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INTRODUCTION

Critical investigation of Fielding has focused on the major novels, Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. In a study of Jonathan Wild, an encounter with the great man theme is unavoidable: everyone who knows Fielding knows that Jonathan Wild is the "great man." And studies of recent years have helped to show the value of the minor writings of Fielding for a broader understanding of his work. Most notably, Henry Knight Miller's commentary has treated at some length the extent of Fielding's concern with the problem of the great man in the Miscellanies. Yet, in comparison to the extent to which it underlies Fielding's works, this theme has received only inadequate attention. The predominant concern of critics with the major novels has been the major reason for this neglect, because in them the theme is not as obtrusive as in the minor works. A consideration, then, of Fielding's treatment of the great man throughout his works can help to reveal something of the continuity and development of his thought and method.

Fielding's concern with the theme is part of a general eighteenth century concern, rooted in classical thought and literature but shaped by the environment of the day. The first chapter, therefore, presents the background of the idea of the great man, especially in those works in which greatness is interpreted from the point of view of the moralist and those in which the relationship of the great man to society is explored. This distinction is made for convenience: it is based on differences in emphasis -- on the social or the moral aspects of the great man theme -- but it helps to point out the different trends of the
traditional background. Basic are the works in which the emphasis lies on the moral aspect of the theme; and a specifically Christian tradition in some of them provides a special branch of this category. For the second group, the works emphasizing the social aspects of the theme, there also arises a separate branch in which the political concern is predominant, centering in the eighteenth century around the person of Walpole. The second chapter deals with Fielding's first significant works, the plays which he produced until his work was cut off by the Licensing Act -- a measure provoked by the increasing intensity and political significance of the great man satire in them. In some of the plays the satire is especially extensive, but, even when apparently incidental, it still is evidence of the significance of the theme in Fielding's work. Because of my choice of a chronological arrangement, a discussion of Fielding's most detailed and systematic statements concerning greatness is delayed until chapter three; it is in Jonathan Wild and other works included in the Miscellanies that Fielding defines greatness as he uses the term in his other works: it becomes an inclusive term referring not only to the man in a position of authority but also to any vain man who imagines himself to be superior to others, who sees himself as possessing either the internal or external qualifications for greatness. In the Miscellanies, too, Fielding clarifies the relation of the term to such other important eighteenth century concepts as "the good man," "the hero," "vanity," and "ambition." The fourth chapter deals briefly with the satire of false greatness in Shamela, but primarily with the relation of greatness and goodness in the two great novels, Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. Finally,
in chapter five I show that though his most intensive presentation of the great man theme occurs in *Jonathan Wild*, Fielding's last novel, *Amelia*, may properly be seen as a culmination of his exploration of the problem which engaged him for more than thirty years.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION


2. The only survey of Fielding's treatment of the great man theme is in Kenneth William Keuffel's unpublished doctoral dissertation, *The "Great Man" in English Satire, 1710-1743* (University of Pennsylvania, 1959). Keuffel discusses only a few plays and the works of the *Miscellanies*; his chief concern is with Walpilian allusions.
CHAPTER ONE

THE BACKGROUND

Austin Dobson has established for the doubting that Fielding was a "genuine scholar," and his statement that the two most important sections of Fielding's library were the collections in law and classical literature was substantiated by Ethel Thornbury's publication of the catalogue of the library. ¹ Robert Wallace's emphasis on Fielding's interest in history and biography, a valuable corrective to Thornbury's concern with the influence of epic poets and critics, does not substantially alter the fact that the classics in general were known to Fielding, and loved and revered by him. ² The writing of some of his favorites explores the subject of the great man, and much of what appears in these writings forms a basis for the eighteenth century view, and in particular Fielding's moral view, of the great man.

Two of the ancients who are especially important for the formulation of the idea of the great man in the eighteenth century are Aristotle and Cicero, the writers Fielding cited not only as "two of the greatest authorities in all Antiquity," but also as "great men."³ Aristotle, in his consideration in the Nichomachean Ethics of the moral virtue that is mean between two vices, describes a goodness that he calls rare and noble.⁴ Especially significant for the eighteenth century view of the great man is Aristotle's discussion of ambition. Stating that the mean is proper pride, he assumes that some desire for honor
is good, but that a person who is excessively ambitious has an empty vanity, while the unambitious has undue humility. The relationship between vanity and ambition that was to become especially significant in Fielding's work is carefully considered: the vain man wishes greater honor than his merits deserve, though his claims may not exceed those of a person whose pride is appropriate to his merits. True pride is possible only in one of noble and good character. That this proud man is concerned with honor is justified by the greatness of his virtues, but, though he is pleased by being honored by good persons, he does not consider even this honor to be of highest importance. The question of ambition and proper pride came to be of major significance in the treatment of the problem of the great man, but the other moral virtues Aristotle describes as belonging to the magnanimous man -- his courage, temperance, liberality -- were also significant in the formulation of the picture of true greatness.

Cicero in De Officiis is more specifically concerned with greatness than is Aristotle. The first of the two characteristics he posits as basic to a brave and great soul, however, is similar to Aristotle's proper pride. The great man must have a contempt for outward circumstances and should strive for only that which is becoming and should be superior to the influence not only of other persons and of his own passion, but of calamities as well. The second requirement concerns action: the great man should risk even his life in great matters beneficial to others. In Cicero's discussion of justice in De Republica too the subject of the great man is discussed. As he
points out the discrepancy between utility and justice, Cicero shows that the conqueror is extolled for his virtue not only by the ignorant but also by philosophers, despite the injustice of his actions. Alexander is his example of the tyrant who gains his power unjustly; and the story is told of the encounter between Alexander and the pirate, who, when asked by what right he plundered, replies that it is the same as Alexander's for conquering the world.  

Seneca emphasizes the first of Cicero's requirements. In the Preface to Physical Science he defends his writing by comparing it to that of historians whose theme is the work, especially the ills, done by others. The greatest victory in life, he stresses, is to subdue oneself, to endure adversity with joy, to bear whatever happens as if it were the very event wished for. To try to grasp the universe in one's mind is thus greater than to have subdued nations. In this Preface Seneca then derides not only the writers who record the actions of conquerors, but also those (Philip and Alexander, or other conquerors who achieved fame by destroying mankind) who, rather than curing their own suffering, have prepared suffering for coming generations. Here is an early instance of the derision which in the eighteenth century was to be heaped on the "great man" who brought others suffering.  

This derision is also present in De Beneficiis, particularly in Seneca's relation of incidents concerning Alexander, who, with Caesar, was to become the symbol of the ruthless destroyer in Fielding's day. For instance, Seneca tells of the overwhelming pride which made Alexander glad to accept the citizenship of Corinth, feeling he was following the path of Hercules, the only previous recipient of the honor. Seneca's comment is
that Alexander did not know the true nature of glory, for he failed to distinguish between popular approbation and merit. Seneca points out too that Hercules, in contrast to the plunderer Alexander, conquered not for himself but only to defend the good. 10 Alexander is again cited in Seneca’s discussion of the pleasure worthy of a hero that is given by freedom from anxiety. The conquerer is not wise, he says, for the truly great man has all things: unlike Alexander, who always continued to need more kingdoms than he seized, he has all and covets nothing. 11 We see in Seneca’s work too an early concern with size as a measurement of greatness. In a passage that sounds prophetic of the sermons of the seventeenth century, Seneca warns of the fickleness of fortune in determining not only private life but also the rule of sovereigns. Saying that some kingdoms are chosen to be raised and some to be destroyed, Seneca points out that some are dashed down from their pinnacles. The sight is great, he continues, only because the observers are small -- the standard is based on our own smallness. 12

In the work of the historians, derided by Seneca, there is however a similar moral note. Sallust in his consideration of the Rome of Cato and Caesar clearly outlines the distinction between true and false greatness which was to become commonplace in the eighteenth century, as he points out the difference in methods used by the noble and the base in achieving honor and praise. Thus in the comparison between Julius Caesar and Cato it is Cato, the man without ambition, who is upheld as the greater. 13 Sallust relates both Caesar’s speech recommending leniency toward the conspirators and Cato’s recommending death.
(Cato's concern with the loss of the true meaning of words, though he does not specifically mention greatness, foreshadows the eighteenth century's concern with the loss of meaning of words—a concern evident in the ironic use of the term great man and especially in Fielding's ironic definitions in the Covent-Garden Journal. Cato points out that greatness was achieved in Rome not by arms but by other qualities which have in his day been replaced by ambition as the distinction between good and bad has been lost. Private vices have thus become dangerous to the republic.) Sallust reflects on the characters of the two men whose speeches he records, both of whom he considers to be worthy of merit. Stressing the good nature of Caesar and the uprightness of Cato, his portrayal comes to be commonplace in the picture later to be held of the ambitious Caesar and virtuous Cato. This view of Caesar is, for example, given by Suetonius, who, though he praises Caesar's mercy against both the neutrals and Pompey's men in the civil war, agrees that the conspiracy against him was justified by Caesar's abuse of his power, and in particular by his acceptance of honors too great for a mere man.

A moral point of view is given also by Plutarch, Fielding's favorite historian, who reached the high point of his fame in the eighteenth century. The portraits of Lycurgus, Aristides, and Cato show Plutarch's attitude toward the role of virtue in the character of great men to be similar to that of Sallust in the comparison of Cato and Caesar. Lycurgus is praised because he thinks the happiness of a kingdom, as of man, depends on the virtue and love of the inhabitants rather than on its power over other cities; and Aristides and Cato are praised because they rose to power solely through their virtue and industry. On the other hand, Konrat
Ziegler's comment regarding in particular the eighteenth century French interpretation of the popular historian indicates the nature of the appeal of his works: "Wie man wohl die verschiedensten Richtungen ihre Meinungen und Bestreben mit Worten der Bibel oder Goethes belegen sieht, so bietet auch das umfassende Werk Plutarchs ein Reservoir, aus dem sehr verschiedene Geister und Zeiten das ihnen Zusagende schöpfen." 18 Evidence for Ziegler's comment is found in the works of James Thomson, in particular in Winter, as the philosopher, "Rous'd at th' inspiring Thought" of conversing with the dead, throws aside "The long-liv'd volume," evidently Plutarch's Lives, and and observes the "Mighty Dead" passing before him. Thomson's list of the Greek heroes includes ten portrayed by Plutarch, and the selection reveals the prevalent attitude toward the great man: Alexander is not included, but Lycurgus and Aristides are; and the list begins with an addition not in Plutarch: Socrates, who had become established as a type of truly great man as opposed to the conqueror. Of the Romans, Cato and Brutus, but not Caesar, are included. 19

Though Plutarch does not go so far as to deny greatness to the men who were to be cited as examples of false greatness, his portraits, his search into the secret Recesses and Images of the Soul" and his "Discoveries of Virtue and Vice in Men" 20 serve as a basis for comment by many later writers who preferred to forget that Alexander could stand as a representative of one who had a clear conscience as well as of misguided ambition. Plutarch, who draws no black or white portraits, does comment on true and false greatness as he states in the Comparison of Caesar with Alexander that "We often find in the greatest Men a Mixture of Grandeur and Meaness at which Those who do not well consider the
Infirmary of human Nature would be astonished.' He notes that Alexander, misled by Achilles' valor, chose to imitate him "without distinguishing what was truly Great, and what was barbarous and brutal in his Character." Alexander was not great in his imitative barbarous murder of the men, women, and children of the Cusseans. Nor was he great in his creation of false appearances in, for instance, his exceptionally large weapons and heavy bridles. Caesar, in contrast, is praised for his lack of such vanity and barbarous excesses, though Plutarch admits that Caesar committed some cruel actions against his conquered enemies. Still, Plutarch points out instances of the humanity of the two, and in the final consideration of their ambition does not judge adversely. And it is largely in courage rather than goodness that Alexander wins over Caesar: "In all the Performances of Caesar we see the Great Man, but still it is Man; there is nothing in them above the reach of human Power. Whereas in the great actions performed by Alexander, one can distinguish as it were some Rays of Divinity... Caesar claims our Esteem, but Alexander seizes our Admiration." Yet Plutarch leaves the reader to judge in which of the two can be found the "most perfect and essential greatness." 21

Plutarch's contribution to the development of the idea of the great man lies in his stress on the essentially human, many-sided character of the great man, and it is his method of portrayal, rather than specific moral judgments, that made his portraits of the prominent men of antiquity live for the eighteenth century reader. Thus many of the incidents that he records, leaving "their more shining Actions and Achievements to be treated of by Others," 22 are related later with a significance he does not specify. Alexander's questioning the messenger whether Homer
has come to life again, 23 his weeping that he has not conquered one of an infinite number of worlds, 24 his encounter with Diogenes; 25 Caesar's comment that he would prefer being the first man in a barbarian village to being the second man in Rome and weeping that he had not done anything memorable at the same age at which Alexander had conquered many nations 26 all are recorded by Plutarch without the condemnation of ambition that is added by later writers.

While the historians and moralists considered the question of the nature of greatness, the satirist ridiculed those who wished to achieve it without the necessary qualifications. Juvenal's tenth satire, on the folly of man's wishes, includes a section on man's desire to gain honors. Dryden renders the judgment in terms that were to become commonplace in the eighteenth century discussions of greatness: "So many would be Great, so few be Good." 27 Continuing with an implicit moral judgment as he comments on the destruction to mankind that has resulted from man's desire to be great, Juvenal cites Hannibal and Alexander as examples of men who possessed unbounded ambition.

In Lucian the satire primarily takes the form of revelation of the true character of those who claim to be great. The method is that of stripping them of what Lucian calls the encumbrances put on for the show on earth. In the Ferry-Boat, for instance, the cobbler who asks to be let aboard Charon's boat gives an account of a great man who, as soon as he was stripped of his luxuries in death, was seen to be merely ridiculous. 28 The satiric narrator of Menippus relates that those criminals who were proud because of their riches and power were judged especially severely by Minos. 29 In the Dialogues of the Dead, No. XXIV,
Mausolus, proud of his power and conquest as well as his appearance, is shown by Diogenes to be only the greatest of slaves. In the tenth Dialogue, too, among those stripped of their possessions and qualities are a rich man, a prince, a general—and a philosopher, who is stripped of his clothes, arrogance and hair. Lucian is concerned not only with those who hold political or military power, but with any claimants to greatness; by showing them without their outward signs of greatness, he makes a moral judgment.

To go from Lucian to Milton is admittedly a long jump; perhaps, though, the omission of centuries can be justified by the statement that in the moral consideration of greatness, it is largely the classical and the Christian traditions that influenced Fielding. Even without recent demonstrations which have shown the influence of the writings of churchmen on Fielding's thought, the sermon volumes in Fielding's library and his specific references to sermons would be a sign of their importance. Milton's significance for Fielding is perhaps less directly important (though it seems, on the whole, to have been too generally ignored). His portrayal of the archetypal falsely great man and truly great man can hardly be dismissed, however, for in *Paradise Lost* there is a clear statement of the Christian attitude toward greatness. And Milton too is concerned with exposing false greatness. Satan, as Fielding was later to comment, "appears to be the bravest spirit in the universe" in Milton's poem; he is the creature guided in his attempts at conquest by his pride, and the conqueror who brings misery rather than happiness to his subjects and is not himself contented by his exploits. And when Satan achieves power on earth the disharmony he
brings with him includes the possibility that false greatness will be admired.

Michael, showing Adam the panorama of the future, replies to his question concerning those who "deal Death/ Inhumanly to men, and multiply / Ten thousand fold the sin of him who slew / His Brother" (XI, 676-679) that in the future

Might only will be admir'd,
And Valor and Heroic Virtue call'd;
To overcome in Battle, and subdue
Nations, and bring home spoils with infinite
Man-slaughter, shall be held the highest pitch
Of human Glory, and for Glory done
Of triumph, to be styl'd great Conquerors,
Patrons of Mankind, Gods, and Sons of Gods,
Destroyers rightlier call'd and Plagues of men.
(XI, 689-697)

This view is sustained In Paradise Regained, Book III, as Christ rejects Satan's temptation of glory. In this temptation Satan again reveals his false conception of greatness by comparing Christ's fame to that of military conquerors at his age: Alexander, Scipio, Pompey, and "Great Julius," who "wept that he had liv'd so long / Inglorious."33 True glory, Christ replies, is gained only of God by the just man; on earth, "glory is false Glory." Christ continues in terms similar to Michael's as he shows the fallacy of considering conquest glorious. He goes on to state how true glory may be obtained: by peaceful deeds, wisdom, patience, temperance; he cites Job and Socrates as examples of those who became famous for these qualities. Though Milton is presenting a picture of false greatness in Satan and though he rejects especially in the opening of Book IX of Paradise Lost the heroism of the classical epic with its military hero and warlike subject, he considers his poem to have a heroic argument concerning "the better fortitude / Of Patience and Heroic Martyrdom /
Unsung" (IX, 31-32). Thus Adam is the hero of the epic, the great man whose patience and heroic martyrdom are developed, as George Williamson points out, by his response to the consequence of the fall. Yet, though Adam becomes great through his endurance of suffering, there is in the background throughout the poem the "Greater Man" who will "Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat." 35

In the sermons with which Fielding was familiar there is a further concern with the Christian dichotomy dramatized by Milton between the falsely great and the truly great. 36 Archbishop Tillotson in the "Thanksgiving Sermon for the late Victory at Sea preached before the King and Queen at Whitehall, October 27, 1662" preaches on the text of Jeremiah IX:23, 24, in which man is directed to glory not in his own wisdom, might, or riches, but rather in knowing God. Gloriing in one's own accomplishments is foolish, according to Tillotson, and Lucifer's attempt to match God's "Power and Greatness" is cited as proof of the fruitlessness of the attempts of man to become great. Rather one should attempt to understand God, for without becoming like him in goodness "there can be no true Majesty and Greatness, so neither any true Felicity and Blessedness." Finally, then, Tillotson cites examples of true and false greatness in modern Europe. One (Louis XIV) dazzles the world with splendor and greatness, but failing to know God's supremacy, is a cruel tyrant; in contrast, the other (William III), knowing God to be Lord, attempts to imitate God's perfections and does not, like the first, glory in his own greatness. 37
Isaac Barrow in a sermon entitled "The Reward of Honouring God" is concerned with a similar subject: our duty to honor God, and his reward as he honors us. Though Barrow, unlike Tillotson, takes into consideration man's innate and virtuous wish for honor, his conclusion is similar: virtue and pity, along with esteem for God, result in true greatness; thus the "heroical activity" of the apostles makes them superior to "those Hectors in Chivalry, those Conquerours andachievers of mighty exploits (those Alexanders and Caesars) who have been renowned for doing things which seemed great, rather than for performing what was truly good." In another sermon, "No Respect of Persons with God," Barrow stresses God's impartiality in his judgment of man, and, showing that all men are equally removed from God, states God's preference for goodness alone. The same law, he stresses, exists for "Princes and great Men" as for "Peasants and mean Artisans." The only distinction he allows is that if there is any difference, great men should live especially strictly in accord with God's laws because of God's special bounty toward them. Pointing to the final judgment, he stresses that a man's rank on earth will be held in no regard, that "spurious glory" will be of no worth; instead, the greatest glory which man can achieve will be granted to those who are adopted into the royal family of heaven. By implication, those who have kept God's laws will be the great. 

