Enlightenment masculinity: towards experience and embodiment

Philip Carter

Lise Andries and Marc André Bernier eds., *L'Avenir des Lumières / The Future of Enlightenment* (Hermann, Paris, 2019), 123-38.

Masculinity as a category of historical analysis is relatively youthful, energetic and still on the rise. As a result, gendered histories of men now represent a major theme in social and cultural historiographies of the eighteenth century, and especially of the British Isles on which this essay focuses. This ascendancy has been swift and impressive. According to the online *Bibliography of British and Irish History* fewer than 25 books, articles and journals—tagged as studies of 'masculinity', and covering the period 1660 to 1830—were published between 1988 and 1997. The following decade marked the start of the rapid and ongoing increase, with a near six-fold increase (132 works between 1998 and 2007) and a further 240 additional titles published from 2008 to May 2018.

Masculinity's youthfulness also makes it ripe for review and assessment. Described in 2005 as a still 'nascent field', the gendered history of men has been scrutinized and fashioned by those keen to learn from, and assimilate with, more established fields such as women's history and the history of sexuality.[1] Historians have reflected on the subject's potential contribution to understanding the past, its scope, assimilation (or otherwise) within established chronologies, and the strengths and weaknesses of prevailing methodologies.[2] Historiographical reviews relating specifically to eighteenth-century Britain include those by Helen Berry (2001) and Dror Wahrman (2008). Most notable is a 2005 special issue of the *Journal of British Studies*, edited by Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, which set out the

---

[1] Alexandra Shepard 'From anxious patriarchs to polite gentlemen: manhood in Britain, c.1500-1700', *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (2005), 281-89, p. 281.
[2] These include John Tosh, 'The history of masculinity: an outdated concept?', in John Arnold and Sean Brady eds., *What is Masculinity?* (London: Palgrave MacmIllan, 2011) and Michael Roper, 'Subjectivity and emotion in gender history', *History Workshop Journal*, 59 (2005), 57-72.

limitations of current research practices and offered suggestions for future development.[3] Key here was their call to move beyond the then dominant perception of historical masculinity (and eighteenth-century masculinity in particular) as 'cultural codes and representations'. In its place, Harvey and Shepard advocated a sharper focus on 'men's social relations with each other and with women, and on subjective experience.' Their hope was to close what they and others regarded as the 'considerable breach' then separating the conceptualization, and resulting histories, of eighteenth-century masculinity from that of earlier and later periods. The challenge was two-fold. First, to better understand the distinctive, and more persistent, chronologies specific to historical masculinity, and appreciate how the continuities of early modern manhood often overrode well-established periodization. Second, to develop 'a fully comprehensive history' with its incorporation of men's 'social (and psychic) experience' with its promise of richer, more variegated accounts of masculinity at points in time.[4]

While Harvey and Shepard encouraged histories that broke free of existing chronological divisions, others advocated the study of masculinity through the framework of the Enlightenment as an established and chronologically defined system of knowledge. In *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*, also published in 2005, Barbara Taylor and Sarah Knott sought principally to explore 'the relationship between Enlightenment and feminism'. This said, men and male values were subtly present in many of volume's thirty-nine essays—as deniers, critics or agents of feminism. Theirs, however, was a collection also distinguished by its early and explicit attempt to assimilate 'enlightenment psychology, medicine and moral philosophy' with masculinity. In so doing, they considered the implications of enlightenment for the construction and conduct of 'new types of men'. These included the 'gallant', championed by Hume for his modern chivalry (and famously attacked by Wollstonecraft as the latest iteration of patriarchal authority), and the

---

[3] Helen Berry, 'Scrutinizing men: current trends in the history of British masculinity, 1600-1800', *History Workshop Journal*, 52 (2001), 283-6; Dror Wahrman, 'Change and the corporeal in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century gender history: or, can cultural history be rigorous?', *Gender & History*, 20 (2008), 584-602; 'What have historians done with masculinity? Reflections on five centuries of British history, c. 1500-1950', *Journal of British Studies*, 44 (2005), 274-362.
[4] Shepard, 'Anxious patriarchs', p. 289.

