WORLD'S CLASSICS

HENRY FIELDING

JOSEPH ANDREWS AND SHAMELA

THE WORLD'S CLASSICS

HENRY FIELDING

The History of the Adventures of

Joseph Andrews

And of his friend Mr. Abraham Adams

AND

An Apology for the Life of

Mrs. Shamela Andrews

Edited with an introduction by
DOUGLAS BROOKS-DAVIES

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press, Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP
Oxford New York
Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogota Bombay
Buenos Aires Calcutta Cape Town Dar es Salaam
Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madras Madrid Melbourne
Mexico City Nairobi Paris Singapore
Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw

and associated companies in
Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a trade mark of Oxford University Press

The text of Joseph Andrews *was first published in the 'Wesleyan' Edition by Oxford University Press in 1966*
Joseph Andrews *was first issued with* Shamela *in this edition in the Oxford English Novels series in 1970*
First issued as a World's Classics paperback in 1980

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available
ISBN 0 19 281550 4

19 20

Printed in Great Britain by
Caledonian International Book Manufacturing Ltd.
Glasgow

INTRODUCTION

SHAMELA, the first of a long line of parodies and imitations provoked by Samuel Richardson's *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded*,[1] was published on 4 April 1741, by which time three editions of *Pamela* had appeared[2] and been greeted with what Parson Oliver, with justice, terms, in his opening letter, 'an epidemical Phrenzy'. The 'Phrenzy' continued despite *Shamela* and other attacks, and in December 1741 Richardson brought out the second part of *Pamela*. It was followed two months later by *Joseph Andrews* (22 February 1742).

Three editions of *Shamela* were called for,[3] and attest to a fair amount of contemporary popularity. The initial interest soon waned, however, and there seems to have been no further demand for it, probably to Fielding's relief. For he doubtless thought it too bawdy and too immediately topical to enhance his reputation, altogether too minor a piece (especially after *Joseph Andrews*) to be worth perpetuating. There was yet another reason for wanting so stringent an attack on *Pamela* forgotten, as several commentators have observed: when he wrote *Shamela*, Fielding apparently didn't know that Richardson was the author of *Pamela*; and despite the fact that *Shamela* had been published anonymously, its authorship was an open secret. To have agreed to further editions, therefore, and to have confessed publicly to the work (a thing Fielding never did), would have caused unnecessary embarrassment to the Richardson circle, which included Fielding's novelist-sister Sarah.

Although the Richardsonians grumbled about *Joseph Andrews* (Dr. George Cheyne referred to 'Fielding's wretched Perfor-

[1] See Bernard Kreissman, *Pamela-Shamela: A Study of the Criticisms, Burlesques, Parodies, and Adaptations of Richardson's 'Pamela'*, University of Nebraska Studies, N.S. xxii (1960).

[2] 6 November 1740; 14 February 1741; 12 March 1741.

[3] A second edition came out on 3 November 1741, and the same year also saw a Dublin edition published 'for Oli. Nelson at the Milton's Head in Skinner's Row'.

mance', and said 'it will entertain none but Porters or Watermen),[1] its treatment of *Pamela* was in no way as offensive as *Shamela*'s had been. Written in the last four months of 1741, it may have been prompted in part by the knowledge that Richardson had completed his sequel to *Pamela*, and by the fact that public interest in *I Pamela* showed no sign of waning[2] so that a more carefully planned corrective was called for. Furthermore, there is little doubt that pressing financial difficulties encouraged Fielding to embark on a large-scale work in the hope of greater remuneration than *Shamela* and such other ephemera as the poem *Of True Greatness* and the electioneering tract *The Crisis: A Sermon* (both 1741) could offer him. It was his good fortune that, with the manuscript of *Joseph Andrews* to sell, he should have been introduced—perhaps by the poet James Thomson—to Andrew Millar (1706–68), later to become one of the greatest booksellers and publishers of the century. Millar, who published much of Fielding's later work, including *Tom Jones* and *Amelia*, paid £183. 11*s*. for the novel.[3]

Joseph Andrews sold at 6*s*. for its two duodecimo volumes and was immediately popular, even though its popularity could not match *Pamela*'s: the first edition of 1,500 copies was followed on 10 June 1742 by a thoroughly-revised second edition of 2,000 copies, which was succeeded in turn by a third edition of 3,000 copies (March 1743), attributed for the first time to 'Henry Fielding, Esquire', and 'illustrated with Cuts' by the booksellers' engraver James Hulett (d. 1771). Two further editions, both of 2,000 copies, appeared before Fielding's death in 1754: in October 1748 and December 1751.

