DOI: https://doi.org/10.26512/rfmc.v10i3.49429

Honour and Interest: Mandeville on Chastity as an Artificial Virtue

[Honra e Interesse: Mandeville sobre a Castidade como uma Virtude Artificial]

Andrea Branchi *

Abstract: Bernard Mandeville began his philosophical anatomy of the relativity of human values with women, and throughout his writings he maintained a keen interest in the status and capabilities of women and the double standard imposed on women and men in many areas of life, making it an exemplary perspective on human sociability. The essay traces the development of Mandeville's arguments about women in his works and examines the role played by his reflection on chastity in the context of his account of the artificial virtues.
Keywords: Women. Pride. Marriage. Shame. Hume.

Resumo: Bernard Mandeville iniciou sua anatomia filosófica da relatividade dos valores humanos com as mulheres, e ao longo de seus escritos manteve um grande interesse no estatuto e capacidades das mulheres e no duplo padrão imposto a mulheres e homens em muitas áreas da vida, tornando-a uma perspectiva exemplar da sociabilidade humana. O ensaio traça o desenvolvimento dos argumentos de Mandeville sobre as mulheres nas suas obras e examina o papel desempenhado pela sua reflexão sobre a castidade no contexto de sua explicação das virtudes artificiais.
Palavras-chave: Mulheres. Orgulho. Casamento. Vergonha. Hume.

*Professor at the American University of Rome. He holds a PhD. from the Università di Bologna. E-mail: abrabranchi@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1627-540X.

'Tis said of widow, maid, and wife,
That honour is a woman's life:
Unhappy sex! who only claim
A being in the breath of Fame
(MOORE 1822, p.165)

In the Preface to his last research work, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*, in his own words the third volume of the *Fable of the Bees*, Bernard Mandeville restates the central tenets of his philosophy of passions and the strict standard of moral merit he had adopted in all of his writings: "There is no Virtue that has a Name, but it curbs, regulates, or subdues some Passion that is peculiar to Human Nature" MANDEVILLE, 1732, p. ix). According to Mandeville moral language is irreducibly human, artificial, earthly, it has no other origins than the play of human passions:

> It is wrong to under-roast Mutton for People who love to have their Meat well done. The Truth of this, which is the most trifling Thing I can readily think on, is as much Eternal, as that of the Sublimest Virtue. If you ask me, where this Truth was, before there was Mutton, or People to dress or eat it, I answer, in the same Place where Chastity was, before there were any Creatures that had an Appetite to procreate their Species (MANDEVILLE, 1732, p.viii).

This is not a casual observation. Chastity for Mandeville is unnatural, in his philosophical anthropology it is an exemplary expression of an artificially developed virtue. Perhaps we forget too often that the whole of Bernard Mandeville's philosophical research could be considered as a gendered account (O'BRIEN, 2009, p. 21). He began his philosophical anatomy of the relativity of human values with women, by denouncing from a female perspective the relativity of the standards of honour and virtue and the social consequences of discrimination. Throughout his writings, Mandeville maintained a keen interest in the condition and abilities of women and on the double standard imposed on women and men in many areas of life. He made this issue a revealing one, an exemplary perspective on human sociability.

In 1709, as his first prose work in English, Mandeville authored *The Virgin Unmask'd, Or, Female Dialogues, Betwixt an Elderly Maiden Lady, and Her Niece, on Several Diverting Discourses on Love, Marriage, Memoirs and Mo-*

rals, Etc. of the Times, a book of female dialogues in which an expert woman advises her niece about the practical suffering that women endure in marriage, where they are totally dependent on their husbands for their material welfare and personal reputation. They discuss the difference in education between the sexes in a world controlled by men. Mandeville's contributions to the periodical *The Female Tatler* in July 1709-10 made a polemical target of Richard Steele's 'public spirit' ideology and his enterprise of reformation of manners in discussing standards of female and male honour and their relativity and inequality and vindicating women's active participation in public life. In his *Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions, Vulgarly Call'd the Hypo in Men and Vapours in Women* (1711) written in dialogic form, Mandeville builds three fictitious cases that bring together most of the symptoms of the disease in a single family; staging himself as a doctor summoned by a hypochondriac patient, who presents his case along with that of his wife and their daughter, both suffering from hysteria (MANDEVILLE, 1711, KLEIMAN-LAFON, 2017, pp. 4-5). Along with woman's role in the mechanisms of a consumer society, in the *Fable of the Bees* (in particular in the 1723 edition) Mandeville discusses prostitution, modesty, chastity, seduction, differences in education to shame in women and men, the psychology of shame in women and the social pressure that leads to infanticide because of the social value placed on a reputation for chastity, presenting femininity as one among a number of socially useful learned behaviours (O'BRIEN, p. 23). In his 1724 pamphlet on prostitution, advancing the proposal for state regulated brothels and describing in detail the physiology of sexual excitement and the social censure that unchaste women suffer, Mandeville unambiguously assesses the status of chastity as an artificial virtue. In his mature writings, the ten dialogues between Cleomenes and Horatio published as *The Fable of the Bees Part II* and *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*, Mandeville reviews the role of chastity in his evolutionary account of human values and institutions. Women are therefore a key subject and an important perspective on human sociability. In Mandeville's philosophical anthropology, human beings are inevitably driven by their passions, to the point of deceiving themselves about their own nature and motivations and deluding themselves into acting out of rationality. At the roots of human capability to socialize Mandeville identifies the dynamics of pride and shame, the operations of the desire for recognition, what in his mature writings he calls the passion of 'self-liking', that sentiments of overvaluation of one's self, which is constantly reliant on other people to be confirmed, reassured and gratified. Sociability, for Bernard Mandeville is the result of an evolutionary process that, in polemic contrast to both the abstract rationalism

of contractarian theories and to the theorists of natural sociability, he characterised in his mature writings as the outcome of an evolutionary, spontaneous progression, achieved not by the suppression but by the gradual domestication of self-regarding passions into forms of confrontation compatible with social cohesion and civic growth, the development of shared systems of sentiments of approval and disapproval grounded in the mechanisms of pride and shame. Codes of honour. In this perspective, a detailed analysis of those behaviours and traits of character worthy of public approbation and blame is a compulsory step. The operations of pride and shame do not involve any behaviour of their own. The objects of the desire of esteem and the fear of shame are to be specified. Mandeville's attentiveness for the manners of his time: the social norms of the age of Politeness, the contemporary code of Modern Honour, its origin, history and function and its most extreme and controversial expressions – duelling and infanticide – are thus not simply the occasional material for Mandeville's anatomy of human nature, but a coherent and necessary component of his philosophical research (LOVEJOY, 1961, p. 93; LUBAN, 2015).

The aim of this essay is to review Mandeville's reflection on chastity as an artificial virtue, his account of chastity and courage as paradigmatic expressions of the relativity of human values, in the context of the broader reflection on sociability. In short, to explain how chastity and courage are keywords that are fundamental in all of Mandeville's writings, as they were for his contemporaries.

1. Chastity and Courage

In *The Spectator* 99 Joseph Addison plainly sums up the double standard of male and female Honour: "The great Point of Honour in Men is Courage, and in Women Chastity. If a Man loses his Honour in one Rencounter, it is not impossible for him to regain it in another; a Slip in a Woman's Honour is irrecoverable." (ADDISON STEELE, 1711-12; 99, June 23, 1711.) By the early eighteenth century, duels were forbidden by almost all European legislation, and had been condemned as a deadly sin by the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century Council of Trent, and yet, to challenge someone to a duel for a misunderstanding or for an argument over precedence, and to behave politely with those who you were attempting to kill, remained a ritual of enormous social prestige and a fundamental, defining feature of gentlemanliness. This was an age where the rapier – the slender sword with a sharply-pointed two-edged

blade, well known in iconography and cinema – was a characteristic component of every upper-class man's attire and fencing part of his education. Thus, courage, the traditional cornerstone virtue of male honour, was to be exhibited in masculine contexts, that is, in prearranged combats, duels of honour (BRANCHI, 2006, pp. 28-51). Chastity, the key virtue of female honour, appears to be essentially synonymous with passivity, the avoidance of sin, of dishonour; the reverse of the activity and consequence that constituted male honour. Women's virtue not only is determined exclusively in the intercourse with the other sex, but it is presented as essential to female nature. Whereas men have the opportunity to act courageously and regain their tainted honour by performing in a duel, women are to be either chaste or not. Once lost, their honour cannot be recovered (GOWING, 1996; YLIVUORI, 2016). The deep-rooted tradition of thought sanctioning female inferiority and the lustful nature of women, is a feature of Western civilization since classical antiquity, strengthened by Christian thought and reiterated in the Renaissance. In a late seventeenth century book of advice to his daughter, reviewing the traditional justification for female chastity grounded in the necessity to keep the lineage and the 'purity of blood,' George Saville remarked on the injustice, the unfairness, of men in making "in the utmost degree criminal in women" what for them is permissible. However, he continued, "whilst the point of honour continues to be so plac'd, it seems unavoidable to give your sex the greater share of the penalty" (SAVILLE, 1688, p. 34) The mass of didactic literature and conduct books for young ladies published in those years stressed that this double standard, the fact that men were permitted liberties of which no woman could ever avail herself and keep her honourable reputation, is in the nature of things (BRYSON 1998). As a matter of fact, English women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries lived under male domination. A 1718 annual reference book provides a summary of the way in which the female condition of subjection was sanctioned by the English law:

> Women in England, with all their Moveable Goods so soon as they are married, are wholly in potestate Viri, at the Will and Disposition of the Husband (...) She can't Let, Set, Sell, Give away or Alienate any thing without her Husband's Consent. (...) The Woman upon Marriage loseth not only the Power over her Person, and her Will, and the Property of her Goods, but her very Name (CHAMBERLAYNE, 1718, pp.176-177)