more progressive man of feeling defined by his sympathetic behaviour in male as well as female company.[5]

With these collections students of eighteenth-century masculinity were presented with two outstanding works of assessment, review, innovation and prognosis. Now, nearly a decade and a half on from their publication, it is timely to reflect on the impact and uptake of these particular commentaries, especially among those who write on eighteenth-century manhood in ever-greater numbers. Such a review raises several important questions. To what extent has historians' enthusiasm for masculinity broadened the categories of manhood under investigation? How have methodologies developed with or contributed to these new research areas? Are we now more true to historical masculinity in the chronologies imposed; and to what degree have we followed Taylor and Knott in engaging with epistemological frameworks such as enlightenment, and to what effect? Finally, where do the gaps now lie, and how might histories of masculinity develop in the future?

A decade ago, eighteenth-century men were typically well-off and well-behaved. Within British historiography, a growing interest in male identity and conduct drew heavily on the idea of Britons as a 'polite and commercial people', in which women gained status as agents of an eighteenth-century civilizing process characterized by consumerism, exchange and new forms of sociability. Historians' interest in the implications of this agency in turn prompted studies of the intersection of politeness with masculinity. The outcomes of this 'first generation' of research, published in the late 1990s and early 2000s, focused on three main concerns: the evolution of concepts of polite behaviour; the changing strategies by which eighteenth-century men ensured the compatibility of masculinity in polite society; and the cast of male archetypes who served to illustrate successful or failed syntheses of manliness and manners.[6] For Harvey and Shepard, it was precisely this focus on politeness, public

---

[5] Barbara Taylor and Sarah Knott eds., *Women, Gender and Enlightenment* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), xvi, xviii.

[6] Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity. National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1996); Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain, 1660-1800* (Longman: Harlow, 2001), and Lawrence E. Klein, 'Politeness and the interpretation of the British eighteenth-century', *Historical Journal*, 45 (2002), 869-98.

display and precept that placed eighteenth-century masculinity at odds with alternative—and comparatively more nuanced—historiographies of patriarchy, honour and domestic life undertaken for the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries.

More than ten years on from these concerns, it is clear that 'politeness no longer dominates histories of eighteenth-century masculinity'.[7] However, this is not a subject that's lost all credibility or appeal as mode of enquiry. Refinement remains an important theme in studies of enlightenment manhood, even if this interest is more now on polite masculinity as a cultural norm to be resisted, and one that now takes its place within a broader and more representative range of male attributes and behaviours.

As a consequence, the refined man has been extracted from the prescriptive literature by which historians first came to him, and relocated in real-life settings in which the complexities and contradictions of social practice can be observed. Historians are now better at understanding the social contexts in which politeness was and was not required. Kate Davison's work on male laughter, for example, reveals how setting and company gave rise to different forms of conduct: what was stifled in formal situations could be enjoyed more openly and informally with closer associates. Throwing off polite norms did not threaten masculinity but made way for older alternative forms, such as bawdiness, wit and drunkenness, which in appropriate contexts 'were valorized over the idea of politeness.' As Karen Harvey notes, historians now see male conviviality and drink as evidence of the 'dynamism of masculine identity', which permitted new forms of male cultural authority and licence.[8] Historians like Jason Kelly and Vic Gatrell go further, identifying the persistence of vulgarity and sexual revelry as a male elite's active resistance to new

---

[7] Karen Harvey, 'Ritual encounters: punch parties and masculinity in the eighteenth century', *Past and Present*, 214 (2012), 167-203, p. 171.

