Satirical Aspects of *Joseph Andrews*

Makoto Sakuma

I

It is commonly acknowledged that with the publication of *Pamela* a new genre in literature came into existence and that the year 1740 was quite significant in the development of the new genre, that was to be "the novel". This prevailing view is partly right and quite convenient to explain the cause of the birth of the novel in view of the change of the English society. This clear-cut and lucid explanation of the making of the novel is, in a sense, dangerous because of its very lucidity. Almost all the literary works are too complex to be judged from a generic viewpoint. The view that the people of the new born social class needed their standards of living in easy and familiar writings and Richardson fitly gave them such utilitarian standard in *Pamela*, is, of course, too simple and has already been rejected as such. This too simplified analysis of *Pamela* is now corrected and the more favourable view to the author of *Pamela* has been held by many critics.

Accordingly such comments by Maynard Mack seem to be too stereotyped:

> The story (i.e. *Pamela*), intended as a moral exemplum, was actually a rather vulgar bourgeois success story, matching at some essential points Richardson's own rise (from an industrious and prudent apprenticeship in a printing house to marriage with his master's daughter and succession to the firm) and in fact the rise of the business classes generally in the century in which he wrote.[1)]

Maynard Mack's opinion is handed down to some kind of, if not severe, critical comment of Alan D. McKillop. In *The Early Master of English Fiction*, McKillop says:

> Richardson was fifty years old when he changed the course of English fiction by writing and publishing *Pamela*.

> His career as apprentice, journeyman, and master printer helps to explain, completely, his career as an author, and has recently been closely studied. The early Richardson seems so conventional, so industrious, and so docile that we are sometimes disposed to liken him to Francis Goodchild, Hogarth's industrious apprentice, or even to the subservient shopkeeper in Defoe's *Complete English Tradesman*.[2]

Both Mack's and McKillop's remarks faithfully reflect Richardsonean ways of thinking and living. In brief, we should trace Richardson's intention along the line of the full title of *Pamela*. The title begins with *Pamela, or Virture Rewarded* and it continues with a typically substantial eighteenth-century sub-title:

> *In a series of Familiar Letters from a Beautiful Young Damsel, to her Parents. Now first Published in order to cultivate the Principles of Virtue and Religion in the Minds of the Youth of Both Sexes. A Narrative which has its Foundation in Truth and Nature; and at the same time that it agreeably entertains, by a Variety of curious and affecting Incidents, is entirely divested of all those Images, which, in too many Pieces circulated for Amusement only, tend to inflame the Minds they should instruct.*

All that is essential in *Pamela* can be deduced from this long title. All the vulgar didactic moralization on the conduct of a servant girl and even the coarse pornographic development of her rape are explicitly shown in this title. Rosemary Cowler in "Introduction" to her edition of the interpretations of *Pamela* aptly explains the meaning of this title.

"To cultivate the Principles of Virtue and Religion" is one thing; to tie virtue to reward, as the main title pointedly does, is very much another. The suggestive linkage, however negatively posed, between the instructing and inflaming potentialities of those "*curious* and *affecting* Incidents"[3] also hints a disquieting moral ambiguity or coarseness, perhaps a Defoe-like technique of titillating under the guise of edifying.[4]

It may be easy to reject and laugh at this ordinary traditional view, and the tendencies of critical considerations are to find and appreciate the profound psychological study of Richardson. But too much stress on Richardson's psychological insight may be erroneous and unbalanced. In this respect, to regard him as "a genuine precursor of Dostoevski and Lawrence[5] is the deviation from true recognition of his genius and the dangerous clairvoyance into his non-

existent qualities. Therefore in considering *Pamela*, we should start at the original intention of Richardson when he set to work. Without taking this procedure, it will be impossible to assess the fundamental meaning of Fielding's attacks toward Richardson in his *Shamela* and *Joseph Andrews*.

The didactic moralizing attitude of Richardson, and moreover, the blunt, self-satisfied unconsciousness of the vulgarity in inculcating 'virtuous' ways of living in a servant girl, is too much for Fielding.

To Richardson's idea that Virtue is to be Rewarded in this world, Fielding must have felt much antipathy. Antipathy as motivating power is a key to realize the direction of Fielding's indefatigable brain. This repulsion of Fielding to the utilitarian moralizing in Richardson clearly indicates Fielding's standpoint as a rather antique moralist belonging to the neo-classical age. Fielding always took a detached position in the matters of "this world" which had been rearranged as a new social stratum came into being with no cultural tradition and no standard of living. His antipathy to the idea of the reward in this world came from his negative belief in the newly developing society, the production of early capitalism.

His natural and willed attitude as an outsider enabled him to see the contemporary society as it really was, and also set the limit on his work. Thus he is too much detached to exert a hypnotic influence on his readers, however deeply he may interest them. Arnold Kettle's comment on *Jonathan Wild* is also applicable to *Joseph Andrews*, and *Tom Jones*.