Girls in the upper classes could be taught to read and write, along with sewing, music, singing, dancing and drawing, but they had no access to higher education. Being denied the knowledge of Latin, they were thus excluded from the learned professions. The only access for women to the public sphere – even if only as domestic creatures – was marriage, as a matter of fact the only respectable 'career' open to female citizens. Thus, the shame of dishonor and the public ignominy that a woman might incur for her sexual conduct (even because of rumours) had an enormous impact on her life because it meant the loss of opportunity that inevitably followed such a revelation. The situation did not go unnoticed and attracted the attention of many. A variety of social, political, economic and philosophical developments in the last decades of the seventeenth century enflamed the debates over women's identity and their social standing. Descartes's radical doubt, the scepticism toward the common prejudices of mankind, and overall mind-body dualism, provided a new perspective on human anatomy, and consequently produced a whole new range of arguments on the characteristic of the female mind. A series of researches in physiology and midwifery resulting from new developments in medicine in the post-Cartesian era provided evidence against attempting to ground social differences between the sexes on presumed anatomical differences and challenged the traditional view of women as inferior and incomplete versions of men, as men *manqué*. (Cf. LAQUEUR, 1990, in part. pp. 64-68; COHEN, 1997). After 1660 a significant number of voices argued against the traditional ideas concerning female sexual anatomy, menstruation, orgasm, conception and developed influential accounts of generation that stressed women's active and essential – if not principal – role in reproduction at a time when patriarchal theorists derived male superiority at least in part from men's presumed generative powers (Cf. TAUVRY 1701, in part. pp.126-130). John Locke's fundamental individualistic assumption on human beings as free and equal in the state of nature gradually extended from the political arena into the domestic order. The Glorious Revolution, the Hanoverian settlement and the demise of patriarchal political theory undermined traditional family-state analogies as explanations for social order and tools of female subordination. The debate over the role and status of women in society was particularly lively in Britain. The late seventeenth and the eighteenth century is regarded as a period which witnessed not only a shift in the way human bodies were understood, but also the rise of an increasingly polarized notion of gender differences; the idea of two incommensurable sexes, where the woman is not simply counted as a defective occurrence of the male (HARVEY, 2002). As at many other times in history, women's bodies and rights were the terrain of broader ideological struggles.

2. Educated Women

Bernard Mandeville discussed women and women's issues in almost all of his writings, always stressing the equal capacities of women and men, endowed with the same "wit and understanding" if appropriately educated: "the generality of women are quicker of invention, and more ready at repartee, than the men, with equal helps of education" (MANDEVILLE 1709, pp. 27-28; 1729, p.173; 1711, p. 174). The issue of women's lack of access to instruction and its profound implications is a central theme in his first writings. In the ten dialogues between the elderly and 'wise' Aunt Lucinda and her young niece Antonia in *The Virgin Unmask'd*, the two women discuss the unequal conditions between the sexes in an articulate analysis of the general subjugation of women through the male monopoly of education and culture and the consequences of the unequal standards of public reputation imposed on women. In warning her niece about the snares which men use to seduce women and enslave them into wedlock and the harsh reality of conjugal life, the elderly spinster complains that men are offered a sound education, apt to stimulate the development of their skills and abilities. They have the opportunity to attend schools and universities to have their minds sharpened by the best scholars and teachers. Meanwhile, Lucinda protests, women are "pricking a clout." (MANDEVILLE, 1709, p. 28). Education is simply denied them. Women can be taught to sing, to dance, to dress and to be trained in good manners "but these Things chiefly concern the Body, the Mind remains uninstructed" (MANDEVILLE, 1709, pp. 27-28, 48). In his vindication of the rights and abilities of women, Mandeville relies upon the continental tradition of *libertinage érudit*, in particular, the works of Pierre Bayle and of François Poullain de la Barre, the author in the 1670s of a series of path-breaking and influential feminist works, in which he tuned up Cartesianism into a social philosophy and developed a radical and philosophically sophisticated egalitarian argument (COOK, 1992, p. 473; STUURMAN, 2004; ISRAEL, 2006, p. 572; STUURMAN, 1997; COHEN, 1997). For Mandeville, women's empowerment strategies should focus on access to education, intellectual training and self-knowledge. Women should not only be granted access to books and masters and have the opportunity to train their minds; but, in order to apply their skills in the public sphere, they should also develop a knowledge of their own bodies, their own anatomy. To study books "of Physics and Anatomy, the inward Government of our bodies doesn't take more time and effort, than to embroider a piece of Fillegrew Work" states Lucinda, echoing again a passage in the writings of Poulain de la Barre (MANDEVILLE, 1709, p.125). Also, in comparing the present state of women's subjugation to the idea of an original

state of equality: "In Paradise men and women were upon an even foot. See what they have made of us since: Is not every Woman that is Married a Slave to her Husband?", Lucinda relies on Poulain De la Barre. The French writer in his works had developed a conjectural history of inequality explaining how the original state of peaceful collaboration in which men and women performed the same tasks in harmony was broken by men, on the ground of their superior physical strength and women's temporary vulnerability during pregnancy and childbirth. They progressively imposed a gendered separation by gradually restricting women's range of activities and barring them from the outset of holding political power (STUURMAN, 2004, pp. 204-205). Writing again as a female character, in his collaboration with the periodical *The Female Tatler*, Mandeville's female voice denounce men's control over culture as a strategy to establish and perpetuate their domination over women:

> Letters were denied us, lest we shou'd see and claim our great Prerogative and Equality with haughty Man, to whom we were created Friends not Servants, and designe'd to advise and assist him in the Government of the Earth. (...) Since Men have enslav'd us, the Greatest part of the World have always debar'd our Sex from Governing, which is the Reason that the Lives of Women have so seldom been describ'd in History (MANDEVILLE 1709-10, p.171, p. 237).

Men have excluded women from education and from writing history, from reading and being read in books, thus maintaining male domination by handing down a culture in which women's fate is submission, their most precious quality is meekness, and their public reputation for virtue is based solely on chastity:

> The Writing of History has been all along engross'd by the Men, of which the most Cunning have always been so careful to pick out the most remarkable Subjects, never endeavouring to render any Name Immortal whose Greatness was not able to perpetuate their Own" (MANDEVILLE 1709-10, 88, Jan. 25, 1710 p.171, see also 68, p.115).

Mandeville was probably well acquainted with the Dutch debate on women's education and was certainly aware of the treatment of these topics – marriage as slavery, and men actively discouraging women from learning – in the writings

of Mary Astell, who in a *Serious Proposal to the Ladies for the Advancement of their True and Greatest Interest* called for the establishment of convent-like institutions for women who wish to choose a world of retreat in religious and intellectual studies. But Astell's perspective, according to which the career of the educated woman is an austere and withdrawn life, is significantly contrasted by Mandeville's view, which reserves active participation in public affairs for women:

> Why should we be treated almost as if we were Irrational Creatures? We are industriously kept from the Knowledge of Arts and Sciences, if we talk Politicks we are laugh'd at; to understand Latin is petty Treason in us; silence is recommended to us a necessary Duty, and the greatest Encomium a Man can give his Wife is to tell the World that she is Obedient (MANDEVILLE 1709-10, 88, Jan. 27, 1710; Cf. TOLAND, 1704, Preface; CHAMPION, 2003, pp. 52-53).

In most of his contemporary sources egalitarianism between the sexes is limited to the mental sphere. Mandeville goes further, contributing to the contemporary debate with an articulated insight into the practical sufferings of women, and their hindered social condition, stemming from their disadvantages in education. The practice of keeping women uneducated, the norm at the time, not only condemns them to a subordinate social role but also exposes them to further misfortunes. Men's skills in social relations and in seduction are sharpened by education, and women are dangerously exposed to them. They can be 'easily' conquered and brought to a socially disadvantageous situation; either being trapped into a hair-raising marriage or irredeemably losing their honour, and according to the rhetoric of reputation, inexorably fall into a downward spiral of moral depravity (Cf. DABHOIWALA, 1996, p. 207). In *The Virgin Unmask'd* Lucinda is indignant about women's condition of subjection: when young, to their fathers and when married, to their husbands. This oppression implies a further damage to their character, they are often 'silly' because they are brought up to be 'silly'. Although endowed with the same intellectual capabilities they are not equipped to compete with men in reason: "she that listen to them, is ruined, and her Liberty is lost (...) our Wit may be equal with theirs, but in Every Thing else they exceed us." (MANDEVILLE, 1709, p. 27-28.) In the exemplary narrations, sort of proto-novels that cover seven of the ten dialogues of the book, Lucinda exploits well-established narrative traditions and expands them far beyond the presumed 'happy endings' to illustrate the real

conditions of subordination imposed on women by marriage and the psychological distress they face, namely domestic violence, the pains of pregnancy and childbirth and the complete loss of their independence (VICHERT 1975, pp. 1-10; BRANCHI, 1996; cf. POCOCK, 1975, p.405).

3. Natural and Artificial Courage

Mandeville's early critique of the effects of contemporary sexual morality on women's lives progressed in *The Fable of the Bees* and in his later writings to an arrticulated anatomy of human nature in terms of motivating passions. The very first detailed account of the differences between the original passionate impulses and their 'sociable' counterparts, of that gradual domestication of passions that characterizes the difference between human intercourse in the 'wild state of nature' and in 'civil society', appears in the first edition of the *Fable of the Bees* and concerns courage and chastity. In accounting for the martial virtues that move combatants to fight in war as well for the propensity of his contemporaries to engage in that highly ritualized homicide-suicide which is a duel of honour, Mandeville identifies a paradigmatic and universal mechanism of human nature. Duelling, where standing on the field testify of the prevalence of the fear of shame over the fear of death, although relatable to a definite gender, as well as rank of people, represents for Mandeville the most extreme expression of a constant, fundamental feature of human nature which stands at the very roots of sociability: the tendency to strive for social recognition, acting in accordance with idealised self-image to satisfy the impulses of pride and fear of shame, absorbed in a practice of self (and mutual) deception.

