

Paul Kelleher  
Department of English  
Emory University  
Book Proposal

## **Making Love: Sentiment and Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century British Literature**

### ***Introduction***

*Making Love* argues that the literature of eighteenth-century Britain fundamentally reimagined the form and substance of sexual desire. Despite their official adherence to traditional moral codes grounded in self-control and self-denial, a closer look at the rhetorical strategies of literary essayists and novelists reveals an unexpected development: moral virtue is rendered nearly synonymous with the pursuit and enjoyment of sexual pleasure, specifically those pleasures shared by impassioned men and women. Through close readings of Richard Steele and Joseph Addison's *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*, Eliza Haywood's *Love in Excess*, Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*, and Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*, I show how representations of moral feeling and virtuous conduct are fashioned—more often than not—through the tropes of heterosexual desire. Haywood, we find, maps the awakening of sympathetic feeling almost exactly onto the process of falling passionately in love, while Richardson describes conjugal love as the embodiment of “all tender relations in one” and Fielding rewrites benevolence as “the glorious lust of doing good.” But this is not, to my mind, merely a heightening of the erotic tone of literary language and convention. By crafting morality in the image of sexuality, I suggest that these authors conceptually position heterosexual desire as the very precondition of morality as such. More specifically, in these literary texts, a desire for someone of the opposite sex no longer signals, first and foremost, a lustful and possibly sinful impulse that needs to be socially tamed and corrected, but rather an inclination to form intimate bonds that are emotionally rich and psychologically complex. The passionate union of man and woman is thus depicted as the first step toward the creation of forms of ethical recognition and reciprocity that ultimately inspire feelings of sympathy and benevolence. In short, where pleasure leads, morality follows. But at the same time, I suggest, as heterosexual love laid claim to both pleasure and moral virtue, other forms of desire increasingly were rendered morally suspect and socially marginal.

In eighteenth-century Britain, the notion that moral virtue allows and perhaps even depends upon sensual indulgence immediately would have called to mind the controversial thesis of Bernard Mandeville's notorious work, *The Fable of the Bees*. Self-love and self-interested pleasure seeking, for Mandeville, drive human behavior, and through the arts of hypocrisy and disguise, cunning social actors translate “private vices” into “public benefits”: pride and ambition don the mask of honor, while lust takes on the complexion of love. From a certain perspective, the authors I examine in this book might seem to bear an uncanny resemblance to the often-demonized Mandeville. How else are we to account for their effort to situate sexual desire and erotic pleasure at the heart of moral life? The key to understanding their ideological innovation, I argue, lies in how these authors appropriate and recast the concept of self-love. In contrast to Mandeville and his intellectual forbears, Hobbes and La Rochefoucauld, all of whom assert a primary human predilection for pursuing and satisfying self-interested desires, these essayists and novelists articulate a variety of counter-narratives regarding the relationship between self-love and sexuality. From *The Tatler* to *Tom Jones*, the traditional image of lust as a

self-interested passion is displaced in favor of a new moral vision, in which the first stirrings of sexual desire initiate, and the advent of conjugal love completes, the individual's transcendence of egoism. Feeling desire and falling in love become, in the hands of these authors, the privileged—and highly pleasurable—means for overcoming the psychological and emotional limits of self-love and for developing a moral sensibility attuned to the thoughts and feelings of others.

The suspicion that self-love lurks in the recesses of the human heart troubled the eighteenth-century imagination. At the same time, it inspired a wide range of writers to counter the bleak worldview of Hobbes and Mandeville with less pessimistic accounts of politics, society, and morality. These intellectual departures from egoistic philosophy brought into being the literature and culture of sentimentalism. Without denying the reality of self-interested (even malicious) behavior, sentimentalism—in its broadest sense—foregrounded and championed the human propensity to feel sympathetically and act benevolently. In this regard, the transformation of sex and morality charted in this book cannot be understood without reference to the broader currents of sentimental thought and representation in the eighteenth century. Although critics conventionally (and I believe, mistakenly) place them in two different literary camps—the sentimental (Steele, Addison, and Richardson) versus the un- or antisentimental (Haywood and Fielding)—the authors addressed in this book collectively explore one of the central questions posed by sentimentalism: how is the human capacity for moral goodness most effectively translated from individual feelings and actions into broader structures of social and political life?