> The basic weakness of *Jonathan Wild*,.....is that no one on the "good" side actually fights for human values .....It is a weakness which springs direct from the limitations of Fielding's social vision.[6]

Apart from *Amelia*, this detached and critical posture towards his contemporary society clearly shows that Fielding belongs to the family of the authors of the picaresque novel. In the picaresque novel, the hero, or anti-hero, plays the role of the unbiased eye, with which he critically observes the society he himself has been rejected from. The strange impersonality of Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones comes from this. They are the convenient and unbiased eyes. The images reflecting to these eyes are the staffs with which the imagined world is constructed according to a rather simple planning.

Deep in his scornful objection to *Pamela's* utilitarian moralization there is a strong attachment to old and out-of-date moral standard coming from his pride in his ancestory. The pride and knowledge of the classical writings naturally led Fielding to be scornful to the

self-satisfied vulgar teachings of Richardson. The very fact that Richardson had not a regular classical education may have irritated Fielding with aristocratic mind. Richardson must have had a decent elementary education, and perhaps he had a year or so at a good secondary school. He himself says that he had "only common School-Learning," and it is certain that he did not have the regular classical education. He says that he had no "tolerable Knowlege" of any language except English, and all the evidence shows that he was not being modest.

"The very great Advantage of an Academical Education I have wanted,"[7] he wrote to Dr. Graham. And as Young remarked, Richardson is a "natural genius" who with a moderate education had conquered a new province of writing.[8]

In contrast with Richardson, Fielding always takes pride in his birth as a descendant of the aristocracy, though the traditional legend that he was descended from a younger branch of the Hapsburg family is a seventeenth-century invention. The important point is that the tradition was apparently believed by Fiedling himself, "since he used a seal which displayed the double-headed Austrian eagle bearing a coat of arms on its breast."[9]

His belief in this tradition and pride in his alleged nobility became stronger as he was obliged to struggle for his daily living. The pride in his noble blood and frustration in the real world worked on him in various ways. It is interesting enough to observe that this pride of his takes an inversive direction depricating the fashionable society.

As an example of this seemingly democratic idea can be found in *Miss Lucy in Town*. This ballad-opera was produced at Drury Lane on 6 May 1742 and it had been written some years earlier by Fielding in collaboration with an unknown playwrite. The democratic idea is expressed in the speech of the deserving ex-footman to the dissolute peer. "How, my lord, resign my wife! Fortune, which made me poor, made me a servant; but Nature, which made me an Englishman, preserved me from being a slave. I have as good a right to the little I claim, as the proudest peer hath to his great possessions; and whils't I am able, I will defend it." After this utterance one of the characters remarks: "Henceforth I will know no degree, no difference between men, but what the standards of honour and virtue create; the noblest birth without these is but splendid infancy, and a footman with these qualities is a man of honour."[10]

This democratic sentiment, however, cannot be said to come from any belief in the rising middle-class people, who were searching for a guidance in living. This sentiment came from Fielding's anger

and hatred for the corrupt ruling class and the fashionable society. It is true that Fielding's anger was quite genuine and that his attack was full of courage. In "Dedication to the Public" of *Eurydice Hiss'd; or, A Word to the Wise*, Fielding boldy declares:

> "If nature hath given me any talents at ridiculing vice and imposture, I shall not be indolent, nor afraid of exerting them, while the liberty of the press and stage subsists, that is to say, while we have any liberty left among us."

As is clearly seen in *The Historical Register for the Year 1736* the chief target of Fielding's attack is Walpole and those who are manipulated by him in the shameless buying out policy.

In the second of the political scenes the attack and the ridicule are turned on so-called "Patriots", or members of the Opposition, who are induced by bribes to abandon the principles of their party and echo the slogans of the Government. Dudden's description is quite to the point in showing the scene.[11]

Four "shabby fellows" come in from different doors, shake hands, and drink to liberty, property, and successful trade. They unanimously agree that the island of Corsica "is in an ill state" and that they themselves are "a set of miserable poor dogs." "That we are, sure enough," cries one of them," that nobody will deny." At this moment an "impudent fellow" named Quidam (i.e. "a Certain person," or, in plain words, Walpole), who has been laughing in his sleeve at the "Patriots" behind the scenes, comes forward and disputes the assertion.

This "Quidam" is "the first and greatest politician" and the whole audience were sure to recognize that the greatest politician was no less a person than Walpole. The word "great" means "degenerated" in Fielding's use of the word as is clearly shown in the title of *The Life of Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great.* It is important to notice Walpole's position as a representative of the new-born bourgeois class. It is quite significant that the toast of the "Patriots" is for the prosperity of their trades. The lack in sympathy or even understanding towards the middle class people and their materialistic ways in managing the affairs of this world is the fundamental characteristic of Fielding's thought and belief. Strange absence of the middle class people in Fielding's works accounts for this attitude of his. His sympathy is towards the outcast. We can find the example in the scene of injured Joseph Andrews.

