13414

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR... Elsie...B...Holmes.....

TITLE OF THESIS... The...Control...of.....
...Narrative...Distance.....
....in.....Tom...Jones.....

UNIVERSITY..University....of...Alberta.....

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED....Ph.D.....

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED.....1972.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed)..Elsie...Holmes

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

..11048-82..Ave..
..Edmonton..61..
.....Alberta.....

DATED..August..16..1972

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE CONTROL OF NARRATIVE DISTANCE IN TOM JONES

BY

ELSIE B. HOLMES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Control of Narrative Distance in Tom Jones," submitted by Elsie B. Holmes in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

.....
External Examiner

Date Aug. 15, 1972.

Abstract

Henry Fielding commented, in one of his essays about authors, that "To invent good stories, and to tell them well, are possibly very rare talents" (Tom Jones, IX, i). Rare talents they may be, but Fielding himself possessed both. His Tom Jones has been considered a masterpiece by astute critics of the past two hundred years. Yet while it is praised for its plot, humour, style, delightful characters, and engaging portrayal of eighteenth-century English life, all too often the finer points of Fielding's narrative technique have been overlooked.

One of the most fundamental concepts in the modern technical analysis of fiction is that of narrative "distance," for it relates to the reader's relationship with the author, the narrator, and the characters. Wayne Booth, more than any other literary critic, has explored the meaning of narrative distance and demonstrated its significance in the criticism of the novel. He stresses, in The Rhetoric of Fiction, that there is no one ideal distance to be sought, but that "Every literary work of any power . . . is in fact an elaborate system of controls over the reader's involvement and detachment along various lines of interest."

In this study, I demonstrate that Tom Jones is, in its technique, a work of considerable sophistication because it is such "an elaborate system of controls" over the reader's responses. The thesis is an analysis of Fielding's use of numerous distancing devices, a consideration of the manner in which the novel becomes increasingly representational, and a demonstration of the various

means by which Fielding controls the distance between the reader and Tom.

The way the reader responds to Tom is of particular significance because Fielding keeps him at considerable distance throughout much of the novel. That the reader responds to Tom emotionally only rarely until the last three books of the novel is a result not only of the way Fielding uses distancing techniques in depicting him, but of the way the reader's relationship with Molly Seagrim, Mrs. Waters, Lady Bellaston and Sophia Western affects his response to Tom. The reason the characterization of these women is so important is that the reader's censure of Tom comes as a result of his affairs with the first three, and the effect, in each case, upon Sophia. In the thesis, therefore, chapters analyzing Fielding's portrayal of the four women relate closely to two chapters dealing with the characterization of Tom.

Distancing techniques considered are contrast, conflict, authorial intrusions of many kinds, dialogue as opposed to narration, mock heroic and stylized language, irony, thematic emphases, and the ordering of the episodes. Through these elements in the narrative, as well as through the overall alternation or fusing of scene and summary (or "showing" and "telling"), Fielding manipulates the reader's intellectual and emotional responses to his hero, and to Tom Jones as a whole.

Acknowledgements

I should like to thank Professor R. G. Baldwin, who suggested the topic for this thesis, for his valuable criticisms and suggestions. I appreciate also his guidance throughout the course of my doctoral program. Professors Juliet McMaster and A. T. Elder also read a draft of the thesis, and I am grateful for their helpful comments.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

Henry Fielding's Tom Jones has been praised for its unified plot, its engaging picture of eighteenth-century English life, its comedy and its appealing style. Yet even critics who regard it as a magnificent novel are apt to consider it technically inferior to later novels and too unsophisticated for close textual analysis. Gregor and Nicholas, in commenting on the generally accepted assumption that while poetry and drama change, the novel develops, state that such an attitude leads to the feeling that we are, when looking back at the eighteenth-century novels, "in the presence of primitives."[1] This viewpoint is obvious in the words of Louis Kronenburger when he says:

> The book is, indeed, so masculine, so solid, so engaging that, delighted as one is to talk it over with a friend, one shies off a little from assessing it as a critic. In a certain sense, one would as soon "assess" a good dinner. There are no dark things to be cleared up in Tom Jones, and no deep things to fathom; Fielding's masterpiece must be accounted among the great simple novels. One never stops reading the story to reflect on what it means; one never has half the impulse to look back that one has to move forward.[2]

In The Rise of the Novel, Ian Watt, too, while admitting that Tom Jones is a great book, claims "it is a very personal and unrepeatable kind of success: Fielding's technique was too eclectic to become a permanent element in the tradition of the novel--Tom Jones is only part novel, and there is much else--picaresque tale, comic drama, and occasional essay."[3] And then there is F. R. Leavis, who dismisses Fielding completely in a few sentences, though one

may find consolation in the fact that he excludes from his "great tradition" more novelists than he includes. To him, Fielding's works are weak technically because of their thin content: "There can't be subtlety of organization without richer matter to organize, and subtler interests, than Fielding has to offer."[4]

Maurice Johnson's assessment of Fielding, however, which is similar to that of many recent critics, is that his technical skill is far from primitive:

> Perhaps the conventional idea of Fielding as a surface artist who was superb in "plot" but ostentatiously refused to probe into motives, can be somewhat minimized when it is seen to what extent he attempted . . . to bring the inner life of his characters to view. Tom Jones can be read rewardingly with an eye precisely on techniques of narration usually associated with novelists who learned their art after the middle of the nineteenth century. . . . In 1749 he had pushed a considerable distance toward realization of Thomas Hardy's "visible essences" and Henry James's "representational values," "aspects," and "visibilities," through which theme, characters, and plot are subtly rendered.[5]

The sophistication of Fielding's narrative technique is sensed by the perceptive reader of Tom Jones, though he may not understand fully the qualities giving power to the novel. He may realize, moreover, that his responses are being controlled, yet be unaware of the means by which Fielding does this. Both the nature of Fielding's technique in Tom Jones and the nature of the reader's response may be demonstrated, however, through a study of narrative "distance" in the novel.

Though it has not been much discussed until recent years, narrative distance is one of the most basic concepts in the technical analysis of fiction. While it relates necessarily to all elements in

a narrative, distance refers especially to the particular kind of focus upon events, whether direct or indirect, and the type of identification a reader has with the author, the narrator, and the characters in the story as a result. The narrative focus, for example, is direct when the reader is involved with--watching, as it were--the characters and events. And the focus is indirect when he is listening to the narrator tell him about the characters and the events. The extent to which the reader identifies, at various places in the story, with the narrator or the characters depends upon the narrative method being used at a given time. Thus by a careful use of various narrative techniques and devices an author will control the reader's distance from, and reactions to, himself, the narrator, and the characters.

Wayne Booth, more than any other literary critic, has explored carefully the meaning of narrative distance, demonstrating, in The Rhetoric of Fiction, the significance of this concept for the criticism of the novel. He demonstrates very clearly that while there is no one ideal distance (a fact which complicates the concept),[6] "Every literary work of any power--whether or not its author composed it with his audience in mind--is in fact an elaborate system of controls over the reader's involvement and detachment along various lines of interest."[7] The reader, Booth claims, experiences various degrees of involvement and various degrees of detachment as a result of the techniques an author uses to control reader response. Booth's explanation of what he terms "lines of interest" is complex but instructive:

> The values which interest us, and which are thus available for technical manipulation in fiction, may be roughly divided into three kinds. (1) Intellectual or cognitive: We have, or can be made to have, strong intellectual curiosity about "the facts," the true interpretation, the true reasons, the true origins, the true motives, or the truth about life itself. (2) Qualitative: We have, or can be made to have, a strong desire to see any pattern or form completed, or to experience a further development of qualities of any kind. We might call this kind "aesthetic" if to do so did not suggest that a literary form using this interest was necessarily of more artistic value than one based on other interests. (3) Practical: We have, or can be made to have, a strong desire for the success or failure of those we love or hate, admire or detest; or we can be made to hope for or fear a change in the quality of a character. We might call this kind "human," if to do so did not imply that 1 and 2 were somehow less than human. This hope or fear may be for an intellectual change in a character or for a change in his fortune; one finds this practical aspect even in the most uncompromising novel of ideas that might seem to fall entirely under 1. Our desire may, second, be for a change of quality in a character; one finds this practical aspect even in the purely "aesthetic" novel of sensibility that might seem to fall entirely under 2. Finally, our desire may be for a moral change in a character, or for a change in his fortune--that is, we can be made to hope for or to fear particular moral choices and their results.[8]

According to this explanation of reader response, a reader's "intellectual interests" turn on his desire to find out "the facts of the case," or to discover the truth about the world of the book. Closely related is the "qualitative interest," a desire evoked within the reader to see certain qualities of the novel completed, or worked out satisfactorily, by the end of the story. The "cause-effect" element within a novel is one of these--a reader feels that certain causes should produce certain results, as in actual life. And while this reaction is sometimes very close to a reader's "practical" response, he must distinguish, Booth claims, between an interest in a character as a personal friend, and an interest in seeing the

appropriate effects from his actions:

> The hero commits a crime--and we are torn between our appetite for the proper effect, discovery or punishment, and our practical desire for his happiness.[9]

Other "qualitative interests" are termed by Booth "Conventional expectations," "Abstract forms," and "Promised qualities." By the first, he means expectations fostered by consistency of technique throughout a literary work: "when I begin what I think is a novel, I expect to read a novel throughout."[10] By "abstract forms" he means that the use of "Balance, symmetry, climax, repetition, contrast, comparison" form part of a reader's response to a novel; and by "promised" qualities he refers to distinctive techniques evident early in a literary work which the reader will continue to look for throughout. Then finally, by "Practical interests" Booth means the reader's response to the characters as people--a concern for their happiness and success, which is an emotional involvement with them:

> . . . what I am calling practical interests, and particularly moral qualities as inferred from characteristic choices or as stated directly by the author, have always been an important basis for literary form. Our interest in the fate of Oedipus and Lear, of David Copperfield and Richard Feverel, of Stephen Dedalus and Quentin Compson, springs in part from our conviction that they are people who matter, people whose fate concerns us not simply because of its meaning or quality, but because we care about them as human beings.[11]

Booth stresses that in every great literary work many such "interests" are in operation. For example, a reader's "emotional concern in Shakespeare is firmly based on intellectual, qualitative, and moral interests."[12] And any skillful author, whether or not he is aware of it, evokes varied responses, with the result that the reader's

distance from the characters, or his involvement with the characters, is manipulated continually in a manner that leads him to an appreciation and understanding of the author's accomplishment:

> In any reading experience there is an implied dialogue among author, narrator, the other characters, and the reader. Each of the four can range, in relation to each of the others, from identification to complete opposition, on any axis of value, moral, intellectual, aesthetic and even physical.[13]

This account of Booth's "implied dialogue" continually going on during any reading experience, of the "lines of interest" controlling the reader's responses, and of the author's means of controlling narrative distance, has been given in some detail in order to establish the theoretical basis of this present study. For I shall demonstrate, through an analysis of Fielding's distancing devices, that Tom Jones is "an elaborate system of controls over the reader's involvement and detachment along various lines of interest,"[14] and as such is, in its technique, a work of considerable artistic power. The thesis will be an analysis of Fielding's use of numerous distancing devices, a demonstration of the various means by which Fielding controls the distance between the reader and Tom, and a consideration of the manner in which the novel becomes increasingly scenic, and realistic. As the scenic depictions increase in number and in length, the reader's emotional interests are aroused more frequently and his identification with the characters increases. Thus as the distance between reader and characters decreases, the reader senses an increasing realism in the narrative.

For this study of Tom Jones, the "lines of interest" will be defined somewhat less finely than in Booth's The Rhetoric of Fiction. While his three categories, with their sub-divisions, provide an impressive theoretical explanation of distance, the distinctions made are too fine to be used effectively in practical criticism. Thus I shall term the varied responses of the reader either "intellectual" (by which I mean both the intellectual and qualitative interests of Booth) or "emotional" (by which I mean the practical interests described by Booth). The first category includes all of those responses to the novel which lead the reader to respond to the narrator more than to the characters, though it implies a relatively impersonal interest in them: the reader of Tom Jones, for example, is curious about Tom's parentage, or his future, even before he is allowed to respond emotionally to Tom. Moreover, the reader desires to see Tom, and other good people in the novel, rewarded and the villains punished. This concern, termed by Booth a "cause-effect" response, may lead to a conflict within the reader. Intellectually, one knows Tom must learn discretion and deserves, occasionally, some punishment for his misdeeds. Yet at the same time the reader wishes him happiness and success. If the reader were allowed to respond to Tom emotionally too early in the novel, or too fully, he might not judge him at all, which would be as inadequate a response as judging him too harshly. Thus the narrator, by arousing the reader's intellectual interests, keeps him sufficiently detached from Tom.

The form and narrative technique of the novel also affect the reader's intellectual response. As he recognizes, early in the novel, distinctive stylistic patterns, he may come to "expect," rightly, that the balance of the work will be consistent with the beginning. Any sudden and pronounced shift in style, structure, or technique, could conceivably produce a distance so great as to shatter the image, so that the reader would lose interest in the story and the characters, reading on only to see how the author would continue. Fortunately, Fielding maintains, to a considerable extent, the same form, style and technique, varying his use of narrative mode and distancing devices only to enhance his overall effect. The gradual increase in his use of scene (and hence in realism), for example, is a part of Fielding's control of distance, and is not so startling that the reader's relationship with the narrator or the characters is injured.

The reader's emotional interests, though aroused most frequently and most powerfully in the London books, are appealed to at various times throughout the novel, as later chapters will indicate. So much has been written about Fielding's external approach to character that it is common for critics to consider his characters as types to whom the reader cannot respond in any intimate manner. Yet one surely does develop a genuine interest in, and concern for, Sophia and Tom especially. Sophia (after her stylized introduction) is depicted realistically throughout most of the novel and this means that the reader's response to her is more emotional than to any

other character. Tom, on the other hand, is kept at considerable distance in the first six books, brought closer during the middle books, and closer still during the London episodes. One's emotional response to him increases gradually, though the various "intellectual" interests that form part of his characterization do not cease. How Fielding keeps these responses to Tom in balance (according to the overall effect desired at the time) will be considered in subsequent chapters. But that there is an emotional dimension to the reader's responses to the characters of Tom Jones, and especially to Tom and Sophia, is evident. While we may not come to know them as we know Clarissa, or Emma, or Uncle Toby, we are made to care about Sophia and Tom, and enjoy them. Fielding manipulates the reader into just enough involvement to keep the story from seeming empty and meaningless, though not enough to result in a sentimental or over-serious response.

Since there is no one kind of narrative technique that is inherently superior to all other kinds, Fielding's control of the reader's responses to Tom Jones need not be considered through a contrast with the types of control used by other authors; nor need reader involvement with a character in Tom Jones be assessed by a comparison with his response to characters in other novels. Rather this novel should be analyzed by an examination of its own unique technique. One must note its effects, then consider how these were achieved. One of the major reasons Wayne Booth's study of narrative distance is so valuable as a basis for analyzing Tom Jones is

that he assesses a literary work according to its effects, and not according to any standard which he considers ideal. He does not posit one particular type of novel as being superior, nor one technique as being essential because, to repeat, he stresses that there is no one ideal distance to be sought: "Let each work do what it 'wants' to do; let its author discover its inherent powers and gauge his techniques to the realization of those powers."[15] To be critically restrictive in this respect is, inevitably, to omit certain great works of art.

Basically, Booth deals with the author's manipulation of the reader in relation to the narrator, the work as a whole, and the characters. And all of these relationships depend upon the narrator's use of what Booth terms "showing" and "telling." Does the narrator present characters, and events, dramatically? Or does he merely describe a character and report what has happened? In other words, is the reader listening to the narrator, or watching the characters? Percy Lubbock, in The Craft of Fiction, makes the same distinction in narrative method by using the terms "scene" and "summary," or "drama" and "panorama" (or "picture"). Hence his study too is basic to this analysis of Fielding's technique in Tom Jones.

Lubbock's book is a consideration of the narrative modes used in a number of great novels chosen because of the effects they have had:

> Let us very carefully follow the methods of the novelists whose effects are incontestable, noticing exactly the manner in which the scenes and figures in their books are presented. The scenes and figures, as I have said, we shape, we detach, without the smallest

> difficulty; and if we pause over them for long enough to see by what arts and devices, on the author's part, we have been enabled to shape them so strikingly--to see precisely how this episode has been given relief, that character made intelligible and vivid--we at once begin to stumble on many discoveries about the making of a novel.[16]

While he does not use the term narrative distance, Lubbock insists that the "world of the novel" must be viewed by a critic "in detachment" in order that its various elements may be seen objectively. At the same time he admits frankly the difficulties--and even, in a sense, the impossibility--of really contemplating the form of a novel: "It is revealed little by little, page by page, and it is withdrawn as fast as it is revealed."[17] Lubbock's approach is central to the present consideration of Tom Jones because my analysis of it is, broadly speaking, in terms of the balance of scene and summary. In the course of a novel, the use of scene brings the reader close to the events and the characters, whereas the use of summary keeps him listening to the narrator. In any effective novel--and this includes Tom Jones--there is continual alternation between the two modes and, indeed, a fusing of the two, through which the reader is manipulated into an appropriate response to the work as a whole.

There are problems, as Lubbock admits, in defining the words dramatic, pictorial, or panoramic, and even scene and summary. His own use of the words in varied ways does not lessen the confusion. For example, he uses the word "drama" with the gay abandon of a chameleon. In his chapter on War and Peace, Lubbock uses the term to refer to the plot, the entire story, the contrast noted by the

title, the conflict reported in the book; and, to add to the problem, he speaks of "the general drama of life" and "a drama of young affections."[18] In his chapter on Madame Bovary, he is more precise, distinguishing between drama and picture according to whether the reader is concerned with the actions or with the "form and colour they assume in somebody's thought."[19] However, he still speaks of opposition, or conflict, as drama. When he writes of Thackeray's Vanity Fair, he says that it is primarily panoramic, with occasional dramatic scenes, and also brief "flashes of revelation . . . and they are all the drama, strictly speaking, that he extorts from his material."[20] In contrasting Thackeray and Maupassant, Lubbock says that in the works of the latter "we are close to the facts, against them and amongst them," with "the author's machinery unnoticed," and this is why he is more dramatic than Thackeray.[21] Finally, when he comes to his discussion of Henry James, who is, he says, able to "dramatize the seeing eye," Lubbock's definition appears to narrow so that it refers primarily to the Jamesian central consciousness point of view which, more than any other method, he claims, gives "intensity of life."[22] Implied here, therefore, is the idea that to achieve intensity is to be dramatic—and one can see, then, that his earlier uses of the word drama are, in fact, apt, and that it is for him extremely difficult to be precise. After treating James as the ultimate in dramatic representation, Lubbock uses the term in its broader sense once again as he indicates the need for a balance in drama and picture, or "the laying of method upon method" as the two are fused.

While a narrower, more precise definition of "drama" and "dramatic" would be useful for an analysis of fiction, it is possible, and perhaps essential, to use the term as Lubbock does, agreeing with him "that a 'scenic' and a 'panoramic' presentation of a story expresses an intelligible antithesis, strictly and technically."[23] A scene, it must be remembered, consists not necessarily of dialogue, but is the depiction either in narration or dialogue or both of an episode "at a certain selected hour in the lives of these people whose fortunes are to be followed." The reader is placed directly before the action: "The motion of life is before us, the recording, registering mind of the author is eliminated. That is drama."[24] Because the reader, in such a scenic passage, views the characters so closely, the realistic impact of the incident is increased. The presentation is panoramic when the reader surveys "from a height, participating in the privilege of the novelist--sweeping their history with a wide range of vision and absorbing a general effect,"[25] and when he is listening to the narrator instead of watching the "motion of life." In such passages, the incident often seems less realistic, or convincing, because of the distance maintained between the reader and the characters involved. Yet as Lubbock points out, there is a sense in which everything in a novel, and not just the scenic episodes, is dramatized.[26]

While most novelists seem to incline toward one method or the other--either the panoramic or the dramatic (and Lubbock says

Fielding inclines toward the first)--a skillful writer will, according to him, always use both narrative modes in order to achieve the appropriate level of intensity:

> . . . the quality of a novelist appears very clearly in his management of the two, how he guides the story into the scene, how he picks it out of the scene, a richer and fuller story than it was before, and proceeds with his narrative.[27]

This "management of the two" is what controls, to a great extent, the reader's level of involvement. A panoramic approach, with much summary, increases the reader's distance from the characters, while the dramatic method, with many scenes, decreases distance. In the first, the narrator's presence is prominent, and the reader is close to him, while in the second the opposite is true. But neither mode is effective alone. Speaking of the endless possibilities of fusion and combination of the novelist's modes, Lubbock says:

> . . . we see them alternated, united, imposed one on another, this point of view blended with that, dramatic action treated pictorially, pictorial description rendered dramatically--and these words I use throughout . . . in the special sense that I have indicated.[28]

While an author may heighten a "flat, pictorial, descriptive surface by the arts of drama" he can spoil his effect by overdoing it. Lubbock warns that "peppering the surface with animated dialogue . . . making the characters break into talk when they really have nothing to contribute" weakens the overall effect:

> The dramatic rule is applied more fundamentally; it animates the actual elements of the picture, the description, and makes a drama of these.[29]

In Wayne Booth's consideration of the showing and telling narrative modes, he states that any contrast between the two is really of little use until the type of narrator used is specified; that is, whether he is dramatized or not, and whether he is an observer, an agent in the story, or a third person reflector, because each type uses commentary of a different sort, and summary of a different kind. Tom Jones, which has a dramatized intrusive narrator who is an observer, uses what Norman Friedman calls the "editorial omniscience" point of view, where the tendency is away from scene, for "it is the author's voice which dominates the material, speaking frequently as 'I' or 'we'."[30] This particular type of narrator is the kind most criticized by Lubbock and other Jamesian critics, who consider the central consciousness point of view to be the ideal in dramatic rendering. This restrictive approach is the major weakness in Lubbock's book. While he chooses novels for analysis on the basis of the effects they have had, and while his criticism of each is sound, he cannot resist the temptation of suggesting that most of them would be greater works of art if the authors had used methods closer to that of Henry James. For example, War and Peace is really two novels; Anna Karenina would be better if the method arose out of the subject; Balzac's technique is too mechanical; and Thackeray's intrusions get a little tiresome. Obviously, Lubbock considers that the supreme achievement in dramatization is "the type of the novel in which a mind is dramatized,"[31]

which is, of course, a work in which the central consciousness point of view is used.

A number of recent critics, however, in addition to Wayne Booth, argue that the use of "editorial omniscience" is not necessarily an outdated and ineffective narrative technique. Geoffrey Tillotson, for example, in writing about "Authorial Presence," and the belief that to include the "teller in his tale" is to use an outmoded narrative form, says that

> It was a mistake . . . to assume that the discovery of this new form invalidated the old. Far from it. Indeed the old form may well come to be used again, perhaps to become the dominant form. For it had many convenient pockets, as it were, which make the new form rather resemble those so-called "utility" garments we knew in the war--garments devoid of all "extras," even in the way of pockets.[32]

Similarly, Francis Gillen demonstrates, through a careful analysis of The Awkward Age, which is often termed Henry James' most dramatic novel, that it is virtually impossible to have a good novel without some authorial comment:

> In all, I have counted in the novel thirty direct comments, excluding the subjunctive semicomments and those which were linked to a piece of stage action. Sometimes the comment gives the reader an important fact he would not be likely to gather from the dialogue itself. . . . These comments help of course to control the reader's attitude. Other comments convey an habitual attitude or characteristic, and thus guide the reader toward a proper evaluation of dialogue.[33]

While admitting that this novel does "obviously tend toward drama," Gillen stresses that the term "dramatic" has too frequently been taken to mean the disappearance of the author to the extent that the reader must make his own decisions about the characters and events of the book. Such an understanding of the term is, of course, not

accurate, and, as Gillen aptly notes, James was "ultimately a greater novelist than he was a theorist."[34] One might note here, as well, that James himself was less extreme than many of his followers in both his theory and his practice of dramatic representation. That he did not consider a novel with an intrusive narrator to be necessarily inferior is evident by his praise of Tom Jones:

> He [Tom Jones] has so much "life" that it amounts, for the effect of comedy and the application of satire, almost to his having a mind, that is to his having reactions and a full consciousness; besides which his author--he handsomely possessed of a mind--has such an amplitude of reflexion for him and round him that we see him through the mellow air of Fielding's fine old moralism, fine old humour and fine old style, which somehow really enlarge, make every one and every thing important.[35]

The dramatic point of view and editorial omniscience are not as mutually exclusive as some theorists would have us believe. There can be considerable distance, yet dramatic intensity. And an analysis of Fielding's accomplishment in Tom Jones will show that despite the use of an intrusive narrator, and despite the general choice of the panoramic method, the novel is, nonetheless, dramatic in several different respects. The term "dramatic" will be used here, as in Lubbock, in a broad sense to define the many ways in which Fielding achieves intensity in Tom Jones—not only by the use of dialogue or scene, but through contrasts and conflicts, the nature of the plot, and even through the relationship of the intrusive narrator to the work and to the reader. Fielding's "elaborate system of controls" causes a continual fluctuation in the reader's involve-

ment in the story and with the narrator, which in itself gives power to the novel.

Not all critics have distinguished carefully between Fielding and his narrator, and even those who have done so sometimes (understandably) become confused. For at times the narrator is, in fact, the historical Fielding--as, for example, when he speaks of his first wife, Charlotte, or recommends a certain inn to be found on the road to London. Whatever his guise, the speaker in Tom Jones is vitally important to the overall effect of the novel. Martin Price terms him "sophisticated";[36] A. D. McKillop speaks of his "steadying influence and broad views";[37] R. S. Crane calls him "a man we can trust";[38] and Daniel J. Schneider says:

> Not only does he inspire confidence concerning the fortunes of his sympathetic characters; he exhibits throughout, in his own person, an energy, a zest, an effervescence, a fertility of sympathy and wit, and an exuberant pride in his creation that everywhere deepen our pleasure in the life-affirming qualities of his novel. He is detached, to be sure, but he is also genial, expansive, relaxed, warm.[39]

Considering the qualities ascribed to the narrator by all who consider his role seriously, it is easy to agree with Glenn Hatfield that he is a projection, "part caricature and part idealization, of Fielding's own authorial mind,"[40] with Wayne Booth, who terms him "Fielding's dramatic version of himself,"[41] and with Robert Alter, who says he is Fielding's "most fully realized character."[42]

This genial narrator in Tom Jones speaks repeatedly to the reader, and it is necessary in considering the narrator-reader relationship to

realize that the reader to whom he speaks is also a creation, distinct from the individual holding the printed, bound volume. Sherbo calls him the "inside" reader, as opposed to the "outside" reader, and these terms are good ones. The inside, or created reader is, says Henry Miller, "the catholic representative of his age";[43] and, according to Walter Stuart, "simply the good-natured one . . . an agreeable counter, one of the chorus of assent in the Socratic dialogue."[44] Sherbo lists a number of characteristics of the "composite reader," supported by numerous references to the text, though he admits that "Obviously, there are other readers addressed."[45]

While the narrator is implicating his inside reader, he is at the same time implicating the outside reader who gradually identifies with his counterpart within the novel; we read, "as it were, over the shoulders of the assumed readers."[46] Both readers are referred to, one would suspect, in the introductory chapter to Book VII, where the narrator's emphasis is on the dramatic nature of his relationship with his readers:

> There are many other reasons which have induced us to see this analogy between the world and the stage.
>
> Some have considered the larger part of mankind in the light of actors, as personating characters no more their own, and to which in fact they have no better title, than the player hath to be in earnest thought the king or emperor whom he represents. . . .
>
> In all these, however, and in every other similitude of life to the theatre, the resemblance hath been always taken from the stage only. None, as I remember, have at all considered the audience at this great drama.
>
> But as Nature often exhibits some of her best performances to a very full house, so will the behaviour of her spectators no less admit the above-mentioned comparison than that of her actors.[47]

There is an analogy as well between the listeners to the various interpolated tales in Fielding's novels and the actual readers of his novels, who are, in effect, listening to the narrator.[48] In the Man of the Hill digression, for example, we are very much aware of Tom and Partridge as listeners, and this "enables us to be more than listeners ourselves," as well as providing, through this perspective, an important "illusion of objectivity."[49]

The relationship between the narrator and his created readers, and between the narrator and his actual readers is a developing one in which the narrator leads both through a process of judgment to an agreement with his own opinions and norms:

> The way the narrator leads the reader through the world of Tom Jones is an essential element of the meaning of the novel. He is typically interested in the reader's reaction to the events of the plot and how the characters act. He explains and he questions. He qualifies and he allows the reader to interpret as he pleases. The narrator attempts to give the reader both the immediacy of occurrence and the privilege of meditation. He early brings the reader into the story, or at least into the world of the novel, by involving his judgment in the process of events.[50]

John Preston seems to consider the many references to the reader to refer primarily to us "outside" readers, stressing that Fielding is, through this means, trying "to school the reader, to induce him to attend closely and judge well," because Tom Jones is primarily a book "about judgment."[51] What all of these critics recognize is that the narrator serves as a guide, a teacher, a companion and a friend who, through a vast array of technical devices, leads the reader to a true judgment and a satisfying involvement in the story. And the power of the narrator over the reader is summed up neatly

by George Sherburn when he comments that Fielding "frequently plays his reader as a fisherman might a trout."[52]

Though an intrusive narrator is associated most often with the panoramic narrative mode, this unique narrator-reader relationship in Tom Jones may be considered dramatic in the sense of its continually changing nature and the way it is a part of, and yet distinct from, the world of the novel. Throughout the whole of Tom Jones, the reader is involved in both the world of the novel and the actual world, though one relationship or the other is always dominant. Because it is the narrator who controls his involvement in each, however, the narrator may be said to play a major role in the dramatic power of the novel. Lubbock speaks of "making a drama of the narrator himself,"[53] but is referring only to a first-person narrator within the novel. Considering the very broad sense in which he uses the term dramatic, it is surprising that he never speaks of the dramatic nature or function of the narrator-observer. Lubbock claims that the content of Henry Esmond is just as undramatic as that of Vanity Fair, but the difference is that in Henry Esmond the narrator is among the characters.[54] This technique, of course, leads to a different kind of reader involvement than when the narrator is an observer, though Lubbock's assumption that it is a more satisfying involvement is certainly open to question. In novels with an intrusive narrator-observer, such as Vanity Fair, or Tom Jones, the reader is involved in two dramatic relationships, one with the narrator (which

is never dull) and the other, usually less personal but equally fascinating, with the characters in the novel. These two dramatic relationships are controlled by Fielding through his use of a variety of technical devices. It is useful--indeed, necessary--to examine these individually in order to assess the effect of each upon the narrative, and upon the reader's responses. Hence I shall, in this introductory chapter, discuss these distancing devices, using illustrations of each from Tom Jones, so that Fielding's overall narrative method will be demonstrated prior to the more specific analysis which concerns his control of the reader's response to Tom.

There are problems that arise when considering distancing devices in a schematic manner. The format both in this chapter and in those to follow may suggest, for example, that the techniques discussed are the only means Fielding uses in his control of narrative distance. But such is not the case. Further, the discussion of various devices individually, or in categories, may suggest that a given technique always has the same effect--that is, that an authorial intrusion always detaches the reader from the scene, or the character, or that dialogue inevitably increases the dramatic power of a passage. That the techniques to be discussed usually have a certain effect will be evident in the analyses to follow, but that there are exceptions will be noted as well. These problems notwithstanding, there is validity for a highly structured study of Fielding's control of distance because only by examining, separately, these many and varied devices evident in Tom Jones does the reader understand his own response to the novel.

In brief, the techniques to be noted throughout the thesis, and introduced in this chapter, are as follows: Fielding's use of contrast in his presentation of characters; his manner of showing the conflict that develops frequently between the paired characters; his use of techniques that may be categorized as "scene-summary" devices because they relate closely to the use of the two narrative modes; his use of comic devices--particularly mock heroic or stylized language and irony; his ordering of episodes, and, finally, the various thematic emphases of the novel.

What Fielding terms the "vein of contrast" is evident particularly in the first section of Tom Jones (Books I - VI) when characters are being introduced. Because the pairing of characters, which results in either an explicit or implicit contrast, tends to produce "type" characters, reader response at these points in the novel (and generally when contrast is used) is more intellectual--to the story as a whole, and to the characters en masse--than emotional. The most prominent paired characters are the two Squires, Tom and Blifil, Thwackum and Square, the Blifil brothers, and Bridget Allworthy and Mrs. Western. And in most cases, a conflict of some kind develops between the matched characters. Generally, conflict decreases the distance between the characters and the reader, because he responds with some level of emotion to both the victim and the antagonist.

There are various techniques affecting distance which relate closely to the division of the narrative into the two basic modes--

scene and summary. These are the author's use of dialogue (direct or indirect) as opposed to narration, and the many kinds of authorial intrusions. The use of dialogue indicates a scenic depiction, though some scenes are completely lacking in dialogue. And the presence of authorial intrusions generally indicates the summary mode, though they may at times enhance the dramatic power of a scene. Writing of these two narrative modes as they are used in Tom Jones, Leo Braudy says that in the fourth chapter of Book I the reader is first invited "to become aware of the mixture of description and presentation in the narrator's own method" through the description of the area around Mr. Allworthy's home which leads up to the scene at breakfast between him and his sister: "The narrator expects the reader to appreciate equally well the high hill of his own rhetoric as well as the exaggerated rhetoric of the characters."[55] V. S. Pritchett, as well, comments on the skillful way in which Fielding uses summary to explain characters or prepare for a scene, reserving the intensity and realistic devices for the main action.[56]

As the story progresses, Fielding's method in Tom Jones appears to change somewhat. Scenic passages increase, dialogue occurs more frequently, and the reader's involvement with the characters increases. This trend, which will be discussed more fully in subsequent chapters, has been noted by a few critics. R. Halsband, for example, writing of the complexity of the technique of Tom Jones, notes that the story of Tom's growth to manhood is told primarily by narrative, whereas the story of the "fateful six weeks" in London is told "by dramatic

means."[57] While Halsband implies that this change is deliberate, and stylistically effective, Dudden, noting the same thing, says:

> . . . the ending of the story is unfortunately hurried and huddled. In striking contrast with the perfect clarity with which the various incidents are distinguished and timed throughout the greater part of the book, the momentous events of some of the final days are massed together so confusedly that it is impossible to understand exactly how and when they severally occurred. Fielding himself appears to have been conscious that the narrative in his concluding chapters is excessively compressed. He speaks of the 'variety of matter' which he is obliged to 'cram' into his eighteenth book; and adds, addressing the reader, 'when thou hast perused the many great events which this Book will produce, thou wilt think the number of pages contained in it scarce sufficient to tell the story.'[58]

Fielding's comment, surely, may just as likely mean that he was fully aware of the need for greater intensity and realism in his final book. Moreover, what neither Dudden nor Halsband notes is that the scenic narrative method does not appear suddenly in the last part of the novel, but is used, though to a lesser extent, at various points in the book. According to Lubbock, this is the normal method of the good novelist:

> Inevitably, as the plot thickens and the climax approaches--inevitably, wherever an impression is to be emphasized and driven home--narration gives place to enactment, the train of events to the particular episode, the broad picture to the dramatic scene.[59]

Whatever Fielding's reason, his choice of method for the latter part of Tom Jones was a happy one because of the way the scenic method contributes to a more emotional reader response.

This increasingly representational mode is not a shift in technique that startles the reader, for Fielding has prepared us by using scenes throughout the entire book whenever greater realism and an increased level of reader involvement are required. In fact, it is

the skillful manner in which Fielding moves from summary to scene at crucial moments that not only controls reader response but gives dramatic power to the story. For example, early in the novel (I,iii) the narrator summarizes various facts about Mr. Allworthy, reports briefly on his journey to London and his return home, then focuses on a scene in his bedroom:

> Mr. Allworthy had been absent a full quarter of a year in London, on some very particular business, though I know not what it was; but judge of its importance by its having detained him so long from home, whence he had not been absent a month at a time during the space of many years. He came to his house very late in the evening, and after a short supper with his sister, retired much fatigued to his chamber. Here, having spent some minutes on his knees—a custom which he never broke through on any account--he was preparing to step into bed, when, upon opening the cloathes, to his great surprise, he beheld an infant, wrapt up in some coarse linen, in a sweet and profound sleep, between his sheets. (I, 5-6)

Thus the introduction of the infant Tom is made the most intense part of the passage. As the story continues, the arrival of Mrs. Wilkins and her conversation with Mr. Allworthy is presented scenically, though preceded by summary narration about her and why she delayed answering his call. While this scene is not depicted primarily through dialogue, there is a focus on a particular place, at a particular time, on a specific event of significance. But how tedious it would be if any more of the information given in the chapter were presented more fully. This is but one example of the way Fielding alternates modes of narration to provide intensity where it is most needed.

Because a character is revealed most vividly through his speech, the manner in which he enters the story is significant to his characterization: is he introduced through the narrator's comments,

or in a scene? And if in a scene, is he introduced primarily through dialogue? For example, we are given very little information about Mrs. Wilkins before we see her in the scene in Mr. Allworthy's bedroom. After her reaction to Mr. Allworthy's appearance is described, the narrator reverts to summary to provide more information, though after this the scene continues, with the first direct discourse in the book given to Mrs. Wilkins. The effect of the scene, in which she speaks much more than Mr. Allworthy, is that she is characterized effectively by the end of the third chapter of the first book. There is no need to keep her at a distance; rather, it is important to subsequent events that we view her closely, and judge her subjectively, at this moment when the baby is discovered.

Particular speech patterns contribute to characterization as well, though Dudden's assessment of Fielding's skill in this regard is somewhat over-stated:

> Fielding . . . stands out as a master of the art of reporting conversation with delicate adjustment of the kind of talk to the kind of talker. He presents convincingly all styles--the measured utterance of Mr. Allworthy, the blatant vociferation of Squire Western, the sentimental effusiveness of Mrs. Miller, the plain business parlance of Old Nightingale, the spluttered outbursts of Thwackum, the rambling loquacity of Partridge. Even the muddled speech of country boors, brought out with great difficulty and many scratchings of the head, is not beyond his power to imitate.[60]

While he does vary the speech patterns of various characters, with considerable comic effect, Fielding's dialogue for each character would not stand up to a close scrutiny for consistency as would, for example, the dialogue of Jane Austen's characters. Similarly, although his choice of direct and indirect discourse contributes to

the overall effect of a scene, there is no apparent principle at work determining his choice of one or the other.

What is evident in Tom Jones is that the fluctuation between narration and dialogue and between the panoramic and dramatic modes (as well as the ways in which the two are fused) is a result of Fielding's unique way of laying "method upon method." Through this fusion he controls both the reader's intellectual and emotional responses to the novel, leading him to a satisfying involvement with both the narrator and the characters within the story.

Authorial comments, as well, fall into the "scene-summary" category of distancing devices. Though these intrusions are, in fact, a powerful means of controlling the reader's distance from the characters, as well as a significant reason for the effectiveness of Tom Jones, they have been criticized roundly. Elizabeth Drew, for example, says that

> the perpetual overflow into lecture and commentary is a trial for the modern reader. Standing always at our elbow, the author will not leave us alone. He must interpret it all for us, with his 'sagacious penetration'; he must direct our attention where he wants it, and control our reactions, and even deliberately mislead us if it suits his purpose.[61]

Irma Sherwood, too, claims that Fielding goes too far with his comments, with the result that the focus is "on the mechanism of the work and on the author's attitude toward his material, rather than on the material itself." While admitting the brilliance of Tom Jones, she claims that

the author's shadow keeps intruding itself between the reader and the imaginative world of the novel. The world is pictured and its inhabitants are set into motion; but they are at the same time manipulated, dissected and discussed.[62]

Similarly, Ian Watt says that in Tom Jones

the author's commentary makes no secret of the fact that his aim is not to immerse us wholly in his fictional world, but rather to show the ingenuity of his own inventive resources by contriving an amusing counterpoint of scenes and characters.[63]

Certainly Miss Drew's criticism contains an accurate assessment of what the commentary does, though she fails, unfortunately, to recognize the benefits of our being thus manipulated. Likewise, both Miss Sherwood and Mr. Watt fail to consider that Fielding's method does not ignore the material completely in favour of the mechanism or the technique. We may not be immersed "wholly" in Fielding's fictional world, but we are immersed sufficiently, at continually varying depths, to enable us to become involved and yet retain our ability to judge.

The numerous comments in Tom Jones do not detract from the story; rather, they result in reader involvement that is different from, though not inferior to, the involvement induced in other novels. An analysis of several major characters, along with representative passages relating to each, will demonstrate that these intrusions relate closely not simply to the reader's response but to the level, and type, of dramatic intensity achieved at any particular time. While a scenic passage, in which the narrator does not intrude, will be more realistic, and probably more intense, than a passage filled with intrusions, the latter style has a dramatic power of its own.

Much of the comment in Tom Jones takes place in Fielding's introductory chapters, which both Ford Madox Ford and Somerset Maugham suggest may be skipped. Few scholars take this suggestion seriously, though R. S. Crane states that "while we would not like to lose them . . . the returns from them, even as embellishment, begin to diminish before the end."[64] At the other extreme, we have the view of Andrew Wright, who claims that one of the faults of Amelia is that it has no introductory chapters: it shows "Fielding without a mask," and is an example of "the flawed achievement of a great novelist who turned his back on his own fictional inventions."[65] Because this view, also, is narrow, implying that an author must have the same intentions, and use the same technical devices, in each novel, it too is inadequate.

Generally, critics who appreciate Fielding react defensively in an effort to find artistic validity for the introductory chapters. They seem to be regarded as an awkward element in the novel that must be accounted for because the contents are, admittedly, of interest and value. It is the overall effect, however, that is most important, and in Tom Jones these chapters help the reader to become acquainted with the narrator's moral and artistic views in a way that makes the comments within the narrative much more meaningful. Because they stress the fact that the narrator and the reader are in one world, the actual world, and Tom Jones in another, the fictional world, these chapters contribute considerably to the reader's understanding of both.

Fielding's narrator is evident not only in the introductory chapters, but in the narrative as well, and I shall comment briefly on the major types of intrusions: self-conscious comments, parenthetical statements, remarks directed to the reader, generalizations, references to literature, and symbolism. As a self-conscious narrator, for example, he speaks about his decision to digress when he feels like it, about the faults of critics, and about the nature of his novel. On several occasions he insists that he is merely relating facts, leaving the reader to judge, thus emphasizing that his story is a "history," and he the historian. At other times, by either feigning ignorance or refusing to disclose information he emphasizes his role as artist. Frequently the narrator omits conversations he feels might be "unnecessary" or "impertinent," thus avoiding "giving offense" and at the same time getting on with his story.[66] Omissions in the accounts of Tom's affairs with women, for example (to be referred to more fully later), serve to remove the focus from what is happening and distance Tom at a time when reader reaction would be critical. All of the self-conscious comments contribute in some way to the reader's response to the narrator of Tom Jones, which is one aspect of his intellectual interest in the novel.

Parenthetical expressions, also, draw attention to the narrator as manipulator of both "the facts" and the reader. Specifically, this practice slows down the pace of the narrative, perhaps through diverting the reader's attention, providing infor-

mation, or simply emphasizing a comic or ironic comment. In the account of Mr. Allworthy's illness, for example, the narrator reports Tom's reaction as follows:

> The news of Mr. Allworthy's danger (for the servant told him he was dying) drove all thoughts of love out of his head. He hurried instantly into the chariot which was sent for him, and ordered the coachman to drive with all imaginable haste. (I, 82)

Here the most serious part of the news is placed in parentheses, leaving the reader torn between two reactions: first, a feeling that this is an after-thought, representing only the servant's notion, and second, a tendency to accept literally the significance of the words. Thus the comment is ironic, merely one of several signals given the reader that this illness is not to end in death. Parentheses are used frequently for understatement, also, as when Tom, on Mazard Hill, hears screams, and "without saying a word to his companion (for indeed the occasion seemed sufficiently pressing) ran. . . (I, 396)." Sherbo claims there are 270 examples of parenthetical statements in Tom Jones, and suggests that any writer

> who finds it virtually impossible to get through a few sentences without adding, qualifying, identifying, conceding, etc. something by use of parentheses or parenthetical expressions is betraying something about himself by his very enslavement to the habit.[67]

Though he provides a detailed list of the categories of parenthetical statements, with numerous examples, Sherbo never says just what it is that Fielding betrays about himself by this practice. Since it is, obviously, a habit (at least to some extent), the categories are of little significance. Almost every type of comment may be found at one time or another in parentheses, and the most important point to

note, therefore, is how, in a given passage, the parentheses contribute to the tone or narrative focus.

Perhaps the most obvious intrusions in the narrative of Tom Jones are the comments directed specifically to the reader--remarks such as "To deal plainly with the reader" (I, 30); "I shall leave the reader to determine" (I, 31); "I would have the reader to consider" (I, 154); and ". . . we scorn to deceive our reader" (I, 284). As indicated, one must distinguish between the inside, or created, reader, and the outside readers, but that we (the outside readers) are, through such comments, involved with the narrator in a distinctive way is indisputable. And through such appeals the narrator involves us in the story as well. Frequently the narrator actually appeals to the reader's judgment, refers to his knowledge, gives him information, or provides guidance. As a result, this particular type of intrusive comment keeps the reader aware of his responsibility to judge well.

Generalizations and allusions to literature are further kinds of intrusions contributing to Fielding's "expansive" style. Eleanor Hutchens considers such references as ironic, claiming that allusions to law, medicine, classical literature and other areas of life give the subject "an air of dignity, method, reason or importance which does not belong to it."[68] While this is so, every such reference serves as well to remove the focus from the immediate scene or character. This lessens the intensity of the incident, increasing the distance between the reader and the characters involved,

because one's attention is drawn momentarily to an analogous situation or person. While generalizations sometimes have a highly comic effect, or a strong moral tone, they always broaden the reader's response and lessen his emotional reaction. This is well illustrated in the comment by the narrator about Mr. Western's determination to have Sophia marry Blifil:

> Instances of this behavior in parents are so common, that the reader, I doubt not, will be very little astonished at the whole conduct of Mr. Western. If he should, I own I am not able to account for it; since that he loved his daughter most tenderly, is, I think, beyond dispute. So indeed have many others, who have rendered their children most completely miserable by the same conduct; which, though it is almost universal in parents, hath always appeared to me to be the most unaccountable of all the absurdities which ever entered into the brain of that strange prodigious creature man. (I, 283)

Mr. Western as a parent is compared first with "many others" who have acted similarly; then, through the word "universal," with almost all parents in the world; then his action, and theirs, is assessed as "the most unaccountable of all the absurdities" ever thought of by man, "that strange prodigious creature." The reader, to say the least, is led to consider mankind, and his strangeness, and even, through the word "creature" to realize that other creatures (animals) would not be guilty of such an unaccountable action. In any case, the reader's mind moves far beyond the immediate situation, and beyond Squire Western. On the one hand the reader is forced to consider that the Squire, after all, is like all other parents, but on the other to admit that the particular practice referred to is both absurd and inhuman. Fielding is careful to keep the reader's

assessment of this man firmly under control, for while we must note his cruelty and his crudity, yet he is not, ultimately, to be regarded a villain. Such generalizations as that just quoted, as well as Sophia's obvious affection for him, and his for her, all contribute, along with his highly comic speech and mannerisms, to an accurate judgment.