Their answer to this question is the discursive phenomenon explored in this book. By representing heterosexual desire as the catalyst that moves the individual from egoism to ethical sociability, these authors make ideologically possible—that is, both emotionally desirable and politically urgent—what cultural historians have identified as a central feature of sentimental culture: namely, the idealization of conjugal love. But the moral progression from desire to love entails more than simply an intensification of feeling. Indeed, in the pages of these authors, the basic contours of human relations are reoriented around the sentimental ideal of conjugal love, which comes to be valued and celebrated for its supposed ability to give desire a fixed form and a public significance. On the one hand, within the domestic household, love is imagined to harness desire in the service of cultivating emotional constancy and familial cohesion. On the other hand, through the bearing and rearing of children, love is understood to tether desire to the task of reproducing and sustaining culture, the nation, and even humanity itself.

The sentimentalization of sexual desire remakes the human subject, inside and out. Accordingly, I argue that eighteenth-century British literature marks a decisive turning point in the history of sexuality, and as *Making Love* makes clear, the consequences of this ideological revolution were wide-ranging and, quite often, pernicious. First, as heterosexual desire increasingly eclipses alternative ways of imagining moral feeling, virtuous conduct, and social attachment, these authors discursively anticipate the central norm of modern society: namely, the domestic household of husband, wife, and children, which in its most aggressively disciplinary form, is understood to be an individual's only access to a fully realized moral life. Second, the ideological elevation of heterosexual desire and conjugal love sharply narrows the moral imagination, collaterally demoting the ethical value of other relations between self and other (such as friendship) and pathologizing the forms of emotional attachment and sociability grounded in same-sex desire. *Making Love* thus reveals how present-day debates regarding

moral feeling, bodily pleasure, sexual ethics, and the politics of marriage continue to be shaped (in often unacknowledged ways) by ideologies forged in the eighteenth century.

### ***Contribution to Scholarship***

*Making Love* primarily intervenes into two scholarly conversations. First, I aim to recast how sexuality is conceptualized within British eighteenth-century studies. Second, through my engagement with eighteenth-century literature and culture, I seek to historicize and thus reorient the methodological approaches that currently inform sexual studies and queer theory.

Some of the most influential scholarship on eighteenth-century Britain has trained its sights on the question of sexuality and traced the literary and cultural ramifications of both normative and non-normative forms of sexual desire. As foundational work by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Nancy Armstrong, and Walter Laqueur, among others, has demonstrated, this moment in history witnessed profound changes in how men and women understood the relationship between the most intimate aspects of themselves (their bodies, pleasures, and affections) and the broader forces (such as patriarchal power, domestic ideology, and medical taxonomy) that shaped and often constrained their lives. While this scholarship informs my own thinking, *Making Love* brings to light what has remained unexplored by other critics: the dynamic interplay between literature and philosophy in the history of sexuality. The ideological transformation of sexual desire that I identify in eighteenth-century Britain was deeply rooted in the urgent questions moral and political philosophers posed regarding egoism and sociability, questions that were in turn relayed to a wider public through an ever-expanding literary sphere. Other critics have turned to eighteenth-century literature in order to document, for instance, changing definitions and practices of masculinity, femininity, friendship, kinship, publicity, and privacy. By focusing critical attention on the relationship between literary representation and philosophical culture, my book illuminates the conceptual forces that underpin and, to a large extent, determine the shifting ideologies of gender and sexuality explored by other critics. As *Making Love* demonstrates, eighteenth-century literature fundamentally rewrote the ethical relationship between self and other as heterosexual fiction, the sentimental story of how pleasure, desire, and love become synonymous with the virtues of moral goodness.