> Though there were several great Coats about the

> Coach, it was not easy to get over this Difficulty which Joseph had started. The two Gentlemen complained they were cold, and could not spare a Rag; the Man of Wit saying, with a Laugh, that Charity began at home; and the Coachman, who had two great Coats spread under him, refused to lend either, lest they should be made bloody; and Lady's Footman desired to be excused for the same Reason, which the Lady herself, notwithstanding her Abhorence of a naked Man, approved: and it is more than probable, poor Joseph, who obstinately adhered to his modest Resolution, must have perished, unless the Postillion, (a Lad who hath been since transported for robbing a Hen-roost) had voluntarily stript off a great Coat, his only Garment, at the same time swearing a great Oath, (for which he was rebuked by the Passengers)" that he would rather ride in his Shirt all his Life, than suffer a Fellow-Creature tolie in so miserable a Condition.[12]

In blief, Fielding would not find any merit in the way of the new rising bourgeois class. Therefore he is always finding faults with the Richardsonean thoughts and beliefs, because Richardson is one of the representatives of the new people. *Pamela's* seemingly vulgar moralizing, naturally, irritated him, and especially the idea of "Virtue Rewarded" must have angered him. Fom the older moral view of Fielding, virtue must not expect a worldly reward. In *The Champion* Fielding gives his definition of virtue. 'I do not know a better general definition of virtue, than that it is a delight in doing good.'[13] According to Dudden, ".....in his (i.e. Fielding's) view, good nature and virtue are one and the same thing. The essence of each is altruism, tenderhearted benevolence, pure philanthropy.[14]

From Fielding's view, Pamela's admittance into the upper society with her so-called virtue is absurd and irritable enough. Thus came *Shamela.*

We are inclined to analyse Fielding's way of parody by juxtaposing *Pamela* and *Shamela.*

Letter XV of *Pamela* goes as follows:

> He then put his hand in my bosom, and indignation gave me double strength, and I got loose from him by a sudden spring, and ran out of the room; and the next chamber being open, I entered it, shut to the door, and it locked after me: but he followed me so close, he got hold of my gown, and tore a piece off, which hung without the door;

for the key was on the inside.

I just remember I got into the room; for I knew nothing further of the matter till afterwards; for I fell into a fit with my terror, and there I lay, till he, as I suppose, looking through the keyhole, espied me upon the floor, stretched out at length, on my face; and then he called Mrs. Jervis to me, who, by his assistance, bursting open the door, he went away, seeing me coming to myself; and bid her say nothing of the matter, if she was wise.[15]

And the corresponding letter of *Shamela* runs thus.

LETTER **II.**

SHAMELA ANDREWS *to* HENRIETTA MARIA HONARA ANDREWS.

Dear Mamma,

O What News, since I writ my last! the young Squire hath been here, and as sure as a Gun he hath taken a Fancy to me; *Pamela*, says he, (for so I am called here) you was a great Favourite of your late Mistress's; yes, an't please your Honour, says I; and I believe you deserved it, says he; thank your Honour for your good Opinion, says I; and then he took me by the Hand, and I pretended to be shy: Laud, says I, Sir, I hope you don't intend to be rude; no, says he, my Dear, and then he kissed me, 'till he took away my Breath and I pretended to be Angry, and to get away, and then he kissed me again, and breathed very short, and looked very silly; and by ILL-Luck Mrs. *Jervis* came in, and had like to have spoiled Sport.—*How troublesome is such Interruption*! You shall hear now soon, for I shall not come away yet, so I rest,

Your affectionate Daughter,

SHAMELA.[16]

Fielding's irritation and scornfulness towards Richardsonean morality can be approved. But, while Richardson at least establishes his own morality in the way of life of the ordinary working class, Fielding only laughs at the tactfulness of a servant girl. With his comically satirical power, *Shamela* is quite successful as a parody. Maurice Johnson regards *Shamela* as "one of the important parodies of prose fiction in English" and says that "*Shamela* amusingly and tellingly distorts its models in minute details; but the reader does not have to be aware of those details, or even to have read Richardson's *Pamela*, its

foremost model, to share much of the sport and to recognize most of the oblique truths in *Shamela*."[17] The very fact that Pamela is allowed into the upper-class is laughing absurdity to Fielding. To the current of the English society after the Glorious Revolution, Fielding purposely shut his eyes, though, as a magistrate, he is always conscious of the evils of the world. With his old standards of morality, he knows, he cannot cope with the evils. But, it is not until *Amelia* was published that his gloomy desperate recognition of the human evils became central theme in his work.

In Fielding's age, the rearrangement of social classes is rapidly in progress. Pamela's admittance to the Booby family is symbolical enough. But to the trends of the society, Fielding has only a negative attitude. This negative attitude is clearly shown in the last part of *Joseph Andrews*. Here Pamela is introduced as a mean and arrogant woman who is inclined to show off her superiority as a member of the upper class. Joseph's firm resolution to marry Fanny is rejected by Mr. Booby and Pamela as foolish behaviour.