Another fairly typical example of a generalization is found in the narrator's comment after Tom relates his slightly abridged life story to Little Benjamin:

> Not that Jones desired to conceal or to disguise the truth; nay, he would have been more unwilling to have suffered any censure to fall on Mr. Allworthy for punishing him, than on his own actions for deserving it; but, in reality, so it happened, and so it always will happen; for let a man be never so honest, the account of his own conduct will, in spite of himself, be so very favorable, that his vices will come purified through his lips, and like foul liquors well strained, will leave all their foulness behind. For though the facts themselves may appear, yet so different will be the motives, circumstances, and consequences, when a man tells his own story, and when his enemy tells it, that we scarce can recognize the facts to be one and the same. (I, 333)

Here Tom is compared with all mankind in the sense that no one, apparently, ever tells the whole truth about himself. Thus at a time when he may, possibly, deserve censure, Tom is distanced. Moreover, the fact that the narrator makes a contrast not between two men telling their own stories, or between a man telling his own, and a friend relating it, but between such a man and his <u>enemy</u>, makes any criticism of Tom impossible. We are reminded of the way Tom's enemies in Somerset did tell his story, and conclude that Tom's own version is much closer to the truth.

Fielding's numerous references to literature usually serve a similar purpose by removing the reader's attention from the immediate event. One which lightens the tone of an otherwise serious passage is made, for example, when Tom, after leaving Paradise Hall, considers where he should go: "The world, as Milton phrases it, lay all before him; and Jones, no more than Adam, had any man to whom he might resort for comfort or assistance" (I, 257). By this allusion to the final lines of Paradise Lost, Tom is--momentarily, at least--termed another Adam, an Everyman, who has "Providence his guide" as he sets out. Moreover, the association of Tom's misdemeanours with the theme of Paradise Lost ("man's first disobedience" and the fall of all mankind) adds humour which lessens the reader's concern. In the same way, the many classical references increase distance between an event or a character and the reader. Both Mrs. Partridge and the mother of the Man of the Hill are referred to as Xantippe (I, 46, 359), for example, and the allusion effectively places each woman in a long line of shrews.

References to Fortune are really classical allusions as well, though they have a less powerful distancing effect than those just mentioned because Fielding is merely using an expression employed by classical writers rather than alluding to a specific event or person. References to Fortune do not, as has been suggested, carry some weighty philosophical meaning. To say, as John Preston does, that the plot of the story is amoral because it centers on Fortune,[69] and that "intention, will, desire, all are overruled by Fortune,"[70] or to claim,

as Ehrenpreis does, that these references play a major role in Fielding's opposing of "Christian providence to pagan fortune"[71] is to attribute more to them than they deserve. Other than the obvious one of chance, there seems to be no consistent meaning. Like his use of parentheses, Fielding's continual use of the word "fortune" is a habit, though it too has an effect on the tone of a passage by detracting, briefly, from an emphasis on a character's personal responsibility for his actions. In this sense these are references that may affect characterization. But we are, after all, rarely allowed to forget that the story is art, and that we, as well as all the characters, are being firmly controlled, and that not by chance. This is the point Robert Alter makes in contrasting Tom Jones with the traditional picaresque novel:

> Now one of the important effects of seeing Tom Jones's adventures always through the translucent medium of Fielding's controlling intelligence is effectively to eliminate any element of chance from the narrative. The author of Tom Jones refers again and again to Fortune, to whose whim the lamentable protagonist is presumed to be totally subjected, but it becomes increasingly apparent that when Fielding says Fortune he means Fielding.[72]

Symbols and figures of speech are intrusions also. Like generalizations, these contribute to the "expansive" style, though they usually increase rather than diffuse the intensity of a passage. Fielding himself suggests yet another effect:

> That our work, therefore, might be in no danger of being likened to the labours of these historians, we have taken every occasion of interspersing through the whole sundry similes, descriptions, and other kind of poetical embellishments. (I, 101)

Two "embellishments" which enhance both the style and meaning of the

novel are the feast metaphor with which Fielding introduces his work and the travel metaphor relating to the narrator and the reader. While the feast metaphor stresses the nature of the work as artifice, because his subject is human nature "dressed up" through the "author's skill," the travel metaphor focuses on the friendship of the narrator and reader. As a result, both are really more than "embellishments," for they help define the two worlds of the novel—that of the story, and that of the narrator and reader.

Frequently love is depicted symbolically in Tom Jones, generally with the effect of removing sentimentality from the account and either reducing or preventing the reader's emotional response to the lovers in question. Of this depiction of love, Henry Knight Miller says:

> We encounter this emotion a number of times rendered in the metaphor of mere lip-smacking Appetite; we see it in medical terms. . . . it is presented delectably in terms of a military operation, or as a battle with the Reason; it is linked metaphorically with religion, or again, with the reading of romances; and it is a Hunt, a pursuit. Each of these contexts (and there are others), often worked out in astonishing detail, provides a new dimension for the complex, mingled vice-virtue of Love. . . . And when the range of this interesting emotion, from those for whom "Love probably may . . . very greatly resemble a Dish of Soup, or a Sir-Loin of Roast beef" (VI,i) to the rather stern and abstract caritas of an Allworthy, is considered, we may see that the subject has truly been amplified in a sense that begins in rhetoric but concludes in wisdom.[73]

Figures of speech, also, are used occasionally in a way that, paradoxically, helps not simply to characterize an individual but to decrease his individuality. For example, one's response to Thwackum is affected by the simile about his "use of Scriptures and their commentators, as the lawyer doth his Coke upon Lyttleton, where the comment is of equal authority with the text" (I, 79). Similarly,

Mrs. Wilkins is compared to a kite (I, 12) as she sallies forth to discover the mother of the baby boy and, later, is reported as having "gotten a true scent" of the truth (I, 51). Both allusions to the animal world are extremely apt in revealing aspects of her character, yet setting her at some distance.

In addition to all of these distancing devices in the "scene-summary" category, there are comic techniques that control the reader's responses: these are mock-heroic language, stylization and irony, all of which set a character or a situation at considerable distance from the reader and lessen his emotional involvement. Such devices, obviously, have an effect on both narrative modes. While any scene, for example, is more intense than summarized narration, a scene including mock-heroic, stylized or ironic language (whether in the dialogue or the narration) is less representational than if ordinary language were used. The reader's emotional response is either prevented or modified, even if the event is potentially serious.

In his Preface to Joseph Andrews, Fielding indicates the importance of comedy in his fiction not only by his use of the term "comic epic in prose," but by the way he differentiates between the burlesque, which is "the exhibition of what is monstrous and unnatural" and the comic, which is confined "strictly to nature." He makes it clear that he plans in his writing to adhere to nature "from the just imitation of which will flow all the pleasure we can this way convey to a sensible reader."[74] Later, in his Dedication

to Lyttleton (in Tom Jones), Fielding indicates something of his purpose through words that have become famous for epitomizing his type of novel:

> I have employed all the wit and humour of which I am master in the following history; wherein I have endeavored to laugh mankind out of their favourite follies and vices. (I, xvii)

While the immediate concern with Fielding's humour is primarily technical, the fact that the comedy of Tom Jones and its moral tone are, in Fielding's view, so closely related is extremely relevant. The reason is that the comic devices help to keep the reader's intellectual and emotional responses to the novel in balance: the comic techniques normally arouse the reader intellectually, yet because they enhance the author's moral emphases the reader's emotions are involved to some extent. By making a moral comment through irony, for example, Fielding arouses in the reader a moral response that is neither completely intellectual, nor impersonal, nor over-subjective.

Perhaps more than any other comic technique the mock-heroic descriptions in Tom Jones set back from the reader the episode and the individual being referred to. The mock-epic form is essentially satirical since it is mocking the lofty form of the epic by using an imitation of epic devices for describing an insignificant event. According to R. G. Seamon,

> Mock-heroic satire achieves its effect by presenting the reader with a sequence of perspectives on reality. Each perspective carries with it a standard of value, and that standard affects what is perceived. When the sequence is complete the reader has been unburdened of his propensity to fix on one perspective, and he is aware of the ironic contrasts that the presentation of different perspectives creates.[75]

Seamon goes on to say that in mock-heroic satire "there is a continual tension between two sets of values,"[76] thus implying the relationship between this device and the moral tone of the work. Such a relationship may be illustrated in Tom Jones through the description of the battle between Mr. and Mrs. Partridge:

> As fair Grimalkin, who, though the youngest of the feline family, degenerates not in ferocity from the elder branches of her house, and though inferior in strength, is equal in fierceness to the noble tiger himself, when a little mouse, whom it hath long tormented in sport, escapes from her clutches for a while, frets, scolds, growls, swears; but if the trunk, or box, behind which the mouse lay hid be again removed, she flies like lightning on her prey, and, with envenomed wrath, bites, scratches, mumbles, and tears the little animal.
>
> Not with less fury did Mrs. Partridge fly on the poor pedagogue. Her tongue, teeth, and hands, fell all upon him at once. His wig was in an instant torn from his head, his shirt from his back, and from his face descended five streams of blood, denoting the number of claws with which nature had unhappily armed the enemy. (I, 101)

The description then continues, in plain language, with what Mr. Partridge tries to do, though some of the references to his wife are still stylized: for example, he tries to get hold of her arms, "to render those weapons which she wore at the ends of her fingers useless." Though the passage quoted above does not include a full-scale epic battle, such as the one involving Molly in the churchyard, the use of an epic simile and epic description is especially effective because of the contrast with the plain narration about the victim. As a result, Mrs. Partridge is made a comic figure, set at considerable distance from the reader, while the narrator's refusal to laugh at Mr. Partridge (other than through the gentle irony about his lack of boldness) leads the reader to respond to him sympathetically. His

moral superiority is stressed, while at the same time the "message" is kept from being too somber through the comic depiction of the villain.

There are, in addition, a number of passages, and even single sentences, in Tom Jones that are highly stylized though not, strictly speaking, within the mock-heroic mode. It is evident Fielding chooses such language deliberately in order to have, at particular moments, the distancing effect of an elevated tone. Of Fielding's adeptness at moving from stylization to plain narration, McKillop says:

> . . . he is more than a match for any of his situations or characters. He is superior to his subject without being contemptuous of it. He ranges from the vernacular speeches of Squire Western to carefully applied passages of elevated rhetoric, largely though not exclusively mock-heroic. These variations from the sound middle style which he uses for analysis, discussion, and narrative summary extend the range of his imagination, feeling, and humour far beyond his formal ethical preoccupations.[77]

An example of stylized narration which provides an elevated and comic tone at a crucial moment is found in the account of the fight between Northerton and Tom at the inn:

> The conqueror perceiving the enemy to lie motionless before him, and blood beginning to flow pretty plentifully from his wound, began now to think of quitting the field of battle, where no more honour was to be gotten; but the lieutenant interposed by stepping before the door, and thus cut off his retreat. (I, 297)

As is often the case, stylized language is confined to comments about one individual, while the style shifts abruptly when another person is referred to. Such a practice may have the effect of distancing one character, and allowing the reader to identify with the

other, or it may keep the reader's reactions to the incident in appropriate balance. Here, for example, this report of Northerton's reaction adds just enough comedy to assure the reader Tom is not seriously hurt, but not so much as to make the episode ridiculous.

According to Ian Watt, Fielding's comic language keeps the characters from being convincing, for "hackneyed hyperboles" are inadequate to depict intensity of emotion. Fielding, of course, is not trying to depict intense emotion through his comedy. He does this through other means, as is evident in the London books of the novel especially. But the comic language does have an effect on characterization, as Robert Alter indicates when he says that Fielding's stylization is simply another way of "reproducing the immediacy of inner experience"[78] because any author's method of revealing character is, after all, artifice. Therefore, whether an author pretends he is not there, or calls attention to his presence, his creation may be convincing. Fielding, says Alter, depends for his unique effect on "the artfully ostentatious manipulation of words,"[79] continually reminding the readers in various ways "of the literary artifice through which that world comes into being."[80]

In the dialogue of Tom Jones occasional stylization often serves a comic purpose. While Fielding does not always maintain strict consistency in the dialogue of a character, he does manage to achieve effects that intensify certain situations. Of this

skill, Alter says:

> Fielding's dialogue is . . . pervasively stylized. This is apparent in the language his characters speak, which shifts from self-parody to literary parody to formal comic soliloquy, and even when simulating the vividness of earthy speech, is an artful exaggeration rather than a transcription of it. . . . Equally important, what the characters say as well as how they say it is usually stylized; much of it is rather improbable by the standards of ordinary realism but comically revealing and perfectly right in context.[81]

As one of his examples, Alter refers to Mrs. Wilkins' comments about the infant Tom after he is found in Mr. Allworthy's bedroom ("Faugh! how it stinks! It doth not smell like a Christian"), claiming that no one--not even a woman like Mrs. Wilkins--would ever make such statements, "but precisely because of their bold stylization, they provide a wonderful moment of comic illumination."[82] Comic they are, to be sure, though the reader at this time does not really note the improbability of the statements, for his introduction to Mrs. Wilkins has prepared him adequately for this response. At the same time, her words serve to characterize her even more, providing a vivid contrast to the response of Mr. Allworthy, who does not even hear her outburst once the baby takes hold of his finger.

Fielding's stylization, in both dialogue and narration, is one of the many ways he gives form and control to his novel, while maintaining "a certain distance and decorum"[83] that controls the reader's involvement. Such language keeps the reader's emotions from being too much engaged and frequently adds comedy to a fairly serious event. That Fielding is adept at adapting his style to his subject matter is shown by the fact that there is no use of the

mock heroic, and much less stylization, in the final six books of the novel where the events are more serious than earlier in the story.

Most Fielding critics have written extensively about the irony in Tom Jones. In fact, irony is often considered to be the main source of humour and the primary reason for the success of the novel. Because irony is implicit in mock-heroic and stylized language, as well as in some authorial comments, it is difficult to consider it in isolation. However, for the purposes of this introduction it will be sufficient to note, in brief, the effects of irony upon the reader's responses to the narrator, the characters, and the novel as a whole.

In her extremely helpful book on the irony in Tom Jones, Eleanor Hutchens praises Fielding for the way he has assimilated the techniques of earlier ironists, yet has surpassed them in demonstrating in this novel irony of "a variety and complexity not usually credited to him." Furthermore, she claims the effects are closely related to the persistent authorial presence which has been so criticized.[84] The reason for this relationship is that the nature of the irony depends on whether a narrator is, to use Booth's terms, reliable or unreliable, for in the latter case there is always some "confusion of distance" resulting from the reader's uncertainty of the trustworthiness of the narrator.[85] In Tom Jones, there is a reliable narrator whose beliefs are, obviously, those of the author. When the narrator uses verbal irony, the

reader recognizes it as such, and finds his own judgments and sympathies affected accordingly. And ironies of plot, while they contribute at times to reader suspense, or to the comic effect, do not cause confusion or lead to doubts about the narrator's control of the work.

The ironic attitude necessarily causes detachment. According to Thomas Mann, such detachment in a novel has a unique effect:

> The novel . . . keeps its distance from things, has by its very nature distance from them; it hovers over them and smiles down upon them, regardless of how much, at the same time, it involves the hearer or reader in them by a process of weblike entanglement. The art of the epic is 'Apollonian' art as the aesthetic term would have it; because Apollo, distant marksman, is the god of distance, of objectivity, the god of irony. Objectivity is irony and the spirit of epic art is the spirit of irony.[86]

Certainly the irony in Tom Jones contributes to the detachment of the reader from the world of the novel and involves him with the narrator. For while listening to the narrator, the reader is part of the "ironic attitude" that gives both author and narrator "a firm position of elevation over the world" being described. This distance aids him in making judgments, as Alter points out:

> The perspective of irony is invaluable to the novel because of a danger inherent in the basic impulse of the genre to immerse us in contemporary reality; for reality seen from so close is likely to be a shapeless mass of clamorous particulars which can easily subvert both moral intelligence and aesthetic lucidity . . . one of the bases for Fielding's objection to the whole method of Pamela.[87]

Like the mock-heroic and the stylized language, irony of all kinds is related to the moral themes of Tom Jones. Fielding's artistic skill is evidenced by the fact that he manages, as Miss Hutchens says, to "keep his material simultaneously under the eye

of comedy and the eye of moral judgment."[88] When verbal irony decreases, the reader's judgment is more subjective, or emotional, as is evident in the last third of the novel. But when there is danger of a highly emotional moral judgment, irony serves to detach the reader once again. This type of fluctuation in the reader's response illustrates Muecke's claim that in ironic literature

> there is a constant interplay of objectivity and subjectivity, freedom and necessity, the appearance of life and the reality of art, the author immanent in every part of his work as its creative vivifying principle and transcending his work as its objective 'presenter'.[89]

On the one hand, this kind of control of the reader's reactions prevents him from ever really fearing that Tom will--as the narrator suggests--end his life on the gallows; on the other hand, it keeps the reader aware that Tom is in increasingly dire straits as the story proceeds. As Crane so aptly states, the "peculiar comic pleasure" one receives from Tom Jones includes a mixture of fear, pity, and indignation, that makes the book more than a "mere amiable comedy" for the reader is kept aware that events need not work out so well as they do.[90]

Comic techniques in Tom Jones contribute, generally, to the increasing of the reader's intellectual responses to the novel. They contribute, in almost every instance, to the distancing of characters and events, enabling the reader to assess both with some detachment. Yet because they are used often to stress Fielding's moral points of view, they are not utterly unrelated to the reader's emotional

involvement in the story. For a moral judgment involves both the intellect and the emotions.

These many narrative techniques that have been introduced in this chapter are the major devices Fielding employs in Tom Jones to control the reader's distance from both the narrator and the characters. Both the intellectual and emotional interests of the reader are manipulated through the use of the "vein of contrast" and by conflicts; by the careful manner in which Fielding moves from summary to scene, or from narration to dialogue; by the skillful use of many kinds of intrusive comments; and by comic techniques. As the ensuing analyses of characters and representative passages will demonstrate, distance is controlled as well by the ordering of the episodes in the various sections of the novel, by the judgments of the characters upon each other, and by the reader's own role as a judge. Tom himself is the central figure in this study, and thus my analysis of the novel will begin with him. Throughout the thesis, frequent mention will be made of the three "sections," "parts" or "divisions" of the novel. Such references refer, of course, to the generally accepted division of Tom Jones into three equal parts: Books I - VI, the Somerset books; Books VII - XII, the "road" books; and Books XIII - XVIII, the London books.

Chapter Two: Tom as a Boy

Fielding's manner of controlling narrative distance in Tom Jones is illustrated best in the way he presents the character of Tom. The method, throughout much of the novel, is a kind of indirect characterization, though the reader, nonetheless, is involved closely in a continual process of judgment from the moment he sees the baby in Mr. Allworthy's bed. It is the manner in which the reader is manipulated into either involvement or detachment, criticism or sympathy, that controls his judgment of Tom and makes the novel as a whole so appealing. That every part of the novel is important to the characterization of Tom has been demonstrated most fully by R. S. Crane in his perceptive analysis of the plot. The "dynamic system of actions" making up the plot is, he claims,

> first to bring Tom into an incomplete and precarious union, founded on an affinity of nature in spite of a disparity of status, with Allworthy and Sophia; then to separate him as completely as possible from them through actions that impel both of them, one after the other, to reserve their opinions of his character; and then, just as he seems about to fulfil the old prophecy that "he was certainly born to be hanged," to restore them unexpectedly to him in a more entire and stable union of both affection and fortune than he has known before.[1]

What has not been demonstrated, however, is the manner in which Tom is, to a surprising extent, characterized through the depictions of others with whom he is involved. Because the reader is kept at considerable distance from Tom through much of the story, an assessment of him is made not simply from assumptions about his motives, or from reports of his actions, though these are important. The

assessment, in addition, is affected by the manner in which other individuals are portrayed. Especially significant are Molly Seagrim, Mrs. Waters, Lady Bellaston and Sophia, for the reader's critical and sympathetic reactions to Tom from Book IV to the end of the novel are related closely to his associations with these women. Thus it is pertinent to consider the kinds of responses the reader has to each. Are they primarily intellectual, primarily emotional, or both? Is there a moral reaction as well? And if so, how does this moral reaction concern one's response to Tom? But first, let us consider certain general principles about the depiction of Tom, and then his portrayal in the first three books.

Most critics writing about Fielding's portrayal of Tom make a moral assessment of his character. One of the earliest such comments is found in an unsigned review in the Gentleman's Magazine (1750):

> Tom Jones, as much a libertine as he is, engages all sensible hearts by his candor, generosity, humanity, his gratitude to his benefactors, his tender compassion, and readiness to assist the distressed.[2]

Other contemporary reactions were less sympathetic. The view of Samuel Richardson, for example, is well known, as is that of Samuel Johnson, both of whom deplored, largely on moral grounds, the manner in which Fielding's hero was portrayed. Recent critics do not term Tom a "libertine" or condemn Fielding for having an immoral hero but rather stress his many good qualities more than his lack, at times, of discretion. That Fielding intends a moral emphasis,

however, is generally accepted. M. Irwin, for example, says the reader is clearly intended "to see Tom's story . . . as a series of follies bringing eventual retribution."[3] And Sheldon Sacks comments as follows on the way Fielding depicts Tom's involvement with women:

> Jenny's ostensible fall . . . calls for one of the first really complex judgments to be made in the novel, and its importance is proportionate to the number of times that signals in the novel must control the reader's attitude toward characters who participate in unchaste activities: Tom's affairs with Jenny Jones, Molly Seagrim, and Lady Bellaston, for example, must be represented so as to ascribe to each of the participants the appropriate kind and degree of blame if Fielding is to accomplish the artistic end of Tom Jones. If we see Tom as a confirmed sinner, punitive comedy or artistic chaos must result; if we see Jenny, under the name of Mrs. Waters, as unforgivably lewd in sleeping with Tom, Fielding cannot use her as he does in the comic resolution of the novel.[4]

Thus Sacks suggests the way in which Fielding's technique manipulates the reader into an appropriate and accurate assessment of the three women and Tom, though he does not consider explicitly the effect of the depiction of the women upon one's judgment of Tom.

Ian Watt says that because of Fielding's external approach to character, "personal relationships are . . . relatively unimportant in Tom Jones."[5] But this claim suggests an over-simplified interpretation of the novel, for Tom's personal relationships--which are, in fact, one aspect of Fielding's external approach to character--are surely of vital importance to the reader's understanding of Tom, as the ensuing analyses will indicate. Through his portrayal of these four women, as well as through other narrative techniques, Fielding controls carefully the distance between Tom and the reader, and the nature of their relationship.

Another claim made by Ian Watt about Tom is that there is "only a very general sort of development" in him throughout the novel.[6] Yet there is a fairly obvious two-fold "development" within Tom which is basic to both the plot and theme of Tom Jones: first, a negative development, evident in Tom's tendency to become more indiscreet, and even deceitful, as the story progresses; second, a positive development, which is the progression Tom makes, in the last third of the novel especially, toward acquiring genuine prudence. At the conclusion of the story, after Tom wins Sophia, the reader is assured that the hero has learned his lesson. Tom is, as Hamilton Macallister says, "innocent" and "harmless" at the outset, but coarsens as the story proceeds.[7] This coarsening may be, as Macallister suggests, a result of Fielding's decreasing concern with motivation, though it is significant as well to note the relationship of this tendency within Tom to his ultimate learning of prudence. For if his misdeeds did not become increasingly serious, his development and maturity would not be convincing. There are readers, of course, who insist that Tom's reformation as it is given is far from convincing: that it occurs too quickly, that he does not suffer sufficiently for his indiscretions, or that he changes only because his personal fortunes improve. Such critics, apparently, would have Fielding change his narrative style and technique, especially in the characterization of Tom, even more than he has done in the final few books of the novel. Considering the manner in which Tom is depicted throughout the book, and considering

Fielding's general artistic principles, Tom's depiction in the last part of the novel is sufficiently vivid and dramatic. Any greater shift in narrative technique would be too startling. It is obvious, through the way Tom's reformation is reported and shown, that Fielding wants to emphasize how his hero has matured through his experiences: how he has, indeed, learned prudence at last. The fact that the scenic method is used more consistently in the London books, especially in the last three, stresses most effectively both the negative and positive aspects of Tom's "development" which is definitely more than "very general" even though Fielding never resorts to an internalized psychological analysis.

This gradual change in the narrative technique used to portray Tom is related closely to the reader's response to him, and judgment of him, as the analysis here, and in the final chapter, will demonstrate. In summary, however, the trend is as follows: in the Somerset books, Tom is kept at considerable distance from the reader except for a few scenes in Book VI prior to his expulsion from home; in the "road" books, he is depicted fairly vividly in the incidents that occur as he travels, with the exception of the Upton episode, where great care is taken to keep him at some distance; in London, he is depicted frequently in highly scenic passages, thus reducing the distance between him and the reader, and increasing the realism of the narrative. It may be said, then, that only as Tom develops and matures through his adult experiences is he revealed to the reader. And even as this development is gradual, so the reader's emotional

involvement with him is extremely limited until Tom has demonstrated that he possesses, in addition to "much goodness, generosity, and honour"[8] some prudence. That this is a main thematic emphasis of the novel is revealed by Fielding in his Dedication to Lyttleton:

> Besides displaying that beauty of virtue which may attract the admiration of mankind, I have attempted to engage a stronger motive to human action in her favour, by convincing men, that their true interest directs them to a pursuit of her. For this purpose I have shown that no acquisitions of guilt can compensate the loss of that solid inward comfort of mind, which is the sure companion of innocence and virtue; nor can in the least balance the evil of that horror and anxiety which, in their room, guilt introduces into our bosoms. And again, that as these acquisitions are in themselves generally worthless, so are the means to attain them not only base and infamous, but at best incertain, and always full of danger. Lastly, I have endeavoured strongly to inculcate, that virtue and innocence can scarce ever be injured but by indiscretion; and that it is this alone which often betrays them into the snares that deceit and villainy spread for them. A moral which I have the more industriously laboured, as the teaching of it is, of all others, the likeliest to be attended with success; since, I believe, it is much easier to make good men wise, than to make bad men good. (I, xvi)

In the first three books of Tom Jones, which concern the hero as an infant and an adolescent, the reader is rarely allowed to view Tom closely. The narrator's method is primarily "telling," with events in subsequent books designed to "show"--gradually--the truth of what the narrator has here said. These books are not entirely without dramatic passages, however, for both narrative methods are used in the dual introduction of Tom. In the first, the narrator uses the scenic method primarily, focusing on the baby as Mr. Allworthy first sees him:

> . . . he [Allworthy] was preparing to step into bed, when, upon opening the cloathes, to his great surprize he beheld an infant, wrapt up in some coarse linen, in a sweet and profound sleep,

between his sheets. He stood some time lost in astonishment at this sight; but, as good nature had always the ascendant in his mind, he soon began to be touched with sentiments of compassion for the little wretch before him. (I, 5-6)

Following this brief scene, more summary follows. But with the arrival of Mrs. Wilkins, another scene takes place, in which the process of judgment upon the bastard child begins: Allworthy's reaction is the opposite to that of Mrs. Wilkins, whose antagonism anticipates the way other characters react to the baby and, later, to Tom as a child and young man. These initial reactions thus introduce the "judgment" theme within the novel, a theme which concerns Tom primarily, and keeps the reader continually involved in making judgments of his own. That he is being manipulated by the narrator is evident. But at the same time he is learning to judge not simply by appearances, or according to the views of others, but to consider all the evidence, including his own inclinations.

The fact that the reader, in his early assessment of Tom, identifies with Allworthy is worthy of note. For though he is the person whose opinion is most vital to Tom's fortunes, Allworthy becomes an inadequate, even dangerous, judge--and an illustration for the reader of how not to assess Tom or anyone else. Commenting on the unreliability of Allworthy's judgments, A. E. Dyson says:

He pursues his moral arithmetic with unfailing zeal for the truth, but his data are wrong, so his answers are wrong as well. He is mistaken about Jenny Jones, about Partridge, about Tom, in a manner which causes them very great hardship before they are through. And he is mistaken about Bridget Allworthy and about Master Blifil, in a manner that delivers him as a dupe into their hands. . . . Mr. Allworthy's failure of judgment is clearly one of the main strands

in the moral texture of the whole, and what it indicates is Fielding's profound mistrust of Reason in ethics. . . . The one thing Mr. Allworthy lacks is the instinct to smell people's souls. Because he lacks this, all his virtuous striving does not show him where true virtue is to be found.[9]

And John Preston, after assessing Allworthy in a similar manner, points out that Fielding expects the reader to judge more accurately:

Allworthy, then, invites ridicule by playing at God. And, after all, his detachment turns out to be less than god-like. . . . Yet, while this certainly does not mean that we should not "condemn the wisdom or penetration of Mr. Allworthy," it sharply reminds us that without the author's help we would fare no better ourselves. There is, Fielding suggests, something heroic in Allworthy. If Tom is the comic hero, always acting and always in the dark, Allworthy, never allowed to withhold judgment or to be less than his best, is the book's most admired yet poignant figure, its tragic hero in fact. Yet, in our respect for the stubborn excellence of Allworthy, we are not to reconcile ourselves to judging like him. We are expected to go "behind the scenes," to do in fact what the author has been doing for us. There is no credit in ignorance.[10]

Through the scenic introduction of the infant Tom, the reader's emotions are, naturally, aroused. But the emphasis upon the judgment theme involves the reader intellectually as well. Moreover, the emotional response to the child is modified by the rapid shift in focus to the actions of other characters and the matter of the baby's identity. Only the occasional reference, in subsequent chapters, to Mr. Allworthy's deep affection for little Tommy helps to keep the initial sympathetic response in the reader's mind. When baby Blifil is born, for example, Allworthy's affection for the foundling is mentioned, though the "pairing" of the two boys is suggested as well:

Though the birth of an heir by his beloved sister was a circumstance of great joy to Mr. Allworthy, yet it did not alienate his affections from the little foundling, to whom he had been godfather, had given his own name of Thomas, and whom he had hitherto seldom failed of visiting, at least once a day, in his nursery.

> He told his sister, if she pleased, the new-born infant should be bred up together with little Tommy; to which she consented, though with some little reluctance: for she had truly a great complacence for her brother; and hence she had always behaved towards the foundling with rather more kindness than ladies of rigid virtue can sometimes bring themselves to show to these children, who, however innocent, may be truly called the living monuments of incontinence. (I, 40)

For some time following this comment, little more is said about Tom, for after Mrs. Wilkins announces that Partridge is, without a doubt, Tom's father, the events concern others: first, the Partridge family, then Captain Blifil.

At the beginning of the third book, a more complete introduction of the hero of Tom Jones takes place. One would expect this one to be more scenic than the first, but such is not the case. Significantly, in the introductory chapter to this book, Fielding refers again (as in II, i) to his use of both summary and scene, relating his remarks here to the portrayal of Tom:

> As we are sensible that much the greatest part of our readers are very eminently possessed of this quality [true sagacity] we have left them a space of twelve years to exert it in; and shall now bring forth our heroe, at about fourteen years of age, not questioning that many have been long impatient to be introduced to his acquaintance. (I, 72)

The omitted twelve years, as Fielding says, are relatively unimportant in the course of this "history," for the emphasis is upon Tom's development as a young man. But one should note as well that the inclusion of even selected childhood incidents would probably arouse the kind of emotional response the reader felt, momentarily, when viewing the helpless infant in Mr. Allworthy's bed. Thus the omission of such incidents which would form no significant part of

Tom's maturing experiences contributes to the distancing of him in these early books.

This second introduction of Tom at fourteen is written in a way that minimizes the reader's identification with him even at this stage of his life. First, there is obvious irony in the descriptions of Tom and Blifil:

> The vices of this young man [Tom] were, moreover, heightened by the disadvantageous light in which they appeared when opposed to the virtues of Master Blifil, his companion; a youth of so different a cast from little Jones, that not only the family but all the neighbourhood resounded his praises. (I, 73)

In the same passage, the apparently "universal" antagonism of others toward Tom is mentioned, an antagonism evident through all of the first six books of the novel:

> Tom Jones was universally disliked; and many expressed their wonder that Mr. Allworthy would suffer such a lad to be educated with his nephew, lest the morals of the latter should be corrupted by his example.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Tom Jones, who, bad as he is, must serve for the heroe of this history, had only one friend among all the servants of the family; for as to Mrs. Wilkins, she had long since given him up, and was perfectly reconciled to her mistress. This friend was the gamekeeper, a fellow of a loose kind of disposition. (I, 73)

The contrast of Tom with the cunning and deceitful Blifil, as well as the emphasis upon the antagonism shown Tom by various despicable characters, serves to arouse the reader's sympathy. Yet the passage is comic, and sympathy is extended primarily because Tom is an innocent victim, not because the reader has come to know him intimately.

Several incidents are reported, primarily in summary, that reveal Tom's nature even more. The major one, said by the narrator to "set the characters of these two lads more fairly before the discerning reader than is in the power of the longest dissertation," is the partridge hunt, in which Tom is caught within Squire Western's grounds and tells a lie to protect Black George. Though the incident occurs when Blifil is abroad with his mother, this does not prevent his later accusations against Tom after the two have a fight. And perhaps this is the sense in which the event sets Blifil's character "fairly before the discerning reader." As further examples of Tom's "vices," the narrator reports several other actions: "robbing an orchard . . . stealing a duck out of a farmer's yard, and . . . picking Master Blifil's pocket of a ball" (I, 73). Then, after Black George loses his job, Tom sells his horse and his Bible in order to assist the starving Seagrims, actions which are admirable but get him into trouble because he is misrepresented before Mr. Allworthy. Yet ultimately Mr. Allworthy's reaction is sympathetic. Thus the reader is still able to identify with Allworthy in his assessing of Tom.

The obvious irony of the comments about Tom's "vices" leaves the reader in no doubt of the narrator's opinion. Moreover, several other remarks in these first three books emphasize the narrator's view. He says, for example, that Tom was "an inoffensive lad amidst all his roguery" (I, 81); and that because he is convinced his readers "will be much abler advocates for poor Jones," he will not

relate what Allworthy said to Thwackum and Square in defence of Tom (I, 95). That these incidents in Tom's childhood, reported with numerous authorial intrusions, and generally in summary, have a thematic importance in introducing into the novel the "prudence" theme is evident in the following comment by the narrator:

> In recording some instances of these [Tom's actions], we shall, if rightly understood, afford a very useful lesson to those well-disposed youths who shall hereafter be our readers; for they may here find, that goodness of heart, and openness of temper, though these may give them great comfort within, and administer to an honest pride in their own minds, will by no means, alas! do their business in the world. Prudence and circumspection are necessary even to the best of men. They are indeed, as it were, a guard to Virtue, without which she can never be safe. It is not enough that your designs, nay, that your actions, are intrinsically good; you must take care they shall appear so. If your inside be never so beautiful, you must preserve a fair outside also. This must be constantly looked to, or malice and envy will take care to blacken it so, that the sagacity and goodness of an Allworthy will not be able to see through it, and to discern the beauties within. Let this, my young readers, be your constant maxim, that no man can be good enough to enable him to neglect the rules of prudence; nor will Virtue herself look beautiful, unless she be bedecked with the outward ornaments of decency and decorum. And this precept, my worthy disciples, if you read with due attention, you will, I hope, find sufficiently reinforced by examples in the following pages. (I, 92-93)

There is very little dialogue given Tom in these introductory books. The first example is his outburst, with tears, when Allworthy apologizes for being too severe in the matter of the partridge incident: "Oh, sir, you are too good to me. Indeed you are. Indeed I don't deserve it" (I, 77). The next (which includes both direct and indirect discourse) is an explanation to Allworthy, following Blifil's accusation, of why he protected Black George:

Tom said, 'He scorned a lie as much as any one: but he thought his honour engaged him to act as he did; for he had promised the poor fellow to conceal him: which,' he said, 'he thought himself farther obliged to, as the gamekeeper had begged him not to go into the gentleman's manor, and had at last gone himself, in compliance with his persuasions.' He said, 'This was the whole truth of the matter, and he would take his oath of it'; and concluded with very passionately begging Mr. Allworthy 'to have compassion on the poor fellow's family, especially as he himself only had been guilty, and the other had been very difficultly prevailed on to do what he did. Indeed, sir,' said he, 'it could hardly be called a lie that I told; for the poor fellow was entirely innocent of the whole matter. I should have gone alone after the birds; nay, I did go at first, and he only followed me to prevent more mischief. Do, pray, sir, let me be punished; take my little horse away again; but pray, sir, forgive poor George.' (I, 82-83)

Finally, there is Tom's confession about why he sold his little horse:

'Indeed, my dear sir, I love and honour you more than all the world: I know the great obligations I have to you, and should detest myself if I thought my heart was capable of ingratitude. Could the little horse you gave me speak, I am sure he could tell you how fond I was of your present; for I had more pleasure in feeding him than in riding him. Indeed, sir, it went to my heart to part with him; nor would I have sold him upon any other account in the world than what I did. You yourself, sir, I am convinced, in my case, would have done the same: for none ever so sensibly felt the misfortunes of others. What would you feel, dear sir, if you thought yourself the occasion of them? Indeed, sir, there never was any misery like theirs.' (I, 94)

And following Allworthy's puzzled enquiry, Tom continues:

'Oh, sir! . . . your poor gamekeeper, with all his large family, ever since your discarding him, have been perishing with all the miseries of cold and hunger: I could not bear to see these poor wretches naked and starving, and at the same time know myself to have been the occasion of all their sufferings. I could not bear it, sir; upon my soul, I could not. . . . It was to save them from absolute destruction I parted with your dear present, notwithstanding all the value I had for it: I sold the horse for them, and they have every farthing of the money.' (I, 94)

Thus each instance of dialogue is in a scene showing Tom making an explanation or apology that stresses his basic goodness of heart. These speeches inevitably arouse the reader's emotions, though

the fact that the dialogue is not extensive, and occurs rarely, means that while these particular scenes may be memorable, they do not decrease significantly the distance being maintained between Tom and the reader.

While these three books are not highly scenic, particularly in passages relating to Tom, one must note that a kind of dramatic intensity is achieved nonetheless. For in spite of the limited dialogue, the prominence of the narrator, and the distance at which Tom is kept from the reader, an interest in him is aroused. This interest is evoked not simply because he is announced as the hero, or because he is a foundling, but because his situation is dramatic. We are told about an innocent child, an outcast from society, who from birth is surrounded by an antagonistic host of people who become increasingly hostile as he grows up. The antagonism reaches its height, of course, when Allworthy joins this "host" and sends Tom away from Paradise Hall. This situation, which is related to the judgment theme earlier discussed, is dramatic because it shows, in essence, Tom versus his environment.[11] The conflict continues, in varying ways, throughout the book, though the "antagonistic host" is less apparent during the middle section and the first half of the London books. Nonetheless, Tom's development in maturity throughout the novel is revealed, in part, in his increasing ability to distinguish between deserved and undeserved antagonism, and to cope with both. The story ends when the conflict between him and

his environment ceases. He has learned prudence, he has discovered his identity, and is given his rightful position in society. Thus this dramatic element--the antagonism toward Tom--which is introduced in the first three books adds interest and some intensity to his characterization even though the reader's emotional response is infrequent.

In summary, then, these first three books of Tom Jones, which present the dual introduction of the hero, the judgment theme, and the beginnings of a dramatic conflict involving Tom arouse the reader intellectually more than emotionally. We are curious about Tom's parents and his future, yet are prevented from becoming emotionally involved with him by the prominence of the narrator, the limited amount of dialogue, and the irony. Though the emotions are aroused, briefly, in the infant scene and the apology scenes, this reaction is modified considerably by the prominence of summarized narrative and other distancing techniques. Hence the narrative mode is primarily panoramic. But Fielding has introduced a measure of dramatic intensity, through the antagonism directed toward Tom, without actually resorting to frequent use of scene and dialogue. His method here illustrates, therefore, not only Lubbock's claim that a good novelist will alternate, or even fuse, both narrative modes, but his statement that there is a sense in which "Everything in a novel, not only the scenic episodes but all the rest, is to be in some sense dramatized."[12]

Fielding's method of depicting Tom as a boy affects the reader's judgment in several ways. Because he has seen little of Tom directly, the reader is influenced strongly by the narrator's comments. These sometimes effusive statements are supported by Allworthy's sympathy and affection for Tom, as opposed to the antagonism of characters the reader dislikes, and the reader's personal inclination to favour the boy. Since the reader's opinions, however, are still being formed primarily on the basis of what he is told, rather than from his own viewing of Tom in action, his judgment--though detached--cannot be termed a considered and personal assessment. He is being manipulated, very strongly, as he will be, in differing ways, throughout the novel. But even though the manipulation continues, the reader's judgment of Tom will become, ultimately, a personal one after he has not only listened to the narrator's opinions, deduced the author's opinion, noted the comments about Tom by other characters within the story, but has been given an opportunity, in addition, to view Tom for himself. Thus both narrative methods--the scenic and the panoramic--are essential in controlling the levels of distance necessary for accurate judgments.

In the depiction of Tom in the remaining fifteen books of Tom Jones, the reader's response is affected not only by what the narrator and characters within the novel think or say about Tom, but also by his personal relationships with others, notably

Molly Seagrim, Mrs. Waters, Lady Bellaston and Sophia Western. The reason these relationships are especially important is that Tom's affairs with the first three of the women, and the resulting effects in each case upon Sophia, are the only actions for which Tom may be justly censured. And hence the analysis of each woman, which will follow, demonstrates not simply Fielding's use of the devices which control distance--though this is done--but also how the reader's response to the woman is related to his response, at that particular time, to Tom.

Chapter Three: Molly

The depiction of Molly Seagrim in Books IV and V of Tom Jones illustrates clearly Fielding's skill in controlling the reader's involvement with a character. Here is a girl who is given some individuality, yet remains in the background; a girl who receives very limited sympathy, yet is not condemned. The reason for this is that Fielding, by using a largely panoramic presentation, such as is characteristic of the first six books generally, keeps Molly at considerable distance from the reader, yet by varied technical devices makes her character interesting. Hence the reader does not respond emotionally to Molly. One would suspect, as a result, that the girl would emerge as merely a type character, important to the story only as The Cause of most of Tom's problems in Somerset. That she is more than this is a result of the dramatic intensity achieved by Fielding's narrative technique. This analysis of the manner in which Molly is characterized, and the later analysis of Tom in the Somerset books, will demonstrate as well the way Fielding controls the reader's assessment of Tom in Books IV and V through the manner in which he depicts Molly. The reader is kept at considerable distance from them both.

In his indirect introduction of Molly, Fielding employs most of the devices which help to characterize her in later episodes. For example, the first reference to her is extremely general: the

narrator has been trying to explain why Tom is insensitive to the charms of Sophia, and, after a lengthy preamble filled with allusions and generalizations, as well as complimentary remarks about Tom, he states that "The truth then is, his heart was in the possession of another woman."[1] Rather than satisfy the reader's curiosity immediately about this other woman, he eliminates first (unnecessarily) the possibility of its being Mrs. Blifil, then mentions the "family of George Seagrim" which includes five children, singling out the "second of these children . . . whose name was Molly, and who was esteemed one of the handsomest girls in the whole country." After this generalization, which causes the reader to consider the "whole country" of girls, and also the "whole country" of judges who have thus esteemed her, the narrator alludes to a statement by Congreve which not only comments on Molly's appearance but sets her in an even wider context, that of all possessors of "this something" which is part of true beauty:

> Congreve well says there is in true beauty something which vulgar souls cannot admire; so can no dirt or rags hide this something from those souls which are not of the vulgar stamp. (I, 120)

Following this allusion, the narrator reports the beginnings of Tom and Molly's romance, showing clearly who was the aggressor, yet revealing that Tom was strongly attracted toward her. As in the earlier paragraphs introducing Molly, here too the narrator takes time to comment at length about Tom and his good principles, after which he describes Molly:

> Now, though Molly was, as we have said, generally thought a very fine girl, and in reality she was so, yet her beauty was not of the most amiable kind. It had, indeed, very little of feminine in it, and would have become a man at least as well as a woman; for, to say the truth, youth and florid health had a very considerable share in the composition.
>
> Nor was her mind more effeminate than her person. As this was tall and robust, so was that bold and forward. So little had she of modesty, that Jones had more regard for her virtue than she herself. And as most probably she liked Tom as well as he liked her, so when she perceived his backwardness she herself grew proportionately forward. (I, 120)

In this chapter (IV, vi), as in subsequent episodes, Molly and Tom are treated <u>separately</u> to a great extent, with the narrator's focus seldom being on them together. This particular treatment, of course, prevents the reader from concentrating too much upon their romance, or becoming involved with them as a couple. Moreover, the indirect kind of introduction given Molly--in which even the scenes are designed to prevent the reader's emotional response to her--is typical of the technique used in later passages concerning her.

As stated in the introductory chapter, Fielding's major devices for controlling distance can be grouped into various categories: contrasts and conflicts, devices relating to the scene and summary narrative modes, and comic techniques. In addition to these groups of devices, the ordering of the episodes in each major section of the book and the emphasis within the novel upon various kinds of judgment have an effect on the reader's response. An examination of Fielding's use of these techniques in portraying Molly will demonstrate not simply the general effect they have upon

a narrative, but also why the reader reacts to her as he does--with some interest, but without becoming emotionally involved.