In the sermons of Robert South, too, there is much concern with greatness. In the "Sermon Preached at Christ Church...October 17, 1675," on
the subject of ingratitude, he mentions that frequently those who are ungrateful are also proud and ambitious. Satan himself is South's first example, and Adam and Eve follow. South continues by making an analogy with political action, saying that it is usual to see those who have been raised by the "favour and interest of some great Minister, to trample upon the steps by which they rose, to rival him in his greatness" and to try to achieve his place. As in Milton, there is the suggestion that the devil is the prototype of all the falsely great. In the "Sermon Preached at Westminster-Abbey, April 10, 1676," on the text, "For the Wisdom of this World, is Foolishness with God," South shows clearly that he equates this wisdom with what the world considers greatness: "And surely the bare remembrance that a man was formerly Rich or Great, cannot make him at all happier there, where an Infinite Happiness, or an Infinite Misery shall equally swallow up the sense of these poor Felicities." And he goes on to show that worldly greatness cannot make a man happy, citing Alexander's wish for more worlds to conquer as typical of man's attitude of dissatisfaction with his earthly lot. As conclusive evidence for his text South again uses the example of Satan -- Satan who climbed so high through his ambition that he fell: "And has not our own experience sufficiently Commented upon the Text, when we have seen some by the very same ways by which they had designed to rise uncontrollably, and to clear off all obstructions before their ambition, to have directly procured their utter downfall, and to have broke their necks from that very Ladder, by which they had thought to have climbed as high as their Father Lucifer; and
there from the top of all their greatness to have looked down with scorn
upon all below them. 41 And, in another sermon, South shows the fallaciousnes
of the normal understanding of the methods of God, who is shown to control
"great Things and Persons" so that instead of climbing gradually until they
become greatest, they may fly "to the Top and Height of all Greatness and
Power." Worldly greatness is only illusory; it is always controlled by God,
and "all the great things of the world" are achieved not through merit but by
chance. 42

The Christian point of view toward the great man was explored in
detail in 1701 by Richard Steele in The Christian Hero, the subtitle of
which, "Or, No Principles but those of Religion Sufficient To Make A Great
Man," declares the thesis developed in the work. Steele is concerned that
man more readily forms himself on the basis of morality than of religion,
that he is eager to imitate the Roman way but merely voices approval of the
Christian path. Essentially his question is why the heathen is considered
more heroic than the Christian, "Why it is that the Heathen struts, and the
Christian sneaks in our Imagination . . . ." If Christianity raises rather
than lowers our minds, he suggests, those who have portrayed only heathens
"have robb'd their Pens of Characters the most truly Gallant and Heroic that
ever appear'd to Mankind." 43 The appearance of ambition, "a monstrous
Excrescence of the Mind," is seen as a result of the fall, after which life
becomes an art. 44 Even the apostles at first wished only for worldly great-
ness -- "Power, Preferment, Riches, and Pomp"; and Peter, "who it seems
ever since he left his Net and his Skiff, dreamt of nothing but being a great Man, " was reprimanded for striving for the glory of man rather than of God. But true greatness appears at the "Great King’s Accession to the Throne," at which "Men were not Ennobled but say’d." The greatness that man can achieve thus comes from meekness, the "Heroic Virtue" that allows a "Poor Hero" to suffer poverty and deserve a greater prize than the favorites of fortune, for it is based on a "great, not a groveling idea of things" that sees the littleness of the place of man in the universe. Similarly, almost twenty years later, Steele makes a defense of Socrates as a great man on the basis that he was willing to endure suffering — that he was, in Steele's words, "the first Martyr for the true God." "Every Instance of Fortitude... in the Cause of Truth, or support of Justice, has, in a degree, a Tincture of that Virtue which this noble Philosopher exerted in Vindication and Assertion of him from whom all things flow that are truly great and praiseworthy."

Steele next states the relation of great and low in this world in a manner reminiscent of Tillotson: "... if Men would sincerely understand that they are but Creatures, all the distinction of Great and Little, High and Low, would easily be swallowed up in the Contemplation of the Hopes we entertain in the Place we shall have in his Mercy, who is the Author of all things." Considering the motives of the ordinary World, as well as of "Captains, Heroes, Worthies, Lawgivers, and Saints," Steele arrives at the conclusion that "True Greatness of Mind" can be maintained only on the basis of Christian principles.
In particular, he points out that these principles are especially well suited to the motives of those who achieve worldly greatness, to "an enlarg'd Love and Ambition to serve the World," for the outward circumstances of this greatness are so oppressive that a man must have inward strength to be happy in the position: that is, honor and glory are not enough to sustain him, "for the repeated Pomp and Pageantry of Greatness must needs become in time, either Languid in the Satisfactions they give, or turn the Heads of the Powerful, so that 'tis absolutely necessary that he should have something of more inward and deep regard, to keep his condition from being an Oppression, either to himself or others." 49 Steele is in agreement with the moralists who declared that fame is not sufficient reward for the great man, that he must be content in his life, yet his basis as he contrasts man's littleness to true grandeur is specifically Christian.

In the conclusion of Steele's discussion of the Christian Hero, his theme becomes partly political in nature, as the falsely great (and by implication, un-Christian) tyrannical ruler is contrasted with the benevolent ruler, the portraits suggesting Louis XIV and William III, the two rulers Tillotson also had compared. 50 A similar contrast, made on the basis of Christian principles, appears in the same year in Rowe's Tamerlane, in which the falsely great Bajazet is contrasted with the benevolent Tamerlane -- again Louis XIV and William III.

Although Steele presents a Christian attitude in much of his writing, his interpretation of greatness is not consistently based on specifically Christian principles.
In particular, in a letter on the subject "Greatness Among the Moderns," addressed early in the century simply to "my Lord," he makes a clear distinction between true and false greatness, or the ancient and modern conceptions of greatness. The ancient conception is essentially Cicero's. Steele refers to the two characteristics "my author" requires of a great mind: the private "contempt of Exterior Considerations" and a willingness to serve the public, "when a man who is master of His Temper, as thus describ'd, enters upon Publick business with a design of serving His Country in the most important and difficult affairs, with the prospect before Him, of undergoing the greatest Toils and hazard of all that makes life agreeable to ordinary men, nay with danger to life itself." In contrast Steele describes modern greatness, which considers the public only secondarily, if at all. This greatness he discusses according to three categories: personal (characterized by self-love), domestic ("the endavour to make our Own the first of the Children of Men"), and genealogical (providing for and preferring relations). The distinction between true and false greatness reappears in similar form in a letter of June 4, 1713, to the Earl of Oxford, whom Steele addresses in the following manner: "If incidents should arise that should place your own safety, and (what Ambitious Men call) Greatness, in a ballance against public Good, our All depends upon Your Choice under such a Temptation." The concern with ambition is obvious in Steele's periodicals, too. In the Tatlers, Nos. 5 and 6, he is concerned with general characteristics of greatness. In the Spectator, No. 39, he examines the ways that men achieve glory, comparing Louis XIV
unfavorably with Peter the Great, who had concern for his people. The Spectator, No. 172, again recalls Cicero's statements as Steele considers the honor that people gain through the possession of abilities rather than the use of them:

"But those men are truly great, who place their ambition rather in acquiring to themselves the conscience of worthy enterprises, than in the prospect of glory which attends them." In The Englishman, too, Steele defines ambition as "the Desire of Preheminence [sic] without Regard to the Means, whether just or unjust," and cites Louis XIV, a "great Person," as an example of unjust ambition. In Steele's consideration of the moral problem of greatness he makes a correlation between highwaymen and "greater Criminals" which will later be developed by satirists; the correlation had been made earlier, but the ironic statement that criminals are great men is not so common; referring to Alexander Smith's The History of the Lives of the most noted Highwaymen, he states that "There is a Satisfaction to Curiosity in knowing the Adventures of the meanest of Mankind; and all that I can say is, that I have more respect for them than for greater Criminals, who are described with praise by more eminent Writers."52

Other English writers condemned the great man on moral grounds: Swift, whose satire was to be specifically political in Gulliver's Travels, had already made an implicit moral judgment on conquerors in the Tale of a Tub as he ironically discussed the vapor the world calls madness: "without its Help, the World would . . . be deprived of those two great Blessings, Conquests and Systems . . ." He thus continues by placing Alexander in a category of madmen
with Jack of Leyden, the anabaptist leader, and Descartes. Gay in some of his Fables, too, though he is primarily concerned with political affairs, considers the moral basis of greatness. In II, xi, "to a Young Nobleman," he describes the noble ancestors of the young prince, but concludes "Let virtue prove you greatly born." The fable, then, concerns a packhorse which is reproved by a carrier for claiming greatness on the basis of his noble ancestors. The contrast of true and false greatness is further explored in I, xvii, as the dog who attempts to keep the wolf from stealing sheep states "Great souls with generous pity/Melt which coward tyrants never felt." The wolf in justification replies that the dog should address his "tyrant lord," for "Ten thousands are devoured by men." And in two fables (I, xxxi, "A Universal Apparition" and I, xxxix, "The Father and Jupiter"), the moral is that the greatness gained by ambition brings only misery; the advice, that one should seek virtue rather than greatness.

The moral concern with the problem of greatness was so extensive that, as Aurélien Digeon has pointed out, Voltaire wrote a preface to the 1732 English edition of his history of Charles XII to justify his work. The "Discourse" contains the familiar contrast between the true greatness, as embodied in those "Princes . . . whose actions have benefitted mankind" and the falsely great, the "bad Princes." Voltaire continues:

Conquerors are a species between good Kings and Tyrants, but partake most of the latter, and have a glaring reputation. We are eager to know the most minute circumstances of their lives. Such is the miserable weakness of mankind, that they look with admiration upon persons glorious for mischief, and are better pleased to be talking of the destroyer than the founder of an Empire.
Yet Voltaire's claim that he wrote the history from a desire to benefit princes by revealing the "vanity of being a conqueror" was not proof against attack, and the Grub-Street Journal responded with a discussion of the conqueror in which Voltaire's classification of Louis XIV among the truly great was questioned. The article begins in the following manner:

Ambition and Avarice are the most predominant of human Passions. The first, as it implies an unbounded Desire of Conquest, is a barbarous and savage Principle; but true Ambition, is a rational Love of our Fellow Creatures. Narrow Souls are astonished at the false Greatness of Alexander, for weeping when he read the mighty Actions of Achilles, and at that of Caesar, when he wept at the Victories of Alexander. These were no better than powerful Robbers and base Invaders of the Rights and Liberties of Mankind; yet their names are venerated, when a Brutus shall be condemned for Breach of Friendship to a Tyrant; a Pelopidas forgotten, who restored the Liberties of his Country; and when a Lewis shall be called Great for a magnanimous Conspiracy against the Freedom of the Christian World.

The Mohametans have a Maxim that Success gives a heavenly Sanction to all Actions . . . Thus the same Species of Villainy which gains one a Crown, would hang another. The Life of Charles XII of Sweden, as written by Voltaire is a Series of Impedence and Temerity, Revenge and Folly. His Behavior at Bender shows him fitter for Bedlam than to govern a Nation. 58

The moral aspect of greatness is more fully explored in Pope's Essay on Man, the opening lines of which already indicate the importance of this subject:

Awake, my St. John! Leave all meaner things
To low Ambition, and the pride of Kings
Let us (since Life can little more supply
Than just to look about us and to die)
Expatriate free o'er all this scene of Man;
A mighty maze! but not without a plan . . . . . . (lines 1-6) 59

In the disavowal of ambition which leads to greatness, Pope, in a manner reminiscent of Seneca's attitude toward conquerors and their historians, 60
introduces his subject, man, and man's place in the universe. The philosophic
basis on which he considers deviations from the order of the universe is stated
in lines 267-280, in which he describes all as part of a perfect whole in which
there is, to God, "no high, no low, no great, no small." It is then man's error
that he is proud, that "All quit their sphere, and rush into the skies"
(II, 123-124), and the "fierce Ambition in a Caesar's mind" (I. 159) is one
instance of man's unwillingness to accept his place. It is in Epistle IV that
Pope gives his commentary on the nature of true greatness, citing both Alexander
and Charles XII as instances of villains who are called great and Socrates as a
truly great man, one who can be content in his own virtue:

    Look next on Greatness; say where Greatness lies?
    "Where, but among the Heroes and the Wise?"
    Heroes are much the same, the point's agreed,
    From Macedonia's madman to the Swede;
    The whole strange purpose of their lives, to find
    Or make, an enemy of all mankind!
    Not one looks backward, onward still he goes
    Yet ne'er looks forward farther than his nose.
    No less alike the Politic and Wise,
    All sly slow things, with circumspective eyes:
    Men in their loose unguarded hours they take,
    Not that themselves are wise, but other weak.
    But grant that those can conquer, these can cheat,
    'Tis phrase absurd to call a Villain Great:
    Who wickedly is wise, or madly brave,
    Is but the more a fool, the more a knave.
    Who noble ends by noble means obtains,
    Or failing, smiles in exile or in chains,
    Like good Aurelius let him reign, or bleed
    Like Socrates, that Man is great indeed.

    (217-236)

In other works of the approximate date of the Essay on Man there appears
a Christian attitude much like Steele's. In drama, George Lillo's Christian
Hero in 1735 contrasts the tyrannical conqueror Amurath with the Christian Scanderbeg. In the "Brief Account of the Life and Character of Scanderbeg inscribed to the Readers of the Christian Hero," Lillo states that "his actions are as wonderful, and his character as perfect and exalted, as any of the ancient heroes of Greece and Rome." And the concluding description of the hero establishes the moral basis which could form a statement as well of the character of the ancient heroes: "He had no ambition, no avarice, no luxurious appetite to gratify: he fought not for power but liberty: he spoiled his enemies to humble them, and to subsist his own people, not to enrich himself." In the play, accordingly, the discontent of the ambitious conqueror Amurath is contrasted with the content of Scanderbeg. And Scanderbeg himself makes the familiar contrast between "godlike Brutus" and "Caesar and his temporary Chain" to continue with a discourse on ambition (IV. iv). 62 But the specifically Christian basis of his own actions has already been stated in an earlier speech about the base ambition which wishes "the shadow" rather than "substantial glory." Scanderbeg continues:

The name of prince, of conqueror and king,  
Are gifts of fortune and of little worth,  
They may be, and too often are, possesst  
By sordid souls, who know no joy, but wealth;  
By riotous fools, or tyrants drench'd in blood;  
A Croesus, Alexander, or a Nero.  
The best are sure the greatest of mankind.  
Our actions from our characters. Let me  
Approve myself a Christian and a soldier,  
And flattery cannot add, or envy take  
Ought that I wish to have, or fear to lose. 63  
(II. 1)
The continued interest in the Christian hero is perhaps most dramatically shown in the fact that the *Gentleman's Magazine* in the year of Lillo's play advertised a contest with prizes for the best poems entitled *The Christian Hero*. Eight of the twenty-four poems entered were published in 1736; the contest closed with the publication of a poem not entered in the contest but entitled "Cranmer. The Christian Hero."  

In the Christian tradition one must name too Samuel Richardson; that Fielding thoroughly disapproved of *Pamela* is clear from Shamela and Joseph Andrews, but he praises Clarissa highly in a letter to Richardson, and he recommends the book in two issues of the *Jacobite's Journal*. Richardson's place in the Christian tradition is evident from his own words about the heroine of Clarissa, written in the Preface to Grandison: "The Heroine ... as a truly Christian Heroine, proves superior to her Trials; and her Heart, always excellent, refined and exalted by every one of them, rejoices in the Approach of a happy Eternity." But not only is Clarissa truly great; set against her is Lovelace, who is identified with the falsely great. It is, in fact, by his own association of himself with the heroes who had already traditionally been classified as falsely great that he characterizes himself. Thus, Anna Howe relates to Clarissa what she has heard of Lovelace: that he had compared himself to Caesar, who performed great actions by day and wrote them down by night, and "valued himself that he only wanted Caesar's out-setting to make a figure among his contemporaries." And Lovelace in a letter to Belford compares himself to Caesar, saying that "Caesar was not a prouder man than
Lovelace."68 (Lovelace refers to his expectation of perfection in women, recalling the incident in which Caesar repudiated his wife merely for being in Clodius' company.) A comparison is made to Hannibal, too, as Lovelace reflects on his own desire for revenge against the Harlowes:

Every man to his genius and constitution, Hannibal was called The Father of warlike stratagems. Had Hannibal been a private man, and turned his plotting head against the other sex; or had I been a general, and turned mine against such of my fellow-creatures of my own, as I thought myself entitled to consider as my enemies, because they were born and lived in a different climate; Hannibal would have done less mischief; Lovelace more. That would have been the difference.

Not a sovereign on earth, if he be not a good man, and if he be of a warlike temper, but must do a thousand times more mischief than I. And why? Because he has it in his power to do more.69

Here the contrast between the good and the falsely great is clearly stated.

Finally, the continuing interest in greatness is evident in a work of the mid-century, Samuel Johnson's Imitation of Juvenal's tenth satire (1749).70 Like Juvenal's, the whole poem deals with man's ambition, but specific passages reveal the continuing modern concern with false greatness. The common statement of man's vain wish to achieve greatness is made:

Unnumber'd suppliants crowd Preferment's gate,
A thirst for wealth, and burning to be great;
Delusive Fortune hears the incessant call,
They mount, they shine, evaporate, and fall.

(73-76)

The poem is modernized as Johnson gives instances of those whose wish for power could not be satisfied, and he includes (in place of Juvenal's lines on Hannibal) the famous reference to the modern falsely great conqueror, Charles:
"He left a name, at which the world grew pale, /To point a moral, or adorn a tale" (ll. 221-222). But his citation of the falsely great is on a specifically religious basis: for his conclusion is that love, patience and faith can be gained by man— that these are not vain wishes but that man can achieve happiness through these. Here one can see the result as an ancient attitude is adapted to the Christian point of view toward the great man. 71

While the moralists were concerned largely with the qualities necessary for greatness, other writers concentrated on a consideration of the great in their relation to society. This treatment of the theme of greatness, the province largely but not exclusively of the satirists, also had its origin in the writing of the ancients. Juvenal's first satire, on his reasons for the writing of satire, shows his interest in the relationship of the great man and the lowly. Dryden's translation is as follows:

The Great man, home conducted, shuts his door;  
Old Clients, wary'd out with fruitless care,  
Dismiss their hopes of eating, and despair.  
Though much against the grain, forc'd to retire,  
Buy Roots for Supper, and provide a Fire.  
Mean time his Lordship lolls within at ease . . . .
(199-204)

Dryden notes too in the Argument that Juvenal "not only gives a fair warning to Great Men, that their Memory lies at the mercy of future Poets and Historians, but also with a finer stroke of his Pen, brands e'en the living, and personates them under dead men's Names." 72 In Juvenal's thirteenth satire, as he addresses a defrauded friend, he makes a statement concerning the relation of great and poor in society, a statement that was to become commonplace in the
eighteenth century: that the fates of criminals differ, that for the same action one may be crucified, another crowned. Juvenal's emphasis, it is true, is on the punishment meted out by the gods, but the social implication is present. Already in John Oldham's seventeenth century adaptation of the satire we see two lines in Juvenal expanded to five with emphasis on the importance of rank in judgment, though the moral basis is still clearly evident:

Besides, for the same fact, we've often known
One mount the cart, another mount the throne;
And foulest deeds, attended with success,
No longer are reputed wickedness,
Disguised with virtue's livery and dress. 73

But Chaucer had already treated, with emphasis on the social rather than the moral question, the distinction between the crimes of the little and the great.
The Manciple, defending his use of lemmans to refer to the lover of Phebus' wife, points out that the distinction between the words lemmans and lady depends on rank rather than on behavior. He continues by pointing out the essential similarity between the thief and such a tyrant as Alexander:

Right so bitwixe a titlelees tiraunt
And an outlaw or a theef erraunt,
The same I seye, ther is no difference.
To Alisaunder was toold this sentence,
That, for the tirant is of gretter myght,
By force of meynee, for to slee[n] downright,
And brennen hous and hoom, and make al playn,
Lo, therfore is he cleped a capitayn;
And for the outlawe hath but smal meynee
And may not doon so greet an harm as he,
No brynge a contree to so greet mescheef,
Men clepen hym an outlawe or a theef. 74

(223–234)
F. W. Chandler in *Romances of Roguery* points out concerning these lines that "Just this idea of paradoxical kinship between the highest and lowest is the core and center of every satirical romance of roguery, from the most insignificant of Spanish novellas to Fielding's *Jonathan Wild the Great*." Chaucer, like Juvenal, was concerned with the differing result of the crimes, while Cicero had been concerned rather with the morality of the action of Alexander in his treatment of the incident Chaucer related.