My argument that the philosophical problems of self-love and pleasure are at the heart of eighteenth-century sexual ideology suggests an alternative to the dominant ways that Michel Foucault's work has been deployed in sexuality studies and queer theory. Most scholars in the fields of sexuality studies and queer theory continue to be inspired primarily by the Foucault who critiqued the practices of discipline and punishment and the discourses of normality and perversion. In contrast, my engagement with Foucault draws on his later speculations regarding how sexual pleasure becomes caught up in processes of moral problematization. In the second volume of *The History of Sexuality* (on the "use of pleasure"), he asks, "how, why, and in what forms was sexuality constituted as a moral domain?" The Foucauldian history of sexuality, to my mind, asks us to interrogate the moralization of pleasure, that is, the discursive fashioning of "good" (i.e., disinterested and benevolent) forms of pleasure as opposed to "bad" (i.e., self-interested and narcissistic) forms of pleasure.

It is the contention of *Making Love* that eighteenth-century sentimental literature largely invented a soon-to-be dominant species of pleasure: the pleasure of conjugal love, in which the passion of man for woman, and woman for man, reaches its truest fulfillment not in the gratification of sexual appetite but rather in a consummation that conflates erotic desire and

moral sensibility. Other forms of pleasure, however, did not fare as well, particularly those regarded as antithetical to conjugal love. The pleasures associated with same-sex desire, for instance, were increasingly identified as selfish withdrawals from procreation, and by extension, as indications of an individual's moral disregard for the fate of "humanity" itself. Foucault's critical intuitions inform these arguments, but in significant ways, my book departs from the analyses he offers in the second and third volumes of *The History of Sexuality*. In these works, Foucault's explorations of pleasure, sex, and ethics focus mainly on Greek and Roman culture; he tracks how male citizens shaped their pleasures through practices of moral austerity and stylization, and further, how through these practices of self-regulation, male political elites trained and readied themselves to govern others. Importantly, for the ancients, the male citizen could engage in sexual relations with both women and men, as long as he respected the different protocols the governed cross-sex and same-sex erotic encounters. We find a very different world in eighteenth-century Britain, where the center of moral gravity shifts toward the heterosexual pleasures pursued and enjoyed in scenes of courtship and conjugal domesticity. As I show, austerity is displaced in favor of intensity, sublimity, and even excess—all of which, when situated within the ideological framework of conjugal love, can be legitimated as vital sources for moral feeling and conduct. Unlike the ancients, though, who were able to imagine an ethics of same-sex desire, eighteenth-century British writers morally disqualified—indeed, often vilified—the sexual pleasures shared between men or between women. Ultimately, by revealing how conjugal love came to monopolize pleasure and desire as well as the moral virtues of sympathy and benevolence, *Making Love* proposes a new understanding of how the eighteenth century makes possible modern conceptions of heterosexuality and homosexuality. To mention only one example: Freud's notorious assertion that homosexual desire is essentially "narcissistic" and his frankly sentimental idea that heterosexual reproduction is "altruistic" clearly indicate that a crucial chapter of the history of sexuality was written in the eighteenth century.

## ***Chapter Summaries***

### **Chapter 1: "The Beauty of Virtue"**

My opening chapter considers the rhetorical strategies that British philosophers of moral sentimentalism developed in their critiques of self-interest and egoism, particularly as these notions were promulgated in Hobbesian political theory and Protestant theology. Against such grim political and theological understandings of humankind, in which the individual is single-mindedly (even violently) compelled to pursue self-interested motives, moral philosophers privileged sympathetic and benevolent feeling and imagined forms of civil association grounded in the belief that "good nature" predisposes men and women to live together peacefully and justly. This sentimental recasting of morality emerges most forcefully and influentially in the third earl of Shaftesbury's *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711) and Francis Hutcheson's *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (1725). The ideological centerpiece of both texts is the theory of an innate "moral sense," which instinctively leads the individual to affirm the principles of virtue and to engage in disinterested forms of conduct. By grounding morality in the very workings of the human body, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson strongly undermine competing theories that stress the primacy of self-interest in human behavior. But at the same time, I argue, in their efforts to naturalize morality, both Shaftesbury and Hutcheson consistently draw on the rhetoric of heterosexual desire as a way to