Mandeville's account of the process of domestication of natural courage into an artificial passion in civil society is developed by examining its psychological structure in common with animals, its modification and function in society, its development in the different stages of civilisation and its role in contemporary manners (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 216). Natural courage arises when anger overcomes the fear that man, alike other animals, naturally feels when faced with what frustrates the fulfilment of his two primary desires: hunger and lust (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 205; Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.11, [1116b 22-35]). This passion belongs to "Man in his Savage State; for if we examine him as a Member of a Society and a taught Animal, we shall find him quite another Creature: As soon as his Pride has room to play, and Envy, Avarice and Ambition begin to catch hold of him, he is rous'd from his natural

Innocence and Stupidity" (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, pp. 205-206). Society increases man's dependence on others as well as opportunities to be shamed and angered, so fear must likewise be increased by threats of social sanctions imposed on aggressive actions towards others. In the body of the *Fable of the Bees* Mandeville exploits the rhetorical device set up in opening essay of the book, the *Enquiry of the Origin of Moral Virtues*: the 'skilful politician' creator and supervisor of human institutions, which in his later writings he understands as a metaphor for a slow process, a shorthand to refer to that evolutionary dynamic of desires and needs of which sociability is made. Natural courage is short-lived and difficult to control, being based on anger. Therefore, it is not only useless in civilised society, but also harmful. Once united in society, men could be dangerous animals: their appetites and needs have multiplied, and so have the opportunities to face obstacles in satisfying them (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 206). "The first Care therefore of all Governments is by severe Punishments to curb his Anger when it does hurt, and so by increasing his Fears prevent the Mischief it might produce" (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 206). Still, a form of artificial courage is needed to promote the martial virtues and preserve men's ability to take up arms to defend society. Thus, the clever politician devises an "Equivalent for Courage" which makes men fight: an artificial courage, a principle of valour strong enough to overcome the fear of death. (GOLDSMITH, 2001, p. 142) In this way sheer self-preservation, the fear of death peculiar to natural courage, gives way to artificial courage, a passion that sharpens sensitivity to the opinion of others and places social recognition above all other values. "The great Art to make Man Courageous" consists then, literally, in inspiring him "with as much Horror against Shame, as Nature has given him against Death," in stimulating those artificially instilled passions of honour and fear of shame that stimulate women to modesty and men to fight. The practice of suicide testifies of the paramount strength of the fear of shame in human nature: "that there are things to which Man has, or may have, a stronger Aversion than he has to Death, is evident from *Suicide*. He that makes Death his choice, must look upon it as less terrible than what he shuns by it" (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 210). Paraphrasing a passage from Pierre Bayle's *Miscellaneous Reflexions*, Mandeville addresses a figure who has been the subject of debate on the 'feminine question' but also of numerous legal and religious discussions on rape and suicide, the Roman noblewoman Lucretia. Her act of self-destruction after the rape by Tarquin, traditionally accounted for as the highest example, the embodiment of the virtue of female chastity, is used by Mandeville to account for the strength of vanity and the fear of public reproach. Without even refraining from criticising Lucretia's suitability as an

instance of exemplary chastity, remarking that her suicide after the rape was "a certain sign that she valued her Virtue less than her Glory, and her Life less than either", Mandeville stresses that women's modesty and manly bravery are wholly artificial virtues: "The Courage then which is only useful to the Body Politick, and what is generally call'd true Valour, is artificial, and consists in a Superlative Horror against Shame, by Flattery infused into Men of exalted Pride (...) vanity, shame, and above all constitution, make up very often the courage of men, and virtue of women." (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 213)

4. The Power of Shame

Most of the revisions and the addenda to the Remarks in the 1723 edition of *The Fable of the Bees* are concerned with women. Targeting Shaftesbury's conception of man's natural sociability, Mandeville further develops his analysis of artificial values and, along with duelling and artificial male courage, the theme of female honour and sexual mores becomes the illustrative focus of his arguments on nature and artifice (O'BRIEN, 2009, p.21-25). Drawing on a physiology of passion and on its dynamics in the processes of social intercourse Mandeville expounds the effects, the force and the function of the passion of shame, detailing how "the Greediness we have after the Esteem of others, and the Raptures we enjoy in the Thoughts of being liked" are a consistent reward for the taming of our strongest passions, and "consequently keep us at a great Distance from all such Words or Actions that can bring Shame upon us" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723 (1723), p. 68). Human beings are so successfully trained to feel shame that the distinction between lustful men and chaste women appears a wholly natural difference, rather than socially determined:

> The Multitude will hardly believe the excessive Force of Education, and in the Difference of Modesty between Men and Women ascribe that to Nature what is altogether owing to early Instruction: Miss is scarce three Years old, but she is spoke to every Day to hide her Leg, and rebuk'd in good Earnest if she shews it; while Little Master at the same Age is bid to take up his Coats, and piss like a Man (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 142-143, pp. 68-69).

The taming by education of the natural impulses of lust "that Passion that prompts mankind to labour for the Preservation of our Species", represents for

Mandeville a paradigmatic example of the modification of passions in society: "It is remarkable", he writes, "that the most polished, and best instructed" are generally unfamiliar with their own natural lustful impulses, "and here I can but observe the difference between man in the wild state of nature, and the same creature in the civil society" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 143). In the latter, "where the Rules of Religion, Law and Decency, are to be follow'd, and obey'd before any Dictates of Nature, the Youth of both Sexes are to be arm'd and fortify'd against this Impulse, and from their Infancy artfully frighten'd from the most remote Approaches of it" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 143). The kind of modesty that has "a pretension of chastity as its object," consists in a sincere and painful effort to stifle and conceal before others that inclination which nature has given to us to propagate our species. "The Lessons of it, like those of Grammar, are taught us long before we have occasion for, or understand the Usefulness of them." (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 69). Women are not naturally ashamed of their sexuality, and the blush on the cheeks of a "Virtuous Young Woman" concerning sexual matters, argues Mandeville, disappears when "she is sure she is undiscover'd" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 65). The rules of modesty enacted upon women entails avoiding unfashionable denudation, which are subject to variations according to times and places, and a strict control of their language and their gestures. By simply observing the behaviour of modestly educated adult women, girls apprehend caution in covering themselves before boys, "and the same Caution being inculcated to her by Precept, as well as Example, it is very probable that at Six she'll be ashamed of shewing her Leg, without knowing any Reason why such an Act is blameable, or what the Tendency of it is" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 69). It is different for men. Mandeville follows and pillages Pierre Bayle's articulated commentary on women but disagrees with his claim that women are by nature more lustful than men. (BAYLE, 1708 CLXII, CLXIIL). While education equally trains all members of polite society to control and repress their sexual impulses to a greater degree than they otherwise might, women are forced to exercise an even stronger self-command. Simply because man's sexual appetite "is more violent and ungovernable," and therefore men are believed to be unable to follow the norms of modesty easily, they "may take greater liberty"; while women must carry a heavier social burden (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, pp. 70-71). But this situation has deep and tragic implications for women. The 'double standard' allows men to pursue sexual gratification without much fear of public disapproval, but women are left to defend their reputation of chastity against social censure: "it is the Interest of the Society to preserve Decency and Politeness; that Women should linger, waste, and die, rather than relieve

themselves in an unlawful manner" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p.144; see NACOL, 2015).

In particular, in the *Patin* entry of his *Dictionary* and in the *Miscellaneous Reflections*, Pierre Bayle had shown an intense interest in sexual morality, taking, according to several commentators, an exceptionally open view of women when dealing with the issue of abortion and infanticide (avoiding clarifying the question of whether they are to be considered morally identical) (WOOTTON, 1997, p. 214). In France, under King Henry II, explains Bayle, women who obtained abortions were punished more severely than any other criminals, but the fear of public opinion acted on them more powerfully than their conscience, or the fear of legal punishment. Comparing the power of conscience with the point of honour, the ineffectiveness of the first over the latter, Bayle argued that the "ideas of the point of honour are the strongest bank which stop the torrent of incontinence (...) If religion had more power on women than the point of honour, would there be so many found that stifle their children?" Practising infanticide women act in contempt of God, and in spite of their religion, because "they will not lose their share in human honour" (SCRIBANO, 1981, pp. 186-220; WOOTTON, 1997; PITASSI, 2004; MC KENNA, 2004). In this sense, social sanctions are much more effective than religious ones, since abortion is much rarer where female chastity is less valued, the double standard extolling female chastity is the main culprit in infanticide (WOOTTON, 1997, pp. 215-216). In the Remark C (addenda 1723) to *The Fable of the Bees*, Mandeville sketches a scene of life, a story to exemplify the social effects of the double standard and to explain, from a woman's point of view, the dynamics that lead to infanticide. "People of Substance" may sin without being noticed, but servants and poor women seldom have the opportunity of concealing a "Big Belly." An unfortunate girl of good birth, "left destitute" and forced to work as a chambermaid, may preserve her chastity for years, "and yet at last meet with an unhappy Moment in which she gives up her Honour to a Powerful Deceiver, who afterwards neglects her." Women like her, observes Mandeville, are so overwhelmed by social insistence upon female chastity, and by the fear of public blame, that they are likely to risk committing abortion and infanticide. "The more violently the dread of coming to Shame hurries her away, the more Wicked and more Cruel her Resolutions will be, either against her self or what she bears." (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 75).

> All mothers naturally love their children: but as this is a passion, and all passions centre in self-love, so it may be subdued by any superior

> passion, to sooth that same self-love, which if nothing had intervened, would have bid her fondle her offspring (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 75; cf. 1729, pp. 227-228).

One type of self-love, the natural love of women for their children, can be superseded by another, more powerful and socially inculcated type of self-concern: the fear of shame (O'BRIEN, 2009, p. 21). The counterfactual proof that chastity is an artificial virtue peculiar to civilised society is to be found in the fact that "Common Whores (...) hardly ever destroy their Children (...) not because they are less Cruel or more Virtuous, but because they have lost their Modesty to a greater degree, and the fear of Shame makes hardly any Impression upon them" (MANDEVILLE 1714/1723, p. 76). The duel is to artificial courage as infanticide is to artificial chastity: the cult of the self on which honour is grounded requires a bloody tribute.

