was part of the King's "government and that peace may be broken in many instances without an actual force. 1. If it be an act against the constitution or civil Government; 2. If it be against religion; and, 3.If against morality."[34]The third point, though Curll's publications would seem to be "against morality," still referred to Christian morality, as the judges explication made clear:

"Christianity is part of the law, and why not morality too?"[35] The Chief Justice was more concerned with the discrediting of religion rather than the supposed obscenity of the book.

Unfortunately for Curll, Christian morality—the body of 'Policy'—was specifically targeted by *Venus in the Cloister*. Although the new category of obscene libel would establish the foundation for the invention of pornography, it was still attached at the hip to Christian and religious morality, not the 'public morals' that porn would offend against. The fact that Curll published a book that targeted Christianity was the key that led to his conviction, not the supposed obscenity of work's discourse. My idea here is supported by the fact that the next person convicted of obscene libel was John Wilkes, who libeled the Church and a Bishop in his *Essay on Women*.[36] If graphic obscenity was a requirement for the conviction of obscene libel, then John Cleland would have been prosecuted and convicted for *Fanny Hill,* which he was not.

Public morality would be the key to nineteenth-century laws, which targeted any works that had the "tendency…to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall."[37] As shown above, there was not yet any concept of 'public morality' articulated or expressed. This is not to say that it was not beginning to develop in the seventeenth-century: one example of this was the hearty public debates over masquerades in the same year that Curll was placed on trial. The debate between Bishop Edmund Gibson and the members of the Court eventually caught even King George I in the crossfire. Although this is not the place to discuss the debate in great detail, it is relevant here because, as Bradford K. Mudge pointed out, the debate over the masquerades was first and foremost "a debate about both the status of 'fiction' in society, and the

appropriateness of certain fictions for certain parts of the public."[38] Although masques were acceptable for the upper classes, their failure to conceal them to the general public would cause the other classes to indulge in them. The debate, as a result, occurred at nearly every level of society and was documented in the public sphere through the print market, playing a valuable role in shaping emerging understandings of public morality. I would argue that these sorts of conversations/debates are turning points or crossroads in cultural history—increasingly so as the public sphere and independent media developed—where the 'winning' side determined or at least heavily influenced how a society reacts or interprets to an event or a thing. In this case, there was no clear winner, as hapless George I first supported the Church and then supported the nobility. Nevertheless, morality, especially publically-accessible morality in novels, plays, and elsewhere became a prominent topic of the era, an example of which is Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*.

Pamela or, Virtue Rewarded (1740), was the sort of novel that set a typology for everything following it—there was a distinct before and after. According to Mudge *Pamela* was Richardson's "vigorous attempt to reform the romance novel that had been popularized [by women.] [It] attempted to redefine the romance novel to make it at once more realistic and more moral."[39] And indeed, *Pamela* is intensely moralistic, its original title page after all, read that it was "*designed to inculcate the principles of virtue and religion in the YOUTH of BOTH SEXES… entirely divested of all those images which… tend to inflame the minds they should instruct*."[40]Although there is no room to examine *Pamela's* plot at length here, it concerns a girl named Pamela Andrews, who is met with unwanted advances by her employer, Mr. B, after the death of her mother. The novel reaches its ultimate emotional and moral climax when the

aristocratic Mr. B has his maidservant Mrs. Jewkes (representing the whore) hold Pamela (the virgin) down for an attempted rape, whereupon she faints dead away, resisting the advances of the man by cutting off the narration. Curiously, she notes later on that she "cannot answer for the liberties taken with her in her deplorable State of Death"[41] But Mr. B. repents, 'realizes' that he cannot take her by force, and decides he must marry her—leaving her chastity intact and rewarding her virtue. The novel ends safely in a societally-acceptable and endorsed middle-class marriage, where the rapacity of the aristocracy has been tamed with the virtues of the working class. Despite (or perhaps, because of) the fact that *Pamela*'s plot is more than a little licentious—with its kidnapping and attempted rape of a 15-year-old—*Pamela* became immensely popular. Not only was it the first major cultural phenomenon—there were *Pamela* prints and paintings, *Pamela* playing cards and fans—there were both encouraging and angry reactions. Within a year of its publication, there appeared reactions positive (*Pamela Commedia, Pamela's Conduct in High Life*) and negative (*Shamela, Pamela Censured, The True Anti-Pamela*).[42] As it happens, the two most notorious works to originate out of the eighteenth-century are also reactions against *Pamela*—*Justine,* also known as *The Misfortunes of Virtue* (1742), and *Fanny Hill,* or *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748). It is the latter of which I would like to examine, along with the persecutions of its author.

Fanny Hill, with its first-page promise of "Truth! stark, naked, truth!" does not fail to live up to the subtitle *Woman of Pleasure*.[43] As Mudge points out, the novel is also very deliberately poised as a reaction or an 'alternate history' to *Pamela:* Fanny is also kidnapped and imprisoned at fifteen by a brothel madam, Mrs. Brown (who is characterized as a whore) and nearly has her virginity sold to the affluent "Lord B" before being rescued by another nobleman named

Charles. The same symbolic figures are all there: the poor and powerless girl, forced to work for a living, the kidnapping, and the attempted rape accompliced by a whorish older woman. Even the Lord B seems to be Cleland's wink at Richardson's 'Mr. B.' However, *Fanny Hill* is also more 'realistic:' when Fanny's true love Charles disappears, she is again forced into prostitution, as she is power- and penniless. When her first patron arrives to 'have' her, he (like Mr. B) places his hand on her breast and she faints dead away… awakening to find him not repentant, but "buried in me."[44] Fanny of course goes on through many other 'arduous' tasks before being reunited with Charles at the end of the novel. Each of these episodes are nearly purely sexual, and the narrative of the story could be reduced to a series of sexual positions and activities, much like a modern pornographic film. The fact that she is reunited and married to Charles at the end of the novel perhaps shows how much of an impact Richardson's novel had—she is, after all, within the confines of a safe middle-class marriage at the end. She also makes the point that she, like Pamela, is rewarded: she is "in the bosom of virtue" and spends the end of the novel philosophizing on the nature of virtue and vice.[45]

Like *Venus in the Cloister* and many other early erotic works*, Fanny* is interested in the nature of women and female perspective perceived and written by men. Additionally, Cleland priotizes heterosexuality over all other orientations by downplaying lesbian interaction and describing homosexual acts between men as "criminal."[46]Another difference between *Fanny* and later works is that it remains remarkably non-vulgar in its language—Cleland uses, or comes up with nearly every euphemism for 'penis' possible. Although there are some moments in the novel that could be considered 'philosophical' or critical, it is a much harder stretch for *Fanny Hill* than it is for *Venus in the Cloister* or *An Essay on Women.* For example, some scholars

have suggested that Fanny's references to the penis as a 'machine' shows that Cleland was heavily influenced by a philosophy of materialism.[47]It is undeniable however, that *Fanny Hill* is more 'pornographic' or more recognizably so than *Venus in the Cloister*, which does not even focus on men. The truly innovative aspect of *Fanny Hill* is that it strips away the philosophizing found in bawdy dialogues in favor of a novel format and links it to an internal and private sexuality. This, I argue, is be would be the redeeming factor that would save Cleland.

Even though *Fanny Hill* ends within the confines of a safe, middle-class marriage, and Fanny becomes 'virtuous' at the end of the book, the work and its author were not seen as virtuous. In fact, they were seen as quite the opposite—Cleland was first threatened with prosecution in November of 1749 and forced to pay fines, and then in March 8th of the following year, God himself prosecuted Cleland—at least, according to the Bishop of London. Bishop Thomas Sackton, reacting to a series of earthquakes in London, wrote "A Letter on Occasion of the Earthquakes in 1750" addressed to the people of London. In it, he declared that it was his "heart's desire and prayer to God… that you may be saved" from the "unnatural lewdnefs" England was immersed in, and he targeted *Fanny Hill* specifically as an "open insult on religion and good manners."[48] Cleland was again brought on trial, whereupon he disavowed the book and wished it would be forgotten—and even "with God in his side, the Bishop of London could not bring about a prosecution for a literary crime whose status as a crime was culturally undefined."[49] I believe that the Bishop's failure to have Cleland prosecuted or satisfactorily punished provides another example of a cultural crossroads, but in this case, it illustrates a gap between political and religious forces that usually worked in tandem. As Cleland did not engage in the libels or criticism that convicted others, and just wrote literary

erotica, the political powers-that-be did not necessarily see *Fanny Hill* as 'disturbing the King's peace.' Religious figures however, saw *Fanny* as an 'open insult,' and their failure to achieve prosecution, I argue, led ultimately to the organization of the Proclamation and the Suppression of Vice Societies. These societies will be discussed further in a moment, but it is enough to point out that they were religiously organized and motivated groups that used political methods and lobbying to achieve their goal of a legal recognition of the menace posed by erotic and pornographic works.Lynda Nead comments that without the "vociferous campaigning of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, the passing of an obscenity law might have been postponed for some years."[50]