Contrast is fairly significant in Fielding's portrayal of Molly. Because she is the reason for Tom's insensitivity to the charms of Sophia, Molly's introduction into the story is made within the context of a potential romance between Sophia and Tom. We have just had the elegant introduction of Sophia, followed by an actual description of her; then the backward look to the "bird incident," which not only sets the characters of Tom and Blifil in perspective, but reveals Sophia's perception about each, and her affection for Tom. From this the focus returns to the present, narrowing to the scene in which Tom requests Sophia to intercede with her father on behalf of Black George. This incident not only illustrates Tom's goodness and Sophia's obvious love for him, but it reminds the reader at a most appropriate time of Tom's friendship with the Seagrims. Because the recounting of these episodes illustrates that Sophia is all that the narrator has claimed her to be, the contrast between her and Molly is intensified when Molly, in the following chapter, is introduced. That the narrator intends such a contrast is evident by the chapter heading:

> An apology for the insensibility of Mr. Jones to all the charms of the lovely Sophia; in which possibly we may, in a considerable degree, lower his character in the estimation of those men of wit and gallantry who approve the heroes in most of our modern comedies. (I, 118)

The reader has in mind, at this point, "the lovely Sophia" whose "mind was every way equal to her person," and who, without a doubt, is in love with Tom. That Tom is insensitive to her is, as the narrator says, difficult to understand. Thus the indirect introduction of Molly is particularly appropriate. A more vivid description, or a scene revealing her in all her coarseness, would make the contrast far too startling and reflect unfavorably on Tom. As it is, the contrast is sharp enough, with the emphasis being on the levels of refinement in the two girls, though Molly is presented also as having certain charms that would appeal to any young man. She is, after all, "esteemed one of the handsomest girls in the country" (yet another contrast), possessing beauty consisting of "youth and florid health," though "with very little of feminine in it." However, her mind is "bold and forward," unlike that of the blushing Sophia, though her aggressiveness is attributed to her affection for Tom and the "uncommon comeliness of his person." The balance achieved is admirable, for the portrayal of Molly might easily have over-stressed her coarseness or made her too untypical. As it is, the reader sees her as representative of her social class, but still interesting as an individual. Significantly, when Fielding discusses the importance of his use of the "vein of contrast" (V,i), he uses an illustration that is especially pertinent to this contrast of Molly and Sophia:

> . . . can it be doubted, but that the finest woman in the world would lose all benefit of her charms in the eye of a man who had never seen one of another cast? (I, 153)

This contrast with Sophia, therefore, as well as the indirect introduction, serves to keep Molly at considerable distance at this point. As a result, the reader makes no emotional type of moral judgment upon her, or upon Tom.

In subsequent episodes, contrast is used in several other ways to comment upon Molly: when she attends church in Sophia's gown she is a contrast not only to Sophia, but to "her equals"; in the battle in the churchyard, this contrast leads to conflict. While the conflict is a result of Molly's elevation of herself above her peers, their antagonism contributes to the contrast, causes the conflict, and leads the reader to identify with Molly rather than with them. This sympathy, however, is not an emotional response; rather it is the kind of sympathy one gives to any victim, friend or not. Shortly thereafter, in the scene at the Seagrim home, Molly is shown with an antagonistic family. Here a similar kind of contrast is used to evoke the same sort of sympathy, and to hold in check any moral judgment of the girl. All of these contrasts, implicit or explicit, and the conflicts, add interest and even some intensity to the character of Molly.

In the first section of Tom Jones, the narrator-reader relationship is particularly interesting because the reader is still keenly aware of his dependence upon the narrator. Yet theirs is a dramatic relationship also, for the narrator is involving the reader continually, both with himself and in the world of the novel, through devices that are being termed, in this study, "scene-summary"

distancing techniques. Paradoxically, some of the very techniques that make the reader most aware of the narrator add life to the characters in the story. This is especially evident in the characterization of Molly, for authorial intrusions of various kinds--self-conscious comments, references to the reader, generalizations, allusions to literature, symbolism, and figures of speech--play a major role both in keeping her at some distance and in giving some dramatic force to her character. As a result, the reader responds to her in a way that is appropriate to the thematic emphasis of the novel, and to the characterization of Tom at this point in the story.

In addition to the specific kinds of intrusions just referred to, there are some direct comments in which the narrator gives his opinion of Molly. While he makes his assessment of her quite clear, he often speaks in a manner that allows the reader to make further inferences of his own. For example, the first description of Molly, given earlier, includes information about her nature, though the words "generally thought" and "most probably" indicate that the narrator pretends not to know everything about her. In the account of her dressing in her finery for church, he emphasizes her vanity, but merely implies her promiscuity:

> Molly was charmed with the first opportunity she ever had of showing her beauty to advantage; for though she could very well bear to contemplate herself in the glass, even when dressed in rags; and though she had in that dress conquered the heart of Jones, and perhaps of some others; yet she thought the addition of finery would much improve her charms, and extend her conquests. (I, 122)

After Tom learns through Molly's sister about the earlier affair with Will Barnes, the narrator recounts Will's amorous exploits and in so doing states that "Will had, in reality, the sole possession of Molly's affection, while Jones and Square were almost equally sacrifices to her interest and to her pride" (I, 173). If he had these comments only, in addition to the narration of events and the dialogue, the reader would have an accurate view of Molly, but his own judgment would not be as fully exercised and the character of the girl would hold little interest. The reason for this is that the use of varied types of intrusions, along with other distancing techniques, causes a sometimes ambivalent reaction to Molly and a fluctuation in the reader's kind of response to her. Because these statements about her appearance and character both keep her at some distance and yet prevent her from being merely an abstraction, they form an integral part in her characterization. In the final analysis, the reader's opinion of Molly is the same as that of the narrator, but the experience of considering her afresh in almost every passage, from diverse points of view, results in what is, in fact, an impersonal involvement.

Fielding's self-conscious narrator makes various kinds of comments about his unique role as historian and creator, observer and manipulator. He is relating facts, yet creating a story; observing his creatures, yet manipulating both them and his readers. By thus drawing attention to himself, the narrator defines just what kind of story this is--usually stressing its historical

accuracy through direct comments, but implying, at the same time, its status as a fictional work of art. During the Molly episodes, for example, several such comments are made. Prior to the churchyard battle, the narrator announces that he is going to invoke the Muses "as we are diffident of our own abilities" (I, 124). Then, after Square has been discovered in Molly's bedroom and the beginning of their affair recounted, the narrator explains that he did not communicate Square's interest in Molly earlier than this because Square said nothing himself. Later, he insists that he relates the story of Molly and Tom in the grove only because "that historic truth to which we profess so inviolable an attachment, obliges us to communicate it to posterity" (I, 191). Each of these examples stresses the narrator's role as historian while implying his role as artist: he is a writer who tells what has happened though he is concerned that he do so with both style and accuracy. In writing about Molly, therefore, he will not omit "the facts," but his artistic aims and moral convictions will direct his method of telling them. As historian, the narrator is necessarily removed from his account because he is relating events in which he did not participate; as artist, he sets himself back still further from the story because of the emphasis upon his role as manipulator and the "history" as artifice.

Other self-conscious comments are those in which the narrator makes a pretence of ignorance. In such cases the reader reacts

with heightened curiosity, impatience, annoyance, or even with laughter and an opinion of his own. For example, when Tom visits Molly in her bedroom, and finds Square there, the description of how the rug might have fallen is highly comic:

> Now, whether Molly, in the agonies of her rage, pushed this rug with her feet; or Jones might touch it; or whether the pin or nail gave way of its own accord, I am not certain; but as Molly pronounced those last words, which are recorded above, the wicked rug got loose. . . . (I, 168)

Since how the rug fell is utterly irrelevant, this explanation not only lengthens and sets the scene but makes Square look as ludicrous as possible by inviting the reader to visualize every second of the incident. As a result, Molly's probable embarrassment is almost forgotten, and when finally referred to has little impact on the reader.

On other occasions, the narrator refuses to reveal or explain facts. In the churchyard, after the battle, the narrator declares that Tom finds Molly "in a condition which must give both me and my reader pain, was it to be described here." The fact that he has described, in vivid detail, the appearance of Goody Brown indicates that he wants to control his portrayal of Molly in a way that is not necessary for her antagonists. To describe her at this moment would make her a grotesque figure, or possibly lead to an undeserved dose of sympathy and an over-emphasis upon her affair with Tom. Similarly, the narrator omits the brief "parley" between the drunken Tom and Molly before the two retire into the grove, with the effect of making this scene of them together just as fleeting as possible.

Thus all of these examples show the narrator ostensibly putting his artistic principles ahead of "historic truth."

The narrator as a manipulator is seen as well in the frequent use of parentheses which serve, as shown in the introductory chapter, to isolate, or stress, various kinds of comments. There are several examples which are part of the characterization of Molly. After Tom falls in love with Sophia, he decides to offer money to Molly, hoping that "her egregious vanity (somewhat of which hath been already hinted to the reader)" will make his plan effective. Because of the parentheses, the remark seems to be an afterthought, an insignificant aside, whereas in fact this device serves to stress it. Later, when the narrator is disclosing the details of Molly's affair with Square, we are told her reason for accepting Square as a lover was not "solely the consideration that two are better than one (though this had its proper weight)", and, again, the tone is altered and the appropriate part of the sentence emphasized through the use of parentheses.

All of these varied kinds of self-conscious comments relating to Molly, therefore, contribute in some way to her characterization by reminding the reader of the narrator's firm control of the story, and of Molly. Thus the reader's intellectual interests are aroused and maintained.

Occasionally the narrator speaks directly to the reader about Molly. In his explanation of Tom's insensitivity to Sophia, for instance, which leads up to the introduction of Molly, the narrator

supposes that "the reader will be surprised at our long taciturnity . . . and quite at a loss to divine who this woman was" (I, 119). Later, "that the reader may be no longer in suspense," he refers to the Seagrims and to Molly (I, 120), and, finally, after explaining that Tom "attributed the conquest entirely to himself," comments that "this the reader will allow to have been a very natural and probable supposition" (I, 121). During the churchyard scene, the narrator refers to the pain the reader would feel if Molly were to be described as Tom finds her, while in the account of Tom's visit to her there are four more direct references to the reader: the first regarding Molly's vanity, the next reporting her supposed "great raptures" on finding Tom at the door, the third concerning the appearance of her room, and, finally, a statement about her preference for Tom. What is most interesting about all of these is that none, except the reference to her vanity, constitutes a direct rhetorical comment emphasizing the narrator's opinion of Molly. On the other hand, they do not evoke reader sympathy either. Rather, through either giving information to the reader, or through the use of mild irony, they prevent any strong reaction whatever. This is in striking contrast to the comments addressed to the reader about Tom in these early books, for most of them stress his good looks and good nature.

The generalizations which contribute to Molly's characterization tend to be more negative in content than the comments just noted. But because generalizations cause an increase of distance between

the reader and the character or event, these do not lead to any strong moral reaction against Molly. First, there is the reference to Congreve, already noted, which points out that Molly has a certain quality possessed by all true beauties. Then, in the account of Molly's going to church in Sophia's gown, the narrator generalizes about the fact that ambition and vanity flourish as well in a country churchyard as in the drawing room, thus putting Molly again in an almost universal context. From here the scope is narrowed to the realms of religion ("Schemes have indeed been laid in the vestry") and politics ("Here are plots and circumventions, parties and factions, equal to those which are to be found in courts"). Finally, the focus in the passage narrows to women--those of high life and those of low life--and to Molly herself and her appearance. This lengthy generalization is a comment not only on Molly, but on the mob which attacks her out of envy and spite. These comments, as well as the narrator's use of the words "her equals" in recounting the incident, remind the reader that Molly is one of this group, even though at this moment a distinct contrast is established. For Molly and the mob--as well as almost everyone else in the world--possess a similar kind of ambition and vanity.

During his account of the churchyard battle, the narrator interrupts his recital of the action to generalize about how women fight:

> It is lucky for the women that the seat of fistycuff war is not the same with them as among men; but though they may seem a little to deviate from their sex, when they go forth to battle, yet I have observed, they never so far forget, as to assail the bosoms of each other; where a few blows would be fatal to most of them. This, I

know, some derive from their being of a more bloody inclination than the males. On which account they apply to the nose, as to the part whence blood may most easily be drawn; but this seems a far-fetched as well as ill-natured supposition. (I, 126)

While the effect of this explanation is to class Molly with all other fighting women, including her present antagonists, it also leads to a physical description of the grotesque Goody Brown that presents such a vivid contrast with Molly that her individuality is actually asserted.

When Tom arrives home just in time to rescue the arrested Molly, the narrator reports that she was being conducted "to that house where the inferior sort of people may learn one good lesson, viz. respect and deference to their superiors" (I, 135), proceeding then to comment on the difference in these two classes of people. Hence he diffuses the focus once again to the wider range of all the lower classes, as opposed to all the higher classes. At the same time, however, this is a satirical remark that evokes a kind of sympathy for Molly, who is about to go to prison because she happens to be of the "inferior sort."

When Tom visits Molly, the narrator's account of her astonishment is preceded by the comment that

The extremes of grief and joy have been remarked to produce very similar effects; and when either of these rushes on us by surprize, it is apt to create such a total perturbation and confusion, that we are often thereby deprived of the use of all of our faculties. (I, 166)

After having thus placed Molly once again in the broad context of the human race generally, the narrator proceeds to describe her specific reaction, implying while doing so that her experience is an extremely common one.

Much later, in the account of the grove incident, we are told that "No sooner had our heroe retired with his Dido" than Blifil and Thwackum appeared. To consider Molly as Dido recalls, of course, that other aggressive female who won the love of Aeneas, at least temporarily, while the use of an allusion to Virgil provides a distinct sense of distance and incongruity. Because the overall import of these generalizations and literary allusions is to depict Molly as a typical vulgar country girl, the reader's response to her is, at these points in the story, almost totally intellectual rather than emotional.

If generalizations diffuse the intensity of an incident, symbolism increases it. Interestingly, there is no persistent symbolism concerning Molly herself, or her affair with Tom, as there is in the affair of Tom and Mrs. Waters. Whereas Sophia's love for Tom is discussed in terms of disease and war imagery, the affair of Molly and Tom is never so described. Tom's gratitude and compassion toward Molly is termed a "garrison" in the citadel of his heart, and she herself is referred to as "the fortress of virtue," but neither concerns a love between <u>them</u>: the first relates to Tom's attitude toward Molly after he falls in love with Sophia, while the second refers to Square's conquest of Molly. In the latter case, it is interesting to note that food imagery as well is used in the report of Square's winning of Molly:

> . . . it is probable he at first intended to have contented himself with the pleasing ideas which the sight of beauty furnishes us with. These the gravest men, after a full meal of serious meditation,

> often allow themselves by way of dessert. . . . His appetite was not of that squeamish kind which cannot feed on a dainty because another hath tasted it. (I, 169)

The fact that Molly is so described in connection with Square, but not with Tom, illustrates yet again the way the narrator treats Molly and Tom separately as much as possible. Doubtless any suitable symbolism, or apt figures of speech, relating to them both would give their affair an undue significance and implicate Tom more than is desirable.

Molly is shown very seldom through dialogue, either direct or indirect. While the scene at the end of the churchyard battle includes comments by others, the only reference to her speech is: "She now first bursting into tears, told him how barbarously she had been treated." The first conversation in which Molly is directly involved is in her home, where she is shown, in the argument with her parents and sisters, as forward, vulgar and proud:

> Molly answered with great spirit, 'And what is this mighty place which you have got for me, father?' - for he had not well understood the phrase used by Sophia of being about her person - 'I suppose it is to be under the cook; but I shan't wash dishes for anybody. My gentleman will provide better for me. See what he hath given me this afternoon. . . .' (I, 129)

Strangely enough, though perhaps this is consistent with her artfulness, Molly says nothing when Tom rescues her from the constable after she has been arrested. Though Tom's words to her are reported, in indirect discourse, her attitude or response is not even noted. She is presented vividly, however--though the scene is brief--when Tom visits her in her room. Her immediate reaction to

Tom's arrival is reported with apt irony: she is so overwhelmed she is speechless. But after Tom explains the purpose of his visit, her tongue is loosed at once:

'And this is your love for me, to forsake me in this manner, now you have ruined me! How often, when I have told you that all men are false and perjury alike, and grow tired of us as soon as ever they have had their wicked wills of us, how often have you sworn you would never forsake me! And can you be such a perjury man after all? What signifies all the riches in the world to me without you, now you have gained my heart, so you have - you have -? Why do you mention another man to me? I can never love any other man as long as I live. All other men are nothing to me. If the greatest squire in all the country would come a suiting to me tomorrow, I would not give my company to him. No, I shall always hate and despise the whole sex for your sake--' (I, 167)

It would appear that only when the reader is unlikely to censure Tom does the narrator show Molly so vividly, as on this occasion, and earlier with her family. Though this is Molly's last direct speech during the incident in her room, the narrator does report that after Square's presence is revealed she "cried out she was undone, and abandoned herself to despair," being "silenced by the evidence." After Tom leaves, too, we are told that "she began to upbraid Square," but her anger is soon mitigated. The chapter ends with a summary of her outburst to him:

She then poured forth a vast profusion of tenderness towards her new lover; turned all she had said to Jones, and Jones himself, into ridicule; and vowed, though he once had the possession of her person, that none but Square had ever been master of her heart. (I, 172)

Only the briefest of conversations is reported between Molly and Tom when they meet in the grove, significantly the only one in which the words of both are given directly. Tom's eight-word

sentence, however, is in stark contrast to his verbose outburst about Sophia a few moments before. That Molly is seen at closer range in this her final appearance is effective not only in illuminating once again her aggressiveness (which reduces the reader's criticism of Tom) but also in leaving the reader with an accurate impression of her character. Moreover, the vivid view, brief as it is, makes this particular meeting of Molly and Tom one which does arouse the reader's criticism of Tom. For though Molly is, obviously, the aggressor, Tom, by this time, has declared his love for Sophia. Hence the scene causes the reader to react to Molly morally--with some emotion--in a way he has not done to this point. This response is kept strictly controlled, however, by her speedy disappearance and the highly comic treatment of the fight in the grove that follows.

Intensity of impression is gained not only through the use of dialogue, but through scenic presentation, which may or may not include dialogue. Molly, however, is revealed in few scenes, even as she is given little dialogue. Scenic passages are the brief one in church, the churchyard battle (in part), the argument at the Seagrims, Tom's rescue of Molly from the constable, Tom's visit to her room (in part) and the accidental meeting in the grove. Without a doubt, the most representational of these is the scene at the Seagrim home, not only because of the amount of realistic dialogue which is not preceded by summary, but because of the absence of authorial comment until the argument has ended.

Significantly, this scene, which depicts Molly most vividly, has nothing to do with Tom; nor does the scene in the church or the churchyard. Because Molly, at church, is wearing Sophia's dress to hide her pregnancy, the reader's mind may well be on both Tom and Molly. But the mob, after all, attacks only out of envy.

Scenes focusing on Molly and Tom together are few. The first is at the end of the churchyard battle, when Tom appears and assists Molly. The emphasis, however, is upon his actions until he bids her farewell at her house. Then when he rescues Molly from the constable, Tom embraces her before them all, though the focus shifts at once to him and Allworthy. The focus upon Tom and Molly when he visits her is brief also, for as soon as the "accident" discloses Square the scene involves Tom and Square primarily. Even as the dialogue in the grove scene is limited, the scene itself is brief, and followed at once by the narrator's rationalizations about Tom.

In summary, then, the foregoing examples of "scene-summary" distancing techniques emphasize the depiction of Molly as a typical country wench, though with enough individuality and vitality to justify to us Tom's interest in her. By his choice of either narrative mode in accord with the need for distance or involvement, judgment or sympathy, and by his judicious use of these particular distancing devices, the narrator has provided considerable dramatic intensity within a mainly panoramic presentation.

The response of the reader of Tom Jones to Molly is affected also by Fielding's comic techniques. Generally, these contribute to the sense one has of the work as artifice and therefore increase the reader's distance from Molly. Yet because such devices are used in both narrative modes--scene and summary--they do not affect the reader-narrator relationship, or the reader-novel relationship, in quite the same way as do the intrusions or contrasts which necessarily emphasize the panoramic nature of the presentation. The comic language--whether mock-heroic, stylized, or ironic--affects both narration and dialogue and the reader's response to a passage by the manner in which it limits emotional involvement. Rather than increasing directly the reader's intellectual responses, comic language distances a reader by limiting or preventing an emotional involvement at a time when the incident itself may be potentially serious.

Through his use of the mock-heroic, for example, Fielding sets Molly at considerable distance from the narrator and reader. Sympathy would be given, normally, to a pregnant girl being assaulted by a mob, and to some extent one does sympathize with Molly. Yet this response is kept in check by the comedy of the style: we identify with Molly merely because she is the victim, and less grotesque than her antagonists.. By saying, at the beginning of his account, "let us here invite a superior power to our assistance," the narrator is distancing himself from the event. He then proceeds with his story which includes the mock-heroic equivalent of the epic invocation, epic simile, epic battle, epic catalogue of warriors, and

epic speech. Such a recounting keeps the event in perspective: Molly is viewed as a crude, proud wench who is bold, promiscuous and generally typical of her class; yet she is here seen as a highly comic figure who cannot be condemned. If the battle were described in plain language, the reader's response would probably be too personal for he would react with an emotional kind of sympathy that would distort the picture of Molly he is intended to have. Significantly, Tom's part in the battle is summarized in plain language, perhaps an indication that his heroism is not to be regarded comically.

The other mock-heroic description of a battle, that between Tom and Thwackum, is a result of Molly's pursuit of Tom, though she is nowhere to be seen. Because she is the cause of the fight, however, and because this incident marks not simply the end of her relationship with Tom but the beginning of his serious problems, one is aware of her throughout. Perhaps it is at this point that the reader first realizes just what an antagonistic force Molly has been—though unwittingly. Yet, as is noted by Robert Alter, the episode is made highly comic and ironic:

> It is ironical that Molly should manifest herself when Tom is thinking of Sophia, or that Sophia's reaction to Tom's injuries should convince her aunt that the girl loves Blifil, or that Western should attack the man he is about to choose for a son-in-law and rescue the one he will soon wish to be hanged. The ironies enlarge one another and spread themselves across the book until every important character is involved.
>
> It is because these stronger notes underlie the mock-heroic vibrations that those have their full comic power. When the course of the entire novel is exposed to such possibilities, we must grant Fielding a series of triumphs that transform the mock-epic mode into a truly heroic comedy, with humour absorbed by a harmony like the resolutions of Shakespearean romance.[2]

The comedy of the grove scene, provided primarily by the mock-heroic description, stresses that the incident preceding the fight is not to be regarded too seriously. Thus the narrator tells the story in a manner that prevents the reader from over-reacting emotionally or morally to either Molly or Tom.

Stylized language affects the portrayal of Molly in a similar way. Writing of Fielding's style, Robert Alter says that his "artfully ostentatious manipulation of words"[3] is of even greater significance than his use of the mock epic because "through the fine control of tone, rhythm, imagery, syntax, by the shrewd play with and against the received meanings of words," this stylized language achieves "the qualities of precision of reference, complexity of statement, aesthetically pleasing form, that are traditionally associated with the language of poetry."[4] And in the section of Tom Jones presently under consideration the stylization surely does add to the comedy, which in turn affects the reader's responses and involvement. In the scene at the Seagrim home, for example (IV,x), following the argument between the parents about how to answer Sophia's request that Molly be her maid, the narrator uses stylization in reporting Black George's method of ending the squabble:

> No sooner, therefore, had this symptom appeared, than he had immediate recourse to the said remedy, which though, as it is usual in all very efficacious medicines, it at first seemed to heighten and inflame the disease, soon produced a total calm, and restored the patient to perfect ease and tranquillity. (I, 130)

While it is Mrs. Seagrim who is "the patient," the passage is pertinent to the portrayal of Molly. For this stylized, comic passage at the end of a scene which reveals so vividly the Seagrim family serves to remove them from close observation at a point where the reader may well be in danger of identifying too closely with their victim, Molly.

Parson Supple, whose distinctive language provides comedy wherever he appears, adds to the comic depiction of Molly through his recounting of the churchyard incident to Squire Western, Tom and Sophia:

> I was saying such garments are rare sights in the country; and perchance, too, it was thought the more rare, respect being had to the person who wore it, who, they tell me, is the daughter of Black George, your worship's gamekeeper, whose sufferings I should have opined, might have taught him more wit, than to dress forth his wenches in such gaudy apparel. She created so much confusion in the congregation, that if Squire Allworthy had not silenced it, it would have interrupted the service: for I was once about to stop in the middle of the first lesson. Howbeit, nevertheless, after prayer was over, and I was departed home, this occasioned a battle in the churchyard, where, amongst other mischief, the head of a travelling fiddler was very much broken. This morning the fiddler came to Squire Allworthy for a warrant, and the wench was brought before him. The squire was inclined to have compounded matters; when, lo! on a sudden the wench appeared (I ask your ladyship's pardon) to be, as it were, at the eve of bringing forth a bastard. . . . (I, 132)

During the hilarious scene in Molly's bedroom, the comedy arises not only from the situation itself, but from the appropriate way it is recounted. For example, the narrator reports Tom's arrival as follows:

> It cannot therefore be wondered at, that the unexpected sight of Mr. Jones should so strongly operate on the mind of Molly, and should overwhelm her with such confusion, that for some minutes she was

unable to express the great raptures, with which the reader will suppose she was affected on this occasion. (I, 166)

And a few moments later, in the midst of Molly's tearful outburst to Tom, "an accident put a stop to her tongue, before it had run out half its career."

When Molly appears suddenly in the grove, interrupting Tom's lyrical speech in praise of Sophia, the partly stylized description of Molly helps to detract from the realism of the scene, and from the repelling picture of the girl:

> At these words he started up, and beheld--not his Sophia, no, nor a Circassian maid richly and elegantly attired for the grand Signior's seraglio. No; without a gown, in a shift that was somewhat of the coarsest, and none of the cleanest, bedewed likewise with some odoriferous effluvia, the produce of the day's labour, with a pitchfork in her hand, Molly Seagrim approached. (I, 192)

The irony pervading all of Tom Jones, in narration, dialogue and intrusions, is, of course, evident in these examples of the mock-heroic and stylized language as well. But there are additional examples from the Molly episodes which illustrate further the effect of irony upon the reader's response to her. Particularly pertinent is the dramatic irony. For a considerable length of time, for example, the reader knows much more about Molly than Tom does; moreover, the other characters know about her pregnancy and her general reputation before Tom does. Though the reader does not know about Will Barnes until Tom is told, the narrator's earlier comment that "she had in that dress conquered the heart of Jones, and perhaps of some others" (my italics) is sufficient to suggest the truth. It is our knowledge of Molly (and of course Tom's utter ignorance) that

adds interest and comedy to his intervention in the churchyard fight and in her arrest, his inner turmoil, and his visit to her to break off their affair honourably. Even after finding Square, Tom does not suspect Molly of having still other lovers. Thus the reader is forced to conclude that Tom is not only compassionate and generous, but extremely naive, and that Molly, as well as being artful, surely must be "one greatly the object of desire" because of her "youth, health and beauty" (I, 121, 120).

The reader, of course, is kept in ignorance at times. For example, he has no proof for some time that Molly's child is not Tom's, nor does the reader know of Square's interest in Molly until Tom discovers this, for the provocative parenthetic comment following the churchyard battle is extremely ambiguous: "Square, changing his mind (not idly, but for a reason which we shall unfold as soon as we have leisure), desired the young gentlemen to ride with him another way" (I, 127). To have revealed to the reader Square's involvement with Molly at that time would have introduced irrelevant information at a point where Tom's interest in Molly is being pointed out, and would have detracted from the hilarious nature of the scene in her bedroom.

These examples of irony, as well as the verbal irony evident in the descriptions of Molly's appearance and character, contribute to the maintaining of a distance between the reader and Molly. This distance prevents an emotional response to her and, consequently, limits one's criticism of her, or of Tom. While it is accurate to

say that distance is necessary for judgment, a moral judgment is normally both subjective and objective; thus such a judgment comes as a result of both involvement and detachment. Obviously, the reader is not to judge Molly subjectively; nor is he to criticize Tom--except in the most limited sense--for his affair with her. When one is prevented from responding emotionally to a character, as one is in the case of Molly, the qualities in the narrative that appeal to the intellectual interests in the story become prominent. In the case of Molly, for example, the reader's interest in her is kept fairly impersonal: he is curious about her character, curious about the effect she will have upon Tom, and interested in noting the various narrative techniques Fielding uses to portray her.

While the reader's assessment of Molly is affected by all of these technical means (which combine to reveal the narrator's opinion), it is influenced as well by the wide range of expressed judgments of Molly within the story itself. Some of these have already been noted: her reputation as "one of the handsomest girls in the country," the envy and antagonism of "her equals," the attitude of her family, and Tom's "affection," which later turns to gratitude and compassion, though never condemnation. The range of expressed opinions, however, goes beyond these.

In Parson Supple's intriguing account of the churchyard battle, for example, he deplores Molly's promiscuity, while Squire Western,

predictably, says that he thinks this of no importance whatever. Implied here, and stated explicitly after the fight in the grove, is Western's conviction that such wenches are essential to the welfare of the country. In contrast to this is the attitude of Thwackum, who terms Molly "that wicked slut," "a wanton harlot," and one of "these vermin," though he does not know her exact identity. Square, on the other hand, the first time he sees Molly, is "pleased with her beauty" and in fact "liked the girl the better for the want of that chastity, which, if she had possessed it, must have been a bar to his pleasures." Yet it is he who puts into Allworthy's mind the "first bad impression of Tom" by suggesting that the young man's interest in the Seagrims is solely on Molly's account.

The judgment of Allworthy, like that of Sophia, is more upon Tom than on Molly, though Sophia at one time has regarded the girl with interest and pity. Allworthy sentences Molly to prison with "truly upright" intentions, apparently considering her not so much an individual as a social evil. But when he discovers Tom's involvement with Molly, he terms her, in speaking to Tom, "a poor girl" who has been corrupted and ruined. While the narrator stresses Allworthy's "detestation" of the "vice of incontinence," he also shows that the Squire's major judgment in the case is not upon Molly. Even when he stops condemning Tom, because he cannot help but admire his "honour and honesty," Allworthy makes no reference to the girl. Likewise, Sophia appears to view Molly

impersonally, making no judgment upon her whatever. Sophia's mental anguish results from her love for Tom, as is evident in her anger when Mrs. Honour insists on discussing Tom's affair with Molly, denouncing the girl as a "beggar wench" and "a forward kind of body."

It is significant, surely, that those characters whose opinions the reader most respects make the most impersonal responses to Molly: Sophia, first, and then Allworthy. Sophia has every right to despise Molly, and perhaps she does. And Allworthy has a right, even yet, to send her either to prison or at least out of the parish. But he does not. Both he and Sophia are concerned primarily with Tom. One feels that they regard Molly as simply having acted in a manner typical of her social class. The fight in the grove and the subsequent discussion suggest how the reader is to judge Molly: not in the manner of Thwackum and Blifil, or even of Squire Western, but as Sophia does. And she ignores Molly. Whether Sophia is too proud to admit that Tom's affair with this wench has upset her, or whether she is too involved with Tom herself to be bothered with Molly, is not revealed. But in either case the reader's reaction is influenced strongly by Sophia's attitude. His opinion of Molly remains impersonal, though he is forced, through the many pronouncements about the girl, to view her in varying ways. All of the opinions contribute in some way to leading the reader to the desired detachment and objective judgment

essential to the story. As Robert Alter says, this experience of making a judgment not only involves the reader in the story but enhances the depiction of the character concerned:

> We tend, I suspect, to be wary of the faculty of judgment, imagining that its continual exercise will somehow reduce characters, flatten and simplify them. In Fielding, for the most part, quite the reverse is true: his characters become more vividly alive, even more complex, as he judges them and asks us to judge them. This is especially surprising because his treatment of characters is not particularly analytical.[6]

Similarly, Henry Knight Miller considers the "matter of Opinion" one of the central themes and basic structural elements of Tom Jones because of the importance of "the 'light' in which an act is viewed, and the 'colors' in which it is presented."[7]

The particular way in which the episodes of Books IV and V are ordered contributes as well to the type of response the reader has to Molly. Thus a summary of the way direct and indirect views of her are alternated is in order. Through her indirect introduction as a contrast to Sophia, Molly is kept in the background, but the focus is upon her directly as she dresses in Sophia's gown, goes to church, and fights her peers in the churchyard. Parson Supple's account of this incident continues to keep Molly before the reader, though indirectly. When Tom rescues her from the constable, she is viewed directly once again, though briefly, with the focus being primarily upon Tom. After this incident, the narrator concentrates, appropriately, upon Tom and Sophia for some time, though Molly is kept before the reader through the several accounts of Tom's turmoil. She is shown vividly, though briefly, when Tom visits

her, then relegated to the background once Square appears. And in the succeeding chapter the account of Tom's concern that Molly's child is his, followed by the information he and the reader receive to the contrary, keeps the girl in the reader's mind. One forgets about her, however, during the chapters dealing with Mr. Allworthy's illness, for Tom has by this time terminated his affair with her. Thus when she reappears, in the grove, the brief view of her and Tom together is especially vivid. The final focus upon Molly is an indirect one, for though she is not present during the battle, she is responsible for it and is discussed by Western, Thwackum and Blifil. Appropriately, the final comments about her are comic: first, the Squire's cry, 'Soho! Puss is not far off. Here's her form, upon my soul; I believe I may cry stole away'; and, second, the narrator's explanation that she had indeed crawled away, upon four feet, when the intruders appeared.

In each of the three sections of Tom Jones, there is a bedroom scene where an unexpected and unwanted visitor arrives. And each of these parallel scenes is fairly typical both of Fielding's overall narrative technique in that part of the novel and of his technique in depicting the woman concerned. An examination of each of these scenes, therefore, will illustrate the manner in which Fielding uses, in one passage, both narrative modes and numerous distancing techniques. The scene in Molly Seagrim's bedroom, for example, may be considered a paradigm for Fielding's method of

presenting Molly, and for his narrative mode in the first six books. The reason this scene may be thus considered is that we see in it a continually changing focus, frequent use of the major distancing devices (as has been noted), and a depiction of Molly that is in accord with her overall portrayal in Books IV and V. She is, ostensibly, the main figure in this incident (this is, after all, her room, and these are two of her lovers), but Fielding manages to maintain the indirectness that is evident in his total characterization of her. Moreover, by concentrating on Square after "the accident," Fielding minimizes the effect of earlier statements referring to Tom's affair with Molly: "Tom had no objection to this situation of his mistress" (after learning she is in bed) and "he was so entirely possessed, and as it were enchanted, by the presence of his beloved object, that he for a while forgot Sophia, and consequently the principal purpose of his visit" (I, 166). And this keeping of Tom in the background, especially in passages where he is involved with Molly, is typical also of the treatment given him in these books.

Appropriately, the chapter begins with the account of Tom's turmoil--partly in the form of a soliloquy--which reveals fairly vividly his own idea of Molly's affection for him:

> He considered this poor girl as having sacrificed to him everything in her little power; as having been at her own expense the object of his pleasure; as sighing and languishing for him even at that very instant. Shall then, says he, my recovery, for which she hath so ardently wished; shall my presence, which she hath so eagerly expected, instead of giving her that joy with which she hath flattered herself, cast her at once down into misery and despair? Can I be such a villain? (I, 165)

Immediately following this decision, the thought of his genuine love for Sophia, and hers for him, so overwhelms him that he decides to break off with Molly after all. Tom's vacillating attitude here affects the reader's view of Molly, even though he knows her better than Tom does, for the passage involves the reader closely in the problem Molly has caused, though it reminds him also of the strong physical appeal she obviously has. The focus then is directly on Tom, indirectly on Molly, until he arrives at the door of her room. Briefly, it is on them both, though all but Molly's tearful outburst is related either in summary or indirect speech. When the "accident" occurs at the crucial point in her speech, the emphasis moves from her to the physical surroundings, and finally to Square, with the disclosure of what this accident was. From here on the episodes center upon him, and on Molly only by implication. Commenting on this part of the incident, Robert Alter notes the effect of the narrator's phrase "among other female utensils" in reference to Square's situation:

> The phrase here that has often, and understandably, evoked comment is, of course, "among other female utensils." It is a miracle of satiric compression: the addition of that lethal "other" places Square for us precisely where Fielding wants him, reducing the teacher of noble ethical ideals to a kind of ambulatory dildo, heaped together with sundry unnamed female appurtenances which, as Molly's intimate possessions, would in all likelihood be neither very clean nor sweet nor pleasant to behold. The satiric point of the phrase, moreover, transfixes Molly together with Square,[my italics] because the application here of "female utensils" brilliantly exposes the crude standard of sexual utilitarianism upon which she bases her relationships with men, Tom included.[7]

In spite of Molly's embarrassment when Square's presence is disclosed, the reader has little sympathy for her, though the emphasis upon Square through the numerous comments prevents any moral judgment of her either. One has little inclination, in any case, to criticize her for being Square's mistress, for this arrangement has, as Square claims, a certain "Fitness" about it. It is her deceit, and the effect of this upon Tom, that arouses the reader's indignation. He is delighted, therefore, that Tom has discovered her infidelity, as this will free him from his sense of obligation. After referring to the consternation of both Molly and Square, the narrator shifts his focus to Tom, whose outburst of laughter illustrates the right response. The subsequent dialogue between Tom and Square maintains this tone, for Square's pronouncements, in view of his appearance all this time, make him ridiculous and Tom admirable, with Molly, in the background, largely ignored until Tom leaves.

In this episode, the manner in which a minimum of action is expanded to an extremely lengthy account illustrates the way even a set scene can be dramatic. One has a sense of comic and dramatic suspense from the point where Square's ludicrous posture and appearance are described to where, seventy-six lines later, Molly's reaction is noted. By inserting, in between, comments about the probable surprise of the reader, the real nature of philosophers, the way Square's affair with Molly began and has proceeded, as well as information about why Molly's sister allowed Tom to proceed upstairs, the narrator--paradoxically--both diffuses the intensity

of the action and adds dramatic interest. Without this information, the reader's response would not be as accurate, yet to have provided it any earlier would have removed some of the comedy here and have caused an inappropriately personal response.

The entire chapter is largely picture, or panorama, with specific scenes only at moments of greatest importance: Tom's inner turmoil, including his soliloquy (prior to his visit), his arrival, and the conversation with Molly. Even to this point there is considerable summary, including the narration about their greeting at the door. Here the narrator takes over, and a series of allusions, comments, descriptions and straight narration continues to the place where Tom's laughter breaks the embarrassed silence (and the suspense of the reader) and another scene follows --that between him and Square. While their conversation is depicted dramatically, that of Square and Molly after Tom's departure is not.

That this incident can seem so intense when it is treated in such a leisurely manner is evidence of Fielding's skill in fusing the two narrative modes in a manner that adds dramatic interest to a panoramic presentation. The intensity, it must be noted, results not only from the use of dialogue and scene from time to time but also from the devices that emphasize the presence (and power) of the narrator. In this episode, the very sequence of paragraphs, as well as the inclusion of so much diverse information in the middle

of the narration, provides most of the suspense, magnifying the event in accord with its importance to Tom's situation and state of mind. If presented wholly in scenic fashion, the incident would lack this powerful effect, for it would not involve the reader's judgment as this method does. As in the first six books generally, therefore, and in the overall depiction of Molly, Fielding chooses for his recounting of this incident a panoramic approach in which intensity is achieved largely through devices that keep the reader at a distance. The reader's intellectual responses are so cleverly controlled that an interest in Molly (impersonal though it is) is aroused and maintained until her part in the story is completed.

Chapter Four: Mrs. Waters

The reader of Tom Jones responds to Mrs. Waters in a much more personal way than he does to Molly Seagrim. This is a result of the nature of the events at Upton as well as the techniques by which Fielding depicts them and characterizes Mrs. Waters. As the ensuing analysis will demonstrate, both the intellectual and emotional interests of the reader are aroused. At first, he responds emotionally to her, and to Tom. But as the Upton events proceed, the reader becomes detached, gradually, until by the conclusion of the passage he is hardly aware of Mrs. Waters. That she should be portrayed more vividly than Molly, and that Tom's second affair should arouse the reader's censure more than the first, is, of course, in accord with the increasing realism in the way events are portrayed.

The fact that the reader does not know on his first reading of Tom Jones that Mrs. Waters is Jenny Jones helps to keep her at some distance. One would react with considerable surprise and doubtless some condemnation at this point if told that the rather intellectual, modest and plain Jenny Jones had become this sort of woman. But without that contrast in mind, one does not view Mrs. Waters in a particularly judgmental manner. In any case, this withholding of information restrains one's emotional involvement with her. And the references throughout the Upton episode to her

identity arouse the reader's curiosity. The manner in which the distance between this woman and the reader gradually increases--as his emotional involvement with her lessens--relates closely to the overall effect of this incident upon the reader's judgment of Tom. Only after Sophia arrives is the reader actually critical of Tom, and by then Mrs. Waters has, it would seem, disappeared from the scene. The focus has moved from her, gradually but completely, so that the reader has ceased to be involved with her, yet has never actually condemned her. And in view of her vital role later in the novel, the fact that the reader has not, here at Upton, reacted to her negatively, is important. This present analysis of Mrs. Waters will not include her earlier appearance in the story as Jenny Jones. It is only her affair with Tom, and the way both are depicted at Upton, that is relevant.

In contrast to the leisurely, indirect introduction of Molly Seagrim, Mrs. Waters enters the story abruptly: Tom hears "most violent screams," then sees "a woman stript half naked, under the hands of a ruffian, who had put his garter round her neck, and was endeavoring to draw her up to a tree."[1] Almost at once, a brief conversation takes place between the victim and Tom, in which only the woman's words are reported directly: 'I could almost conceive you to be some good angel; and, to say the truth, you look more like an angel than a man in my eye' (I, 397). After commenting on the aptness of the woman's remark, the narrator proceeds to describe the "redeemed captive" in more detail:

> . . . she seemed to be at least of the middle age, nor had her face much appearance of beauty; but her cloaths being torn from all the upper part of her body, her breasts, which were well formed and extremely white, attracted the eyes of her deliverer, and for a few moments they stood silent, and gazing at each other. (I, 397)

At this point the reader's attention is diverted, for Tom's eyes fall upon the woman's attacker, Northerton, and a conversation ensues between the two men. Not for long is the victim neglected, however, and in reply to Tom's enquiry, "She answered that she was an entire stranger in that part of the world." Thus Tom decides, in accordance with the advice of the Man of the Hill, to take her to Upton. But before they set out, her speech (expressing, ostensibly, a philosophical and religious attitude toward her attacker's escape) not only is ironic but helps to maintain the focus upon her:

> 'As to the fellow's escape,' said she, 'it gives me no uneasiness; for philosophy and Christianity both preach up forgiveness of injuries. But for you, sir, I am concerned at the trouble I give you; nay, indeed, my nakedness may well make me ashamed to look you in the face; and if it was not for the sake of your protection, I should wish to go alone.' (I, 399)

Through the comic manner in which the walk to Upton is reported (with Tom walking ahead of the half-naked woman, who refuses to wear his coat yet repeatedly calls for his assistance), Mrs. Waters' nature is indicated yet more clearly. As a result, by the time the two arrive at Upton, the reader has had a fairly thorough introduction to this woman, though he does not know her name. Moreover, his emotions have, in all probability, been aroused. Because Fielding, in this introduction of Mrs. Waters, has revealed her

quite vividly through a scene that includes considerable dialogue, we respond to her at once--through what we see, not what we are told about her. But from the moment the walk to Upton begins, the narrator's presence and control become more evident. As Tom and the woman set out, for instance, the narrator claims he does not know why she refused to wear Tom's coat, says he cannot believe she lured Tom deliberately to keep looking back at her and, finally, makes the allusion to Orpheus and Eurydice.

Of this introduction of Mrs. Waters, Ehrenpreis says:

> There is, necessarily, no preparation at all for her struggle at the foot of Mazard Hill, and we have no advance reason to think the plot will hinge on her connection with Tom. All these arrivals come eventually to be fitted into the author's careful plan, but meanwhile the sense of his well-intentioned power over us maintains the comic tone.[2]

This comment implies that the realistic depiction of Mrs. Waters in the rescue scene is offset somewhat by the sense one has of being in the presence, and under the power, of the author.* In any case, the reader, in the rescue scene, is hardly aware of the controlling or comic presence of the narrator. Since the comedy is restrained at first, the reader becomes interested in Mrs. Waters, and to some extent emotionally involved with her, before the narrator's controlling presence becomes pervasive. The abrupt introduction, obviously, is in accord with the circumstances at

*Ehrenpreis, it should be noted, does not distinguish between the terms author and narrator--using the former, or simply "Fielding" when he refers to the speaker.

the time, as well as with the action and narrative style used throughout the "road" section of the novel. Moreover, it is necessary if the woman's identity as Jenny Jones is to be concealed. Nonetheless, in spite of the essential abruptness, Mrs. Waters needs to be characterized sufficiently, by the time she reaches the inn, to enable the reader to react appropriately to her at that time, and, later, in London. These first glimpses of her, therefore, brief though they may be, are vivid enough to keep the reader's emotional response to her from being completely offset. She disappears from the scene, and the reader may, for a time, forget her, but she retains, nonetheless, more individuality than Molly ever possesses because of the way Fielding portrays her.

While one cannot help but make a contrast between Mrs. Waters and Sophia, it is much more indirect than that between Molly and Sophia. This lack of an explicit contrast is fitting at this stage of the story, when Tom thinks he has forever lost Sophia, though the fact is, of course, that neither he nor the reader has forgotten her. Thus an implicit contrast is sensed. Suitably, the narrator introduces Mrs. Waters, through reporting her "violent screams," just at the moment when Tom, on Mazard Hill, admits to his companion that his meditations are upon the one he loves. As a result, the subsequent introduction of this screaming woman into the story is, though to a limited extent, within the context of Tom and Sophia's romance.

Even before she arrives at the inn, Sophia is kept before the reader. For example, at the moment when Mrs. Waters' amorous advances toward Tom are successful, the narrator reports that

> To confess the truth, I am afraid Mr. Jones maintained a kind of Dutch defence, and treacherously delivered up the garrison, without duly weighing his allegiance to the fair Sophia. (II, 5)

Then, when the first two young ladies arrive at the inn, the reader is allowed to believe they are Sophia and Honour. Not until the later arrival of "two young women in riding habits," who are more fully described, does the reader know the truth. Whereas the contrast between Molly and Sophia is made largely before Molly is introduced, thus affecting one's initial assessment of her, here the contrast between the women is suggested only when Sophia enters the action, and this is after the last appearance of Mrs. Waters and Tom together. Thus the method of handling the contrast is in accord with Fielding's technique of gradually increasing the distance between Mrs. Waters and the reader. Yet because Mrs. Waters' individuality has been asserted fairly strongly, the implied contrast does not suggest that she is a type character; nor does it eliminate or offset completely the reader's emotional response to her. As with the contrast of Molly and Sophia, this implied contrast of Mrs. Waters and Sophia contributes to the reader's criticism of Tom. But by reserving the emphasis to the end of the episode, the narrator controls this critical reaction very carefully. The contrast with Sophia is, of course, not to the advantage

of Mrs. Waters, though reader criticism of her as well as of Tom is restrained, or even prevented, by the fact that she is no longer a part of the action.