> 'My Fortune enables me to please myself likewise,' said Joseph; 'for all my pleasure is centered in Fanny, and whilst I have Health, I shall be able to support her with my Labour in that station to which she was born, and with which she is content.' Brother, said Pamela, 'Mr. Booby advises you as a Friend; and, no doubt, my Papa and Mamma will be of his Opinion, and will have great reason to be angry with you for destroying what his Goodness hath done, and throwing down our Family again, after he hath raised it. It would become you better, Brother, to pray for the Assistance of Grace against such a Passion, than to indulge it.'—'Sure, Sister, you are not in earnest; I am sure she is your Equal at least.'—'She was my Equal,' answered Pamela, 'but I am no longer Pamela Andrews, I am now this Gentle-man's Lady, and as such am above her—I hope I shall never behave with an unbecoming Pride; but at the same time I shall always endeavour to know myself, and question not the Assistance of Grace to that purpose.'[18]

Here, Fielding's scornful and satirical attitude towards Pamela is quite obvious. And at the same time, the use of the word Grace is a key to understand Fielding's characteristic in Christian belief. As is evident in *Shamela*, where the absurd Parson Tickletext is made to praise *Pamela* for inculcating "the useful and truly religious Doctrine of *Grace*," Fielding associated the religion of Richardson's heroine with the Methodism of George Whitefield, whose Antinomian stress

upon the efficacy of faith and grace rather than good works, Fielding deplored. This particular stress upon good works rather than mere faith is everywhere found as a fundamental religious posture of Fielding. In a conversation with a Bookseller, Parson Adams declares; '...my own Opinion, which hath always been, that a virtuous and good Turk, or Heathen, are more acceptable in the sight of their Creator, than a vicious and wicked Christian, tho' his Faith was as perfectly Orthodox as St. Paul's himself.'[19] Stressing the supreme importance of good works, Parson Adams echoes a passage from a sermon by Bishop Hoadly: 'We may be... certain, That an honest Heathen is much more acceptable to [God], than a dishonest and deceitful Christian; and that a charitable and good-natured Pagan has a better Title to his Favour, than a cruel and barbarous Christian; let him be never so orthodox in his Faith.'[20] Furthermore, the ironical allusion to Whitefield's Antinomianism can be found in Joseph's letter to his sister Pamela.

> 'I don't doubt, dear Sister, but you will have Grace to preserve your Virtue against all Trials; and I beg you earnestly to Pray, I may be enabled to preserve mine: for truly, it is very severely attacked by more than one: but, I hope I shall copy your Example, and that of Joseph, my Name's-sake; and maintain my Virtue against all Temptations.'[21]

NOTES

(1) "*Joseph Andrews and Pamela*" (Editor's title). Introduction to Maynard Mack's edition of *Joseph Andrews* (New York, 1948), p. ii.
(2) McKillop, *The Early Masters of English Fiction*, p.51.
(3) Italics by Rosemary Cowler.
(4) Rosemary Cowler, "Introduction" to *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Pamela* (London, 1969), p.8.
(5) Morris Golden, *Richardson's Characters* (The University of Michigan Press, 1963), p. viii.
(6) Arold Kettle, *An Introduction to the English Novel*, Vol. I, p.51.
(7) to Graham, 3 May 1750.
(8) Quoted in T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson, a Biography* (1971), p. 568.
(9) F. Homes Dudden, *Henry Fielding, His Life, Works and Times* (1966), vol. I, p.1.
(10) *Miss Lucy in Town*, ad. fin.
(11) Dudden, *Henry Fielding*, vol.I, p.200.
(12) *Joseph Andrews* (The Wesleyan Edition, 1967), p.53.
(13) *The Champion*, 3 Jan. 1740.
(14) Dudden, *Henry Fielding*, vol.I, pp. 273–274.
(15) Samuel Richardson, *Pamela* (Everyman's Lib.), p.20.
(16) Henry Fielding, *Shamela* (In *Joseph Andrews* and *Shamela*, Oxford

University Press, 1970), P.326.

(17) Maurice Johnson, *Fielding's Art of Fiction* (Oxford University Press, 1961), p.19.

(18) *Joseph Andrews*, BK. IV, Ch. vii (p.302).

(19) Ibid., p.82.

(20) Quoted in Battestin's edition of *Joseph Andrews*, p. 83.

(21) *Joseph Andrews*, p.47.