embody their vision of moral life. Shaftesbury, for instance, draws a close analogy between the “natural affection” that inspires an individual to promote the welfare of society and the “zeal” found in conjugal love and parental “kindness,” while Hutcheson figures the moral sense as the masculine “love” of a “beautiful,” overtly feminized “virtue.” By doing so, I suggest, these philosophers of sentimentalism prepare the way for—indeed, make ideologically possible—more literal understandings of heterosexual desire as *the* privileged form of moral feeling.

## **Chapter 2: “Love Within Reason”**

Shaftesbury’s and Hutcheson’s heterosexualization of moral feeling resonates suggestively with the ideological reshaping of reason, morality, and desire we find in Joseph Addison and Richard Steele’s widely read literary periodicals, the *Tatler* (1709-1711) and the *Spectator* (1711-12, 1714). In the *Spectator*, when Addison famously declares his desire to bring “philosophy out of the closets and libraries, schools and colleges, to dwell in clubs and assemblies, at tea-tables, and in coffee-houses,” his philosophical undertaking also entails a moral-psychological agenda: to cultivate his readers’ “virtue and discretion” and to reclaim them from the “desperate state of folly and vice into which the age has fallen.” As I show in this chapter, Addison and Steele understand folly and vice as unreasonable and immoral forms of thought, feeling, and conduct, ones that transgress the norms of polite sociability and disrupt how men and women ideally should relate with one another in the public sphere. The moral sensibility that informs the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* thus bears the traces of its historical context. According to Jürgen Habermas’s influential argument, the rise of the public sphere in early eighteenth-century Britain redrew the traditional boundaries between the “public” and the “private” and fashioned a social space in which various kinds of relationships, from the political to the romantic, could be conducted with greater flexibility and freedom. But such freedom inspired a good deal of moral anxiety—not least in Addison and Steele, whose literary enterprise depended on the public sphere that they, at the same time, regarded as a breeding ground for vice and folly. In order to combat this moral threat, Addison and Steele rhetorically construct an intensely sentimentalized representation of heterosexual desire, conjugal love, and parental tenderness. Indeed, as I suggest, they formulate an ideological fantasy that persists to this day: the notion that heterosexual domesticity tames an individual’s selfish, irrational tendencies, cultivates his or her moral sensibility, and in turn, populates the social realm with reasonable men and women passionately dedicated to protecting the future of the family and the country.

## **Chapter 3: “Love in Excess and the Ecstasy of Sympathy”**

Eliza Haywood’s longstanding reputation as an author devoted to representing the voraciousness and volatility of passionate love makes her, at first glance, a somewhat surprising figure to include in a study focused on the sentimentalization of sexual desire. However, a closer look at her first novel, *Love in Excess* (1719-20), reveals how strikingly Haywood’s writing aligns with the sentimental ideology articulated in the pages of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. As I suggest in this chapter, Addison and Steele’s rhetorical unification of reason and passion under the aegis of conjugal love reemerges, albeit in revised form, in Haywood’s depiction of how intense passions and pleasures give rise to reasonable, emotionally tempered, and socially legitimate forms of “conjugal affection.” Beneath the stylized conventions of what scholars have termed “amatory fiction,” *Love in Excess* undertakes a sophisticated exploration of the relationship between sexual