Similar correspondences between high and low are pointed up by Restoration dramatists. In Congreve's *Old Bachelor* correspondence is made by the reflections of Setter on the qualities necessary for his occupation, pimping: "Undoubtedly, 'tis impossible to be a pimp and not a man of parts. That is, without being politic, diligent, secret, wary and so forth: -- and to all this, valiant as Hercules -- that is, passively valiant and actively obedient. Ah, Setter, what a treasure is here lost for want of being known!" (I. ii) Reflecting that if he were known he might become a great man, and that he would not be the "first that has procured his greatness by pimping," he is awakened from his "dreams of glory." In *Love for Love*, too, Valérie compares his low position with that of the great, saying that secretaries of state, presidents of councils, and generals have a life like his in which all morning crowds of visitors solicit for promises already made. The comment on the nature of the great man is then made by Scandal, who replies that, "like a true great man," Valérie is more concerned with evading his creditors than with finding ways of fulfilling his promises. Such satire as is found in Congreve's comedies
becomes commonplace in comments about greatness in comedy of the eighteenth century.

Symptomatic of the concern with the relation of the great man to society at the turn of the century is a casual allusion at the beginning of Sir Samuel Garth's Dispensary to the relationship of the lowly and the great villain:

Not far from that most celebrated Place,  
Where angry Justice shews her awful Face;  
Where little Villains must submit to Fate,  
That great ones may enjoy the World in State;  
There stands a Dome, Majestick to the Sight. . . . 81
(7-11)

Garth's statement of the difference in the punishment of the great and the little villain was adopted by Steele as motto for the Englishman, No. 48, in which he discusses the nature of greatness; though his concern is largely moral in this paper, the motto is an indication of the less important but still present social comment in the paper. 82

There had already been some immediate political concern in connection with the moral question of greatness, as in the allusions to King William, and, for instance, in Steele's essay "Greatness among the Moderns." The term great man had been used ironically in political allusion too: Swift, for instance, in an essay on political lying in the Examiner, No. 14 (November 9, 1710), praises the "Great Man," the Earl of Wharton, for his talents:

In describing the Virtues and Vices of Mankind, it is convenient, upon every Article, to have some eminent Person in our Eye, from whence we copy our Description. I have strictly observed this Rule; and my Imagination this minute represents before me a certain Great Man famous for this Talent, to the constant Practice of which he owes his twenty years reputation of the most skilful Head in England, for the management of nice affairs. 83
And in an attack on Marlborough in No. 27 (February 25, 1710) of the *Examiner*,
in a discussion of avarice, he implies that Marlborough would be a "truly
great man" if he were to give up the vice of covetousness. 84

With the rise of Robert Walpole, then, the social concern begins to
take such a specific direction that there is hardly a reference to the great man
that does not refer to this particular great man, and the political satire
becomes the chief form of comment on the social aspect of the problem. As
Plumb points out, the name was especially suitable for Walpole both because
of his manner and his weight (twenty stone); and for a period of more than
twenty years it was applied to him, from at least as early as December, 1720,
in a letter by Thomas Brodrick to the Lord Chancellor Middleton, to Walpole's
fall from office in 1742. 85 Usually derisive, as in Brodrick's letter, the term
came to be so common in this association that any reference to a great man
can be suspected to be political in its nature. Irwin's statement concerning
the political use of the term is pertinent:

As politician, as conqueror or tyrant, and as a common rogue,
the great man was thus exposed to the condemnation and scorn
of poets, essayists, and dramatists, whose aim was the moral
instruction of their readers. Because of Opposition's insistence
on the greatness of Walpole, there is a temptation to attach to
terms of 'greatness' and 'great man' a solely political connotation.
This is a misplaced emphasis. The basic idea of greatness --
the quality which consists in bringing all manner of Mischief on
Mankind -- was a moral commonplace during the first half of the
eighteenth century. The political writers merely employed it
more often and more effectively than did writers who lacked a
definite target. 86

Thus the term "great man" became familiar in political journalism, being
used even by Walpole's defenders. Steele, for instance, in the Whig *Pasquin*,

No. 46 (Tuesday, July 9, 1723), replies to an article in the True Briton; he not only quotes the term but uses it himself as he defends "a certain Great Man." But the term was not merely to be a label, and it was explored by both his defamers and defenders. Thus Edward Young praised Walpole in lines which are at least meant to be an analysis of greatness in the Instalment. To the Right Honourable Sir Robert Walpole, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter (1726):

Joy then to Britain, blest with such a Son;
To Walpole Joy, by whom the Prize is won;
Who nobly-conscious meets the smiles of Fate;
True Greatness lies in daring to be great.

The praise of Walpole could be included with general social and moral comment, as in Young's satires called The Universal Passion. Stating the universality of the love of praise, Young makes the association between the falsely great of high and low station: "What is not Proud? The Pimp is Proud to see / So many like himself in high degree." Vain as false greatness is, he states, men attempt to purchase it with gold; but the "rich knave's a Libel on our Laws." In the satire addressed specifically to Walpole, then, he cites instances of falsely great conquerors, in particular Alexander, and says that those courtiers who reach false greatness are not less guilty; in contrast, Walpole is held up as an example: "Such Courtiers were, and such again may be, / Walpole, when men forget to copy thee."

More frequently, however, satire rather than praise of Walpole was related to moral and social concerns. Gulliver's Travels is here a prime example, for it is, as Keuffel points out, full of general satire on false greatness.
In the Voyage to Lilliput, there is general comment on man's pretense to greatness in the contrast between the smallness of the Lilliputians and the largeness of their claims. This contrast is pointed up most clearly in the description of the Emperor with his grandiose claims. In sharp contrast to these claims, too, is the fact as seen in the attempt of others, including, by implication, Walpole, to gain honor by leaping and creeping (I. iii). There is also an implicit judgment of great men of English politics and their claims in Gulliver's description of the ideal system once observed in Lilliput:

In choosing persons for all employments, they have more regard to good morals than to great abilities; for, since government is necessary to mankind, they believe that the common size of human understandings is fitted to some station or other; and that Providence never intended to make the management of public affairs a mystery, to be comprehended only by a few persons of sublime genius, of which there seldom are three born in an age: but they suppose truth, justice, temperance, and the like, to be in every man's power; the practice of which virtues, assisted by the experience and a good intention, would qualify any man for the service of his country, except where a course of study is required.

(I. vi)

In the second voyage, English political false greatness is again the prime target, the satire reaching its height as the King of Brobdingnag, after hearing Gulliver's account of the English political system, concludes, to Gulliver's surprise, that "it doth not appear from all you have said, how any one virtue is required towards the procurement of any one station among you" (II. vi). And in Book III, though the satire turns to various kinds of false greatness, requirements for political greatness in particular are noted, as, for instance, a person with great abilities is considered ignorant and stupid because he has no ear for music (III. iv). The satire is continued as Gulliver views professors at the
Academy of Lagado whom he considers "wholly out of their senses" proposing schemes for choosing people for office on their own merits and for instructing rulers to place their own interest on the same foundation as that of the people (III. vi). It is carried on as at Glubbdubdrib, the Island of Sorcerers or Magicians, the Governor calls up great men for Gulliver to view (III. vii).

A moral comment on the nature of conquerors is suggested as, with the typical eighteenth century point of view, Alexander is revealed to have died because of drink and Caesar says the "greatest actions of his own life were not equal by many degrees the glory of taking it away," while Brutus strikes Gulliver with awe. The political perspective is then given as the senate of Rome in one chamber is contrasted with "an assembly of somewhat a latter age in counter-view in another. The first seemed to be an assembly of heroes and demigods, the other a knot of peddlers, pickpockets, highway-men and bullies." And even in Book IV, a whole chapter (IV. vi) is devoted to a discussion of the English court, and especially the chief minister, in which the false greatness of the court is revealed, for the virtue which Swift finds necessary for greatness is seen to be lacking as it had been shown to be lacking in Gulliver’s relation to the King of Brobdingnag of the political system in England. In Book IV, in particular, the whole system is seen to be lacking in the goodness that is associated with the proper use of reason.

In Gay too the moral comment on the nature of greatness is associated with specific satire of the great in politics. In the Fables, in particular, there is a great deal of comment on the great man Walpole as well as general statement
about greatness. As K. W. Keuffel points out, "It may be only natural to find many warnings against believing the flattery of courtiers in poems addressed to a royal prince, who will of course spend a lifetime surrounded by flatterers; but the frequency and intensity of this satire against the courtiers is such as to make one suspect, as Swift hints, that all is not innocence. After all, at this time Walpole's party was often referred to as 'courtiers.'"  In one of the most pointed of these fables, entitled "The Baboon and the Poultry" (Series II. iii), the baboon is the "minister in chief" and is "branded as a publick thief." The commonly noted similarity between thief and great man is here used to satirize Walpole, who was frequently to be called a thief. The baboon himself reflects on the method of the great in public office: "The common practice of the great / Is, to secure a snug retreat." In the Introduction to Fable II. iv, "The Ant in Office," Gay makes clear that he will expose corruption wherever he sees it, even if "great ears" are offended by the exposure. In the tale, then, the corrupt ant who is made chief treasurer is found out at last, and the significance of the closing of the introduction is made clear: "And who's so great, / That has the privilege to cheat?"  

In the Beggar's Opera Gay's range of satire is broader, but still his main concern is greatness. In part he is attacking the portrayal of greatness in other works, in particular in heroic drama and sentimental comedy, and of course in opera. Bertrand Bronson points out that Gay is ridiculing not only the "manners and sentiments of operatic romance," but also the low society itself. Both high and low are ridiculed through the low characters because of their pretense to a greatness they do not have. But the social concern is predominant: the Beggar
says that had the play remained as he first intended it, it would have had a
"most excellent Moral. 'Twould have shown that the lower Sort of People
have their Vices in a degree as well as the Rich: And that they are punish'd
for them." This moral is conveyed largely through the allusions to the
great, in particular to Walpole, in the play. Thus it is that the corruption is
exposed -- the corruption which Gay said in the Fables he would attack even
among the great. Swift recognizes the nature of Gay's achievement, at the
same time commenting on greatness: "To expose vice, and to make people
laugh with innocence, does more public service than all the Ministers
of State from Adam to Walpole, and so adieu." 96

That the attempt of Gay to ridicule the political great did not go unnoticed
is evidenced by the many contemporary allusions. 97 Swift's consideration of
whether the play is of political significance in his "Vindication of Mr. Gay
and the Beggar's Opera" in the Intelligencer, No. 3, points to the allusion to
the great man whose virtues "are no more to be suspected, than the Chastity
of Caesar's wife." 98

In the Craftsman, No. 85, (February 17, 1728), Phil-Harmonicus
complains of the innuendos by means of which a statesman was made to seem not
merely as bad but perhaps even worse than Jonathan Wild. 99 And in the
Memoirs Concerning the Life and Manners of Captain Mackheath (1728) the
words of the writer who states that he wishes to stop the applause of the robber
simply hint again that Walpole is not a hero but a thief. The warning to
Mackheath, too, of punishment stalking behind him and the implication that he
will be destroyed, are clearly warnings to Walpole. 100
There can be no question that the *Beggar's Opera* was directed at the
great man, Walpole. There has, however, been some question about *Polly*,
the play that followed, and as recent an editor as William Schultz has
commented that

The satire of the sequel is so general in its application to the
vices of mankind that we are bound to conclude that those who
engineered the prohibition looked for particular thrusts and conse-
quently pretended to find them. As to a direct attack on the Whig
administration, it seems almost wholly innocent and inoffensive;
the Walpole circle had no more to fear from this kind of social
philosophy than it would from an ordinary Sunday sermon within
the bounds of London and Westminster.\textsuperscript{101}

More recently, though, critics have seen that the play is full of political satire,\textsuperscript{102}
and it now seems clear that there are not merely harmless innuendos but that
behind such general social comments as the bawd *Mrs. Trapes*' comment that
in London the manners of the great are such that honesty and morals are left
to the poor,\textsuperscript{103} there is clear comment on the great man Walpole. Thus *Polly*
on hearing of her father's death states, "I wish all great men would take
warning."\textsuperscript{104} Gay's contemporaries already knew the reason that *Polly* was
not produced: in 1731 James Miller, tracing the progress of dramatic poetry
in England, wrote that "taking too much Freedom with the Great, / \textsuperscript{Laughing}
Comedy/ in *Polly's Opera* receiv'd its Fate."\textsuperscript{105}

The comments of the *Examiner* and *Craftsman* on the *Beggar's Opera* are
representative of the attitude that was taken by Opposition periodicals in the
portrayal of greatness. Similarly, the *Select Letters Taken from Fog's Weekly
Journal* was dedicated "To the Greatest Blunderer in Christendom."\textsuperscript{106}

And an article on the great man satirically defends him against charges that
he was not an encourager of learning. Typical too is an essay in Common Sense (Saturday, December 23, 1738), a moralistic life of a "certain great man deceas'd," who evidently stands for Walpole. Everywhere there is comment about the great man.

The voice of the opposition was heard too in the ballads that referred disparagingly to the great man. "A New Norfolk Ballad, By Sir Francis Walsingham's Ghost" (1730), for instance is concerned with the political problem of which symptoms are seen in England's corruption. There is a reference to the "Downfall of the Great Minister," and ironic references are made to "the Statesman so great" and the "Great Man." "The Statesman; a New Court Ballad" (1731) gives an account of Walpole's becoming a "great man" by means of bribery and a prediction that he will be hanged. Almost any situation could suffice for a new ballad about the "great man"; thus the negotiation of Walpole with the Spanish envoy in London about the Spanish degradations on English vessels gave rise to a ballad entitled "The Negotiators" (1738). The poem concludes ironically with a praise of the great man, Walpole, as politician:

How happy is Britain such Heroes to breed
To stand by the Nation in Cases of Need!
What a Great Man is he!  

A more direct comment on the nature of political greatness is made in "A Plain and Honest Declaration" (1740); Walpole himself is represented as speaking:

When first I undertook the Load
And burthen of this state,
I turn'd my Back upon my G—d,
Resolving to be Great:
And tho' I know I must be d--n'd,
I'd rather be so than slamm'd.
The popularity of attack on Walpole in the ballads is matched by attacks on the stage, of which The Beggar's Opera was the most popular. But, as M. D. Hessler has pointed out, though Fielding's plays are often cited as the motive for the passing of the Licensing Act of 1737, the satire on the great man must have been more common during the time that Walpole was in power than appears from plays that have survived through printing. A few examples suffice to show that neither Gay nor Fielding was alone in the attacks. William Mountfort's The Fall of Mortimer was revised to satirize Walpole's politics; in this play Mortimer (Walpole) is allowed to reveal his stupidity and vice through his own comments about his use of power as, for instance, in Act II he tells Secret, who has been giving him tips about Sergeant's niece and about making Sergeant a Judge: "He shall be a Judge--I am much refreshed with the thoughts that I can serve the Nation, and myself so luckily--but is she such a pretty, sweet dapper Piece of Beauty? I will make thee a great Man before it be long." The Fall of Bob (1736), though it is almost incoherent and contains only scattered hits at the great, in its title alludes to predictions that Walpole would fall. The play Mustapha (1739) too suggests Walpole in the portrayal of Rustan, who attempts to make Solyman the Second, Emperor of the Turks, distrust his son Mustapha; the allusion is pointed up in a question asked Rustan about the peaceful shepherd's life: "Can such a life / Provoke a great man's envy?" (III. vi) Even without specific mention of greatness the irresponsible man in public office could be
saturated. James Thomson in his *Agamemnon* of 1738, for instance, increases the significance of the character Egisthus to the plot as he draws attention to the role of the ruthless adviser too readily trusted by the King. 115 Fielding's attacks were halted by the Licensing Act of 1737, but others, a little more subtle, could continue.

And the poets could continue to attack false political greatness. James Miller in *Are These Things So? The Previous Question, from an Englishman in his Grotto, to a Great Man at Court* (1740) characterizes himself as a hermit inquiring about the state of England. Lining up the usual charges against Walpole, he says that if the great man is innocent he should speak up, and if guilty he should reflect on his expectations and death:

But of what Dead? not those whose Memory,
Bloom with sweet Savour through Posterity.
Those deathless Worthies, who, as Good as Great,
Or rais'd a fall'n, or prop'd a sinking State;
Or in the breach of Desolation stood
And for their country's Welfare pledg'd their Blood:
No! with the Curs'd your Tomb shall foremost stand;
The Caveston's and Wolsey's of the Land. 116

The answer Yes, they are: being an Answer to Are these Things so? repeats the charges and considers the results of Walpole's political greatness. The only recommendation that is made is that Walpole himself cut off "A Life of Guilt, and save a sinking Land." Here the nature of the symbol of the great man in politics can clearly be seen: the ironic use of the term points up what he was seen to represent: corruption in politics which results in evil to the society. 117

The recommendation to Walpole was not long to be necessary, for with
Walpole's fall, the interest with the great man in politics was to decline. True, a ballad, a "New Ode" was addressed to "a Number of Great Men, Newly Made," after the new ministry was formed in 1742, but with the loss of the symbol of greatness in politics came a decline in the concern with the political aspect of greatness. This, as we shall see in Fielding, does not mean that the theme of greatness, or the great man, is no longer significant in literature.
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CHAPTER TWO

THE PLAYS

Already in his first printed work, The Masquerade, a Poem, published on Saturday, January 27, 1728, the day of the first performance of the Beggar's Opera, Fielding draws on the satiric moral tradition that pointed to the similarities between delusions of rulers and of the inmates of Bedlam: the speaker's muse and guide, Calliope, relates that the sot at the masquerade who finds "joy imperial" in drink becomes "As great an emperor as any / In Bedlam, Russia, or Germany." Here are examples of the types of the great who figure most prominently in Fielding's plays. There is a reference to the man of high position, here an emperor but in the plays usually a nobleman or politician, one who possesses the external signs of greatness. When he lacks corresponding moral qualities, the "greatness of soul" that should equal his position, references to this type of "great man" are usually ironic, with a suggestion that the name is not appropriate to the object. On the other hand, "greatness" is frequently used ironically too in connection with characters of any rank or profession to indicate the self-deception (seen in The Masquerade in an extreme form) which leads them to consider themselves qualified for the appellation.

In Fielding's first play, Love in Several Masques (first produced February
16, 1728), we again see his interest in greatness. False greatness is embodied in Sir Positive Trap, whose vanity at first seems to make him only ridiculous in the claim he makes for greatness on the basis of having noble ancestors. He is first introduced by Merital's words concerning the guardian of the young lady, Helena, whom he loves: "Sir Positive Trap ... is an old, precise knight, made up of avarice, folly, and ill-bred surliness of temper, and an odd, fantastic pride built on the antiquity of his family, into which he enrols most of the great men he ever heard of." In addition, the knight's objections to Merital's love for Helena show his insistence on the continued greatness of his family: his objections are, as Merital himself says, that the lover has no title, an estate which is too small—and he is not a fool (I. i; Henley VIII, 16-17). When Sir Positive himself appears, the truth of Merital's judgment is proven by Sir Positive's reference to "the illustrious race of Traps" (II. vi; Henley VIII, 36) and his statement, "Ay sir, we are a strong family, an Herculean race! Hercules was a Taap by his mother's side" (IV. vii; Henley VIII, 70). Not only the folly of his argument but also his willingness to ally himself with the falsely great is suggested in his defense of his title to Lord Formal: stating that an old English baronet was above a lord, he claims that Julius Caesar, because he was called by his Christian name, was a baronet (III. vii; Henley VIII, 51). And, echoing a statement attributed to Caesar, Sir Positive establishes the connection in a later scene as, unhappy about being called an upstart, he
states that he would prefer being the "first rogue" of a good family to being
the first honest man in a bad one (V. vii; Henley VIII, 85). Fielding
allows him to make his own moral judgment on himself, and in the next speech,
to touch on a social problem involved with the problem of greatness. Defend-
ing his choice, Sir Positive says that the man whose father was hanged is
reviled, but that many who deserve hanging are not. Perhaps, too, there is
in this statement a political allusion; the suggestion that some who deserve
hanging receive no punishment was, in 1728, enough to recall the many hints
by Opposition writers that Walpole deserved hanging. That Fielding's chief
concern is moral, however, is substantiated by a portion of dialogue between
Sir Positive and his ward. Helena objects that her uncle's severe expression
causes him to look like "one of the Caesar's head in our long gallery";
Sir Positive agrees that there may be a resemblance, "for Julius Caesar,
by his great grandfather's wife's great grandmother, was a Trap." Helena's
joking objection that Julius Caesar left no legacy motivates Sir Positive to
make a speech on honor in which he claims that true honor cannot be bought
or obtained, but must be inherited, and that no one can be a great man unless
his father has been one. To his tirade Helena answers simply: "But, if I
were to choose a husband, I should be more forward to inquire into his own
merits than those of his ancestors" (V. i; Henley VIII, 78-79).