But the facts, stated thus baldly, do nothing to answer the question, why was Fielding so troubled by *Pamela* as to write two replies to it? The answer—and I think it is basically a fairly simple one—can emerge only from an examination of the works themselves.

[1] Letter to Richardson of 9 March 1742, quoted in A. D. McKillop, 'The Personal Relations between Fielding and Richardson', *Modern Philology*, xxviii (1930–31), 425.

[2] The fourth and fifth editions had appeared on 5 May 1741 and 22 September 1741 respectively.

[3] The agreement is reprinted in full in Battestin's Introduction to the 'Wesleyan' *Joseph Andrews*, pp. xxx–xxxi.

Shamela was essentially a topical piece. This is apparent from the echo of the title of Colley Cibber's autobiography (April 1740) in the format of *Shamela*'s own title[1] (Cibber, poet laureate and destined to be the new hero of Pope's 1743 *Dunciad*, had already been attacked for literary incompetence in Fielding's periodical *The Champion*,[2] and was to be satirized again in *Joseph Andrews*); from the exploitation (in *Shamela*'s Dedication) of the Dedication to Lord Hervey of Dr. Conyers Middleton's *History of the Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero* (February 1741) (Hervey was a political ally of '*his Honour*',[3] i.e. Sir Robert Walpole, another of Fielding's perennial targets); and it emerges, too, from the attacks on the Methodism of George Whitefield, which was anathema to Fielding's rational, Augustan temperament. His objections to Whitefield are conveniently summarized by Adams in *Joseph Andrews*, I. xvii: '. . . when he began to call Nonsense and Enthusiasm to his Aid, and to set up the detestable Doctrine of Faith against good Works, I was his Friend no longer . . . can any Doctrine have a more pernicious Influence on Society than a Persuasion, that it will be a good Plea for the Villain at the last day; *Lord, it is true I never obeyed one of thy Commandments, yet punish me not, for I believe them all?*'

But even at this point we can begin to see the satire in *Shamela* as something rather more than random shafts loosed at disparate topical targets: it is Adams's reference to the adverse effect of Methodism on society that gives us the clue. Fielding's targets are all disruptive, emblems of political, literary, and religious disorder: the sickly, effeminate Hervey epitomizes the corruption of the Walpole administration; Cibber, crowned head of the kingdom of letters, was professionally incompetent;[4] and Methodism, in its emphasis on salvation through grace rather than works, on the individual rather than society, was yet another threat to the established social order. And it is into this pattern that the attack

[1] See note on title page.

[2] E.g. the numbers for 22 and 29 April, 3, 6, and 17 May 1740. Cibber is tried 'for the Murder of the *English* Language'.

[3] See John Puff's letter, *infra*, p. 319.

[4] So, as a biographer, was Conyers Middleton. In contriving excuses for the inexcusable actions of his subject he too was guilty of corrupting and discrediting language (Glenn W. Hatfield, *Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony*, 1968, p. 149).

on *Pamela* fits, together with the satire at the expense of a corrupt clergy embodied in the figures of Williams, and also the gullible Tickletext who, with fellow clergymen, has made it his 'Business . . . not only to cry [*Pamela*] up, but to preach it up likewise . . .' (p. 321).