Another contrast--this time involving conflict--is evident in the relationship of Mrs. Waters to the landlady of the inn. Because of her apparent moral concerns, the landlady objects to Mrs. Waters' appearance; Mrs. Waters, acting the part of a highly respectable, though injured, woman, reacts violently to the accusations and a fight ensues. Like that between Molly and "her equals" in the churchyard, however, this scuffle reveals more similarities than differences in the combatants. The later arguments of Mrs. Waters and this landlady demonstrate as well that both have, in fact, the same moral standards, belong to the same social class, and express their convictions similarly: by shouting and fist-fights. This comparison helps to distance Mrs. Waters from the reader, though the landlady's attitude and the conflicts between them arouse some sympathy for Mrs. Waters as well. Thus this particular contrast contributes to a balanced response to the woman, a response of both sympathy and criticism. Significantly, the implicit emphasis in both the realistic introduction of Mrs. Waters, and in the contrasts and conflicts, is upon her physical attributes, an emphasis that is sustained through the balance of her portrayal.

Numerous kinds of intrusions relating to the scene-summary narrative modes affect the depiction of Mrs. Waters. Interestingly, the early descriptions of her, given above, are brief and primarily factual, generally describing her physical appearance or her passions, unlike those of Molly, which include extensive comments about her vain and ambitious nature (as well as her promiscuity) or those about Tom, in both episodes, which stress his good nature and good looks. Here, at Upton, it is after several such comments about Tom that the narrator says of Mrs. Waters simply that she had "a great affection for him. To speak out boldly at once, she was in love" (II, 2). A little later, after the landlady has served their supper, and Mrs. Waters has sensed that Tom is in love with someone else, her thoughts are reported:

> The beauty of Jones highly charmed her eye; but as she could not see his heart, she gave herself no concern about it. She could feast heartily at the table of love, without reflecting that some other already had been, or hereafter might be, feasted with the same repast. (II, 9)

When the narrator, in his account of the woman's history, hesitates to say anything "to the disadvantage of the loveliest part of the creation," he surely is implying that certain unsavoury details could be related. And, finally, after the episode in her bedroom, the narrator praises her excellent acting before all of the intruders. Significantly, these comments refer primarily to her appearance, her strength, and the nature of her interest in Tom (or, presumably, any other man) rather than to her mental qualities. Hence the view of her is narrower, and more immediate, than that of Molly. As with the portrayal of Molly, however, the straight-

forward remarks about Mrs. Waters give accurate and adequate information, though the various other kinds of intrusions add interest and complexity to her character.

While one is slightly less aware of the narrator and his role during the Upton episode than in the passages concerning Molly, there are several comments of the "self-conscious" type. As in the Molly episodes, the narrator claims that he is reporting facts (his role as historian), though he has a right to omit whatever he pleases (his role as artist). When he pretends to be ignorant of the facts, as, for example, in relating the story of Mrs. Waters' affair with Northerton, he is acting as historian, though when he refuses, at the beginning of the Upton episode, to tell Mrs. Waters' story at that time, he is exercising his authority as artist--a manipulator of the facts. This latter emphasis is slightly less prominent here than in the Molly episodes. Other than his delay in telling the woman's story, there are two occasions when the narrator refuses to disclose information: first, he begs to be excused from revealing where Tom had been before returning to his own bed (II, 35), and of course he is concealing nothing at all; and, second, he implies that he omits certain details about Mrs. Waters that might be to her disadvantage to relate (II, 11).

In the comment about Tom just referred to, the use of parentheses--"(but from whence he returned we must beg to be excused from relating)"--stresses the statement. In a similar

remark about Mrs. Waters—"(for we must confess she was in the same bed)"--parentheses once again have the same effect. Their use serves, in addition to stressing a comment, to remind the reader of the narrator's role as manipulator of the "facts," and thus they are related closely to the intrusions indicating the narrator's role as artist. Because the narrator, as historian, is at one level of distance from his characters and the events, and as artist is at a second level, the fact that more of these comments about his portrayal of Mrs. Waters tend to emphasize the first role is consistent with the narrator's slightly less obtrusive presence here than in the passages concerning Molly.

Several times the narrator implicates the reader through speaking directly to him: once merely giving information (Mrs. Waters is now covered with a pillowbeer); twice with reference to the reader's probable curiosity about the woman's story, and twice calling for the reader to form an opinion. These latter two references both relate, lightheartedly, to the woman's affair with Tom: first, when reporting Tom's response to her, he asks the reader to realize that because of "the many charms which all centered in our heroe" and "the fresh obligations which Mrs. Waters had to him" (II, 2), it was natural she should have a good opinion of him. Significantly, the reader is not asked to consider how natural it was for Tom to yield to her advances. Then, during the scene in the bedroom, when Tom (taking Mrs. Waters' hint) makes his

"apology" to her, the narrator says, "The reader may inform himself of her answer, and, indeed, of her whole behaviour to the end of the scene" (II, 21).

These comments are all of a more personal nature than the analogous ones concerning Molly, with the exception of the statement about Molly's "egregious vanity." Here, at Upton, those just noted concern Mrs. Waters' success in using her physical charms to the best advantage, as do the two about her story, which is primarily a history of her love affairs. Because such comments turn the reader's attention to the narrator, they contribute to an increasing distance between the reader and Mrs. Waters, yet by stressing her personal attributes in this way they help to retain in the reader something of the emotional interest earlier aroused.

While generalizations diffuse the intensity of an episode, those used in the characterization of Mrs. Waters are less varied in content and less diversified in their references than those about Molly. Thus they do not emphasize to the same extent Mrs. Waters' typicality except, perhaps, in the matter of her strong passions. In stating, for example, that she is "in love" with Tom, the narrator generalizes about the meaning of that phrase in a way that defines aptly Mrs. Waters' passion:

> To speak out boldly at once, she was in love, according to the present universally received sense of that phrase, by which love is applied indiscriminately to the undesirable objects of all our passions, appetites, and senses, and is understood to be that preference which we give to one kind of food rather than to another. (II, 2)

Whereas Molly is viewed on several occasions in an almost universal context, being compared with people of both low and high life, politicians, clergymen, lawyers, and everyone who is vain and ambitious, the analogous comments about Mrs. Waters all compare her with other women. In the account of her affair with Northerton, the narrator speaks of the general ability of women to be capable of "that violent and apparently disinterested passion of love," thus explaining Mrs. Waters' willingness to aid Northerton. Then, through the remark about the ability of "the fair sex to act the part of being virtuous," her ability to dissemble in front of the intruders in her room is explained. When, for the second time, she is interrupted in her bedroom, her different reaction is noted by the statement that since women "value their reputation" more than "their persons," Mrs. Waters screamed less loudly on this occasion because her reputation was not in danger. More narrow generalizations are those concerning the "delicate race of women" who (in contrast to Mrs. Waters) cannot go anywhere without a coach, and the "ladies in a fright" who (like Mrs. Waters) use words only as "vehicles of sound, and without any fixed ideas."

In addition, several classical allusions have a similar theme and distancing effect: that to the story of Pasiphae, who fell in love with a bull; that to Ovid's references to what is "called in our own language, the whole artillery of love," and, to Mrs. Waters as "the poor unfortunate Helen, the fatal cause of all the

bloodshed." To compare her with Helen of Troy in the kitchen battle episode is particularly incongruous, yet the allusion, like the others, adds comedy, decreases the reader's involvement in the incident being recounted, and intensifies aptly the narrator's persistent emphasis about her character.

Through these generalizations, therefore, the intensity of the incidents is not diffused quite as much as if the references made went beyond the world of women. Thus while this technical device serves to set Mrs. Waters in a larger context, arousing intellectual interests, it does not eliminate completely one's emotional response to her. A similar effect is evident in two generalizations concerning Tom and Mrs. Waters together: first, in the literary allusion to two lovers, Orpheus and Eurydice, then in the comment explaining the landlady's idea that Tom and Mrs. Waters had, when they came to the inn, "certain purposes in their intention." To diffuse the focus somewhat, and add comedy, the narrator then says that these "purposes,"

> . . . though tolerated in some Christian countries, connived at in others, and practised in all, are, however, as expressly forbidden as murder, or any other horrid vice, by that religion which is universally believed in those countries. (I, 401)

That symbolism plays a major role in characterization is asserted by William York Tindall in "Excellent Dumb Discourse":

> We must discover, if we can, the function of symbols and for whom they are designed. As for the second of these, a symbol in a novel may serve a character, the author, the reader, or the critic.
> Some symbols, plainly for a character in the book, are there to carry something to him and by his reaction to enlighten us about him.[3]

In the Upton episode, the major emphasis of the narrative devices just noted is intensified through the use of symbolism, especially the metaphors used for love. Fielding himself, in his chapter about Love (VI,i), distinguishes, in symbolic terms, between the two types when he refers to "what is commonly called love, namely, the desire of satisfying a voracious appetite with a certain quantity of delicate white human flesh" and then to the kind and benevolent type of love. While Tom's love for Sophia, though not without physical passion, is primarily of the latter type, the interest Mrs. Waters has in Tom is definitely in the first category.

In discussing the use of various metaphors in Tom Jones, Henry Knight Miller claims they have value in amplifying characters, themes or actions: "they enlarge our comprehension, they extend the feeling-tone, and subtly, they create the sense of a world of ordered and interlocking values."[4] He notes, moreover, that metaphor generally amplifies the good and diminishes "the evil character or idea--often by witty or ingenious turns, or by hyperbole . . . or reductive devices."[5] While the metaphors used to characterize Mrs. Waters' efforts to win Tom may not appear to amplify the good, they do, by providing comedy, give this part of the episode a lightheartedness, and impersonal tone, that is essential if the relationship of Tom and Mrs. Waters is not to be taken too seriously.

Symbolism is especially comic and powerful in the supper scene at Upton . Here it is that "a battle of the amorous kind" takes place, recounted with ample use of food imagery. Because Tom and Mrs. Waters are eating a meal (or at least Tom is), the references to appetite and food to signify Mrs. Waters' sexual desire are realistically introduced, while through authorial comment and narration the use of both the war and food metaphors continues. Tom's great hunger causes him, with "immoderate ardour," to consume three pounds of beef, while "his fair companion, who eat but very little . . . was indeed employed in considerations of a different nature." After Tom has "entirely satisfied that appetite which a fast of twenty-four hours had procured him . . . his attention to other matters revived." Before continuing the narration, the narrator comments at length about Tom, and Mrs. Waters' passion for him, defining the latter as a love which "is understood to be that preference which we give to one kind of food rather than to another." Interestingly, the narrator makes no comment about any such passion Tom may have, at this time, for Mrs. Waters. Then, through a mixture of military and food imagery (and in mock-heroic fashion), the description of her attack on Tom is given. Tom's response, however, is referred to very briefly, in military terms only: "I am afraid Mr. Jones maintained a kind of Dutch defense, and treacherously delivered up the garrison." Later, the food metaphor is used again effectively to define Mrs. Waters' feelings,

though not Tom's when the narrator reports that she could "feast heartily at the table of love" even if someone had already "feasted with the same repast." The fact that this heavy symbolism is used when the incident being described is especially personal indicates Fielding's ability to retain intensity, yet restrain the reader's emotional and moral reactions. While the somewhat emotional response to Mrs. Waters that has already been evoked does not cease, this particular type of symbolism reduces her individuality. The reader's interests are diverted from her as an individual to the author's technique and the narrator's powerful presence.

This middle section of Tom Jones (Books VII - XII) contains, in general, more dialogue than the first section, though much of it, once again, is given to minor characters. More exceptions are evident in these books, however, for we have long conversations in which Tom is involved: with Partridge, the Man of the Hill, the gypsy king, and others he meets as he travels. But whenever an incident is of critical importance to the reader's assessment of Tom--particularly when the reader tends to be critical of Tom--he is given little dialogue. That this is evident in the passages about his affair with Molly has already been noted. Here, at Upton, this same principle is apparent, not only in the case of Tom (to be considered more fully later) but with Mrs. Waters as well. Following the rescue scene in the woods, which contains considerable dialogue, there is almost none between Mrs. Waters and Tom during

the ensuing incidents. As indicated, the narrator seems to begin a distinct, though gradual, distancing process from the moment the two set out for Upton. During the remainder of the episode the most realistic dialogue involving Mrs. Waters is that with the serjeant and the landlady, then, briefly, her outburst to the assembled company in her bedroom. Significantly, in the kitchen battle (which begins because of her) and in the supper scene, she is given none at all. In contrast, while Mrs. Waters and Tom are upstairs, the kitchen crowd converses (primarily about the two upstairs) in animated fashion, providing, at a suitable distance, another perspective on Mrs. Waters. This limiting of dialogue not only sets Mrs. Waters, and Tom, at some distance, but provokes the reader into making inferences of his own about what is being concealed. Thus his judgment is being exercised continually through this as well as other means.

In connection with the use of dialogue, it is worth noting that though Partridge, Tom, the Man of the Hill and Mrs. Fitzpatrick all relate their own stories, Mrs. Waters does not. While the reasons are, of course, that there is obviously some mystery about her, that she is, with good reason, unwilling to disclose to Tom her personal history, and that Tom, in fact, must be kept ignorant even of what the narrator chooses to disclose to the reader, the effect is to decrease further the reader's emotional involvement with her. Certainly he is curious, and interested in her, but curiosity

is primarily an intellectual response, and neither the facts given nor the narrator's manner of telling them evoke any emotional reaction.

Because of the rapid sequence of events at Upton, the entire episode seems, at first reading, to be primarily scenic. Yet this is not so, though Fielding's method of using distancing devices contributes to the dramatic intensity one senses. While our introduction to Mrs. Waters is in a fairly vivid scene, the realism evident there decreases as the episode proceeds, though dramatic intensity is sustained. And even as dialogue involving Mrs. Waters is limited, direct views of her, following the rescue, are few and brief, with much use of authorial comment and comic devices. After she and Tom arrive at the inn, direct, or scenic, views of Mrs. Waters are only the brief arrival scene, her conversation with the serjeant, her argument with the landlady (in which Tom intervenes), and, finally, the scene in her bedroom. Though she is involved, briefly, in the fight, her part is merely summarized in a few sentences. Similarly, the supper scene, in a sense, is a scene, yet it must be termed pictorial rather than dramatic because of the lack of dialogue. Moreover, its immediacy is compromised somewhat by the powerful presence of the narrator. Because the reader is viewing Mrs. Waters and Tom directly, yet is very much aware of the narrator who is manipulating the reader's response so powerfully through symbolism and comic language, this passage--perhaps more

than any other in the entire Upton episode--illustrates a fusing of the two narrative modes, what Lubbock calls "a laying of method upon method."

Other scenes at Upton do not reveal Mrs. Waters directly, though the fact that minor characters are portrayed vividly contributes to the reader's sense of dramatic realism. Furthermore, the continual, rapid movement, such as the running up and down stairs and the many exits and entrances; the gradual introduction of additional characters into the fight, and into the bedroom scene; the fascinating innkeepers and their servants, and the instances of mistaken identity, all recall Restoration stage comedies. So while these devices increase the reader's awareness of the artifice of Tom Jones, and of the means by which Fielding is controlling the reader's responses, they contribute to the dramatic intensity, which tends to keep the reader from noting just how indirectly Mrs. Waters is depicted through much of the action at the inn. Because the manner of her introduction suggested her powerful personality, and because even the techniques used to increase the reader's distance from her emphasize--as do techniques arousing the reader's emotions--her strong physical passions, Mrs. Waters' individuality is sustained sufficiently throughout the entire Upton episode.

While the comedy of the Upton episode results in part from the nature of the action, the type of people involved, the narrator's

intrusions, and the dialogue, Fielding's use of mock-heroic language and irony adds significantly to the humour. Unlike the passages about Molly, these contain no stylized language relating to Mrs. Waters apart from that inherent in the imagery and the mock-heroic passages.

The fight in the kitchen of the inn is recounted, in part, through mock-heroic language. Interestingly, this fight results from Mrs. Waters' partial nakedness, whereas a similar fight resulted from Molly's being over-dressed. In each case, the cause epitomizes a major point being made in the story about each woman: Mrs. Waters' physical attributes, and Molly's vanity. However, this fight at Upton reminds the reader also of the one in the grove at Somerset, for even as it was fought because of Molly, who had disappeared, here, too, Mrs. Waters, though the cause, joins in belatedly and only briefly. And the mock-heroic language is confined almost wholly to descriptions of the actions of Susan and Partridge, except for this conclusion:

> Now the dogs of war being let loose, began to lick their bloody lips; now Victory, with golden wings, hung hovering in the air; now Fortune, taking her scales from her shelf, began to weigh the fates of Tom Jones, his female companion, and Partridge, against the landlord, his wife, and maid; all which hung in exact balance before her; when a good-natured accident put suddenly an end to the bloody fray, with which half of the combatants had already sufficiently feasted. (I, 404)

To have described Mrs. Waters' part in the fight in mock-heroic language would have made her ridiculous and have diminished her

individuality far too early in the episode. Through reserving his use of this technique, as far as Mrs. Waters is concerned, for her "attack" upon Tom at supper, Fielding has used it most effectively. In this scene, after much summary and authorial comment, the narrator states that Mrs. Waters is in love with Tom, clarifies just what type of love this is, then describes her tactics:

> Now Mrs. Waters and our heroe had no sooner sat down together than the former began to play this artillery upon the latter. But here, as we are about to attempt a description hitherto unassayed either in prose or verse, we think proper to invoke the assistance of certain aerial beings, who will, we doubt not, come kindly to our aid on this occasion.
>
> 'Say then, ye Graces! you that inhabit the heavenly mansions of Seraphina's countenance; for you are truly divine, are always in her presence, and well know all the arts of charming; say, what were the weapons now used to captivate the heart of Mr. Jones.'
>
> 'First, from two lovely blue eyes, whose bright orbs flashed lightning at their discharge, flew forth two pointed ogles; but happily for our heroe, hit only a vast piece of beef which he was then conveying into his plate, and harmless spent their force. . . . Many other weapons did she assay; but the god of eating (if there be any such deity, for I do not confidently assert it) preserved his votary. . . .'(II, 3-4)

When the "parley" that ensues ensures the woman's victory, "the Graces think proper to end their description." Such a rendering of this scene certainly provides the comic intensity required to prevent a realism that would draw the two much too close at this particular moment. Again, the reader is more entranced by the distinctive technique than by what is actually occurring. While the narrator makes Molly's aggressiveness very evident also, he does it primarily through the events, or his own comments, whereas

here (by both the mock-heroic descriptions and the type of imagery used) Mrs. Waters' activity is depicted with an intensity that corresponds to her own strong passions, yet has a distancing effect.

As with the portrayal of Molly, irony of various kinds enhances the characterization of Mrs. Waters. Eleanor Hutchens comments, aptly, on Mrs. Waters' ironic role in the plot of the novel, for while it is this affair between her and Tom that seems to cause Tom's ruin--the loss of Sophia, the wounding of Fitzpatrick, Tom's imprisonment, and the discovery that he has apparently committed incest--everything finally works out to his advantage because of Mrs. Waters' revelations on his behalf in London. Miss Hutchens goes on to say that the role of Mrs. Waters

> is ironic from the first, for as she establishes his low status as a bastard outsider by falsely acknowledging him as her son in the beginning, so it is she who in the end first discloses to Allworthy his true parentage, his status as a member of Allworthy's own family.[6]

Mrs. Waters' significant role in the plot of the novel makes reader reaction to her here at Upton most important. Fielding appears to expect the reader to be somewhat critical of her, yet rather to like her; to become, at first, emotionally involved with her, and then detached at the point when the critical reaction might be too strong. One of the aids to this growing detachment is the verbal irony; and that which refers directly to Mrs. Waters, while stressing the woman's strong physical passions, serves to modify considerably the earlier emotional response.

In the account of the rescue, for example, and the walk to Upton, verbal irony has this comic and detaching effect: first, we note her apparent lack of concern over Northerton's escape because her eyes were "perhaps rather turned toward her deliverer"; then, her plea for Northerton on Christian and philosophical grounds and, finally, the comments on her actions during the walk to Upton:

> I cannot believe that Jones was designedly tempted by his fair one to look behind him, yet as she frequently wanted his assistance to help her over stiles, and had besides many trips and other accidents, he was often obliged to turn about. (I, 399)

After arriving at the inn, Mrs. Waters' hearty thanks to Tom include the words that "she hoped she should see him again soon, to thank him a thousand times more" (I, 400). Similar examples may be found in the account of the supper scene and the incident in Mrs. Waters' bedroom. And, suitably, the ironic tone is retained in the final comment about her:

> Upon the road she was perfectly reconciled to Mr. Fitzpatrick, who was a very handsome fellow, and indeed did all she could to console him in the absence of his wife. (II, 42)

In the depiction of Molly, the use of contrast, conflict, and many kinds of authorial intrusions contributes in a positive manner to the reader's intellectual response to Molly, whereas the comic devices contribute to this response in a negative way by controlling the reader's tendency to respond emotionally. In the portrayal of Mrs. Waters, the effect of the various techniques is only slightly different. It is the realistic introduction of the woman, along

with the few vivid views of her thereafter, that causes an emotional--and, to some extent, a moral--response to Mrs. Waters. Then the use of contrast, conflict, and intrusions contributes, in general, to the gradual distancing process that takes place though, as has been noted, there are exceptions. Thus the reader's various intellectual interests are being aroused as the episode proceeds. Comic techniques contribute to this by limiting or preventing an emotional response. However, as demonstrated, the contrasts and the intrusions are less powerful here as detaching devices than in the portrayal of Molly. And the conflict adds intensity of a kind that does not arouse one's emotions but keeps one involved. Moreover, because both the narrative techniques that appear to distance Mrs. Waters, and those that lead to reader involvement with her, stress the same quality--her physical passions--her character is clearly defined and made interesting. The reader's overall response, it would seem, is a balance between involvement and detachment as a result of the way various interests of both the intellectual and emotional kind are aroused.

There is much less use of the judgment theme in the portrayal of Mrs. Waters than with Molly, partly because of the time element and partly because of the location of the incidents. Here, at an inn, where the action takes less than twenty-four hours, and where most of the occupants are strangers to one another, criticism of the sort so prominent in Somerset simply cannot take place. Nonetheless, an instant judgment is pronounced by the Upton landlady

upon both Tom and Mrs. Waters when they arrive at the inn: in her opinion they must have "certain purposes in their intentions" that she would term "vulgar concubinage." After learning that the woman is "Captain Waters' lady," however, her opinion changes utterly. This shift in attitude is a result of the serjeant's opinion of Mrs. Waters, implied by his courteous address to her. Later, when telling the company what he knows of her story, the serjeant does not condemn her though he suspects she and the Captain are not married and knows she and Northerton were "very well acquainted." Then while Susan, in talking with her mistress, makes a kind of judgment by insisting that Mrs. Waters and Tom were in bed together, the main point of the discussion is to stress the landlady's illogical manner of assessing her guests' morals. A little later, in her distorted story to Sophia, Susan terms Mrs. Waters "an ordinary woman," a remark which may (in the sense in which Susan meant it) be the most accurate assessment of all.

As in Somerset, with Molly, Sophia is uncritical, as far as the reader can ascertain, of Tom's mistress, being concerned only with Tom himself and her own love for him. We learn later, of course, that her main reason for being angry with him was that she believed he had used her name loosely in front of others. But it is worthy of note that she expresses no opinion of this woman with whom Tom spent the night at Upton.

Significantly, the final opinion of Mrs. Waters during this part of the book is expressed by Tom himself:

> Nor could he bring himself even to take leave of Mrs. Waters; of whom he detested the very thoughts, as she had been, though not designedly, the occasion of his missing the happiest interview with Sophia, to whom he now vowed eternal constancy. (II, 42)

The fact that Mrs. Waters has, compared to Molly, few antagonistic people around her affects the reader's reaction as well. The kitchen battle, though intense, it would seem, while it lasts, produces no lasting animosity toward the woman. Then other than when she is attacked by Northerton in the woods, and shunned by the angry Tom as he leaves Upton, she cannot be considered a victim, as is Molly. Northerton's brutality arouses the reader's indignation toward him, and evokes sympathy for Mrs. Waters, but the relative lack of any antagonism during the subsequent incidents keeps the reader from over-reacting toward her. This, of course, helps him to make a fairly objective judgment of her.

The location and time element affect not only the judgment element but the ordering of the episodes at Upton. Whereas the focus shifted considerably in the early books of the novel because of the several aspects of the plot, here there is no such diversity of interest. From the rescue scene to the time when Sophia arrives at the inn, and Mrs. Waters disappears, Mrs. Waters is being considered continually, either directly or indirectly. In fact, even the events at the inn following the last appearance of Mrs. Waters (such as Sophia's discovery of Tom's unfaithfulness, her placing of the muff on his bed, Tom's remorse, and Squire Western's arrival) all

relate to some extent to Tom's affair with Mrs. Waters, thus keeping the reader aware of her, at least some of the time, in an indirect manner after the focus has shifted to others. Because the emphasis in these concluding events at Upton is upon Sophia, however, the reader thinks of Mrs. Waters less and less as a result of becoming involved in the Squire's search, and Tom's search, for Sophia. Thus the increasing distance between the reader and Mrs. Waters is, in part, a result of the focus gradually and naturally leaving her because of the careful way in which the events are ordered.

In spite of this gradual distancing during the Upton episode, Mrs. Waters is, when she reappears in London, once again a dynamic character. This is a result not only of the nature of the plot at that point, and her part in delivering Tom from all of his misfortunes, but of the way she is depicted at Upton. The balance achieved in her portrayal in this part of the novel--the balance between reader involvement and detachment--has prevented the reader from reacting negatively to her. Actually, the reader's initial reaction to her when she appears in London is mixed also: he is curious about the reason for this reappearance (an intellectual interest or response) and slightly annoyed at her amorous advances to Tom in prison (an emotional reaction). But as her significant role in the plot becomes evident, the reader's emotional involvement increases. Moreover, her individuality and

several commendable qualities in her character are stressed: obviously, she is a humane and admirable individual. Some of the traits evident in Jenny Jones back in Somerset come to the fore here, though not at Upton. At this point in the story the reader realizes why he has been prevented from making any emotionally charged moral judgment of Mrs. Waters earlier in the book.

The bedroom scene at Upton epitomizes to a considerable extent Fielding's method of portraying Mrs. Waters, his technique for the Upton episode as a whole, and also his narrative method for the "road" section of the novel generally. The intensity, the rapid action, the number and type of characters involved, the part played by Mrs. Waters, and the way Tom's involvement is treated make it an excellent example of the way Fielding manipulates the reader's responses at this stage of Tom Jones.

Even as the description of Molly's bedroom is pertinent to the incident there, because its size and furnishings contribute to the "accident" disclosing Square, here the location is important as well. This incident, as described, could occur only in an inn: consider Fitzpatrick's noisy arrival, at midnight, as he looks for his wife, his bribe to Susan, his dash upstairs, and his breaking down of the door, which provide a realistic prelude to the incident in the room. After Fitzpatrick falls headlong into the room, Tom jumps from the bed ("upon his legs likewise, appeared--with shame

and sorrow are we obliged to proceed--our heroe himself"); Mrs. Waters screams (". . . in the most violent manner, crying out murder! robbery! and more frequently rape!"); Maclachlan enters with sword in one hand and candle in the other; Mrs. Waters screams again (using similar words as on the previous occasion), and when the landlady finally appears she too "began to roar as loudly as the poor woman in bed had done before" (II, 21).

While the analogous scene in Molly's bedroom is treated in a leisurely manner, with much authorial comment, here intensity is achieved by this continual action and more of an emotional response is evoked because of Tom's greater involvement. Though Tom is not condemned, neither is he excused. Actually, the episode is so treated that the reader concentrates upon him very little, in spite of a concern about the possible results of this indiscretion. Though the focus in this scene is on both Tom and Mrs. Waters, it is she who takes control of the potentially embarrassing situation. In any case, the matter of her identity, and not whether or not she was in bed with Tom, is really the problem. Had the main emphasis been on her reputation, and hence on Tom's, the reader's response would have been much different--more critical of them both. As it is, this emphasis upon the woman's identity, which is prominent in the entire Upton episode, detracts from what was really going on and increases the curiosity the reader has felt about her all along. As in the Upton episode as a whole, therefore, the reader's intellec-

tual response is evoked in a way that balances, though does not eliminate, his emotional involvement.

Though she is the central figure in the scene, Mrs. Waters is given little dialogue. However, the reader is aware of her throughout, for she is never relegated to the background as Molly is. Indirectly, the focus is kept upon Mrs. Waters: through Fitzpatrick's efforts to approach the bed, Mr. Maclachlan's intervention, Tom's quick response to her hints, and the landlady's harangue. At the same time, it is these intruders who provide much of the comedy of the scene and thus divert the reader's attention from Tom and Mrs. Waters as guilty lovers.

In spite of this diffusion of the focus, all that occurs and all that is said in the incident reinforces the emphasis throughout the entire Upton episode on Mrs. Waters' physical attributes: the incident takes place in her room, where she and Tom were in bed; Fitzpatrick's search is for a supposedly unfaithful wife; Maclachlan is reading one of Mrs. Behn's novels in order to learn how to recommend himself to the ladies; Mrs. Waters and Tom apparently convince the intruders of their "innocence"; and the landlady's distress is, in part, a result of her concern that this attempted rape will ruin the reputation of her inn.

In addition to those referred to, there are several other contrasts between this scene and that in Molly's bedroom which relate to the differing methods used for the two incidents, and in the two depictions of character: whereas Tom, in visiting Molly,

is the innocent intruder, with the incident serving to free him from Molly; here, he is the guilty one, and the incident leads him into serious trouble with Sophia. Yet though Square is made an object of ridicule, Tom is not. Here it is the intruders, especially Fitzpatrick as he falls flat on his face, who are made the comic figures. Furthermore, while the incident in Molly's room is a largely pictorial presentation, a set scene, here the continual action makes this a scene that could, with some adaptation, be presented on stage. Each scene has dramatic intensity, though of a different type. Finally, when the narrator reports Mrs. Waters' skill as an actress("none of our theatrical actresses could exceed her, in any of their performances, either on or off the stage") we are reminded of Molly who, when discovered with Square, cried out she was undone, for she "was yet but a novice in her business," not having learned as yet the art of pretence.

The narrative techniques used in this scene at Upton are typical, therefore, of those used for the characterization of Mrs. Waters, for the Upton episode, and for part two of the novel. Through minor characters who are highly comic and realistic, through comic devices that modify or prevent an emotional involvement, and through a mixture of the scenic and panoramic modes, the incident arouses the reader both emotionally and intellectually. In the entire "road" section of the novel there is this same kind of rapid action, hilarious comedy and variety of characters, with a

continual alternation, and fusion, of the two narrative modes. Less panoramic, in general, than the first six books, these books contribute significantly to the reader's increasing knowledge of, and affection for, Tom. Moreover, the method used in this bedroom scene is in accord with the overall portrayal of Mrs. Waters as well, for the reader's response to her, as has been demonstrated, is a mixed response that leads to an appropriate relationship with her, and an accurate assessment of Tom.

Chapter Five: Lady Bellaston

Lady Bellaston, unlike Molly and Mrs. Waters, is a thoroughly despicable woman. Thus the reader's reaction to Tom during his affair with her is more negative than at any other place in the novel. Even so, this criticism is controlled carefully, not simply through Fielding's depiction of Tom, but through that of Lady Bellaston. The reader's dislike of her increases continually, yet his response to Tom is a mixture of censure and sympathy.

A number of critics of Tom Jones have felt that the affair of Tom with Lady Bellaston spoils, or at least mars, the novel. Scott, for example, agreed with Samuel Richardson that Tom was "unnecessarily degraded" by the incident, and Austin Dobson, though insisting that Fielding does not present Lady Bellaston as a typical woman of the time, claims that the objectionable nature of the episode could have been removed:

> Even in this most questionable part of Tom Jones, I cannot but think after frequent reflection on it, that an additional paragraph, more fully and forcibly unfolding Tom Jones's sense of self-degradation on the discovery of the true character of the relation, in which he had stood to Lady Bellaston--and his awakened feeling of the dignity and manliness of Chastity--would have removed in great measure any just objection, at all events relating to Fielding himself, by taking in the state of manners in his time.
>
> Another point suggested by these last lines may be touched en passant. Lady Bellaston, as Fielding has carefully explained (ch. i, Book xiv) was not a typical, but an exceptional, member of society; and although there were eighteenth-century precedents for such alliances . . . it is a question whether in a picture of average English life it was necessary to deal with exceptions of this kind, or, at all events, to exemplify them in the principal personage. But the discussion of this subject would prove endless.[1]

More recently, Sherburn has commented on the loss of "effervescence and verve" in the last six books of Tom Jones, attributing this in part to the change in setting "to London, to the lodging house, the gaol, the gilded mansion of Lady Bellaston, who was certainly ashamed of nothing."[2] And R. S. Crane says that "With the best will in the world . . . it is impossible not to be shocked by Tom's acceptance of fifty pounds from Lady Bellaston on the night of his first meeting with her."[3] As Wilbur Cross comments, the critics of Tom in the early section of Tom Jones have been replaced by "Fielding's fellow novelists and critics" and while they have generally condoned the night at Upton, which bothered Tom the most, "the crux of the character has always been the affair with Lady Bellaston."[4]

Such comments as these illustrate not only the varying responses readers of the novel have to Tom's affair with Lady Bellaston, but the powerful effect her characterization has upon one's assessment of Tom. Certainly if Fielding wished to arouse the reader's criticism of Tom to a greater extent than earlier in the story he chose an apt means. The reader does respond more emotionally to Tom here in London not only because some of his behaviour is revolting, but also because the manner in which the narrator presents both Tom and Lady Bellaston forces the reader to become personally involved with them. Yet the narrator accomplishes this without relinquishing his own powerful role. In the depiction of Lady Bellaston, for example, one may see, by examining the dis-

tancing devices used, how Fielding causes the reader's response to her to be, at times, fairly objective, and at other times extremely subjective. The overall effect is that the reader comes to realize how evil she really is. The general trend evident in her characterization is that there is a gradual lessening of the distance between her and the reader, as the London episodes proceed, a movement from an amused and curious reaction to her to a strongly emotional and moral response. In the ensuing analysis, which will concentrate on the portrayal of Lady Bellaston during her affair with Tom, I shall demonstrate the means by which Fielding evokes this particular response in the reader.

Whereas the natures of both Molly and Mrs. Waters are indicated clearly through their introductions, the early references to Lady Bellaston arouse first a positive, then an ambiguous, response in the reader. First mentioned by Sophia (VII, vii), Lady Bellaston is seen as a potential protector to the distressed girl, when she tells Mrs. Honour about a

> lady of quality in London, a relation of mine, who spent several months with my aunt in the country; during all which time she treated me with great kindness, and expressed so much pleasure in my company, that she earnestly desired my aunt to suffer me to go with her to London, As she is a woman of very great note, I shall easily find her out, and I make no doubt of being very well and kindly received by her.[5]

In view of later events, Honour's reply about the lady's possible objections is ironic, though it does not at this time raise any suspicions about Lady Bellaston since Sophia's good judgment has

been demonstrated already. Yet in Sophia's additional explanation to Honour, the perceptive reader may well note a similarity between this "lady of quality" and Mrs. Western, a comparison that is not reassuring:

'You are mistaken, Honour,' says Sophia; 'she looks upon the authority of a father in a much lower light than I do; for she pressed me violently to go to London with her, and when I refused to go without my father's consent, she laughed me to scorn, called me silly country girl, and said, I should make a pure loving wife, since I could be so dutiful a daughter. So I have no doubt but she will both receive me and protect me too, till my father, finding me out of his power, can be brought to some reason.' (I, 275)

The emphasis upon Lady Bellaston as a benefactor, however, at this time of Sophia's distress offsets any momentary doubts the reader may have about the woman's character.

When Sophia finds Lady Bellaston in London, her role as a protector is prominent again, for after receiving Sophia's message, the woman extends "a most pressing invitation" which the girl accepts. Here, again, is a slightly disconcerting comment, for the narrator states Sophia had no trouble finding the lady, "for indeed there was not a chairman in town to whom her house was not perfectly well known" (II, 98). Yet this remark may be interpreted as simply a compliment. And in any case, when Sophia arrives at Lady Bellaston's house, she receives "a most hearty, as well as a most polite, welcome":

The lady had taken a great fancy to her when she had seen her formerly with her aunt Western. She was indeed extremely glad to see her, and was no sooner acquainted with the reasons which induced her to leave the squire and to fly to London, than she highly applauded her sense and resolution; and after expressing the highest satisfaction in the opinion which Sophia had declared she entertained of her

> ladyship, by chusing her house for an asylum, she promised her all the protection which it was in her power to give.
>
> As we have now brought Sophia into safe hands, the reader will, I apprehend, be contented to deposit her there awhile, and to look a little after other personages. (II, 99)

The reference, by the narrator, to "safe hands," in addition to the earlier emphasis upon this woman as a protector and benefactor to Sophia, whose trouble is of great concern to the reader, contributes to the reader's generally positive, though relatively impersonal, response to Lady Bellaston.

The ambiguous comments about Lady Bellaston appear more significant, however, once we have actually viewed her directly. This happens when Mrs. Fitzpatrick visits her, early one morning, to discuss Tom and Sophia. Since the reader has already discovered what Mrs. Fitzpatrick is like, this close friendship between the two women leads to a further doubt about Lady Bellaston which is increased by the confidence Mrs. Fitzpatrick has that her friend will agree with her own views:

> For she did not in the least doubt, but that the prudent lady, who had often ridiculed romantic love, and indiscreet marriages, in her conversation, would very readily concur in her sentiments concerning this match, and would lend her utmost assistance to prevent it. (II, 164)

It is actually not until the conversation between the two women begins, however, that the reader is sufficiently close to Lady Bellaston to experience an ambivalent reaction toward her. Yet one's reaction, at this point, though felt, is difficult to explain, for in view of the information she possesses, Lady Bellaston's expressed determination to save Sophia from an unwise marriage is

surely commendable. Moreover, her insistence that she must see Tom, and "be acquainted with his person" is also reasonable. And finally, her comment to Mrs. Fitzpatrick about Sophia's father is accurate:

> Di Western hath described her brother to me to be such a brute, that I cannot consent to put any woman under his power who hath escaped from it. I have heard he behaved like a monster to his own wife, for he is one of those wretches who think they have a right to tyrannize over us, and from such I shall ever esteem it the cause of my sex to rescue any woman who is so unfortunate to be under their power. - The business, dear cousin, will be only to keep Miss Western from seeing this young fellow, till the good company, which she will have an opportunity of meeting here, give her a properer turn.' (II, 166)

When Lady Bellaston and Tom meet in Mrs. Fitzpatrick's drawing room, the reader's ambivalent response begins to turn into a negative response. This is a result of the way in which Lady Bellaston's arrival is described, the way she, Mrs. Fitzpatrick, and the Irish peer ignore Tom utterly in their exhibition of "artificial good-breeding," and finally through the manner in which Lady Bellaston's departure is described. Thus by the end of this introduction of Lady Bellaston into the story the reader's emotions are being aroused to a limited extent as a result of his moral reaction against this woman. At the same time, he retains a certain intellectual curiosity about her character and role in the story.

Contrast and conflict are used in the characterization of Lady Bellaston in slightly different ways, and with different

effects, than in the portrayals of Molly and Mrs. Waters. Once we realize Lady Bellaston's interest in Tom, there is an implicit contrast--and a conflict--between her and Sophia. But unlike the earlier contrasts, here the two women, though vastly different in age, are much closer in social rank and are for some time living in the same house. One sees them together, in an apparently satisfactory relationship, before Tom even meets Lady Bellaston. The subsequent incidents are heavy with dramatic irony: Sophia looks to Lady Bellaston for protection, unaware for some time of the woman's interest in Tom; Tom looks to Lady Bellaston for help in finding Sophia, though he realizes finally that he will get little assistance. Yet neither Tom nor Sophia is fully aware of Lady Bellaston's character, though the reader is--and so, apparently, is most of London.

When the affair of Lady Bellaston and Tom begins, Tom has neither affection for her (as he once had for Molly) nor physical passion (as he had for Mrs. Waters). He becomes involved primarily because he hopes this woman will lead him to Sophia. His lack of personal interest in Lady Bellaston is explained when the narrator's description of her emphasizes the stark contrast between her and the lovely Sophia:

> . . . he could never have been able to have made any adequate return to the generous passion of this lady, who had indeed been once an object of desire, but was now entered at least into the autumn of life, though she wore all the gaiety of youth, both in her dress and manner; nay, she contrived still to maintain the roses in her cheeks;

> but these, like flowers forced out of season by art, had none of that lively blooming freshness with which Nature, at the proper time, bedecks her own productions. She had, besides, a certain imperfection, which renders some flowers, though very beautiful to the eye, very improper to be placed in a wilderness of sweets, and what above all others is most disagreeable to the breath of love. (II, 190)

There are several incidents which cause the reader to consider the two women together. At the masquerade, for example, though one is not certain who the domino is, Tom talks continually of Sophia, and the reader cannot help but think of Lady Bellaston. Then when the woman unmasks the preceding conversation is placed in the appropriate context. On a later evening, when she arrives home to discover Tom and Sophia in her drawing room, Lady Bellaston's skill in deception is in vivid contrast to Sophia's confusion. In both of the scenes in Tom's bedroom, the women must be considered together, for Mrs. Honour, each time, brings news of Sophia to Tom. These incidents not only cause embarrassment to Tom, but also contribute to the complications in his relationship with Sophia. And when Lady Bellaston's shrewd schemes against Sophia become evident, the open conflict between the two women begins. While conflict has been implicit in their relationship from the time the two are seen as rivals, the "fight" has been carried on only by Lady Bellaston. Now, when Lord Fellamar enters the action, Sophia fights back. Unlike the earlier conflicts involving Molly and Mrs. Waters, which were fist-fights, here a more serious and insidious conflict takes place. It is not merely

a fight over Tom, but a conflict which reveals vividly Lady Bellaston's passionate jealousy as opposed to Sophia's admirable spirit in refusing to be pushed into a loveless marriage. We have here, then, a battle of wits and not fists. Furthermore, while the fist-fights in which Molly and Mrs. Waters are involved show each woman as, in truth, fighting "her equals," here no such comparison is pertinent. Lady Bellaston and Sophia have virtually nothing in common, except social rank and an interest in Tom--which Sophia will not admit.

Whereas the contrast made between Molly and Sophia sets Molly back from the reader, promoting his intellectual response toward her, and whereas the less explicit contrast between Mrs. Waters and Sophia contributes to the more balanced response toward Mrs. Waters, here the contrast and the developing conflict serve to enhance one's emotional and moral responses to Lady Bellaston. By seeing the two women together from the outset of the London scenes, by sensing gradually the stark contrast between them, and by the very nature of the conflict, the reader is led not only to a deeper sympathy with Sophia, but to an increasing dislike of Lady Bellaston. And both are emotional responses. One must note, moreover, that the presence of Sophia in London at this time causes the reader's reaction to the affair of Tom and Lady Bellaston to be much more critical than would otherwise be the case.

Contrast, in the first six books of Tom Jones, definitely contributes to a distancing of characters, because the matching of paired characters tends to lessen their individuality. At Upton,

contrast is used in a manner that helps to keep the reader's emotional and intellectual responses in balance. And here, in London, the contrast between Lady Bellaston and Sophia is shown in a manner that serves not to diminish the individuality of either, but, rather, to point out the characteristics of Lady Bellaston more vividly. Conflict is used similarly. In Somerset, the fist-fights are recounted in a way that contributes to the reader's impersonal response to Molly; they add intensity, but do not evoke an emotional reaction. At Upton, the fight in the kitchen and the scuffle in the bedroom to some extent have a similar effect since sympathy is extended to Mrs. Waters, the victim, in spite of the obvious similarities between her and the landlady. Yet the more serious conflict (as seen in London) begins at Upton, with the arrival of Sophia, for her discovery of Tom's infidelity and her resultant actions mark the beginning of a conflict between her and others for Tom. Her part in this conflict, as in London, is through the use of her wits. In London, therefore, the conflict is serious and intense, thus arousing in the reader an emotional and moral reaction that could never be evoked by a fist-fight.

Though the reader of Tom Jones senses that the events in London are depicted in a more representational manner than those in the earlier part of the novel, he finds, on close examination, that the narrator still intrudes a great deal. Because of the number of scenic episodes, their generally serious nature, and the increase

in direct discourse, one is simply less aware of the narrator's comments. By actual count, there are as many intrusions in the third as in the first or second sections of the novel. These are shorter, however, more closely related to the incident being related, and less comic. Thus the distance between the reader and the characters is decreased, and that between the reader and the narrator--in one sense--increased. Yet the narrator-reader relationship is not less personal. The reader has just become accustomed to the narrator, has accepted his point of view and norms, and is thus less dependent upon him. What happens now is that the narrator and reader together view the characters and the events, with the reader being manipulated by the narrator into making an independent assessment.

In the depiction of Mrs. Waters at Upton, the distance between her and the reader increases gradually, as the reader's involvement with her becomes less personal as the episode proceeds. In the depiction of Lady Bellaston, this is reversed. From a fairly impersonal introduction, through which the reader experiences an ambivalent response, but also a curiosity about Lady Bellaston, there is a definite movement toward an emotional response that becomes increasingly negative as the London events transpire. Direct comments by the narrator about Lady Bellaston, however, begin only after Tom's meeting with her following the masquerade. Thus they do not affect one's initial impression of her, or help to resolve the earlier ambiguous response. Had the narrator made such state-

ments earlier they would certainly have contributed to the distancing, yet their negative nature would have caused a premature judgment. The effect these comments have is to stress gradually the intensity of Lady Bellaston's passions, her shrewdness, and her utterly unscrupulous nature. It is difficult, especially in this section of the novel, to separate the omniscient narrator's recounting of the story from his explicit intrusions. But several examples will serve to demonstrate the effect of the latter. For instance, the narrator, after dropping a hint about Tom's sudden acquisition of money, states that Tom

> really had received this present from her, who, though she did not give much into the hackney charities of the age, such as building hospitals, &c., was not, however, entirely void of that Christian virtue; and conceived (very rightly, I think) that a young fellow of merit, without a shilling in the world, was no improper object of this virtue. (II, 185)

A little later, when Tom realizes Lady Bellaston is going to be of no help in his search for Sophia, the narrator refers explicitly to Lady Bellaston's "violent fondness" for Tom, then to his sudden affluence. The description of her follows, along with comments about Tom's unhappy situation because of his sense of "honour" and obligation. The fact that the physical description of Lady Bellaston is not given until this point in the story is noteworthy: the reader has had no reason to suspect that she possesses no physical charms until Tom is anxious to be rid of her.