[8] Kate Davison, 'Occasional politeness and gentleman's laughter in 18th-century England', *Historical Journal*, 57 (2014), 921-45, p. 944; Harvey, 'Ritual encounters', pp. 172, 200.

forms of polite masculinity. Eighteenth-century men behaving badly are back in fashion.[9]

Other studies are taking politeness in new directions. Consequently polite masculinity is no longer the preserve of a metropolitan 'public sphere' of coffee-houses and clubs that attracted earlier historians of enlightenment manhood. In studies of the standing army and militia, for example, Matthew McCormack highlights the importance that military men attached to such '"polite" practices as bodily comportment, fine dress, and heterosexual gallantry' that gave rise to 'a male body … suited to the material technologies and battlefield tactics of the time.'[10] Alert to the shifting notions of conduct over the course of the eighteenth century, McCormack also makes clear the importance of alternative expressions of eighteenth-century refinement—notably sensibility—for military field training and the forging of a post-1757 'New Militia' of patriotic civilian soldiers. The outcome is a relocation of the 'man of feeling' and male weeping in some unexpected arenas; the British navy, as considered in Joanne Begiato's account of the emotional Jack Tar, or the American war of independence and in subsequent fashionings of the republic as considered by Sarah Knott. [11]

Knott's trans-Atlantic framework is also one of many studies to demonstrate the value broader regional and international approaches to histories of masculinity. This has seen (in England) a move away from London and fashionable centres, such as Bath, to—among others—the English universities and to surveys of middling and lower working-class men in the north-west.[12] In Scotland, historians' interest in

---

[9] Jason Kelly, *The Society of Dilettanti: Archaeology and Identity in the British Enlightenment* (London: Yale University Press 2009), ch. 2, and Vic Gattrell, *City of Laughter: Sex and Satire in Eighteenth-Century London* (London: Atlantic Books, 2006).

[10] Matthew McCormack, *Embodying the Militia in Georgian England* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2015), p. 118, and 'Dance and drill: polite accomplishments and military masculinities in Georgian Britain', *Cultural and Social History*, 8 (2011), 315-30, p. 327.

[11] Joanne Begiato, 'Tears and the manly sailor in England, c.1760-1860', *Journal for Maritime Research*, 17 (2015), 117-33; Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

[12] Heather Ellis, Foppish masculinity, generational identity and university authorities in eighteenth-century Oxbridge', *Cultural and Social History*, 11 (2014), 367-84, and Hannah Barker, 'Soul, purse and family: middling and lower-class masculinity in eighteenth-century Manchester', *Social History*, 33 (2008), 12-35.

enlightenment models of social evolution has traditionally located its male practitioners in the politer parts of Edinburgh or Glasgow. By contrast, recent studies of Scottish masculinity by Lynn Abrams and Rosalind Carr look to developments in Highland manhood that saw both a 'taming' of clan violence and the development of distinctive forms of patriotic North British martiality. Nor was the refined masculinity at the heart of the Scottish enlightenment without its tensions and contradictions, as is evident in research on male aggression and commerce in mid-century Edinburgh.[13] Others, while maintaining earlier scholars' interest in male refinement, have followed their subjects overseas by gendering, and reinvigorating, studies of the elite grand tour.[14]

It is not simply that masculinity is now being traced in a wider range of sites; rather that our understanding of its forms, as shaped by these alternative locations and contexts, is becoming more sophisticated. This is perhaps most apparent in recent studies of masculinity and eighteenth-century domestic life, which is rethinking men's conduct and experience as householders, husbands and fathers. Leading this re-evaluation is Karen Harvey whose *The Little Republic: Masculinity and Domestic Authority in Eighteenth-Century Britain* appeared in 2012. Here Harvey engages with one of her key concerns regarding first-generation histories of eighteenth-century masculinity: namely, the failure either to locate men in the home or to consider domestic life as instructive for understanding of masculinity in this period.