II

As is commonly pointed out, *Joseph Andrews* started from his intention to make a parody of *Pamela*. Surely this is a commonly shared notion and we cannot deny the fact that Fielding's mocking enmity to Richardson's worldly and utilitarian recognition of living led Fielding to create the antipodal world of fiction. Certainly this is a very important point in analysing the characteristics of Fielding's first work of fiction. Fielding himself writes a severe and ironical remark on *Pamela* in the first chapter of this history. Fielding's starting point and the whole course of this history are set on the spirit of parody and irony. We must, first, take notice of the tone of ironical mocking to *Pamela*, together with the attack on Colley Cibber's *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber*. Fielding's particular way of mocking irony is here shown quite evidently. Fundamental difference between Fielding and Richardson can be known from the passage that ridicules *Pamela* together with Fielding's deep-rooted contempt for Cibber, the world-famous theatre manager and poet. Apart from his ethical repulsion to Richardson, his raillery towards Cibber is of much interest because it is directed towards Cibber's vanity. The theory of Fielding's comic epic is here carried out in this attack to Cibber. Fielding was especially amused by a passage from Chapter III of the *Apology:*

> "I am now come to that Crisis of my Life when Fortune seem'd to be at a Loss what she should do with me. Had she favour'd my Father's first Designation of me, he might then, perhaps, have had as sanguine Hopes of my being a Bishop as I afterwards conceived of my being a General when I first took Arms at the Revolution. Nay, after that I had a third Chance too, equally as good, of becoming an Under-propper of the State."[1)]

In many other places, Fielding ridiculed this innocent pride in Cibber. These attacks of Fielding's must be noted, for they have profound relations with his motive for writing this history coloured with comical-ironical spirit. If we try to analyse the theory of laughter which is made clear in his "Preface" to *Joseph Andrews*, we must examine Fiedling's personal reaction to *An Apology* as an embodiment of un-selfcriticized vanity in Cibber.

Earlier than in *Joseph Andrews*, in *The Champion* (6 May 1740) Fielding had similarly referred to the same passage, in which Cibber implies, "That he narrowly escaped being a General or a Bishop." Later, in *The Covent-Garden Journal* (28 April 1752) he again ironically applauded "our worthy Laureat," who "in the excellent Apology for his Life., gave Thanks to Providence that he did not in his Youth betake himself either to the Gown or the Sword." As is evident from these quotations, Fielding's reaction to Cibber's *Apology* is too tenacious as to be overlooked as a casual raillery to an old rival in the theatrical world. Even though Cibber, for his part, had contemptuously alluded to Fielding as ' a broken Wit,' representing him as a mercenary scribbler whose scurrilous satires against 'Religion, Laws, Government, Priests, Judges, and Ministers' caused a justly incensed legislature to censor the stage,[2] Fielding's jibing at Cibber was so persistent as to continue at the very end of his career, in *The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*. The most plausible explanation as to this tenacity can be found in the fact that Fielding found in Cibber the most convincing example of human vanity which might make disinterested observers laugh. And this is the core of Fielding's theory of laughter. While using Cibber as a substantial example of vanity which is just fit for his theory of the ridiculous, Fielding was led to choose *Pamela* as a moralistic target for his vent of anger coming from his rather aristocratic belief in the older and virtually invalid moral standards. Thus Fielding set these two in the very beginning of *Joseph Andrews*.

> What the Female Readers are taught by the Memoirs of Mrs. Andrews, is so well set forth in the excellent Essays or Letters prefixed to the second and subsequent Editions of that Work, that it would be here a needless Repetition. The authentic History with which I now present the public, is an Instance of the great Good that Book is likely to do, and of the Prevalence of Example which I have just observed: since it will appear that it was by keeping the excellent Pattern of his Sister's Virtues before his Eyes, that Mr. Joseph Andrews was chiefly enabled to preserve his Purity in the

> midst of such great Temptations; I shall only add, that this Character of Male-Chastity, tho' doubtless as desirable and becoming in one Part of the human Species, as in the other, is almost the only Virtue which the great Apologist hath not given himself for the sake of giving the Example to his Readers.[3]

The last part of the passage above quoted is highly effective in its ridicule of *Apology* if contrasted with the following remarks: *An Apology* 'which deals in Male-Virtue, was written by the great Person himself, who lived the Life he hath recorded, and is by many thought to have lived such a Life only in order to write it.'[4] Though vanity in Cibber is so tenaciously attacked, it is for the purpose of creating laughter. This is one of laughing stocks which fill the world of comical absurdities, the delineation of which is the chief object of Fielding's works, especially *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*. Caricaturization (though the word may angers Fielding) of this slight vice, vanity or ostentation, is the chief means of Fielding in his attempt to make the new 'kind of Writing, which' he does 'not remember to have seen hitherto attempted in' his 'language.'[5] After the famous definition, 'The only Source of the true Ridiculous (as it appears to me) is Affectation,[6] Fielding discourses on vanity. ".....the Affectation which arises from Vanity is nearer to Truth than the other (i.e., Hypocrisy); as it hath not that violent Repugnancy of Nature to struggle with, which that of the Hypocrite hath."[7] In the consideration of Fielding's art of parody, we may not overlook his ridicule at Cibber's use of words. As Cibber's self-satisfied pompous vanity in his own career is expressed in so careless uses of English words, Fielding cannot restrain himself from making some comments on the Poet Laureate. In his self-styled "sublime Style," he ridicules Cibber in *Joseph Andrews*.