For, invoking the familiar Augustan correlation of taste and morals,[1] Fielding would have interpreted the popularity of *Pamela* (especially with the clergy) as a significant comment on the degeneration of contemporary morality. Its readers could not, apparently, see that what *Pamela* explicitly proclaimed, through its subtitle *Virtue Rewarded* and the marriage of its heroine to a wealthy squire, was the reduction of the abstract ideal, Virtue (the sum of a man's corporeal and intellectual excellences), to the purely self-regarding, prudential, retention of virginity (the only 'virtue' that made sense to the burgeoning middle class at which Richardson's fiction was directed). This inevitably struck Fielding, as an upholder of and subscriber to the values of Christian humanism, as yet another pernicious instance of linguistic corruption—symptomatic of a far more profound corruption—comparable to the equivalent debasement of (among others) such words as 'greatness', 'honour', and 'prudence'.[2]

What Fielding does in *Shamela*, therefore, is to expose the contemporary (Richardsonian) notion of virtue as a sham (note that 'Virtue' itself isn't mentioned; instead, the orthographic corruption 'Vartue' renders it appropriately vulgar and thus mimes the corruption in meaning). And so the key words in *Shamela* are 'feign', 'act', and 'pretend' (especially the last). Moreover, like *Pamela*, *Shamela* begins with two 'puffs' (letters of self-recommendation masquerading as objective praise); and, as Hatfield has shown, this habit is another kind of imposition, another example of the abuse of language.[3] It is *Shamela*'s task

[1] Fielding himself wrote that 'There is a strict Analogy between the Taste and Morals of an Age; and Depravity in one always induces Depravity in the other' (Sarah Fielding, *Familiar Letters between the Principal Characters in David Simple*, 1747, Letter xl); and cf. the equation of 'true virtue' and 'true taste' in *Amelia*, IX. ix.

[2] The distinguishing of true from false prudence is, indeed, the major concern in *Tom Jones*; see, e.g., Hatfield, *op. cit.*, ch. v, and Battestin, 'Fielding's Definition of Wisdom: Some Functions of Ambiguity and Emblem in *Tom Jones*', *E.L.H., A Journal of English Literary History*, xxxv (1968), 188–217.

[3] Hatfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 82 ff.

once again to make the artifice in *Pamela* apparent.[1]

To understand Fielding, then, we must accept the Augustan view of the interdependence of society and language. When words lose their traditional significance, when they are corrupted or take on private meanings, then society ceases to cohere: *Shamela* is a warning to a society whose readiness to accept Pamela's professions at their face value showed it to be more preoccupied with appearance than reality, shadow than substance. Tickletext's progression, under the guidance of Oliver, from credulity and self-deception (at the beginning) to a knowledge of the 'true' Pamela which is also self-knowledge (at the end) is intended to mime the reader's—and, ultimately, society's—own similar progression.

But in exposing the inadequacy of Pamela's 'virtue', *Shamela* offers no explicit, constructive alternative of its own. It was just such an alternative that Fielding set out to provide in *Joseph Andrews*.

The key here lies in the stilted presentation of Joseph in the opening scenes of the novel; for it seems to me that Hatfield[2] is right to suggest that this fulfils a thematic function; that what Fielding is doing, through the figure of the virgin-Joseph who repudiates Lady Booby's advances with such verbal assurance (I. viii), is to establish at the beginning his own 'built-in' equivalent to Pamela. Joseph, in other words, is a comment on the passive and negative nature of Pamela's 'virtue'. The move to the comedy of the road is thus a deliberate strategy enabling Fielding to oppose passive 'virtue' with the more inclusive notion of an *active* virtue, the ultimate social ideal of charity to one's neighbour and the practical expression of what he called 'good-nature'.[3]

The concept of virtue as charity attests, as Battestin has shown,

[1] Though in fact none of the letters were Richardson's, most of them having been written by Aaron Hill.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 173 ff.

[3] 'Good-nature is that benevolent and amiable temper of mind, which disposes us to feel the misfortunes, and enjoy the happiness of others; and consequently pushes us on to promote the latter, and prevent the former; and that without any abstract contemplation on the beauty of virtue, and without the allurements or terrors of religion' (*An Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men*). For Fielding's definition of virtue as 'a certain relative Quality, which is always busying itself without Doors, and seems as much interested in pursuing the Good of others as its own', see *Tom Jones*, XV. i.

to Fielding's belief in the Pelagian doctrine of the latitudinarians that a man's salvation can be earned through good works.[1] He has also shown that the latitudinarian ideal of goodness is defined in sermons as comprising chastity with respect to the individual and charity with respect to society. These virtues are complementary, and often symbolized by the biblical Joseph (who resisted Potiphar's wife) and Abraham (the supreme example of faith perfected through works (James ii. 20–24)). Hence—comically deflated but with more than a little of their original dignity—the two heroes of Fielding's novel.