Unlike the unrepentant Curll, Cleland was duly chastised, and his next two books—*Memoirs of a Coxcomb* (1751) and *The Woman of Honour*(1768)—did not even risk straying over the lines that *Fanny Hill* had crossed. Even if he had thought of writing a more pornographic novel for 1768's*Woman of Honour*, he would have been sharply reminded of the dangers of such a move by the 1763 conviction of Wilkes. Furthermore, towards the end of his life in 1789, Cleland would find himself living in an era of changing mores and norms. Richardson's *Pamela*, which had been praised from the pulpit and "said to do more good than twenty sermons," soon developed the scent of scandal about it: in 1815 "a young lady looked over the shoulder of Charles Lamb as he was reading this very same *Pamela*. She retreated very soon indeed, and…there was 'a blush between them.'"[51]In 1786, a duke's mistress could be introduced to the Queen, but by 1802 Charles James Fox had to marry his before she could be introduced in polite society.[52]There is also the famous anecdote of Sir Walter Scott, who was asked by his great-aunt to get copies of Aphra Behn's romances, which she had enjoyed reading

as a young woman. Despite Scott's suggestion that she might not find "'either the manners or the language…to be 'quite proper reading,'" she insisted.[53] When he obtained them for and she reviewed them, she was shocked, returned them immediately and suggested that Scott "Take back your bonny Mrs. Behn and…put her in the fire."[54] Interestingly, she continued, saying:

> But is it not very odd, that I, an old woman of eighty…sitting alone, feel myself ashamed to read a book, which sixty years ago I have heard read aloud for large circles consisting of the first and the most creditable society London?"[55]

Finally, there are the oft-cited observations of Francis Place, who "consistently argued at this period that, in the groups he was concerned with, a dramatic increase in moral respectability—including sexual—had started in the mid-1790s… by about 1815 has already progressed so far that practices and attitudes standard in Place's youth were unthinkable."[56]

By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century the shift in morality had even begun reaching into the 'rapacious' aristocracy: King George III issued a *Royal Proclamation For the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue, and for the Preventing and Punishing of Vice, Profaneness and Immorality.* The proclamation was urged by the succeeding Bishop of London, Beliby Porteus, and William Wilberforce. The *Proclamation,* one of George III's first acts as King, called for (among other things) the eradication of "loose and licentious Prints, Books, and Publications, dispersing Poison to the minds of the Young and Unwary and to Punish the Publishers and Vendors thereof."[57] This was the very first time 'prints, books, and publications' were singled out because of their sexual nature instead of their critique of religion, society, or politics. Earlier *Proclamations for Encouragement* by King George I and Queen Anne did not target books, prints, or publications as George III's did. This novelty is undoubtedly attributable to the influence of Wilberforce, who once famously stated that "God Almighty has set before

me two great objects, the suppression of the slave trade and the reformation of manners."[58] Almost as if to take credit, Wilberforce established the Proclamation Society immediately after the *Proclamation* was issued.

The Proclamation Society was not created *ex nihilo*, but modeled after a seventeenth-century group called Society for the Reformation of Manners (and a similarly-named sixteenth century one). This Society, however, was set up in order to, quite literally, proclaim and enforce the *Proclamation*: Wilberforce argued that the "Attorney-General and Secretary of State…are too much cramped by their political relations to discharge [their] duties with effect; yet some official check on vice is absolutely needed."[59] Wilberforce's (slightly disingenuous) comments here help explain why the Vice and Proclamation Societies became so obsessed with prosecution—he essentially argues that the government was 'too busy' and unconcerned with the issue. It seems that government was not interested in the expenditures or exertions necessary to launch a campaign against vice, or they did not feel that it was particularly necessary, and so left it to private individuals, who formed societies. The Society for the Suppression of Vice would note that "the exertions of an individual may doubtless produce very excellent effects within the sphere in which they may operate," but they would not be enough, and the "only effectual barrier… which can be opposed to the overwhelming tide of corruption which threatens our repose, is the united efforts of individuals combining in one extensive and firm association, the virtue, wisdom, and energy of each."[60]

The Proclamation Society managed to be a barrier for a few years, prosecuting a John Morgan in 1788 for publishing *The Battles of Venus: A Descriptive Dissertation on the Various*

Modes of Enjoyment(1650?) and Lewis McDonald for the older *The School of Venus* (1680). A third and a fourth prosecution were brought against a James Hodges in 1780 for his publication of Cleland's *Fanny Hill* and theeighteenth-century erotic work *A Dialogue between a Married Lady and a Maid* (1740).[61] By and large, however, it seems that the Proclamation Society did little more than proclaim—there are several surviving editorials, letters, and sermons arguing for the suppression of vice by members. This may be because the Proclamation Society was a largely upper-class society—it contained, among others, "the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, seventeen bishops, six dukes, and eleven other peers."[62] Inactive and ineffective, they were soon superseded and absorbed by the more middle-class, and practically-minded Society for the Suppression of Vice.

Founded in 1802, The Society for the Suppression of Vice (hereafter, the Vice Society or the SSV) issued their first open letter to the public in the same year, titled *Society for the Suppression of Vice, Consisting of Members of the Established Church*.In it, they declared that "something must be done and vigorously to check the impropriety of a luxurious and dissipated age."[63] Although they were full of praise for the Proclamation Society, "rejoyc[ing] in an opportunity of publicly acknowledging, with the upmost gratitude and respect, the great obligations of this country to the Proclamation Society," they also "lament[ed] that profaneness and immorality have encreased [*sic*] among us to such a degree, that to contend with them successfully requires more."[64] This is not to say that the SSV was hostile or antagonistic to the Proclamation Society—in fact, they managed to work side by side with them "hoping, by their joint efforts and influence to check the contagion of dissolute example and licentious practice,"

and, when the two combined forces, they redoubled their efforts against the vice that seemed to seize England at every limb.[65]

Although also consisting of several members of the Church, the Vice Society was initially much more secularly and practically-minded. Instead of trying to win hearts and minds, and convince people to reform through sermons and editorials, the SSV elected to use the British Magistrates and Courts as their primary weapon to "trace corruption to its source…disclose its covert recesses…drag offenders into light… [to] risque [*sic*] [their] personal safety against those whose trade is rapine, and whose profession is hatred and hostility" and most importantly, to "discharge the expenses necessary to support their prosecution."[66] The Vice Society was set up from the beginning as a legal society—in addition to giving their members advice on how to navigate and utilize the legal system. The SSV also published advice books for policemen in addition to placing charts in most of their public addresses that listed the crimes they could prosecute, the statue numbers, and the penalties.[67] For example, under the "False Weights and Measures" category it listed 16 Statues including "8 Hen c. c. 5, 11 Hen. 7.c.4…22&23 Ca.2.c.12…37 Geo.3. c.143." Under this, the Offence, Statues, and Penalties subheadings listed "Persons using false Weights and Measures; 35 Geo. 3; Liable to a Penalty of 40s. for every Offence" respectively.[68] Compared to the other offenses the SSV prosecuted, the "Obscene Books and Prints" category was rather sparse, did not cite any statues, and only said that "Persons selling obscene Books and Prints…*May* be indicted, imprisoned, and put in the pillory."[69] By the middle of the century however, in no small part due to their lobbying efforts, the SSV was able to add several more statues and their increasingly exacting penalties to their charts.