> Now thou, whoever thou art, whether a Muse, or by what other Name soever thou chusest to be called, who presidest over Biography, and hast inspired all the Writers of Lives in these our Times: Thou who didst infuse such wonderful Humour into the Pen of immortal *Gulliver*,... Lastly, Thou who without the Assistance of the least Spice of Literature, and even against his Inclination, hast, in some Pages of his Book, forced Colley Cibber to write English....[8]

The quotation above is quite interesting in two ways. The one is the raillery to Colley Cibber in his wrong usages of English, which I will try to examine later on. The other is Fielding's praise for Swift.

Both Swift and Fielding use irony as their chief means in their mutual endeavours to construct their own fictitious worlds. As is pointed out by Martin Battestin in his edition of *Joseph Andrews*, Fielding's admiration for Swift, who, together with Lucian and Cervantes, comprised the 'great Triumvirate' of satirists (*The Covent-Garden Journal*, 4 February 1752), is perhaps best indicated in the words in *The True Patriot* (5 November 1754): there Swift is called 'A Genius who deserves to be ranked among the first whom the World ever saw. He possessed the Talents of a Lucian, a Rabelais, and a Cervantes, and in his Works exceeded them all. He employed his Wit to the noblest Purposes, in ridiculing as well Superstition in Religion as Infidelity, and the several Errors and Immoralities which sprung up from time to time in his Age; and lastly, in the Defence of his Country, against several pernicious Schemes of wicked Politicians.' Fielding's homage to Swift's writings clearly shows his own characteristics in writing: a direct attack on worldly, self-satisfied people. Both Swift and Fielding are, in a sense, the outcasts from the place in the sun. 'Frustration' is the key word which is applicable to both of them. Swift was banished to Ireland losing all the hopes of preferment in the Church. Fielding could not live in the theatrical world because of the Licensing Act which was put into force 21 June 1737, owing to his scornful and severe attack on Walpole in *The Historical Register for the Year, 1736*, which was enacted in 1737 in the Little Theatre. *The Historical Register* is quite important in knowing his fundamental attitude as a satirist which is in common with that of Swifts,' Fielding's avowed precursor in ironical writings. His method of 'teaching by ridicule' is obviously put forth in *The Historical Register* as is declaired by Mr. Medley.

> Why, sir, my design is to ridicule the vicious and foolish customs of the age, and that in a fair manner, without fear, favour, or ill nature, and without scurrility, ill manners, or commonplace; I hope to expose the reigning follies in such a manner, that men shall laugh themselves out of them before they feel that they are touched.[9]

This attitude of teaching by ridicule is Fielding's chief method through all the writings, down to *The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*. In the "Dedication' in *Tom Jones*, he declairs, 'I have endeavoured to laugh mankind out of their favourite follies and vices.' Indeed this way of teaching by ridicule is of the same quality with Swift's way, it is also shared with Addison's and Steele's way of correction of

the vices of the age. Fielding's profound admiration for Swift immediately reflects his own method of teaching by ridicule which is theoretically explained in his "Preface" to *Joseph Andrews*. What remains to be carefully considered is the direct attack on *An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber;* for Fielding himself says in *Preface* that he refuses to attack directly.

> ...I have no Intention to vilify or asperse any one: for tho' every thing is copied from the Book of Nature, and scarce a Character or Action produced which I have not taken from my own Observations and Experience, yet I have used the utmost Care to obscure the Persons by such different Circumstances, Degrees, and Colours, that it will be impossible to guess at them with any degree of Certainty; and if it ever happens otherwise, it is only where the Failure characterized is so minutes, that it is a Foible only which the Party himself may laugh at as well as any other.[10]

If we take his words as they are, his ridicule of Colley Cibber is not so serious as it becomes his starting point in composing his History. It will be Cibber's pompous and self-satisfied way in writing his own life that leads Fielding to make comical attack on *Apology*. And the fact that this self-satisfied autobiography was made in very incorrect English that makes Fielding laugh at this Poet Laureate. Here I can discern his laughing which comes from the difference of appearances and reality. Glenn Hatfield says on this point.

> Actually Cibber's eccentric use of language was probably as much due to a kind of exuberant carelessness as to ignorance, but his willingness to confess to such a fault (not, one suspects, without a certain amount of perverse self-satisfaction) could scarcely have been expected to appease writers like Pope and Fielding who believed that an author had a special responsibility to the language in which he wrote.[11]

Cibber wrote in the *Apology*;

> I grant that no Man worthy of the name of an Author is more faulty Writer than myself. That I am not a Master of my own Language I too often feell, when I am at a loss for Expression. I know too that I have too bold a Disregard for