Less obtrusive allusions to Hercules, traditional exemplar of heroic virtue, reinforce the implications of the biblical echoes. Adams, for instance, possesses the 'Strength of a Wrist, which *Hercules* would not have been ashamed of' (I. xvii), and doubtless his crabstick alludes to the Herculean club.[2] Joseph's physical strength (I. ii, viii) and 'expert . . . Cudgel-playing' (I. xii), together with a reference in I. vii ('*Slipslop* . . . would not venture her Place for any *Adonis* or *Hercules* in the Universe . . .'), are, I think, sufficient to confirm him, too, as a Hercules figure. But additional (if oblique) support comes from the characterization of Didapper—Joseph's foil in Book IV—as 'not of the *Herculean* Race' (IV. vii): a notion developed by Adams in IV. xiv ('. . . if I had suspected him for a Man, I would have seized him had he been another *Hercules*, tho' indeed he seems rather to resemble *Hylas*').[3]

One final suggestion can perhaps be made in this respect: that in the case of Joseph Fielding may well have intended the Herculean allusions to point specifically to the Prodican fable of the 'Choice of Hercules' (recorded by Xenophon in his *Memorabilia*, II. i. 21–33), which narrates how the young Hercules, 'passing from boyhood to youth's estate', seats himself at a crossroads and is approached by two women, Vice (or Pleasure) and Virtue. The one offers him a life of easy luxury;

[1] M. C. Battestin, *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art: A Study of 'Joseph Andrews'* (1959), ch. ii.

[2] This doesn't exclude Battestin's suggestion that it could also be the pilgrim's staff (*ibid.*, p. 89).

[3] An interesting link is thus established between *Joseph Andrews* and *The Champion*, which Fielding edited from 1739 to mid-1741. The 'champion' after whom the periodical is named is Captain Hercules Vinegar, whose role of active champion of virtue closely anticipates those of Joseph and Adams.

the other, a life of virtuous but arduous activity. It is the latter that Hercules finally chooses.[1]

The 'Choice of Hercules' was extremely popular in the eighteenth century. Addison moralized on it in *The Tatler*, no. 97 (22 November 1709); Shaftesbury further popularized it in his *A Notion of the Historical Draught or Tablature of the Judgment of Hercules* (reprinted in the *Characteristicks*, a copy of which Fielding possessed); it provided the subject for one of Bach's secular cantatas,[2] for Handel's *Hercules* (1745), and was parodied by Hogarth and Reynolds.[3] The list is by no means exhaustive; and I have a feeling that *Joseph Andrews* should be added to it as a dramatized version of the fable in which the Herculean Joseph, on the point of manhood,[4] rejects Vice (in the figures of Lady Booby and her grotesque parody Slipslop) to pursue Virtue in the figure of the modest Fanny, who is herself shadowed (in a kind of Una-Duessa relationship) by Pamela when she appears in person in Book IV.

It is but a short step from the Hercules motif to *Joseph Andrews* as 'comic Epic-Poem in Prose'. Fielding's formula has provoked critical controversy too detailed to go into here;[5] and all I should like to suggest is that, as well as owing something to the tradition of biblical epic,[6] there is a possibility—hinted at by two earlier critics—that the journey of Adams and Joseph may be 'Odysseyan' in more than a vague, undefined, sense;[7] that it may, in fact,

[1] Quoted from Loeb edn., trans. E. C. Marchant (1923).

[2] *Die Wahl des Hercules*, composed for the birthday of Friedrich Christian, Crown Prince of Saxony, in 1733. See Anthony Blunt, 'God and Prince in Bach's Cantatas', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, ii (1938–39), 178–82, where reference will also be found to Hercules as 'saviour of virtue and victor over the vices'.