Bursting so dramatically onto the scene, the Vice Society went quickly about its business, targeting all of the Vices, Profanities and Immoralities that the *Proclamation* identified. In 1802 alone, the Vice Society prosecuted 220 shopkeepers and 218 publicans for the Profanation of the Lord's Day, 20 individuals for the "frauds and abuses practiced in selling by FALSE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES," 26 for the "evil consequences resulting from LOTTERIES," and 5 houses and 11 persons for being riotous and disorderly, brothels, or gaming houses.[70] They also successfully prosecuted 5 sellers of "BLASPHEMOUS, LICENTIOUS, AND OBSCENE BOOKS, AND PRINTS, as tending to inflame the minds and to corrupt the morals of the rising generation," more than the Proclamation Society had managed to prosecute in a decade in a half.[71] Two were sentenced to six months imprisonment, one to twelve, one to six and then an additional two years when he was caught again in the same year.[72]

Their description of obscene literature is interesting for several reasons. First is that the *argumentum ad liberos*, or the "think of the children" argument is utilized in relation to erotic works for one of the first times. This shows that children's literacy was growing increasingly common, and that the burgeoning genre of children's literature was a concern of the SSV. Indeed, they begged parents to pay attention to children's books as they had been found "a most successful channel for the conveyance of infidel and licentious tenants. It is indeed no longer safe to trust the title of the books, the terms virtue and vice have no longer the same signification as formerly"[73]

Second, these 'protect the children' arguments by the Vice Society and others lends support to an idea presented earlier—that the invention of pornography as a regulatory

category was directly tied to the increasing rates of literacy among the working classes, women, and children—or, put another way "the marked revival of moral censorship in England…was the result of a number coinciding developments, but the moral welfare of newly-literate groups was the overwhelming impetus."[74] The English wit and Anglican cleric Sydney Smith, noted that since the Society for the Suppression of Vice did not prosecute the wealthy it should be called "'a society for suppressing the vices of persons whose income does not exceed £500 per annum.'"[75] In the same mode was William Pitt's refusal to prosecute Godwin's *Political Justice* because it was published at three guineas a set: "a three-guinea book could never do much harm among those who had not three shillings to spare."[76] Each of these actions helps to give a general impression of a widespread goal—the protection and reform of the working classes.

This is a common trend that runs through all of the prosecutions for obscene libel and later, pornography: the prosecuted individual is always a member of (or associated with) the middle or working class, and his dangerous wares run the risk of corrupting the women, the children, and all who walk down Holywell street, peering in the shop windows. This is the most interesting thing about the Vice Society's comments—that while the religious aspect of obscene libel is still present in 'blasphemous,' there is a much greater focus on the lewdness and licentiousness of the books and prints. It was no longer religious or philosophical aspects that endangered the readers or incited them to revolt; it was the mere hint or suggestion of sex or sexuality. This fear of sexuality was apparent in the earliest publications of the Vice Society, where they comment breathlessly that

> the nature of the subject forbids such a description as would be necessary to convey a just notion of the extent of the evil which they have encountered. Suffice it to say, that

> the most corrupt device the morbid imagination of voluptuous sensuality ever yet conceived can scarcely be supposed to exceed in depravity the subjects of the publications discovered by the Society.[77]

And these publications were dangerous—one Magistrate, proceeding over Vice Society trial, said that

> the mischief done to the community by such offences greatly exceeds that produced by murder; for in the latter case, the mischief has some bounds, but no bounds can be set to the pernicious consequence of a crime which tends to the entire corruption of morals.[78]

Even in the era of revolution, and Napoleon on the Continent, pro- and anti-Jacobin movements and laws in the Homeland, the concern over erotic literature continued to grow.

As the century passed, the Vice Society's prosecutions increased, they seemed to become increasingly obsessed with prosecution for blasphemy and obscene literature at the expense of all of their other goals, such as profanation of the Sabbath.This was because,as the century progressed, erotic/obscene literature had, much to their dismay, become much more accessible and forthrightly sexual. To illustrate this point further, it is enough to point out that the Proclamation Society prosecuted books that were first published over a half-century beforehand, and in some cases the books targeted were over a century old. These were the types of works that were examined earlier, that combined *philosophe* ideas with eroticism. The first prosecutions of the Society for the Suppression of Vice were older works as well, many of them 'Italian,' suggesting Aretine works first published in the middle of the sixteenth century. Over the course of the nineteenth-century there was a dramatic upswing in the number of newly written and published pornographic books. There was also a dramatic upswing in the

number of Vice Society prosecutions. By 1857 Lord Campbell would note that the SSV had 159 prosecutions for obscenity under their belt, of which 154 were successful.[79]

The suggestion here is that, as the SSV's prosecutions and campaign intensified, so did the Holywell Street production and creativity. The Society for the Suppression of Vice and other associated moral reformers thought they were facing an organized campaign to destroy England: it was apparent to them, "beyond all reasonable doubt, that associations have been formed for the most nefarious purposes, which have threatened the very existence of civil society."[80] So they fought Holywell Street through the courts and by lobbying for more vigorous laws. The writers seemed to respond in kind, writing to the definition of obscenity that the SSV had offered, imagining the'most corrupt device the morbid imagination of voluptuous sensuality' they could. In many ways, *Fanny Hill* had been a precursor, in its separation of religious and social criticism from the sensuality. Despite its embrace of the latter, it began to pale in comparison to new works. Indeed, older books such as*Fanny Hill*were found lacking and reissued with reduced dialogue, new scenes, and 'greater' obscenity.

It seems necessary here to emphasize that I am not reverting to the old trope of Victorian hypocrisy/prudishness. It would be too easy to mock the Vice Society's intentions and goals in the light of a modern and supposedly enlightened time. When the Society for the Suppression of Vice began their campaign they had widespread support amongst British public, intellectuals, and politicians. The medical establishment underwrote it with their theories of spermatorrhea, politicians strengthened it with new laws and regulations, and it saw nearly universal sponsorship from the Church. Until the SSV took a remarkably religious turn in the late

1820's (after the absorption of the Proclamation Society), they did very well financially, reaching subscription heights of more than £1000 per annum between 1803 and 1807 and still maintained more than £500 per annum thereafter.[81] Even Thomas Carlile, who was engaged in a painful, multi-decade battle with the Vice Society for publishing the works of Thomas Paine said that "had you confined yourself to [suppressing vice], no honest or moral man would have complained of or objected to your conduct as a society."[82]The Vice Society continued prosecutions for obscenity through 1857, but their focus from the 1819 Six Acts, specifically The Blasphemous and Seditious Libels Act, was on blasphemy, until the end of the war. Regardless, their presence was felt among the Holywell Street writers and publishers. Despite this, or perhaps because of this, new books began to appear on the market in the 1820s and the 1830's. One of the most famous of these was *The Lustful Turk*.

The Lustful Turk was first published between 1828 and 1830 by John Benjamin Brookes, and then republished by William Dugdale in 1857 (which will become important in a moment). Using the same epistolary form that *Pamela* does, the book purports to be a series of letters from Emily Barlow to her friend Silvia Carey. In the first letter, Emily begins by describing her trip from England to India to meet her Uncle, but then goes silent for a month. Abruptly (for the reader), Sylvia receives a long letter from Emily, which begins with her heartbrokenness: "Pity me, my dear friend… Oh God, Sylvia, I have no longer any claim to chastity. Surely never was a poor maid so unfeelingly deprived of her virtue."[83] The letter goes on to describe her capture by Moorish pirates, her enthrallment into slavery, and her first night in the harem of the Dey of Algiers. Like Pamela and Fanny, Emily faints when the letter reaches its physical and emotional height: "uttering a piercing cry I sank insensible in the arms of my cruel ravisher. How long I

continued in this happy state of insensibility, I know not."[84] Unlike Pamela and Fanny however, Emily leaves nothing to the imagination in describing her rape beforehand: "my cries seemed only to excite… sucking my lips and breasts … tearing and cutting me to pieces, until… the whole of his terrible shaft was buried within me."[85]

The rest of the letters continue on in this trend, describing (in detail!) her repeated rapes, floggings, and beatings. Eventually, Emily seems to suffer a sort of Stockholm Syndrome and enthusiastically embraces her situation, willingly giving up her 'second maidenhead' to the Dey. Replying to her, Sylvia is repulsed at "your disgusting letters … your debased situation, and the infamous satisfaction it gives you!"[86] Offended by this, the Dey orders Sylvia's kidnapping and then rapes and imprisons her as well, almost as if to prove a point. Both women become token bodies, enslaved to the Lustful Turk, and the harem becomes a sort of 'pornotopia' of delight created for the reader.[87] However, the lull does not hold, and "an awful catastrophe put an end to our enjoyments:" in an act of protest against anal sex, another girl in the harem cuts the Dey's penis off with his knife and then kills herself.[88] The Dey, unfazed, has his physician cut off the remainder, preserves the 'members' in glass jars for Sylvia and Emily, and sends them home to England.