5. A defence of Marriage

Mandeville develops the most extended reflection on female chastity and its status as an artificial virtue in his pamphlet on prostitution. In the Remark H (1723), drawing on the age-old argument for tolerating prostitution, namely the greater danger of sexual violence that virgins and wives would face if prostitution were forbidden, Mandeville had already illustrated the multiple advantages of state-regulated prostitution. If men are allowed to take advantage of "Courtezans and Strumpets," England could then preserve the virtue of its honest women, following the example of Amsterdam, where brothels were permitted in somehow separated areas, and 'good Rules and strict Discipline' are observed in these "Markets of Love" (NACOL 2015, pp. 80-81). The argument is greatly expanded in the *Modest Defence of the Publick Stews*, Mandeville's 1724 seventy-eight-page pamphlet, in which, wearing at the same time the mask of the cynical satirist and that of the wise lawmaker and social reformer, on the basis of a psychological and physiological analysis of male and female sexual drives, he advances a scheme aimed at defending the vital institution of matrimony by mean of a system of public houses of prostitution. Given the intense force of lust: "this violent Love for Women is born and bred with us; nay, it is absolutely necessary to our being born at all", a wise legislator should act with this in mind: "as there is constantly in the Nation, a certain Number of young Men, whose Passions are too strong to brook any Opposition; Our Business is

to contrive a Method how they may be gratify'd with as little Expence of Female Virtue as Possible" (MANDEVILLE, 1724, pp. 6, 62). To express the same in practical terms, "tho' the Laws can't prevent Whoring, they may yet regulate it" (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 60). Mandeville explicitly calls his own reasoning a "Syllogism":

> the only way to preserve Female Chastity, is to prevent the Men from laying Siege to it: But this Project of the Publick Stews is the only Way to prevent Mens laying Siege to it: Therefore this Project is the only Way to preserve Female Chastity (MANDEVILLE, 1724, pp. 50-51).

Mandeville's plan aims to derive a conspicuous series of *public benefits* from a *private vice*: a system of public brothels would be much healthier for courtesans and their customers. Prostitutes would periodically be inspected for disease and provided with a form of health insurance.

The second most important issue in the whole pamphlet, generally overlooked because the magnetic attraction of the subject of whoring, is marriage, the final goal of the whole scheme for the preservation of female chastity. "Whoring, instead of being an Enemy to Matrimony, will advance and promote the Interest of it as much as possible." In his early writings, Mandeville had offered a very cynical view of marriage, although in the preface to *The Virgin Unmask'd* he took care to distance himself from the main character, the spinster aunt Lucinda:

> My Design through the whole, is to let young Ladies know whatever is dreadful in Marriage, and this could not be done, but by introducing one that was an Enemy to it. Therefore, tho' Lucinda speaks altogether against Matrimony, don't think that I do so too (MANDEVILLE, 1709, p. ix)

When he wrote these words, Bernard Mandeville had been the husband of Elizabeth Lawrence for ten years. They had married on February 1, 1699 in London, in the church of St-Giles-in-the-Fields, when she was eight months pregnant. Their first son Michael (1699-1769) was born just a month later, and their daughter Penelope (1706-1748) seven years after. Between 1700 and 1709 Bernard Mandeville had an illegitimate son and with his wife Elizabeth he had

three more children. They all died very young. In *Modest Defence* Bernard Mandeville praises marriage on the basis of two different representations: on the one hand, as a communion of love and mutual respect between husband and wife; on the other, as a core institution in human societies, for its role of replenishing the population and ensuring the integrity of family lines. Briefly after having referred to "that mutual Love and Affection between Man and Wife, which is so necessary to both their Happiness." Mandeville looks at matrimony as the highest standard of emotional and sexual fulfilment:

> When a Man and a Woman select one another out of the whole Species, it is not merely for Propagation; nay, that is generally the least in their Thoughts: What they chiefly have in View, is to pass the Remainder of their lives happily together, to enjoy the soft Embraces and mutual Endearments of Love; to divide their Joys and Griefs; to share their Pleasures and Afflictions; and, in short, to make one another as happy as possible. As for Children, they come of Course, and of Course are educated according to their Parents abilities. (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 34)

Marriage – and its emphasis on chastity – is also a fundamental institution in the process of civilisation, in the transmission of property, wealth, power, rank and family influence:

> Since the World is now no longer in a State of Nature, but form'd into several Societies independent of one another, and these Societies again divided into several Ranks and Degrees of Men, distinguish'd by their Titles and Possessions, which descend from Father to Son, it is very certain that Marriage is absolutely necessary, not only for the regular Propagation of the Species, and their careful Education, but likewise for preserving that Distinction of Rank among Mankind, which otherwise would be utterly lost and confounded by doubtful Successions. (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 27)

Marriage appears to be a peculiarly vulnerable institution, likely to suffer if men are either too lustful, or not lustful enough (MONRO, 1975, p. 80). If young men are too chaste "the first Fit of Love would turn their Brains Topsy-turvy, and we should have the Nation Pestered with Love Adventures and Feats

of Chivalry: By the time a Peer's Son came to be Sixteen, he would be in danger of turning Knight-Errant, and might possibly take a Cobler's Daughter for his Dulcinea". The other extreme is equally dangerous: "most young Men give too great a loose to their Passions, and either quite destroy their Inclination to Matrimony, or make their Constitutions incapable of answering the Ends of that State" (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 29).

The system of public stews, according to Mandeville, provides the condition to reach the "Golden Mean so much desired". Also, where well-organized sex for hire is available, men would spend less energy in attempting to overcome the chastity of their female equals; overall they would acquire sufficient experience in sexual relation and learn to control their desires in order to maintain their virility in a state of health.

All this applies to men. And for women? The situation is totally unequal: male desire must be satisfied, and Mandeville proposes to do this with dedicated professionals, in order to save 'honest women'. Female desire, as Mandeville explains with much anatomical detail, is no less intense, but it is much more hazardous to gratify for moral and social reasons. Departing from the anatomy of female genital organs and the physiology of women's sexual excitement, Mandeville further questions the double standard and argues for a structural equivalence between female and male genitals. The Dutch physician refers to "our late Discoveries, in Anatomy," which can "find out no other Use for the Clitoris, a perfect copy of the Penis, 'tho in Miniature" but to stimulate female desire "with its frequent erections" (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 45).[1] A significant number of informed commentators in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century rejected the view that female biology provided a sound basis for female subjection and contested the attempts to ground social differences between the sexes on presumed anatomical differences (LAQUEUR, 1990, in part. pp. 64-68; COHEN, 1997, pp.121-142).[2] The rediscovery of the clitoris in seventeenth century medical literature is part of that broad shift from the iso-

[1]Mandeville was certainly up to date with medical and anatomical theories and practices. He could have read the works of Dutch physician, anatomist, and physiologist Reigner de Graaf, or Daniel Tauvry, *A New Rational Anatomy* or the well-known *Anthropologia Nova*; or, *A New System of Anatomy*, by James Drake, which included some of de Graaf's diagrams of the female reproductive system. Daniel Tauvry, *A New Rational Anatomy, containing an explication of the Uses of the Structure of the Body of Man and Some other Animals according to the Rules of Mechanicks*, London 1701; in part. pp. 126-130.

[2]*The Midwives Book; or, The Whole Art of Midwifery Discovered*, by Jane Sharp, the first English woman to publish a book on midwifery in 1671, had four editions by 1725. It stressed the equivalence in reproduction of men's and women's roles, the analogy between the clitoris and the penis, the importance of the female orgasm for conception and complained of the inadequacies of female education. Irvin Primer, in his critical edition of the *Modest Defence*, remarks that Mandeville would surely have known this book. (PRIMER, 2006, p. 70).

morphic, hierarchical one-sex model in which women are imperfect versions of men, to the modern understanding of the sexual difference. Arguing for the equivalence rather than for gender hierarchy is the first step toward the development of understanding of the sexual difference. The whole point of the accurate description of female anatomy is for Mandeville to stress the "Violence of Female Desire" exclusively in relation to the "terrible Risque a Woman runs to gratify it (...) the Minds of Women are observ'd to be so much corrupted by the Loss of Chastity, or rather by the Reproach they suffer upon that Loss" (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 41). It is exclusively a social fact, that women are expected to remain chaste and suffer if they don't. "Dissolute" women, namely those who satisfy their desire outside the realm considered socially acceptable, are corrupted, and doomed to suffer, but exclusively because of other people's opinion:

> These Woman (...) are commonly Guilty of almost the whole Catalogue of immoral Actions: (...) Not that these are necessary Concomitants of Lewdness, or have the least Relation to it, as all lewd Men of Honour can testify; but the Treatment such Women meet with in the World, is the Occasion of it (MANDEVILLE, 1724, pp. 16-17)

Female chastity is peculiarly vulnerable, explains Mandeville, it requires efforts to be preserved. Women have to cope with the strength of their sexual desire. The conflict between their violent natural wishes and their "inborn modesty innate reservedness" requires a sense of interest, to be brought to a successful result. To counterbalance their violent natural desire, women have "a strong notion of honour carefully inculcated into them from their infancy", as a matter of fact the main ingredient of artificial chastity:

> Young Girls are taught to hate a *Whore*, before they know what the Word means; and when they grow up, they find their worldly Interest entirely depending upon the Reputation of their Chastity. This Sense of Honour and Interest, is what we may call artificial Chastity; and it is upon this Compound of natural and artificial Chastity, that every Woman's real actual Chastity depends. (MANDEVILLE 1724, p. 42)

In a world dominated by men's rules, it is demanded of women that they manage and administer their chastity just as men manage property, capital and

credit. In this sense Mandeville declares that "we may conclude, preferring Truth to Complaisance, that by far the greater Part of Womenkind hold their Virtue very precariously; and that Female Chastity is, in its own Nature, built upon a very ticklish Foundation (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 49). The ticklish foundation on which female chastity rests is its vulnerability: its unique social worth, the fact that it depends on men as well, and the dangers for women because of their extremely limited access to education, to a proper intellectual growth, to the development of the ability to compete with and resist men. Even the slightest stain on their honour will irreparably preclude them from their only chance of assuming a role in society, namely marriage "for the Reproach they must undergo, when a Slip of this nature is discover'd, prevents their marrying in any Degree"

> Whereas Honour once routed never rallies; nay, the least Breach in Female Reputation is irreparable; and a Gap in Chastity, like a Chasm in a young Tree, is every day a Widening (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 77).