Of Fielding's next play, The Temple Beau (first performed January 26,
1730), Cross says that "it is Love in Several Masques all over again," and
this is true in regard to Fielding's treatment of the great man theme.
The theme is evident already in the Prologue, written by Ralph, who says that the stage may be the road to fame of those denied comfort by the great of the gay world of the court. Fielding’s own moral concern is evident as he poses the virtue of Bellaria and Veromil against the false greatness of Sir Avarice Pedant and his family, much as Helena’s and Merital’s virtue was set against Sir Positive’s false greatness. The contrasting opinions of greatness are exemplified in a dialogue in which Lady Lucy Pedant suggests her desire to imitate the greatness of a conqueror; and her reference to Alexander, like Sir Positive’s to Julius Caesar, is one of many indications of her false conception of greatness. Citing an incident referred to frequently in the eighteenth century as evidence of Alexander’s insatiable ambition, she tells Bellaria that her wit and beauty were meant to enslave mankind, and that she should not love just one man: "Your eyes should first conquer the world, and then weep, like Alexander’s, for more worlds to conquer." Bellaria’s reply establishes the contrast in the characters of the two women: "I rather think he should have wept for those he had conquered. He had no more title to sacrifice the lives of men to his ambition than a woman has their ease. And I assure, you, madam, had my eyes that power you speak of, I would only defend my own by them, which is the only warrantable use of power in both sexes" (II. vii; Henley VIII, 124-125). Bellaria’s statement is then recalled and substantiated in a later scene in which she refuses to revenge herself on her lover Veromil for his unjustified suspicion of her. Telling him she
realizes the sincerity of his love, she adds that she "would not give you an uneasy hour, to gain more worlds than you deserve" (III. xii; Henley VII, 150).

As Veromil in turn is shown to be equally forgiving toward his friend Valentine in the final scene, Valentine exclaims, "Generous, noble soul." This virtue which wins over the falsely great to achieve happiness is then associated with true greatness in the concluding lines spoken by Veromil:

Heaven meant so blest, so exquisite a fate,
But to reward the virtuous and the great.
(V. xxi; Henley VIII, 186-187)

In Fielding's next play, The Author's Farce, (first produced March 30, 1730), there is an increased consideration of the political and social aspects of greatness. The pseudonym on the title-page, "Scriblerus Secundus," indicates Fielding's intention to follow the satiric tradition of Pope and the prologue indicates his indebtedness to Buckingham's The Rehearsal, with its satire on heroic drama. The allusion to Drawcansir and Parthenope, characters in Buckingham's play, suggests Fielding's view that the dramatic situation has not changed greatly since Buckingham wrote:

Too long the Tragic Muse hath awed the stage,
And frightened wives and children with her rage.
Too long Drawcansir roars, Parthenope weeps,
While every lady cries, and critic sleeps.
(Prologue; Henley VIII, 193)

Fielding's attack, though, is broader than Buckingham's: that he is concerned in general with the "pleasures of the town," not merely with literature, is indicated by the title of Luckless' farce. But in the frame of the farce Witmore speaks for Fielding, as W. R. Irwin has noted, in the lecture he gives Luckless concerning the state of literature in the town: "party and prejudice,"
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he says, carry all before them. Witmore's concluding satirical advice to Luckless is to attach himself to a great man if he still wishes to write and to be a pimp to him, flattering him "with as many virtues as he has vices."

To Luckless' suggestion that some must thrive honestly in the world, Witmore, pointing out the dishonesty in other professions, says that none thrive by profiting mankind except the husbandman and the merchant, "yet these are represented as mean and mechanical, and the others as honourable and glorious" (I. v; Henley VIII, 204-205). These statements (the latter of which already suggests the point of view of Jonathan Wild) concerning the falseness of the views of the town are then dramatized in Luckless' puppet-show, in which a society is drawn which is an allegorical representation of the one seen in the rest of the play. This is a kingdom in which false greatness reigns. Those persons who are imported into the Kingdom of Nonsense include not only five persons of "great quality," but also members of the various professions: courtiers, attorneys, counsellors, poets, players, doctors, apothecaries, fellows of colleges, and members of the Royal Society. Opera echoes the opinion of the town as he lists the various ways one may try to become great, concluding "When you cry he is rich, you cry a great man." Nonsense repeats the line "in an ecstasy," and decides she wishes to be his wife (III. i; Henley, 239-240). And the air in which Mrs. Novel pledges her love for Opera is not only a parody of a declaration in favor of true love instead of riches; it also points up her own choice of false greatness
in a kingdom in which Nonsense reigns (III. i; Henley VIII, 250). But the attitude toward greatness in the town is revealed not only in the puppet show. Luckless' servant, Jack, for instance, reports to Mrs. Moneywood, Luckless' landlady, that the man she took to be a bailiff is surely a great man, for he has jewels and has paid well for services rendered him (II. xi; Henley VIII, 227). Here too, the appropriate motto is "When you cry he is rich, you cry a great man."

The remainder of Jack's speech contains one of several allusions in the play to political greatness. Jack states that the great man has given the chairmen so much money that some people believe that he intends to run for election to Parliament. 12 And within the Kingdom of Nonsense affairs are shown to be similar: the Prime Minister of Nonsense, according to Luckless, is a bookseller. (III. i; Henley VIII, 234). The question of the fitness of Walpole to be Prime Minister is perhaps again in Fielding's mind as he has Dr. Orator state a riddle: "A fiddle is like a statesman: Why? Because it's hollow" (III. i; Henley VIII, 243). A statement by Punch is similar in its implications. As he considers taking up various professions and is discouraged each time by Luckless's proof that he lacks the necessary requirements, he decides, "why then I'll turn great man, that requires no qualification whatsoever" (III. i; Henley VIII, 237).

Yet the satire on greatness takes a new turn at the conclusion of the play as Luckless, the writer who has been ridiculing false greatness, becomes a great man himself, the King of Bantam, and chooses all who have sued before Nonsense
to entertain the city of Bantam -- "All proper servants for the King of Bantam."

Even Mrs. Moneywood is made great as Punch reveals that she is the queen of Old Brentford who has been expelled by the King of New Brentford; the allusion to the two kings of Brentford suggests again a parallel to the Rehearsal, this time not in the matter being rehearsed, but in the play itself.¹³ That Fielding saw the Rehearsal as a satire on false greatness is evident not only from this passage but from his discussion of the play in The True Patriot, No. 16, February 11, 1746. The leader of this issue, an essay on the instability of human greatness, contains quotations from sections of Buckingham's play in which the two usurpers appear on the stage, only to run off without apparent reason. Fielding's commentary is, "No human Wit can ever bring Greatness to a more farcical End." And Fielding suggests in his play that not just drama, but life in England itself, is characterized by the folly in which false greatness may thrive. The final stanza by Luckless, now King of Bantam, makes an ironic commentary on the nature of qualifications for greatness:

Taught by my fate, let never bard despair,
Though long he drudge, and feed on Grub Street air:
Since him (at last) 'tis possible to see
As happy and as great a king as me.

(III. 1; Henley VIII, 258–259)

Against this background of Fielding's early plays the appearance in 1730 of Tom Thumb. A Tragedy (first produced April 24) can be seen not primarily as that of a new type of drama but as a more consistent satiric indictment of false greatness than Fielding had yet produced; and the appearance of the expanded
The Tragedy of Tragedies. Or, the Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great the next year is then evidence of Fielding's increasing interest in this theme. False greatness in varying forms had been exposed in the first three plays, and in The Author's Farce in particular Fielding had been concerned with a society in which literary and political greatness was not based on merit. Don Tragedio served as Fielding's vehicle for satire on the bombast of drama in the earlier play, and in Tom Thumb the continual satire on the language of tragedy and heroic drama becomes a means of satirizing false conceptions of greatness. Too, there is a parallel between the rule of the Goddess of Nonsense and the rule of Tom Thumb—as there is also between the rule of the newly crowned King of Bantam and the triumph of the little hero. Indeed, the latter parallel is suggested by a passage spoken by Huncamunca, Tom's love:

O Tom Thumb! Tom Thumb! Wherefore art thou Tom Thumb? Why hadst thou not been born of royal race? Why had not mighty Bantam been they father? Or else the king of Brentford, Old or New? (II. iii; Henley IX, 37)

Thus Fielding has already developed his basic method by the time he chooses Tom Thumb as a symbol: he shows the smallness, moral and in this play physical, of that which is considered great. The figure of Tom Thumb serves excellently for this purpose; since he had already been labelled Tom Thumb the little, any mention of greatness in association with him suggests a discrepancy between what he is and what he is considered to be. The method is similar to that of Gulliver's Travels, and Fielding may be indebted to Swift for the idea of using physical smallness to represent moral smallness, smallness that
becomes ridiculous when it is accompanied by pretension to greatness (as in
the case of the Lilliputian emperor). In Fielding, though, there is no observer
to trace a moral, even naively, and the implicit moral judgment is left to the
audience. Fielding’s specific source of course is the story of Tom Thumb
himself, and the suggestion of using the little hero as a subject of tragedy may
have come directly from a pamphlet called A Comment Upon the History of Tom
Thumb, probably written by William Wagstaffe.17 Throughout the pamphlet,
which is actually a parody of the ballad criticism of Addison, Tom Thumb is
humorously considered as a hero. Though there is not frequent reference to
greatness, it is noted—in a way that could have been suggestive to Fielding—
in a passage on the “Greatness of Soul of this little Hero, amidst the greatest
Dangers that cou’d possibly befall him, and which are the unavoidable Attendants
of human life” and in a comment on “The Relation of our Hero’s being put into a
Pudding, and convey’d away in a Tinker’s Budget; which is design’d by our
Author to prove, if it is understood literally, that the greatest Men are subject
to Misfortunes.”18 From Wagstaffe, too, may have come a hint for the
editorial commentary for this particular work, though the name “H. Scriblerus
Secundus” provided sufficient precedent.

That many of the plays Fielding chose for parody were seventeenth century
rather than contemporary works is an indication that he was not satirizing
merely the dramatists but also the public that was still patronizing their works.
True, particular passages are parodied, but the total effect of the play is an
overall satire of what constituted heroic drama and what made it popular—and
here the hero, the great man, is especially important. Fielding’s reduction of
the superhuman hero to the midget reveals especially clearly the pretentiousness
of his claims and the exaggerated praise which the playwright allows other characters to give him. Fielding was late in his life to define Great in a way that could have been appropriate here: "Applied to a Thing, signifies Bigness; to a Man, often Littleness, or Meanness." This contrast between claim and fact, obvious already in the 1730 edition, is pointed up in the Preface to the 

*Tragedy of Tragedies*, in which Fielding argues against those who object to the hero's size that the greatness of a man's soul does not correspond with the size of his body; the suggestion merely hints at what is shown in the play: that Tom's soul is not very large either, though in the *Dramatis Personae* he is called "a little hero with a great soul" (Henley IX, 15). That Fielding saw increasingly the possibility to point up the contrast between what Tom Thumb was thought to be and what he actually was is evidenced not only by the addition of the Preface and cast of characters in 1731 but also by revisions in the expanded version of the play, in particular, revisions in which a mention of greatness is added to what in the first edition was merely a mention of Tom's name. Thus "Tom Thumb approaches; / The welcome hero... is arrived" (I. ii; Hillhouse, 57) becomes "the great Tom Thumb, the little hero... is arrived" (I. ii; Henley IX, 23), and the little-great contrast is emphasized. And the derogatory comment of the maid of honor, Mustacha, about her mistress's lover is changed from "that little insignificant Fellow, Tom Thumb" (II. i; Hillhouse, 65) to "that little insignificant Fellow, Tom Thumb the Great" in 1731 (I. vi; Henley IX, 37).

Irwin has appropriately commented that "Scorn'g restraint as unworthy
of his great soul, Tom Thumb exists throughout in a state of frenzy. His actions include his killing the bailiff and follower for attempting to arrest the courtier Noodle. As a final proof of his greatness, the tragic hero is swallowed by a red cow. In the first edition, the Queen is allowed to solace herself over the loss of Thumb with the thought of Tom Hickathrift, who is "as great a man as Thumb" (II. viii; Hillhouse, 71). The king's comparison of Tom to Alexander and Caesar, concluding with "Let England boast no other than Tom Thumb" (I. iii; Henley IX, 28) not only points up the hero's insignificance but also reveals the king's failure to judge greatness on a moral plane. Not only Tom Thumb but the other characters of the play are shown to be less than great: King Arthur "stands a little in fear" of his wife, and Queen Dollallolla is a "woman entirely faultless, saving that she is a little given to drink, a little too much a virago towards her husband, and in love with Tom Thumb."

Noodle and Doodle are the courtiers in place, Foodle the courtier who is out of place (Dramatis Personae; Henley IX, 15). Ridiculing the popular taste for dramatic entertainment with characters that are, he implies, no better than those he presents, Fielding points up the failure of society to distinguish between true and false greatness.

He was perhaps pointing out too the failure of the public to recognize the distinction between what the great man in England, Walpole, was, and what he pretended to be. The additional references in the 1731 edition to Tom's greatness perhaps were intended not merely to strengthen the contrast between
Tom's size and reputation but also to suggest the great man of England. The
queen, whose liking for Thumb suggests Queen Caroline's alleged liking for
Walpole and whose control over her husband also suggests the power of the
Queen of England, is already allowed to say in 1730 that "little Tom Thumb
will be a great man made" (I. v; Henley IX, 30). And in 1731 Fielding
stresses by additions the English setting of the play and the fact that Tom is an
English hero: in the passage in which the King compares Tom to the ancient
conquerors, Fielding adds comments about modern European "heroes":
France's Messieurs, Holland's Myheers, Ireland's O's, and Scotland's Mac's.
And the concluding line of the speech, "Let England boast no other than Tom
Thumb," is a 1731 addition (I. iii; Henley IX, 28). Another change points
to a familiar warning to Walpole. In a passage in which Grizzle laments his
fortune, change from emphasis on bestowing of court favor to specific concern
with greatness is evident in the following lines:

    Greatness is a laced coat from Monmouth Street,
    Which fortune lends us for a day to wear,
    To-morrow puts it on another's back . . .
    (I. iv; Henley IX, 30)²¹

Since W. L. Cross's statement that Tom Thumb was a hit at Walpole, critics
have tended to hedge the issue of political allusion. Even Hessler's careful
study of Opposition literature bases the suggestion that political satire has
perhaps merely been read into the play in part on her failure to find a reference
to Walpole as Tom Thumb in other satirical literature.²² But there is a ballad,
"Robin's Glory, or the Procession of the Knights of the Bath," which in the first stanza the allusion to Tom Thumb is made in connection with the familiar symbol of Walpole's "Rarick-shoowe":

My Masters give Ear,
And a Story you'll hear
Of a fine Rarick-Show and a Garter,
Ne'er was seen such a Sight,
Since Tom Thumb was a Knight,
In the Days of our noble King Arthur. 23

The presence of the allusion in the ballad suggests that the political comment in the play was not as obscure as has generally been assumed.

In Rape upon Rape, the first of Fielding's plays to follow Tom Thumb (first produced June 23, 1730), there is a distinct change of tone—a change not only in the nature of the subject but also in Fielding's attitude toward it. While in Tom Thumb one is made to laugh at the folly that claims greatness without deserving it, in Rape upon Rape Fielding is largely concerned also with the danger to society of such a false conception in the hands of the ruthless.

Thus two kinds of false greatness are revealed. The folly of Politic, who considers himself a great politician but proves himself to have only bombast greatness, is shown in a chiefly humorous way. His ideas concerning greatness are not shown to be wrong: the morality of his statement concerning greatness is not questioned as he says "To govern yourself is greater than to govern a kingdom, said an old philosopher"; and his next statement too, "to govern a woman is greater than to govern twenty kingdoms," leads only to the statement from his sensible daughter that he should concern himself with his own business
and his daughter's affairs rather than with the public's, with cardinals and kingdoms. Despite his theories, Politic is blind to his own nature and his daughter's for politics as he learns it from the newspapers concerns him more than anything else. His dream of his own greatness concerns his political career, and when his daughter tells him she wishes he had been less a politician, he merely says she is deceived, for he may become one of the greatest men in England. (That he is later revealed to be ignorant of geography in no way disturbs his plans. (I. iv; Henley IX, 84) And he would rather have his daughter be a politician than a woman of quality (I. ii; Henley IX, 81).

But in the two types of bombast greatness that are portrayed in the play, we see a distinction that becomes more significant in some of Fielding's later works: for Politic's delusion is an instance of folly, while that of Justice Squeezum is brought about by his villainy. Thus Squeezum's is of potential danger to society. The moral implications in Squeezum's case are clear: the justice is falsely using his position, as is pointed out repeatedly by statements that he is the "greatest of villains." Fielding is concerned with pointing out the potential consequences of the menace within the society. There is a statement of the social aim of the play and its moral basis in the Prologue, which begins with a picture of Greece, where vice was ridiculed without partiality, where "no grandeur could the mighty villain screen "from satire, where no title could spare "the great right honourable fool," and where public villains were named.

In contrast, "vice hath grown too great to be abused," and satirists refrain from
lashing those who can revenge themselves through their power. Yet, the

Prologue states, in the play to follow vice "clothed with power," the lion in his
den, will be attacked; for reverence is due power only when it is used for the
public welfare (Henley IX, 75-76). 24

Thus a concern for society is uppermost in the portrayal of Justice

Squeezum, the "great man" who abuses his power for his own purposes. The
likeness that Squeezum has to the great conquerors who are also great in power
but not virtue is suggested in Sotmore's statement that the justice will be
accompanied to Tyburn by more pomp than that which ushered Alexander into
Babylon (IV. vii; Henley IX, 132). In accordance with this portrayal, Squeezum
makes statements which reflect his acceptance of a superficial view of greatness;
for instance, he says "A gentleman, and poor: sir, they are contradictions. A
man may as well be a scholar without learning, as a gentleman without riches"
(II. vii; Henley IX, 103). His subordinate Staff has a similarly limited view;
he says of Ramble, "I fancy he's some great man; for he talks French, sings
Italian, and swears English" (II. ii; Henley IX, 94). Finally, the justice's
judgment of Ramble is determined by Ramble's inability to pay a bribe: "Well,
sir, if you cannot pay for your transgressions like the rich, you must suffer for
them like the poor" (II. vii; Henley IX, 103-104). The commentary on the
power of wealth, stated most succinctly by Worthy (I. v; Henley, IX, 145-146),
of course has political implications; and it may not be going too far to see
allusions to Walpole's alleged methods of maintaining power by means of his
villainy. Already in the Prologue as Fielding states his intention to shield no "mighty villain," the political satire could have been recognized by his audience in the "screen" allusion. Too, the continual reference to the hanging which the dishonest public servant deserves may be an echo of warnings to Walpole of the fate that he was said to deserve. Even Squezum, before he is discovered, is made to say that those who would make their fortunes at home should not fear "the bench" any more than a soldier does the field, for "a halter hath been fatal to many a great man, as well as a bullet" (II. i; Henley IX, 93).

In his next play, The Letter Writers (first performed March 24, 1731), Fielding is again largely concerned in his treatment of greatness with the social aspect of the immorality that allows false greatness to flourish.