On the level of language and propriety, *The Lustful Turk* does not particularly take great strides, and is rather consistent with *Fanny Hill.* Although it is a bit more 'vulgar' with its language, it still avoids the common names and graphic description of genitalia.*The Lustful Turk* also does not touch on many of the sexual acts or extremes that later works would. Like *Fanny Hill,* the work also prioritizes heterosexual contact and avoids any mention of homosexuality. Its

main innovation may have been forthright description of heterosexual anal sex. Bondage, especially flogging, had a long history of representation in England, dating even earlier than Curll's*Treatise on Flogging,* and was so widespread that it was referred to as *le vice anglais.* On a philosophical level however, *The Lustful Turk* was terribly upsetting to Victorian moralists—not only does it involve rape, it involves the (eventually) willing participation of English women in fornication and adultery with an infidel and a foreigner. Nor are Emily and Sylvia punished as they should be—at the end of the novel Emily is working on marrying "Irish earl, who I have a presentiment will be found worthy of acceptance" and might be able to "erase the Dey's impression from my heart."[89] It disrupts the need for a middle-class marriage and presents female sexuality in a manner that must have deeply disturbed the SSV, who declared that "women are elevated in the scale of society and the suavity of manners … they have a mild, conciliating, forbearing, and civilizing spirit."[90] Compounding this, *The Lustful Turk* even manages to insult English men through Emily's cuckolded husband, the law with a corrupt English captain who sells her into slavery, and religion with a subplot of two corrupt priests and their seduction and trafficking of women into the Dey's harem.

It was little surprise, then, that when William Dugdale appeared in front of Lord Campbell in 1857 for publishing the work, he was found guilty of publishing obscene libel, the same crime that Curll had been prosecuted for 130 years earlier. Despite persistent lobbying during the intervening decades, the Society for the Suppression of Vice had not been successful in getting major vice legislation passed. In 1817, the SSV's Secretary, George Pritchard, testified before the House of Commons about their crusade. When asked how many prosecutions the Vice Society had launched, Pritchard testified

> between thirty and forty, in all of which they have succeeded… [but] in consequence of renewed intercourse with the continent, incidental to the restoration of peace, there has been a great influx …of the most obscene articles of every description.[91]

The House of Commons continued questioning him about the nature of the prosecutions, eventually asking his opinion on the adequacy of the current laws against obscene literature. Pritchard responded that the current libel law was

> by no means adequate to the suppression of such offenses; for if an itinerant dealer is detected in the very act of dealing obscene prints …he cannot be apprehended without a warrant, which cannot be obtained until after a bill of indictment is presented and found against him … a thing almost impossible … I do not see how this evil can be effectively put a stop to, unless constables and other persons are enabled to seize such offenders without a warrant.[92]

He further testified that many dealers were able to escape with impunity, and that many shops on Holywell Street were able to openly display obscene books and prints for sale.

Although House of Commons did not act on his testimony immediately, by 1824 the Society had succeeded in getting a rider to the 1824 Vagrancy Act that declared

> every Person wilfully [*sic*] exposing to view, in any Street, Road, Highway, or public Place, any obscene Print, Picture, or other indecent Exhibition … shall be deemed a Rogue and Vagabond, within the true Intent and Meaning of this Act; and it shall be lawful for any Justice of the Peace to commit such Offender … to the House of Correction, there to be kept to Hard Labour for any Time not exceeding Three Calendar Months.[93]

In lobbying for this law, the SSV had sought to specifically target Holywell Street, which was notorious for its 'obscene prints, pictures and other indecent exhibitions,' that were visible from the street. Unfortunately for the SSV, the 1824 Act did not define what a 'public place' was, and they found themselves lobbying for further revision fourteen years later. The 1838 Vagrancy Act extended the earlier Act to include the display of such material inside a shop or

house.[94] Though this law was more stringent, it still required 'public display,' and it still did not grant the SSV power to seize and destroy material. Furthermore, they were frustrated by individuals like Dugdale, who had associates or relatives run his business while he was in jail. Finally, the Vagrancy Act was found wanting because it did not stipulate increased punishment for repeat offenders, such as Dugdale, who was prosecuted no less than nine times by the SSV. A greater, more powerful Act was needed, and the 1857 trial of William Dugdale and his associate William Strange, launched by the Society would provide this impetus.

The Society for the Suppression of Vice, during the course of the trial, managed to impress upon the mind of the judge, Lord John Campbell, the great danger presented by obscene literature. Curious, Campbell examined *The Lustful Turk* and the other books that Strange and Dugdale were accused of publishing. For all of the reasons outlined above, and more, Campbell declared his "'astonishment and horror' particularly at the low price at which it was sold, declared it to be a' disgrace to the country' and proclaimed that it was 'high time that an example should be made,'" sending Dugdale to prison for a year.[95] Not to belabor the point, but Campbell's revulsion to the low cost and ease of access is a further example of how indecency hinged upon access by certain groups. A couple days later, on May 11th, Campbell announced to the House of Lords that he had "learned with horror and alarm that a sale of poison more deadly than prussic acid, strichnine, or arsenic—the sale of obscene publications and indecent books—was openly going on."[96] Confirming the double standard, Campbell noted that the poison available was not alone "indecent books of a high price, which was a sort of check" but that "the most licentious and disgusting [material] w[as] coming out week by week,

and sold to any person who asked for them, and in any numbers."[97] Six weeks later, he introduced the Obscene Publications Act into the House of Lords.

There is little purpose in documenting here all the twists and turns of the Act through the House of Lords and Commons, as it has been chronicled many times. The surprising aspect of the process (for readers steeped in the stereotype of Victorian prudishness) is how much resistance the Act initially encountered in the Houses. Opposition was led by Lord Chancellor Cranworth, and supported Lords Lyndhurst, Brougham and Wensleydale, all who opposed the bill on the grounds that there was no way of defining what the bill sought to suppress: Lord Lyndhurst commented that

> "My noble and learned Friend's aim is to put down the sale of obscene books and prints; but what is the interpretation which is to be put on the word 'obscene?' I can easily conceive that two men will come to entirely different conclusions as to its meaning."[98]

Furthermore, the consensus was that the bill granted constables too much power without enough oversight. In its original form, based on the strength of one person's testimony, the authorities were allowed to enter and search any building and then seize and destroy any material they thought might be obscene.[99] The Lords noted that these authorities were not well-known for their aesthetic or cultural judgment.

The resistance was such that Lord Campbell thought to abandon his attempt, but decided to move forward on the strength of Society and individual lobbying. He noted to the House of Lords that he received

> such strong solicitations to proceed from various Members of that House, from clergymen of all denominations, from many medical men, from fathers of families, and

> from young men who themselves had been inveigled into those receptacles of abomination against which his Bill was directed.[100]

By the time the bill reached the House of Commons it saw near-universal support from "nearly all shades of the press …and Campbell and the Society got their act with only minor amendments."[101] Campbell was finally able to sell the act to the Lords by promising that it applied "exclusively to the works written for the single purpose of corrupting the morals of youth and of a nature calculated to shock the common feelings of decency in any well-regulated mind," and that any book that made any pretensions of being literature or art, classic or modern, had nothing to fear from the law.[102] The real enemy, to Campbell and the press, was Holywell Street, which was repeatedly invoked as the center of London's "moral and cultural impurities, [pouring] forth noxious publications, which… threatened to poison all who came into contact with them."[103] The irony for Morris Ernst was that less than three decades later "the law would be used against the classical works the Lords had wanted to guard, and especially against current literature."[104] This, Kendrick argues, was because the class-bias that structured the Act had broken down:

> works of known merit—works that gentlemanly consensus had canonized—should be exempt from prosecution. Articles without pedigree should be subject to seizure and destruction only when they were offered for public sale … Campbell relied on these features of the social order with a typically English confidence that the system would prevail indefinitely.[105]

The Society for the Suppression of Vice put the magistrate's newly-granted powers to use immediately and by December of the same year, Lord Campbell was able to declare 'Mission Accomplished' over Holywell:

> He was told that informations [*sic*] had been laid against dealers of the publications in question in Holywell Street; that warrants had been granted and searches made; and

> that large quantities of these abominable commodities had been found, and the parties owning them summoned before the magistrates… at last he was told, it was now in the quiet possession of the law, for the shops where these abominations were found had been shut up, and the rest of the houses were now conducted in a manner free from exception.[106]

If true, this did not remain the case for very long.