[3] Edgar Wind, '"Borrowed Attitudes" in Reynolds and Hogarth', *ibid.*, 182–85.

[4] 'Mr. *Joseph Andrews* was now in the one and twentieth Year of his Age' (I.vii i).

[5] Recent discussions include those by Homer Goldberg, 'Comic Prose Epic or Comic Romance: The Argument of the Preface to *Joseph Andrews*', *Philological Quarterly*, xliii (1964), 193–215, and Irène Simon, 'Early Theories of Prose Fiction: Congreve and Fielding', in *Imagined Worlds*, ed. Maynard Mack and Ian Gregor (1968), pp. 19–35.

[6] On which see Battestin, *The Moral Basis*, pp. 39–41. I develop the idea—showing how it could have been suggested by *Pamela*—in 'Symbolic Numbers in Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*' (in *Silent Poetry*, ed. Alastair Fowler, 1970).

[7] Ethel M. Thornbury, *Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic* (1931), p. 108, and John Butt, *Fielding* (1959 edn.), pp. 16–17, note that both works trace

conceal allusions to the Homeric epic which, in contrast to such brilliant mock heroics as the battle in III. vi, are intended to direct us in yet another—oblique—way to the novel's moral.

Adams's visit to the pig-keeping Trulliber in II. xiv, for example, offers a clear parallel to Odysseus's visit to the swineherd Eumaeus in *Odyssey* xiv (this had become a traditional exemplum of charity, and there is an obvious ironic disparity between Trulliber's hypocritical protestations of charity and the swineherd's charitable welcome of the ragged Odysseus).[1] Other less striking but still plausible echoes would include the scenes between Lady Booby and Joseph at the beginning, and Joseph's encounter with the robbers and stage-coach in I. xii. Thus, Lady Booby is in love with Joseph as Calypso is with Odysseus; she turns Joseph away, unwillingly, just as Calypso is forced (by a message from Zeus) to part unwillingly with Odysseus—except that unlike Lady Booby, who strips Joseph of his livery, Calypso provides Odysseus with food and clothing (and in the divergence, of course, lies the moral). As for the second instance, it seems that, in addition to the obvious glance at the Good Samaritan parable, we are meant to detect faint echoes of Odysseus's encounter with Nausicaa in *Odyssey* vi: Joseph is robbed, stripped (despite 'the Coldness of the Night'), and thrown into a ditch, where he remains unconscious until a stage-coach comes by; Odysseus arrives, naked and wretched, at Phaeacia (v. 450 ff.). He makes for himself a bed of fallen leaves—first lamenting over the coldness of the night—and sleeps until awakened by the playing of Nausicaa and her maidens who have driven to the spot in a waggon drawn by mules. Odysseus hides his nakedness with a branch, as Joseph is enabled (through the good nature of the postilion) to conceal his nakedness with a greatcoat. Nausicaa offers Odysseus hospitality; the stage-coach passengers are

the journey of a man to his homeland through hardships after incurring the wrath of a superior (Poseidon, Lady Booby). Butt also suggests a more exciting analogy between Venus's hatred of the prince in Fénelon's *Télémaque* because he rejects Pleasure for Virtue (Minerva), and Lady Booby's wrath against Joseph because he rejects her for Fanny (*ibid.*). The relevance of this to the 'Choice of Hercules' motif is clear; for it was traditional to see the opposition of Pleasure and Virtue in terms of a confrontation between Venus and Diana-Minerva.

[1] Douglas Brooks, 'Abraham Adams and Parson Trulliber: The Meaning of *Joseph Andrews*, Book II, chapter 14', *Modern Language Review*, lxiii (1968), 794–801.

eventually persuaded to act charitably towards Joseph, though solely from prudential motives.[1]

Such echoes, while obviously insufficient to establish the *Odyssey* as a sustained ironic commentary are, nevertheless, a good example of the characteristic neoclassical device of functional literary allusion: the *Odyssey* is used as a yardstick here as the *Aeneid* is in *The Dunciad*. But since the allusions in *Joseph Andrews* serve to redefine the Richardsonian notion of virtue (and also to filter *Pamela* through an inherited consciousness, so that we can assess it more sanely and objectively), it is appropriate to see just how far Fielding embodies Richardson's novel in his own.