Other direct intrusions about Lady Bellaston are similar. When she emerges from her hiding place in Tom's bedroom, for example,

after Mrs. Honour leaves, the narrator exclaims, "How shall I describe her rage?" and then proceeds to do so. Later in the same episode the narrator refers to her nature and her thoughts at this moment:

> She was, indeed, well convinced that Sophia possessed the first place in Jones's affections; and yet, haughty and amorous as this lady was, she submitted at last to bear the second place; or, to express it more properly in a legal phrase, was contented with the possession of that of which another woman had the reversion. (II, 211)

Finally, in the introductory chapter to Book XV, the narrator makes a comment about subsequent events which defines aptly Lady Bellaston's character:

> . . . while Mr. Jones was acting the most virtuous part imaginable, in labouring to preserve his fellow-creatures from destruction, the devil, or some other evil spirit, one perhaps cloathed in human flesh, was hard at work to make him completely miserable in the ruin of his Sophia. (II, 244-245)

The self-conscious authorial comments made in connection with Lady Bellaston stress the narrator's role as artist primarily, though he does term his account "Our history" (II, 169) and insists that it is his business only to record the truth (II, 223). Far more often, however, he refuses to disclose details. Frequently these are "conversations" not recorded either because the details are not material to the history or would be of no interest to the reader. Hence the conversation in Mrs. Fitzpatrick's drawing-room is omitted; as is the "vulgar abuse" spoken about Tom after he leaves, and the "conversation" on three occasions between Lady Bellaston and Tom. In each of these incidents, the nature of the

summary and the narrator's comments impart clearly what is left out: for example, the first visit of the two "lasted from two till six o'clock in the morning"; the second consisted "only of the same ordinary occurrences as before"; and then, in the first scene in Tom's bedroom, there ensues between Lady Bellaston and Tom another "long conversation, which the reader, who is not too curious, will thank me for not inserting at length" (II, 211). Moreover, when Jack Nightingale tells Tom what he--and everyone else--knows about Lady Bellaston, the narrator does not include all the details. Ostensibly, he omits certain information because of his "too great a tenderness for all women of condition." In addition, he says, "future commentators on our works" might call him the "author of scandal." The omissions, therefore, are eloquent examples of understatement that illustrate the narrator's awareness of his power over the reader.

This emphasis upon the narrator as artist necessarily stresses his manipulative acts, which seems inconsistent with his less obtrusive presence in this part of the novel. Yet these manipulations, which remind us of his presence, are one of the major means of controlling the reader's assessment of both Lady Bellaston and Tom. By limiting the information about Lady Bellaston early in the sequence of incidents in London, the narrator keeps the reader's aversion for her somewhat in check; as the story proceeds, however, what is omitted leads the reader to speculations and judgments of

his own that define the woman's character more aptly than an explicit account could do. In omitting her "conversations" with Tom, for example, the narrator indicates quite clearly what was actually going on, though the summarizing and the comments distance Tom and Lady Bellaston considerably. The same principle of omitting scenes of this type is followed when Molly and Tom meet in the grove and, again, to a lesser extent, at Upton (though the narrator in this case does not draw attention to his omissions). As Alter says, the narrator in Tom Jones adheres to a practice of "decorous reticence."[6] But he is concerned also about the reader's assessment of Tom: criticism must not outweigh sympathy. Thus it is in Lady Bellaston's association with Tom that this reticence is used rather than in her association with other characters. For example, her conversations with Lord Fellamar, Mrs. Western and Mrs. Fitzpatrick about Sophia and Tom reveal her unscrupulous nature very vividly.

As with Molly and Mrs. Waters, there are, in the depiction of Lady Bellaston, some parenthetical statements that affect the tone of a passage. Usually the words so set off are stressed, with a comic or ironic effect. Thus when Lady Bellaston's maid tells her mistress about Tom, the narrator says the woman "conveyed the same to her lady last night (or rather that morning)" (II, 165). Similarly, in Mrs. Fitzpatrick's drawing room, "the conversation began to be (as the phrase is) extremely brilliant" (II, 168).

About Lady Bellaston's giving money to Tom, the narrator says she "conceived (very rightly, I think) that a young fellow of merit, without a shilling . . . was no improper object of this virtue" (II, 185). When Tom despairs of getting news of Sophia, the narrator says of Lady Bellaston: "(. . . the lady began to treat even the mention of the name of Sophia with resentment)" (II, 189). And toward the end of Tom's affair with Lady Bellaston, Nightingale asks Tom if he has had any news from the woman--"(for it was now no secret to any one in that house who the lady was)" (II, 274). The narrator proceeds to comment on Tom's ignorance of such women who are "visited (as they term it) by the whole town, in short, whom everybody knows to be what nobody calls her" (II, 275). Interestingly, each of these comments relates either to the artifice and hypocrisy of Lady Bellaston and her society, or to her passion for Tom. The parentheses serve to draw the reader's attention to words that would otherwise possibly be overlooked.

The direct references to the reader about Lady Bellaston, though most provide information rather than involve the reader's judgment, contribute to his overall negative reaction to this woman. The narrator, apparently assuming that the reader has certain attitudes, provides information that strengthens them. For instance, in the passage where Lady Bellaston first refers to Tom, the narrator says: "Here the reader will be apt to wonder"--and then explains that Lady Bellaston received the information about

Tom from her maid (II, 165). After Tom leaves the gathering at Mrs. Fitzpatrick's, the reader is told of the "vulgar abuse" the others heaped upon him (II, 169). Later, at the masquerade, the narrator says "the reader may have already conceived no very sublime idea of the lady in the mask," and, the next day, tells the reader where Tom's money came from. On each occasion when the two meet, the omission of part of their "conversation" is drawn to the attention of the reader, as is the fact that Lady Bellaston, in a note, invites Tom to her own house instead of to their regular meeting place. The narrator explains to the reader, furthermore, why Lady Bellaston does not keep her appointment with Tom, comments on her actual position in London society, and conveys the reader to her house for the whist party at which the cruel trick is played on Sophia--which, he says, "many of our readers, we doubt not, will see with just detestation" (II, 251).

While there are a few comments directed to the reader that concern Tom and Lady Bellaston together, such as the one made about Tom's reaction to the woman's first note to him, or the narrator's appeal to "men of intrigue" to consider Tom's reaction to the letters, these apply, strictly speaking, more to Tom than to Lady Bellaston. So the overall effect of these intrusions which refer directly to the reader is to provide negative information about Lady Bellaston. Such intrusions, by emphasizing the narrator-reader relationship, have a distancing effect, yet because of the

personal nature of these they contribute somewhat to the reader's criticism of the woman. As a result, such statements aid the reader in making a moral judgment that is fairly objective.

In most of the generalizations and literary allusions about Lady Bellaston, the context is even narrower than that evoked by the similar comments about Mrs. Waters. While generalizations made about Molly Seagrim cause extremely broad comparisons which comment on her qualities of mind (vanity and ambition) as well as on her promiscuity, and those about Mrs. Waters are less varied, comparing her only with other women, with an emphasis upon physical qualities, most of these about Lady Bellaston compare her with a still narrower group: one type of woman, in one segment of society. Yet through these comparisons both her mental shrewdness and physical passion are commented upon.

There are two classical allusions, however, which have the greatest distancing effect because of the incongruity of the comparisons being made. First, there is the reference to the "priests of Cybele" when Lady Bellaston's footman thunders at Mrs. Fitzpatrick's door. Cybele was a Phrygian goddess, called by the Romans "the Great Mother," who was worshipped by her priests with cries and shouts and clashing symbols and drums. This incongruous comparison suggests something of the ludicrous nature of the incident to follow, and comments ironically upon Lady Bellaston's position in London society. Then much later, after her scheme against Sophia is under-

way, Lady Bellaston's rebuke and admonition to the procrastinating Lord Fellamar is compared, by the narrator, to the words of two famous orators:

> Let those who have had the satisfaction of hearing reflections of this kind from a wife or mistress, declare whether they are at all sweetened by coming from a female tongue. Certain it is, they sunk deeper into his lordship than anything which Demosthenes or Cicero could have said on the occasion. (II, 254)

Again, the absurdity of this humorous allusion causes reader detachment from the incident concerned. In the case of the first literary allusion, which forms part of the scene where Lady Bellaston and Tom meet, such distancing aids in keeping the reader's reaction fairly impersonal. In the second instance, the effect is similar. Considering that this lecture Lady Bellaston gives to Lord Fellamar is about the proposed rape of Sophia, the reader's moral and emotional response, without such comedy, could well be much more negative than Fielding desires it to be at this time. Should the reader react with utter revulsion to Lady Bellaston before Tom breaks off his involvement with her, the reader's criticism of Tom would be heightened considerably.

A number of generalizations cause the reader to view Lady Bellaston as a typical member of one segment of London female society. When she enters Mrs. Fitzpatrick's drawing room, for example, she makes a curtsy to her hostess, then to Tom, at which point the narrator intrudes:

> We mention these minute matters for the sake of some country ladies of our acquaintance, who think it contrary to the rules of modesty to bend their knees to a man. (II, 168)

The implied contrast between country and city women is continued in another generalization, made after the narrator explains that he is going to omit much of the conversation which is not "material to this history":

> . . . I have known some very fine polite conversation grow extremely dull, when transcribed into books, or repeated on the stage. Indeed, this mental repast is a dainty, of which those who are excluded from polite assemblies must be contented to remain as ignorant as they must of the several dainties of French cookery, which are served only at the tables of the great. To say the truth, as neither of these are adapted to every taste, they might both be often thrown away on the vulgar. (II, 168)

Later, in relating the woman's plot against Sophia, just prior to the whist game incident, the narrator says:

> . . . she was in reality a very considerable member of the little world; by which appellation was distinguished a very worthy and honourable society which not long since flourished in this kingdom . (II, 249)

With irony, the narrator comments on the "good principles" of this society, one of which is to tell "one merry fib" every day. In addition,

> Many idle stories were told about this society, which from a certain quality may be, perhaps not unjustly, supposed to have come from the society themselves. As, that the devil was the president; and that he sat in person in an elbow-chair at the upper end of the table; but, upon very strict inquiry, I find there is not the least truth in any of those tales, and that the assembly consisted in reality of a set of very good sort of people, and the fibs which they propagated were of a harmless kind, and tended only to produce mirth and good humour. (II, 250)

When Lady Bellaston discovers that Honour is also in Tom's bedroom, she walks "majestically" from the room, with the narrator commenting that "there [is] a kind of dignity in the impudence of the women of quality, which their inferiors vainly aspire to attain

to in circumstances of this nature" (II, 271). Similarly, when Jack Nightingale tells Tom about the woman's reputation, the narrator explains why Tom was ignorant of this:

> . . . he had no knowledge of that character which is vulgarly called a demirep; that is to say, a woman who intrigues with every man she likes, under the name and appearance of virtue; and who, though some over-nice ladies will not be seen with her, is visited (as they term it) by the whole town, in short, whom everybody knows to be what nobody calls her. (II, 275)

A few generalizations comment more specifically on Lady Bellaston's nature. First, in the matter of her jealousy she is compared with all other women:

> . . . when the effects of female jealousy do not appear openly in their proper colours of rage and fury, we may suspect that mischievous passion to be at work privately, and attempting to undermine, what it doth not attack above-ground. (II, 245)

More indirectly, her affair with Tom is compared with those described in French novels:

> I am so far from desiring to exhibit such pictures to the public, that I would wish to draw a curtain over those that have been lately set forth in certain French novels; very bungling copies of which have been presented us here under the name of translations. (II, 189)

Lady Bellaston's words to Tom, when she visits him (and Honour is behind the curtain) are said to be typical of those all lovers say when they wish to "be answered only by a kiss" (II, 269).

The fact that there is almost no symbolism or figurative language used in the characterization of Lady Bellaston contributes to her realistic depiction. Symbolism, though frequently adding intensity to a passage, tends to de-personalize a character, or to add comedy which reduces an emotional involvement. This is evident

in the supper scene at Upton. Here, however, the only examples of figurative language are in the description of Lady Bellaston, where the "roses in her cheeks" are said to be "like flowers forced out of season by art" and later, when her rage after emerging from behind the curtain in Tom's room is thus described: "streams of fire darted from her eyes, and well indeed they might, for her heart was all in a flame" (II, 210).

Perhaps the most obvious contribution to the increasingly representational form of the last six books of Tom Jones is the increase in dialogue. While there is still considerable narration, with many intrusions, there is less summarizing. McKillop says this change in narrative method relates to the London setting, which Fielding considered "a disadvantageous medium."[7] Thus because London characters are "dull and affected," having "vice without the wit," Fielding does not, according to McKillop, give any character sketches in detail:

> Largely in accordance with this change in social setting, Fielding now depends on dialogue rapidly interchanged in set scenes; there are fewer long self-characterizing speeches than he had used in presenting the humors of the road, and fewer leisurely discussions of general principles than in the first part. This change can also be described by saying that the later books cover shorter and shorter periods of time and become more and more crowded with incident.[8]

In part, McKillop's analysis is accurate, though the change in narrative method is surely not this closely related to the London setting. There are scenes of rapid dialogue in the two earlier sections of the novel also, where intensity or realism is desirable.

In London, moreover, there are fewer characters to introduce, and thus "fewer long self-characterizing speeches." Yet both Jack Nightingale and Mrs. Miller are described at some length and given fairly long speeches, and even Lord Fellamar and the elder Nightingales have considerable space devoted to them. The increase in dialogue is related, then, primarily to the nature of the events, in particular as they involve Tom. In noting how much more dialogue is given to Lady Bellaston than to either Molly or Mrs. Waters, one can see that Fielding wants the reader to view her more closely than he views either of the other women. For example, there is the dialogue between Tom and Lady Bellaston at the masquerade, the conversations between them in Tom's bedroom and (with Sophia as well) in Lady Bellaston's drawing room. Then the many notes sent by each to the other are, in a sense, direct speech, though the focus upon the characters concerned is less direct.

There are almost no passages in the chapters relating to Lady Bellaston's affair with Tom that are lacking entirely in dialogue. One is that in which Tom's second meeting with Lady Bellaston is told in summary. Yet it contains two of her notes. Other chapters without dialogue concern the Nightingale affair and Mrs. Hunt's proposal to Tom. There are, in fact, no passages involving Lady Bellaston herself where she does not speak directly or write a note. And in addition to her several conversations with Tom, referred to above, there are those she has with Sophia, Lord Fellamar, and Mrs. Fitzpatrick. Thus the reader views her, as a result, in several different

situations and from various points of view. We are therefore dependent less on the narrator's comments than in the case of Molly or Mrs. Waters, and more on Lady Bellaston's own speech.

The number of scenes--as opposed to summary--increases significantly in part three of the novel, with the increase in dialogue contributing to their realism. At Upton, there is a rapid sequence of incidents, with a limited amount of summary, though little dialogue between Mrs. Waters and Tom. The scenes in London, however, are depicted more realistically. Whereas Molly and Tom are viewed separately much of the time, and Mrs. Waters and Tom, though viewed together, are depicted in a way that reduces the reader's emotional response to them, here the scenes involving Tom and Lady Bellaston are dramatic not simply through the use of stage techniques, as at Upton, but in a representational sense. For example, consider the scenes in Mrs. Fitzpatrick's drawing room, at the masquerade, in Lady Bellaston's drawing room, and twice in Tom's bedroom. And when Tom receives notes from Lady Bellaston, the focus, indirectly, is upon her as well as upon him. In contrast to scenic views of Molly and Mrs. Waters, those of Lady Bellaston are extensive, with little apparent effort by the narrator to divert the reader's attention from her to minor characters. The narrator uses summary, however, in describing her several meetings with Tom, Tom's feelings about her, her thoughts and feelings about him, and Tom's predicament. Because of the

time period in which the London events occur--about thirty days--summary is not as essential as in the chapters about Molly, whose affair with Tom lasted about a year and a half, or in the chapters about Mrs. Waters, which cover events of no more than twenty-four hours.

Thus the dramatic elements of the sort found in the largely panoramic first section of Tom Jones, and of the highly theatrical episode at Upton, are both used in the Lady Bellaston and Tom affair, and the London events generally. But in addition the narrative mode used here is dramatic in a manner analogous to Lubbock's "scenic" presentation. Like the narrative method used in the first six books, and particularly in the depiction of Molly, that used in this latter part of the novel includes a great many authorial comments that contribute to the reader's detachment, at times, from the characters and the events. Moreover, these very distancing devices, as indicated, contribute to an intensity that is dramatic: for example, the comments about Lady Bellaston that evoke a strongly negative response. Then, like the narrative method used to depict Mrs. Waters, and in the second section generally, the narrative method of part three includes certain theatrical techniques which emphasize the artificial behaviour of Lady Bellaston and London society. Consider, for example, the masquerade scene and the number of references made to plays. There are, moreover, a number of scenes in these books that could be reproduced on

stage with much less adaptation than would be required with the bedroom or supper scenes at Upton. Lady Bellaston's ability to dissemble is illustrated when she visits Mrs. Fitzpatrick, when she arrives home to find Tom and Sophia in her drawing room, and when she discovers Mrs. Honour behind the curtain in Tom's bedroom. In contrast, Tom and Sophia both have difficulty in practicing this sort of deceit (though Tom learns, as will be demonstrated later). This emphasis upon Lady Bellaston's hypocrisy, in addition to the nature of the various kinds of authorial comments, keeps the reader from over-reacting to her, though one's response to her, as to Tom, becomes increasingly emotional as the episode progresses. The reason for this is that the climax of the novel is being reached, with events becoming more serious for Tom. Accordingly, the amount of dialogue, and scenic presentation, increases. Thus Fielding's technique in the last six books of the novel includes the devices and emphases of earlier sections, but is adapted to provide the needed intensity in the story and the increased realism in the depiction of Tom.

Comedy decreases noticeably in the London section of Tom Jones. While Fielding may be emphasizing, to some extent, the distinction between the city and the country, yet one cannot forget the evil characters and despicable deeds mentioned in the early books of the novel. The lack of comic devices relates not so much to location, then, as to the nature of the plot, the type of characters introduced,

and the fact that Tom's actions in London cause the reader to criticize him more severely than earlier in the story. Lady Bellaston, therefore, is treated in a much more serious manner than either Molly or Mrs. Waters. And one is much closer to her because of the absence of comic effects which would restrain an emotional response.

In the episodes concerning Molly and Mrs. Waters, mock-heroic language is used to add an impersonal and comic element to incidents that would otherwise draw the reader too close to the woman, and to Tom. Here, however, there is no use of this device. The lack of mock-heroic passages, as well as the limited use of any stylized language referring to Lady Bellaston, contributes to the realism of the narration. One might term the description of Lady Bellaston's arrival at Mrs. Fitzpatrick's house stylized, for the narrator refers to the "priests of Cybele," but such language at this early stage of her portrayal is merely in accord with the narrator's procedure of gradually decreasing the distance between her and the reader. Then the narrator says of the masquerade that "the great high-priest of pleasure, presides; and, like other heathen priests, imposes on his votaries by the pretended presence of the deity, when in reality no such deity is there" (II, 180). Indirectly this relates to Lady Bellaston, though once the dialogue at the masquerade begins, no such language is used. Yet this is a scene that could well have been treated in mock-heroic fashion, at least in part, had Fielding wished to lighten the tone. But the fact that it is above

all concerned with Tom's search for Sophia, and with illustrating the aggressiveness of Lady Bellaston, makes a more serious style effective and consistent with the technique of this part of the novel.

To discuss fully the use of irony in any part of Tom Jones is virtually impossible, and certainly unnecessary for the purposes of this study. Irony permeates the entire novel, though it is less obvious--and less humourous--in the final books. Once again, then, it will be sufficient merely to show how irony affects the reader's response to Lady Bellaston. Ironies of plot--most of which are resolved in these books--have little to do with her. Eleanor Hutchens points out, however, in her excellent study of irony in Tom Jones, that one kind of irony of plot is a deliberate deceit which "finds its irony in its plausibility":

> There is nothing ironic in the telling of a plain lie, unsupported by apparent reason or truth; it is the lie which pretends to belong in a known pattern, or in a causal chain, which defeats expectation in an ironic way.[9]

Then, after commenting that Blifil is a master of the plausible lie, and Mrs. Fitzpatrick and Lady Bellaston are minor artists in it, Miss Hutchens refers to the scene including Sophia, Tom and Lady Bellaston:

> The best scene of unsuccessful pretense is that in which Tom, Sophia, and Lady Bellaston confront each other at Lady Bellaston's house (XIII,ii). Tom and Lady Bellaston pretend to Sophia that they do not know each other, and she is successfully deceived; but Tom must pretend to join Sophia in pretending to Lady Bellaston that he and Sophia are not acquainted, although she knows that they are and he knows that she knows it. Thus poor Sophia is successfully fooled and at the same time is unsuccessful in her own attempt to deceive.

As a further irony, the element of truth in what she says--that is, that Tom has found and returned her pocketbook--is not credited by Lady Bellaston.[10]

Irony is evident as well in Fielding's use of the word "prudent," as Miss Hutchens and several other critics of Tom Jones have noted.[11] Suffice it to say, therefore, that Lady Bellaston is twice termed "prudent," first in her ridiculing of romantic love, and then, by Jack Nightingale when he says "her favours are so prudently bestowed that they should rather raise a man's vanity than his gratitude" (II, 276).

Verbal irony relates frequently to the affectation and vanity of the people of London, and to Lady Bellaston as she fits into this society. The conversation at Mrs. Fitzpatrick's, for instance, is termed "extremely brilliant"; the masked lady at the masquerade assures Tom that "upon my honour" Miss Western is not in the room; the same woman tells Tom later that his pretensions to Sophia are "imprudence." And Lady Bellaston's generosity to Tom is termed a "Christian virtue." The narrator's explanation of Lady Bellaston's actual position in London is heavy with verbal irony, as well as satire upon this society:

> Though the reader may have long since concluded Lady Bellaston to be a member (and no inconsiderable one) of the great world; she was in reality a very considerable member of the little world; by which appellation was distinguished a very worthy and honourable society which not long since flourished in this kingdom.
>
> Among other good principles upon which this society was founded, there was one very remarkable; for, as it was a rule of an honourable club of heroes, who assembled at the close of the late war, that all the members should every day fight once at least; so 'twas in this, that every member should, within the twenty-four hours, tell at least one merry fib, which was to be propagated by all the brethren and sisterhood. (II, 249-50) (Italics mine)

Following further comment in the same tone, the narrator concludes:

I find there is not the least truth in any of those tales, and that the assembly consisted in reality of a set of very good sort of people and the fibs which they propagated were of a harmless kind, and tended only to produce mirth and good humour. (II, 250) (Italics mine)

At this point we learn about the plan of "this comical society" to demonstrate, at the whist game, just how attached Sophia is to Tom Jones. Moreover, both Lady Bellaston and Lord Fellamar are termed "noble persons" as they scheme for the rape of Sophia. Thus irony is not merely a detaching device, but is one means by which Lady Bellaston's character is further defined. Such comments as those quoted are, in places, comic, but the irony is generally less humourous and more grim than earlier in the novel. Without it, of course, the reader's moral reaction to Lady Bellaston would be even more emotional than it is.

Various judgments of Lady Bellaston made by other characters contribute to the reader's assessment of her. Sophia's opinion, for example, becomes extremely negative once she gets to know her. This dislike, at first, stems from Lady Bellaston's efforts to have Sophia marry Lord Fellamar. Later, when Sophia discovers Tom's involvement with Lady Bellaston (through the proposal letter), the anger extends to Tom as well. After Tom sends (by Mrs. Miller) a further letter to her, however, the narrator comments as follows about Sophia:

She certainly remained very angry with him, though indeed Lady Bellaston took up so much of her resentment, that her gentle mind had but little left to bestow on any other person. (II, 349)

Sophia's attitude here is worthy of note, for though she knew of Tom's affair with Molly, Sophia made no criticism of Molly and little of Tom. And after the Upton episode, Sophia's anger was not directed at Mrs. Waters, or even (primarily) at Tom for being unfaithful, but rather at Tom for apparently being careless in his use of her name. In both cases, the reader is affected strongly by Sophia's opinion--an opinion which leads her almost totally to ignore the woman in question. Here, then, where there is a much different type of association among the three individuals concerned, Sophia's detestation of Lady Bellaston, as well as her angry reaction to Tom, definitely affects the reader's judgment of both.

Mrs. Fitzpatrick's opinion of Lady Bellaston is interesting because it changes in accord with her own situation: first, when she decides to visit Lady Bellaston early one morning, she terms her a "prudent lady" who, because she ridicules romantic love, will agree to do all she can to prevent the match of Tom and Sophia. Much later, however, when writing to Mrs. Western about Sophia's whereabouts, Mrs. Fitzpatrick says, "You know, madam, she [Lady Bellaston] is a strange woman; but nothing could misbecome me more, than to presume to give any hint to one of your great understanding" (II, 262).

Mrs. Western's opinion of Lady Bellaston is summed up in her admonition to her brother about how to meet this woman in London:

'There is a decorum to be used with a woman of figure, such as Lady Bellaston, brother, which requires a knowledge of the world, superior, I am afraid, to yours.' (II, 263)

Mrs. Miller, in her rebuke to Tom for having a woman visit him late at night, suggests that no woman of good reputation would come to a man's room at that hour. Later, in her talk with Tom about Mr. Allworthy, Mrs. Miller indicates again her opinion of Lady Bellaston (though she does not know her): "I beg you not to converse with these wicked women. You are a young gentleman, and do not know half their artful wiles" (II, 211).

Even Mrs. Honour expresses a judgment of Lady Bellaston, though she, like Mrs. Fitzpatrick, is an opportunist whose opinion vacillates. When visiting Tom, giving him news of Sophia, Mrs. Honour speaks frankly about Lady Bellaston, completely unaware of her presence in the room:

> '. . . to be sure the servants make no scruple of saying as how her ladyship meets men at another place. . . . I only says what I heard from others--and thinks I to myself, much good may it do the gentlewoman with her riches, if she comes by it in such a wicked manner.'(II, 209-210)

During the second such visit, however, when she is hidden, then discovered by Lady Bellaston, Honour proceeds from the exclamation, "as poor a wretch as I am, I am honest" to a diplomatic response to Lady Bellaston's dissembling: "sure I never had so good a friend as your ladyship," and finally to a hint for a job as the woman's maid. Later, in a letter to Tom, she asserts that Lady Bellaston is "won of thee best ladis in thee wurld" (II, 282). Thus Honour's assessment, appropriately, is the opposite to that made by Sophia, Tom, and the reader, in the sense that it moves from negative to positive.

It is Nightingale whose knowledge of Lady Bellaston is the most accurate and complete. From him Tom learns the truth:

'. . . you are not the first young fellow she hath debauched. Her reputation is in no danger, believe me'. . . . he entered upon a long narrative concerning the lady; which, as it contained many particulars highly to her dishonour, we have too great a tenderness for all women of condition to repeat. . . . 'She is remarkably liberal where she likes; though, let me tell you, her favours are so prudently bestowed, that they should rather raise a man's vanity than his gratitude.' (II, 275-276)

What is stated, and implied, through Nightingale's comments is summed up aptly by Squire Western. First, in talking to his sister about going to London to get Sophia, he responds to Mrs. Western's advice (earlier quoted) about London formalities as follows: "And what must I stand sending a parcel of compliments to a confounded whore, that keeps away a daughter from her own natural father?" (II, 264) Then, in London, when he is telling Mr. Allworthy about the efforts of his female cousins to have Sophia marry Lord Fellamar, Squire Western says:

'There was my lady cousin Bellaston, and my Lady Betty, and my Lady Catherine, and my lady I don't know how; d--m me, if ever you catch me among such a kennel of hoop-petticoat b--s! . . . . "Surely," says that fat a--se b-, my Lady Bellaston, "cousin, you must be out of your wits. . . ."'(II, 333)

And the good Squire's assessment, of course, is more accurate than he knows.

The ordering of the episodes in the London books affects the reader's judgment of Lady Bellaston only in a limited way: they are, as will be demonstrated later, more related to the depiction of Tom. However, the earliest references to her, and the first scene or two,

leave the reader with an ambivalent reaction, as has been mentioned. But from the point where Tom meets her to where he ends their affair, she is before the reader--directly or indirectly--most of the time. The varying focus upon her does contribute to the control of the distance between her and the reader: consider, for example, the distance maintained at first, in the scene where Tom meets her, in the masquerade scene (where she is not identified) and in the subsequent summary about the beginning of her affair with Tom. But subsequent events show her more vividly until the point in the story where the focus is upon Tom's involvement in the Nightingale affair. By this time, one is glad to have her put at some distance once again, especially since the next views reveal her as an unscrupulous schemer determined to arrange Sophia's marriage to Lord Fellamar. Through these passages, as well as the whist game incident and the attempted rape, which illustrate Lady Bellaston's evil nature, the reader's moral indignation (an intellectual and emotional response) is aroused. By the time of her second visit to Tom, therefore, the reader finds her much more objectionable than on the earlier visit. As a result, he is less inclined to sympathize with Tom in his embarrassment because Tom has, apparently, made no effort to end his affair with this despicable woman. Then Lady Bellaston's letters to Tom, his "proposal" letter to her, and her reply, increase the reader's disgust even more. In light of these events, her subsequent actions against both Sophia and Tom are not surprising.

In the ordering of the episodes in London, therefore, the way that the focus is either upon Lady Bellaston, or removed from her, affects the reader's response to her. Moreover, the fact that she is seen with various people, and in several types of situations, means that she can be depicted realistically without being shown only with Tom. It is significant that her shrewdness is revealed primarily in scenes with Lord Fellamar or others with whom she plots for the marriage of Sophia to one she detests. The ordering of the episodes controls the reader's involvement with her, and his judgment of her, also, in the sense that the incidents become increasingly serious and her portrayal gradually more vivid.

Both bedroom scenes involving Lady Bellaston may be considered as typical of Fielding's narrative technique in the six London books, and of his method of portraying Lady Bellaston. Thus a brief examination of these scenes, during which I shall make comparisons with the analogous scenes in the first two sections of the novel, will demonstrate further what this analysis of Lady Bellaston has done--namely, indicate that Fielding becomes more representational in the final part of Tom Jones, though he continues to use devices that are prominent in the first two sections.

Whereas the analogous scene in Book V took place in Molly Seagrim's bedroom, with Tom being the intruder, and whereas the scene in Book X took place in the inn bedroom, with the focus being upon Mrs. Waters' identity, here, in London, there are two similar scenes,

both occurring in Tom's room. On her first visit, Lady Bellaston threw herself into a chair when she arrived; in the second, however, she "squatted herself down on the bed." The location of these incidents--Tom's bedroom--is significant in stressing not only Lady Bellaston's aggressiveness but Tom's personal involvement and responsibility for his dilemma. His indiscretion is emphasized further after Lady Bellaston's first visit when Mrs. Miller, in rebuking him for having a lady visitor until 2:00 a.m., receives from Tom an indignant, self-righteous reply.

The extent to which Sophia is involved in these scenes is significant as well, for though she is not in the room, the focus is upon her more specifically than in the two earlier scenes. When Tom goes to visit Molly, for example, it is as a result of his love for Sophia and his determination to break with Molly, yet the Molly and Square affair is the focus of the incident. At Upton, we are merely reminded of Sophia by the narrator when he claims that Tom yields to Mrs. Waters without duly weighing his allegiance to Sophia. Then, soon afterwards, Sophia herself arrives at the inn. Yet there is no antagonism between Sophia and Mrs. Waters--indeed, they never meet; similarly, there is none between Sophia and Molly. Here, in London, the differing relationship between Sophia and the "other woman" is evident in these two scenes. Tom's predicament is complicated because the two know each other and because, for some time, Sophia is living with Lady Bellaston. In addition, Tom becomes involved with Lady Bellaston in an effort to locate Sophia.

And the implicit contrast, as well as the gradually deepening conflict that develops is evident in these incidents. In the first, when Lady Bellaston is there, Mrs. Honour arrives with news of Sophia, and a letter from her to Tom; in the second, Mrs. Honour again brings news of Sophia, though this time she arrives first. In both instances, Tom's obvious love for Sophia is so evident to Lady Bellaston that her jealousy is increased, as is her determination to prevent their marriage.

The scenes are typical as well in their fairly serious import. Whereas the scene with Square, Molly and Tom is hilarious, and that in the Upton bedroom highly comic as well, here, though the incidents are not without humour, they are depicted in a manner that leads the reader to experience both a concern for Tom and some criticism of him. The main source of comedy in each scene is Mrs. Honour. After her departure, in the first incident, the narrator's description of Lady Bellaston's rage is comic, though Tom's distress, his deceitful response, and the realistic dialogue modify the comedy considerably. In the second incident, Mrs. Honour's long harangue prior to Lady Bellaston's arrival is again comic. But then the arrival of Lady Bellaston adds intensity and suspense, a concern for Tom and, once again, some criticism of Tom. While the conversation is, at times, humorous, this humour is controlled by the realism of the dialogue, by Lady Bellaston's shrewdness, and Tom's evident distress.

Both incidents are more scenic than the analogous incident at Upton. The chapter describing the bedroom scene at Upton opens with a stylized passage, includes many authorial comments, and emphasizes the actions and words of the intruders, who are minor characters. Here, the first bedroom incident actually begins with a letter from Lady Bellaston to Tom, is followed almost at once by a second letter, and then, after only brief narration, by the arrival of the woman herself "very disordered in her dress, and very discomposed in her looks." From this point to the end of the incident, there is dialogue almost continually, either between Tom and Lady Bellaston or between Tom and Mrs. Honour. The only summary is near the end of the account:

> Here ensued a long conversation, which the reader, who is not too curious, will thank me for not inserting at length. It shall suffice, therefore, to inform him, that Lady Bellaston grew more and more pacified, and at length believed, or affected to believe, his protestations. . . . (II, 211)

The narrator then proceeds to describe Lady Bellaston's thoughts about the entire situation, reporting the agreement the two make to meet, in future, at her house. Thus the incident concludes with the two distanced somewhat by this use of summarized narration.

The second bedroom visit begins more vividly than the first, with a spirited outburst from Mrs. Honour to Tom, interrupted at first by his occasional comment. Finally, Partridge bursts in to announce that "the great lady" is upon the stairs. Tom's dilemma and his course of action are described in narration, followed by a

scene between him and Lady Bellaston. The realistic dialogue, which illustrates Tom's increasing ability to dissemble, is given in full, in contrast to the former visit where some of their conversation was omitted. The arrival of the drunken Nightingale adds comedy and a further complication, since it leads to Lady Bellaston's discovery of Mrs. Honour. But at the same time it resolves Tom's immediate dilemma. The scene concludes with the focus upon Mrs. Honour and Lady Bellaston, and finally upon Tom and Mrs. Honour. Thus the summary in this instance (and the omitted conversation) concerns Honour and Tom, who discuss his infidelity to Sophia. The account concludes with the narrator's comment that this "unfortunate adventure" worked out to the satisfaction of only Mrs. Honour.

In both incidents, the narrator's presence is evident, yet the reader is involved primarily with the characters--especially Tom. The stylization in the first incident (about Lady Bellaston's rage), the summary at the end, and the narrative report of the woman's thoughts and feelings, modify the reader's emotional response. In the second incident, there is more narration about Tom: at the time of Lady Bellaston's arrival, for example, and, later, at the time of Nightingale's arrival. And when Lady Bellaston finds Honour behind the curtain, Tom's embarrassment is reported by the narrator. In this second, and more serious, bedroom scene, therefore, the narrator distances Tom from the reader

more than in the first. On the other hand, the narrator is, seemingly, less concerned about diverting the focus from Lady Bellaston, for he allows us to view her more closely than in the earlier scene.

Both scenes have considerable dramatic impact--as do the London events generally. This results from the nature of the incidents, from Tom's involvement, and Sophia's indirect involvement. But in addition, as in the similar scene at Upton, there are stage techniques used that are reminiscent of Restoration drama: abrupt entrances, hiding behind curtains, dissembling, and a basic problem arising from a love-affair complication. While the spirited dialogue makes these scenes ones that could be presented on stage most effectively, the scenic narrative technique makes them dramatic in the fictional sense as well. According to Lubbock's definitions, such incidents as these, though not wholly scenic, are dramatic because the reader's gaze is primarily upon the characters and not upon the narrator. While summary is used, scene is predominant. One might say, then, that these scenes not only typify the narrative technique of the third section of the novel, but include within them the dramatic emphases evident in both of the earlier sections of Tom Jones, and in both of the earlier bedroom scenes.

The involvement of Tom, and the reader's criticism of him for his affair with Lady Bellaston, make these scenes representative of the London section of the novel. While the narrator controls very

carefully the reader's judgment of Tom, these incidents evoke a much greater criticism of him than do his two earlier affairs. This is a result not only of Lady Bellaston's nature, or the presence of Sophia in London, but of the fact that Tom should, by now, have learned his lesson. And the narrator, by the way he depicts the London scenes,manipulates the reader into just this kind of reaction: there is less rhetorical comment praising Tom's goodness and sense of honour, and an increase in the number of times he is scenically depicted. Even though the reader knows more about Lady Bellaston than Tom does, he is not excused by the narrator as he seems to be in the early parts of the novel. At the same time, some sympathy is aroused for him on these two occasions through the sense of embarrassment he experiences, his obvious turmoil, and his lack of experience that causes him, on the second occasion, to act as an inexperienced "gallant" in hiding Mrs. Honour. In any case, this close view forces the reader to make a judgment. And the judgment is affected by the manner in which Lady Bellaston is portrayed.

The two bedroom incidents contribute to the reader's increasing emotional response to Lady Bellaston in several ways. In the first incident, her notes to Tom, her words after she arrives in his room, and her rage after Mrs. Honour's departure, all illustrate her strong passion for Tom. Her insistence on seeing Sophia's letter indicates her powerful jealousy, while her willingness, eventually,

to accept (though not admit, outwardly) Sophia's position as first in Tom's affections, illustrates the nature of her "love." One is reminded of Mrs. Waters' similar thoughts after she realized Tom was in love with another woman.

On the second occasion, Lady Bellaston is portrayed even more vividly, for her rage is more realistically described and her ability to deceive demonstrated more aptly. This is in sharp contrast to Tom's consternation, though strangely similar to Mrs. Honour's ability to assume immediately an appropriate role that will further her own personal position. Lady Bellaston's shrewdness now appears in a way not apparent in the earlier scene. Perhaps the reader's awareness of this quality in her is intensified by the fact that he knows, by this time, of her scheme for the ruin of Sophia.

Both of these bedroom scenes involving Tom and Lady Bellaston in London, therefore, may be considered as paradigms for the manner in which Fielding depicts Lady Bellaston, for the way in which his portrayal of Tom at this stage of the book is made more vivid, and for the general narrative method in the third part of the novel. The method is, primarily, more scenic than panoramic, through the use of more dialogue, more scenes, less symbolism and comedy, and less prominent intrusions. The reader becomes more involved with the characters, making judgments, now, on the basis of his own assessments of the individuals in the story as well as on the basis

of the narrator's comments. The reader reacts more emotionally to Lady Bellaston than to either Molly or Mrs. Waters, though his involvement is controlled sufficiently to make his judgment of her--and of Tom--appropriate and accurate.

Chapter Six: Sophia

Sophia Western is portrayed more realistically--and, of course, characterized more fully--than Molly, Mrs. Waters or Lady Bellaston. Consequently, the nature of the reader's relationship with Sophia is not as immediately apparent or as easily defined as his relationship with the other three women. One does not find, for example, a steady increase in realism from her first appearance to her last. There is, rather, continual variation in the way the scenic and panoramic modes are alternated, and fused, resulting in frequent changes in the reader's involvement with her. The general pattern--though such a schematic summary is, perhaps, an over-simplification--is that from Books IV through VI the reader's relationship with Sophia moves from an almost wholly intellectual response toward her to a fairly deep emotional involvement. From Books VII through XII the reverse is evident: the reader's emotional involvement gives way to detachment. And in the London books, which begin with Sophia at some distance from the reader, one notes a steady increase in his emotional response to her through Book XVI, at which time this is modified. For the final two books the reader's reactions are at times intellectual, at other times emotional, or--more often--both, resulting in a balanced and most satisfying relationship during these concluding chapters of the novel.

The reader's assessment of Tom is affected much more by the way Fielding portrays Sophia than by the way he presents any of the other women. As the heroine, Sophia is, of course, vastly superior in character to the others, and her relationship with Tom is basic to the plot and theme of the novel. Nonetheless, the extent to which the reader's response to Tom and involvement with him are controlled through Sophia is surprising. While the reader is manipulated very skillfully into an appropriate relationship with Sophia--through devices that arouse both his admiration and his affection--he notes at the outset that though the heroine is not depicted as a symbol of perfection she is definitely not to be judged as other characters are to be judged. Of Fielding's skill in depicting Sophia, Hamilton Macallister says:

> Sophia is not so perfect as to be inhuman. She has the sort of human qualities that some of Shakespeare's heroines possess. . . . Like Rosalind, from As You Like It, and Viola, she combines a fresh simplicity of mind with the courage to go out into the world on her own. She has more physical courage than Viola, who trembled at the idea of a duel. 'A good brisk pace,' she says to her maid, Mrs. Honour, 'will preserve us from the cold, and if you cannot defend me from a villain, Honour, I will defend you, for I will take a pistol with me. . . .' (VII, 7) And when a man rides up to her in the darkness (X,9) 'she neither screamed out nor fainted away'. . . . Sophia, we feel, is generally a more capable character than those other Fielding heroines; she is a squire's daughter, and an heiress. Like Fanny, she has that simplicity of mind: '. . . her understanding was of the first rate, but she wanted all that useful art which females convert to so many good purposes in life and which, as it rather arises from the heart than from the head, is often the property of the silliest of women'. (VII, 3)

The reader of Tom Jones cannot help but respond to Sophia with both admiration and affection because Fielding makes his own pre-

ference for her so apparent. Her character, in fact, is based upon his first wife, Charlotte, as he reveals when he says that Sophia "resembled one whose image never can depart from my breast,"[2] and that future generations who read about Sophia will be reading "the real worth which once existed in my Charlotte" (II, 156). In addition, there are frequent comments in the course of the narrative about the speaker's tenderness for his heroine, or his haste to return to her and her concerns. While such comments draw attention to the narrator (and the author) this undoubted affection for Sophia cannot help but influence the reader. Yet Sophia is distanced from the reader as well, through techniques that prevent her from being merely a sentimental heroine with whom the reader identifies too closely. Another comment by Macallister is pertinent here:

> Fielding had the gift, which the 19th-century novelists did not have, of being able to describe without sentimentality women as seen by man, with those female qualities men dream of rather than see in real life. Though this type of romantically-conceived woman became a trap to Dickens and Thackeray, Sophia is real, and this may be because of Fielding's 'external' technique, and the ironically flippant, burlesque diction, which prevents both Fielding and us from becoming too emotionally involved with her.[3]

Similarly, A. Digeon, in comparing Sophia with Richardson's Clarissa, comments,

> The secret lack of balance in Richardson's characters is due to the fact that, though their destinies are tragic, their souls are small, occupied with infinitesimal details of feeling, the slaves of worldly convention, of religious or sentimental formalities. The most striking example of this lack of balance is Clarissa, who is crushed beneath her destiny. Sophia Western, on the contrary, is the true type of a woman made for life, capable of following the way which she has hewn out for herself, and of accomplishing her long and heavy task with energy.[4]

Not all critics would agree with these assessments which suggest the vivid realism evident in Fielding's Sophia. She has been viewed, in fact, as a symbol, or emblem, of wisdom. Claiming that "the definition of Wisdom" is the novel's most important theme,[5] Martin Battestin says that the meaning within the novel of sophia, or wisdom, "is presented to the reader as 'an Object of Sight' in the character of Fielding's heroine."[6] He sees the novel as one in which Fielding chooses his characters and shapes his plot in a way that objectifies this theme, though he does not term the book an allegory in the sense that The Faerie Queene is an allegory:

> Tom Jones differs from the conventional allegory in that Fielding's story is primary and autonomous: characters, events, setting have an integrity of their own and compel our interest in and for themselves; they do not require, at every point in the narrative, to be read off as signs and symbols in some controlling ideational system. Whereas Una is "the One," Sophia Western is the girl whom Tom Jones loves and her family bullies. Spenser's heroine engages our intellect; Fielding's our affection and sympathy. Yet at the same time Fielding shares with the allegorist the desire to render the abstractions of his theme--in this instance, to find the particular shape and image for the complementary concepts of providence and Prudence, of divine Order and human Virtue, which were the bases for his comic vision of life.[7]

Battestin claims further that Fielding in his novels deserts the "realistic" mode for the "Emblematical." Hence Sophia, he says, represents wisdom, with her marriage to Tom representing the attainment of true wisdom.[8] To consider Sophia thus definitely reduces her individuality. Nonetheless, the meaning of her name, and the thematic significance of "wisdom" within the novel cannot be ignored totally. Thus the symbolic element in the characterization of Sophia is one way in which she is distanced from the reader. The

major problem in Battestin's analysis, however, is that he does not reconcile clearly his apparent conviction that Sophia is a convincing individual (she has "our affection and sympathy") with his extravagant claims about her symbolic position. The reason is that he overemphasizes the latter idea.

Sophia, then, is distanced slightly by her function within the novel as a symbol of wisdom. Yet such an interpretation, which tends to lessen one's emotional involvement with the girl, does stress her excellence of character. Through most of the story, however, this symbolic element is much less obtrusive than other aspects of her portrayal. One remembers Sophia as a convincing individual, not as a symbol. And when Tom finally wins her, we think not of his acquisition of wisdom, but of his acquisition of Sophia. Thus this study will concentrate on Fielding's portrayal of Sophia as a believable heroine to whom the reader responds in varying ways throughout the book, yet never in a critical manner. We are not allowed, moreover, to respond to her emotionally at all times, and never to an excessive degree. The manner in which she is depicted leads the reader to experience both a sense of awe and a growing affection, the two responses being evoked in a manner that enhances not only her own characterization but that of Tom.