No doubt the Holywell Street authors laid low for a few years, but less than a decade later the *Saturday Review* reported that "the situation was as bad as ever, and that 'the dunghill is in full heat, seething and steaming with all its old pestilence.'"[107] There was a renaissance of pornography in the Strand, with new books being issued by the year. Visitors to Holywell Street in the years following the Obscene Publications Act would see such titles as: *Intrigues in a Boarding School* (1860), *Confessions of a Lady's Maid* (1860), *How to Raise Love or The Art of making Love, in more ways than one* (1863), *Lucretia or the Delights of Cunnyland* (1864),*The Inutility of Virtue*—cheekily printed for the 'Society of Vice' (1865), *The New Epicurean or the Delights of Sex* (1865), *Adventures of a School Boy* (1866), to provide a small selection. Selective purchasers were rewarded when specialized genres and keywords began to develop, similar to modern-day pornographic subgenres: the boarding school, virgin confessions, nunneries, sex guides, flagellation—each with their own literary conventions and tropes. In comparing them to earlier works, it makes little difference on which title one chose to peruse, as nearly all of them saw a dramatic escalation in lubricity, some to the point of absurdity. One of the most obscene and absurd was *The Romance of Lust* which began appearing as early as 1859, and will be discussed in greater detail below.

Much of this renaissance was attributable to William Dugdale's release from prison, but other publishers such as John Hotten or William Lazenby soon realized the profits to be made.

All of the above titles and hundreds more, were noted, described, and excerpted in Henry Spencer Ashbee's *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* (1877),*Centuria Librorum Absconditorum*(1879) and *Catena Librorum Tacendorum* (1885).All three titles are subtitled*: Being Notes Bio- Biblio-Icono-graphical and Critical, on Curious and Uncommon Books*. Originally privately published, the books were attributed to the pseudonymic 'Pisanus Fraxi,' and they are essentially whirlwind bibliographies of pornographic books.[108]Ashbee's bibliographies and excerpts are invaluable to historians of pornography, as they preserved and documented the works that were the most prone to destruction. There is not space here to expound on Ashbee or his works in great detail, but they have been examined more thoroughly than I could hope to by several other writers.[109]

Additionally, the *Indexes* are written from the perspective of a knowledgeable insider, who is able to discuss the authors and publishers of Holywell street books with intimacy. For example, Ashbee is able to talk knowledgably about *The Romance of Lust*, which was published anonymously by Lazenby in four volumes between 1873 and 1876.In the third volume of his *Index* Ashbee asserts it was written by William Simpson Potter, a minor 19th century novelist although he says that the book was "not the produce of a single pen, but consists of several tales, 'orient pearls at random strung,' woven into a connected narrative by a gentleman, perfectly well known to the present generation of literary eccentrics and collectors."[110] He describes Potter as a "shrewd business man, the ardent collector, and the enthusiastic traveler … [with] a patriarchal, almost reverent appearance."[111] Altogether, Ashbee comments that *The Romance of Lust* "though no masterpiece of composition" is better-written than most of its competition.[112] But, almost with a frown, Ashbee says that it contains scenes

> not surpassed by the most libidinous chapters of [Sade's] *Justine.* The episodes, however, are frequently most improbable, sometimes impossible, and are as a rule too filthy and crapulous. No attempt is made to moderate the language, but the grossest words are invariably employed.[113]

A brief survey of the work, which maunders through 300-plus dense pages of description, would give this impression as well.

The *Romance* is a blow-by-blow account of the amorous career of the protagonist Charles, told from his point of view. He begins by stating that he was fifteen, with two younger sisters: "Mamma treated us all as children, and was blind to the fact that I was no longer what I had been … my passions were awakening."[114] The death of his father and the increasing illness of his mother causes her to hire a governess named Evelyn to educate and discipline Charles and his two sisters, Mary and Eliza. Charles becomes infatuated with Evelyn and watches her undressing and toilet every night in the bedroom he shared with her and his sisters. Being so innocent, he of course never thinks of "applying [his] fingers for relief," and remains innocent for a few more pages (and two months later) whereupon his mother is visited by a friend, Mr. B (who seems to have the most reoccurring name in English erotica), and his wife.[115] The wife, Mrs. Benson, in one long-winded and glorious night, "initiat[es Charles] into all the rites of Venus …the *ne plus ultra* of erotic pleasure."[116] The next fifty pages describe, in gratuitous specificity, all of the rites Mrs. Benson initiates him in. She also gives him a guide on how to manage his affairs, perhaps the only code of morals that is followed throughout the book. She lectures that he must "show great discretion and ready wit … [for] discretion is the trump card of success" and most importantly, he must let all his lovers "for some time imagine that each

possesses you for the first time… you must enact the part of an ignoramus *seeking* for instruction."[117]

The rest of the book is, quite simply, an exercise in increasing bawdiness, endless sex, and trampling of all societal boundaries. With Mrs. Benson's advice, he manages to seduce and impregnate Evelyn, who tricks a local lord into marrying her. He also moves first to "initiate my darling sister [Mary] into the delightful mysteries I had just been instructed in" and then, when she has her period, is "reduced to my dear little sister Eliza."[118] The second volume includes his orgies with his sisters and an older gentleman named James MacCallum, and the siblings' seduction of their new governess, Miss Frankland. The end of the second volume and the beginning of the third concerns Charles' 'seduction' by his aunt and uncle, and then the seduction of an extremely young village boy named Dale by him and his uncle. The fourth book reaches the height of profligacy and hedonism when all of the parties come together in a tumult:

> myself in my aunt's cunt, which incest stimulated uncle to a stand, and he took to his wife's arse while her nephew incestuously fucked her cunt. The Count took to the delicious and most exciting tight cunt of the Dale, while her son shoved his prick into his mother's arse, to her unspeakable satisfaction. Ellen and the Frankland amused themselves with tribadic extravagances.[119]

And so on. The fourth volume comes to a close with a description of the children of the assorted couples, and how they too were "initiated in all love's delicious mysteries by their respective parents."[120]With a final commentary by Charles, the book ends: "we are thus a happy family, bound by the strong ties of a double incestuous lust. It is necessary to have these loved objects to fall back upon, for alas! All the earlier partakers of my prick are dead and gone."[121]

All concerned, *The Romance of Lust* manages to cover sexual education, masturbation, heterosexual sex, lesbianism, male homosexuality, flagellation anal sex, double penetration, sexuality, incest, pedophilia, and coprophilia on a the short list. Unlike the stories that this essay began with, there is almost no dialogue, and very little plot that is not related to sex or serving as a vehicle, segue, or bridge to another sexual encounter. Nor is there really an effort at philosophizing or any sort of moral struggle. Lisa Sigel has, perhaps, attempted to redeem the work by arguing that the text is concerned with chronicling "a child's growth to adulthood through his sexual awakening and activities …the [book] explains, expands, and reinforces the [act of penetration] …penetration becomes the essence of sexual activity."[122] Although this is true, it seems that the text provides just as many examples of 'gamahuching,' or oral sex, as the author calls it, and all other forms of sex abound as well. However, Siegel is right when she notes that "all penetration is good:" the novel presents all sex, sexual act, and sexualities in a positive, enthusiastic manner.[123]

The reality of the issue, however, was that Holywell Street literature had matured into something resembling modern pornography in all but name—and as the word became increasingly popular, erotic literature simply came to fall under the umbrella of 'pornography.' Ashbee, perhaps the scholar *emeritus* of the field, also noted this in the introduction to his final (and most modern) *Index*:

> We cannot fail to perceive that while in the former books [like *Fanny Hill*] the characters, scenes, and the incidents are natural, and the language not unnecessarily gross, those in the latter are false, while the words and expression employed are of the most filthy description. CLELAND's characters—Fanny Hill, the coxcomb, the bawds, and the debauchees with whom they mix, are taken from human nature and do only what they could and would have done under the very natural circumstances in which they are

> placed; whereas the persons in the latter works are the creations of a disordered brain, quite unreal, and what they enact is either improbable or impossible. Thus, the nature of English erotic fiction is changed.[124]

Indeed, Ashbee argues that "immoral and amatory fiction…must unfortunately be acknowledged to contain, *cum granum salis*, a reflection of the manners and vices of the times—of vices to be avoided, guarded against, reformed… English Erotic Novels, I repeat, are sorry productions."[125] That language of his—'vices to be avoided, guarded against, reformed'—sounds suspiciously similar to the SSV's description of their own goals. In truth, it is likely the best one-sentence summary of their entire project that has been written. "Better were it" Ashbee continues, "that such literature did not exist. I consider it pernicious and hurtful to the immature, *but at the same time* I hold that, in certain circumstances, its study is necessary, if not beneficial."[126]

As is no doubt obvious by this point, I agree with Ashbee's contention that the study of pornography is necessary. I would not go so far as to argue that I think it would be better if pornography (and everything that word implies) did not exist, because, as shown here (and elsewhere), these sorts of representations have been used in Western culture since 'the beginning.' Renaissance writers empowered by the printing press, built off of Greek and Roman writers and thoroughly and enthusiastically embraced the erotic as a method of communication, of critique, and of discourse. So popular were these writings that the 1593 Council of Trent was the first to outlaw them, and the first to see that ban backfire when Italian bawdy writing spread across Italy and then Europe. After all, as Pietro Aretino in the fourteenth or Earl Rochester in the seventeenth-century would gleefully point out, everyone looks the

same naked or having sex. All bodies, common, holy, or royal are reducible to the same basic parts—the body is the ultimate leveler of class.