passion and moral psychology. Haywood figures excessive love, I argue, as simultaneously a form of ecstasy and sympathy. When Melliora's extraordinary beauty sends Count D'Elmont, her guardian and would-be seducer, into raptures of love, he experiences "a discomposure he had never felt before." For her part, Melliora quickly discovers that her guardian is "not an object to be safely gazed at," as his alluring "form" causes her to feel "a kind of painful pleasure." But in this moment of sexual crisis, *Love in Excess* deviates from the narrative trajectory of seduction fiction. The very intensity of D'Elmont's passion induces a heightened state of moral perception and responsiveness, whereby his ecstatic love for Melliora becomes the affective medium through which he will sympathize with both her fear of seduction and her anguished, barely concealed love for him. Meanwhile, the novel's representation of Melliora's equally rapturous passion for D'Elmont signals that the excesses of love ultimately will serve the ideal of conjugal mutuality. Indeed, as I demonstrate, Haywood's conflation of ecstasy and sympathy inaugurates a series of ideological convergences—between reason and sense, thought and feeling, desire and morality—that makes possible the novel's closing tableau of "conjugal affection."

#### **Chapter 4: "Pamela and the Domestication of Moral Sentiment"**

Often regarded as the novel that launched the genre of sentimental fiction in Britain, Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* (1740) is the eighteenth century's most influential depiction of how passion and seduction are transformed into love and marriage. When her master, Mr. B, attempts to seduce her, Pamela virtuously resists both his overt physical advances and his more cunning attempts to trick her into surrendering to his illicit desires. Captivated by Pamela's tireless defense of her chastity, and equally enthralled by the rhetorical power of her letters and journals, Mr. B eventually undergoes a moral conversion: his "culpable passion" becomes "love, true love," and he "rewards" Pamela's virtue by marrying and thus socially elevating her. As feminist critics in particular have argued, the novel offers its readers a potent—and problematic—fantasy of heterosexual love, in which seemingly forward-looking political tendencies (such as social mobility and class critique) are largely undercut by the reassertion of male power and the celebration of female submission. Although this reading of *Pamela* remains persuasive, this chapter examines an aspect of the novel's sexual ideology that has been almost entirely overlooked by critics. Specifically, I demonstrate that, as she resists his sexual advances, Pamela repeatedly translates her struggle with Mr. B into a series of alternative narrative scenarios, ones in which she imagines herself not as a young woman ensnared within a seduction plot, but rather as a man heroically embodying and defending the traditionally male virtues of austerity, courage, and fortitude. By identifying with Samson, King David, and Shakespeare's Hamlet, among other male figures, Pamela displaces chastity as the sign of her virtue. Consequently, her imaginative self-fashioning masculinizes her moral character and interrupts, for a time, the logic of heterosexual desire that governs the novel. But the dictates of conjugal love are soon enough imposed on Pamela's unruly character. As I argue, being disciplined as a normative heterosexual subject requires the remaking of Pamela's desires: specifically, she is compelled to relinquish the masculinizing power of a "noble mind," and in its place, embrace "the natural impulses of a generous and grateful heart," which Richardson represents as the moral feelings best suited for a dutiful wife. In other words, once the novel becomes a fiction of "true love," the transgressive expansiveness of Pamela's moral imagination must contract into the heteroerotics of the sentimental heart.