Not until the fourth book of Tom Jones is Sophia introduced into the story, and then it is with a mighty flourish of stylized language,

classical allusions and flowery "embellishments." Critics have considered this introduction in varying ways. According to Ian Watt, Sophia "never wholly recovers from so artificial an introduction, or at least never wholly disengages herself from the ironical attitude which it has induced."[9] Arnold Kettle says: "The ironical opening description of Sophia is really a way of not describing her."[10] Eleanor Hutchens comments that while Fielding no doubt intended "to portray in Sophia the highest perfection of young womanhood" what he actually did was "to introduce her in ironically flowery language and then to begin the actual description with an incongruous flatness."[11] On the other hand, Daniel J. Schneider comments on the remarkable effectiveness of the stylization of the passage, noting that "one cannot fail to be struck by the fact that Fielding is thoroughly enjoying himself":

> There is a vigor of imagination that will be satisfied only by amplitude--though Fielding tells us this is but "a short hint" of what he can do. The mockery is so infused with an exuberant pleasure that it is almost cancelled out, and a genial warmth and affection, reinforced by the allusion to Fielding's own wife, pervades the passage. Fielding is pleased with his heroine; and perhaps it is to the communication of his deep satisfaction with her, with his creation, that a very considerable share of our pleasure is owing. The joys of creating, the father's delight in his child, become ours; the mood in which the imagination feels its freedom and revels in its self-assertion communicates itself contagiously, and, like any pure expression of high spirits untinged by malice, gives us release and joy.[12]

Maurice Johnson, too, says that this passage, "as an announced exercise in 'sublime' language . . . prepares the way for a heroine as fresh and beautiful as Spring."[13] He goes on to claim, moreover, that for Fielding this entire passage is really

a device for rejecting rhetoric, preparatory to the entrance of a heroine who, however lovely, is not a goddess but very much a human being. She cannot live up to the absurd, bookish sublimity of the introductory rhetoric, nor would the reader wish her to; after six paragraphs of introduction she steps down from the flower-strewn stage.[14]

Similarly, Robert Alter says that "The elevated style is honestly meant to give her a certain real grandness--and I think that it clearly succeeds."[15]

Such differing opinions indicate the powerful effect of Fielding's means of introducing his heroine. Her entrance into the story certainly cannot be ignored. That Fielding intended the reader to consider the passage carefully is evident from his own remarks about how he introduces her. Speaking of "poetical embellishments" (I, 101) as having value in refreshing the mind of the reader, he proceeds to speak of the similarity of such "embellishments" to the methods used by dramatists to herald the arrival of a hero or heroine on the stage. Finally, after a specific illustration of one such practice--that of strewing the stage with flowers before the great personages enter, he says:

> Our intention, in short, is to introduce our heroine with the utmost solemnity in our power, with an elevation of stile, and all other circumstances proper to raise the veneration of our reader. Indeed we would, for certain causes, advise those of our male readers who have any hearts, to read no further, were we not well assured, that how amiable soever the picture of our heroine will appear, as it is really a copy from nature, many of our fair country-women will be found worthy to satisfy any passion, and to answer any idea of female perfection which our pencil will be able to raise. (I, 103)

There is no reason to interpret this passage ironically, especially in view of the fact that Fielding is basing his heroine's characteri-

zation upon his beloved first wife. So we must take seriously his claim that he wishes her to enter the "stage" with pomp and ceremony, in a manner that will suitably impress the readers. Her introduction is, after all, rather late in the story. Perhaps an extra flourish is required to stress not only the personal affection of the author for Sophia, but to set her apart from other characters and, for a time, from the readers. The stylized description, with the numerous classical references, is slightly amusing, though one does not laugh at Sophia. No other character has been thus introduced, but then no one has deserved such veneration. After four paragraphs of lofty description, the narrator says:

> Yet it is possible, my friend, that thou mayest have seen all these without being able to form an exact idea of Sophia; for she did not exactly resemble any of them. . . . most of all she resembled one whose image never can depart from my breast, and whom, if thou dost remember, thou hast then, my friend, an adequate idea of Sophia.
>
> But lest this should not have been thy fortune, we will endeavour with our utmost skill to describe this paragon, though we are sensible that our highest abilities are very inadequate to the task. (I, 104-105)

At this point the narrator gives an actual physical description of Sophia, using common language interspersed with lines of poetry. But when he begins to describe her mind his language once again is slightly stylized:

> Her mind was every way equal to her person; nay, the latter borrowed some charms from the former; for when she smiled, the sweetness of her temper diffused that glory over her countenance which no regularity of features can give. But as there are no perfections of the mind which do not discover themselves in that perfect intimacy to which we intend to introduce our reader with this charming young creature, so it is needless to mention them here; nay, it is a kind of tacit affront to our reader's understanding, and may also rob him of that pleasure which he will receive in forming his own judgment of her character. (I, 106)

The use of varying narrative styles in the chapter describing Sophia helps to keep the reader's initial response to Sophia in balance: it is largely an intellectual response, for she is being set off from ordinary mortals, yet some comments by the narrator indicate her admirable personal qualities as well.

As Schneider suggests, Fielding is, in his introduction of Sophia, having fun. And in so doing, he prevents an emotional relationship between the reader and her at this early stage of the story. These distancing devices used in her introduction are a major means in this part of the novel of stressing Sophia's superiority. Much later, when Tom despairs of ever winning her, we as readers are apt to recall our feeling toward her here. And because we have been led to consider her with some awe, at a distance, we are better able to understand Tom's feelings when he is convinced that he, as an outsider in society, can never do more than gaze upon her from a distance.

Another means the narrator uses in the first part of the novel to maintain some distance between the reader and Sophia is to take a backward look at an earlier, significant, event. Immediately following the introduction of the heroine, the narrator goes back about five years to "commemorate a trifling incident" which had, nonetheless, "some future consequences." Much has been written about this episode, because of the way it depicts the characters of Blifil and Tom, Sophia's perception of each, the theories of

Square and Thwackum, and the common sense of Squire Western. The incident itself, however, is a tender one, in which the bird, little Tommy, is let loose by the villainous Blifil. While Tom, in trying to rescue the bird, falls from the tree into a pond, the bird is carried away by a hawk:

> Poor Sophia, who now first heard of her little Tommy's fate (for her concern for Jones had prevented her perceiving it when it happened), shed a shower of tears. These Mr. Allworthy endeavoured to assuage, promising her a much finer bird: but she declared she would never have another. Her father chid her for crying so for a foolish bird; but could not help telling young Blifil, if he was a son of his, his backside should be well flead. (I, 109)

Neither the comedy of the subsequent discussion among the theorists nor the emphasis upon the differing natures of Tom and Blifil would be sufficient to restrain an emotional response to Sophia if this incident had been recounted at the time it occurred. But by the device of placing it five years earlier, some of its immediacy is lost, and the narrator's main point is to indicate Sophia's early interest in Tom. We are told, for example, that "from this day Sophia began to have some little kindness for Tom Jones, and no little aversion for his companion," and that "Many accidents from time to time improved both these passions in her breast" (I, 112).

As stated in earlier chapters, Fielding's use of contrast is frequently a distancing device. Particularly is this the case when characters are introduced in pairs, as in the first few books of Tom Jones. Yet Sophia is not so depicted. She stands alone. We see many characters "paired": Tom and Blifil, the two Squires,

Mrs. Western and Bridget Allworthy, the two Blifil brothers, Thwackum and Square, and Molly and "her equals." But no contrast, either implicit or explicit, exists in the first six books that comments upon Sophia or causes the reader to view her as a type character. While Molly Seagrim is presented as a vivid contrast to Sophia (as has been demonstrated), we do not view Sophia as a vivid contrast to Molly. The reason for this is that while the introduction and description of Molly are made in a manner that reveals Sophia's superiority the reader's assessment of Sophia is in no way affected by the introduction of Molly as a rival. Sophia does not need such a contrast for her excellence to be apparent. She has, already, our complete admiration and, to some extent, our affection.

In his depiction of Molly, Fielding uses techniques that arouse the reader's intellectual interests but restrain his emotional involvement with her. These same devices are used, with somewhat different effects at times, in the depiction of Sophia. As already demonstrated, the narrator's comments about his favourite character evoke a similar affectionate response within the reader. Moreover, the fact that the narrator discloses Sophia's thoughts frequently (which most often concern her feelings for Tom) tends to involve the reader's emotions though his reaction is controlled by the narrator's intrusive presence. For example, after Sophia learns of Tom's affair with Molly, the narrator describes just how much Sophia loves Tom yet how determined she is to forget him:

> The situation of this young lady was now very different from what it had ever been before. That passion which had formerly been so exquisitely delicious, became now a scorpion in her bosom. She resisted it therefore with her utmost force, and summoned every argument her reason (which was surprisingly strong for her age) could suggest, to subdue and expel it. In this she so far succeeded, that she began to hope from time and absence a perfect cure. (I, 142)

The self-conscious comments relating to Sophia stress the narrator's role as historian more than as artist, for there are a number of occasions when he feigns ignorance of the circumstances. Statements directed to the reader are not merely informative (as is generally the case with Molly) but tend to praise Sophia. Unlike those relating to Tom, however, these do not call upon the reader to make a judgment. The narrator simply takes for granted what the reader's opinion is and, in several cases, even assumes the reader is able to guess Sophia's thoughts. Significantly, there are very few generalizations or references to literature. Other than the allusions in her introduction, there are only two generalizations, both concerning her love for Tom. The first is an explanation of why Sophia, and not her father, recognized the symptoms of love in Tom--merely because one lover will always recognize another, even as one knave will recognize another; the second is a comment that it is a generally accepted principle that "misfortunes do not come single." Unlike Molly, then, Sophia is not de-personalized through numerous comparisons with individuals or groups of people in various walks of life. And with Sophia, most of the narrator's comments tend to increase the reader's affection for the girl, whereas the narrator manages to use similar techniques to keep Molly at some distance.

While the only symbolism relating to Molly bears on her affair with Square, and not Tom, Sophia's love for Tom is described, several times, through disease imagery. This imagery is especially appropriate when first used because she is trying to conquer her love for Tom, who is not as yet in love with her. That Fielding should choose to have his heroine admit her love for the hero, before it is returned, is significant, for this distinguishes Sophia from the Richardsonian heroine who would never admit to falling in love before the gentleman in question had declared his affection for her. Moreover, such imagery helps to reduce the sentimentality that could result from a direct account of Sophia's thoughts about Tom. One of the major symbols of the novel, the muff, is here introduced also. This is one of the devices termed by Maurice Johnson (using Fielding's term) a "minute wheel" which contributes to Fielding's "feigning of reality,"[16] and bringing of "the inner life of his characters to view."[17] Such objects which may be used both literally and symbolically are significant, he says, because they suggest relationships, or feelings, rather than state them openly. The muff, for example, is

> a means by which Fielding suggests states of mind and emotion that could not very well have been merely explicated or dramatized, partly because they are--at first anyway--states that the characters do not fully recognize.[18]

This muff, at first, is a symbol of Sophia's love for Tom, then of their mutual, though undeclared, love. Later in the novel (as will be demonstrated) it is used occasionally to comment on the state of Tom's and Sophia's relationship at a particular time.

The major difference in the depictions of Molly and Sophia is not in the manner in which authorial intrusions such as those just noted are employed, but rather in the narrator's greater use, with Sophia, of dialogue and scene. There is, seemingly, little attempt after Sophia's introduction to restrict the direct views of her, as there is with Molly or with Tom. There is, moreover, a gradual increase in dialogue and scene as the story unfolds: after the stylized introduction, the backward look to the bird incident, and the summary about several years of Sophia's life, there are, at first, brief scenes, with limited dialogue, leading up to the emotional conversations of Book VI where Squire Western and his sister are trying to arrange a marriage between Sophia and Blifil.

There is, for example, considerable realism in the following scenes: Sophia's conversation with Tom in which she agrees to intercede with her father on behalf of Black George and asks Tom, in turn, to persuade her father to take fewer risks when hunting; Sophia's brief conversation with Black George; Parson Supple's account to Squire Western, Tom and Sophia of the churchyard battle; the conversation between Sophia and Mrs. Honour about Molly, and finally the accident scene, which is followed by conversations between Sophia and Tom, and Sophia and Honour. In each of these, except the scene in which Parson Supple tells his story, Sophia speaks directly. The following excerpt from the conversation between Tom and Sophia after Sophia is thrown from her horse illustrates the sort of immediacy achieved in all of the scenes including Sophia:

She soon after, however, recovered her spirits, assured him she was safe, and thanked him for the care he had taken of her. Jones answered, 'If I have preserved you, madam, I am sufficiently repaid; for I promise you, I would have secured you from the least harm at the expense of a much greater misfortune to myself than I have suffered on this occasion.'

'What misfortune?' replied Sophia eagerly. 'I hope you have come to no mischief?'

'Be not concerned, madam,' answered Jones. 'Heaven be praised you have escaped so well, considering the danger you was in. If I have broke my arm, I consider it as a trifle, in comparison of what I feared upon your account.'

Sophia then screamed out, 'Broke your arm! Heaven forbid.'

'I am afraid I have, madam,' says Jones, 'but I beg you will suffer me first to take care of you. I have a right hand yet at your service, to help you into the next field, whence we have but a very little walk to your father's house.' (I, 143-144)

Later, after Tom falls in love with Sophia, we have two more memorable scenes involving them both: Sophia's rescue of her muff from the fire, and the meeting of the two lovers in the garden. Though the former is related wholly in narration, there is a scenic quality to the passage as a result of the way the focus is directly upon Sophia:

Sophia looked this evening with more than usual beauty, and we may believe it was no small addition to her charms, in the eye of Mr. Jones, that she now happened to have on her right arm this very muff.

She was playing one of her father's favourite tunes, and he was leaning on her chair, when the muff fell over her fingers, and put her out. This so disconcerted the squire, that he snatched the muff from her, and with a hearty curse threw it into the fire. Sophia instantly started up, and with the utmost eagerness recovered it from the flames. (I, 164)

Later, when the young couple meet, accidentally, in the garden, there is a fairly lengthy passage of dialogue which, though somewhat stylized, is uninterrupted by the narrator's comments. And when Mrs. Western concludes that Sophia is in love with Blifil, scenes increase in intensity and realistic dialogue, in accord with the

seriousness of Sophia's situation. She has, for example, several passionate arguments with both her aunt and her father. Finally, there is the scene where Tom goes, ostensibly, to persuade Sophia to accede to her father's demands. And the sixth book ends with an exchange of letters between Tom and Sophia, followed by Sophia's dialogues with Honour about her plight.

The reader's increasing involvement with Sophia is affected only occasionally by comic devices. Several ironies of plot in these books lighten the tone of the story, however: Sophia's request to Black George that the pregnant Molly be her maid; Sophia's decision to go on a trip to forget Tom, who then breaks his arm and is confined to her house; Sophia's missing Tom by just a few minutes because she paused to change her hair ribbons before going to the canal; and Sophia's swoon in the grove which causes her aunt to believe the girl is in love with Blifil.

Verbal irony relating to Sophia, though limited, is evident in the language of her introduction and in the disease imagery used to describe her love for Tom. Then it is through Sophia, primarily, that Fielding reveals the irony in his use of the word "prudence." According to Eleanor Hutchens, the word, on the one hand, means "the quality equipped with its favourable associations" and on the other "the word that is denotatively accurate but, without the usual connotations, a mockery of the valuable quality it pretends to represent."[19] This is illustrated best in the way Fielding refers to Mrs. Western's lectures to Sophia about marrying Blifil:

> Sophia had passed the last twenty-four hours in no very desirable manner. During a large part of them she had been entertained by her aunt with lectures of prudence, recommending to her the example of the polite world, where love (so the good lady said) is at present entirely laughed at, and where women consider matrimony, as men do offices of public trust, only as the means of making their fortunes, and of advancing themselves in the world. (I, 246)

Throughout the novel, Sophia receives lectures of this sort, and, as Miss Hutchens notes, "One of the most entertaining features of these recurrent lectures is Sophia's complete insensibility to them. She is a prudent girl in the best sense."[20]

Other than in his introduction of Sophia, Fielding rarely uses mock-heroic or highly stylized language in his depiction of her. One example, however, is his description of Sophia's state of body and mind when Squire Western rushes—roaring--to her room after learning that she is in love with Tom, who is in there with her:

> As when two doves, or two wood-pigeons, or as when Strephon and Phyllis (for that comes nearest to the mark) are retired into some pleasant solitary grove, to enjoy the delightful conversation of Love . . . here, while every object is serene, should hoarse thunder burst suddenly through the shattered clouds, and rumbling roll along the sky, the frightened maid starts from the mossy bank. . . .
>
> Or as when two gentlemen . . . are cracking a bottle together at some inn or tavern at Salisbury, if the great Dowdy . . . should rattle his chains. . . .
>
> So trembled poor Sophia, so turned she pale at the noise of her father. . . . (I, 232)

But as Squire Western arrives, Sophia faints in Tom's arms, causing her father, in his anxiety for her welfare, to forget why he had come. And the epic simile, followed by stylized narration, prevents a sentimental or even a concerned response by the reader at this supposedly critical moment.

As a further example of Fielding's use of language in depicting Sophia, it is interesting to consider the conversation between her and Tom when they meet, accidentally, in the garden. We note here a fairly marked difference in the dialogue of the two lovers. Because both are ill at ease, their conversation begins "with some of the ordinary forms of salutation" (I, 175), namely, references to the weather. When, in their walk, they arrive at the place where Tom, years before, had tumbled from the tree into the canal, they discuss that incident in a stilted manner:

> When they came to the tree whence he had formerly tumbled into the canal, Sophia could not help reminding him of that accident, and said, 'I fancy, Mr. Jones, you have some little shuddering when you see that water.' - 'I assure you, madam,' answered Jones, 'the concern you felt at the loss of your little bird will always appear to me the highest circumstance in that adventure. . . .' (I, 176)

As Tom gains courage, he speaks of personal matters in less formal language. But even so, his final remarks are more stylized than are Sophia's. He exclaims, for example,

> 'What am I saying? Pardon me if I have said too much. My heart overflowed. I have struggled with my love to the utmost, and have endeavoured to conceal a fever which preys on my vitals, and will, I hope, soon make it impossible for me ever to offend you more.' (I, 177)

And she replies,

> 'Mr. Jones, I will not affect to misunderstand you; indeed, I understand you too well; but for Heaven's sake, if you have any affection for me, let me make the best of my way into the house. I wish I may be able to support myself thither.' (I, 177)

A similar distinction in language is evident in the two letters which form the last communication between Tom and Sophia in Somerset: Tom's is flowery, hers plain and straightforward. While

While the passage from which these lines are taken is not without comedy, and irony, it does serve to stress Sophia's passion for Tom, and the seeming hopelessness of their romance. Through this scene, and similar ones in Book VI, we have become personally attached to Sophia in a way that will keep her before us throughout the second section of the novel where she is seen less frequently. And even as Tom's affection for Sophia does not decrease during his separation from her, so the reader's affection continues, though he is forced to consider her now with greater detachment.

In Books VII through XII of Tom Jones, the "road" section of the novel, the narrator's focus seems to be upon Tom more often than upon Sophia. Only two books (X and XI) are concerned with her adventures along the road, though we see her as well in Book VII, while she is still at home. The intense action of Book VII, in fact, which pertains to the proposed marriage of Blifil and Sophia, and Sophia's decision to run away, increases the reader's concern for her. Our final glimpse of Sophia, before the focus moves to Tom and his adventures on the road, is the view of her meditating about actually yielding to her father's demands. In this memorable passage, Sophia's thoughts are related carefully and vividly, though by using narration rather than a present-tense soliloquy, the narrator limits the reader's emotional reaction, causing him instead to respond to the comedy of her deliberations:

> She reverenced her father so piously, and loved him so passionately, that she had scarce ever felt more pleasing sensations, than what arose from the share she frequently had of contributing to his

one may attribute this difference in language to the fact that Tom is the anxious and eager wooer, or to the fact that Sophia has been in love with him for so long that she has learned to control her feelings, one must note that the language given to them in these passages is fully in accord with Fielding's overall characterization of each: Tom is being kept at a distance from the reader, and Sophia is not. The reader is allowed to respond to her emotionally in a way he cannot, at this time, respond to Tom. And thus the reader becomes involved in their romance largely as a result of the way Sophia is depicted.

That our last glimpse of Sophia in the sixth book should be her conversation with Honour about Tom is appropriate, for the love of Sophia and Tom has engaged the reader's interest and aroused his concern. Consider, for example, how the following excerpt from the conversation Sophia has with Honour evokes an emotional response within the reader:

'Honour,' says Sophia, 'you are a good girl, and it is vain to attempt concealing longer my weakness from you; I have thrown away my heart on a man who hath forsaken me.'--'And is Mr. Jones,' answered the maid, 'such a perfidy man?'--'He hath taken his leave of me,' says Sophia, 'for ever in that letter. Nay, he hath desired me to forget him. Could he have desired that if he had loved me? Could he have borne such a thought? Could he have written such a word?'--'No, certainly, ma'am,' cries Honour; 'and to be sure, if the best man in England was to desire me to forget him, I'd take him at his word. . . .'

. . . . . .

'Nay, to be sure, ma'am, answered Honour, 'your la'ship hath had enough to give you a surfeit of them. To be used ill by such a poor, beggerly, bastardly fellow.'--'Hold your blasphemous tongue,' cries Sophia; 'how dare you mention his name with disrespect before me? He use me ill? No, his poor bleeding heart suffered more when he writ the cruel words than mine from reading them. . . .'(I, 248)

> amusement, and sometimes, perhaps, to higher gratifications; for he never could contain the delight of hearing her commended, which he had the satisfaction of hearing almost every day of her life. The idea, therefore, of the immense happiness she should convey to her father by her consent to this match, made a strong impression on her mind. Again, the extreme piety of such an act of obedience worked very forcibly, as she had a very deep sense of religion. Lastly, when she reflected how much she herself was to suffer, being indeed to become little less than a sacrifice, or a martyr, to filial love and duty, she felt an agreeable tickling in a certain little passion, which though it bears no immediate affinity either to religion or virtue, is often so kind as to lend great assistance in executing the purposes of both.
>
> Sophia was charmed with the contemplation of so heroic an action, and began to compliment herself with much premature flattery, when Cupid, who lay in her muff, suddenly crept out, and like Punchinello in a puppet-show, kicked all out before him. . . . (I, 283-284)

This incident, perhaps more than any other in the Somerset part of the novel, demonstrates the ordinary human qualities of the heroine. She, like anyone else, is tempted to act in a way that would feed her ego, though make her miserable. But love wins. Sophia's earlier spirited responses to her aunt and father, this "meditation" scene, and her plans to escape to London, contribute considerably to making her character convincing. If she were depicted only as a paragon, the reader's response to her would remain primarily intellectual: he would feel a sense of awe, curiosity, or even boredom. But these incidents, located strategically at the outset of the second section of the novel, demonstrate, as do the events of book six, that Fielding wished his heroine to be realistic.

Not until after the Upton episode does the narrator tell about Sophia's escape from home. Hence the reader's curiosity and concern prevent him from ever becoming completely detached from her in the chapters that follow. In addition, there are several references to

Sophia during these chapters that keep her in our minds: the toast Tom makes to her, the landlady's fabricated story about her, Tom's reference to her when he talks to the barber, and the narrator's reference when Tom submits to Mrs. Waters at Upton.

When Sophia arrives at Upton she is termed by the narrator "one of the most beautiful creatures in the world." Though she is not yet identified, this comment and the scene demonstrating her charming manners are sufficient to convince the reader it is indeed Sophia. The nature of her re-entry into the story may well cause the reader, along with those in the kitchen of the inn, to experience a certain sense of awe. This reaction, though less intense, is similar to what the reader experienced when Sophia was first introduced. And it is strengthened by the use of an epic simile as part of the description of Sophia lying on her bed. Yet this feeling of admiration and awe toward Sophia is less powerful now than in Book IV not only because the stylization is much less extensive, but because she has, since her entry into the story, been depicted vividly as a mistreated, frightened, but courageous girl. And no distancing technique can erase this impression from the reader's mind. Nonetheless, the narrator's manner of describing her appearance at Upton may well reinforce the idea that one's relationship with Sophia must begin with awe and admiration, after which a more intimate friendship will develop. Certainly this introduction of Sophia at Upton does set her apart, though the subsequent incidents leading to her hurried departure from the inn in a state of great mental distress arouse within the reader, once again, an emotional response that is similar

to what he felt in Books VI and VII during her troubles while at home.

At Upton, after Sophia appears, the reader cannot help but think, at least briefly, about the differences between her and Mrs. Waters. Yet such an implicit contrast in no way affects his assessment of Sophia. Even Mrs. Waters is not greatly affected--certainly not to the extent that Molly is affected by being compared with Sophia--for the shift in focus from Mrs. Waters to Sophia causes the reader to lose interest rapidly in Mrs. Waters. Interestingly, in this one chapter in which Sophia appears during the Upton episode, the stylized opening gives way to realistic narrative and dialogue, whereas in the depiction of Mrs. Waters a vivid introduction gives way, very gradually, to symbolism, mock-heroic language and other techniques that distance her from the reader. Sophia's last and most significant action at Upton, however, the placing of the muff on Tom's bed, is reported in summary. As a result, this incident which emphasizes Tom's unfaithfulness is not made so vivid that the reader's indignation is greatly aroused. While sympathy for Sophia is increased considerably at this moment, the technique prevents the reader from experiencing a very emotional response to Sophia or a strong moral response to Tom.

Immediately following the Upton episode the narrator reports how Sophia and her father arrived at the inn. By this backward look, which shifts the focus from Tom, the narrator reports the story of Sophia's escape in a manner that limits the reader's in-

volvement in her midnight escapade. Then the story continues with an account of Sophia's adventures after leaving Upton, which tend to keep her distanced from the reader. Mrs. Fitzpatrick's lengthy story, for example, though it makes a kind of comment upon Sophia's own situation, also removes the focus of interest from her. Similarly, when she is mistaken for Jenny Cameron the resulting confusion and comedy divert the reader's attention from Sophia's greater problems. And her last appearance in this section of the novel (her arrival in London) is reported in summary. Hence in part two of Tom Jones there is a gradual distancing of Sophia from the intense scenes of Book VII to the brief, summarized account of her arrival at Lady Bellaston's house.

Most of the distancing devices which fall into the "scene-summary" category are evident in the depiction of Sophia in this part of the novel. There are, for example, many direct comments about Sophia's nature and beauty. She is, according to the narrator, "all simplicity," very courageous, very much in love with Tom, and perceptive. While self-conscious comments refer to the narrator's roles as historian and artist, the former role is slightly more prominent, even as it is in similar comments relating to Mrs. Waters. The narrator's direct references to the reader are mostly informative and rhetorical, referring, as do other intrusions, to Sophia's excellence of character. Whereas the analogous statements about Mrs. Waters relate almost entirely to her physical qualities, these

about Sophia stress the nature of her mind and her character. A few such comments are obviously ironic, such as the statement that perhaps some readers may condemn Sophia as a "wanton baggage" or may, perhaps, be capable of "laughing at the offence given to a young lady's delicacy" when the landlord assists her in getting off her horse. But normally the narrator's remarks are more serious, in accord with his high opinion of Sophia which he assumes the reader shares.

The generalizations about Sophia also stress the quality of her mind and character (even as those about Mrs. Waters relate to her physical qualities) in a way not unlike the direct comments to the reader. Yet through generalizations Sophia is compared with others who have similar qualities, and thus is distanced slightly by being considered, for example, along with all people who are affable, honest, courageous, confused, or who choose love over duty and are unreasonable because of being in love. Significantly, she is not grouped with any one class of society or any particular professional group. While the intensity of a situation is always lessened by Fielding's "expansive" style, one's mind in these instances does not move far from Sophia herself. The only literary allusions are comic ones to Cupid and Plato: the first, already quoted, occurs when the narrator explains that Sophia decided to forget Tom but Cupid, in her muff, changes her mind; the second is the narrator's comment that Sophia's voice, as she speaks to her guide, is"much fuller of honey than was ever that of Plato, though his

mouth is supposed to have been a bee-hive" (II, 48). These allusions, which evoke Greek mythology and philosophy, are essentially comic and as a result lighten the tone of the passages concerned.

Symbolism referring to Sophia in these books is similar to that found in the earlier books. Disease imagery, for example, is used again to describe Sophia's love for Tom, while food imagery is used to refer to Blifil's feeling about Sophia. The muff, introduced in Book V as a symbol of Sophia's love for Tom, and later their mutual love, appears here at Upton as a symbol of Tom's unfaithfulness. By the end of the Upton episode, the muff is in Tom's possession. And even as Sophia, earlier, used it to represent her absent lover, from here on Tom makes it, along with Sophia's pocketbook when he finds it, his constant companion and bedfellow.[21] Squire Western's hunting imagery is used, it seems, whenever he appears, and while it comments more upon him than upon his daughter or her suitors, it does enhance the "pursuit" motif which is especially prominent in the middle books of the novel.

Irony of plot and verbal irony continue, from time to time, to change the tone of a passage by either adding comedy or diverting the focus from Sophia's troubles, or both. Sophia's meditation about the virtues of giving in to her father's command to marry Blifil is, for example, ironic. Then there are several ironic situations in which Sophia is indirectly or directly involved: when Tom is manipulated by the landlady of an inn into talking freely about her;

when Susan at Upton lies to Sophia about Tom's remarks concerning her; when Sophia unexpectedly meets Harriet Fitzpatrick (a meeting which leads to complications for both Sophia and Tom); and when she is mistaken for Jenny Cameron. The major verbal irony in these books is in Mrs. Fitzpatrick's story because of the way it comments not only upon that woman's character but in a very indirect manner upon Sophia's own romantic problems. Supposedly this story is a lesson in prudence, yet the reader discovers what Sophia strongly suspects--that Mrs. Fitzpatrick is hardly an example of genuine prudence.

The stylized language is limited to two epic similes and a stylized passage announcing the time of day. In addition to the epic simile (already mentioned) describing Sophia on her bed at Upton, there is one about Sophia's concern when she thinks her father may have overtaken her and Harriet at the inn where they have stopped to rest:

> As a miser, who hath, in some well-built city, a cottage, value twenty shillings, when at a distance he is alarmed with the news of a fire, turns pale and trembles at his loss; but when he finds the beautiful palaces only are burnt, and his own cottage remains safe, he comes instantly to himself, and smiles at his good fortune: or as (for we dislike something in the former simile) the tender mother, when terrified with the apprehension that her darling boy is drowned, is struck senseless and almost dead with consternation; but when she is told that little master is safe, and the Victory only, with twelve hundred brave men, gone to the bottom . . . so Sophia, than whom none was more capable of tenderly feeling the general calamity of her country, found such immediate satisfaction from the relief of those terrors she had of being overtaken by her father, that the arrival of the French scarce made any impression on her. (II, 77)

And in the account of Sophia's escape from home, a brief stylized passage makes the incident seem less serious:

> Twelve times did the iron register of time beat on the sonorous bell-metal, summoning the ghosts to rise and walk their nightly round. - In plainer language, it was twelve o'clock. . . . (II, 46)

In each instance, the language affects the reader's reaction to the incident being recounted, for stylization lessens his emotional response and contributes to his detachment from the event and the characters concerned.

In summary, then, it may be said that the reader's involvement with Sophia during this middle section of the novel gradually decreases. In part, this is a result of the nature of events, for Sophia is involved in very few road adventures. The fact that we see less of Sophia than in Books IV through VI enables us better to identify with Tom, who sees her--while on his journey--not at all. Yet Fielding ensures, through his techniques of presenting Sophia, that while there is a lessening in the reader's emotional involvement he maintains his concern and affection for her.

Sophia is in the background at the beginning of the third part of Tom Jones. While her arrival in London was noted at the end of Book XI, the London events begin only when Tom arrives. Book XII concerns the last part of his journey, Book XIII his arrival in London. Thus the reader, with Tom, is still prevented from viewing Sophia. During the London events there is, for the first four books, a gradual decrease of this distance between the reader and Sophia, with a fairly steady increase in emotional involvement. Narrative devices are employed, however, to control this involvement,

might become sentimental, whereas with Lady Bellaston the narrator frequently omits details of her visits with Tom, obviously because of the effect this would have upon the reader's view of him.

Direct references to the reader about Sophia are primarily informative, though they provide details arousing sympathy for her whereas those about Lady Bellaston have the opposite effect. Lady Bellaston, moreover, is compared through generalizations with others in a particular segment of London society, or with certain types of women, whereas Sophia, as in the Somerset books, is rarely referred to in generalizations. And when she is, the comparison or association does not reduce her individuality to any great extent but rather stresses her plight. For example, in order to justify Sophia's lie to Lady Bellaston, the narrator refers to Lord Shaftesbury's philosophy that at times "to lie is not only excusable but commendable" (II, 201). And in referring to Sophia's discomfiture at the presence of Lord Fellamar, the narrator compares her feeling to that "delicacy in women" which makes them uneasy in the presence of men who have "pretensions to them, which they are disinclined to favour" (II, 349).

Even as Lady Bellaston is not treated symbolically, though she is described twice with apt figures of speech, Sophia, also, is rarely described through imagery or metaphor. The muff, now in Tom's possession, may symbolize to him the absent Sophia, yet it really comments more upon his love than hers. Lord Fellamar's passion for Sophia is termed a fire; Mrs. Western, in threatening to

to prevent sentimentality, and to keep the reader's intellectual interests aroused. We find, moreover, that the more closely we become involved with Sophia, the more we criticize Tom, and thus the narrator's efforts to keep our response to her under control have the effect of controlling our judgment of Tom.

While the narrator's presence is still evident in these books, there is a slight decrease, especially in the final three books, in the various types of authorial comments about Sophia. It is instructive and interesting, however, to note, in brief, the overall effect of the major distancing techniques in these books both in comparison with those used for Lady Bellaston, and those used for Sophia earlier in the novel. Direct statements about Sophia, for example, are still mostly rhetorical. Self-conscious comments continue to refer to the narrator as both an historian and an artist, though here the latter role rather than the former (as in the earlier parts of the novel) is the more prominent. This is a result primarily of deliberate omissions, as in the depiction of Lady Bellaston. The narrator omits, for example, much of the conversation between Lord Fellamar and Sophia, then claims, several times, to leave certain matters to the reader's imagination: the situation of Fellamar and Sophia when Western bursts into the room; the looks and thoughts of Tom and Sophia when they meet, by chance, in Lady Bellaston's drawing room, and what Sophia said, or did, or thought, upon reading Tom's letter brought by Black George. Thus with Sophia the narrator avoids indulging in descriptions or details that

return the girl to her father, uses war imagery; Squire Western, at the end of the novel, uses his usual hunting terms in speaking to Tom and Sophia, but there is only one occasion when Sophia herself is described figuratively. This passage, which precedes an account of Sophia's anguish about the efforts to marry her to either Blifil or Fellamar, stresses the girl's plight, but in a somewhat lighthearted manner that reduces the reader's concern:

> The lowing heifer and the bleating ewe, in herds and flocks, may ramble safe and unregarded through the pastures. These are, indeed, hereafter doomed to be the prey of man; yet many years are they suffered to enjoy their liberty undisturbed. But if a plump doe be discovered to have escaped from the forest, and to repose herself in some field or grove, the whole parish is presently alarmed, every man is ready to set dogs after her; and, if she is preserved from the rest by the good squire, it is only that he may secure her for his own eating.
>
> I have often considered a very fine young woman of fortune and fashion, when first found strayed from the pale of her nursery, to be in pretty much the same situation with this doe. The town is immediately in an uproar; she is hunted from park to play, from court to assembly, from assembly to her own chamber, and rarely escapes a single season from the jaws of some devourer or other; for, if her friends protect her from some, it is only to deliver her over to one of their own chusing, often more disagreeable to her than any of the rest; while whole herds or flocks of other women securely, and scarce regarded, traverse the park, the play, the opera, and the assembly; and though for the most part at least, they are at last devoured, yet for a long time do they wanton in liberty, without disturbance or controul. (II, 339-340)

There are differences in technique in the depiction of Sophia and Lady Bellaston not merely in the way various kinds of authorial comments are employed, but in the way comic devices are used. There is, for example, even less use of comedy in the portrayal of Sophia in London than in that of Lady Bellaston. No highly stylized comic language is used, for example. And there are no genuinely comic scenes that contribute to Sophia's characterization, other than the

one in which she flatters her aunt in an effort to be allowed to refuse all suitors at this time:

'You will pardon me, dear madam,' said Sophia, 'if I make one observation: you own you have had many lovers, and the world knows it, even if you should deny it. You refused them all, and, I am convinced, one coronet at least among them.' . . . 'you have had very great proposals from men of vast fortunes. . . . You are now but a young woman, and I am convinced would not promise to yield to the first lover of fortune, nay, or of title too.' (II, 342)

Several ironies of plot add a comic touch to several incidents, yet in each there is a serious tone as well. When Tom arrives at Mrs. Fitzpatrick's house, for example, he has missed Sophia by only ten minutes. Similarly, Sophia leaves the theatre early on the evening Tom has, to his disgust, been prevented from going. Yet the result is happy, for they meet. When Tom, Sophia, and Lady Bellaston talk, later that same evening, there is irony in the way Sophia is successfully fooled yet is unsuccessful in her own attempt to deceive.[22] And in the proposal scene, the manner in which Sophia's refusal of Tom turns gradually into a consideration of him, and then, ostensibly because of her father's command, into an acceptance of him, is both humorous and ironic. There is little verbal irony apart from that which is inherent in ironies of plot, or certain of the narrator's comments already mentioned. A further example of the latter, however, is in the introductory chapter to Book XVII, where the remark about Sophia is obviously ironic since the reader, by now, is convinced that all will work out well for her. What the narrator says actually intensifies this conviction:

But to bring our favourites out of their present anguish and distress, and to land them at last on the shore of happiness, seems a much harder task; a task, indeed, so hard that we do not undertake to execute it. In regard to Sophia, it is more than probable that we

shall somewhere or other provide a good husband for her in the end--either Blifil, or my lord, or somebody else. . . . (II, 328)

The reader's response to Sophia, however, is controlled in this section of the novel not merely by the authorial intrusions or comic techniques just referred to, but by the increased number of scenes, the more frequent use of dialogue, and the nature of the events themselves. The reader experiences, in general, a gradual increase in emotional involvement with Sophia during the first four books of the London section; then his response begins to fluctuate somewhat. This overall trend may be illustrated by considering the events of these six books in "movements": the first ending with Sophia's meeting with Tom at Lady Bellaston's; the second with the attempted rape of Sophia; the third with Sophia's letter to Tom after she learns of his "proposal" letter to Lady Bellaston, and the fourth ending with the conclusion of the novel.

In the first movement, Sophia is not viewed directly until the concluding scene. But there is no effort, in this re-introduction of Sophia in London, to arouse the reader's awe by depicting her as a paragon. While she is, during the first chapters of the London books, distanced from the reader, it is not through stylization or rhetorical remarks. Actually, the references made to Sophia stress her human qualities, from the point where Fielding speaks of "my Charlotte" (II, 156) right through to the description of her embarrassment when talking with Lady Bellaston after Tom leaves them. Our concern for Sophia, furthermore, is maintained prior to this

scene because of our identification with Tom as he searches for her. When, by chance, he finds her, this direct view of the lovers together (the first since Book VI) is vivid and realistic. And the location of their reunion adds suspense, for the reader knows, and Tom knows, that Lady Bellaston may return at any moment. Sophia, on the other hand, is not aware that the two are even acquainted. Hence the dramatic irony of the situation decreases slightly the reader's involvement in this scene. Moreover, when the conversation is on the verge of becoming sentimental, Sophia enquires of Tom how he happened to come to this house. But his dilemma is solved by Lady Bellaston's arrival home. And her arrival, the irony pervading the ensuing conversation, and the implicit contrast between the two women alter the tone of the passage considerably. The conflict even now beginning between Sophia and Lady Bellaston is evident in their confrontation here, especially during their conversation after Tom leaves. And the reader's awareness of Lady Bellaston's character and of the nature of Tom's involvement with her causes reader sympathy for Sophia to be, at this point, much stronger than it is for Tom.

The next movement reveals Lady Bellaston's scheme to marry Sophia to Lord Fellamar, a scheme originating from her own jealousy, not from any good will toward Sophia. But before these scenes there are several indirect references to Sophia: in Lady Bellaston's letter to Tom, through Sophia's own letter to Tom, in the description of Tom's reaction during the embarrassing bedroom scene, and finally, when Tom, later, tells Mrs. Miller his story "without once mention-

ing the name of Sophia" (II, 222). At this point the narrator refers to Mrs. Honour arriving with "dreadful news concerning his Sophia," but he does not reveal what this news is. Rather, in a new chapter, the focus moves to Lady Bellaston and her schemes. Scenes including Sophia are the whist party and the attempted rape incident. Sophia's personal situation, obviously, is becoming serious, not merely because of her separation from Tom, which appears to be permanent, but through the intensive efforts being made to force her marriage to another. The reader, as a result of these events and his increasing knowledge of Lady Bellaston's character, becomes more emotionally involved with Sophia. The scenic method, of course, adds to the realism, which once again is greatest at the end of the movement. And the vividness of this scene (the attempted rape) is increased by its highly theatrical nature. Sophia, we are told, is sitting "alone and melancholy" reading a tragedy, Fatal Marriage. The narrator, in his account, makes frequent use of stage directions--"the book dropt from her hand," "a shower of tears ran down into her bosom," and "the door opened, and in came Lord Fellamar." Advancing, "making a low bow," Lord Fellamar speaks, and the dialogue that follows is rapid and intense. The timely arrival of Squire Western, however, at the most critical moment, makes the reader's suspense fairly brief. Thus the narrator, once again, controls, though does not prevent, the reader's emotional response.

From Squire Western's arrival in London to the end of Book XVI, Sophia endures even greater distresses. She is shunted around, alternately locked up and freed, told she must marry Blifil, told

she must marry Fellamar, and accordingly is in considerable anguish. At the beginning of this third movement (XV,vi) the narrator goes back to relate how the Squire found his daughter, thus removing the focus from London immediately after the rape scene. For the balance of Book XV, the reader continues to view Sophia indirectly: when Mrs. Honour brings news of her to Tom, and Lady Bellaston arrives; when Tom tells Jack Nightingale about his true love; when Tom realizes, as he considers Mrs. Hunt's proposal, that he must be true to Sophia even if he never wins her; and finally, when Partridge brings Tom the news that Sophia is with her father, and that Black George will convey a letter to her. In Book XVI, Sophia is seen several times, primarily in scenes with her father, including the one in which she receives Tom's letter with her dinner. Later, after further information about Blifil's feelings for Sophia is given in a backward look that is primarily summary, a scene follows in which Blifil and Western walk in, unannounced, to visit Sophia and her aunt. But more indirect references follow: in the discussion about her between Mrs. Western and Lady Bellaston; in the narration about Lady Bellaston's schemes for Sophia's marriage, and in the references to her in Tom's conversation with Mrs. Fitzpatrick. The number of times in this movement in which Sophia is depicted indirectly illustrates Fielding's ability to decrease reader involvement at a time when Sophia's serious circumstances are likely to arouse his emotions in a way that might offset a response to the comic and ironic tone of the novel. Moreover, this

narrative trend in movement three prepares the reader for the additional shift in focus that is about to come.

The third movement ends without another scenic view of Sophia, but rather with her letter to Tom, who is now in prison:

> 'You owe the hearing from me again to an accident which I own surprizes me. My aunt hath just now shown me a letter from you to Lady Bellaston, which contains a proposal of marriage. I am convinced it is your own hand; and what more surprizes me is, that it is dated at the very time when you would have me imagine you was under such concern on my account. - I leave you to comment on this fact. All I desire is, that your name may never more be mentioned to
>
> 'S. W.' (II, 327)

While the reader's sympathy for Sophia is still great, his sympathy for Tom, at this moment, is greater. For though Tom is far from blameless, Sophia has been grossly deceived about him. This apparent end of the romance adds interest and suspense to the story, yet because the imprisoned Tom is misrepresented the reader's sympathy for him is aroused. In the first two movements of the London section, the reader's emotional involvement with Sophia increased gradually because of her plight. But the events and techniques of this third movement serve to halt this trend.

The final movement of the novel begins with Sophia's letter to Tom (or, more precisely, the account of its effect upon Tom) and ends with the happy conclusion of the novel. The reader, by this time, has no reason to fear that Sophia will marry either Blifil or Fellamar, for Allworthy is refusing to force a marriage, Mrs. Miller is trying desperately to assist Tom and his cause, and the continual quarrelling of Squire Western and his sister is a help to

Sophia. Thus the reader's concern for her, though it does not cease, is less intense than it was earlier.

These final two books are filled with rapid action, generally depicted scenically. Sophia is viewed in scenes with her aunt, her father, Mrs. Miller, Lord Fellamar, Allworthy, and finally Tom. As Tom's problems are resolved, one feels a sense of relief for Sophia as well. Yet near the end of the novel she becomes, once again, the paragon who is seemingly unattainable and unapproachable. From the passage including Sophia's letter, the narrator, by increasing the distance between her and the reader, has been preparing the reader for this view of her which is demonstrated when she tells Mrs. Miller, Allworthy and her father that she will not consider Tom as a husband. The manner in which she takes control of her situation shows that her determination not to be pushed around applies to her relationship with Tom as well as with Blifil and Lord Fellamar. Her attitude sets her apart from the other characters, apparently separates Tom from her forever, and arouses in the reader a sense of respect and awe akin to that he felt at Upton, or when she first entered the story.

The proposal scene best illustrates Sophia as both the paragon and the passionate young girl who really is in love with Tom. Here we see her, at first, as dignified and poised. In the conversation with Tom, she is firmly in control both of herself and the situation, whereas he is visibly distressed. It is she, after an embarrassing

silence, who begins the conversation, after Tom had "attempted once or twice to speak, but was utterly incapable, muttering only, or rather sighing out, some broken words" (II, 417).* From this point until her father arrives, Sophia guides the conversation, refusing at first even to consider Tom's proposal:

> 'I do not, I cannot,' says she, 'believe otherwise of that letter than you would have me. My conduct, I think, shews you clearly I do not believe there is much in that. And yet, Mr. Jones, have I not enough to resent? After what past at Upton, so soon to engage in a new amour with another woman, while I fancied, and you pretended, your heart was bleeding for me? Indeed, you have acted strangely. Can I believe the passion you have profest to me to be sincere? Or, if I can, what happiness can I assure myself of with a man capable of so much inconsistency?' (II, 417)

As the conversation proceeds, however, there is a gradual lessening of Sophia's firmness, evident in her admission that she is not refusing him forever, in her blush and smile when he leads her to the mirror, and in her comment that something less than a year could perhaps be the waiting period: 'Perhaps it may be something sooner . . . . I will not be teazed. If your passion for me be what I would have it, I think you may now be easy' (II, 419). Sophia makes little effort to disguise her love for Tom, though her poise and strength of will arouse considerable awe not only in Tom but in the reader. Commenting on this scene, Ehrenpreis says:

> When the conversation begins, Sophia speaks with simple elegance, in clear though formal language, while Tom uses a slightly desperate rhetoric, more exclamatory than inventive. He calls her,

*This, by the way, is in marked contrast to the stylization evident in earlier conversations between these two in which Tom declared his love for Sophia.

'my Sophia'; she calls him, 'Mr. Jones'. To her dignified and accurate charges of infidelity he returns sincere, if guilt-ridden, apologies, with fulsome assurances of penitence. At this point one would traditionally look for a softening of Sophia's line and a blushing submission to her wooer. But instead of moderating the rationality of the lady's remarks, Fielding keeps them chilly. . . .

We are almost convinced: Sophia's strength of character is unexpected; and yet it seems right: this is the girl who stood up to her father and her aunt; whom imprisonment could not break down; who was not afraid to carry pistols; and who courageously followed a strange guide at midnight in order to be brought to her waiting-woman (10.9) . . . .