> that Correctness which others set so just a value upon.... Whenever I speak of any thing that highly delights me, I find it very difficult to keep my Words within the Bounds of Common Sense: Even when I write too, the same Feeling will sometimes get the Better of me: of which I cannot give you a stronger instance, than in that wild Expression I made use of in the first Edition of my Preface to the *Provoked Husband;*... You may well ask me, How could I possibly commit such a Wantonness to Paper? And I own myself the Shame of confessing, I have no Excuse for it, but that, like a Lover in the Fulness of his Content, by endeavouring to be floridly grateful, I talk'd Nonesense.[12]

Hatfield's explanatory remark follows: "It is probably with this passage in mind (and particularly Cibber's comparison of himself with a transported lover) that Fielding in *Joseph Andrews* develops a burlesque heroic simile comparing the powers of love to "metamorphose and distort the human senses" with the powers of "the great Cibber, who confounds all number, gender, and breaks through every rule of grammar at his will, [and so] hath....distorted the English language."[13]

What is more important in analysing Fielding's art is the close relationship between his ironical remark and the secret spring lurking in his creation of Mrs. Slipslop. Mrs. Slipslop is introduced before us with her habitual malapropism and lustful inclination. Her pride in the knowledge of the town and hard words is strongly contrasted with her appearances and wrong uses of her words. Her conviction concerning her 'high status' in the fashionable society is effectively ridiculed with her portrait and her notorious malapropism. Just as Cibber's vanity and conviction are smashed down by the reference to his incorrect uses of words, Mrs. Slipslop's vanity is exposed and ridiculed. Both her appearances and wrong usages of her words betrays her true nature. Here is quite an interesting sketch of this old maid:

> She was a Maiden Gentlewoman of about Forty-five Years of Age, who having made a small Slip in her Youth had continued a good Maid ever since. She was not at this time remarkably handsome; being very short, and rather too corpulent in Body, and somewhat red, with the Addition of Pimples in the Face. Her Nose was likewise rather too large, and her Eyes too little; nor did she resemble a Cow so much in her Breath, as in two brown Globes which she carried before her; one of her Legs was also a little shorter than the

other, which occasioned her to limp as she walked.[14]

This description of Mrs. Slipslop is quite effective in creating our laughter in contrast with her vain pride. The fundamental mechanism of Fielding's comical art can be found in the juxtaposition of this old maid with innocent Parson Adams.

> Mrs. Slislop the Waiting-Gentlewoman, being herself the Daughter of a Curate, preserved some Respect for Adams; she professed great Regard for his Learning, and would frequently dispute with him on Points of Theology; but always insisted on a Deference to be paid to her Understanding, as she had been frequently at London, and knew more of the World than a Country Parson could pretend to.
>
> She had in these Disputes a particular Advantage over Adams: for she was a mighty Affecter of hard Words, which she used in such a manner, that the Parson, who durst not offend her, by calling her words in Question, was frequently at some loss to guess her meaning, and would have been much less puzzled by an Arabian Manuscript.[15]

Fielding's raillery to Cibber in respect to his incorrect uses of words is transformed into Slipslopism. We must also notice that her delineation as so queer and ugly a creature comes from Fielding's particular way of contrast: for Mrs. Slipslop has the role to impress the reader with Fanny's beauty and her innocently pure character. Mrs. Slipslop's portrait is an interesting contrast to the picture of Fanny, as both descriptions are purposefully antithetic. Sean Shesgreen's suggestion as to Mrs. Slipslop's role is of much interest. "Fanny has delicate, idealized features and a robust, healthy from; Slipslop, on the other hand, has a coarse, grotesque appearance and a corpulent, disproportionate body. Again, Fielding's theory of physiognomy is at work: the maid's bovine form and pimpled face, with its small eyes, are outward signs of her gross, animal lusts and her circumscribed powers of perception."[16]

Here Fielding's image of Cibber is projected on his grotesquely amiable figure of Mrs. Slipslop, which is taken from Nature as Fielding himself proudly declares.

NOTES

(1) Colley Cibber, *An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber* (AMS Press, Inc. New York, 1966), Vol. I, pp. 55–56.
(2) Ibid., p.286.
(3) *Joseph Andrews* (The Wesleyan Edition), pp. 19–20.
(4) Ibid., p. 18.

(5) Ibid., p.3.
(6) Ibid., p.7.
(7) Ibid., p.8.
(8) *Joseph Andrews*, pp. 238–239.
(9) *The Historical Register for the Year 1736*, I,1.
(10) *Joseph Andrews*, p. 10.
(11) Glenn Hatfield, *Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony* (The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p.69.
(12) Suggestion is from *Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony*, pp. 69–70.
(13) Ibid., p. 70.
(14) *Joseph Andrews*, p.32.
(15) Ibid., pp. 25–26.
(16) Sean Shesgreen, *Literary Portraits in the Novels of Henry, Fielding* (Northern Illinois University Press, 1972), p. 98.