Thus Fielding's method is similar to that of the Beggar's Opera as he points up comparisons between those people of various classes who try to achieve spurious greatness. Much of the satire of the society is achieved through the words of Risque, Rakel's servant, who is unhappy with his situation, which is affected by that of his employer. In the first act Fielding establishes the reason for Rakel's discontent: the fact that he sees others of his "profession" thriving while he starves. Stating that he did not expect a luxurious life while his master was a soldier, he objects that his situation has not changed now that he has become a pimp for the same master: he is vexed that his "plump brethren of the same profession" ride in coaches while he starves. The suggestion of corruption in high as well as low places is substantiated in Risque's next speech, in which he tells Rakel that "If you were but as like a great man in
your riches as you are in your promises, I should dine oftener by two or three
days a week than I do now" (I. 1; Henley IX, 162). And the familiar correspondence
between the common pimp and the flatterer of great men is explicitly stated
when Risque states in a later scene, "This it is to serve a poor, beggarly, lousy--
If half this dexterity had been employed in the service of a great man, I had been
a captain or a Middlesex justice long ago" (I. iii; Henley IX, 166). The
suggestion that Rakel is like a great man may have a specific allusion to the
great man in politics, Walpole—an allusion that would be pointed up by Risque's
accusation before the constable that Rakel is a highwayman, and that he had
warned Rakel that he would end at the gallows (II. XI; Henley IX, 187).

There may be political allusions too in other parallels suggested between the
characters and the great man, but still the general social significance pre-
dominates. In the scene, for instance, in which Commons, among the whores,
pretends to be Alexander the Great and requests the musicians to play Alexander
the Great's march, his own wish to be a "great man," a mere conqueror, is
evident, but soon his pretense changes as the whores are concerned about the
threat that a Justice of the Peace will find them. Commons then tries in
earnest to convince them that he is a lord, for, he says, a justice would not dare
attack a man of quality. Thus he comments on the political system which allows
special privileges to the great— a comment similar in significance to those
of Squeezum. His certitude of his own greatness is revealed again later in
the scene as he prides himself on his manner of sending the musicians away:
saying that Hannibal could not have done it better, he exclaims, "What pity that
such a brave fellow as I am should be made a parson of!" (II. ii; Henley IX, 177-179) He further reveals his conception of greatness as he tells Rakel that the term cuckold is not so reproachful a term as it is usually thought to be for half the great men in history are cuckolds (I. ii; Henley IX, 164-165). But the comment is primarily of significance in regard to the society in which, as in the play, the characters strive for greatness, but only a limited kind—one that grants them their pleasures.

Fielding's next play is a sustained satire on political greatness. As Cross points out, it "wears a very innocent look" that excuses the biographers who bypass it as merely one of his farces or as a jumble of unintelligible incidents, but what Fielding meant must have been clear to his audience in 1731. 25 First named the Welsh Opera, then revised and renamed the Grub-Street Opera (first performed as the Welsh Opera on April 22, 1731), the play is indebted to the Beggar's Opera not only in its form, that of the ballad opera, but in the treatment of the subject of greatness. As in the Beggar's Opera, the representation of great persons by the low forms the basis of the satire, both particular and general, on vice in low and high places. The difference in the representation is that there is no ironical attribution of greatness to low persons; except for the Royal Family represented by the meek Sir Owen Apshinken, the domineering Lady Apshinken and the weak Master Owen, the persons satirized in the government are portrayed as mere servants and nothing more. Thus Robin represents Walpole; William the Coachman is
Pulteney; John the Groom is John, Lord Hervey; and Sweetissa is Walpole's
mistress, Maria Skerret. The action reflects current events too: the quarrel
of the Apshinkens with Owen over his marriage is a version of the quarrel of
the King and Queen with the Prince of Wales. William's attempt to rid the
household of Robin is Pulteney's struggle to gain power superior to Walpole's.
And Robin's favors to his brother suggest the offices that Robert Walpole
gained for Horatio, as his dishonesty in general reflects the accusations made
against the Prime Minister. Fielding suggests the pettiness of the actions of
the great by portraying them as lowly characters, and Walpole is not the only
guilty servant. Fielding's ridicule centers on Walpole, the great man, but
the faults of the other greats of the time are ridiculed too. Hessler has
stated that Fielding's attitude in this play is non-partisan; at least, the attack
on political false greatness is not strictly partisan. Parson Puzzletext's
statement near the conclusion is a reflection on the entire situation: "I think
it is a difficult matter to determine which deserves to be hanged most; and if
Robin, the butler, hath cheated more than other people, I see no reason for it,
but because he hath had more opportunity to cheat." The song that follows re-
lates the specific satire to the general social theme:

In this little family plainly we find
A little epitome of human kind,
Where down from the beggar, up to the great man,
Each gentleman cheats you no more than he can.

(III. xiv; Henley IX, 273)

This relation between the various levels of society, also indicated through
the political allegory, is stated in various ways in the play. Thus Robin, finding
a letter addressed to Sweetissa which causes him to suspect her honesty, states:

"I find footmen are as great rogues as their masters... and Chambermaids
are as bad as their ladies, and the whole world is a next of rogues." The song
that follows repeats the theme: "For rich and poor / Are rogue and whore"
(I. viii; Henley IX, 227). k The superficiality of the usual conception of greatness is shown in Sweetissa's statement that "they" say men dressed in a
specific way "are the greatest men in the kingdom" (I. xi; Henley IX, 232),
in Parson Puzzletext's judgment that what is excess in drink is determined by
the quality of the person who drinks (I. ii; Henley IX, 214), in Molly's statement
that "no woman can pass without one good quality, unless she be a woman of
very great quality" (II. ii; Henley IX, 239), and in Robin's regret that, unlike
a man of honor, he can lose his honor (III. viii; Henley IX, 263). The song
that follows states that if a man becomes "honourable," he can still be a man
of honor though he may be the greatest of rogues. Another song, too, brings
the familiar theme that the great of all professions thrive: the great courtiers,
great parsons, great whores, and the "great rogue" (II. v; Henley IX, 247).
Here too there is probably an allusion to Walpole—there are many greats in
other professions, but only one great rogue.

In Fielding's play of rogues, unlike Gay's characters again are presented
who at least in part are meant to offset the portrayal of greatness in the others.
Mr. Apshones and Molly are not involved with the ambition and scheming at the
Apshinkens, and Mr. Apshones indicates his own attitude toward the kind of
greatness revealed there: "Let the great rob one another, and us, if they please;
I will show them the poor can be honest. I desire only to preserve my daughter, let them preserve their son" (II. i; Henley IX, 235). At the conclusion of the play then the moral significance of the opposition is clearly shown: Master Owen, recognizing Molly's worth, says that though she is only a tenant's daughter, she is worthy of a crown. And Molly replies that she would have loved Owen had she been a great princess. Owen echoes Molly's statement that grandeur and wealth bring pain. The change in his attitude toward greatness is shown in his decision to marry Molly, for he has incurred the risk of being dishonoured; still he says, "While fancy's dreams cheat the great, / We pleasure will equally prove" (III. xv; Henley IX, 275).

In the next plays, there is a marked tendency toward general social comment rather than political concern. Thus in The Lottery (first produced January 1, 1732), Fielding attacks the system of lotteries without directly attacking the government. And the one passage in the play, too, which directly mentions greatness, is concerned with the general social situation, with emphasis on the corruption in low as well as high places. As the familiar comparison is made between the great man's followers and pimps, the criticism is directed at the one who is willing to prostitute himself in the service of another. Lovemore, assuming that the woman he mistakenly thinks to be a bawd will take his money, asks, "When a great man attempts to disburse / What little man asks his intent?" (Scene ii; Henley VIII, 286)

In the Modern Husband, then, a play which Fielding had probably written a year before it was performed on February 14, 1732, we see that he is still
concerned with the social aspect of the problem of greatness. But Fielding's unwillingness to aim direct political satire is indicated by the dedication to Walpole. It is tempting to consider the Dedication to have been ironical, but there is no evidence that Fielding's intention was anything other than serious as he praised Walpole’s actions and advised him to be a patron of arts for his own benefit as well as that of poets. 29 At any rate, the portrayal of Walpole in the dedication is extensive enough to discourage an attempt to associate him and Lord Richly, the great man of the play. 30 Lord Richly's failure to recognize true merit is perhaps like Walpole's, but his corrupt morals are also a commentary on the system in which greatness such as his is based merely on wealth. On the other hand, those who allow him to control them come off just as badly as he does—Mr. Modern, who is willing to profit by the lord's interest in his wife, and Mrs. Modern, who objects only when she fears that her reputation will suffer. Set against the falsely great man and those who pander to him are the virtuous Mr. and Mrs. Bellamant. But Fielding's special concern for the case of the meritorious in a society in which vice leads to false greatness is shown in particular in two scenes which seemingly were inserted especially for the purpose of social commentary. That Fielding wishes to include a scene in which the falsely great man is discussed, regardless of its suitability, is supported by Cross's statement that Fielding labored for months trying to improve the play. 31 Bravemore appears in no other scenes than I. viii and ix; Merit in these and in addition inexplicably in the group that is witness to Richly's attempted seduction of Mrs. Bellamont in Act V. In Act I, scene viii, Merit and Bravemore are the ones who reveal in a dialogue their
understanding of the great and the road to greatness. Merit, who has avoided
the houses of the great "as much as virtue does" still hopes his services for
his country may speak for him, although he knows "What an abundance of poor
wretches go to the feeding the vanity of that leviathan -- one great rogue." As
part of the system too he sees that the followers of a great man are like him:
To Bravemore's statement that the servants of great men are great men too,
Merit replies that Richly's porter came from a family consisting of a pimp,
a bawd, and whore; and exclaims: "How happy is that country, where pimping
and whoring are esteemed public services, and where grandeur and the
gallows lie on the same road!" (I. viii; Henley X, 20-21). The statements
concerning the nature of false greatness are confirmed in the following scene
at Lord Richly's levee, where Merit's claims are ignored though the Lord is
entertained by the remarks of Lord Lazy, Colonel Courtly, and Mr. Woodall.
And Richly's attitude is expressed at the conclusion of the scene in his
classification of all the visitors as "poor chimerical devils" who are not capable
of returning favors. He sets himself above them but reveals his similarity
to those who are working only for their selfish ends as he says that "great men,
justly, act by wiser rules" (I. ix; Henley X 25). The statement as spoken by him
is ironic, for he is shown during the play to be neither great, nor just, nor
wise; and his corruption is revealed to all in the final act of the play. Perhaps
Richly is meant to reveal to Walpole and the country not only the possible fate
of the powerful man who does not consider his responsibilities but also the
potential danger to society of the great man and of those who allow him to control
them.

The Debauchees (first performed June 1, 1732) is the only one of Fielding's plays in which there is no direct comment on greatness, although as in the preceding plays, Fielding is concerned with abuses within a society. Perhaps the setting of the play, Toulon, the location of the Jesuit Seminary that Fielding had in mind, did not suggest to him any ideas of the greatness or grandeur, even the false, that he had satirized in plays with London settings. Perhaps the sordid story, too, based on the case of the priest Father Girard, interested him so exclusively that he was unconcerned with the hits at the great that usually characterized his plays. As Cross points out, there is much talk about purgatory, nunneries, and holy water -- but evidently Fielding saw no even superficial greatness about these subjects, which he ridiculed throughout the play. 32

In The Covent-Garden Tragedy, however, which was presented as an afterpiece to The Debauchees on June 1 and which has an English setting, it is clear that his specific concern with greatness is by no means forgotten. But it is clear too that political greatness is no major issue. In the Author's Farce and Tom Thumb the satire of the portrayal of greatness in literary works had been combined with political satire. In the Prolegomena to the Tragedy, however, the lack of such satire is pointed out by Fielding himself; in the "Criticism on the Covent-Garden Tragedy, Originally Intended for the Grub-Street Journal," the criticism is made that the sentiment is deficient because there is no indication that courtiers are fools and statesmen rogues. But there
is an implication that the great are sometimes no better than the common people: this is suggested in a passage on greatness similar to one in The Masquerade. Gallono, the sot, comments that "Wine makes the cobbler greater than a king" (I. vii; Henley X, 118); the line here not only reflects on his own conception of greatness but also gives a hint similar to that of The Masquerade that the ruler too may be intoxicated by his power.

But Fielding's main concern with greatness in the play is revealed not through specific attacks on social and political abuses but by his ridicule of a work in which greatness is presented -- presented, he suggests, falsely, for the "classical" figures of Ambrose Phillips' The Distrest Mother (adapted from Racine's Andromache) can be seen to bear resemblances to the characters of a bawdy house "tragedy." Thus Fielding is critical of the morality as well as the artificiality of style in the work and of course too of the public taste which still allowed the performance of the work twenty years after its composition. As he had in Tom Thumb, Fielding suggests the failure of dramatist and audience to judge greatness properly; in his burlesque Fielding attempts to show that characters Phillips had presented as great figures had only outward qualifications for their positions. In case anyone had missed the parallels through which he hinted at the true nature of Phillips' characters, Fielding himself has the imaginary Grub Street critic of the Prolegomena explain that "As for the characters of Lovegtrlo and Kissinda, they are poor imitations of the characters of Pyrrhus and Andromache in The Distrest Mother, as Bilkum and Stormandra are of Orestes and Hermione" (Henley X, 107). The many
parallels in action are also an ironic commentary on the moral level of the
characters of Phillips' tragedy. Thus Orestes' coming as ambassador of the
Greeks to the court of Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, in Phillips' play, with the added
purpose of seeing Hermione, whom he loves (I. i), is reduced to Bilkum's coming
to Mother Punchbowl's bawdy house (I. iii; Henley X, 114-116). Pyrrhus' attempt
to win Andromache (I. iv) becomes Lovegirlo's overture to Kissinda to take her
into keeping (I. ix; Henley X, 119-121). And there are many more parallels
which suggest the shallowness of the emotions of Phillips' characters and the lack
of morality of the supposedly noble characters. In the prologue Fielding
specifically mentions portrayals of greatness in a defense to which he was to return
in other works:

Examples of the great can serve but few;
For what are kings' and heroes' faults to you?
But these examples are of general use.
What rake is ignorant of King's Coffee-house?
Here the old rake may view the crimes he's known,
And boys dread hence the vices of the town:
Here nymphs seduced may mourn their pleasures past,
And maids, who have their virtue, learn to hold it fast.
(Henley X, 111)

Wolfgang Iser sees the prologue as a serious defense of Fielding's play, saying
of the lines above: "In dieser Verteidigung of "die innere Kraft des Landes" leistete ihm die Komödie einen weiteren Dienst; in dem sie ihm die Möglichkeit bot, in das bunte Menschenleben des Alltags zu greifen und das aus zugängliche Beispiele für Jedermann zu bilden -- eine Möglichkeit, die der Tragödie versagt blieb." Probably this passage, however, isironical in its comment, suggesting rather that as Phillips' play was of no use to anyone, so the burlesque story will be worthless in its lessons. The lesson of the play, given by Lovegirlo, supports this interpretation: "From such examples as of this and that, /We all are taught I know not what"
(II. xiii; Henley X, 133). The presentation of greatness in The Distrest Mother, Fielding suggests, is lacking in any value for the public because of the lack of moral basis: thus the final statement reveals Fielding's concern with the problem of greatness in the moral and social realms. Drama should serve the public, but it cannot if its foundation is false.

In the Mock Doctor, (first produced June 23, 1732) Fielding creates a situation in which one who is in no way deserving of the title is considered to be a great man. The play is in large part an adaptation from Molière's Le Medicin malgré lui, but Fielding is satirizing in particular the notorious French physician Dr. John Misaubin, who was regarded as a quack in Fielding's London. 36 Dr. Misaubin is praised ironically in the introductory letter, which Fielding addresses to him. Fielding states that Misaubin's pill has done so much good that his fellows have turned against him and represented "one of the greatest men of this age as an illiterate empiric" (Henley X, 138-139). In the play itself there are several references to the mock doctor's being a great man -- references which make an ironic commentary on greatness and reveal the ease with which a man may pose as great without having the necessary qualifications. The revelation begins as Dorcas, attempting to revenge her simple husband Gregory for his abuse of her, tells James and Harry that her husband is the great physician they are looking for, but that he does not want to be known as one. James replies, "All your great men have some strange oddities about them." and Dorcas agrees that Gregory's whim is strange "in so great a man." And she continues to speak of "the great man" as she relates the "miracles" he has performed (I. iv; Henley X, 149). When Gregory appears, then, James
says that "we know you, sir, to be a very great physician," and when Gregory denies this, James insists, "Yes, the greatest physician in the world" (I. v; Henley X, 151–152). When James gives an account of Gregory's strange actions to Sir Jasper, who thinks his daughter is in need of the physician, the father too states that "'Tis strange so great a man should have those unaccountable odd humours you mentioned" (I. vii; Henley X, 154). All of these references to greatness show how easily the world may be deceived by a pretense to greatness or a statement that another is great. Because of the credulity of others, Gregory can refer to himself in a later scene as a "great physician." The shallowness of his own understanding too is shown as, clearly knowing nothing of him, he says that Aristotle was a "great man," a "very great man" (I. ix; Henley X, 157). And even others of his profession are deceived: Hellebore, who inquires of Gregory if he is the "great doctor," readily agrees to Gregory's suggested treatment for what he claims to be Dorcas's insanity, a cure that consists only of abuse (I. xiv; Henley X, 166). But Fielding seems to wish to show that those who know a great man must recognize his true nature, a nature that is shown here to be that of a rogue: thus Dorcas interrupts Sir Jasper and Gregory by running in with the question, "Where is this villain, this rogue, this pretended physician?" (I. xvii–xix; Henley X, 171–172). But the pride of the man who has been elevated to the position of greatness is such that, though it is revealed that he is no physician, he still demands respect, and tells his wife that "I'll henceforth have you behave with all deference to my greatness." Fielding is clearly concerned
with the social problem caused by the hypocrite who is thought to be great. Perhaps too there is again an attempt at political satire, with a hint that Walpole, like Misabun, is a quack. According to Sheridan Baker, Walpole is alluded to in a reference to the pills and to the "illiterate empiric," and in the mentions of the "great man." His most convincing argument is his citation of the pamphlet named The Empiric, written against Walpole, to which was attached a ballad portraying Walpole as a doctor. That the political aspect of greatness was not forgotten by Fielding is evidenced by the air which states that for gold one often finds "The great in leagues combined /To trick and rob the poor" (Act. I. x; Henley X, 160).

In The Miser, Fielding's next play and adaptation of Molière (first performed February 16, 1733), the social concern is again predominant in the treatment of the great man, but here Fielding again concentrates his attention on the relationship of the high and low, or rich and poor. In the first three scenes the servants are shown imitating the airs and affectations of the upper classes, and the point of view they adapt from their social superiors is later stated in a comment by the maid Lappet, who congratulates herself on the lies she has told that day: "... what a pity it is that a woman of my excellent talents should be confined to so low a sphere of life as I am! Had I been born a great lady, what a deal of good I should have done in the world" (V. xvi; Henley X, 269). Her use of the word good in this connection is symptomatic of the displacement of value in the entire society. This displacement is discussed by Mariana, one of those set against the corrupt as embodied in the play by the miser Lovegold: bantering with Frederick, his son, she pretends to uphold the "maxim" that "he who is rich can have no
vice, and he that is poor can have no virtue" (V. vii; Henley X, 224). The other uncorrupted characters too are shown to have a saner attitude toward greatness than the one stated by Mariana but held rather, Fielding suggests, by the society. In particular, they state the relation of greatness to happiness. Frederick says, for instance, that he would rather be called the husband of the "greatest of blessings," Mariana, than have the title of the greatest of princes (V. v; Henley X, 221). And Harriet, commenting on her preference for a husband of Clerimont's worth over one with grandeur, states that parents "are too apt to forget how seldom true happiness lives in a palace, or rides in a coach and six" (I ix; Henley X, 188).