All along the way, erotic discourse, obscene libel, and pornography have been negotiated, defined, argued over, and enabled by the printing press, the book, and the market. As Lisa Siegel puts it, rather than "merely engaging in the libidinal, [pornography] emerged from the very movements that defined the modern world: humanism, the scientific revolution, and the Enlightenment."[127] I have shown in this essay how pornography played a role in emergent capitalism with Curll and his commodification of erotic literature—perhaps the unacknowledged ancestor of Hugh Hefner and *Playboy*. I have also examined its role in the formation of the novel: Richardson's reaction against amatory fiction in *Pamela,* was, in turn, criticized by *Fanny Hill* and others. I also detailed the role pornography played as a construct of, and constant antagonist to the English moral societies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Their definitional role in shaping public morality shaped the genre itself, causing a sort of arms race or feedback loop that created modern pornography as we know it.

The impacts of genre hardly end there, as it contributes to Western culture in many significant ways. For example, it was a powerful informer of the Modernist aesthetic—one can easily argue that James Joyce or D.H. Lawrence would not have been as significant without the controversies over sex(uality) that surrounded and informed their work. The work of the Society for the Suppression of Vice also continued to have an impact well into the twentieth-century—for example, 13 'obscene' paintings by D.H. Lawrence were seized by the British government in 1929 from the Warren Gallery in London. The paintings were then prosecuted

under the 1838 Vagrancy Act that the Vice Society had lobbied for, only "spared from being burned on condition that they were never exhibited in Britain again."[128]

In the beginning of this essay, I asked what changed between Rochester and Rossetti—why Rossetti's *Jenny* inspired such a diatribe against the poet whereas Rochester only seemed to briefly miff King Charles II. The short answer is that the contexts and the audience changed and with them, the interpretations. Rochester's *Satyre*, which combined the erotic discourse with political criticism, could comfortably exist in the same world as *Venus in the Cloister*, which combined *philosophe* literature with erotic titillation, and was written for, to, and by the upper classes. *Jenny* however, existed in the same world as *The Romance of Lust*, separated by only four years. *Jenny* and the *Romance* existed in a post-Obscene Publications Act world, where the Society for the Suppression of Vice—although on its last legs—had finally been triumphant in convincing the government of the danger obscene publications presented, because they could be purchased and consumed by any member of the increasingly literate public. Rochester lived in a world where mistresses, affairs, and eroticism were, for the upper classes, acceptable. Rossetti lived in a world where middle- and upper-class reformers had largely succeeded in creating and enforcing public morality. As a result, the *Satyre* was, in its context, a poem that, although critical of the King, did not upset the balance of things. *Jenny*, however, with its idealization of a 'common' prostitute, outraged decency, sacrificed purity, and falsified history—not just because the prostitute was a danger to the morals of the working-classes.

The intervening story of the movement from erotic discourse to pornography is thus a mirror-history to the rise of capitalism, morality, and the middle class. Starting with Edmund

Curll's commodification of any work even vaguely licentious or scandalous and the government's response of making obscene libel prosecutable by the temporal courts, the push and pull between profit and enforcement would ultimately divorce eroticism from the earlier socio-political and religious criticism that accompanied it. *Fanny Hill* was retrospectively momentous in that separated the erotic and critical voices, and disposed of the critical. The failure of its prosecution demonstrated a problem that middle-class religious and moral reform groups organized against, empowered by a shift in attitude by the larger culture. As the government would not prosecute the producers, sellers, or consumers of erotic works, the Societies used the courts as a weapon while simultaneously lobbying for more weaponry.

The landmark 1857 Obscene Publications Act, drafted by the SSV, represented the culmination of this effort and Lord Campbell was able to declare victory over Holywell Street. In retrospect however, the declaration was a premature one, and Holywell (and its wares) went on existing. Like the Edmund Curll who had once set up shop near it, Holywell pachydermatously went on existing, past the death of Lord Campbell in 1861, and past the dissolution of the Society for the Suppression of Vice in the 1880's, until it was destroyed in the early twentieth-century to make room for Kingsway and Aldwych. With the rise of modernity and the internet, the Society for the Suppression of Vice's worst nightmare has been realized: unfettered access to unlimited pornography throughout all levels of society. On top of this, there has been no serious and sustained effort by either the government or by moral societies to challenge this new norm. Though battle-scarred and dusty, and perhaps only temporarily, it seems that the Holywell Street writers can declare a sort of victory. In an age of unlimited access to pornography however, it is perhaps even more important to realize that the nature

and forms of pornography are historically constructed, have changed before, and can change again.

NOTES:

[1]Buchanan, Robert Williams. *The fleshly school of Poetry, and other phenomena of the day*. London: Strahan& Co., 1872, pgs. 66-69. Ruskin, in reviewing the poems before publication, was also discouraging, saying that he would "be sorry if you [Rossetti] laid the [poem] before the public… [it has] too great boldness for common readers." See the Rossetti Archive's webpage on *Jenny:*http://www.rossettiarchive.org/docs/3-1848.raw.html

[2]Rochester, John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of. "A Satyre on Charles II."Goucher College.faculty.goucher.edu/eng211/a_satyre_on_charles_ii.htm (accessed May 5, 2013), lines 1-9.

[3]Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. "Jenny ."Poetry Foundation.http://www.poetryfoundation.org/poem/184527 (accessed May 5, 2013), lines 1-4.

[4] Rossetti, lines 139, and 372.

[5] The one exception to this, Lisa Siegel's *Governing Pleasures*, does inform some aspects of this paper, but is largely concerned with visual, not printed, pornography, and focuses on the second half of the century.

[6]Additionally, Donald Thomas'*A Long Time Burning*touches on the SSV and its precursor, focusing on their censorship activities and on on the religious prosecutions of the SSV.

[7]Moulton, Ian Frederick. *Before Pornography*. Oxford [England: Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 8.

[8]"pornography, n.". OED Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/view/Entry/148012?redirectedFrom=pornography& (accessed May 01, 2013).

[9]Kendrick, Walter. *The Secret Museum*. Philadelphia: Viking, 1987, pgs. 14-16.

[10] Kendrick, p. 57.

[11]Qtd. in Kendrick, p. 63.

[12] Moulton, p. 36.

[13]Nead, Lynda. *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000, pg. 161.

[14] Ibid, p. 164.

[15] Ibid.

[16]Hunt, Lynn Avery. *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800*. New York: Zone Books, 1993, p. 13.

[17] Moulton, p. 14.

[18] Long title: "An act forpreventing the frequent Abuses in printing seditious treasonable and unlicensed Bookes and Pamphlets." Although preempted in time by earlier acts and decrees of the Star Chamber, the 1662 Licensing Act was the earliest and longest-lasting act until the 1857 Obscene Publications Act. A timeline of all relevant laws, decrees, and regulations is available on the Center for Intellectual Property and Information Law page: http://copy.law.cam.ac.uk/cam/index.php.

[19] Ibid.

[20]Straus, Ralph. *The Unspeakable Curll*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1927, p. 4.

[21]Qtd. in Straus, p. 101.

[22] Straus, p. 100.

[23]Republished in *When Flesh Became Word*, a collection of eighteenth century libertine literature, edited by Bradford K Mudge.Mudge, Bradford Keyes. *When Flesh Becomes Word.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 316.

[24]Ibid, p 154.

[25] Ibid, 154-155.

[26] Ibid, p. 190.

[27] Or, as the English knew it, French kissing.

[28]Ibid, p. 316.