## Chapter 5: “*Tom Jones* and the Virtues of Sexuality”

Although his literary rivalry with Samuel Richardson has lead most critics to overlook Henry Fielding’s investment in sentimentalism, Fielding’s most important novel, *Tom Jones* (1749), energetically champions the sentimental ideals of “good nature” and “goodness of heart.” No critic, however, has failed to notice the novel’s numerous—and seemingly morally indulgent—representations of its hero’s various sexual escapades. In this chapter, I consider how Fielding redefines the nature of moral goodness by conflating the benevolent impulses of “good nature” with the equally powerful impulses of male sexual desire. Unlike Haywood and Richardson, Fielding largely relegates the threat of seduction to the peripheries of his novel. Sexual passion nevertheless remains a primary source of narrative interest and provocation, albeit with an important difference: the overabundance of Tom’s passion, rather than its aggressiveness, constitutes the problem around which much of the novel turns. Fielding’s sustained comic irony, I further suggest, renders Tom’s robust sexuality a useful “problem.” On the one hand, reflecting on Tom’s sexual indiscretions affords Fielding a playful occasion for exposing and ridiculing the practical shortcomings of traditional moral codes grounded in bodily discipline or abstract reasoning (the former, embodied by the violent clergyman, Thwackum; the latter, by the hypocritical philosopher, Square). On the other hand, Fielding stresses that Tom’s “natural” inclination for “gallantry” is indissociable from his “open, generous disposition.” And on a broader level, Tom’s character represents a flesh-and-blood manifestation of the moral sensibility that governs the novel as a whole. As early as the novel’s dedication, Fielding recommends the vigorous “pursuit” of the “beauty of virtue,” whose “naked charms” promise to inspire a guiltless, morally edifying love as well as to promote a reader’s “true”—as opposed to selfish—“interest.” Male heterosexual desire, in Fielding’s estimation, infuses morality with vitality; morality legitimates the occasional but necessary excesses of desire; and finally, through the concept of “good nature,” the novel celebrates the union of passion and generosity—a desire for womankind and a concern for humankind—in a sentimental heart such as Tom’s.

### Audience, Market, and Competition

Given its interdisciplinary and multi-genre approach, as well as its commitment to grounding theoretical argumentation in rigorous close reading and literary analysis, I believe that *Making Love* will appeal to a number of different audiences. I also believe that *Making Love* would fit well into Bucknell UP’s series, *Transits: Literature, Thought & Culture 1650-1850*.

The primary audience for my book is scholars whose own research focuses on eighteenth-century Britain, and more specifically, eighteenth-century specialists interested in the following subject areas: the history of the novel and novel studies; gender and sexuality; the culture of sentiment, sympathy, and sensibility; and literature and philosophy. In addition to its broader analyses of sentiment and sexuality, my book offers eighteenth-century scholars a number of literary-historical discoveries that will change the way they view individual authors and the relations between authors. For instance, I demonstrate that Eliza Haywood’s *Love in Excess* silently quotes and revises John Dryden’s translations of Lucretius and Alexander Pope’s translation of Ovid (specifically, Sappho’s epistle to Phaon). In my chapter on *Pamela*, I identify textual evidence suggesting that Richardson not only was familiar with Haywood’s work (he pointedly denied such familiarity), but that in *Pamela*, he appropriates key phrases and plot points from *Love in Excess*. Finally, my chapter on Fielding reveals the strong possibility that

the philosopher David Hume read *Tom Jones* and incorporated its erotic imagery into his *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751).

Beyond the eighteenth-century studies community, *Making Love* promises to attract readers who work in later historical fields. My investigation of how sexuality, feeling, and ethics are ideologically interwoven in the eighteenth century has clear implications for the fields of Romanticism and Victorian studies, where sex and gender have been on the critical agenda for decades and continue to be key reference points for new work in those fields. In addition to its contribution to British literary studies, I anticipate that *Making Love* will speak to many scholars working in the field of late-eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American literature. Critics such as Ann Douglas, Jane Tompkins, Lauren Berlant, Bruce Burgett, Christopher Looby, Julia Stern, and Elizabeth Barnes, among others, have investigated how conceptions of gender and sexuality have been shaped and enforced through the culture of sentimentalism that flourished (and continues to flourish) in the United States. However, given that their work typically offers only brief, often oversimplified considerations of the British antecedents to American sentimentalism, *Making Love* is likely to prove a valuable resource for future research on sex and sentiment in American literature and culture. Finally, *Making Love* will appeal to scholars working in the fields gender studies and queer theory, particularly because my analyses—strongly grounded in both literary history and philosophy—offer an alternative to the deconstructive, psychoanalytic, and performance-based methodologies that inform contemporary theories of gender and sexuality.