It is in the Epistle to Mrs. Clive that precedes Fielding's next published play (The afterpiece Deborah, or a Wife for You All was performed April 6, 1733, but was never published.) that Fielding in his own words states his method: "But while I hold the pen, it will be a maxim with me, that vice can never be too great to be lashed, nor virtue too obscure to be commended; in other words, that satire can never rise too high, nor panegyric stoop too low" (Henley X, 277-279). Though Mrs. Clive's "greatest genius for acting," her "great abilities," are obscured by the factionalism in the theater and the poor taste of the town, not only her acting but also her private character are deserving of praise. And Fielding finds that true merit can never be obscured, though even the nobility favor Italian theaters over the English; and he points out that Mrs. Clive's merit is recognized not by the great but by "the greatest Man of his age." 30 In fact, though she herself is not among the great, Fielding shows her essential greatness and at the same time suggests his own
conception of greatness. The part she took, he tells her, in "the present dispute between the players and the patentees is so full of honour, that had it been in higher life, it would have given you the reputation of the greatest heroine of our age." Thus Mrs. Clive has been truly great in an area which Fielding was frequently to compare to the government in its plotting, in the false greatness of its leaders. In stating the moral basis of the greatness Mrs. Clive achieved with the help of her great abilities, Fielding is drawing in miniature a portrait later to be expanded in his work; and in his praise of this greatness he shows his concern with a society in which true greatness is recognized only by a few but false greatness -- that, for instance, of the opera -- is upheld by the many -- including the nobility who reveal their lack of true greatness by their choice. Fielding's revision of the Author's Farce, performed as a new piece along with the Intriguing Chambermaid in January, 1734, also shows his concern with this problem: in particular, the satire on Italian opera and on the Cibbers is increased, as the father becomes manager of the theater in Hades, and the "great son" continues to reign on earth.  

In accordance with the Epistle, the play contains no great person who deserves the title. The claimants to greatness, the only lords in the play, Puff and Pride, are in themselves, as the names indicate, representatives of false greatness. And satire on the great reaches its peak in the scenes in which these two take advantage of Valentine, the protagonist, at the same time that they scorn him. Their own comments about what seems to be Valentine's ruin, which they have helped to bring about, are in themselves comments on the society in which the lower classes are easily ruined by those above:
LORD PRIDE. Damn me, there's a pleasure in ruining these little mechanical rascals, when they presume to rival the extravagant expenses of us men of quality.

LORD PUFF. That ever such plebeian scoundrels, who are obliged to pay their debts, should presume to engage with us men of quality, who are not.

(II. viii; Henley X, 316)

Colonel Bluff too belongs to those who feel that their position exempts them from moral standards; he, for instance, asks the officials who are attempting to enter Valentine's house: "What is the reason, scoundrels, that you dare disturb gentlemen who are getting drunk as lords?" (II. vii; Henley X, 313). Additional satire on the falsely great is provided in two songs by the chambermaid Lettice. Speaking of the fact that many who are engaged in trade "had shined in rich brocade" were their fathers known, she continues that women find ways to "mend the breed," for sparks grow so low that

From Britons tall,
Our heroes shall
Be Lilliputians all.

(II. iii; Henley X, 308)

Of course the implication is that, like Tom Thumb, the heroes are no longer deserving of the name of heroes. In a song by Valentine with a more obvious moral basis, the kind of honors achieved by the great man as warrior are shown to be false. Showing the warrior's mind as being controlled by ambition to achieve honor and crowns by slaying and enslaving thousands, he states his preference for love (I. iii; Henley X, 291). The stated choice is commonly presented in Fielding's drama, but here the concern with the morality of the conqueror's acts shows Fielding's concern at this point, just before his most extensive satire on the great was written, with the moral
problems involved in a consideration of the great.

But as already hinted in the epistle to Mrs. Clive, Fielding was again greatly concerned with the problem of greatness in society, especially in the theatrical and political realms, and after the Intriguing Chambermaid we find an increased amount of specific social satire on the great. 41

In the dedication, then, of Don Quixote in England to the Earl of Chesterfield, Fielding gives expression to the basis of much of the political satire that is to follow: citing the statement that examples work better than precepts, he continues with a statement that shows his concern with the effect of corruption on society:

This will, my Lord, be found truer with regard to politics than to ethics: the most ridiculous exhibitions of luxury or avarice may likewise have little effect on the sensualist or the miser; but I fancy a lively representation of the calamities brought on a country by general corruption might have a very sensible and useful effect on the spectators.

(Henley, XI, 7)

In dedicating the play to Chesterfield, Fielding was clearly showing his sympathy with the Opposition, and he does identify the administration with "the powerful sons of dulness," as Hessler points out, yet the passage clearly indicates a concern that includes any type of corruption. 42 Hessler's statement that "the play itself is less definitely in favor of the Opposition" does not take into account Fielding's words concerning "general corruption."

In accord with the words of the Dedication, throughout the play corruption, especially in election practices, is exposed as reality collides with Don Quixote's
dream world. Don Quixote himself is not a great man, and his own life may be
dream of greatness is shown to be superior to the attempts of other characters
in the play to achieve a less noble greatness. Thus Don Quixote's concept
of his "heroic profession" (I. iv; Henley XI, 22) becomes especially significant
in its contrast to what the mayor wishes to make of him -- a candidate for
Parliament, who will repay the citizens for having voted for him. Knight-
errantry, in contrast, as Don Quixote sees it, is the quintessence of "all
honesty, honour, virtue" (III. vii; Henley XI, 58-59). And Don Quixote makes
clear the contrast between true and false greatness as he discourses with Sir
Thomas Loveland, who is thinking rather of superficial greatness than of his
daughter's happiness in his plans to have her marry the rich Squire Badger
rather than Fairlove, whom she loves. Asking if it can be possible that Sir
Thomas prefers "that wretch, who is a scandal to his very species," to
"this gentleman, whose person and parts would be an honour to the greatest of it,"
Don Quixote suggests that it is "whimsical" for Loveland to make his daughter
miserable in order to make her happy. And Sir Thomas, calling Don Quixote
a "philosophical pimp," admits that there is truth in his words (III. xiv;
Henley XI, 65). A similar theme is treated in Air II, in which Don Quixote
hears a maid singing that had she been born a princess, she still would have
chosen her Billy, and the final stanza repeats the familiar theme of the failure
of wealth to bring true happiness. In this particular version of the theme, we
can see already a forewarning that Pamela's achievement of station will not be favorably viewed by Fielding:

In title and wealth what is lost,
   In tenderness oft is repaid;
Too much a great fortune may cost:
   Well purchased may be the poor maid.
Let gold's empty show cheat the great;
   We more real pleasures will prove;
While they in their palaces hate,
   We in our poor cottage will love.
   (I. i; Henley XI, 18)

Fielding's concern with the theme here stated is indicated in the fact that the song occurs merely as entertainment which Don Quixote thinks has been prepared for him, and neither the maid nor Billy is ever heard of again.

And again there is a great deal of social criticism which points up the failure of the great to live up to their positions. Don Quixote himself voices some of this criticism as, for instance, he says that jails are only for the poor, while men of fashion may plunder without fear of punishment (I. i; Henley XI, 17). In a passage that sounds very much like Fielding himself, he lectures Sancho on the fact that not virtue but riches and power are esteemed by men and that those are admired who tread to power by destroying other men (II. i; Henley XI, 32). Shortly thereafter he is proven to be right as the mayor tries to persuade him to stand against Sir Thomas Loveland for Member of Parliament and to outdo Sir Thomas's expenditures to win. Don Quixote's final statement is "to what will mankind degenerate! where not only the vile necessaries of life, but even honours, which should be the reward of virtue only, are to be bought with money" (II. iii; Henley X, 35). Don Quixote's judgment
is supported by Squire Badger's comment on great ladies, as he reveals what he has just learned of them: "Who'd marry, when my lord says, here, a man may have your great sort of Ladies, only for wearing a brodered coat, telling half a dozen lies, and making a bow" (III. iv; Henley XI, 55). And the comments on falsely great men and women are echoed by Air X, which contains the familiar statement that both rich and poor are rogues and whores. (II, xiv; Henley XI, 49). There seems to be, however, despite Fielding's concern with politics, little specific personal attack but rather an exposure of general corruption in which all, both high and low, except the virtuous take part. 44

Fielding's next two plays contain only scattered satire on the great. 45 The most telling comment in An Old Man Taught Wisdom (first produced January 17, 1735) is that by Thomas the footman, whom Goodwill's daughter Lucy has married rather than any of an assortment of distant relatives her father had chosen for her. Stating that he will try to be deserving through his love for Lucy and obedience to her father, Mr. Thomas states that his life in a great family has taught him that "no one is respected for what he is, but for what he has; the world pays no regard at present to any thing but money," so that his being a footman will in no way hinder his descendents from being lords if his industry adds to Goodwill's fortune (Henley X, 349).

In the dedication of The Universal Gallant to Charles, Duke of Marlborough, though Fielding states that the young Duke's humanity toward the poor is similar to his forefather's concern for the oppressed, there is no allusion to
the current political situation. And in the play (first produced February 10, 1735), the main concern with greatness is rather a foreshadowing of Amelia than of the political plays that follow. As he is told that Gaylove has been guilty of "some small offences" in lying with other men's wives, Sir Simon Raffler exclaims, "Small offences! and yet to break open a house, or rob on the highway are great offences. A man that robs me of five shillings is a rogue, and to be hanged; but he that robs me of my wife is a fine gentleman, and a man of honour" (III. i; Henley XI, 111). And later in the play as this jealous husband points out the number of ways he may be cuckolded, he says a lord's title gives "a patent to cuckold all mankind" (V. I; Henley XI, 153).

It is in Pasquin, the first play that Fielding produced with the new "Great Mogul's Company" (on March 15, 1735), that direct political attack is predominant in Fielding's concern with the striving that he sees for a mere superficial greatness. The name Pasquin itself, recalling the legend of the two statues at Rome with the names Pasquin and Marforio to which charges and replies, respectively, were fastened, suggests Fielding's role. 46 Though the play contains much satire on Walpole, it is clear that not merely one party or person is the subject of the attack, but all in the society who strive for greatness without virtue; and corruption is shown to exist on all levels. Thus in "The Election," the first of two plays within the rehearsal frame, the bribery of Lord Place and Colonel Promise of the Court party is supported by the willingness of the Mayor to be bribed. And the indirect bribery of Sir Harry of the Country party is met with the same encouragement. Mrs. Mayoress is easily bribed because of her envy of what she thinks is the happiness of people
of quality. And the other voters too merely need to be assured that some material gain will result from their votes. The implication is that any corrupt party, either Walpole's or the Opposition, succeeds largely because of the false conception that exists of greatness. Thus the mayor defends changing sides from the Court to Country party by saying that Sir Harry "is to be -- I don't know what to call him, not I -- some very great man; and as soon as he is a very great man, I am to be made an ambassador of" (II. i; Henley XI, 188). And Mrs. Mayoress too discusses the bribery of the great, this time Lord Place; suggesting that the mayor return a dishonest count in the election, she asks, "How can you expect that great men should do anything to serve you, if you stick at anything to serve them?" Both parties have their "great men." There are probably specific attacks on Walpole, especially in Lord Place's bribery of the mayor by squeezing his hand, for Walpole's "squeeze" was well known in opposition literature. 47 Too, there is specific satire of Cibber and his failure to be worthy of his great position in Lord Place's promise to a voter to make him poet laureate. To the voter's reply that he is no poet, the lord replies that that does not matter, for he will be able to make odes; and to the voter's question as to what odes are, he replies, "Faith, sir, I can't tell what they are; but I know you may be qualified for the place without being a poet" (II. i; Henley XI, 184). All this supports the general picture of a society corrupt in its politics.

In the second part of Pasquin, the rehearsal of "The Life and Death of Queen Common-Sense," then, there is an explanation for the events of the first, for in this play Common Sense is deserted by her one-time followers, by representatives
of religion, law, and medicine, who go to the side of ignorance. The "great
Queen of Ignorance" is welcomed as she appears at Covent Garden by Harlequin,
clearly intended to represent Rich (V. i. Henley XI, 217), and the political
and theatrical realms are shown to be ruled by the same kind of greatness.
The most direct satire on the falsely great occurs in the dialogue between the
two rival queens. Ignorance claims that man need not think, for the wisest
man will be defeated by fortune, who will "set the greatest blunderer above
him." Common-Sense replies that the favorites of Ignorance have caused
this circumstance, and that "Could Common-sense bear universal sway, /No
fool could ever possibly be great" (V. i; Henley XI, 220). Thus when
Common-Sense is killed by Firebrand, the priest who has turned to the worship
of ignorance, she foretells what will occur under the "leaden sceptre" of
Ignorance, ending her oration with the following prediction:

Places, requiring learning and great parts,
Henceforth shall all be hustled in a hat,
And drawn by men deficient in them both.
Statesmen -- but oh! cold death will let me say
No more -- and you must guess et cetera.

(V. i; Henley XI, 224)

Her prediction is substantiated as a messenger from Crane Court appears to
congratulate Ignorance and request an alliance between her Grub Street society
and theirs, and she replies that she considers this society to be of "great
worth." Only the ghost of Common-Sense remains; thus, Fielding shows, those
who are worthy fail to be recognized as great because of the ignorance that
reigns in society: 48 thus the "greatest blunderer," Walpole, can reign along
with the fools of all professions. 49
The **Pasquin** satire is continued in the periodical **Common Sense**, which owes its name to Fielding's play. In the issue for Saturday, May 27, 1737, Fielding himself replies under the signature **Pasquin** to charges in the **Daily Gazetteer**, defending Gay's and his ridicule of vice with the argument that one does not always approve of what he laughs at. In this defense he again points to Walpole as he states that "you will not hardly, I believe, persuade us, how much soever you may desire it, that it is the Mark of a great Character to be laughed at by a whole Kingdom." He insists that not all government is a farce, but that power without dignity cannot be honored by "the Philosopher, or the Man of Sense." Instead, "Greatness in mean Hands" is a subject for burlesque. 50 Here is the theory behind the social, especially political, satire that characterizes in particular Fielding's later plays.

Fielding's next play, **Tumble-Down Dick** (first performed April 29, 1736), frequently served as an afterpiece for **Pasquin**; and in the Dedication to "Mr. John Lun" he shows the relationship of the satire in the two plays. In the ironic flattery of Lun (John Rich's assumed name when he took the role of Harlequin), he makes an implicit association between Rich's role as manager and the role of the great man in public life. In addition, thanking Rich for refusing the play (**Pasquin**) which Fielding had offered him that winter, he says that he could no more wish to play a minor role in Rich's private "dramatic entertainment of greatness" than he could have yielded to "any mean or subservient solicitations of the great men in real life." The praise of Rich for his failure to concern himself with **Common Sense**, since he can succeed without her, relates the play still more closely to **Pasquin**: "you are too great
and good a Manager, to keep a needless supernumerary in your house." Finally, there is praise of his behavior in his "great station" and of his other "great endowments" (Henley XII, 7-9).

The play itself is a satire on the accomplishments of the falsely great, in particular of Rich in the theater, and therefore on the taste of the town that made possible the success of the pantomime The Fall of Phaeton, in the production of which Rich was involved at Drury Lane. As he had in Tom Thumb and The Covent Garden Tragedy, Fielding burlesques the presentation of falsely great persons by presenting low persons, in this play the gods and goddesses transformed into mortals who talk in heroics, and gods who remain gods (though with distinctly human characteristics) and talk in prose. Machine, the director of the pantomime, explains that his reason for using this method is that it is more unnatural, and "the chief beauty of an entertainment, sir, is to be unnatural" (Henley XII, 27). Fielding is in effect saying again that the stage is not representing greatness properly. Thus Clymene and her son Phaeton become a cobbler's wife and her son, and when Phoebus, represented as the watchman, is referred to by Clymene as Phaeton's "great father," the comment on greatness is unmistakeable (Henley XII, 15). Even the gods Neptune and Jupiter are humanized to such an extent that when Neptune, dressed as a waterman, calls himself "the mighty emperor of the sea," and Jupiter upon entrance "with a pair of bellows" is called "great Jupiter," the discrepancy is similar to that involved in naming Tom Thumb "the Great" (Henley XII, 24-25). And Jupiter's conception of himself as privileged by his greatness is exemplified
in his decision to enjoy the wife of the Sun while the Sun is at work. His reply to Neptune indicates his similarity to the falsely great lords Fielding portrays in other plays: "Neptune, this service merits my regard, / For all great men should still their pimps reward" (Henley XII, 29). In addition to these discrepancies shown to exist between name and object in the portrayal of greatness, scattered comments about greatness emphasize Fielding's concern with this problem.

The characters of the play are clearly English citizens in these comments. Clymene, for instance, supports Young Phaeton's attempt to find out whether Phoebus is his son:

Go clear my fame, for greater 'tis in life  
To be a rich man's whore, than poor man's wife.
If you are rich, your vices men adore,  
But hate and scorn your virtues, if you're poor.

(Henley XII, 16)

This statement of the popular attitude toward greatness is followed by the air beginning "Great courtiers palaces contain" which Fielding had already used in the Grub-Street Opera to state the difference in the fate of the little and great of various professions (Henley XII, 16).

In addition to the general concern of the play with a failure to recognize and present true greatness, there is again in this play political satire aimed at Walpole. As Baker has pointed out, the subtitle Phaeton in the Suds is reminiscent of the popular ballad of 1731 called The Statesman's Fall, or Sir Bob in the Dust. 52 This ballad celebrates Walpole's fall during a chase, a fall recalled in the Countryman's comment about the Sun: "Maybe he's going a fox-hunting to-day, but he takes devilish large leaps" (Henley XII, 24). Perhaps too the lamentations of the countrymen about the path of the sun are meant to echo complaints about Walpole's course of actions. Probably there
is an allusion to Walpole's means of achieving greatness through the familiar theatrical manager-politician parallel as the Manager in the pantomime offers the Justice a bribe. And the air from the Grub-Street Opera retains the allusion to the "great rogue" who lives in vogue while lesser rogues are hanged.

One of the pieces performed at the Haymarket during 1736 was George Lillo's Fatal Curiosity. That Fielding accepted the piece after it had been turned down by others, evidently because of the failure of The Christian Hero, is in itself evidence that the piece is deserving of note in a study of Fielding. Moreover, the preface by Fielding indicates a concern for greatness apart from the specific attacks on the falsely great in his own plays of this period. Saying that the tragic muse no longer pleases, Fielding points out that Lillo departs from the "modern fashionable way":

No fustian hero rages here to night;
No armies fall, to fix a tyrant's right;
From lower life we draw our scene's distress:
--Let not your equals move your pity less!
Virtue distrest in humble state support;
Nor think, she never lives without the court.

Thus we have a serious statement of an idea being presented humorously in Fielding's plays: that greatness characterized by tyranny and bombast is less worthy of admiration than humble virtue. As he does in many of his own plays, Fielding here sees the display of bombast greatness in the "fustian hero" as symptomatic of the measurement of worth from outward signs alone. The transition from the consideration of literary subject to life is made implicitly: the audience is asked not to object to the fact that no typical hero is
being presented, but to realize that not only such a hero, or man, is worthy of admiration. In this prologue too the implicit defense of domestic tragedy is a foreshadowing of Fielding's serious rather than comic treatment of the relation of greatness and domestic virtue in *Amelia.*

In Fielding's next play, however, he continued to present the general kind of satire on the society that had characterized his preceding plays. The title *Eurydice, or the Devil Henpecked* (first produced February 14, 1737) indicates its similarity to *Tumble-Down Dick;* but, perhaps because the play was presented at Drury-Lane, more obvious political satire is limited. Here again the gods and goddesses and lofty mortals become men and women, but this time men and women of high society. And through the contrast between their actions and their great positions and names, Fielding satirizes their claims to greatness. Thus Madam Eurydice, who, as the Author says, "is the fine lady of my play; and a fine lady she is, or I am mistaken," plots as a fine lady would to avoid returning to live with her husband. The devil too is a "very fine gentleman" who has a place among the greats: Captain Weazell reports that he "never missed him in or about Westminster Hall."

And the inhabitants of hell are chiefly claimants to greatness; Captain Weazell continues as he advises Mr. Spindle how to be introduced: "No, hanged, no; then he will take you for a poor rogue, a sort of people he abominates so, that there are scarce any of them here. No, if you would recommend yourself to him, tell him you deserved to be hanged, and was too great for the law" (Henley XI, 274). This is of course the familiar allusion to Walpole, made
especially appropriate because the government of hell is likened by implication to the government of England, where George was considered to be dominated by his wife, as Pluto is by Proserpine. The author, replying to the critic's question of why the devil is hen-pecked, says, "Sir, you know where I have laid the scene, and how could hell be better represented than by supposing the people under petticoat government?" (Henley XI, 286). 56 Though the chief concern is with the general behavior of great people, Fielding's specific barbs, though not as direct or numerous as in many other plays, show his continued determination that vice cannot be too great to be lashed.