But with beautiful abruptness the novelist now transforms the case.[23]

Ehrenpreis goes on to comment that this dialogue brings the reader more in touch with Tom than with Sophia, for her "alteration from coldness to cordiality has suggested a yielding retreat rather than an act of will," and that the subsequent action, after Squire Western's entrance, reveals not only Sophia's genuine love for Tom, but the fact that Western really does understand his daughter:

For Sophia the interruption could not be more helpful. In the conflict between love and duty, her father represents the principle to which she can submit with honour. Or rather, true to the spirit of Fielding's comedy, the old conflict is transcended in the harmony of a good-natured person's tendencies. By gracefully obeying the will of her parent, Sophia gives the fullest expression to her own.[24]

What Ehrenpreis does not note is that this dialogue draws the reader to Tom more than to Sophia not only because of her attitude and manner of speaking, but because of Tom's evident distress. He takes Sophia's words, at first, at face value. The reader does not, for he is more aware than is Tom of the strength of Sophia's passion. According to Robert Alter, this scene shows "Sophia . . . turning about Tom in a coy minuet, he urgently pleading his own cause but fearful of being too forward, she out of wounded feminine

pride and a sense of prudence keeping a cool distance, against her natural instincts."[25] Thus Alter implies the portrayal of Sophia here as both the paragon and the young girl in love. The depiction of the lovers in this scene is significant because Tom, at last, is revealed in a way that causes the reader to identify with him, and sympathize with him, more than with Sophia. No effort is being made here to keep Tom at a distance; Sophia, instead, is set back just a little. Once again, therefore, the distance placed between her and the reader is, at that moment, in accord with the distance between her and Tom.

Thus Tom Jones concludes with some modification of the reader's emotional involvement with the heroine, a modification which makes the conclusion superior to the sentimental ending of the traditional romantic tale. The reader's emotions are still engaged, yet the techniques used maintain his intellectual responses to Sophia, and to the story, as well. As a result, Sophia is viewed as both the paragon introduced in Book IV, and the young girl in love who has endured considerable harassment and distress. She is a heroine to whom the reader has responded with awe and admiration, affection and concern, but never censure. Through her, primarily, the reader's interest in the Tom-Sophia romance is aroused and maintained. Only in the final two books is the reader's involvement in their romance increased significantly by the way Tom is portrayed.

Throughout the novel, however, Fielding has portrayed Sophia in a manner that leads the reader not only into an appropriate relationship with her, but into an accurate assessment of Tom. The movement from an impersonal, intellectual response to an emotional one in part one, the distancing that takes place in part two, and then the fluctuation in one's response to Sophia in part three, keep the reader's relationship with her in balance: neither too emotional nor too impersonal. Through her undoubted love for Tom, as well as through her occasional anger at him, the reader's assessment of Tom, through all of his indiscretions and problems, is kept firmly in control.

Chapter Seven: Tom

A study of Fielding's depiction of Tom indicates distinct differences in techniques of characterization between the last three books and the first three books of Tom Jones. There is no abrupt shift in the novel, however, but rather a gradual increase in scenic presentation as the story proceeds. That this change in the way the "scene" and "summary" narrative modes are used is evident in the differing ways Molly, Mrs. Waters and Lady Bellaston are presented has already been noted, as has the fact that in each section of the book the portrayal of the "other woman" has a significant effect upon the characterization of Tom. But the same trend toward increasing realism is evident in other narrative elements important to the portrayal of Tom.

While there is this movement toward an increasingly representational method, one must note as well that throughout the novel, both in episodes concerning Tom directly and those concerning others, the scenic method is used often to increase intensity and realistic impact, or reveal a character vividly. And, as I have demonstrated, in the study of Molly Seagrim particularly, even the panoramic method is, in various ways, made dramatic. Thus Fielding, in Tom Jones, alternates and fuses the two narrative modes in a manner that enhances his theme and his plot. In his study of the various narrative methods, Lubbock points out that an author's choice of method is

always based upon some principle, and that this principle is found within his subject.[1] Accordingly, one may assume that Fielding's "principle" is to be found in the character of his hero, since his overall narrative technique appears to be designed to manipulate the reader's response to Tom--to lead the reader, that is, to an accurate judgment of the hero. Certainly analysis of the novel demonstrates that the manner in which Fielding employs the scenic and panoramic modes has the effect of controlling the distance between the reader and Tom, while at the same time maintaining some suspense, sufficient comedy and a moral tone.

Because the manner in which Fielding uses a number of distancing devices has been demonstrated, in some detail, in the chapters about Molly, Mrs. Waters and Lady Bellaston, and to a lesser extent in the chapter on Sophia, I shall not illustrate their use, and their usual effect, in the same way here. Obviously, with Tom, the possible examples are far too numerous in any case. Moreover, analysis of the major distancing devices affecting the characterization of Tom has shown that there is little difference in the three main sections of the novel in the way many of these are used. Particularly is this the case with authorial intrusions. Thus the narrator remains firmly in control even in the more scenic London incidents. That one is less aware of him in these books (and even during the road scenes in the middle books) is a result, therefore, not of a significant change in his role, or his power, but of a differing use of other narrative techniques.

Before considering these other techniques, however, several points should be noted about the authorial comments concerning Tom (and these remarks relate to the entire novel, not merely Books IV through XVIII). First, there are relatively few self-conscious comments, in comparison with the number relating to Molly, Mrs. Waters and Lady Bellaston, each of whom appears in only a few books of the novel. Rhetorical comments by the narrator about Tom are most frequent in the first six books, decrease considerably in the middle books, then increase again in the London books. And while the generalizations are similar in both number and diversity of emphasis in each division of the novel, the statements made directly to the reader show an interesting development. In the Somerset books, two-thirds of these comments concern the reader's judgment: the narrator either calls for the reader to make a judgment of Tom, or assumes he is making one. In the "road" books, about half pertain to judgment, and in the London books, fewer than one-quarter. While this may be considered merely incidental, the differences are definitely in accord with the general trend evident in Fielding's technique. As the reader becomes more closely involved with Tom, there is less need for this kind of specific guidance by the narrator. As the reader sees Tom in action, the process of assessing him takes place automatically. Certainly some of these comments to the reader are ironic, but even so they have the effect of reminding the reader of his responsibility to form judgments. And he needs this prodding most of all when he is at considerable distance from Tom. As John Preston points out, Fielding is determined

"to draw the reader into the action of his book":

> For the reader's responsibility, to judge well, is itself a part of the subject of the book. That is, the book is about judgment, and the understanding necessary for good judgment.[2]

Throughout the novel, literary allusions compare Tom with such heroes as Adam, Adonis, Aeneas, Orpheus, Ulysses, Hercules and Don Quixote. These references, which have a comic and often a depersonalizing effect, contribute to a lessening of the reader's emotional involvement with Tom. Thus the fact that none of these comparisons occurs in part three is in accord with the more realistic depiction of Tom in that part of the novel. The two literary allusions about him in the London books have a somewhat different effect from those just mentioned: Tom's misery when he receives Sophia's letter asking him not to visit her is, for example, compared to Job's misery.[3] Later, the strength of Tom's love for Sophia is compared to the strength of Caesar's military power (II, 282).

The various distancing devices--the use of contrast and conflict, the "scene-summary" techniques, comic language, the ordering of episodes, and the judgment of one character upon another--are, of course, all used in the characterization of Tom. The above summary states only the major differences to be noted in the use of intrusions in the three sections of the book. And the subsequent discussion of the characterization of Tom will include further references to the major techniques that help to control the reader's response to him. It is partly through the use of the narrator's intrusions, though more as a result of other techniques,

that the reader's response to Tom moves between sympathy and censure throughout the entire novel. While sympathy is the more prominent emotion, the reader is manipulated into censure of Tom which increases as the story proceeds, but never turns into an outright condemnation. A consideration of the means by which Fielding, in each of the three divisions of the novel, manipulates the reader--controlling carefully the distance between him and Tom--will demonstrate this.

The first six books of Tom Jones are largely panoramic in method, containing considerable summary, and a fairly limited amount of dialogue. Especially is this evident in the depiction of Tom, though the extremely indirect presentation of him in the first three books (already examined) is modified somewhat in the final three. This present analysis begins with Book IV, in which both Molly and Sophia are introduced, and Tom's adult experiences begin. At this point the reader becomes more involved with him as a result of the nature of these experiences. In Books IV through VI (as in the later divisions of the novel), certain of Tom's actions cause the reader to censure him. Yet one never condemns him or dislikes him. The reason for this is that Fielding's technique controls the criticism and even promotes, at times, reader sympathy. As the ensuing analysis will indicate, each of these responses may be either intellectual, or emotional. Most often they are both.

Tom's involvement with Molly, particularly on the occasion when he yields to her in the grove, arouses the reader's criticism. After all, we have been told--and shown--that Tom is deeply in love with Sophia, and thus we have had every reason to believe he is through with Molly for ever. And even prior to this, one finds it hard to understand why Tom has "affection" for Molly and not for Sophia. Thus one's annoyance with Tom is aroused, obviously, not so much as a result of his affair with Molly as because of his insensitivity to Sophia and, later, his unfaithfulness to her. Throughout the novel, in fact, as will be demonstrated in this chapter, one tends to judge Tom more for his attitudes and actions relating to Sophia (and on the basis of her attitude to him at the time) than for his affairs with other women. As A. N. Kaul comments,

> Fielding's failure to even rebuke his hero for the affair with Molly is well known and often commented upon. But the real focus of interest here, as elsewhere, is on Sophia. Fielding is concerned less with Tom's taking advantage of Molly's present offerings than with his failure to take advantage of the future rewards promised by Sophia's signals. That is to say, he sees with real comic penetration that at bottom the world is more likely to judge Tom for his sin of omission than for the sin he actually commits.[4]

This tendency to censure Tom is controlled in several ways. First, the manner in which Molly is depicted contributes toward modifying, or even offsetting entirely, the reader's criticism of Tom for his involvement with her. As shown earlier, the narrative technique throughout the episodes portraying Molly leads the reader to an almost totally intellectual response toward her. Though Fielding makes her interesting, he keeps her at considerable

distance. Moreover, his largely separate treatment of Molly and Tom during Books IV and V serves to keep the reader's attention from focusing intently on their affair. Actually, the depiction of Tom in Books IV and V is similar to that of Molly: he, too, is presented in a way that arouses the reader's interest, but not his emotions. And in this connection, one should note that the authorial comments about Tom during this time certainly help to limit the reader's criticism. For example, the long passage about drunkenness following the incident in the grove is included, obviously, to persuade the reader to excuse Tom.

Though the manner in which Sophia is depicted does cause the reader to accuse Tom of "insensitivity," as well as unfaithfulness, at the same time her obvious love for him affects the reader's response in a positive manner. After her stylized introduction, Sophia is characterized in an increasingly realistic fashion. Because she becomes a convincing, likeable individual, the reader responds to her emotionally, and--necessarily--to her obvious desire for a romance with Tom. One feels that if this girl, who has gained our respect and affection, cannot help but love Tom, then his faults must not be considered too seriously. And hence Sophia's opinion serves to curb the reader's tendency to criticize Tom.

The limited amount of dialogue, the comic techniques, and the ordering of the episodes in Books IV through VI also control one's tendency to censure Tom by preventing an over-subjective judgment. Dialogue, for example, though occurring more frequently than in the

first three books, is still limited. How little Tom is given in the recounting of his affair with Molly has already been noted, as has the fact that he is given slightly more in scenes with Sophia. But the stylization of his speech often lessens the impact of the passage, though we note that there is considerable variation in the dialogue given him, according to the occasion. The most frequently noted stylization, of course, is Tom's speech about Sophia in the grove:

> 'O Sophia, would Heaven give thee to my arms, how blest would be my condition! Curst be that fortune which sets a distance between us. Was I but possessed of thee, one only suit of rags thy whole estate, is there a man on earth whom I could envy! How contemptible would the brightest Circassian beauty, drest in all the jewels of the Indies, appear to my eyes! But why do I mention another woman? Could I think my eyes capable of looking at any other with tenderness, these hands should tear them from my head. No, my Sophia, if cruel fortune separates us for ever, my soul shall doat on thee alone. The chastest constancy will I ever preserve to thy image. Though I should never have possession of thy charming person, still shalt thou alone have possession of my thoughts, my love, my soul. Oh! my fond heart is so wrapt in that tender bosom, that the brightest beauties would for me have no charms, nor would a hermit be colder in their embraces. Sophia, Sophia alone shall be mine. What raptures are in that name! I will engrave it on every tree.' (I, 192)

Of the "high style" of this passage, Robert Alter comments:

> Fielding can . . . use it to evoke a lofty mood and lyric setting, quickly modulate to parody, inflate his diction to patently unnatural proportions that reveal a satiric intention, and then explode the whole diaphanous bubble in a burst of earthy realism.[5]

Alter then says of this passage which describes what he terms "Tom's topple from an apostrophe to Sophia into the outstretched arms of Molly Seagrim" that

> When Tom begins to apostrophize, the artificiality of the language is still further heightened. Tom's words all stress a magnificent and preposterous distance from the realities of his physical and psychological makeup and the actual world he inhabits: his language is full of formal poetic inversions, rhetorical subjunctives, hackneyed hyperboles. . . . The Tom who speaks here is a parody of the con-

> ventional Petrarchan lover, down to the familiar resolution to inscribe the name of his beloved on every tree. At this point life intrudes on literature.[6]

One has only to compare Tom's language in his outburst in the grove with the lesser stylization in his conversations with Sophia (earlier referred to) and with the almost complete lack of stylization when he is emotionally upset--such as the occasions when he apologizes to Allworthy, or is overcome with grief during Allworthy's illness--to realize the variety Fielding has achieved. One must note also that the stylized language is used primarily to add comedy on occasions when the reader may tend to be over-critical or to react to Tom too emotionally. Obviously, when he apologizes, or grieves for Allworthy, some emotional response is in order. But in contrast, the report of Tom's distress over how he can desert Molly is not only ironic, but stylized just enough to be comic:

> The idea of lovely Molly now intruded itself before him. He had sworn eternal constancy in her arms, and she had as often vowed never to out-live his deserting her. He now saw her in all the shocking postures of death; nay, he considered all the miseries of prostitution to which she would be liable, and of which he would be doubly the occasion; first by seducing, and then by deserting her. (I, 160)

In the second account of Tom's anguished state of mind, there is less stylization and his thoughts, recorded partly in soliloquy form, arouse the reader's sympathy. Only the irony of the situation (Tom does not realize as yet that Molly is promiscuous) keeps the passage from being serious. A further contrast still is evident in the accounts of Tom's turmoil after he is freed from Molly, for here, where he is in anguish over how he can possibly win Sophia, there

is no comedy, stylization or irony:

> He loved her with an unbounded passion, and plainly saw the tender sentiments she had for him; yet could not this assurance lessen his despair of obtaining the consent of her father, nor the horrors which attended his pursuit of her by any base or treacherous method.
>
> The injury which he must thus do to Mr. Western, and the concern which would accrue to Mr. Allworthy, were circumstances that tormented him all day, and haunted him on his pillow at night. His life was a constant struggle between honour and inclination, which alternately triumphed over each other in his mind. (I, 173)

While there is less irony in the portrayal of Tom in Books IV to VI than in the first three, there is sufficient to maintain a desirable distance between Tom and the reader. As stated earlier, there is dramatic irony in Tom's ignorance, for so long, of Molly's character and reputation. Similarly, his unawareness of Blifil's character is ironic. The ironic use of the word "prudence" as it pertains to Tom is here introduced as well, for the word is used in both its negative and positive senses. First, the narrator refers to the reader who "will blame [Tom's] prudence " in neglecting to try to possess Mr. Western's fortune, and later, Allworthy uses the term in his "death-bed" speech to Tom:

> 'I am convinced, my child, that you have much goodness, generosity, and honour, in your temper: if you will add prudence and religion to these, you must be happy; for the three former qualities, I admit, make you worthy of happiness, but they are the latter only which will put you in possession of it.'(I, 181)

The reader's possible censure of Tom is restrained also by the ordering of the episodes in these three books. Incidents potentially damaging to Tom's reputation are followed by incidents illustrating his goodness: for example, following the churchyard battle, and Tom's rescuing of Molly from the constable, we have recorded

Allworthy's first genuine doubts about Tom's motives and essential goodness. But before any more incidents occur that involve Tom with Molly he breaks his arm rescuing Sophia from her runaway horse, is confined at Squire Western's house for some time, and falls in love with Sophia. Later, just prior to the incident where Tom meets Molly in the grove, there are several chapters relating to Mr. Allworthy's illness, in which Tom's genuine sorrow and selflessness are depicted vividly. These scenes, as well as the method used to recount the incident in the grove, help minimize the criticism the reader feels toward Tom when he yields to the advances of the aggressive Molly. Then though Sophia, after this incident, seems slightly critical of Tom, the complications resulting from Mrs. Western's "discovery" of Sophia's love for Blifil re-directs the focus once again. The concluding incidents--those stressing the love between Sophia and Tom, followed by Tom's expulsion from home--cause the reader to forget Molly and stop criticizing Tom.

This particular way of ordering the episodes not only <u>controls</u> the reader's judgment, but promotes a positive sympathy for Tom, particularly in Book VI after his affair with Molly is over. The sympathy the reader feels is promoted as well by the narrator's rhetorical comments which continue to stress Tom's goodness. For example, when speaking of Tom's general tendency to do right rather than wrong, the narrator says that "though he did not always act rightly, yet he never did otherwise without feeling and suffering for it" (I, 119). A little later, we are told that Mr. Allworthy "began now to form in his mind the same opinion of this young

fellow, which, we hope, our reader may have conceived. And in balancing his faults with his perfections, the latter seemed rather to preponderate" (I, 137).

The stark contrast between Blifil and Tom not only arouses contempt for Blifil but promotes an active sympathy for Tom, who is continually misrepresented and criticized by almost everyone: the "antagonistic host" (referred to in chapter two) includes not only Blifil, but Thwackum and Square, the "mob," Squire Western after he learns of Tom's love for Sophia--and even Squire Allworthy. The contrast between Tom and Blifil, which was evident in the accounts of them as children, becomes most vivid when the match between Blifil and Sophia is proposed, for here Blifil's evil nature is revealed fully. And as happens so frequently in this novel, a conflict develops between two paired characters. In this case, the conflict increases the reader's identification with Tom.

Finally, the declared love of Sophia and Tom, and the apparent hopelessness of their situation, increases the reader's sympathy for Tom. While one's involvement in this romance results largely from the more realistic depiction of Sophia, one responds sympathetically to Tom as well, though with less emotion than to Sophia. The difference in the characterization of the two is related to the judgment theme of the novel, for Sophia is in no sense to be judged, whereas Tom is.* Thus the narrator uses means to control the reader's

*One might, of course, argue that Sophia is judged in the sense of being assessed, as is every character. But the reader's high opinion of her never wavers; hence the reader's judgment, even in a positive sense, is exercised almost not at all.

narrator says, "a kind of Dutch defence" in yielding to her "without duly weighing his allegiance to the fair Sophia" (II, 5). Thus as with Molly, it is the love of Sophia for Tom (and, of course, his for her) that is at the basis of one's censure of Tom. He has, back in Somerset, vowed eternal constancy to her, though it must be noted that at this time he has no hope of ever winning her, or even of seeing her again. Yet her arrival at the inn, followed by her discovery of his actions, intensifies the reader's disapproval because he responds sympathetically to Sophia in her anguish:

> Being now left alone with her maid, [Sophia] told her trusty waiting-woman, 'That she never was more easy than at present. I am now convinced,' said she, 'he is not only a villain, but a low despicable wretch. I can forgive all rather than his exposing my name in so barbarous a manner. That renders him the object of my contempt. Yes, Honour, I am now easy; I am indeed; I am very easy'; and then she burst into a violent flood of tears. (II, 34)

Thus when Sophia decides to leave her muff on Tom's bed, in order that "Mr. Jones would be acquainted with her having been at the inn, in a way which, if any sparks of affection for her remained in him, would be at least some punishment for his faults" (II, 34), the reader applauds her ingenuity.

Reader censure of Tom, however, is controlled once again both through narrative techniques used in the recounting of this episode at Upton, and in the "road" section of the novel as a whole. Actually, the picaresque qualities evident in these six books help to curb the reader's criticism of Tom's actions at Upton: he is, after all, a traveller; he believes he will see Sophia no more; and his actions, we are given to understand, are not uncommon at this inn or any other. But the differences between the traditional

emotional involvement with Tom that are largely unnecessary, and would, in fact, be damaging, in the depiction of Sophia. Hence the reader is allowed to get reasonably close to Tom in these early books only on occasions when his best impulses and good nature are being revealed. And even then, as demonstrated, a strong emotional response is either very brief or prevented entirely. The sympathy that one feels for him is genuine, of course, but remains somewhat impersonal: he is a victim, he is a good young man, and Sophia loves him. But the reader's intellectual interests--a curiosity about Tom's identity and his future, a feeling that he should win Sophia, an interest in the techniques used in the narrative, and a desire to see the many villains punished--are kept aroused.

In general, Tom is presented, in Books IV through VI, by a primarily panoramic narrative mode, into which Fielding inserts scenes to add intensity and interest. And while the reader disapproves of some of Tom's actions, the narrator is careful not only to control this censure, but to evoke sympathy for him even while restraining the reader's emotional response. Through all this, Tom is kept at considerable distance from the reader. But the reader is involved already in the process of judgment, through this particular manner in which Tom is characterized.

In the middle section of Tom Jones, it is Tom's involvement with Mrs. Waters that arouses the reader's indignation. While the woman, once again, is clearly the aggressor, Tom makes, as the

picaresque novel and Tom Jones are important also in the overall effect. As Alter points out in Rogue's Progress, the main difference is that Fielding does not use his hero as a first-person narrator. Alter claims that Tom Jones does not need a first-person narrator as a unifying device and furthermore such a point of view would detract from Fielding's "clearly indicated pattern of cause and effect":

> The picaresque novel usually catches hold of the world by its individual and particular handle. After being cheated by half-a-dozen innkeepers, the picaroon may make some tacit generalization about bewaring of innkeepers, but his mind does not really operate on the plane of generality. He will not often be interested in formulating the generalization, hardly ever in undertaking an analysis of the general question. Fielding, on the other hand, is constantly moving back and forth between particular and general, and in this respect he is more closely related to the English essayists of the period than to the tradition of the novel. Because reality presents to him a logical order, the particular can always be subsumed under a general category, and the particular can be used to inquire into the general, or vice versa. . . .[7]

One may go beyond Alter's comment to note that in addition this movement from general to particular keeps the hero and the reader in a continually changing relationship. Certainly if Tom were the first-person narrator in Tom Jones he would be much closer at all times to the reader. Because one's involvement would be primarily with the hero, and not, in addition, with an intrusive narrator outside of the story, the process of judging Tom would be much more subjective.

The major picaresque element within Books VII through XII is Tom's journey, during which he has a variety of learning experiences. These varied adventures, both before and after Upton, which demonstrate in some way Tom's goodness of heart, contribute to the reader's growing knowledge of Tom and thus to the lessening of criticism when his actions cannot be admired--as at Upton.

The manner in which Mrs. Waters is depicted modifies the reader's censure of Tom also. As I have demonstrated, the reader's involvement with her decreases gradually as the episode proceeds. The symbolism, comic devices and the emphasis upon minor characters all help to prevent the reader from being very critical of Mrs. Waters. As a result, he is not critical of Tom either until Sophia arrives. And even as the reader's involvement with Mrs. Waters is, on the whole, a mixture of emotional and intellectual responses, his reaction to Tom at Upton is mixed also--a mixture of censure and sympathy that results from the way in which both his emotions and intellect are engaged.

The fact that the account of how Sophia and her father arrived at the inn is given in a backward look involving several chapters is another distancing device. For immediately following Tom's departure from Upton, the focus is removed from him and placed upon Sophia. And this, as well as the ordering of the episodes generally in these six books, works to the advantage of Tom. Road adventures both before and after Upton, the emphasis at the beginning and ending of the Upton account upon Tom's good qualities, the considerable emphasis throughout upon minor characters, and the particular times when Sophia appears, or her adventures are related, all affect the reader's level of involvement with the hero.

Not only is one's judgment controlled, however, but sympathy for Tom is again evoked, though to a lesser extent than in the Somerset books. There, reader criticism is controlled and sympathy evoked in a way that offsets the censure almost completely. Here,

this is not the case, even though sympathy is still the stronger of the reader's two reactions.

First of all, the reader does respond to Tom in his distress about being sent away from home. And the soliloquy form of his outburst adds to the fairly emotional impact of the passage:

'I will go this moment--but whither?--why, let Fortune direct; since there is no other who thinks it of any consequence what becomes of this wretched person, it shall be a matter of equal indifference to myself. Shall I alone regard what no other--Ha! have I not reason to think there is another?--one whose value is above that of the whole world! I may, I must imagine my Sophia is not indifferent to what becomes of me. Shall I then leave this only friend--and such a friend? Shall I not stay with her?--Where--how can I stay with her? Have I any hopes of ever seeing her, though she was as desirous as myself, without exposing her to the wrath of her father, and to what purpose? Can I think of soliciting such a creature to consent to her own ruin? Shall I indulge any passion of mine at such a price? Shall I lurk about this country like a thief, with such intentions?--No, I disdain, I detest the thought. Farewel, Sophia; farewel, most lovely, most beloved--' Here passion stopped his mouth and found a vent at his eyes.'(I, 256)

Though his language here is somewhat stylized, Tom's outburst is not ironic and his situation not comic. The stylization, however, keeps the passage from being sentimental and prevents the reader from identifying too closely with Tom at this early point in the novel. The speech arouses the reader's concern and sympathy, yet is not inconsistent with the general narrative style of the first part of Tom Jones or with the style of Tom's speech in these books. Nonetheless, this passage, coming as it does after Blifil's cruel letter is received by Tom, and before the account of Tom's deliberations about his course of action, arouses the reader's emotions to some extent at the outset of the journey.

Some of the incidents along the road serve not simply to detract the focus from Tom's troubles, or his actions at Upton, but to emphasize his virtues in a manner that evokes reader sympathy. Especially is this evident in the adventures Tom has after leaving Upton. While the earlier incidents (his talk with the Quaker, his experiences with the soldiers, his meeting with Partridge, and finally his visit with the Man of the Hill) all show Tom to advantage, later adventures do even more than this. Consider, for example, his generosity to the beggar-man who has found Sophia's pocketbook, and his kindness to the man who attempts to rob him. In the latter incident, the narrator's means of recounting what happened stresses how different Tom is from other travellers:

> Luckily, however, for the poor wretch, he had fallen into . . . merciful hands; for Jones having examined the pistol, and found it to be really unloaded, began to believe all the man had told him, before Partridge came up: namely, that he was a novice in the trade, and that he had been driven to it by the distress he mentioned, the greatest indeed imaginable, that of five hungry children, and a wife lying in of the sixth, in the utmost want and misery. . . .
>
> Jones at first pretended that he would take the fellow at his word and go along with him, declaring that his fate should depend entirely on the truth of his story. Upon this the poor fellow immediately expressed so much alacrity, that Jones was perfectly satisfied with his veracity. . . . He returned the fellow his empty pistol, advised him to think of honester means of relieving his distress, and gave him a couple of guineas for the immediate support of his wife and his family; adding, 'he wished he had more for his sake, for the hundred pound that had been mentioned was not his own.' (II, 154)

This incident demonstrates in a convincing manner that Tom is all that the narrator has claimed him to be. Moreover, when Partridge and the guide suspect that Tom is insane, the reader—the comedy of the whole notwithstanding ("Jones opened the book a hundred times

during their walk, kissed it as often, talked much to himself, and very little to his companions")--responds sympathetically because Tom's ridiculous antics are, we know, a result of his passionate love for Sophia.

There is less open or sustained opposition toward Tom in these books; thus sympathy resulting from the presence of an "antagonistic host" is less frequent here than in Books I through VI. This kind of sympathy, as noted, was somewhat impersonal, consisting primarily of natural pity for a victim. It is in accord with the narrative technique of the novel, however, that at this stage in the story the means used to evoke sympathy are of the sort that cause the reader to relate to Tom more personally and emotionally. And the type of opposition he faces contributes to this. There are some conflicts in these middle books which add dramatic interest, but Tom, most of the time, is well able to cope with the antagonism he meets. The original attitude of the Upton landlady toward Tom and the woman changes fairly quickly, for instance, though the fight is rather dramatic, and comic, while it lasts. Moreover, most of the antagonism expressed toward Tom as he travels (by the Quaker, Northerton, various landladies, the doctor) is overcome fairly soon. None, except the encounter with Northerton, has later repercussions. But the antagonism of Squire Western and the anger of Sophia, which are more serious, affect the reader emotionally. The Squire accuses Tom of having abducted Sophia, or at least of knowing her whereabouts. Since the reader knows this to be false, the un-

deserved accusation causes sympathy for Tom at a time when he needs it desperately. Sophia's anger, however, is justified in part. For Tom has, in view of all his earlier vows, been unfaithful to her. Yet at the same time she has been misinformed, by Susan, and is angry primarily because she believes Tom has talked about her in public. Hence the reader cannot help but sympathize with Tom because he is not guilty of the action which appears to upset Sophia the most.

As in the Somerset books, therefore, the way Sophia is portrayed contributes to both the reader's censure of Tom and his sympathy for Tom. But while one's disapproval is stronger here than in Somerset (because the effect upon Sophia is more serious) the elements promoting sympathy are fewer and less powerful. They do not offset completely the reader's negative reaction to Tom. Nonetheless, Tom's genuine love for Sophia, and hers for him (despite her protestations to the contrary), plus the fact that in spite of Tom's frenzied search the two never meet during their journeys to London, arouse the reader's sympathy. That Tom's and Sophia's love story is the central element even in this middle part of Tom Jones has been commented upon by A. N. Kaul:

> A whole essay could be written--as in fact essays have been written--on this journey of Sophia's and the manner in which Fielding arranges to have her path crisscross that of her lover's. But the point to be made here is that it is during this journey that Tom's and Sophia's love story becomes persuasive and powerful, as we are shown the emotion and experience of love taking shape before our very eyes. There are no doubt varied ways of recreating emotion in art, but the one that Fielding uses depends most on a process of externalization. It is not the minds and declarations of the lovers

that reveal to us, and to themselves, the existence and growth of their love; it is rather the recurring appearance of objects like Sophia's muff or wallet, the coincidences and disappointments of particular places and spots, the overheard mention of each other from random people, the indirect reports of each other's movements, and such little happenings and associations, all of which create a vibrant echo and counter-echo of emotion.

And it is the reality of this emotion--once it thus becomes a reality--that enables Tom Jones to see his way through the confusions into which he has fallen.[8]

Thus the actual, physical distance between Sophia and Tom, which adds suspense, contributes to the reader's involvement with both characters. Moreover, the separation causes the reader to identify more closely with Tom than earlier in the story. One's emotional response to Tom is greater than in Books IV through VI, for both the censure and the sympathy evoked in this section are of a more emotional nature. Yet because Tom, at Upton especially, is still kept at some distance, both reactions are partly intellectual as well.

In London, Tom's actions give the reader more reason to condemn him than at any earlier time in the story. The nature of his affair with Lady Bellaston (and the nature of the woman herself) causes this critical reaction. One sees, furthermore, a certain deterioration in Tom's own character as well, for he learns, with alarming speed, to be deceitful. Consider, for example, the conversation between him and the masked woman as they leave the masquerade:

'. . . . Are you used, Mr. Jones, to make these sudden conquests?'--'I am not used, madam,' said Jones,'to submit to such sudden conquests; but as you have taken my heart by surprize,the rest of my body hath a

right to follow; so you must pardon me if I resolve to attend you wherever you go.' He accompanied these words with some proper actions. (II, 183)

Significantly, the narrator makes no statement excusing Tom or reminding the reader of the young man's inbred gallantry. We know, of course, that Tom's persistence in following Lady Bellaston is a result of his determination to find Sophia, but this does not excuse fully his blatant hypocrisy. Later, when Tom realizes that Lady Bellaston will not help him find Sophia, his continued involvement is attributed by the narrator to a deep sense of obligation. Yet the reader recalls that Tom left Upton, after finding Sophia's muff on his bed, without even speaking to Mrs. Waters, "of whom he detested the very thoughts, as she had been, though not designedly, the occasion of his missing the happiest interview with Sophia, to whom he now vowed eternal constancy" (II, 42). Surely this kind of departure was ungallant since she was, as the narrator says, not "designedly" the cause of his troubles. When we are told, furthermore, that Tom's "necessity obliged him" to accept Lady Bellaston's money, and his "honour . . . forced him to pay the price," the reader recalls that Tom had refused repeatedly to spend Sophia's banknote, preferring, apparently, to starve, simply because of his sense of honour. (Obviously, being a "kept man" is, in these circumstances, more honourable than using the money of one who would have wished him, in fact, to have it.) One must conclude that Tom's sense of honour at this point is not uncontaminated by personal concerns. While there is no suggestion that he enjoys Lady

Bellaston, it seems he does enjoy being a well-dressed man with money in his pocket.

When Lady Bellaston discovers Tom and Sophia in her drawing-room, Tom is ill-at-ease, but soon recovers himself, managing, in fact, to dissemble almost as well as Lady Bellaston herself. Further evidences of Tom's hypocrisy are evident in the scenes in his bedroom with Lady Bellaston. On the first occasion, he calls Lady Bellaston "my dear angel" and makes no apparent effort to end his affair with her. And his ungracious, deceitful reply to Mrs. Miller (he calls his guest a "near relation") evokes further censure. On the second visit the woman makes to his room, Tom is even more hypocritical than before:

> 'I am sure your ladyship will not upbraid me with neglect of duty, when I only waited for orders. Who, my dear creature, hath reason to complain? Who missed an appointment, last night, and left an unhappy man to expect, and wish, and sigh, and languish?' (II, 268)

The reader has been led to assume, earlier in the book, that Tom spoke similarly--but with more sincerity--to Molly and perhaps to Mrs. Waters. But Fielding, on those occasions, did not include the dialogue. While a considerable amount of "conversation" (the word meaning both verbal and non-verbal communcation) between Tom and Lady Bellaston is omitted also, there is sufficient included to give their affair an immediacy and a realism that the earlier ones lacked.

The character of Lady Bellaston, made vivid through the techniques used in her portrayal, is such that the reader is much more

critical of Tom than in his other affairs. Molly and Mrs. Waters, though somewhat coarse, possessed certain charms. And they were really not evil women. But for Tom to become so involved with this woman, especially after he should have learned his lesson at Upton, is both surprising and distressing to the reader. It is interesting to note that whereas the methods of characterization used for Molly and Mrs. Waters do not heighten reader censure of Tom, but rather control or lessen it, the techniques used to depict Lady Bellaston do both. An increase in censure, however, is the more prominent of the two effects. As in each of Tom's affairs, the reader's disapproval of his actions is in proportion to the extent his actions hurt Sophia and complicate his relationship with her. Here in London the effect upon Sophia is most serious. Thus the reader's annoyance with Tom turns, at times, to disgust because Sophia, whom Tom professes to love (and, indeed, really does), is in London, and he knows it, while he continues to see Lady Bellaston.

In outlining Tom's more blatant indiscretions in London, it is well to note once again (as I did in chapter two) that part of the thematic impact of the novel, particularly as it is conveyed through the character of Tom, is communicated by the narrator in comments made about Tom's childhood "vices." The point of the passage (I,92) is summed up in the words that "It is not enough that your designs, nay, that your actions, are intrinsically good; you must take care they shall appear so." Thus Fielding intends the reader to see,

throughout the story, that Tom's development relates not merely to his actions, or motives, but to the acquiring of true prudence. Of this principle in the novel, Glenn Hatfield says:

> It is Jones's neglect of this principle, in his failure to make his outward actions mirror his inner goodness, which accounts for his progressive loss of the sympathy and respect of his true friends from the time he tells the lie to protect Black George (and gives Blifil his first opportunity to discredit him with Allworthy) to the lowest point of his fortunes when he is jailed as a murderer, believes himself guilty of incest, and receives a letter from Sophia renouncing him for his letter of proposal to Lady Bellaston—all of which calamities, as Fielding remarks, are "owing to his imprudence."[9]

Hatfield goes on to emphasize that Fielding is not excusing Tom's affair with Lady Bellaston, for example, or saying it is "basically the result of his imprudence" but is emphasizing that "these vices proceed, in Jones's case, not from a wicked nature but from a defective wisdom."[10]

This considerable censure of Tom, for both his actions and his lack of wisdom, is restrained less carefully now than earlier in the novel. Nonetheless, even though the depiction of Lady Bellaston tends primarily to evoke a negative reaction to her, and to Tom, there are a few techniques used in her characterization that serve to modify our condemnation of her, and thus our censure of Tom. One of these is the use of summary, in place of scene, on several occasions when she and Tom meet. There are the frequent references as well to Tom's search for Sophia, and Lady Bellaston's refusal to help him. Thus though the reader's growing aversion to her leads to a loss of esteem for Tom, at the same time this is curbed when it

becomes apparent that Tom is being duped and manipulated by her.

Reader censure of Tom is modified also by the irony used in the portrayal of Lady Bellaston, especially in the various comments about her position in London society (see chapter 5). These passages enable the reader to consider her with some detachment, with an effect of course upon his response to Tom. Such irony is limited, however, as is verbal irony relating to Tom during his affair with her. What is ironic is Tom's utter ignorance of her character, an ignorance resulting from his lack of knowledge of town ways. True, he becomes hypocritical and deceitful: his affair begins through deceit, at the masquerade, demands more and more hypocrisy as it continues, and finally ends with a deceitful proposal letter. Fielding intends the reader to remember, however, that Tom is never really a part of city life, and that his motivation, much of the time, is admirable: he wants to find Sophia, and resorts to deceit in the proposal letter in an effort to be rid of Lady Bellaston.

The emphasis placed upon the artifice of London society is, therefore, another way the reader is guided in his assessment of Tom. These passages (referred to above) demonstrate the type of society into which Tom has moved, and in which he must try to function. Not only the comments about Lady Bellaston--already noted--but the numerous references to the theatre, or to acting, contribute to the emphasis upon artifice in these six books. First, Tom meets Lady Bellaston at a masquerade, where her identity is disguised, a fact that symbolizes, perhaps, Tom's ignorance, for

some time, of her reputation and character. J. Oates Smith, writing of Fielding's use of the masquerade in his novels, says of this event:

> The all-pervasive atmosphere of deceit and fraud in Tom Jones is given body in London, where Tom and Lady Bellaston meet at "Heydegger's" masquerade. The event is, for Tom, no less than the symbolic representation of all he has had to confront; and the masquerade is enhanced by the fact that Tom is not only ignorant of the identities of those about him, but ignorant of his own "identity" in terms of birth. . . .[11]

The other prominent theatrical event is the visit by Tom, Mrs. Miller and Partridge to the play Hamlet. The change of tone and focus is very welcome at this stage of the story when Tom--he thinks--is freed finally of Lady Bellaston, but the nature of the play epitomizes something of the predicament Tom is really in (even as did the masquerade scene). On the Hamlet incident, Ehrenpreis comments:

> There are as many parallels between Hamlet and Tom as between Isabella [of Fatal Marriage] and Sophia. Yet Fielding in no way dwells upon these common elements: the hero's fatherless state, his reputation for madness, his noble nature, his mother's second marriage to a man villainously inferior to her first husband, and so forth. The only feature explicitly picked out as shared by the prince and the bastard is courage, and that seems a fortuitous observation by Partridge. On the other hand, much is made of the theatrical setting, its lavishness and artifice; and Partridge becomes a primitive touchstone of the 'natural': in his famous unintentional praise of Garrick, the barber demonstrates once more Fielding's confidence that the highest art is the truest.
>
> But most subtly, there is a new refinement of ironical contrast between the truth of the theatre and the masks of society. For when Tom emerges from the playhouse, he plunges into a world like Hamlet's. Thus Mrs. Fitzpatrick, who has also attended Garrick's performance, invites Tom to visit her, thereby exposing him to a duel in which her husband plays Laertes to Tom's Hamlet, with herself a rather indelicate Ophelia. . . . Tom, unlike Hamlet, discovers the real nature of his situation in time to secure his happiness.[12]

The fact that Tom, despite his lapses, does not really fit into this artificial London society is shown through the implied comparison between him and Jack Nightingale,* who is introduced by the narrator as "one of those young gentlemen, who, in the last age, were called men of wit and pleasure about town" (II, 170). Through the narrator's remarks, the account of the fight Nightingale has with his footman, and his subsequent conversation with Tom, the reader sees a young man who accepts the customs of the city yet is possessed of an essentially good heart. Tom, we are told, was

> pleased with the young gentleman. . . . He thought he discerned in him much good sense, though a little too much tainted with town-foppery; but what recommended him most to Jones were some sentiments of great generosity and humanity, which occasionally dropt from him; and particularly many expressions of the highest disinterestedness in the affair of love. On which subject the young gentleman delivered himself in a language which might have very well become an Arcadian shepherd of old, and which appeared very extraordinary when proceeding from the lips of a modern fine gentleman; but he was only one by imitation, and meant by nature for a much better character. (II, 174)

From the outset, both similarities and differences between Tom and Jack Nightingale are implied or shown. Their natures appear similar. Jack, however, has been tainted by living in the city, having adopted its artifice as a matter of course. This contrast, then, by showing Tom's superior qualities, contributes to the

*One might note, again, the less stark contrast between Tom and the person with whom he is "paired" in each section of the novel: the glaring contrast between him and Blifil; the less explicit contrast between him and the Man of the Hill, and now a contrast with a young man who is, in many ways, much like Tom.

modification in the reader's censure of Tom's actions in London. One example of the reader's reaction to Tom being thus affected is found in his admonition to Nightingale about his relationship with Nancy Miller. And in reply to Nightingale's suggestion that Tom himself is not exactly blameless, he says:

> 'Lookee, Mr. Nightingale,' said Jones, 'I am no canting hypocrite, nor do I pretend to the gift of chastity, more than my neighbours. I have been guilty with women, I own it; but am not conscious that I have ever injured any.--Nor would I, to procure pleasure to myself, be knowingly the cause of misery to any human being.'(II,218)

By these words, Tom asserts the moral principle by which his own actions are, obviously, to be assessed. Speaking with sincerity and seriousness, Tom distinguishes between two kinds of relationships with women: one involving true love, such as Jack and Nancy have for each other, and the other being merely a temporary affair of passion. One is reminded, by Tom's words, of Fielding's chapter on Love (VI,i) in which he makes the same distinction. Tom, it would seem, is the author's mouthpiece here as he exhorts Nightingale, and as such he gains stature, at a most appropriate time in the story, in the eyes of the reader. What he claims about his own affairs is generally true, moreover, though by them--at least by the one in which he is at that time involved--he does cause misery to Sophia, though not to Lady Bellaston. In this sense, the speech illustrates his lack of maturity and perception, qualities not fully evident in him until the end of the story.

The ordering of the episodes in the London books controls the reader's attitude toward Tom also. The inclusion of so much de-

tail, at most appropriate times, concerning the Nightingale-Nancy love affair, for example, is one of the most effective controls. But even before Tom becomes involved in Nightingale's problems, there is evidence that Fielding is arranging the focus very carefully in a way that keeps the reader from concentrating for long on Tom's misdeeds. For instance, just after reference is made to Tom's sudden acquisition of fifty pounds, Mrs. Miller relates the story of her distressed relatives, causing Tom to offer the entire sum to her to send to them. The explicit contrast made here between Tom's impulsive generosity and Jack Nightingale's lack of charity causes the reader to forget, momentarily, how Tom acquired this money. Then, on a later evening, just prior to Tom's departure to visit Lady Bellaston, Mr. Anderson (the cousin, and would-be robber of Tom) arrives at Mrs. Miller's house. Here Tom's goodness is demonstrated vividly once again by his concealing from Mrs. Miller the fact that this man had tried to rob him. And thus the reader feels Tom has abundantly deserved his good fortune when he meets Sophia, and not Lady Bellaston, at the end of his ride. Most of all, as in the earlier sections of the novel, the undoubted love of Tom and Sophia for each other restrains the reader's disapproval of Tom's actions. We are made aware frequently of the fact that Sophia still loves Tom, and we respect her perception.

Some of these same elements that restrain the reader's censure of Tom also promote an active sympathy for him. It is noteworthy, however, that sympathy for Tom is evoked more positively in the

final three books after he has terminated his relationship with Lady Bellaston. During the time of his affair with her, the narrator is content merely to keep the reader's annoyance or disgust somewhat modified, but is not concerned about increasing the reader's sympathy for Tom in the way he did earlier in the novel.

To a limited extent, of course, Tom's plight when he is ensnared by Lady Bellaston arouses the reader's concern. While the tendency to censure him is, I feel, stronger than the tendency to sympathize, the narrator does comment just enough about Tom's ignorance of town ways and his determination to find Sophia to arouse the reader's sympathy occasionally. In addition, the various episodes involving the Anderson family, Jack Nightingale and Mrs. Miller not only modify one's judgment of Tom but stimulate one's appreciation for him. In this regard, Mrs. Miller's growing attachment to Tom affects the reader's assessment of him. For when his personal situation becomes fairly grave, she is his most outspoken advocate before Mr. Allworthy and Sophia. That scenes involving Mrs. Miller tend to be fairly emotional has been noted by Ehrenpreis. He claims that sentiment replaces humour in much of the third section of the novel, and that this serves to "muffle and distort" the comic tone:

> The bothersome noise comes from the quivering sentimentality of a number of scenes in London. Certain episodes, whatever their relevance to the story, appear brought in both to exercise our compassion and to give Tom occasions for showing us the depths of his own springs of sympathy.[13]

Certainly there is more sentiment than earlier in the novel. Yet this is part of the change in narrative technique which is in accord with the more serious events, the increasing use of the scenic mode (and hence in realistic impact), and the more emotional response the reader has to Tom at this point in the novel. The sentimental tone from time to time contributes to both the reader's disapproval of Tom, and sympathy for him.

Following his break with Lady Bellaston, Tom is involved in other incidents that increase the reader's sympathy. Particularly relevant are the indications that Tom has learned his lesson well: he rejects Mrs. Hunt's proposal, even though he has no hope at that time of ever winning Sophia; and because he recognizes Mrs. Fitzpatrick's amorous advances toward him he resolves to return there no more. The narrator assures us that

> faulty as he hath hitherto appeared in this history, his whole thoughts were now so confined to his Sophia, that I believe no woman upon earth could have now drawn him into an act of inconstancy. (II, 324)

Both of these incidents are intended, obviously, to demonstrate some development within Tom's character.