6. Cleomenes and Horatio

In his two last research works Mandeville exploits the dialogical form he had adopted in *The Virgin Unmask'd* and in his treatise on medicine. In the *Fable of the Bees Part II* and in the *Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*, Mandeville's mature writings, Cleomenes, admirer of Mandeville and attentive reader of *The Fable of the Bees*, and Horatio, convinced supporter of Shaftesbury's philosophy of natural sociability, discuss a conjectural history of the development of the rules of politeness and of the human capability to socialise, in which chastity imposed on women and the entire cultural construction of rules relating to sex are given as examples of the development of artificial virtues.

In explaining the origin of sociability in *The Fable of the Bees* Part II Mandeville abandons the metaphorical figure of the superhuman politician as a cunning manager inventor of morality and able to tame mankind by praise, in favour of a slow, unplanned, evolutionary process, in which norms and normative practices arise out the piecemeal accumulation of individual acts undertaken, in part, as a response to the praise and flattery of a myriad of individuals. Mandeville characterizes the state of nature not only with the absence of any form of pre-political principle but also of all cultural acquisitions, even the most basic,

including language and rationality. Man is not naturally sociable as Shaftesbury pretends, but on the other hand is not born unfit for society as Hobbes wrote. Their mistake has been to attribute to men in their natural condition skills and capabilities that are in themselves results of the civilization process: "Nature had design'd Man for Society, as she has made Grapes for Wine." All human features can be defined as "natural" but it is "human Sagacity that finds out the Uses we make of them" (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p.185).

> The Works of Art and human Invention are all very lame and defective, and most of them pitifully mean at first: Our Knowledge is advanced by slow Degrees, and some Arts and Sciences require the Experience of many Ages, before they can be brought to any tolerable Perfection. Have we any Reason to imagine, that the Society of Bees, that sent forth the first Swarm, made worse Wax or Honey than any of their Posterity have produced since? (MANDEVILLE, 1729, pp.186-187)

The society of the bees – and here Mandeville leaves aside the allegory that gave the title to his most famous work – is born, grows, reproduces itself (and produces honey) following fixed and unalterable laws of nature, unlike human artefacts. It took centuries to human beings, of trial and error and the accumulated experience of generation after generation to develop the faculty of reasoning, the ability to express themselves verbally and to live together in society (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p. 189; Cf. SCRIBANO, 1980, p.109-117; MAGRI, 1987, pp. xviii-xix; FRANCESCONI, 1996). Only habit and repeated intercourse can stimulate the development of those characteristics that many authors mistakenly attribute to man in his original state: "Men become sociable, by living together in Society" (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p.189). Mandeville's conjectural history of the development of human society begins with the savage family, formed on the basis of self-preservation and the drive to procreate. None of these natural ties are however sufficient to unite the couple in a stable way, let alone the couple to their offspring. In Mandeville's reconstruction the first step towards society is motivated by human weakness and vulnerability to the threat of wild animals that drives families, disunited and deeply conflictual, to unite in common defence. The second passage is the forming of a shared system of sentiments of approval and disapproval, the establishment of prohibitions and penalties upon certain actions within the group. "The second Step to Society, is the Danger Men are in from one another: for which we are beholden to that stanch Principle of Pride and Ambition, that all Men are born with" (MAN-

DEVILLE, 1729, p. 311). It is once men are related that the innate search for superiority and domination over the others enters into play. Mandeville's philosophical anthropology is grounded on two fundamental assumptions. The first: man is a selfish animal, constantly dominated by self-interested passions. Even when he thinks to behave rationally, he is actually driven by a further passion, which he does not recognize it as such. The second: we are aware that a public exhibition of pride and self-esteem is unpleasant; we learn to curb our pride, our self-interest, because we are disturbed by the performance of similar feelings in others. For Mandeville, society is established on real desires and passions, independent of reason, which spontaneously model men's behaviour in terms of regularity and uniformity, without them even being necessarily aware of it. In the 1714 edition of *The Fable of the Bees* Mandeville had used the terms pride, self-love and vanity somehow as synonyms, to refer to a passion common to all humans, and strongly motivating. In the dialogues of the second part of *The Fable of the Bees*, he distinguishes between *self-love* and *self-liking*. With this new term Mandeville aims at stressing the difference between, on the one hand, the animal instinct of preservation, the love for one's physical being. A form of *self-love* which urges living creatures to stock up on all that is necessary for survival, to defend themselves from the elements and to secure themselves and their children. On the other hand, *self-liking* is the feeling of overestimation of one's self, which in man is continually dependent on the approval of others to be confirmed and reassured, it is the passion that drives to establish comparisons with others, motivates to look for opportunities to show with gestures, looks and speeches, their self-esteem (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p.130; KAPUST, 2018, pp. 148-150). Self-love prompts self-preservation, self-liking prompts the search for recognition. In this way pride can become the root of all social virtues, and therefore the protagonist of civil development through a process of sublimation of aggression and its transformation in emulation, hypocrisy, in forms of competition compatible with associated life. Men cannot do without their fellows because confrontation is a double necessity for them: in the relationship with others, men find comfort and confirmation of the opinion of their superiority and impose it with the means that the associated life makes progressively viable (SCRIBANO, 1980, pp. 155-160; SAGAR, 2018, pp. 46-47). The third step in Mandeville's conjectural history of the origins of society is the invention of writing and the establishment of written laws, intended to consolidate the habit of channelling originally aggressive passions into forms of competitiveness compatible with associated life (Cf. MANDEVILLE, 1729, p. 283). Laws are collective works, like language itself, indifferent to the efforts of the individuals. They are a distillation of human knowledge and wis-

dom, the result of a selection by trials and errors. Among the principal laws of all countries, the Christian Decalogue itself can also be used as a counter-proof of the presence of selfish tendencies in human nature. The ten commandments, like all other laws, Cleomenes points out, have been devised to remedy human weaknesses; they are themselves a testimony to the strength of the 'Principle of Selfishness', which legislators have always been committed to fighting. We are commanded to love our neighbours as ourselves precisely because self-liking is the dominant passion in human nature (MANDEVILLE, 1729, pp. 319-323). The contrivance of chastity as the main virtue for women has the same origins and logic, it eliminates a constant source of contention that would always be present if men could not claim possession of women:

> tho'we agree not to take away, and rob a Man of the Woman that is his own, it is yet to be fear'd, that if we like her, this innate Principle, that bids us gratify every Appetite, will advise us to make Use of her, as if she was our own; tho' our Neighbour is at the Charge of maintaining her, and all the Children she brings forth (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p. 232; GIBSON, 1989, p. 82).

The security of society rests both on courage and chastity: on the artificial courage born on pride and honour of its male citizens and their willingness to fight to death for the state and on the chastity of its female members, providing the reassurance that men need in order to be motivated to care for them: that children are their own. Horatio, in the third dialogue asks Cleomene: "Do you think Women have more Pride from Nature than Men?" and he replies: "I believe not: but they have a great deal more from Education". While for men, "a civil behaviour is all the Chastity the polite World requires (...) 'si non caste, saltem caute' a higher degree of self-control is demanded of women because of the intensity of female desire and because of the social sanctions attributed to unchaste women in a male-shaped and male-controlled environment (MANDEVILLE, 1729, pp.12-13). Being exposed to "the Artillery of our sex", to dangerous seducers that may court them with promises and bribes, women need a special training in honour. To educate the young to live in society is to stimulate their self-liking, to "encrease their Fear of Shame". In the third dialogue Cleomene offers the basis for a 'pedagogy of pride' for both sexes. Honour for men is an issue of courage. Young men are to be educated to fear shame more than death. Duelling still maintains an enormous symbolic value because courage was, and still is praised not simply for being an expression

of public-spirited feeling, but as the highest form of self-control, the model of all virtues: the victory over the strongest of all the passions, the fear of death. As for women: "The Pride likewise that produces Honour in Women has no other Object than their Chastity; and whilst they keep that Jewel entire, they can apprehend no Shame" (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p. 124; cf. DICKEY, 1990; HUNDERT, 1994; HEATH, 1998; SIMONAZZI, 2008, in part. pp. 201-216). Sexual mores are women's battlefield, literally their "glorious Field of Mars" (MANDEVILLE, 1732, p. 53).

It is understandable how Mandeville unsettled his contemporaries by reducing the archetypal virtues of courage and chastity – and the whole of the ideal of honour – to the basic dynamic of fear of shame and the urge to please. Horatio is indeed "very much exasperated against the Author [of *The Fable of the Bees*] and his whole Scheme," having ridiculed in his book "martial Courage and Honour" (MANDEVILLE, 1729, p 20). Mandeville had defined honour as "nothing else but the good Opinion of others, which is counted more or less Substantial, the more or less Noise or Bustle there is made about the demonstration of it" and as "a Technic Word in the Art of Civility, and signifies a Means which Men by Conversing together have found out to please and gratify one another on Account of a palpable Passion in our Nature". It is "an Idol, by Human Contrivance, rais'd on the Basis of Human Pride" (MANDEVILLE, 1732, pp.14, 64). In the *Enquiry into the Origins of Honour*, taking this value to its roots in the quest for the approval of others Mandeville writes that

> the highest Honour which Men can give to Mortals, whilst alive, is in Substance no more, than the most likely and most effectual Means that Human Wit can invent to gratify, stir up, and encrease in Him, to whom that Honour is paid, the Passion of Self-liking (MANDEVILLE, 1732, p. 9).

The relativity of sexual duty roles testifies of the arbitrariness of the values human beings judge each other for:

> That honour is not founded upon any principle, either of real virtue or true religion, must be obvious to all that will but mind what sort of people they are, that are the greatest votaries of that idol, and the different duties it requires in the two sexes: (...) the sense of it, is so whimsical, and there is such a prodigious difference in the signification

> of it, according as the attribute is differently applied, either to a man or to a woman, that neither of them shall forfeit their honour, though each should be guilty, and openly boast of what would be the others greatest shame (MANDEVILLE, 1729, pp. 124-125).