Harvey successfully relocates men within the family by shifting from a study of 'home', as a site of feminized domesticity, to 'household' as a microcosmic institution in need of management. As husbands and fathers, men engaged via the popular eighteenth-century art of 'oeconomy'—defined as regularity and probity,

---

[13] Lynn Abrams, 'The taming of Highland masculinity: interpersonal violence and shifting codes of manhood, c.1760-1840, *Scottish Historical Review*, 92 (2013), 100-22; Rosalind Carr, 'The gentleman and the soldier: patriotic masculinities in eighteenth-century Scotland', *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 28 (2008), 102-121; Tawny Paul, 'A "polite and commercial people"? Masculinity and economic violence in eighteenth-century Scotland', in Lynn Abrams and Elizabeth Eger eds., *Nine Centuries of Man: Manhood and Masculinity in Scottish History* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2017), p. 204.

[14] Henry French and Mark Rothery, *Man's Estate. Landed Gentry Masculinities, c.1600-c.1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), ch. 3; Sarah Goldsmith, 'Dogs, servants and masculinities: writing about danger on the Grand Tour', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 40 (2017), 1-21.

coupled with paternal and conjugal duty and authority—to ensure good order and prudent use of a family's economic and moral resources. Harvey's contribution to the history of manhood is considerable: collapsing the lingering gender dichotomy of public and private; reintegrating men into the home in ways that add to our understanding of masculine identity and practice; and demonstrating the richness of the lives of 'ordinary' men in locations far removed from those associated with social and cultural innovation.

New work on the masculinized home also connects us to other historiographical themes. The close association of oeconomy with devotion makes possible new opportunities for integrating masculinity and religion, which remains one of the more neglected areas in an otherwise extensive and growing literature. In response to this shortfall, William Van Reyk and Gareth Atkins, as well as Harvey and Barker, now emphasize the importance of religious devotion, especially those provincial shopkeepers, modest merchants and craftsmen who form so important a constituency in new research on eighteenth-century manhood. Appreciative of the persistence of religious values these men extolled, recent histories have challenged the idea that piety, domesticity and responsibility were the hallmarks of a 'new man' only ushered in by a late-century evangelical revival.[15] Meanwhile the evangelical roots of revivalism have been studied by Phyllis Mack 2008), with reference to the challenges that 'heart religion' imposed on male preachers regarding domesticity or itinerancy, sexuality or celibacy; and by Thomas Dixon (2015) on its creation of new opportunities for emotional display by these men and their congregations.[16]

Studies of religious masculinity also lead to greater awareness of other instances of manhood—the celibate, single or childless man, or the widower—who existed outside the domestic circle. The breadth of men and male profiles now under

---

[15] Harvey, *Little Republic*; Barker, 'Soul, purse and family'; William Van Reyk, 'Christian ideals of manliness in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries', *Historical Journal*, 52 (2009), 1053-73; Gareth Atkins, 'Christian heroes, providence and patriotism in wartime Britain, 1793-1815', *Historical Journal*, 58 (2015), 393-414. For the 'new man' see Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850* (1987; rev. edn, London and New York, NY, 2002), pp. 108–13.

[16] Phyllis Mack, *Heart Religion in the British Enlightenment. Gender and Emotion in Early Methodism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Thomas Dixon, *Weeping Britannia. Portrait of a Nation in Tears* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), ch. 5.

investigation is a particularly striking development within this field of eighteenth-century studies. The result is a much broader and nuanced concept of masculinity that extends well beyond earlier historians' predominant focus on the recreational middling sort. Thus, modern historiography now encompasses—to highlight just a few categories—studies of working and lower middle-class men alongside those of the landed gentry; of would-be husbands and contented bachelors; of emotionally fulfilled or embattled fathers; of young men and the elderly; of the relationship of masculinity to age in a single lifetime or the transmission of masculine values between the generations; or of men's experience of bodily impairment. [17]