Tom's increasingly serious situation, following his fight with Fitzpatrick, arouses the reader's sympathy. Imprisonment, Allworthy's strong displeasure, and the thought of having committed incest plunge Tom into a state of deep distress. And to some extent the reader shares this anguish, even though he knows that all will be well. The reason for this response is that Fielding's

increasing use of scenic techniques causes the reader to respond emotionally to Tom during his problems at this time. When Mrs. Miller visits him in prison, for instance, their conversation has a fairly powerful effect upon the reader's sympathies:

> Jones gravely answered, 'That whatever might be his fate, he should always lament the having shed the blood of one of his fellow-creatures, as one of the highest misfortunes which could have befallen him. But I have another misfortune of the tenderest kind—O! Mrs. Miller, I have lost what I held most dear upon earth.'—'That must be a mistress,' said Mrs. Miller; but come, come: I know more than you imagine.'
>
> . . . . . .
>
> '. . . Shall I go to the lady myself? I will say anything to her you would have me say.'
>
> 'Thou best of women,' cries Jones, taking her by the hand, 'talk not of obligations to me;—but as you have been so kind to mention it, there is a favour which perhaps, may be in your power. . . . If you could contrive to deliver this (giving her a paper from his pocket,) I shall for ever acknowledge your goodness.' (II, 345)

As implied in the preceding quotation, the most potent force arousing the reader's sympathy for Tom, as in the first two sections of the novel, is the love between him and Sophia. As has been demonstrated, Fielding's method of portraying her has a powerful effect upon the reader's responses to Tom, both negatively and positively. In the first three books of the London section, Sophia's presence and the manner in which she is depicted serve to increase the reader's censure of Tom. But in the last three books—after he terminates his relationship with Lady Bellaston—the portrayal of Sophia increases the reader's sympathetic understanding of Tom.

The situations of both Sophia and Tom in the final three books are fairly serious: for Sophia there is the continued effort being made to marry her to Blifil or Fellamar; and for Tom there is the

agony of imprisonment, Sophia's angry letter, and the thought that he has committed incest. Yet Sophia's situation improves fairly rapidly, while Tom's appears to worsen. This trend, as well as the fact that Tom has been misrepresented to Sophia, causes the reader to identify more closely with him than with her in the last two books. By this time, we know that his love for Sophia is such that his faithfulness is assured. As a result, we want him to win her. Hence more than any other element in these chapters, Tom's anguish over his apparent loss of Sophia evokes the reader's sympathetic response. And the fact that this loss seems not to be remedied by the resolving of Tom's own problems keeps the reader's involvement with Tom fairly personal through to the end of the story.

The proposal scene not only reveals Sophia as both a paragon and a passionate young woman, but shows that Tom has at last become worthy of her. He is wholly aware that he is undeserving: "it is mercy, and not justice, which I implore at your hands" (II, 417). And he pleads his cause on the basis of love and sincere repentance:

> 'Could I, my Sophia, have flattered myself with the most distant hopes of being ever permitted to throw myself at your feet in the manner I do now, it would not have been in the power of any other woman to have inspired a thought which the severest chastity could have condemned. Inconstancy to you! O Sophia! if you can have goodness enough to pardon what is past, do not let any cruel future apprehensions shut your mercy against me. No repentance was ever more sincere. . . .'(II, 418)

Fielding is insisting, at this point in the novel, that Tom's education is complete. In reply to Sophia's assertion that she

will never marry a man "who shall not learn refinement enough to be as incapable as I am myself of making such a distinction" [between true love and the "sort of amour" having nothing to do with the heart], Tom exclaims, "I will learn it. . . . I have learnt it already" (II, 419). As Glenn Hatfield says, "Jones's actions demonstrate that he has at last acquired the prudence of outward behaviour that is the necessary complement of his intrinsic good nature."[14]

That Tom has changed in the course of the novel is demonstrated in his reunion with Allworthy (XVIII, x). The narrator's method here is of interest, especially when considered in contrast with the expulsion scene of Book VI, for that scene, other than part of Allworthy's speech to Tom, is almost wholly narration and summary. Though Tom is the major figure, since it is he who is being condemned, the narrator's focus is upon Allworthy. The reader, as a result, is manipulated into passing judgment upon the judge, thus becoming involved himself in the process of judgment--an activity which will continue to be his throughout the novel. Significantly, the part of Allworthy's "harangue" which is not recorded is the enumeration of Tom's crimes, though the passing of the sentence is given in full. Tom's state of mind and actions are reported almost entirely by the narrator, though the focus is directly upon Tom in the account of the dinner scene and his departure. After the first part of Allworthy's harangue, however, we are told that Tom really had nothing to say--indeed, hardly understood the charge against him:

> His heart was, besides, almost broken already; and his spirits were so sunk, that he could say nothing for himself; but acknowledged the whole, and, like a criminal in despair, threw himself upon mercy; concluding, 'That though he must own himself guilty of many follies and inadvertencies, he hoped he had done nothing to deserve what would be to him the greatest punishment in the world.' (I, 240)

Obviously, Fielding is restraining the reader's emotional response to Tom at this early point in the story by the technique used for this critical incident. By giving Tom no direct dialogue, the narrator keeps him at some distance. Yet the lack of generalizations, literary allusions and irony contributes to the immediacy and serious tone of the passage. Moreover, the contrast of Tom and Blifil is both implicit (Blifil is responsible for Tom's expulsion) and explicit, for Allworthy refers to Tom's "illtreatment of that good young man (meaning Blifil) who hath behaved with so much tenderness and honour towards you" (I, 241).

For the first time, Allworthy has rejected his instincts in judging Tom, and his judgment is faulty. Interestingly, the "mob," on the other hand, reacts emotionally, but correctly:

> . . . all the neighbourhood, either from this weakness, or from some worse motive, condemned this justice and severity as the highest cruelty. Nay, the very persons who had before censured the good man for the kindness and tenderness shown to a bastard (his own, according to the general opinion), now cried out as loudly against turning his own child out of doors. The women especially were unanimous in taking the part of Jones, and raised more stories on the occasion than I have room, in this chapter, to set down. (I, 241)

Thus the judgment theme of the novel is illustrated vividly in this incident, which is an example to the reader of how he should, and should not, judge Tom. Fielding is not suggesting that the "mob" is always right--indeed, the fickleness of mob opinion is referred to frequently in the first six books. Yet the reader must infer

from this particular scene, I believe, that some dependence upon personal instinct is essential in forming an accurate judgment. And this is what Allworthy lacks on this occasion.

Whereas Tom was, in the expulsion scene, kept at some distance (in accord with the narrative method generally being used early in the novel), here, in the reunion scene, there is a lively, realistic dialogue between Tom and Mr. Allworthy. Allworthy again gives a long speech, though one must note that here his entire discourse (this time on prudence) is given. It is, admittedly, relevant to the theme, and to the lesson Tom has learned. But Tom, too, is given a considerable amount of direct speech, though the narrator omits the words of both when they first meet because such "agonies of joy which were felt on both sides" are impossible to describe (II, 405). First, Allworthy apologizes, and his sincere sorrow is not surprising, for he has shown similar remorse and emotion in Book V when he feels he has misjudged Tom. And Tom's generous response is typical as well:

> 'The wisest man might be deceived as you were; and, under such a deception, the best must have acted just as you did. Your goodness displayed itself in the midst of your anger, just as it then seemed. . . . I have not been punished more than I have deserved; and it shall be the whole business of my future life to deserve that happiness you now bestow on me; for believe me, my dear uncle, my punishment hath not been thrown away upon me: though I have been a great, I am not a hardened sinner; I thank Heaven, I have had time to reflect on my past life, where, though I cannot charge myself with any gross villainy, yet I can discern follies and vices more than enough to repent and to be ashamed of; follies which have been attended with dreadful consequences to myself, and have brought me to the brink of destruction.' (II, 405-406)

One is reminded by these words of the boy of fourteen who apologized with such sincerity, and the young man so overcome with confusion and

remorse when sent away from home; yet at the same time this speech shows Tom's development in prudence, a development that has taken place through his experiences since leaving Paradise Hall. His words indicate, to be sure, his tendency to be hard on himself, but they are, nonetheless, generally accurate.

Tom's expulsion from Paradise Hall put an end, apparently, to his hopes of winning Sophia, and this reunion, one would think, should remedy that situation. Yet such is not the case. Sophia's apparent determination not to consider Tom as a husband adds suspense and intensity to this discussion between Allworthy and Tom about Sophia:

> 'Sir, I will conceal nothing from you: I fear there is one consequence of my vices I shall never be able to retrieve. O, my dear uncle! I have lost a treasure.'--'You need say no more,' answered Allworthy; 'I will be explicit with you; I know what you lament; I have seen the young lady, and have discoursed with her concerning you. This I must insist on, as an earnest of your sincerity in all you have said, and of the steadfastness of your resolution, that you obey me in one instance. To abide intirely by the determination of the young lady, whether it shall be in your favour or no. . . .'(II, 407)

At the height of Tom's emotion during this conversation, word comes that Mr. Western has arrived. Moments later, Mrs. Miller bursts in upon Tom, who is trying to overcome his tears. While the narrator's focus, indirectly, is upon Sophia, whom Tom has apparently lost forever because of his misdeeds, it is directly upon Tom as he talks about Sophia with Allworthy, Mrs. Miller and Squire Western. Only after extensive dialogue does the narrator interrupt, commenting that there is no time to relate the balance of the conversation.

The scene illustrates, primarily, an increased use of the dramatic (or scenic) narrative mode in the latter part of the novel, as well as the decreasing use of minor characters to provide comedy or some diffusion of focus. The comparison of this scene with the expulsion scene demonstrates the marked difference in the manner in which Tom is depicted now that he has demonstrated his maturity. The reader now reacts to him directly, and thus with more emotion, than he was allowed to do earlier in the novel. During the passages in which his indiscretions were being described, the narrator kept him at considerable distance in order that the reader's judgment might not be too severe. Now, we are allowed to respond to him as a convincing, personable, individual as he speaks and acts before our eyes.

Throughout the novel, the reader has been guided--even manipulated--into seeing Tom in varying ways, all of which contribute to a final assessment of him. Actually, the reader's opinion of Tom at the conclusion of the novel is probably no different from his original opinion. The difference is that he has been able to make a personal, considered assessment that has confirmed his first impression. He has listened to the narrator talk about Tom, has watched other characters react to Tom, and has seen Tom in action, learning through experience. Unlike Allworthy, the reader does not reject his first impressions of Tom and judge him on the basis of certain actions alone. Rather, the reader assesses Tom through various means: what he is told, what he sees, what he infers, and

what he feels. Thus both his mind and his emotions have been exercised.

A. D. McKillop, writing of Fielding's depiction of Tom, does not sense this sort of relationship between the reader and the hero of the novel, even in the concluding books. He claims that Tom is

> an adequate central figure in a comedy, but we are not admitted to intimacy with him; he does not take root in our imagination as an individual; his love for Sophia is not felt from within as a unique experience; we see him in a profoundly respectful and passionately admiring attitude toward the heroine. . . .[15]

Obviously, McKillop does not sense a developing intimacy between the reader and Tom, an intimacy reaching its height in the reunion scene and the proposal scene that follows. Certainly some distance is maintained still, for Fielding does not resort suddenly to a psychological analysis, but the distance here (and in the final three books generally) between Tom and the reader, and the narrator and the reader, is not the same as in Book VI, or Book IX, or indeed any earlier part of the novel. The reader's intimacy with the narrator is maintained, but is now taken for granted, while his involvement with Tom has been increasing gradually until a kind of camaraderie similar to that he enjoys with the narrator is felt. While the reader's involvement in the Tom-Sophia romance is evoked, and kept aroused, largely through the realistic depiction of Sophia, Tom, through varied narrative techniques and through the portrayal of several other characters, is brought gradually closer to the reader. Consequently, in the final three books Tom appears as a convincing, appealing hero, with whom the reader identifies in a manner not possible, or appropriate, earlier in the story.

Conclusion

Tom Jones is not one of the "great simple novels" of English literature. Nor is Fielding a "primitive" author. An innovator he is, to be sure, a "founder of a new province of writing," as he claims (II, i) but not unsophisticated. Tom Jones is a masterpiece not only because of its plot, its humour, and its delightful characters, but because its narrative technique makes these qualities of the novel effective.

What numerous readers of Fielding's Tom Jones have felt has been expressed aptly, though somewhat effusively, by Austin Dobson:

> But what a brave wit it is, what a wisdom after all, that is contained in this wonderful novel! Where shall we find its like for richness of reflection--for inexhaustible good-humour--for large and liberal humanity! . . . . it is against hypocrisy, affectation, insincerity of all kinds, that he wages war. And what a keen and searching observation,--what a perpetual faculty of surprise,--what an endless variety of method![1]

This subjective response to Tom Jones, especially that which is implied in Dobson's reference to the "endless variety of method," is composed of various specific reactions to the novel. One is very conscious, for example, of the powerful presence of the narrator, yet senses a changing relationship as the story proceeds; one notes a difference in the way various characters are portrayed and may well wonder why Fielding keeps his hero at considerable distance from the reader throughout much of the novel. Moreover, one senses that the latter part of the novel is much more repre-

sentational than the early books, though the story as a whole is interesting and, in various ways, dramatic.

The reader of Tom Jones is aware that his responses to the novel are being controlled. Yet at the same time his own judgment is being exercised. Fielding's technique is sufficiently complex, though, that the reader is not immediately conscious of the many different means being used to guide his judgment and control his relationship with both the narrator and the characters. One should suspect, however, and look for, a distinctive technique, for Fielding, at the outset, states that "the excellence of the mental entertainment consists less in the subject than in the author's skill in dressing it up." He makes clear to the reader, moreover, that he will be expected to exercise his "sagacity" as he travels through the novel with his guide.

The novel's power, in large measure, rests on the fact that it is, to use Booth's words, "an elaborate system of controls over the reader's involvement and detachment along various lines of interest." And during the experience of reading Tom Jones, the reader's varied responses to the narrator and to various characters--Tom, in particular--cause different levels of involvement, or different degrees of detachment. In general, the responses, or "lines of interest," may be classified as being either intellectual or emotional.

In order to assess the various techniques in any novel, the critic must, as Lubbock says, view the "world of the novel" with

some detachment. And this study of Fielding's control of narrative distance in Tom Jones has been an effort to do just that: to look closely at individual elements in the technique which control the reader's responses to the novel. The distinction between scene and summary, or the dramatic and panoramic modes, or--in Booth's terms--the showing and telling methods, determines whether the reader's eyes are upon the characters and events, or the narrator. Thus the manner in which the two narrative modes are alternated and fused determines in large measure "the reader's involvement and detachment along various lines of interest." In addition, the reader's responses are controlled by a number of other techniques that function as distancing devices.

The major narrative techniques having an effect upon the reader's distance from the narrator, and the characters, are the use of contrast, various types of conflict, authorial intrusions of many kinds, dialogue, the ordering of episodes, and various uses of the judgment theme within the story. In the preceding chapters I have tried to demonstrate not only Fielding's use of these particular devices, and the effect each has upon his presentation of character and upon particular passages, but also the way his overall narrative technique controls very carefully the reader's assessment of Tom. During much of the novel, Tom is characterized indirectly, and kept at considerable distance, yet the reader, nonetheless, is manipulated into making judgments or extending sympathy from the moment the hero is introduced. The particular way Fielding uses scene and summary,

as well as other distancing techniques, in the first three books, for example, leads the reader to respond to Tom with interest and concern, yet remain uninvolved emotionally. Despite the generally panoramic method used in these books, however, Fielding achieves considerable dramatic intensity through the nature of the events and even through the techniques that have a distancing effect.

With the beginning of Book IV, Tom's adult experiences begin. And from here to the conclusion of the novel his characterization, and thus the reader's assessment of him, is affected strongly by the manner in which Molly Seagrim, Mrs. Waters, Lady Bellaston, and Sophia Western are portrayed. Because the reader's censure of Tom comes as a result of his affairs with the first three of these women, and the effect, in each case, upon Sophia, the reader's reaction to these women is important. Hence I have examined the techniques employed in the characterization of each in order to determine the means by which Fielding manipulates the reader's responses. As a result of the way Fielding depicts Molly Seagrim, for example, she is kept at considerable distance. While the reader finds her interesting enough to experience a kind of "impersonal involvement" with her, he does not respond with enough emotion to criticize her. As a result, he has little tendency to censure Tom for his affair with her. Fielding portrays Mrs. Waters more vividly, however, particularly at the beginning of the Upton incidents. During the scene in the woods in which she is introduced, there is considerable dialogue, and the scenic quality of the pas-

sage causes the reader to respond to her with concern and some emotion. Yet almost at once Fielding begins to use devices that create a distance between the reader and Mrs. Waters, with the result that by the time one has reason to criticize her, and perhaps dislike her, she has been relegated to the background. In his depiction of her at Upton, therefore, Fielding uses techniques that arouse both the emotional and intellectual interests of the reader, resulting in an overall response that is a balance, ultimately, between involvement and detachment. One responds to Tom in a similar way, for at the point where his actions deserve censure, Fielding removes the focus from him through a judicious use of distancing techniques.

Lady Bellaston is portrayed more vividly than either of the other two women, not simply as a result of the nature of the London events, but through Fielding's more consistent use of dialogue and the scenic mode and a lesser use of techniques that create distance. Interestingly, the pattern of the reader's response to her is the opposite of that he has to Mrs. Waters, for he proceeds from an amused, curious and somewhat impersonal interest in Lady Bellaston to a strong emotional and moral reaction. Tom, too, is portrayed more directly, and thus more vividly, in London. There is, in these six books, a gradual increase evident in the strength of the reader's identification with him. Fielding is less concerned, it would seem, to divert the reader's attention from the hero's misdeeds than he was at Upton or in Somerset. Obviously, the increasingly represen-

tational nature of the novel is illustrated both by the techniques contributing directly to the characterization of Tom and by the way each of these three women is portrayed. The generally panoramic nature of Part I is seen in the characterization of Molly, the more scenic nature of Part II in the characterization of Mrs. Waters, and the greater realism of Part III in the characterization of Lady Bellaston. And Tom, during the time of his affair with each woman, is depicted similarly.

As a result of the gradual increase in scenic technique in the novel and the differing ways distancing devices are employed, the reader's response to Tom becomes more personal, emotional, and moral as the story progresses. It is interesting to note, as well, that throughout the novel the reader criticizes Tom more for the way his actions hurt Sophia than for his affairs with the "other women." Fielding evokes this response not merely through the way he recounts the incidents, but through the techniques he uses to characterize Sophia. In general, the reader's relationship with her is a mixture of awe, admiration and affection. And the distance between her and the reader--which changes continually throughout the novel--affects the distance between Tom and the reader at that particular time. Moreover, Sophia's attitude toward the three women with whom Tom becomes involved is significant in controlling the reader's reaction to them, and to Tom. Sophia appears to ignore Molly and Mrs. Waters, and is willing to forget Tom's involvement with them; she is deeply hurt, however, by Tom's affair with Lady Bellaston and

outspoken in her criticism of them both. Thus the reader too is more critical of Tom at this time. On the other hand, one's involvement in the Tom-and-Sophia romance is maintained primarily because of the fairly realistic way Sophia is depicted. I have demonstrated, in the chapters dealing with Sophia and Tom, the differing techniques Fielding uses in their characterization, and the manner in which Fielding controls the reader's assessment of Tom through Sophia. It is, primarily, her love for Tom (despite her occasional protestations to the contrary) that not only curbs the reader's censure of Tom, but evokes an active sympathy for him.

The reader is allowed to respond to Tom emotionally and identify closely with him only occasionally until the latter part of the novel, the final three books in particular. By this time Tom has learned "prudence" and has demonstrated some maturity. Thus even as Tom comes to know and understand himself through various temptations and experiences, so the reader comes to know him as well as he is thus revealed. It is through Fielding's method of controlling distance that the reader's relationship with Tom remains relatively impersonal for so long. Yet one's interest in him is aroused and maintained not merely because he is the hero, or because of Sophia's love for him, but because Fielding, through his practice of "laying method upon method" and employing numerous devices that control distance, has been able to infuse intensity and drama into the novel as a whole and into the character of his hero.

Notes

Chapter One

[1]Ian Gregor and Brian Nicholas, The Moral and the Story (London, 1962), p. 250.

[2]L. Kronenburger, "Fielding: Tom Jones," in The Republic of Letters (New York, 1955), p. 74.

[3]Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1957), p. 300.

[4]F. R. Leavis, The Great Tradition (New York, 1954), p. 12.

[5]Maurice Johnson, Fielding's Art of Fiction (Philadelphia, 1961), p. 137.

[6]Wayne Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago, 1961), p. 123.

[7]Ibid., p. 123.

[8]Ibid., p. 125.

[9]Ibid., p. 127.

[10]Ibid., p. 127.

[11]Ibid., p. 130.

[12]Ibid., p. 133.

[13]Ibid., p. 155.

[14]Ibid., p. 123.

[15]Ibid., p. 378.

[16]Percy Lubbock, The Craft of Fiction (1921; Eighth Printing, London, 1968), p. 21.

[17]Ibid., p. 3.

[18]Ibid., pp. 44 and 56.

[19]Ibid., p. 71.

[20]Lubbock, p. 106.

[21]Ibid., p. 113.

[22]Ibid., p. 118. See also chapters XI and XII of The Craft of Fiction.

[23]Ibid., p. 67.

[24]Ibid., p. 111.

[25]Ibid., p. 66.

[26]Ibid., p. 123.

[27]Ibid., p. 119.

[28]Ibid., p. 75.

[29]Ibid., p. 174.

[30]Norman Friedman, "Point of View in Fiction," PMLA, LXX (1955), 1171.

[31]Lubbock, p. 147.

[32]Geoffrey Tillotson, "Authorial Presence: Some Observations," in Imagined Worlds, eds. Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (London, 1968), p. 216.

[33]Francis Gillen, "The Dramatist in His Drama: Theory vs. Effect in The Awkward Age," Texas Studies in Language and Literature, XII (1971), 671.

[34]Ibid., 673.

[35]Henry James, The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces, ed. R. P. Blackmur (New York, 1934), p. 68.

[36]Martin Price, To the Palace of Wisdom (Garden City, N. Y., 1964), p. 295.

[37]Alan D. McKillop, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence, Kansas, 1956), p. 127.

[38]R. S. Crane, "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones," Critics and Criticism (Chicago, 1952), p. 642.

[39]Daniel J. Schneider, "Sources of Comic Pleasure in Tom Jones," Connecticut Review, I (1967), 58.

[40]Glenn W. Hatfield, Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony (Chicago, 1968), p. 208.

[41]Booth, p. 217.

[42]Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 45.

[43]Henry Knight Miller, "Some Functions of Rhetoric in Tom Jones," Philological Quarterly, XLV (1966), 224.

[44]Stuart, William Harding, "The Role of the Narrator in the Novels of Fielding," Unpublished Dissertation (University of Wisconsin, 1963), 39. Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (1963), 2489-2490.

[45]Arthur Sherbo, " 'Inside' and 'Outside' Readers in Fielding's Novels," in Studies in the Eighteenth Century Novel (Michigan State University, 1969), pp. 48-49.

[46]Hatfield, p. 215.

[47]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), I, 252-53. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[48]Hatfield, p. 215.

[49]Ibid., pp. 203-203.

[50]Leo Braudy, Narrative Form in History and Fiction (Princeton, 1970), pp. 148-49.

[51]John Preston, "Tom Jones and the 'Pursuit of True Judgement'," Journal of English Literary History, XXXIII (1966), 316.

[52]George Sherburn, "A Novelist's Opinions and His Art," Sewanee Review, LXI (1953), 320.

[53]Lubbock, p. 125.

[54]Ibid., p. 126.

[55]Braudy, p. 150.

[56]V. S. Pritchett, The Living Novel & Later Appreciations (New York, 1967), p. 7.

[57]Robert Halsband, "Fielding: The Hogarth of Fiction," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXIII (Sept, 30, 1950), 20.

[58]Frederick Homes Dudden, Henry Fielding: His Life, Works, and Times (1952; Reprinted, Hamden, Conn., 1966), II, 622.

[59]Lubbock, p. 118.

[60]Dudden, II, 696.

[61]Elizabeth Drew, "Henry Fielding: Tom Jones," in The Novel: A Modern Guide to Fifteen English Masterpieces (New York, 1963), p. 63.

[62]Irma Z. Sherwood, "The Novelists as Commentators," in The Age of Johnson, ed. Frederick W. Hilles (New Haven, 1949), pp. 124-25.

[63]Watt, p. 289.

[64]Crane, p. 639.

[65]Andrew Wright, Henry Fielding, Mask and Feast (London, 1965), p. 50.

[66]Sherbo, "Some Aspects of Fielding's Style," in Studies in the Eighteenth Century Novel, p. 60.

[67]Ibid., p. 66.

[68]Eleanor Newman Hutchens, Irony in Tom Jones (University of Alabama, 1965), p. 88.

[69]Preston, "Tom Jones and the 'Pursuit of True Judgement'," p. 315.

[70]Preston, "Plot as Irony: The Reader's Role in Tom Jones," p. 372.

[71]Irvin Ehrenpreis, Fielding: Tom Jones (London, 1964), p. 51.

[72]Robert Alter, Rogue's Progress (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 84-85.

[73]Miller, "Some Functions of Rhetoric in Tom Jones," p. 221.

[74]Henry Fielding, Joseph Andrews, ed. Martin Battestin (Boston, 1961), p. xvii.

[75]Roger G. Seamon, "The Rhetorical Pattern of Mock Heroic Satire," Humanities Association Bulletin, XVII (1966), 37.

[76]Ibid., p. 38.

[77]McKillop, The Early Masters of English Fiction, p. 123.

[78]Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel, p. 29.

[79]Ibid., p. 31.

[80]Ibid., p. 31.

[81]Ibid., p. 51.

[82]Ibid., p. 51.

[83]A. R. Humphreys, "Fielding's Irony: Its Methods and Effects," in Fielding: a Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Ronald Paulson (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1962), p. 17.

[84]Hutchens, p. 27.

[85]Booth, p. 316.

[86]Thomas Mann, "The Art of the Novel," in The Creative Vision, eds. Haskell M. Block and Herman Salinger (New York, 1960), pp. 87-88.

[87]Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel, p. 40.

[88]Hutchens, p. 31.

[89]D. C. Muecke, Irony (London, 1970), p. 78.

[90]Crane, p. 638.

Chapter Two

[1]R. S. Crane, "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones," Critics and Criticism (Chicago, 1952), p. 624.

[2]Gentleman's Magazine (London, 1750), XX, 117.

[3]Michael Irwin, Henry Fielding: The Tentative Realist (Oxford, 1967), p. 90.

[4]Sheldon Sacks, Fiction and the Shape of Belief (Berkeley, 1964), p. 131.

[5]Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1957), p. 287.

[6]Ibid., p. 286.

[7]Hamilton Macallister, Fielding (London, 1967), pp. 98-99.

[8]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), I, 181. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[9]A. E. Dyson, "Fielding: Satiric and Comic Irony," in The Crazy Fabric: Essays in Irony (London, 1965), p. 28.

[10]John Preston, "Tom Jones and the 'Pursuit of True Judgement'," Journal of English Literary History, XXXIII (1966), 322-23.

[11]In referring to the dramatic impact of Tom's personal situation as "Tom versus his environment," I am indebted to Percy Lubbock's analysis of Madame Bovary in The Craft of Fiction. There he states, of Emma, that "She by herself is not the subject of his book. What he proposes to exhibit is the history of a woman like her in just such a world as hers, a foolish woman in narrow circumstances; so that the provincial scene, acting upon her, making her what she becomes, is as essential as she is herself. Not a portrait, therefore, not a study of character for its own sake, but something in the nature of a drama, where the two chief players are a woman on one side and her whole environment on the other--that is Madame Bovary" (80). Despite the differences between Emma and Tom, and between Madame Bovary and Tom Jones, the dramatic principle here suggested by Lubbock is evident, I believe, in Tom Jones, particularly in the first six books.

[12]Percy Lubbock, The Craft of Fiction (1921; Eighth Printing, London, 1968), p. 123.

Chapter Four

[1]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), I, 397. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[2]Irvin Ehrenpreis, Fielding: Tom Jones (London, 1964), pp. 65-66.

[3]William York Tindall, "Excellent Dumb Discourse," in The Theory of the Novel, comp. Philip Stevick (New York, 1967), p. 344.

[4]Henry Knight Miller, "Some Functions of Rhetoric in Tom Jones," Philological Quarterly, XLV (1966), 221.

[5]Ibid., p. 220.

[6]Eleanor Newman Hutchens, Irony in Tom Jones (University of Alabama, 1965), p. 39.

Chapter Three

[1]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), I, 119. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[2]Irvin Ehrenpreis, Fielding: Tom Jones (London, 1964), p. 63.

[3]Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 31.

[4]Ibid., p. 32.

[5]Ibid., pp. 64-65.

[6]Henry Knight Miller, "Some Functions of Rhetoric in Tom Jones," Philological Quarterly, XLV (1966), 219.

[7]Alter, pp. 32-33.

Chapter Five

[1]Austin Dobson, Fielding (London, 1902), p. 132.

[2]George Sherburn, "Fielding's Social Outlook," Philological Quarterly, XXXV (1956), 10.

[3]R. S. Crane, "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones," Critics and Criticism (Chicago, 1952), p. 638.

[4]Wilbur Lucius Cross, The History of Henry Fielding, 3 vols. (New Haven, 1918), II, 215.

[5]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), I, 274. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[6]Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 42.

[7]Alan D. McKillop, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence, Kansas, 1956), p. 125.

[8]Ibid., p. 125.

[9]Eleanor Newman Hutchens, Irony in Tom Jones (University of Alabama, 1965), p. 49.

[10]Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[11]In addition to Miss Hutchens' excellent work on the irony in Tom Jones, note Glenn Hatfield's Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony (Chicago, 1968); George R. Levine's Henry Fielding and the Dry Mock (The Hague, 1967); the chapter on style in Robert Alter's Fielding and the Nature of the Novel; articles by William Empson and A. R. Humphreys in Fielding: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Ronald Paulson; and articles (as listed in the Bibliography) by Sheridan Baker, A. E. Dyson, William R. Irwin, E. Taiwo Palmer, John Preston and Ian Watt.

Chapter Six

[1]Hamilton Macallister, Fielding (London, 1967), pp. 108-109.

[2]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), I, 105. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[3]Macallister, p. 107.

[4]Aurelien Digeon, The Novels of Fielding (New York, 1925), pp. 149-50.

[5]Martin C. Battestin, "Fielding's Definition of Wisdom: Some Functions of Ambiguity and Emblem in Tom Jones," Journal of English Literary History, XXXV (1968), 188.

[6]Ibid., pp. 204-205.

[7]Ibid., p. 205.

[8]Ibid., p. 206.

[9]Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1957), p. 265.

[10]Arnold Kettle, An Introduction to the English Novel, Vol. I (New York and Evanston, 2nd ed., 1967), p. 74.

[11]Eleanor Newman Hutchens, Irony in Tom Jones (University of Alabama, 1965), p. 83.

[12]Daniel J. Schneider, "Sources of Comic Pleasure in Tom Jones," Connecticut Review, I (1967), 60.

[13]Maurice Johnson, Fielding's Art of Fiction (Philadelphia, 1961), p. 108.

[14]Ibid., pp. 108-109.

[15]Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 47.

[16]Johnson, p. 115.

[17]Ibid., p. 137.

[18]Johnson, p. 129.

[19]Hutchens, p. 117.

[20]Ibid., p. 117.

[21]Johnson, p. 134.

[22]Hutchens, p. 50.

[23]Irvin Ehrenpreis, Fielding: Tom Jones (London, 1964), p. 75.

[24]Ibid., p. 77.

[25]Alter, p. 115.

Bibliography

Abbreviations Used

CE	College English
ELH	Journal of English Literary History
MLN	Modern Language Notes
MLR	Modern Language Review
MP	Modern Philology
NCF	Nineteenth Century Fiction
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association
PQ	Philological Quarterly
SR	Sewanee Review
TSLL	Texas Studies in Language and Literature
UR	University Review
UTQ	University of Toronto Quarterly

Primary Sources

Fielding, Henry. Tom Jones. ed. A. R. Humphreys. 2 vols. London, 1962. First included in Everyman's Library 1909. Last reprinted 1966.

_____. Joseph Andrews, ed. Martin C. Battestin. Boston, 1961.

Chapter Seven

[1]Percy Lubbock, The Craft of Fiction (1921; Eighth Printing, London, 1968), p. 72.

[2]John Preston, "Tom Jones and the 'Pursuit of True Judgement'," Journal of English Literary History, XXXIII (1966), 316.

[3]Henry Fielding, Tom Jones, 2 vols., ed. A. R. Humphreys (London, 1962), II, 212. Subsequent references to the text of Tom Jones will be made to this edition.

[4]A. N. Kaul, The Action of English Comedy (New Haven and London, 1970), pp. 176-77.

[5]Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), pp. 47-48.

[6]Ibid., p. 49.

[7]Robert Alter, Rogue's Progress (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 87-88.

[8]Kaul, p. 182.

[9]Glenn W. Hatfield, Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony (Chicago, 1968), p. 180.

[10]Ibid., p. 180.

[11]J. Oates Smith, "Masquerade and Marriage: Fielding's Comedies of Identity," Ball State University Forum, VI (1965), 15-16.

[12]Irvin Ehrenpreis, Fielding: Tom Jones (London, 1964), pp. 42-43.

[13]Ibid., p. 68.

[14]Hatfield, p. 182.

[15]Alan D. McKillop, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence, Kansas, 1956), p. 129.

Conclusion

[1]Austin Dobson, Fielding (London, 1902), p. 133.

Secondary Sources

Alkon, Paul K. "Boswell's Control of Aesthetic Distance," UTQ, XXXVIII, No. 2 (1969), 174-91.

Allen, Walter. The English Novel: A Short Critical History. London, 1954.

_____. Six Great Novelists. London, 1955.

Allott, Miriam, ed. Novelists on the Novel. London, 1959.

Alonzo, Amado. "The Stylistic Interpretation of Literary Texts," MLN, LVII (1942), 489-96.

Alter, Robert. Fielding and the Nature of the Novel. Cambridge, Mass., 1968.

_____. Rogue's Progress. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

Ames, Van Meter. Aesthetics of the Novel. Chicago, 1928.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton, 1953.

Baker, Sheridan. "Fielding and the Irony of Form," Eighteenth-Century Studies, II (1968), 138-54.

_____. "Henry Fielding and the Cliché," Criticism, I (1959), 354-61.

_____. "Henry Fielding's Comic Romances," Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, XLV (1960), 411-19.

Baldwin, R. G. "Great Expectations" in Studies of Major Works in English, ed. John Orrell. Toronto, 1968.

Bart, B. F. "Aesthetic Distance in Madame Bovary," PMLA, LXIX (1954), 1112-1126.

Battestin, Martin C. "Fielding's Definition of Wisdom: Some Functions of Ambiguity and Emblem in Tom Jones," ELH, XXXV (1968), 188-217.

_____. "Osborne's'Tom Jones': Adapting a Classic," The Virginia Quarterly Review, XLII (1966), 378-93.

_____. The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art. Middletown, Conn., 1959.

Battestin, Martin C., ed. Twentieth Century Interpretations of Tom Jones. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968.

Beatty, R. C. "Criticism in Fielding's Narratives and His Estimate of Critics," PMLA, XLIX (1934), 1087-1100.

Bentley, Phyllis. Some Observations on the Art of Narrative. London, 1946.

Bissell, F. O. Fielding's Theory of the Novel. Ithaca, 1933.

Blanchard, F. T. Fielding the Novelist. New Haven, 1926.

Bliss, Michael. "Fielding's Bill of Fare in Tom Jones," ELH, XXX (1963), 236-43.

Bloom, Edward A. The Order of Fiction. New York, 1964.

Booth, Wayne A. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago, 1961.

_____. "The Rhetoric of Fiction and the Poetics of Fictions," Novel, I (1968), 105-17.

_____. "The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction Before Tristram Shandy," PMLA, LXVII (1952), 163-85.

Braudy, Leo. Narrative Form in History and Fiction. Princeton, 1970.

Brogan, Howard O. " 'Visible Essences' in The Mayor of Casterbridge," ELH, XVII (1950), 307-23.

Bullough, Edward. "Psychical Distance as a Factor in Art and an Aesthetic Principle," A Modern Book of Aesthetics, ed. Melvin Rader. Revised edition (New York, 1952), pp. 396-405.

Butt, John Everett. "Henry Fielding" in British Writers and Their Work, No. 6. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1965.

Coley, William B. "The Background of Fielding's Laughter," ELH, XXVI (1959), 229-52.

Coolidge, John. "Fielding and 'Conservation of Character'," MP, LVII (1960), 245-59.

Crane, R. S. "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones," Critics and Criticism (Chicago, 1952), pp. 616-647.

Cross, Wilbur Lucius. The History of Henry Fielding. 3 vols. New Haven, 1918.

Cruttwell, Patrick. "Makers and Persons," Hudson Review, XII (Winter, 1959-60), 487-507.

Digeon, Aurelien. The Novels of Fielding. New York, 1925.

Dobson, Austin. Fielding. London, 1902.

Drew, Elizabeth A. "Henry Fielding: Tom Jones," The Novel: A Modern Guide to Fifteen English Masterpieces. New York, 1963.

Dudden, Frederick Homes. Henry Fielding: His Life, Works, and Times. 2 vols. Oxford, 1952. rpt. Hamden, Conn., 1966.

Dyson, A. E. "Fielding: Satiric and Comic Irony," in The Crazy Fabric: Essays in Irony. London, 1965.

Eastman, Richard M. A Guide to the Novel. San Francisco, 1965.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. Fielding: Tom Jones. London, 1964.

Erlich, Victor. "Some Uses of Monologue in Prose Fiction: Narrative Manner and World-View," Stil-und Formprobleme in der Literatur, 371-78. Proceedings of the Congress--International Federation for Modern Language and Literature.

Farrell, William J. "Fielding's Familiar Style," ELH, XXXIV (1967), 65-77.

Forster, E. M. Aspects of the Novel. London, 1927.

Friedman, Norman. "Point of View in Fiction," PMLA, LXX (1955), 1160-84.

Gentleman's Magazine. Vol. XX. London, 1750.

Gibson, Walker. "Authors, Speakers, Readers and Mock Readers," CE, XI (1950), 265-69.

Gillen, Francis. "The Dramatist in His Drama: Theory vs. Effect in The Awkward Age," TSLL, XII, No. 4 (1971), 663-74.

Golden, Morris. Fielding's Moral Psychology. Amherst, Mass., 1966.

Gregor, Ian and Brian Nicholas. The Moral and The Story. London, 1962.

Halsband, Robert. "Fielding: The Hogarth of Fiction," Saturday Review of Literature, XXXIII (September 30, 1950), 20-21.

Hammond, Geraldine E. Evidences of the Dramatist's Technique in Henry Fielding's Novels. (Bulletin of the University of Wichita, Vol. XVI, No. 10.) Wichita, Kansas, 1941.

Harvey, W. J. Character and The Novel. Ithaca, N. Y., 1965.

Hatfield, Glenn W. Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony. Chicago, 1968.

Hilles, Frederick W., ed. Age of Johnson. New Haven, 1949.

Hutchens, Eleanor Newman. Irony in Tom Jones. University of Alabama, 1965.

Irwin, Michael. Henry Fielding: The Tentative Realist. Oxford, 1967.

Irwin, William R. "Satire and Comedy in the Works of Henry Fielding," ELH, XIII (1946), 168-88.

_____. The Making of "Jonathan Wild": A Study in the Literary Method of Henry Fielding. New York, 1941.

James, Henry. The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces, ed. R. P. Blackmur. New York, 1934.

Jennings, Edward Morton III. "Reader-Narrative Relationships in Tom Jones, Tristram Shandy, and Humphry Clinker," Unpublished Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965. Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 3303-3304.

Johnson, Maurice. Fielding's Art of Fiction. Philadelphia, 1961.

Kaul, A. N. The Action of English Comedy. New Haven and London, 1970.

Kermode, Frank. "Richardson and Fielding," Cambridge Journal, IV (1950), 106-14.

Kettle, Arnold. An Introduction to the English Novel. Volume I. New York and Evanston, 2nd ed., 1967.

Kronenburger, L. "Fielding: Tom Jones" in The Republic of Letters. New York, 1955.

Lavin, Henry St. C. "Rhetoric and Realism in Tom Jones," University Review, XXXII (1965), 19-25.

Leavis, F. R. The Great Tradition. New York, 1954.

Levine, George R. Henry Fielding and the Dry Mock. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.

Lockwood, Thomas. "The Augustan Author-Audience Relationship: Satiric vs. Comic Forms," ELH, XXXVI (1969), 648-58.

Lubbock, Percy. The Craft of Fiction. London, 1921. Eighth Printing, 1968.

Lutwack, Leonard. "Mixed and Uniform Prose Styles in the Novel," Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, XVIII (1960), 350-57.

Macallister, Hamilton. Fielding. London, 1967.

Mack, Maynard. Introduction to Joseph Andrews. Rinehart edition. New York, 1948. Thirteenth Printing, 1960.

Mack, Maynard and Ian Gregor, eds. Imagined Worlds. London, 1968.

Mandel, Jerome. "The Man of the Hill and Mrs. Fitzpatrick: Character and Narrative Technique in Tom Jones," Papers on Language and Literature (1969), 5: 26-38.

Mann, Thomas. "The Art of the Novel," in The Creative Vision, eds. Haskell M. Block and Herman Salinger. New York, 1960.

Maugham, W. Somerset. Introduction to The History of Tom Jones. Toronto, 1948.

McKillop, Alan D. "Some Recent Views of Tom Jones," CE, XXI (1959), 17-22.

_____. The Early Masters of English Fiction. Lawrence, Kansas, 1956.

_____. "The Personal Relations Between Fielding and Richardson," MP, XXVIII (1931), 423-33.

McMaster, Juliet. "Narrative Technique: Vanity Fair" in Thackeray: The Major Novels. Toronto, 1971.

Mendilow, A. A. Time and the Novel. London & New York, 1952.

Milburn, Daniel J. "The Psychology of Wit," in The Age of Wit, 1650-1750. New York, 1966.

Miller, Henry Knight. "Some Functions of Rhetoric in Tom Jones," PQ, XLV (1966), 209-35.

_____, Eric Rothstein, G. S. Rousseau, eds. The Augustan Milieu. Oxford, 1970.

Millgate, Jane. "Narrative Distance in Jane Eyre: The Relevance of the Pictures," MLR, LXIII, No. 2 (1968), 315-19.

Moore, Robert Etheridge. "Dr. Johnson on Fielding and Richardson," PMLA, LXVI (1951), 162-81.

Muecke, D. C. Irony. London, 1970.

Murry, John Middleton. "In Defense of Fielding," in Unprofessional Essays. London, 1956.

Ortega y Gasset, José. The Dehumanization of Art and Other Essays on Art, Culture and Literature. Translated by Helene Weyl. 2nd ed. Princeton, 1968.

Page, Norman. "Categories of Speech in 'Persuasion'," MLR, LXIV (1969), 734-41.

Palmer, E. Taiwo. "Irony in Tom Jones," MLR, LXVI (1971), 497-510.

Park, William. "Fielding and Richardson," PMLA, LXXXI (1966), 381-88.

_____. "What was New About the 'New Species of Writing'?" Studies in the Novel (1970), 112-130.

Paulson, Ronald, ed. Fielding: a Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1962.

_____, ed. Henry Fielding: the Critical Heritage. London, 1969.

_____. Satire and the Novel in 18th Century England. New Haven and London, 1967.

Preston, John. "Plot as Irony: The Reader's Role in Tom Jones," ELH, XXXV (1968), 365-380.

_____. The Created Self. London, 1970.

_____. "Tom Jones and the 'Pursuit of True Judgement," ELH, XXXIII (1966), 315-26.

Price, Martin. To the Palace of Wisdom. Garden City, N. Y., 1964.

Pritchett, V. S. The Living Novel & Later Appreciations. New York, 1967.

Rawson, C. J. "Fielding and Smollett" in History of Literature in the English Language. Vol. 4, Dryden to Johnson, ed. Roger Lonsdale. London, 1971.

Rubin, Louis D., Jr. The Teller in the Tale. Seattle and London, 1967.

Sacks, Sheldon. Fiction and the Shape of Belief. Berkeley, 1964.

Schneider, Daniel J. "Sources of Comic Pleasure in Tom Jones," Connecticut Review, I (1967), 51-65.

Scholes, Robert, ed. Approaches to the Novel. San Francisco, 1961.

_____, and Robert Kellogg. The Nature of Narrative. Oxford, 1966.

Schonborn, Manuel. "Fielding's Digressive-Parodic Artistry: Tom Jones and the Man of the Hill," TSLL, X (1968), 207-14.

Scott, Sir Walter. On Novelists and Fiction, ed. Ioan Williams. London, 1968.

Seamon, Roger G. "The Rhetorical Pattern of Mock Heroic Satire," Humanities Association Bulletin, XVII (1966), 37-41.

Sherbo, Arthur. Studies in the Eighteenth Century Novel. Michigan State University, 1969.

Sherburn, George. "A Novelist's Opinions and His Art," SR, LXI (1953), 316-21.

_____. "Fielding's Social Outlook," PQ, XXXV (1956), 1-23.

Smith, J. Oates. "Masquerade and Marriage: Fielding's Comedies of Identity," Ball State University Forum, VI (1965), 10-21.

Spector, Robert D. Essays on the Eighteenth-Century Novel. Bloomington, 1965.

Spilka, Mark. "Fielding and the Epic Impulse," Criticism, XI (1969), 68-77.

Stephen, Leslie. Hours in a Library, Vol. II. London, 1892. Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1968.

Stevick, Philip, comp. The Theory of the Novel. New York, 1967.

Stuart, William Harding. "The Role of the Narrator in the Novels of Fielding," Unpublished Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963. Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (1963), 2489-2490.

Tate, Allen. "Techniques of Fiction," in Critiques and Essays, ed. J. W. Aldridge. New York, 1952.

Thornbury, Ethel Margaret. Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic. Madison, Wisconsin, 1931.

Tichy, Alex. "Remarks on the Flow of Time in the Novels of Henry Fielding," Brno Studies in English, II (1960), 55-75.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. The English Novel: Form and Function. New York, 1953.

Watt, Ian. "The Ironic Tradition in Augustan Prose from Swift to Johnson" in Restoration and Augustan Prose. Los Angeles, 1956.

_____. The Rise of the Novel. Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1957.

_____. "Serious Reflections on The Rise of the Novel," Novel, I (1968), 205-18.

Williams, Ioan. The Criticism of Henry Fielding. London, 1970.

Wright, Andrew. Henry Fielding, Mask and Feast. London, 1965.