The title The Historical Register for the Year 1736 (first produced March 21, 1737) 57 indicates that Fielding's next play will deal with such events as were mentioned in the annual Historical Register Containing an Impartial Relation of All Transactions, Foreign and Domestic. As one would expect, then, the satire attacks the great of English society and especially of politics. The "Dedication to the Public" is perhaps not so much a parody of political journalism, as Hessler has called it, 58 as a piece of political writing influenced by journalism. In this dedication the satirical aims of the play are pointed up by feigned denial of intention to ridicule. Stating his intention to give the public helpful hints about the theatrical world, Fielding when he refers to corruption then comments that such corruption has the same influence on all societies. When he says the one who introduces it should be treated as one who poisons a fountain, there is no doubt he is referring to Walpole. To further reinforce the satire of the falsely great man, he denies the charge that
he is aiming at overthrow of the ministry, saying that rather he is ridiculing the "absurd and inadequate notions" persons have of the ministry and its methods. The satire is not merely the reverse, that that of inadequate greatness, but is also directed toward those who tolerate such greatness; Fielding hints at this purpose in the dedication by stating that he hopes that the Gazetteer will not think that such persons as he pictures have had the audacity to wish to control a "great people" or that the people could be content under such an administration. He states too that the Quidam of the play could be no one other than the devil, and asks "Is this not the light wherein he (the devil) is everywhere described in Scripture, and the writings of the best divines!" In particular, he uses South's figure of the great man as fishing for victims as he says that the devil's favorite bait has always been gold.

But within the play too Fielding gives clues to the method he uses in his satire. Thus he has Sourwit, the critic, ask Medley, the author of the play being rehearsed, how the play is organized and how the political is connected with the theatrical portion of the "history." Medley, who frequently speaks for Fielding, replies concerning the great: "O very easily -- When my politics come to a farce, they very naturally lead me to the play-house, where, let me tell you, there are some politicians too, where there is lying, flattering, dissembling, promising, deceiving, and undermining, as well as in any court in Christendom" (I. 1; Henley XI, 242). In the play rehearsed, then, Walpole is the chief object of satire, among other unworthy claimants to greatness.
Thus the prologue with its parody of Cibber's odes ridicules a poet laureate whom Fielding considers unworthy of his high office (I. i; Henley XI, 243). This is a proper introduction to the scene supposedly set in Corsica, where the "first and greatest politician" representing Walpole says nothing and the others merely discuss how to gain money. Medley again makes the point: "they are the ablest heads in the kingdom, and consequently the greatest men; for you may be sure all well-regulated governments, as I represent this of Corsica to be, will employ in their greatest posts men of greatest capability" (I. i; Henley XI, 246). The next scene again introduces politicians, this time female politicians, of which Medley says no country can excel the English ones. Their claim to the term great is shown to be false by the triviality of their chatter. And in the following auction scene the satire returns to great men as Hen auctions off a remnant of Political Honesty. Pointing out that is is a practical garment because, both sides being alike, it can be turned, Hen assures the crowd that "several great men have made their birthday suits out of the same piece" (II. 1; Henley XI, 253). As the auction progresses, a gentleman runs in to say that Pistol (Fielding's name for young Cibber) is mad, and thinking himself to be a great man, is marching through the streets. But the emphasis in the satire is not so much on Cibber's ability as an actor, but rather his managerial capacity. Medley again clarifies to Sourwit, so that the audience will not miss the political satire, the resemblance between the political and theatrical states; and in Pistol's speech, his failure to qualify for the title "prime minister theatrical" which he, having gone mad, claims on the basis of his "great ability and parts," is shown, and Walpole's
similar failure is suggested (II. i; Henley XI, 258). Pistol's comparison of himself with Caesar indicates too his false conception of greatness. And the satire on the Cibbers is maintained in the scene in which Apollo, the theater director who knows nothing of drama, is presented. Again Medley suggests that the satire is broader than it may seem, but this time he does not limit it to political realms: instead, he points out that he intends to ridicule in the scene the modern discovery "that a man of great parts, learning, and virtue, is fit for no employment whatever" (III. i; Henley XI, 259-260). In accordance with this discovery "that honesty is the only sort of folly for which a man ought to be utterly neglected and condemned," Apollo's statement that the audience may hiss as long as the theater gets their money, brings Medley's ironic comment that the sentiment is worthy of a great man (III. i; Henley XI, 263). As Keuffel points out, a contemporary audience would have recognized the allusion to Walpole's alleged practices of forcing policies on the country for his own gain.59 When Pistol reappears and refers to his "triumphant course, "Medley explains to Sourwit that Pistol is every insignificant person who considers himself to be of "great consequence" (III. i; Henley XI, 264). Thus all those who claim greatness falsely are ridiculed.

But, to conclude the play, Fielding turns the satire in another specific direction as he brings the patriots on the stage and shows their similarity to the "greatest politicians" of the first act. Even those who claim to wish to destroy the falsely great, Fielding suggests, easily succumb to the tricks of the great man. They too can be bribed by Quidam, the certain great man whom everyone recognized (III. i; Henley XI, 265). As a final satiric comment on the nature
of greatness, Fielding points out that the presentation of Quidam's regaining his bribes is a pantomime burlesquing the great Lum -- John Rich, whose productions had already become for Fielding a symbol of the world turned topsy-turvy.

Fielding's next play, Eurydice Hiss'd (first produced April 13, 1737), also includes a wide range of satire on false greatness in society, this time presented not through a variety of scenes but rather through consistent and deliberate ambiguities surrounding the nature of the greatness of the central character of the play Spatter has under rehearsal. Spatter says that his tragedy is instructive, conveying a "beautiful image of human greatness and of the uncertainty of friends." He continues: "You see here the author of a mighty farce at the very top and pinnacle of poetical or rather farcical greatness, followed, flattered, and adored by a crowd of dependents: on a sudden, fortune changing the scene, and his farce being damned, you see him become the scorn of his admirers, and deserted and abandoned by all those who courted his favour, and appeared the foremost to uphold and protect him" (Henley XI, 298). On one level Spatter's statement is, Fielding would imply, true: that is, the play is about the decline of what is considered by Spatter and people of his judgment to be great, and is therefore a reflection on the judgment of the town. The play too can be seen as a burlesque of other, more lofty plays which claim to have great figures as central to their tragedy. In this way it resembles the Author's Farce, Tom Thumb, and the Covent-
Garden Tragedy. When the tragedy then is presented, Pillage, the tragic hero and author of the farce, is an embodiment of those who, without sufficient basis, consider themselves to be great. In one respect he is Fielding himself, the dramatist who relied on his reputation and his friends instead of proving himself great by his work. And he is any poet or playwright who considers himself great but lacks the qualifications. Thus he has the trappings of greatness; for instance, he holds a levee because, as Spatter says, "my poet is a very great man." And in particular he suggests Cibber in his reply to Honestus that he would rather be "the blundering laureat to a court" than to be remembered in future years for merit (Henley XI, 302). The muse, too, refers to Cibber as she says she would rather "indite the annual verse" of city bellmen or court laureates than aid the scribblers who for hire are willing to help oppress the country (Henley XI, 304). At the conclusion of the play, then, Fielding shows what may happen to such false greatness, as Spatter's farce is damned. And again in this play, as in the earlier ones, there is a figure who is contrasted with the falsely great Pillage: Honestus in this case is the friend, the value of whose advice Pillage only at the end of the play admits, saying he should have relied on the quality of his piece rather than on his supposed friends. His greatness should have been based on merit, which would have been approved by the "Impartial judgment of the town." Honestus' moral in conclusion states:

May mankind profit by this sad example,
May men grow wise, writers grow more scarce,
And no man dare to make a simple farce.

(Henley XI, 308)
But Pillage of course, any of the audience who were familiar with Fielding's work might have guessed without the clues, also suggests political false greatness. Pillage in his first speech compares himself to Wolsey, "that mighty minister" who was also the author of a farce. This allusion in itself is enough to suggest Walpole (Henley XI, 298). And Spatter comments on Pillage's actions as the poet is trying to win support for his play: first, he says, he wishes to warn authors against relying on "party" to support them; and second, he wants to teach "greater persons" to despise attendants and dependents (Henley XI, 301). Here surely there is a warning to Walpole against trying to impose his schemes on the country. Thus in the conclusion Fielding can be seen not only in Pillage but in Honestus, who is warning Walpole that the country may recognize the true nature of the farce he is attempting to produce -- and, thereby, recognize that his claim to greatness is not based on merit. Fielding's satire in the last play he produced before the Licensing Act is social, and chiefly political, but he expresses his hope that the town will be able to judge greatness correctly by means of the example he has given of false greatness. The foundation of his drama remains as it was when he wrote the dedication to Chesterfield, and even earlier; here Fielding attempts to expose corruption by giving a "Word to the Wise." He has become increasingly concerned in his work with social implications of the great man theme.

Because of the wide diversity in the twenty-two published plays which were
performed before the passage of the Licensing Act, it is difficult to formulate any general statement about them. Clearly greatness is not the major theme, or even one of several major themes, in all of them — as it surely is in Tom Thumb. Yet all except one include, if only in a limited way, direct commentary on greatness. As Fielding begins his theatrical career he sets in opposition the falsely great and the good, in both Love in Several Masques and in The Temple Beau. This structure reappears in many of the plays. Already in these two, and especially the next plays, the use of the term great to include those of high position in various professions — and to include ironically those who falsely consider themselves worthy of such position. Too, he begins already in The Author's Farce and Tom Thumb to criticize writers who claim to present greatness to the public but are actually presenting mere bombast. And his presentation of false greatness comes to have social implications, explored especially clearly, for instance, in Rape upon Rape, The Letter Writers, and The Modern Husband. Accordingly, Fielding comes to have increased interest in the failure of the public to judge greatness accurately; this failure is suggested already in the play presented within The Author's Farce as well as in comments made by characters in other plays, but is pointed up especially in Pasquin. As the political implications become especially significant in the later plays, they too merge with other elements of the plays. Thus in Eurydice Hiss'd Fielding combines a laugh at himself with commentary on the false presentation of greatness in literature; on the failure of the public to judge greatness properly; and on the falsely great in politics
and literature, with Walpole and Cibber as special targets. In addition, there is commentary, related to the opposition set up between the false greatness of Pillage and the goodness of Honestus, on the nature of true greatness. We are not far from the complex satire of Jonathan Wild.
NOTES

CHAPTER TWO

1. Wilbur L. Cross, The History of Henry Fielding (New Haven, 1918), I, 60, points out that The Craftsman for Saturday, January 27, announces that the poem will be published the following Monday.


3. M. D. Hessler notes that Fielding used the political background in Tom Thumb, the Grub-Street Opera, and Don Quixote in England, but as she is specifically concerned with Walpolian allusions, makes no general comment about the significance of Fielding's concern with greatness in the plays. Irwin, pp. 64-66, comes closer to representing the importance of the great man in Fielding's works, but limits his brief consideration to the great man as politician, conqueror, or rogue, mentioning only Pasquin, the Historical Register, Don Quixote in England, and Tom Thumb. Winfield H. Rogers, "Fielding's Early Aesthetic and Technique," SP, XL (1943), 529-551, states that "As the symbol lay with Fielding /after Tom Thumb/ it gradually took on richer connotations," but supports this statement only with mention of The Letter Writers and Pasquin, the plays where "Fielding approached the idea." This is surely an understatement.

4. Such self-deception is suggested too in Fielding's dedication (first included in 1731) to "Count" Heidegger, the director of the masquerade, which contains the following statement: "Besides, you have so great a soul, that you despise all scandal -- and live in the world with the same indifference, that people have at a masquerade, where they are not known." L. P. Goggin, "Fielding's The Masquerade," PG, XXXVI (1957), 475-482, comments on the dedication, noting in particular this quotation.

5. Except where otherwise noted, all references to Fielding's works are to The Complete Works of Henry Fielding, Esq., ed. William Ernest Henley (London, 1903).


8. Lady Lucy's boastful statement in another scene that she herself is as cruel as Caligula is in accordance with the point of view here expressed (III.i; Henley VIII, 137).


11. Helen Sard Hughes, "Fielding's Indebtedness to James Ralph," *MP*, XX (1922), p. 33, attempting to prove that Fielding's work shows Ralph's influence points to Fielding's use of the puppet show and his reference to the puppet-show qualities of the stage. She does not, however, note the frequency of allusions to puppet-shows in the eighteenth century. The *Spectator*, No. 31 (Thursday, April 5, 1711), for instance, entitled "A Projector's Plan of an Opera," relates a plan to combine all "the remarkable shows about town," so that the people will not have to bother going to all, into a play called "The expedition of Alexander the Great." When the battle between Alexander and Porus is over, they are to go to a puppet-show together.

12. As Sheridan Baker, "Political Allusion in Fielding's *Author's Farce*, *Mock Doctor*, and *Tumble-Down Dick*," *PMLA*, LXXVII (1962), 225-226, points out, this section is changed in the 1734 edition from the original brief reference to "the Man in the Moon, or some Monster" (1730 ed., p. 27) to the allusion in the Henley edition to the great man and Member of Parliament. Another change that points up the concern with political greatness is the addition in the 1734 edition of the phrase "a great man with his power" (I. iii; Henley VIII, 201).

13. It is tempting to see an ironic allusion, perhaps a foretaste of the technique of *Tom Thumb*, to the size of the great King of Bantam, but I have been unable to find any connotation of smallness in the eighteenth century use of the term. Probably Fielding's allusion to Bantam carried rather the suggestion of outlandishness, as did Dryden's in *To Sir Godfrey Kneller* in 1694: "Flat Faces, such a wou'd disgrace a Skreen, / Such as in Bantam's Embassy were seen." (Poems, ed. James Kinsley. Oxford, 1958, II, 859, 11. 53-54.) There is a reference to the king of Bantam in Congreve's *Love for Love*, I. i; as Sir Sampson relates his adventures: "Body o' me, I have made a cuckold of a king, and the present majesty of Bantam is the issue of these loins" (*The Complete Plays of William Congreve*, ed. Alex C. Ewald. London, n.d., p. 225).

In Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*, V, i, in his *Works* (London, 1775), p. 100, the two kings of Brentford "descend in the clouds, singing, and in white garments." A. D. McKillop in his edition of James Thomson, *The Castle*
of Indolence and Other Poems (Lawrence, Kansas, 1961), p. 204, note to canto lxxxi, cites passages in which Brentford is mentioned as an unattractive town.

14. Notable as forerunners who satirized bombast in tragedy are not only the Rehearsal but also Addison's Spectator papers on tragedy. In No. 40 (April 16, 1711) he speaks of the bombast which proceeds "rather from a swelling than greatness of mind," and in No. 42 (April 18, 1711) he is concerned specifically with the superficiality of the character of the great man in tragedy: "The ordinary method of making a hero, is to clap a huge plume of feathers on his head, which rises so very high, that there is often a greater length from his chin to the top of his head, than to the sole of his foot. One would believe, that we thought a great man and a tall man the same thing."

15. All references to the Tragedy of Tragedies are to the Henley edition. References to Tom Thumb (1730) are to the Hillhouse edition. Fielding's footnote here cites "oh! Marius, Marius, wherefore art thou Marius" from Otway's Marius. Evidently the parody is meant to satirize Otway rather than Shakespeare.

16. The 1621 version of the story accordingly is called "The History of Tom Thumb the Little" (STC #14056); see also Joseph Ritson, Pieces of Ancient Popular Poetry (London, 1791).

17. Little has been said about the relation of Swift's Travels to Tom Thumb; Hillhouse does not concern himself with it, and Keuffel, though he treats both works, does not mention it. Keuffel appears to miss, too, that the play is a satire on the conception of greatness shown in heroic tragedy. Rogers, SP, p. 544, comes more to the point when she writes that Tom Thumb "is the symbol for greatness, physically representing the spiritual insignificance of greatness. The Tragedy of Tragedies is closer to Jonathan Wild than is commonly thought." Her statement of the relation of the drama to the novel is indeed accurate; she might though have mentioned other works which are "close" to the Tragedy of Tragedies.

Hillhouse in a note, p. 182, mistakenly might lead one away from Wagstaffe as Fielding's source. Concerning Fielding's own note "See the History of Tom Thumb, page 2" (Henley IX, p. 64), Hillhouse says that the lines Merlin recites are different in Wagstaffe; actually, Fielding's lines are identical with those in the Comment Upon the History of Tom Thumb (in Parodies of Ballad Criticism, ed. William K. Wimsatt, Jr. The Augustan Reprint Society Publication Number 63. Los Angeles, 1957), pp. 8-9. As recorded in John Ashton's Chapbooks of the Eighteenth Century (London, 1882) p. 208, the lines differ. (This is of course not intended to prove that Fielding used Wagstaffe's
version.) Hughes, MP, pp. 29-30, argues for Ralph's influence on the play. Yet she seems to forget, though she comments that Ralph's account of the possibilities for treatment of Chevy Chase is reminiscent of Addison, that the points of influence she traces could well have come from Addison, Wagstaffe, or others, and that she herself has provided the best argument against her statement that the play was probably written after a recent perusal of Ralph's work.


21. Fielding quotes these lines, giving credit merely to "a burlesque Writer," in The True Patriot, No. 16, Tue., Feb. 11, 1746, as he discusses the instability of human greatness, quoting also from the Rehearsal.

22. Cross, I, 103. Dudden, I, 66-67, merely says "there is some reason to believe" this was Fielding's first experiment in political satire. Hessler, pp. 124-125, finds that Tom Thumb is not significant as a political play. Keuffel, pp. 128-130, makes no positive statement but says it is possible to see political satire in the play.

23. Political Ballads Illustrating the Administration of Sir Robert Walpole, ed. Milton O. Percival (Oxford, 1916), p. 1. Percival says of the ballad, the first in his collection, that it is the earliest he has seen in which Walpole has any prominence. A ballad entitled "The Raree Show Man" is cited in Percival's Appendix, p. 197. See the Champion for Thursday, May 8, 1740 (II, 188), for a comparison by Fielding of Walpole and the master of a raree show.

24. I assume that the prologue is by Fielding. The argument has much in common with his other work, and the use of hath (typical of Fielding but not of other writers of the day) is additional evidence.

25. Cross, I, 105. One might note that Fielding's political satire is at times so well hidden from the modern reader that one critic, Frans Pieter van der Voorde, Henry Fielding, Critic and Satirist (U. S. - Gravenhage, 1931), p. 131, states that the Grub-Street Opera contains Fielding's first hit at Walpole.


27. Cross, I, 114-116, discussing the migration of Fielding and many actors from the Haymarket Theater, which was threatened by interference from the Government, to Drury Lane, which was under government patronage, states
that this move forced Fielding to refrain from pointed satire against Walpole. This is a tempting solution to a difficult problem -- yet Drury Lane was producing the Beggar's Opera in the 1730's, and no one doubted that Walpole was alluded to in this play.

28. Cross, I, 118.

29. Dudden, I, 107, admits the possibility that the dedication was ironical, but says that Fielding may have thought that some flattery of Walpole was worthy trying. Cross, I, 121, on the other hand, states that the dedication "was in the main an adroitly phrased appeal to him to become a protector of letters."

30. On the other hand, a statement by Merit about Richly's levee suggests that Fielding did have Walpole specifically in mind. Merit at the end of I. viii (Henley X, 21) says: "What an abundance of poor wretches go to the feeding the vanity of that Leviathan -- one great rogue." Pulteney's ballad The Honest Jury, estimated by Percival, p. 26, to be of 1729, celebrates the failure of the attorney-general to obtain conviction of the Craftsman to libel. Pulteney looks forward to the fall of Walpole, "the Leviathan," as predicted by the Craftsman.