The classical argument about honour and chastity – that cowardice is tolerated in women as a libertine behaviour is acceptable for men, that "Gallantry with Women is no Discredit to the Men, any more than Want of Courage is a Reproach to the Ladies"– is exploited by Mandeville as evidence that the artificial virtues of courage and chastity are based on self-liking (MANDEVILLE, 1732, p. 68). For Mandeville, all this shows that society is not founded on rational ideals of virtue or on a supposed natural benevolence, but rather on a balance between selfish passions, resulting from a historical process in which sociability itself developed. The inequality between sexes is simply one of the results of the process of civilization, just as manners, morality, society are. Reconstructing the history of the shared systems of sentiments of approbation and disapprobation which make up the ideals of male and female social respectability, Mandeville demonstrates how the rituals of modern honour are nothing else than the result of the modifications of pride, an exemplary expression of that spontaneous, *artificial* order resulting from a *natural* disposition of human passions.

The traveller, if he chance to stray,
May turn uncensured to his way;
Polluted streams again are pure,
And deepest wounds admit a cure:
But woman no redemption knows;
The wounds of Honour never Close
(. . .)
Are there no offerings to atone
For but a single error? None!
(. . .)
Pity may mourn, but not restore
And woman falls — to rise no more!
(MOORE, 1822, pp.165-167).

Conclusion

In his *Treatise on Human Nature* David Hume lists chastity among the artificial virtues, together with justice and the law of nations. In Hume's scholarship is taken for granted that this arrangement was inspired by Mandeville, but the suggestion is not developed. (BAIER 1989; FATE-NORTON, 2000, p. 556; ROBERTSON, 2005, pp. 290-302; WHELAN, 2014, pp. 66-70). In what way and to what extent was Hume actually influenced by Mandeville? Which of Mandeville's texts in particular? How close to Mandeville's is Hume's account of chastity? Is the issue of chastity as an artificial virtue a privileged perspective to look at Hume's reading of Mandeville and the impact that the author of *The Fable of the Bees* had on the Scottish Enlightenment? Even a provisional answer to these questions would require a lengthy essay. In the brief space of these conclusions, I simply review and summarise Mandeville's account of chastity as an artificial virtue through a comparison with Hume's treatment of it in the *Treatise*, in light of the main themes of Hume's reading of Mandeville.

To begin unequivocally, Hume's remarks on female chastity – its origin, its root cause, its function and the forms in which it is disseminated and imposed on women – is closely akin to Mandeville's. As we have seen, the author of the *Fable of the Bees* had pointed out that sexual mores and conventions relating to sex are paradigmatic examples of the "difference between man in the wild state of nature, and the same creature in the civil society" (MANDEVILLE 1714 (1723), p. 143). Similarly, modesty and chastity are for Hume "conspicuous instances" of a more general argument on artificial virtues (HUME, 1740, T 3.2.12.1). In the *Treatise* Hume refers to "the controversy, which of late years has so much excited the curiosity of the publick, Whether (...) Moral Distinctions Be Founded on Natural and Original Principles, or Arise From Interest And Education" (HUME, 1740, 2.1.7.2 and 3). and in the Introduction "Dr. Mandeville" is listed together with Locke, Shaftesbury, Butler and Hutcheson, among those "who have begun to put the science of man on a new footing" (and Adam Smith adopted this same list in his review of Rousseau's *Origins of Inequality* on the *Edinburgh Review*), but as a matter of fact none of the Scots ever *openly* acknowledged Mandeville's account of artificial virtues and his evolutionistic account of the process of civilization (HUME, 1740 p. 5, SMITH, 1755, p. 244). Yet Mandeville is definitely an unavoidable player when it comes to dealing with the development of sociability (FINLAY 2007, pp. 88-99; TOLONEN, 2013, p. 157; LECALDANO, 2015; SAGAR, 2018, pp. 39-54). He had identified the origin and root cause of the chastity and modesty imposed

on women in the need of child-rearing "for the regular Propagation of the Species, and their careful Education", an artificial virtue which serves to avoid the confusion generated by "doubtful Successions" and to convince men that their offspring is truly theirs and therefore worthy their care and protection (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 69). In the opening of his account, clearly referring to Mandeville, Hume states that on the artificial nature of chastity there is no need for special explanations:

> There are some philosophers, who attack the female virtues with great vehemence, and fancy they have gone very far in detecting popular errors, when they can show, that there is no foundation in nature for all that exterior modesty, which we require in the expressions, and dress, and behaviour of the fair sex. I believe I may spare myself the trouble of insisting on so obvious a subject (HUME, 1740, p. 364)

Hume grounds the foundation to the convention of chastity in humankind's natural conditions: "the length and feebleness of human infancy" and "the concern which both sexes naturally have for their offspring". If males are to be induced to "undergo chearfully all the fatigues and expences" required by the care and upbringing of their progeny "they must believe, that the children are their own" (HUME, 1740, 3.2.12.3). The connection of women to their children is naturally obvious, for men it is not. "From this trivial and anatomical observation is deriv'd that vast difference betwixt the education and duties of the two sexes." Since women give birth and men do not, a man needs an 'artificial' guarantee of his paternity of a particular child, he must create an artificial bond. Female chastity and modesty provide just such a bond. Thus, "these notions arise from education, from the voluntary conventions of men, and from the interest of society."

Mandeville was very explicit on the "conventions of men" shaping women's lives and on the deep concern of human communities to keep women under control: "in the Interest of the Society to preserve Decency and Politeness; that Women should linger, waste, and die, rather than relieve themselves in an unlawful manner" (MANDEVILLE, 1714 (1723), p. 144). Mandeville also placed special emphasis on education. Not only he had made of pride and fear of shame, the disposition to seek the approval of others, the key human motivation for conforming to norms of behaviour, but he had brought the artificially inculcated passions of honour and shame that motivate soldiers to action and women

to modesty as paradigmatic examples of the process of domestication of the passions in human sociability, making the bloody toll of duels and infanticide the ultimate example of the dominance of vanity even over self-preservation and maternal instinct. In particular in the addenda to the Remarks in the 1723 edition of the *Fable of the Bees* had insisted on the different upbringings of boys and girls, the 'pedagogy of shame' for women: "Miss is scarce three Years old, but she is spoke to every Day to hide her Leg, and rebuk'd in good Earnest if she shews it (...) Young Girls are taught to hate a Whore, before they know what the Word means" (MANDEVILLE, 1724, p. 42; MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, pp. 68-69, p. 143).

Hume wrote that "From their earliest infancy to their extremest old-age and infirmity" women are universally taught that they must always avoid any sign of immodesty in thought or behaviour. "Education takes possession of the ductile minds of the fair sex in their infancy" (HUME, 1740, T 3.2.12.7). But keeping women in line requires more than fear of punishment. "All human creatures, especially of the female sex, are apt to over-look remote motives in favour of any present temptation" and in the case of sexual appetite "the temptation is here the strongest imaginable". The restraint to be imposed on women is thus "the punishment of bad fame or reputation; a punishment, which has a mighty influence on the human mind" and together with "a particular degree of shame" related to the licentious behaviour of women and a "proportionable praises on their chastity", it is paramount to develop in women the attitude to modesty: "some preceding backwardness or dread, which may prevent their first approaches, and may give the female sex a repugnance to all expressions, and postures, and liberties, that have an immediate relation to that enjoyment." (HUME, 1740, p.365)

The explanation of chastity cannot be separated from its male counterpart, which Hume mentions in closing the argument: "Courage, which is the point of honour among men, derives its merit, in a great measure, from artifice, as well as the chastity of women". Mandeville had made chastity and courage two fundamental keywords. In the *Enquiry on the Origin of Honour* Mandeville reads over the history of recent civilization through the history of self-liking, of that search for signs of public esteem that underlies the human capacity for socialisation. All societies develop forms of social prestige of martial courage related to combat practices, but the advent of 'modern honour' and the duelling code is a phenomenon unique to European culture, which emerged in late and post-medieval culture. With the growing power of centralized monarchies, a

display of martial courage by means of a challenge to a duel, regardless of the outcome of the fight, became a widespread practice of great symbolic value throughout Europe as a demonstration of the martial bravery that elites could no longer exhibit in war. Politeness and modern manners are but the latest stage in the history of pride (SAGAR, 2018, pp. 89-91). While drafting the *Treatise* Hume wrote an *Historical Essay on Chivalry and modern honour* in which direct knowledge of Mandeville's text on honour shines through (Cf. WRIGHT 2012). In the essay Hume develops an explanation of the origins of martial virtues and of the prestige attached to them which is parallel with Mandeville's observations. According to Hume in "all rude Ages and the infancy of every State" courage was the most admired virtue, the chief quality from which all ideas of merit naturally descend The virtue of courage was "in so great Repute that the general name of Virtue was derived from it". Montaigne had noted that for the Romans the etymon of virtue derives from that of force, but it is Mandeville, quoting classical sources, who fully develops this suggestion in the preface to the *Enquiry into the Origin of Honour*, arguing that courage was – and still is – praised not simply for being an alleged expression of public-spirited feeling but as the highest form of self-control, the model of all virtues: the victory over the strongest of all passions, the fear of death. (MONTAIGNE, *Essais*, II, VIII ("Des recompences d'honneur"); MANDEVILLE, 1732, p. v). In the *Fable of the Bees* and in the *Enquiry into the Origin of Honour* Mandeville follows the birth and success of chivalric idealism, tracing a conjectural history of honour as a cultural and literary phenomenon that played a decisive role in the domestication of pride. Both in his early essays and in *The History of England*, Hume accounts for the origin of the chivalric ideals, of "that Monster of Romantic Chivalry and Knight-errantry" was brought to the world by "the necessary Operation of the Principles of Human Nature" when the Barbarians encountered the Roman civilization (HUME, 1947, pp. 54-60). The introduction of the practice of single combats, as in Mandeville's account, is part of the same, general phenomenon. "These absurd, though generous maxims, shed much of the best blood in Christendom during more than two centuries; and notwithstanding the severity of the law and authority of reason, such is the prevailing force of custom, they are far from being as yet entirely exploded" (HUME, 1983, Vol. 1, Appendix II; Vol. 3 Ch. XXIX). Courage in the ancient times "bore that air of Savageness & Barbarity' in the modern ones is dressed with 'chimerical & affected Politeness" (HUME, 1947, p. 59). In the essay *Of the Rise and Progress of Arts and Sciences* Hume refers to men of modern honour as a scourge in society because the public display of honour allows them to acquire social prestige without practising virtue (HUME, 1900, pp. 96-97).