[29]Ibid, pgs. 145-147.
[30]Ibid, p. 201.
[31]Qtd. in Straus, p. 104.
[32] Ibid.
[33]Commonwealth Legal Information Institute. "English Reports: DOMINUS REX v. CURL." English Reports 1795. www.commonlii.org/uk/cases/EngR/1795/1184.pdf (accessed May 1, 2013).
[34]Ibid. For a detailed examination of the development of obscene libel see Manchester, Colin. "A History of the Crime of Obscene Libel." *The Journal of Legal History* 12, no. 1 (1991): 36-57. http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/flgh20#.UlBugiSkrZY (accessed October 3, 2013).
[35] Ibid.
[36]I am aware of the fact that Wilkes may not have written *Essay on Women* at all. The point here is that he stood trial for it.
[37]"Regina v. Hicklin ."Wikisource. http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Regina_v._Hicklin#Decision (accessed May 1, 2013).
[38]Mudge, Bradford Keyes. *The Whore's Story: Women, Pornography, and the British Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 44.
[39]Mudge, *The Whore's Story*, p. 70.
[40]Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela*. London: J.M. Dent, 1914, title page.
[41]Richardson, p. 177.
[42]For positive reactions and the cultural phenomenona see Fysh, Stephanie. *The Work(s) of Samuel Richardson*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997, p. 57-58. For negative reactions see Mudge, *The Whore's Story*, p. 186.
[43]Cleland, John. *Fanny Hill*. London: Harper Perennial, 2009, p. 1.
[44]Ibid, p. 75. I am indebted to Mudge for pointing out that the two scenes are remarkably similar.
[45]Ibid, pgs. 230-238.
[46]Ibid, p. 196.
[47] For example, see Braudy, L. (1970). Fanny Hill and Materialism. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, pgs. 21-40.
[48]Sherlock, Thomas. "A Letter on the Earthquakes in MDCCL." In *Discourses Preached at the Temple Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1812. 325-338, pgs. 325-27.
[49]Mudge, *The Whore's Story,* p. 214.
[50] Nead, *Victorian Babylon*, p. 158.
[51]Ernst, Morris L. *To The Pure: A Study of Obscenity and the Censor*. New York: The Viking Press, 1929, p. 109.
[52]Mason, Michael. *The Making of Victorian Sexuality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 17.
[53]Blann, Robinson. *Throwing the Scabbard Away: Byron's Battle against the Censors of Don Juan*. New York: P. Lang, 1991, p. 9.
[54] Ibid.
[55]Ibid.
[56] Mason, p. 20, and discusses Place through 32.
[57]George III, King . "By the King: A Proclamation for the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue, and for preventing and punishing of Vice, Profaneness and Immorality." In *Part the First: Address to the Public from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Setting Forth, With a List of the Members, the Utility and Necessity of such an Institution and its Claim to Public Support* . London: Printed for the Society, 1803, pg 24.
[58] British Broadcasting Corporation. "William Wilberforce." BBC - Religions. http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/christianity/people/williamwilberforce_1.shtml (accessed September 14, 2013).
[59]Robert Issac Wilberforce, *The Life of William Wilberforce* (London 1838), I, pg. 132.
[60] Society, for the Suppression of Vice *Part the First: Address to the Public from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Setting Forth, With a List of the Members, the Utility and Necessity of such an Institution and its Claim to Public Support* . London: Printed for the Society, 1803, pgs 34-35.

[61] Thomas, Donald. *A Long Time Burning; The History of Literary Censorship in England*. New York: Praeger, 1969, p. 115.
[62] Ibid, p. 114.
[63]Society, For the Suppression of Vice. *Society for the Suppression of Vice, Consisting of Members of the Established Church. WIth a Brief Abstract of Proceedings in 1802*. Bridge-Street, Blackfriars, London: Printed for the Society, 1803, p. 5.
[64] Ibid, pgs 5-6.
[65] Ibid, pgs 6-7
[66]Ibid, pg. 24.
[67] For the advice to their members, see SSV, *Part the First*, pgs. 62-64. For their police handbooks, see Society, For the Suppression of Vice, *The Constable's Assistant: Being a Compendium of The Duties and Powers of Constables and other Peace Officers, chiefly as they relate to the Apprehending of Offenders, and the laying of Information before Magistrates.* Villiers Street, London: Printed for the Society, 1808.
[68] Society, for the Suppression of Vice *Part the Second: Address to the Public from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Containing an Account of the Proceedings of the Society from its Original Institution*. London: Printed for the Society, 1804, pg. 2.
[69] Ibid, my italics.
[70]SSV, *Consisting of Members of the Established Church*, pgs 5-9.
[71] Ibid, p. 2.
[72] Ibid.
[73] SSV, *Part the Second*, p. 26.
[74] Thomas, pg. 122.
[75] Quinlan, Maurice J. *Victorian Prelude, a History of English Manners*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965, p 204.
[76] Ernst, p. 168.
[77] SSV, *Part the Second,* pgs. 16-17.
[78] Ibid, pg. 25.
[79] Thomas, Donald. *A Long Time Burning; The History of Literary Censorship in England*. New York: Praeger, 1969, p. 213.
[80] SSV, *Part the First*, p. 37.
[81] This according to Roberts, M. J. D.. *Making English Morals: Voluntary Association and Moral Reform in Nineteenth-Century England*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 75. Roberts was able to examine the bank records of the SSV, held at Hoare's Bank in London.
[82]Qtd. In *Victorian Prelude,* p. 221.
[83]Anonymous. *The Lustful Turk*. New York: Masquerade Book, 1990, p. 10.
[84] Ibid, p. 23.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid, p 87-88.
[87] The term is Steven Marcus', and it is use to describe the "idealised, imaginative space of pornography" that is characterized by complete unrestraint from social mores and norms of society. Marcus has been criticized for applying the term too broadly and idealistically, but it is useful for our purposes, as it is rooted in late Victorian pornography. Marcus, Steven. *The Other Victorians*. New York: Basic Books, 1966, p. 5.
[88]*The Lustful Turk*, p. 148.
[89] Ibid, p. 149.
[90] SSV, *Part the First,* p. 40-41.
[91]Qtd in Thomas, p. 423-424
[92] Ibid, p. 429.
[93] "An Act for the Punishment of idle and disorderly Persons, and Rogues and Vagabonds, in that Part of Great Britain called England.." legislation.gov.uk. www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1824/83/pdfs/ukpga_18240083_en.pdf (accessed October 3, 2013), p. 669 no. IV. [PDF]

[94] I do not have room to explicate on this point in great detail, but arguably the stereotype of pornography as 'dirty' or 'unclean' came with its association with the vagrants, vagabonds, etc., in the Vagrancy Acts. Pornography in a sense 'exposed' itself to the streets.
[95] Manchester, Colin. "Lord Campbell's Act: England's First Obscenity Statue." *The Journal of Legal History* 9, no. 2 (1988): 223-241, p. 226.
[96]Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, HL Deb 11 May 1857 vol 145 cc102-4. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1857/may/11/sale-of-poisons-and-poisonous (Accessed October 3rd, 2013).
[97] Ibid.
[98]Hansard'sParlimentary Debates, HL Deb 25 June 1857 vol 146 cc327-38 http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1857/jun/25/second-reading (Accessed October 5th, 2013)
[99] See Hansard, and Manchester, 231.
[100]Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, HL Deb 03 July 1857 vol 146 cc864-7, http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1857/jul/03/committee. (Accessed October 5th, 2013). Discussion of SSV lobbying in M. Hardcastle (ed.), *Life of John, Lord Campbell,* London, 1881, vol II, p. 353.
[101] Roberts, MJD. "Making Victorian Morals? The Society for the Suppression of Vice and its Critics 1802-1888." *Historical Studies* 21, no. 83 (1981): 157-73, pg 170.
[102] HL Deb 25 June 1857 vol 146 cc327-38.
[103] Nead, *Victorian Babylon*, p. 164.
[104] Ernst, p. 128.
[105] Kendrick, pgs. 118-119.
[106]Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, HL Deb 07 December 1857 vol 148 cc226-7. http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/lords/1857/dec/07/return-moved-for (Accessed October 5th, 2013).
[107]Qtd. In Thomas, p. 263.
[108] New Documentary Books of New York reissued them in 1962, with all images and prints cut, as *The Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature.*
[109] For the best discussion, see Gershon Legman's*The Horn Book*, though Ashbee is also touched on by nearly every other historian of pornography or sexuality, and many historians of the book when discussing the high Victorian Era. See also *The Other Victorians, The Worm in the Bud,Governing Pleasures*, or Peter Mende's*Clandestine Erotic Fiction in English 1800-1930* which works as a sequel to Ashbee, focusing primarily on 1885-1930, despite its title.
[110]Ashbee, *Catena LibrorumTacendorum*, pg. 188. Published as Volume III of Ashbee, Henry Spencer. *The Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature, Being Notes Bio-Biblio-Icono-Graphical and Critical, on Curious and Uncommon Books*. New York: Documentary Books, Inc., 1962.
[111] Ibid, p. *xlix-l.*
[112] Ibid, p. 185.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Anonymous. *The Romance of Lust*. New York: Grove Press, 1968, p. 3. Some Grove Press editions of this work falsely attribute it to Edward Sellon, who write several erotic books for William Dugdale, including *The New Epicurean* noted above.
[115] Ibid, p. 5. It is very possible that this could be the same Mr. B in *Pamela* and Lord B in *Fanny Hill.* A very mysterious and sexual figure if there ever was one.
[116] Ibid, p. 25.
[117] Ibid, p. 27.
[118] Ibid, p. 30 and p. 68.
[119] Ibid, p. 262.
[120] Ibid, p. 298.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Siegel, p. 93-95
[123] Ibid, p. 95.
[124]Ashbee, *xlii-xliii*.
[125] Ibid, *xxxix-xl.*

[126] Ibid, *lvi-lvii*.
[127]Sigel, Lisa Z. "Introduction: Issues and Problems in the History of Pornography." In *International Exposure: Perspectives on Modern European Pornography, 1800-2000*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2005. 1-36, p. 8.
[128] The Guardian. "Lawrence 'obscenities' finally get a showing." The Guardian. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/nov/22/books.arts (accessed October 10, 2013).