*Making Love*'s argument regarding the ideological convergence of sentiment, sexuality, and moral virtue, its methodological blending of philosophy and literature, and its particular grouping of authors and texts, set it apart from other books in the field of eighteenth-century studies. At the same time, I am actively in conversation with critics who have argued for the centrality of eighteenth-century British literature to the history of sexuality. Through exemplary close readings of late-eighteenth-century fiction written by women, Claudia L. Johnson's *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s—Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen* (U of Chicago P, 1995) offers a sophisticated consideration of how the heterosexist biases of sentimental culture undermine female moral agency and sexual self-determination. Johnson is my closest interlocutor. I develop Johnson's assertion that sentimentalism is instrumental to male heterosexual power by shifting our attention to the first half of the eighteenth century; it is in this historical moment, I argue, that the sentimental logic of heterosexuality-as-virtue definitively takes shape. In addition to Johnson's *Equivocal Beings*, my book is in direct dialogue with the following studies of sentiment, gender, and sexuality: Nancy Armstrong's *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (Oxford UP, 1987), John Mullan's *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford UP, 1988), Markman Ellis's *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender, and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel* (Cambridge UP, 1996), Shawn Lisa Maurer's *Proposing Men: Dialectics of Gender and Class in the Eighteenth-Century English Periodical* (Stanford UP, 1998), Julie Ellison's *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion* (U of Chicago P, 1999), Susan Matthews's *Blake, Sexuality, and Bourgeois Politeness* (Cambridge UP, 2011), and Toni Bowers and Tita Chico's co-edited volume, *Atlantic Worlds in the Long Eighteenth Century: Seduction and Sentiment* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

*Making Love* also enters into a more general conversation regarding eighteenth-century constructions of normative and non-normative sexuality. My consideration of the ideological fashioning of heterosexual conjugal desire complements George Haggerty's important book,



*Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century* (Columbia UP, 1999), which charts the increasing pathologization of male same-sex love across the long eighteenth century. Along with Haggerty's *Men in Love*, books such as Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (Columbia UP, 1985), Lisa Moore's *Dangerous Intimacies: Toward a Sapphic History of the British Novel* (Duke UP, 1997), Alan Bray's *The Friend* (U of Chicago P, 2003), and Thomas A. King's two-volume *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750* (U of Wisconsin P, 2004, 2008) have defined how scholars approach the questions of heterosexual and homosexual desire in eighteenth-century Britain. My book draws on these critics' insights, but at the same time, through my engagement with sentimental discourse and my exploration of the intersections between literature and moral philosophy, I aim to shift both the conceptual terms and the methodology that currently inform queer eighteenth-century studies.

As I mentioned above, I believe *Making Love* would make a strong addition to Bucknell UP's *Transits* series, and it also would complement the titles that have appeared in the earlier series, *Bucknell Studies in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture*. My book's discussions of sentimental feeling, gender, and sexuality resonate with several titles that recently have been published in the *Transits* series, including George Haggerty's *Horace Walpole's Letters: Masculinity and Friendship in the Eighteenth Century* (2011), Brett Wilson's *A Race of Female Patriots: Women and the Public Spirit on the British Stage, 1688-1745* (2011), Kathleen Luby's *Excitable Imaginations: Eroticism and Reading in Britain, 1660-1760* (2012), and Chris Mounsey's edited volume, *Developments in the Histories of Sexualities: In Search of the Normal, 1600-1800* (2013). I would welcome the opportunity to join the Bucknell authors who are transforming how we view the emotional and erotic landscape of eighteenth-century Britain.

### **Additional Information**

The manuscript of *Making Love* is approximately 80,000 words long, including notes and bibliography. Further, the manuscript does not include images or graphics.