> Nothing surely can be more absurd and barbarous than the practice of duelling; but those who justify it, say, it begets civility and good manners. And a duellist, you may observe, always values himself upon his courage, his sense of honour, his fidelity and friendship; qualities which are here indeed very oddly directed, but which have been esteemed universally, since the foundation of the world (HUME, 1900, p. 506)

Not only does Hume follow the Dutch doctor in giving an account of the origins, history and significance of the duel of honour, but like Mandeville he sees the paradox of the duel – founded on motives at once "absurd & generous", "oddly directed & esteemed" – an illegal, public display of martial worth, fashionable and socially approved as an expression of virtue because of the everlasting endorsement of courage as the point of honour among men (HUME 1740 3.2.12.8). In this sense the approbation and prestige attributed to duellists can be traced back to the "primary sentiments of morals" and can be accounted for on the basis of what is considered to be useful or agreeable to a man himself or to others:

> a genuine and hearty pride, or self-esteem, if well conceal'd and well founded, is essential to the character of a man of honour, ... there is no quality of the mind, which is more indispensibly requisite to procure the esteem and approbation of mankind. ... whatever we call heroic virtue ... is either nothing but a well establish'd pride and self-esteem, or partakes largely of that passion (HUME, 1740, 3.3.2.11).

On pride, vanity and the quest for approval Mandeville is a compelling interlocutor. In O*n the Dignity or Meanness of Human Nature*, Hume addresses him directly, provoking him to reconsider his reduction of all motives to self-love: "What say you of natural affection? ... All is self-love?... If you ever give yourself any movement, it would only be from vanity, and a desire of fame and reputation to this same self'. Hume defiantly declares himself willing to adopt Mandeville's point of view if the latter is willing, in return, to revise his denial of the existence of even limited benevolence: "That species of self-love, which displays itself in kindness to others, you must allow to have great influence over human actions, and even greater, on many occasions, than that which

remains in its original shape and form". In conclusion, remarks Hume, those philosophers "that have insisted so much on the selfishness of man" misunderstood that "secret pleasure" that accompanies every act of virtue and friendship and made it into an exclusive motive:

> Vanity is so closely allied to virtue and to love the fame of laudable actions approaches so near the love of laudable actions for their own sake that these passions are more capable of mixture than any other kind of affection; and it is impossible to have the latter without some degree of the former . . . To love the glory of virtuous deeds is a sure proof of the love of virtue (HUME 1900, p. 49).

Yet, the crux of Hume's main criticism of Mandeville focuses on the role of politicians and legislators (HUNDERT, 1994, p. 85, SAGAR, 2018, pp. 57-59). Once identified the original motive to the convention of justice in self-interest and the source of his moral approbation in sympathy, Hume agrees with Mandeville that "Tho' this progress of the sentiments be *natural*, and even necessary, 'tis certain, that it is here forwarded by the artifice of politicians, who, in order to govern men more easily, and preserve peace in human society, have endeavour'd to produce an esteem for justice, and an abhorrence of injustice", but, referring to Mandeville, he adds: "the matter has been carry'd too far by certain writers on morals" that have represented all moral distinction as the effect of artifice and education (HUME, 1740, 3.2.2.25). In two different passages Hume repeat his criticism of Mandeville:

> 'twou'd be in vain for politicians to talk of *honourable* or *dishonourable*, *praiseworthy* or *blameable*. These words wou'd be perfectly unintelligible, and wou'd no more have any idea annex'd to them, than if they were of a tongue perfectly unknown to us.

> . . . had not men a natural sentiment of approbation and blame, it cou'd never be excited by politicians; nor wou'd the words *laudable* and *praise-worthy*, *blameable* and *odious*, be any more intelligible, than if they were a language perfectly unknown to us, as we have already observ'd (HUME, 1740, 3.2.2.25 and 3.3.1.11)

According to Hume, the idea of morality as an artificial creation of lawgivers requires that the agent already possess a disposition, that is trained in

taking pride acting cooperatively. Presumptuously taking the liberty of acting as Mandeville's defence lawyer and drawing on the insightful observations of Eugene Heath, Mandeville could have argued that even in its original and blunt deployment in the *Enquiry on the Origins of Moral Virtue* in *Fable I*, most of his assertions on role of lawgivers and politicians as "inventor of morality" may be employed more generally to indicate how praise and flattery might affect individuals. The notion of honour and shame introduced by politicians is exclusively related to the pride of being human and not animal. In making the desire to consider oneself superior to non-rational animals the defining characteristic of human beings, the mechanism of praise and flattery invoked by politicians is devoid of moral content, it refers to acts related to or emblematic of a preferred group or class, representing specifically human qualities, such as (supposed) rationality and self-control. In making men and women proud to be human rather than animals, the "cunning politicians" made then believe that they had a motive other than the passions (LOVEJOY, 1961, pp.171-180; SCRIBANO, 1980, pp.150-152; JACK, 2015, pp. 1-13; CALLANAN, 2015). Acknowledging in a behaviour apparently shaped by the dictates of reason an appropriate object of pride, individuals are driven by that same passion to accept the principles that make possible social life, and, at the same time, they are dominated by pride and vanity to the point of not being able to recognize their own motives. The repeated performance of such behaviours, supported by self-liking, the desire to receive the endorsement of others, produces shared systems of sentiments of appraisal and conduct, which develops in regular and accepted patterns, paving the way for normativity.

In this scenario, the artificial virtues of chastity and the taming of natural impulses by fear of shame, are literally what makes us human: "by flattering our pride" and inspiring our fear of shame "the Artful Moralist" taught us "if not subdue, at least so to conceal and disguise our darling Passion, Lust, that we scarce know it when we meet with it in our own Breasts". The reward we get for "so much deceit and insincerity practis'd upon our selves as well as others" is something that makes it hard "to abstain from Laughter", nothing more than the petty pleasure of not being a beast: "the vain Satisfaction of making our Species appear more exalted and remote from that of other Animals, than it really is; and we in our Consciences know it to be". It is something very significant for a scholar of human nature:

> this is fact, and in it we plainly perceive the reason why it was necessary to render odious every Word or Action by which we might disco-

> ver the innate Desire we feel to perpetuate our Kind; and why tamely to submit to the violence of a Furious Appetite (which it is painful to resist) and innocently to obey the most pressing demand of Nature without Guile or Hypocrisy, like other Creatures, should be branded with the Ignominious Name of Brutality (MANDEVILLE, 1714/1723, p. 154).

The double standard of female and male honour imposes a heavy yoke upon women, while "the Man that satisfies his Appetites after the manner the Custom of the Country allows, has no Censure to fear". He has "the Liberty to value himself upon the Fury of his unbridled Passion", and even if "he is hotter than Goats or Bulls (...) let him indulge his Appetites (...) he may with safety laugh at the wise Men that should reprove him: All the women and above Nine in then of the men will be on his side" (MANDEVILLE, 1714, pp. 73-74).

Is this fact conclusive proof that women are much more appropriately defined as human beings than men?

References

ADDISON, J. & STEELE, R. *The Spectator*, London, 1711-12.

BAIER, A. C. "Hume on Women's Complexion." In: *The Science of Man in the Scottish Enlightenment: Hume, Reid, and Their Contemporaries*, (ed.) Peter Jones. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1989, pp. 33-53.

BAIER, A. C. 1991c, *A Progress of Sentiments: Reflections on Hume's Treatise*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991

BAYLE P. B. *Miscellaneous Reflections Miscellaneous reflections, occasion'd by the comet which appear'd in December 1680. Chiefly tending to explode popular superstitions, translated from the French. To which is added, The Author's Life*, 2 vols London, John Morphew, 1708.

BERRY, C. J. "Lusty Women and Loose Imagination: Hume's Philosophical Anthropology of Chastity". *History of Political Thought* 24, no. 3, 2003, pp. 415-33.

BRANCHI, A. "La virtù puntigliosa. I filosofi e il duello", In: *Giornale di Storia Contemporanea*, VIII, 2, dicembre, 2006, pp. 28-51.

BRANCHI, A. "Vanity, Virtue & the Duel: the Scottish Response to Mandeville," In: *The Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 12.1, 2014, pp. 71-93.

BRANCHI, A. *Pride, Manners, and Morals: Bernard Mandeville's Anatomy of Honour*. Leiden, 2021.

BRANCHI. A. "Filosofia o letteratura? Mandeville, Fielding ed il contesto settecentesco," *Iride. Filosofia e discussione pubblica* 18-VI, 1996, pp. 479-489.

BRYSON, A. *From Courtesy to Civility. Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*, Oxford, 1998.

CALLANAN, J. J. "Mandeville on Pride and Animal Nature," In: Balsemão Pires E., Braga J. (eds) *Bernard de Mandeville's Tropology of Paradoxes*, (Cham: 2015), pp.125-136.

CHAMBERLAYNE, E. *Magna Britannia Notitia, or The Present State of Great Britain*, London; Bk.III, Ch. v, 1718.

CHAMPION, J. *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722*; Manchester and London, 2003, pp. 52-53.

COHEN, E. "'What the Women of All Times Would Laugh At': Redefining Equality and Difference, Circa 1660-1760", *Osiris*, 2nd Series, 12, 1997, pp. 121-142.

COOK, H. "Bernard Mandeville", In: *A Companion to Modern Philosophy*, ed. Steven Nadler, Oxford, 1992, pp. 469-482.

DABHOIWALA, F. "The Construction of Honour, Reputation and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England" In: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 6 (1996), pp. 201-213.

DICKEY, L. "Pride, Hypocrisy, and Civility in Mandeville's Social and Historical Theory", *Critical Review* 4, 1990, pp. 387-431.

FINLAY, C. J. *Hume's Social Philosophy. Human Nature and Commercial Sociability in A Treatise of Human Nature*, Continuum, 2007

FRANCESCONI, D. "Mandeville sull'origine della società", In: *Il Pensiero Politico*, 1996, pp. 407-433.