From this range of approaches it's now the male body—encapsulated in the practice of 'embodiment'—that is of particular to historians of eighteenth-century masculinity. Valued for its potential 'to reconnect the representation of gender with lived experience and bodily practice', studies of embodiment take several forms. One is a focus on the physical body to consider the implications of height, shape, muscularity and posture for standards of desirable masculinity.[18] Another folds in studies of material culture and consumerism to highlight men's use of clothing or accessories to enhance physical characteristics deemed worthy of special attention, such as the shapeliness of the leg.[19]

Changes in form are seen as reflective of wider preoccupations underpinning historical masculinity, the body being 'an instrument that performs socially or

---

[17] See, on social status: Barker, 'Soul, purse and family', and French and Rothery, *Men's Estate*; on marital status: Amanda Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors: at Home in Georgian England* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 2009) and James Rosenheim, 'The pleasures of a single life: envisioning bachelorhood in early eighteenth-century England', *Gender & History*, 27 (2015), 307-28; on fatherhood: Joanne Begiato, *Parenting in England, 1760-1830: Emotion, Identity and Generation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); on age: French and Rothery, *Man's Estate*; Helen Yallop, 'Representing aged masculinity in eighteenth-century England', *Cultural and Social History*, 10 (2013), 191-210; on physical impairment: David Turner and Alun Withey, 'Technologies of the body: polite consumption and the correction of deformity in eighteenth-century England', *History*, 99 (2014), 775-96.

[18] Matthew McCormack, 'Tall histories: height and Georgian masculinities', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (2016), 79-101, p. 84, and Joanne Begiato, ' Between poise of power: embodied manliness in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British culture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (2016), 125-47;

[19] On clothing and accessories such as razors, see Karen Harvey, 'Men of parts: masculine embodiment and the male leg in eighteenth-century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 54 (2015), 797-821, and Alun Withey, *Technology, Self Fashioning and Politeness in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016).

culturally constructed sexed or gendered identities'.[20] McCormack's work on men's height, for example, reasserts the importance of masculinity as a construction by men and between men, and gives new body—literally and metaphorically—to otherwise abstract discussions of Britain's fighting stock and concerns over social debility and effeminacy. Embodiment also resists simple chronologies of change or expressions of manhood, idealized or otherwise. Bodies, historically speaking, are messy. Thus, a man's height was a mixed blessing, contingent on context: desirable in an eighteenth-century army whose weaponry placed a premium on reach, but less so when it led to a spindliness that was associated with personal insubstantiality and regularly applied to visual caricatures of the 'deficient' men, such as the late-century macaroni.

Embodiment also offers ways in to what remains a key challenge confronting historians of early modern masculinities. How, in short, can we best know what it was like to be a man, and to live by the standards of permissible masculinity, in the eighteenth century? For its proponents this is a methodology that enables us 'to study the lived, embodied experience of gender' and 'reconnect the representation of gender with lived experience and bodily experience.'[21] This relates, most obviously, to physical experience of one's own body, as determined by age, health, work or dress, but also opens up the possibility of men's experience of other men— not least, as shown in William Tullett's work on the senses, those effeminate men whose bodily enhancements, in decoration and perfumes, ran to excess.[22]

Interest in male embodiment forms one strand in a much broader historiographical reorientation away from linguistic and cultural representations of the past and towards 'what historians once used to call reality', grounded in subjectivity, experience and social practice.[23] As Harvey and Shepard made clear in 2005, this shift in focus is particularly pressing in histories of eighteenth-century masculinity— not least because of their once close identification of masculinity with modes of

---

[20] Harvey, 'Men of parts', p. 801.
[21] Harvey, 'Men of parts', p. 800; McCormack, 'Tall histories', p. 84.
[22] William Tullett, 'The macaroni's "ambrosial essences": perfume, identity and public space in eighteenth-century England', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 38 (2015), 163-80.
[23] Lyndal Roper, 'Beyond discourse theory', *Women's History Review*, 19 (2010), 307-19, p. 308.