I have published two articles that present earlier, shorter versions of chapters 2 and 5: respectively, in the journals *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* and *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* (please see my CV for publication details). However, I am mindful of Bucknell UP's guidelines regarding pre-publication, and the material that already has appeared in article form represents no more than 25% of the book manuscript.

### **Delivery Date**

The Introduction and Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 are ready for submission. My revisions of Chapter 1 will be complete by February 1, 2014.

### **Author Information**

Please see the attached *curriculum vitae*.

## **Selected Bibliography**

### ***Primary Texts***

Fielding, Henry. *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling*. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Intro. by Martin C. Battestin. The Wesleyan Edition of the Works of Henry Fielding. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan UP, 1975.

Haywood, Eliza. *Love in Excess; or, The Fatal Enquiry*. Edited by David Oakleaf. 2d Edition. Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press, 2000.

Hume, David. *Enquiries Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch, 3d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Hutcheson, Francis. *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*. Edited by Wolfgang Leidhold. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2004.

Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees*. Edited by F. B. Kaye. 2 volumes. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1988.

Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela*. Edited by Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Shaftesbury (Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of). *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. Edited by Lawrence E. Klein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edited by D.D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1984.

*The Spectator*. Edited by Donald F. Bond. 5 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

*The Tatler*. Edited by Donald F. Bond. 3 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

### ***Secondary Texts***

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Barker-Benfield, G. J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bowers, Toni, and Tita Chico, eds. *Atlantic Worlds in the Long Eighteenth Century: Seduction and Sentiment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bray, Alan. *The Friend*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

- Bredvold, Louis I. *The Natural History of Sensibility*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962.
- Brissenden, R. F. *Virtue in Distress: Studies in the Novel of Sentiment from Richardson to Sade*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1974.
- Cohen, Michèle. *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Crane, R. S. "Suggestions toward a Genealogy of the 'Man of Feeling.'" In *The Idea of the Humanities*, 188-213. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Ellis, Markman. *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender, and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Ellison, Julie. *Cato's Tears and the Making of Anglo-American Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. 1978; New York: Vintage, 1990.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure*. Trans. Robert Hurley. 1985; New York: Vintage, 1990.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 3: The Care of the Self*. Trans. Robert Hurley. 1986; New York: Vintage, 1988.
- Gill, Michael B. *The British Moralists on Human Nature and the Birth of Secular Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.
- Haggerty, George E. *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Halperin, David M. *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Hirschman, Albert O. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Johnson, Claudia L. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s—Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

King, Thomas A. *The Gendering of Men, 1600-1750*. 2 volumes. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004, 2008.

Klein, Lawrence. *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Markley, Robert. "Sentimentality as Performance: Shaftesbury, Sterne, and the Theatrics of Virtue." In *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature*, edited by Felicity Nussbaum and Laura Brown, 210-30. New York: Methuen, 1987.

Maurer, Shawn Lisa. *Proposing Men: Dialectics of Gender and Class in the Eighteenth-Century English Periodical*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

McKeon, Michael. "Historicizing Patriarchy: The Emergence of Gender Difference in England, 1660-1760." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28, no.3 (1995): 295-322.

Mounsey, Chris, ed. *Developments in the Histories of Sexualities: In Search of the Normal, 1600-1800*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2013.

Mullan, John. *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Sheriff, John K. *The Good-Natured Man: The Evolution of a Moral Ideal, 1660-1800*. University: University of Alabama Press, 1982.

Slote, Michael A. *Moral Sentimentalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. Abridged ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.

Todd, Janet. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen, 1986.

Warner, Michael. "Homo-Narcissism; or, Heterosexuality." In *Engendering Men: The Question of Male Feminist Criticism*, edited by Joseph A. Boone and Michael Cadden, 190-206. New York: Routledge, 1990.

----. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books, 2002.