GIBSON, C. *Bernard Mandeville: The Importance of Women in the Development of Civil Societies*, University of British Columbia (Unpublished M.A. Thesis), 1989.

GOLDSMITH, M. M. *Private Vices, Public Benefits: Bernard Mandeville's Social and Political Thought* (2nd ed.), Revised ed., Christchurch, NZ: 2001.

GOWING, L. "Women and the Popular Culture of Dishonour", In: *Transaction of the Royal Historical Society*, 1996, 6, pp. 225-234.

HARVEY, K. "The Century of Sex? Gender, Bodies, and Sexuality in the Long Eighteenth Century", In: *The Historical Journal*, 45, 4, 2002, pp. 899-916.

HEATH, E. "Mandeville's Bewitching Engine of Praise", In: *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 15, 1998, pp. 205-226.

HUME, D. 1740, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Ed. by D.F. Norton, (Oxford: 2000).

HUME, D. *An Historical Essay on Chivalry and Modern Honour*, In: E.C. Mossner, "David Hume's 'An Historical Essay on Chivalry and Modern Honour'", in *Modern Philology*, 45, 1947, pp. 54-60.

HUME, D. *Essays, Moral, Political and Literary*, London: Routledge, 1900

HUME, D. *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688*, in 6 vols. Indianapolis, 1983.

HUNDERT, E. J. *The Enlightenment's Fable. Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*, Cambridge, 1994.

ISRAEL, J. I. *Enlightenment Contested: Philosophy, Modernity and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752*, Oxford, 2006.

JACK, M. "Men Become Sociable by Living Together in Society: Re-assessing Mandeville's Social Theory," in *Bernard de Mandeville's Tropology of Paradoxes: Morals, Politics, Economics, and Therapy*, Balsemão Pires, Edmundo, Braga, Joaquim (Eds.), Cham, CH: 2015; pp. 1-13.

KAPUST, D. *Flattery and the History of Political Thought*, Cambridge, 2018.

KLEIMAN-LAFON, S. "Introduction" In: *Bernard Mandeville, A Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Diseases* (1730), ed. by Sylvie Kleiman-Lafon, Cham, CH: 2017.

LAQUEUR, T. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*, Cambridge: MA, 1990.

LECALDANO, E. "Orgoglio e Società in Mandeville e Hume", In: *Rivista di Filosofia*, CVI, 3, 2015, p.337-359

LOVEJOY, A. O. *Reflection on human nature*, Baltimore, 1961.

LUBAN, D. "Bernard Mandeville as Moralist and Materialist," *History of European Ideas*, 41 (7), 2015, pp. 831-857.

MAGRI, T. 1987, "Introduzione," to *B. Mandeville, La Favola delle Api*, (Roma-Bari: 1987).

MANDEVILLE 1714 / 23 *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (London: J. Roberts, 1714), two editions. 2nd editon, Edmund Parker, 1723; 3rd. edition, J. Tonson, 1724; 4th edition, 1725; 5th edition 1728; 6th edition, 1729; "6th edition," 1732. Modern edition: *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits* ed. F. B. Kaye, 2 vols. (Oxford: 1924). Reissued in facsimile edition (Indianapolis: 1988).

MANDEVILLE 1724 *A Modest Defence of Publick Stews: or, an Essay Upon Whoring as it is now Practis'd in these Kingdoms*, "Written by a Layman" (London: A. Moore, 1724). Modern edition: *Bernard Mandeville's "A Modest Defence of Publick Stews" Prostitution and Its Discontents in Early Georgian England*, ed. by Irwin Primer, (New York-Basingstoke: 2006).

MANDEVILLE, B. 1729 *The Fable of the Bees*, Part II, "By the Author of the First" (London: J. Roberts, 1729; 1730; 2nd edition, 1733. Later editions of both volumes, 1734, 1755 (2), 1772, 1795 (2). Modern editions: *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices*, Publick Benefits ed. F. B. Kaye, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1924).

MANDEVILLE, B. *A Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions, Vulgarly Call'd the Hypo in Men and Vapours in Women, in which the Symptoms, Causes, and Cure of those Diseases are set forth after a Method intirely new. The whole interspers'd, with Instructive Discourses on the Real Art of Physick it self; and entertaining Remarks on the Modern Practice of Physicians and Apothecaries: Very useful to all, that have the Misfortune to stand in need of either. In three dialogues* by B. de Mandeville, M.D. (London: Printed for the author D. Leach, W. Taylor, John Woodward, 1711); reissued, 1715; 3rd ed. (designated as the second edition on the title page) published as *A Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysteric Diseases* (London: Printed for J. Tonson in the Strand, 1730). Modern edition: *A Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Diseases* (1730), Ed. by Sylvie Kleiman-Lafon, (Cham, CH: 2017).

MANDEVILLE, B. *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour, and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*, by "the Author of the *Fable of the Bees*" (London: J. Brotherton, 1732). Reprint: intro. M.M. Goldsmith (London: Frank Cass, 1971).

MANDEVILLE, B. *The Female Tatler*, by "A Society of Ladies" (London, A. Baldwin, 1709-10). Modern edition: By a Society of Ladies: Bernard Mandeville's Essays in the "Female Tatler" Edited, with an introduction and notes, M. M. Goldsmith (Bristol: 1999).

MANDEVILLE, B. *The Virgin Unmask'd; or Female Dialogues betwixt an Elderly Maiden Lady and her Niece on Several Diverting Discourses on Love, Marriage, Memoirs and Morals & of the Times* (London: J. Morphew and J. Woodward, 1709). Reissued as *The Mysteries of Virginity* (London: J. Morphew, 1714); 2nd ed. by Bernard Mandeville (London: G. Strahan, W. Meers, J. Stagg, 1724), reissued (London: A. Bettesworth, C. Hitch, 1731).

MAROTO CAMINO, M. ""My Honour I'll Bequeath unto the Knife", Public Heroism, Private Sacrifice and Early Modern Rapes of Lucretia," in *Imagining Culture: Essays in Modern History and Literature*, Jonathan Hart (ed.), (Abingdon-on-Thames: 2016).

MC KENNA, A. "Pierre Bayle: moralisme et anthropologie," in *Pierre Bayle dans la république des lettres*, ed. by A. McKenna, A. & G. Paganini, Paris, 2004, pp. 321-347.

MONRO, H. H. *The Ambivalence of Bernard Mandeville*, Oxford, 1975.

MOORE, E. *The Female Seducers*, In: *The Poems of Lyttelton, and E. Moore*, Vol. LVI of The British Poets, Chiswick, 1822.

NACOL, E. C. "The Beehive and the Stew: Prostitution and the Politics of Risk in Bernard Mandeville's Political Thought", in *Polity*, 47, 1, 2015, pp.61-83.

NORTON, D. F. & NORTON, M. J. (Eds.) David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* (Oxford Philosophical Texts); Oxford University Press, U.S.A., 2000

O'BRIEN, K. *Women and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-century Britain*, Cambridge: 2009

PITASSI, M.-C. "Entre libido et savoir: les images de la femme chez Bayle," in *Pierre Bayle dans la république des lettres*, ed. by A. McKenna, A. & G. Paganini, Paris, 2004, pp. 307-319.

POCOCK, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment*, Princeton, 1975.

PRIMER Bernard Mandeville's "A Modest Defence of Publick Stews" *Prostitution and Its Discontents in Early Georgian England*, ed. by Irwin Primer, New York-Basingstoke, 2006.

ROBERTSON, J. *The Case for The Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680–1760*, Cambridge: 2005.

SAGAR, P. *The Opinion of Mankind Sociability and the Theory of the State from Hobbes to Smith*, Princeton, 2018.

SAVILLE, G, *Marquis of Halifax, The lady's New-years gift, or, Advice to a daughter: under these following heads, viz. religion, husband, house and family, servants, behaviour and conversation, friendship, censure, vanity and affectation, pride, diversion, dancing*, London 1688.

SCRIBANO, M. E. "La Presenza di Bayle nell'opera di Bernard de Mandeville", in *Giornale Critico della Filosofia Italiana* 60, 1981, pp. 186-220.

SCRIBANO, M. E. *Natura umana e societa competitiva: studio su Mandeville*, Milano, 1980.

SIMONAZZI, M., *Le favole della filosofia. Saggio su Bernard Mandeville*. Milano, 2008.

SMITH, A. "A Letter to the Editors of the Edinburgh Review," (July 1755) in *Essays on Philosophical Subjects*, *Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1976. vol. III pp. 242-246.

STUURMAN, S. "Social Cartesianism: François Poulain de la Barre and the Origins of the Enlightenment," in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 58, 4, 1997, pp. 617-640.

STUURMAN, S. *François Poulain de la Barre and the Invention of Modern Equality*, Cambridge, Ma., 2004.

TAUVRY, D. *A New Rational Anatomy, containing an explication of the Uses of the Structure of the Body of Man and Some some other Animals according to the Rules of Mechanicks*, London 1701.

TOLAND, J., *Letters to Serena*, 1704.

TOLONEN, M. *Mandeville and Hume, anatomists of civil society*, Oxford, 2013.

VICHERT, G. S. "Bernard Mandeville's The Virgin Unmask'd," in *Mandeville Studies*, ed. I. Primer, Den Haag, 1975, pp. 1-10.

WHELAN, F. G., *The Political Thought of Hume and His Contemporaries, Enlightenment Projects Volume 1* (Routledge Studies in Social and Political Thought) 2014.

WOOTTON, D. "Pierre Bayle, libertine?" in *Studies in Seventeenth-Century European Philosophy*, M.A. Stewart (ed.), Oxford, 1997, pp.197-226.

WRIGHT, J. P. "Hume on the origin of 'modern honour': a study in Hume's philosophical development". In: Ruth Savage (ed.) *Philosophy and Religion in Enlightenment Britain*: New Case Studies, Oxford UP. 2012.

YEAZELL, R. B. *Fictions of Modesty: Woman and Courtship in the English Novel*, The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

YLIVUORI, S. "Rethinking Female Chastity and Gentlewoman's honour in Eighteenth-Century England". *The Historical Journal*, 59, 1, 2016, pp. 71-97.

Received: 29/11/2022
Approved: 10/12/2022
Published: 31/12/2022