refined conduct derived from a prescriptive literature concerned with how men should or should not behave. Their call has since been taken up with enthusiasm. This has led, alongside new histories of the body to growing interest in biographical approaches to masculinity, based on male case studies or autobiographical texts such as letters, diaries, journals, and household account books written by or about men. This is not to abandon the place of prescription and cultural representation, but to find ways of exploring what Owen Brittan, in his 2017 study of military masculinity, terms the 'subjective experience in relation to normative expectations'.[24] In truth, some earlier histories did acknowledge the value of studying the intersection of selected male experience and prescribed cultural norms, though only recently has this become a pressing concern. The challenge now, as then, remains how best to extrapolate from the multi-dimensional and contradictory gender identities of individual men to provide broader accounts of the experience of eighteenth-century masculinity at scale. This challenge aside, the potential future benefits of biographical approaches to manhood are considerable, as Brittan's rethinking of early eighteenth-century military men at war and in peace suggests.

Such studies reflect the growing number of subject areas in which historians are now keen to pursue masculinity, as representation, identity and personal experience. To the armed services and war, can be added the household, family and fatherhood, religious life, employment and the male body, among others. This broadening of the study of masculinity has, as we've seen, led to a welcome reassessment of 'polite masculinity' that has in turn extended the social remit to include labouring men and elite grand tourists. And yet, while the polite man is now less dominant, he does retain an appeal which, looking ahead, may gain new momentum as histories of embodiment refocus attention male deportment and poise.

As the scope of eighteenth-century masculinity broadens, so it allows historians to pick up on themes identified by those researching in early and later periods. Enlightenment men are therefore now less at odds with their forebears and successors, with expressions of masculinity seen less as breaks with the past than as

---

[24] Owen Brittan, 'Subjective experience and military masculinity at the beginning of the long eighteenth century, 1688-1714', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 40 (2017), 273-90.

evolutions and reformulations of core masculine values traceable from the early modern to the modern period. Thus, the male householders studied by Harvey display many aspects of seventeenth-century notions of patriarchy; in Van Reyk's reading of Christian manliness the attributes of evangelical new men long predate the 1790s; French and Rothery's story of landed gentry masculinity is one of durability not change, with the prized attributes of self-control, courage, authority and honour evident well into the late nineteenth century; while Begiato's study of male corporeality finds commonalities in mid-Georgian and mid-Victorian attitudes to the body.

In the light of this thematic and chronological broadening of eighteenth-century masculinity, where might its historians turn next? Notwithstanding the contributions of Mack, Van Reyk and others, it is reasonable to identify religion and masculinity—especially within established institutional structures—as a relationship deserving further research. Nearly twenty years on, Jeremy Gregory's pioneering call for a more sophisticated appreciation of the eighteenth-century *'homo religiosus'* still merits attention.[25] Another area is masculinity and political life, which to date has been studied primarily in terms of ideology and franchise reform. Here a key study remains Matthew McCormack's *The Independent Man* (2005) with its assertion of a late eighteenth-century model of male independence—grounded in paternal, conjugal and domestic responsibility—as the key requirement for political legitimacy. McCormack's thesis is complimented by Harvey on 'oeconomy', in which the values and qualities of the prudent householder were transferred to the trustworthy steward of state. Rather less developed, however, is our understanding of the ways in which masculinity played out in the lives of eighteenth-century political figures; or how gender was used in the cut and thrust of political competition, though a few studies—several very recent—do point in this direction.[26]

---

[25] Jeremy Gregory, '*Homo religiosus*: masculinity and religion in the long eighteenth century', in Tim Hitchcock and Michèle Cohen eds., *English Masculinities, 1660-1800* (Harlow: Pearson, 1999).
[26] Matthew McCormack, *The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005). On masculinity in the lives of political figures see Stephen Moore, 'A nation of harlequins? Politics and masculinity in mid-eighteenth-century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 49 (2010), 514-39, and essays by McCormack and Henry French in *The*

There is also work to be done to better assimilate masculinity with other historiographies, and for historians for whom gender is not a primarily interest to incorporate the principal findings of what still remains a rather exclusive, specialist and often self-referential strand of research. As is clear from this review, the majority of recent writing on eighteenth-century men take the short-form of articles and book chapters, often applying gendered readings to closely defined topics or case studies. Early modern masculinity, and British histories of eighteenth-century masculinity in particular, still lacks its panoramic monographs that integrate the discipline's now numerous but often compartmentalised lines of enquiry across several centuries.