Primary Sources:

"An Act for the Punishment of idle and disorderly Persons, and Rogues and Vagabonds, in that Part of Great Britain called England.." United Kingdom Government Legislation www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1824/83/pdfs/ukpga_18240083_en.pdf (accessed October 3, 2013), p. 669 no. IV. [PDF]

Anonymous. *The Romance of Lust*. New York: Grove Press, 1968,

Anonymous. *The Lustful Turk*. New York: Masquerade Book, 1990,

Ashbee, Henry Spencer. *The Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature, Being Notes Bio-Biblio-Icono-Graphical and Critical, on Curious and Uncommon Books*. New York: Documentary Books, Inc., 1962. (Volumes I-III)

Buchanan, Robert Williams. *The fleshly school of Poetry, and other phenomena of the day*. London: Strahan& Co., 1872.

Cleland, John. *Fanny Hill*. London: Harper Perennial, 2009.

Commonwealth Legal Information Institute. "English Reports: DOMINUS REX v. CURL." English Reports 1795. www.commonlii.org/uk/cases/EngR/1795/1184.pdf (accessed September 30th, 2013). [PDF]

George III, King . "By the King: A Proclamation for the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue, and for preventing and punishing of Vice, Profaneness and Immorality." In *Part the First: Address to the Public from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Setting Forth, With a List of the Members, the Utility and Necessity of such an Institution and its Claim to Public Support.* London: Printed for the Society, 1803. (Page 24 of this book).

"Jenny - Collection Introduction." Rossetti Archive. http://www.rossettiarchive.org/docs/3-1848.raw.html (accessed September 15, 2013).

Mudge, Bradford Keyes. *When Flesh Becomes Word: An Anthology of Early Eighteenth-Century Libertine Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

"Regina v. Hicklin ."Wikisource. http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Regina_v._Hicklin#Decision (accessed October 3rd, 2013).

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela*. London: J.M. Dent, 1914.

Robert Issac Wilberforce, *The Life of William Wilberforce* (London 1838).

Rochester, John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of. "A Satyre on Charles II." Goucher College. faculty.goucher.edu/eng211/a_satyre_on_charles_ii.htm (accessed October 5, 2013).

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. "Jenny ." Poetry Foundation. http://www.poetryfoundation.org/poem/184527 (accessed October 5, 2013).

Sherlock, Thomas. "A Letter on the Earthquakes in MDCCL." In *Discourses Preached at the Temple Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1812. 325-338.

Smith, George Barnett. *History of the English Parliament together with an account of the parliaments of Scotland and Ireland*. London: Ward, Lock, Bowden & Co., 1892.

Society for the Suppression of Vice Publications:

Society, For the Suppression of Vice. *Society for the Suppression of Vice, Consisting of Members of the Established Church. WIth a Brief Abstract of Proceedings in 1802*. Bridge-Street, Blackfriars, London: Printed for the Society, 1803.

Society, for the Suppression of Vice *Part the First: Address to the Public from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Setting Forth, With a List of the Members, the Utility and Necessity of such an Institution and its Claim to Public Support*. London: Printed for the Society, 1803.

Society, for the Suppression of Vice *Part the Second: Address to the Public from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Containing an Account of the Proceedings of the Society from its Original Institution*. London: Printed for the Society, 1804.

Society, For the Suppression of Vice, *The Constable's Assistant: Being a Compendium of The Duties and Powers of Constables and other Peace Officers, chiefly as they relate to the Apprehending of Offenders, and the laying of Information before Magistrates.* Villiers Street, London: Printed for the Society, 1808.

Society, for the Suppression of Vice, *Occasional Report V*, London: Printed for the Society, 1809.

Society, for the Suppression of Vice, *Occasional Report VI*, London: Printed for the Society, 1825.

Parliamentary Debates:

Sittings from 1857 of the Houses of Lords and Commons, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, accessed October 3rd, 2013.

HL Deb 11 May 1857 vol 145 cc102-4

HL Deb 25 June 1857 vol 146 cc327-38

HL Deb 03 July 1857 vol 146 cc864-7

HC Deb 12 August 1857 vol 147 cc 1475-84

HL Deb 07 December 1857 vol 146 cc327-383

Secondary Sources:

Ashbee, Henry Spencer. *The Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature, Being Notes Bio-Biblio-Icon-Graphical and Critical, on Curious and Uncommon Books*. New York: Documentary Books, Inc., 1962. (Volumes I-III)

British Broadcasting Corporation. "William Wilberforce." BBC - Religions. http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/christianity/people/williamwilberforce_1.shtml (accessed September 14, 2013).

Blann, Robinson. *Throwing the Scabbard Away: Byron's Battle against the Censors of Don Juan*. New York: P. Lang, 1991.

Ernst, Morris L. *To The Pure: A Study of Obscenity and the Censor*. New York: The Viking Press, 1929.

Fysh, Stephanie. *The Work(s) of Samuel Richardson*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1997.

Hunt, Lynn Avery. *The Invention of Pornography: Obscenity and the Origins of Modernity, 1500-1800*. New York: Zone Books, 1993.

Kendrick, Walter. *The Secret Museum*. Philadelphia: Viking, 1987.

Legman, Gershon. *The Horn Book: Studies in Erotic Folklore and Bibliography*. New Hyde Park, N.Y.: University Books, 1964.

M. Hardcastle (ed.), *Life of John, Lord Campbell,* London, 1881, vol II.

Manchester, Colin. "Lord Campbell's Act: England's First Obscenity Statue." *The Journal of Legal History* 9, no. 2 (1988): 223-241.

Marcus, Steven. *The Other Victorians*. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Mason, Michael. *The Making of Victorian Sexuality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Maurice J. *Victorian Prelude, a History of English Manners*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965.

Mendes, Peter. *Clandestine Erotic Fiction in English, 1800-1930*. London: Ashgate, 1993.

Moulton, Ian Frederick. *Before Pornography*. Oxford [England: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Mudge, Bradford Keyes. *The Whore's Story: Women, Pornography, and the British Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Nead, Lynda. *Victorian Babylon: People, Streets and Images in Nineteenth-Century London*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000,

Pearsall, Ronald. *The Worm in the Bud; the World of Victorian Sexuality*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

"pornography, n.". OED Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/view/Entry/148012?redirectedFrom=pornography& (accessed September 23rd 2013).

Roberts, MJD. "Making Victorian Morals? The Society for the Suppression of Vice and its Critics 1802-1888." *Historical Studies* 21, no. 83 (1981): 157-73.

Roberts, MJD. *Making English Morals: Voluntary Association and Moral Reform in Nineteenth-Century England*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Smith, George Barnett. *History of the English Parliament together with an account of the parliaments of Scotland and Ireland*. London: Ward, Lock, Bowden & Co., 1892.

Straus, Ralph. *The Unspeakable Curll*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1927.

The Guardian. "Lawrence 'obscenities' finally get a showing." The Guardian. http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2003/nov/22/books.arts (accessed October 10, 2013).

Thomas, Donald. *A Long Time Burning; The History of Literary Censorship in England*. New York: Praeger, 1969.

Sigel, Lisa Z. *Governing Pleasures: Pornography and Social Change in England, 1815-1914*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2002.

Sigel, Lisa Z. "Introduction: Issues and Problems in the History of Pornography." In *International Exposure: Perspectives on Modern European Pornography, 1800-2000*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2005. 1-36.