The explicit echoes in Books I and IV mean that *Joseph Andrews* is seen literally to derive from *Pamela* and to end with it, so that the two alternative virtues (as embodied in Fanny and Pamela) can finally confront each other. The choice between them is the reader's, but if he has read the novel aright he chooses correctly. If *Pamela* is explicitly recalled in the first and last books, however, it is implicit in the journey which occupies the central books. The prolonged encounters here with various forms of vice are Fielding's version of Pamela's 'trial' or persecution by Mr. B. on his Lincolnshire estate: the justice of II. xi, Trulliber, the 'roasting' squire, and so on, are as it were objective menaces to be combated and overcome, the comic epic equivalent of Colbrand, Mrs. Jewkes, and the bull that frightens Pamela, all of whom, as Pamela describes them, become grotesque monsters, embodiments of her fears, the creations of her own overheated imagination.[2]

Nevertheless, *Joseph Andrews* also has a structure of its own, independent of literary allusion and deriving from a fairly complex series of internal parallels and echoes—the linking of Books

[1] It is also possible that Joseph's fight with Didapper and resistance to the others who try to prevent his marriage with Fanny are meant as non-ironic parallels to Odysseus's battle with the suitors (only after he has vanquished them can he go to bed with Penelope).

[2] Douglas Brooks, 'Richardson's *Pamela* and Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*', *Essays in Criticism*, xvii (1967), 158–68. On the relationship between the two novels see also R. A. Donovan, *The Shaping Vision* (1966), ch. iv, and Ronald Paulson, *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* (1967), ch. iii.

I and IV through such matters as the recapitulation of Lady Booby's passion for Joseph (I. v–x) in IV. i and the complementary dialogues in I. vii and IV. vi, for instance, and the even closer echoic relationship between Books II and III, clearly expressed through a similar (though more rigorous) system of parallels: in II. ii Adams comes 'to a large Water . . . filling the whole Road', and wades through it because he doesn't see the footpath; in III. ii Adams, with Joseph and Fanny, prepares to swim across a river, not considering that there might be a bridge nearby. II. ix (where Adams rescues Fanny from attempted rape) is answered by III. ix, in which Fanny, after a battle, is abducted; II. xii (the reunion of Fanny and Joseph at an inn) is matched by III. xii, their reunion at another inn, and so on.[1]

It is as a contribution to the novel's symmetry that the interpolated tales[2] are best approached (though they are also, and obviously, a means of broadening its moral perspective). '*The History of* Leonora' (II. iv, vi) parallels, and contrasts with, the main narrative concerning Joseph and Fanny (Joseph leaves Fanny to go to London, Horatio leaves Leonora to attend an assize court; Leonora's love for Bellarmine in Horatio's absence contrasts with Fanny's fidelity, etc.); Wilson's tale (III. iii) contrasts with Joseph's life of integrity, offers a convenient method of instructing Adams and the reader in various forms of vice and vanity, and in its movement from town to country epitomizes the similar symbolic and typically Augustan movement of the novel as a whole; the story of Leonard and Paul (IV. x), in which the problem posed is that of reconciling the sometimes conflicting demands of friendship and marriage, is relevant to the relationship between Joseph, and Adams and his wife. More subtly, '*The History of* Leonora' and '*The History of two Friends*' complement each other across the novel: the narrative in both is interrupted by a battle, and both derive from 'The Novel of the Curious Impertinent' in *I Don Quixote*, IV. vi–viii.

This last point is, of course, but an aspect of the 'Imitation

[1] For more detail, see Douglas Brooks, 'Symbolic Numbers in Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*'.