III

We must here consider the contrivance of *Joseph Andrews* in its form of parody of Richardson's *Pamela*. In its outer form, Pamela and Pamela's brother Joseph make up the enclosing circle in which a fictitious world of Fielding's first novel shows its variegated richness of human characters. In other words, Pamela and Joseph are the framework of this novel. The framework rigidly limits the world of this novel and decides the character of this novel as a parody of Richardson's too famous novel. Fielding's declaration in "Preface" to *Joseph Andrews* as the founder of new genre in literature alluding to Homer is also a manifestation of his self-reliance emulating Richardson's self-conviction as, also, a new species of writing. As is evident in Richardson's letter to Hill, he is conscious of the possibility of "a new species of writing" differing from Romances together with his aim at "the cause of religion and virtue."[1] Now we must take notice of the strange impersonality of the hero, Joseph Andrews. This impersonality comes from his role as a parody of Pamela and thus the embodiment of male chastity. As a mechanical contrivance which sets the limit to the fictional world, the character of Joseph Andrews must, of necessity, not develop in the course of the evolution of the novel. In other words, he should have the static character not to be affected from within. And if Pamela is the embodiment of female virtue, Joseph must be chastity itself coherently. Thus, like Pamela holding off the would-be seducer, her master, who is named Booby——an idiot——

differing from Mr. B in Richardson's work, Joseph must refuse the advances of Mr. B's aunt, widowed Lady Booby.

At the outset, Joseph is introduced as an amusing modernization of the Old Testament Joseph. On the seventh day after her husband's death Lady Booby ordered Joey, "whom for a good Reason we shall hereafter call Joseph, to bring up her Tea-kettle". Of course this allusion is to the chastity of the biblical Joseph, who resisted the solicitations of Potiphar's wife (Genesis xxxix, 7–20). Like Joseph in the Bible, he is a "goodly person, and well-favoured." The brief explanation by Maurice Johnson is of much use. "He has been kidnapped by gipsies (Egyptians), and has been employed in a great house, has rejected the sexual advances of his master's wife, and has suffered from her resulting fury. He is finally revealed in his true identity, is reconciled with his family, and weeps while embracing his father from whom he has been so long separated. Part of the effect of *Joseph Andrews* comes from Fielding's borrowing the portentous Old Testament myth and altering it comically with Potiphar's wife now as Lady Booby, Jacob as Mr. Wilson. And Biblical phrasing is absorbed into Fielding's story: it is not at first sight, I think, easy to say which Joseph is being reconciled with his father if the following is read out of context: "he threw himself at his Feet, and, embracing his knees with tears begged his Blessing."[2)]

As is evident from Johnson's suggestion, Joseph in *Joseph Andrews* is firmly grasped in his role as a parody of Pamela and the Biblical colouring. With this frame firmly setting up, Fielding tried to pour into this frame curiously distorted figures which come into being according to his theory of the ridiculous and the most important figure conceived in the spirit of Romance. Thus we must analyse another Biblical creation, Parson Adams. But there is a slight difference between Pamela and Joseph, because of the existence of amiable Fanny, who appears in chapter XI as "of several new matters not expected." And because of Fanny he could reject Lady Booby, while Pamela managed to be Mr. Booby's wife by her "virtue," after repeated refusals of her master. According to the traditional view, Pamela is described as contriving girl.

> .....his Pamela, intended as a model woman, was in many respects simply a pioneer capitalist, a middle-class *entrepreneur* of virtue, who looked on her chastity not as a condition of spirit but as a commodity to be vended for the purpose of getting on.[3)]

Though criticized as such, Richardson's Pamela has her own character spontaneously evolved from her situation. Pamela's char-

acter, and even her utilitarian moralistic view are quite convincing psychologically. In contrast, Joseph only assumes his role as a mechanical connector of this history, although his name, Joseph Andrews, is used as the title. What I mean by his "impersonality" is this mechanically abstruct character. All through *Joseph Andrews*, we are obliged to be impressed with this strange impersonality in the hero. This mere mechanism of the hero as a framework of a story clearly shows that this novel belongs to the tradition of the picaresque novel. As I mentioned above, this strange impersonality in the hero comes from the restricting condition that he is, from the beginning to the end, used as a parody of Pamela. This embodiment of male chastity is also made from a Biblical material. At this mechanical contrivance in the creation of Joseph Andrews, the hero, we are obliged to feel some emptiness in the world and atmosphere of this novel. To be sure he is a chaste, moderate and clever boy (he, of course, knows what is meant by the insinuation of Lady Booby), but he is lacking in vitality; in other words, the spontaneous development of the hero. The author himself, however, is conscious, from the very beginning, of this lack in bursting energy in the hero, Joseph. In the next chapter, I will try to examine the other hero, Parson Adams.

(*to be continued*)

NOTES

(1) *Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson*, ed. John Carroll (Oxford, 1964), p.41.

(2) Maurice Johnson, *Fielding's Art of Fiction* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961), p. 74.

(3) Maynard Mack, "Joseph Andrews and Pamela" in *Fielding* (Ronald Paulson ed., Prentice-Hall, 1962), pp. 52–53.