Finally, in the intersection of masculinity with studies of enlightenment we have one further area of potential future study. Here rather less progress has been made since Taylor and Knott's call, in *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*, for closer study of how enlightenment psychology, medicine, and thought 'posited new types of men and women.' There are, of course, exceptions. Rosalind Carr's *Gender and Enlightenment Culture in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (2014) both reasserts masculinity's place in Scottish moral philosophy and assesses the implications of a broader enlightenment culture for male identity and behaviours.[27] In keeping with much recent work, Carr highlights the contingencies—of age, social and marital status, venue and company—on which elite, urban Lowland masculinity was shaped.

Elsewhere, however, the enlightenment proves far less conspicuous: certainly few of the works considered in this essay actively engage with the concept beyond a loose equation with civic and social improvement. Recent histories, such as Anthony Pagden's *The Enlightenment, and why it still matters* (2013), similarly pay little attention to masculinity as a theme within enlightenment philosophy and conjectural history, or to the implications of these for men's identities and lives. When men do feature as gendered entities, it is typically as effeminates threatened

---

Palgrave Companion to Masculinity and Political Culture in Europe (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).
[27] Rosalind Carr, *Gender and Enlightenment Culture in Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014).

by the civilizing effects of women, while 'gender' invariably equates to 'women' as agents, beneficiaries or victims of enlightenment, depending on the historian's perspective.[28] Given the contribution of Scottish thinkers to debates on social refinement and, in turn, refined men—as discussed in established works by John Dwyer, G.J. Barker-Benfield and others—this absence from later surveys of enlightenment is surprising.[29]

The impact of Scottish moral philosophy on women's lives and feminism continues to attract scholars in ways that it currently does not for masculinity. Quite how future historians of masculinity engage with the high thinkers of enlightenment remains to be seen. But men are still present and subject to study in broader concept of enlightened civic culture—for example, in their creation and stewardship of the institutions in which discussions on gender rights took place. The late-century male campaigners for women's intellectual equality, described by Arianne Chernock, offer one instance of this, while for Karen O'Brien the British enlightenment asserted women's moral agency and laid the ground for nineteenth-century feminism.[30] In contrast is Mary Wollstonecraft's condemnation of Hume's enlightened gallants behind whom she detected arbitrary power within a new form of patriarchy.[31] For Rosalind Carr, meanwhile, Scottish women's relative absence from enlightenment debate owed much to men's creation of male-only associational spaces that in turn reinforced the 'maleness' of Lowland intellectual culture. Seeing men, as here— obliquely, subtly and by the impressions and legacies they left on gender relations— takes us in different directions that suggest interesting futures for enlightenment masculinity.

---

[28] Anthony Pagden, *The Enlightenment, and why it still matters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 221-4; also Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3rd edn, 2013), first published in 1995 in which the chapter on 'Gender' retains a focus on women, despite subsequent work on masculinity in Scottish enlightenment thought.

[29] John Dwyer, *Virtuous Discourse. Sensibility and Community in Late Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987); G.J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility. Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

[30] Arianne Chernock, 'Cultivating women: men's pursuit of intellectual equality in the late British enlightenment', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 511-31; Karen O'Brien, *Women and the Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[31] Barbara Taylor, 'Feminists versus gallants: sexual manners and morals in Enlightenment Britain', in Taylor and Knott, eds. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*.

.