[2] See the articles by I. B. Cauthen, Jr., Goldberg, and Brooks cited in the Bibliography.

of . . . Cervantes' traceable in *Joseph Andrews*. Parallels have long been drawn between Adams and Don Quixote (the Don lives by an outmoded ideal; Adams lives by the outmoded ideal of Christianity, etc.); but the formal correspondences between the two works have been a more recent discovery,[1] and, together with the echoes of *inter alia* the *Odyssey*, *Pamela*, and the Bible, create layers of allusion which appear ultimately to work towards confirming the infinite variety of experience while simultaneously asking us to relate, to interpret, and to meditate on the essential *repetitiveness* of experience and the immutability of human nature. As Fielding himself declares (following Aristotle, *Poetics*, ix), 'I describe . . . not an Individual, but a Species. . . . The Lawyer is not only alive, but hath been so these 4000 Years . . .' (III. i). And this statement illuminates not only Fielding's use of allusion but his habit of stylized characterization as well, with its indebtedness to contemporary acting conventions and particularly the notion that certain gestures captured the essence of a certain passion (grief, joy, surprise, etc.); so that what the audience was presented with was not so much an *individual's* reaction to a given stimulus as with the *abstract idea* of a passion that would hold true for all men for all time. In *Joseph Andrews*, therefore, as in a play of the period, the characters are, especially at climactic moments (e.g. Joseph's grief in III. xi over the abduction of Fanny),[2] exhibiting their emotions through various prescribed signs authenticated by tradition.

The technique—which informs language as well as gesture—is alien, but its purpose is clear: to detach us from experience so that we can assess it objectively, to give us a sense of perspective by deliberately placing us within a universal context, as it were; which reminds us how fundamentally different the world of Fielding's novels is from that of Richardson's, where objectivity is lost and judgement suspended as we become involved in events which are essentially private and unique.

Finally, we can see that the balanced structuring of *Joseph Andrews*, too, has its part to play; for in tacitly inviting us again

[1] E.g. Battestin, *The Moral Basis*, p. 176 n., which offers the following list: *I Don Quixote*, III. ii, III. iii, III. v, IV. xv–xvi and Part II, chaps. xxxi ff. are echoed by *J.A.*, IV. xiv, I. xiii, III. ii, II. xii, and III. vii respectively.

[2] Other examples are pointed out in the notes.

to relate—book to book, episode to episode, and so on—it is, in a sense, directing us to the secret harmonies of the macrocosm, and the mysterious yet fundamental business of (to quote De Quincey's *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*) 'feeling . . . the secret analogies or parallelisms that connect . . . things else apparently remote . . .'.

D.B.-D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My greatest debt, which it is a pleasure to record here, is to Martin Battestin's edition of *Joseph Andrews* for the 'Wesleyan' Fielding (1967); I have also found J. Paul de Castro's edition of the novel (Scholartis Press, 1929) useful.

This edition of *Shamela* owes much to the work of C. B. Woods, Sheridan Baker, Ian Watt, and Martin Battestin.

I should, finally, like to thank Dr. E. T. Webb for his help with classical allusions.

NOTE ON THE TEXTS

THE TEXT of *Joseph Andrews* reproduced here is that established by Martin C. Battestin for the 'Wesleyan' Fielding. It is based on the first edition (22 February 1742), with the admission of substantive authorial changes from the second edition (10 June 1742) and occasional readings from later editions. A few editorial emendations have also been made. Since the interested reader may consult the full textual apparatus appended to the 'Wesleyan' text, the present edition contains no textual notes.

The present edition of *Shamela* is based on the copy of the first edition (4 April 1741) in the Harold Cohen Library, University of Liverpool, collated with the second edition (3 November 1741). These are the only authoritative editions since, apart from the pirated Dublin edition, the work was not reprinted until this century. Over half the second edition is a reimpression of the first, errors often going uncorrected. Substantive alterations are minor ('Honour', p. 319, l.5, becoming 'Favour'; '*Jervis*', p. 324, l.35, becoming '*Jewkes*', for example), and there are no substantive additions. Some of the emendations are undoubtedly Fielding's, and those that can reasonably be attributed to him have been incorporated into the present text; others just as certainly are not authorial, and these include what is the most noticeable feature of the second edition, the replacement of initial capitals by lower-case letters in such words as 'Time' (p. 318, l.8), and 'Doubt' (p. 321, l.7).