31. Cross, III, 144. Merit's and Bravemore's talk of the great man remains unchanged in the various editions despite other changes.

32. Cross, I, 127.

33. Cross, I, 127, notes that The Distrest Mother (1712) was still a stock piece at Drury Lane. Felix Lindner, Henry Fieldings dramatische Werke (Leipzig and Dresden, 1895), p. 72, states that the play was excessively praised; that it "mit unverdientem Lob überhaupt wurde."

34. Ambrose Philips, The Distrest Mother (London, 1712). Other parallels: Orestes' wooing of Hermione and her agreement to return to Sparta if Pyrrhus chooses to give up her rather than Astyanax (II, ii) - Bilkum's argument with Stormandra over payment, and the agreement achieved by Mother Punchbowl's intervention (II. i & ii; Henley X, 120-124). The whole attempt of Hermione and Andromache to get Pyrrhus' favor for her own cause - Lovegirlo's appearance to Stormandra, and Kissinda's getting him by offering love without payment (II. v & vi; Henley X, 125-128). Hermione's persuading Orestes to kill the "false" Pyrrhus (because he did not choose her, IV. iii) - Stormandra's easy persuasion of Bilkum to kill Lovegirlo, promising love in return (II, vi; Henley X, 126-128). Orestes' plan to kill Pyrrhus and Hermione's stabbing herself over him (V. v) - Bilkum's "killing" Lovegirlo and report of Stormandra's killing herself (II, x; Henley X, 130). Orestes' madness when he hears of Hermione's death (V, v) - Bilkum's when he hears of Stormandra's death (II. xii; Henley X, 131-132).

36. See Cross, I, 131.

37. Baker, PMLA, 227-228. The ballad, entitled "A World of Quacks; or All Men Turn'd Physicians," was published in Fog's Weekly Journal for November 13, 1731; Percival cites the ballad in his Appendix, p. 190. Quotations from the Empryrick, "which came out by way of Epistle, addressed to one of the Profession" appear in Fog's for Saturday, September 25, and Saturday, October 16, 1731.

38. A likely guess is Chesterfield, to whom Fielding was to dedicate his next play. Cross, I, p. 159, states that Chesterfield is the man, but gives no evidence in support of his statement. Fielding continued to hold the high opinion he here expresses of Mrs. Clive; in a note signed C (one of Fielding's signatures in this periodical, as in the Champion) in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 11 (p. 3), she is, according to Jensen, II, 155, spoken of as the "greatest Actress the World ever saw."

39. The reference is to the struggle of the Drury Lane company for survival under John Highmore, especially after the departure of many actors under young Cibber's leadership for the Little Theatre in 1733. See Cross, I, especially 147-155.


41. This increase perhaps was made possible in part by the new theatrical situation, which caused Fielding's next play, Don Quixote in England (which was a revision of a play begun in Leyden) to be acted at the Haymarket rather than the Drury Lane and caused Fielding in the next year to reorganize the players at the Haymarket as "The Great Mogul's Company of Comedians," a name which is in itself a comment on the greatness of the theatre manager of the day with his tyrannical powers. See Cross, I, 157, 177-178.

42. Hessler, 128-129. Hessler comments that the allusion to the sons of dulness foreshadows the Kingdom of Nonsense in Pasquin. She should rather have said it recalls the Kingdom of Nonsense in the Author's Farce, or foreshadows that of Ignorance in Pasquin.


44. Keuffel, p. 136, finds one "good-humored thrust" at Walpole in Sancho's statement that if he becomes governor of an island, he will act as other wise governors do and plunder as rapidly as he can (II. xiv; Henley XI, 49). Keuffel adds that there may be other hits at Walpole, but that most of the satire is not
aimed exclusively at his party.

45. These two plays were produced at Drury Lane.

46. Pasquin had been the title of a newspaper which was published a few years earlier.

47. Hessler's statement, pp. 131-132, is that particular touches suggest "that Fielding had Walpole in mind more definitely than before." Her evidence too is the bribery incident, which, she points out, recalls in particular a paper in the Craftsman, No. 369, July 28, 1733.


49. The dedication of the Select Letters Taken from Fog's Weekly Journal, No. 12 (London 1732) to "the Greatest Blunderer in Christendom" sets the tone of the whole political work.

50. Common Sense (London, 1738-1739), I, 116-117. Fielding did not forget about Common Sense after this period. In the Jacobite's Journal, No. 12, he argues that the mere fact that Jacobism is nonsense is no reason for people of low understanding not to believe in its principles (Saturday, February 20, 1748). Common Sense is mentioned specifically in No. 12 as Fielding, declaring that the principles of Jacobism are inconsistent with it, relinquishes his pose and declares outright that he has tried to laugh men out of their follies (Saturday, March 26, 1748).


52. Baker, PMLA, LXXVII, 228, suggests the ballad as substantiation for the satire he sees on Walpole, but does not suggest the allusion to Walpole's political fall. The ballad is in Percival, pp. 56-58. Percival points out that Wilkins assigned the date 1742 because he thought the poem dealt with Walpole's political fall. (The ballad is also in Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, ed. W. Walker Wilkins. London, 1860.) It is tempting, though perhaps hazardous, to suspect a connection between Fielding's subtitle, Phaeton in the Suda, and a 1733 work which I have not seen entitled Robin in the Suda, or a Hue and Cry after the Bill of Excise, cited by Keuffel among numerous works addressed to Walpole.

54. Quoted by Cross, I, 201.

55. Voorde, pp. 68-69, notes the defense of domestic tragedy, but finds a disparity not extensively discussed between Fielding's theory and practice.


58. Hessler, pp. 135-156.

59. Keuffel, p. 144.
CHAPTER THREE

THE MISCELLANIES

In the three volumes of the Miscellanies which Fielding published in 1743 but which are composed in large part of material written in the preceding years, he carries on in his own voice the commentary on greatness that he had suggested in his dramatic works and in the primarily political articles of the Champion, the Opposition journal which he edited and to which he was the major contributor from 1739 to 1741. In the Champion he had been concerned too with the relation of the great man to society and with the moral basis of greatness, both general and political. It is in the Preface to the Miscellanies, however, as Fielding introduces the works of the three volumes, that he makes what are perhaps his most famous statements on the great man, for instead of giving brief preliminary comments about Jonathan Wild, as he had about the other works, he writes that what is really an essay, complete in itself, on greatness and goodness, the qualities which had frequently been shown in contrast to each other by the moralists. He introduces the story by saying that the portrayal of Jonathan Wild is not a historically accurate one but that roguery, not a rogue, is his subject, thereby immediately revealing that when he uses the term greatness he means false greatness. In disclaiming the intention to satirize any particular individual, however, he seems to be following the tradition of writers who called attention to their satire, especially that of
Walpole, by denying its existence. Finally, he states that he is not drawing human nature in general in the central figure; he suggests, however, a wider range of attack than that on the "great thief" by his statement that "the splendid Palaces of the Great are often no other than Newgate with the Mask on."¹ Fielding goes on to say, "Nor do I know any thing which can raise an honest Man's Indignation higher than that the same Morals should be in one Place attended with all the Misery and Infamy, and in the other, with the utmost Luxury and Honour," and points to the fact that the same "Composition of Cruelty, Lust, Avarice, Rapine, Insolence, Hypocrisy, Fraud and Treachery" have been respected in one class but have led to the gallows in the lower.² Thus he has suggested in the Preface the three concerns that predominate in the narrative itself: the moral, in which roguery, or false greatness, is revealed in its true nature; the political, with specific satire on Walpole; and the social implications suggested by the comparison of Newgate and the abode of the great. But the main purpose, as Fielding defines it, combines a consideration of these three in an attempt to show, as he did in much of his work, that greatness never reaches the reward of happiness attainable by the good.³

The definition of terms follows from the elaboration of his intention. Fielding poses as wishing to defend the use he has made of the term Great, saying with a mixture of direct statement and irony that "honourable Ideas" have been attached to it, but that "the Greatness which is commonly
worshipped is really of the kind which I have here represented," and that it has no claim to the honors ascribed to it (Misc., I, xxv). Thus as he continues by saying that greatness and goodness have no relation to each other, he is establishing a usage that predominates in the narrative: greatness is used to describe what Fielding in other works exhibits as false greatness. Here, however, in contrast to Jonathan Wild itself, where the usage is strictly ironical, he arrives at the statement that the two qualities may exist together to form the character of the "Great and Good," which he elsewhere would call true greatness. Socrates and Brutus are given as examples of men who combine the qualities in a high degree. This combination is said to be the "true Sublime in Human Nature," as Fielding begins his use of literary terminology in his definitions. He continues by referring to the combination as a "glorious Object, on which we can never gaze with too much Praise and Admiration," and as a "perfect Work! the Iliad of Nature," which fills the observer with "Love, Wonder, and Delight" (Misc., I, xxviii). Goodness alone, he points out, lacks the "parts" and "courage" necessary for greatness, and moves one to love but not wonder or delight. In this connection he gives a clue to an interpretation of "my good man" (Heartfree), who, he stresses, is neither a fool nor a coward, but lacks the parts and courage necessary for "any Pretensions to Greatness" (Misc., I, xxviii-xxix). The next definition, of greatness without goodness, continues the literary terminology as Fielding points out that the quality resembles "the False Sublime in Poetry whose Bombast is, by the ignorant and ill-judging Vulgar, often mistaken for solid Wit and Eloquence, whilst it is in Effect the very Reverse" (Misc., I, xxix).
Here then Fielding suggests a relation between his literary satire and moral satire: in each, the public is shown failing to judge correctly what true greatness is and failing to distinguish the great work, exemplified by the Iliad, from the bombast greatness which lacks substance. This bombast greatness, he states in conclusion, is what he wishes to expose; and he again brings together the social and moral themes as he says that he wishes to show the "monster" in its "native deformity," "for by suffering Vice to possess the Reward of Virtue, we do a double Injury to Society, by encouraging the former, and taking away the chief Incentive to the latter" (Misc., I, xxx).

But though Fielding suggests various types of false greatness in the portrayal of his hero in Jonathan Wild, it is in the first work in the Miscellanies that he makes a more explicit statement of his attitude toward the varied undeserving claimants to greatness. As Cross notes, the semi-dedibatory epistles "struck the keynote" of the Miscellanies; that "there is no necessary connection between goodness and greatness; that the good man is not sure to thrive in this world, that the great man is often a rogue." Of True Greatness," which had been published January 7, 1741, as a pamphlet in praise of Fielding's patron Dodington, surveys the falsely great before it arrives at a statement of the nature of true greatness. The opening lines are an echo of the Preface as Fielding states that few recognize the true nature of the "Goddess," greatness, to which they pay homage -- in themselves and in others (Misc., I, 3). He continues by surveying those who are admired for their greatness, to which they pay homage -- in themselves and in others (Misc., I, 3). He continues by surveying those who are admired for their greatness in
society: the favorite at court is compared to the May-pole which is briefly admired, the "Wonder of a Day," and is forsaken as soon as its ornaments are removed. The cynical hermit in contrast is shown as reflecting both pride and envy of power and grandeur in his statement that "Greatness... is to be good and wise" and as lacking thereby the qualities that he himself proclaims as necessary for greatness. The example of Diogenes is followed by the common portrait of Alexander as the type of the ruthless conqueror, and Fielding questions whether Alexander's exploits could qualify him for greatness. From here Fielding moves to view "false Greatness with more awkward Mien" as he points to the proud pedant, described in military terms as he "smiles o'er Heaps of conquer'd Books" and the critics who "scarc to Fame" by deeming on the works of the truly great. Finally the poet is included because of his pride in his ability to bestow honor. As the final example Fielding cites the beau who aims at greatness, and concludes that both external and internal false greatness can be achieved by all: "Who wonders then, if such a thing as this / At Greatness aims, that none the Aim can miss!" Each man finds himself to be superior to some one, and in each profession there is a possibility of seeing oneself great if merit is omitted in the consideration. "The lowest Lawyer, Parson, Courtier, Squire, / Is somewhere Great, finds some that will admire." Similarly, as Fielding turns to consider true greatness, he finds that it is to "no profession, Party, Place confin'd," but that "True Greatness lives but in the noble Mind,"
and he cites examples of it among the professions. In his poem Fielding has
gone a little further than in his preface — he considers as falsely great both
those whom he in the preface calls the great, those with ability and courage
but without goodness, and also those of either high or low rank whose vanity
convinces them they are great. But true greatness here is the same as the
combination of greatness and goodness he has described earlier: it is the
"true sublime" of human nature which Fielding seldom found in life and which
only infrequently is portrayed in his works. The greatness described here
rests on such inward qualities as were stressed in many of Fielding's
precedents — in Aristotle's description of the magnanimous man, in Cicero's
and Seneca's reflections on greatness. The willingness to serve mankind,
not to profit from it, which had been stressed by Cicero (and again by Steele)
is a necessary characteristic. And one should note another assumption
present here, which is not mentioned (though one might argue that it is assumed)
in the Preface: the great man is one "To whose blest Lot superior Portions fall." Not everyone can be a great man. Fielding's choice of examples of
true greatness (from the military, law, and politics) suggests too that this
quality, though it may dwell in the mind, is accompanied by position: but by
position of which the holder is worthy. These assumptions are in accord with
evidence in the rest of the poem that Fielding is against interested largely in
exposing false greatness rather than in drawing a picture for emulation
(though of course the practical aim is to praise Dodington, to whom the poem
is addressed). It is characteristic of Fielding's early work that a major portion of the poem presents types of the falsely great even though the ostensible subject is true greatness.⁷

The statement in "Of True Greatness" that men do not in general realize what it is that they worship as greatness is central to Fielding's thought that in general the good man frequently fails to see beyond appearances, and as in the poem he distinguishes between true and false greatness, so in one of the essays of the first volume of the Miscellanies he attempts to educate man to recognize the bombast that claims greatness.⁸ In the "Essay on the Knowledge of the Characters of Men," he is concerned largely with hypocrisy, pointing out the falseness of appearances, and in connection with this purpose there is a comment in particular on the "political Great Men," who are implicitly put in the category of the falsely great by the allusion to their promises, the value of which, Fielding points out, "is so well known, that few are to be imposed on by them" (Misc., I, 205). There may again be a specific allusion to Walpole in the phrases that Fielding uses in the poem in warning against falsely great men, as there had been in many of his plays.⁹

Similarly in the "Essay on Nothing" Fielding continues to reveal the greatness that is mere bombast. Cross' statement that "So Fielding prattled on delightfully for pages over nothing, with nothing in his head," has been disproven by the studies of Keuffel and especially Miller,¹⁰ and it is clear that Fielding no more meant nothing in the essay than he did when he had Mustacha voice
her surprise over her mistress' falling in love with Tom Thumb by saying
"If you had fallen in love with something, but to fall in love with nothing"
(I. vi; Henley VIII, 37) For, as in Tom Thumb, it is shown that bombast
greatness, which has no value, can be mistaken for real worth; and as Tom
is mockingly held up for admiration as a tragic hero, so in the essay within
the framework of the mock-encomium Fielding ostensibly recommends
that which is empty -- he claims that nothing is great. Thus as he makes
claims for the dignity of nothing, for instance, he shows the emptiness of
outward signs of grandeur as he states that "The Respect paid to Men on
account of their Titles, is paid at least to the Supposal of their superior
Virtues and Abilities, or it is paid to Nothing" (Misc., I, 245). And as he
says, "I have seen a Fellow, whom all the World knew to have Nothing in
him, not only pretend to Something himself, but supported in that Pretension
by others who have been less liable to be deceived" (Misc., I, 246), he is
again commenting on the failure of the public to distinguish between true and
false greatness. And similarly Fielding deals with false greatness as he
shows that nothing is the end of everything in the world. He supports his
argument with the example of ambition, which, he claims, gains nothing
despite the plundering of Alexander, Caesar, "and all the rest of that heroic
Band." Fielding's concluding statement then suggests the point of all the
preceding witticisms: having proved that nothing is the end of all things, he
states, he recommends that man should sacrifice his happiness and innocence
and ease to nothing so that he will never be deceived. For then he will not be concerned by "Changes of Ministries and of Government," since "while Ministers of State are Rogues themselves, and have inferior Knavish Tools to bribe and reward; true Virtue, Wisdom, Learning, Wit, and Integrity will most certainly bring their Possessors — — NOTHING" (Misc., I, 250). One of Fielding's main aims is again to reveal the prevalence of the false in positions of greatness, in particular of political greatness, at the same time that he shows the failure of the public to judge greatness correctly; again his concern is social, moral, and political.

The moral consideration of greatness predominates in another work in Volume I in which Fielding reveals false greatness: "A Dialogue Between Alexander the Great and Diogenes the Cynic." Fielding is concerned through most of the dialogue with the false greatness of the conqueror (an interest seen perhaps also in his translation of "The First Olynthiac of Demosthenes," also included in Volume I), but he exposes here two of the types of greatness he included in "Of True Greatness": that of the cynic as well as of the ruthless conqueror. Fielding allows Alexander to voice his desire for fame as he shows the conqueror to consider the approbation of the crowd a reward sufficient to recompense the danger and difficulties involved in his life. Diogenes is permitted to give the proper retort, as was the hermit in Fielding's poem, as he says that true honor "results from the secret Satisfaction of our own Minds," in which wisdom and virtue must have a share. Thus he exposes the vanity
that lies at the basis of Alexander's wish for applause, but Fielding quickly reverses the attack to allow Alexander to reveal the hypocrisy of Diogenes' railing against the desire for wealth and ambition. Fielding presents in the dialogue two extreme examples of the vices which when found in a lesser degree he considers the appropriate objects of ridicule. Both Diogenes and Alexander are examples of the great who lack goodness.

The second volume of the Miscellanies too contains some of Fielding's most pointed commentary on false greatness. In the Preface Fielding had alluded to the divergent paths which lead to "true Honour," or goodness, and to "Greatness," or villainy, portraying the first as an "open and plain" way and the second as "perverse and rugged Paths" (Misc., I, xxii). This image is continued in the long Lucianic narrative which occupies most of Volume II, A Journey from This World to the Next, etc., in which the narrator on his journey sees the two paths open to those who are on their way to earth. Here again Fielding uses greatness to mean false greatness, and the description of the paths to this greatness and to goodness is similar to, though more detailed than, that of the Preface. Vanity is shown to be the basis of such false greatness as Alexander's in the Dialogue as the narrator comments that the bad road was taken "for the sake of the Music of Drums and Trumpets and the perpetual Acclamations of the Mob" (I. v; Misc., II, 41-42). The satire on false greatness continues as it is related that onlooking spirits mocked those who were destined to be emperors, kings, and other great men, and that those who had drawn lots for these positions frequently changed with cobblers and tailors. Specific political satire follows as a king is shown
choosing the path of goodness, but another spirit, "one who had drawn the Lot of his Prime Minister," hurries after him to bring him back. But the satire is not limited to this portion of the work: in the account Julian the Apostate gives of his adventures, he explains his position as favorite at the Emperor's court by describing the scale of creatures attempting to gain favor; the description is similar to that of the ladder of dependence in Joseph Andrews (I. xii; Misc., II, 99). Too, there is satire on the great in the manner of Jonathan Wild as Julian relates that when as a child he indignantly broke the rattle given him, his father replied, "I warrant thou makest a Great Man" (I. xvi; Misc., II, 120). The falseness of outward signs of grandeur is satirized in the section in which Julian, telling of his life as a king, notes that when he is not attended by splendor, a king can scarcely be distinguished from a cobbler (I. xviii; Misc., II, 144). Lucian's influence is here not restricted to the setting. The passage is reminiscent in its attitude and choice of characters to the passage in the Ferry-Boat in which the cobbler relates that the prince was seen to be ridiculous when stripped of his luxuries. Similarly a type of "clothes philosophy" is evident as Julian claims that as tailor he was responsible for the reputation of his clients: reducing all greatness to outward signs, he says that "The Prince indeed gives the Title, but it is the Taylor who makes the man. To his Labours are owing the Respect of Crowds, tho' these are too often unjustly attributed to other Motives" (I. xxii; Misc., II, 188). For this passage, too, Fielding had precedent in Lucian's statement in Menippus that, though Fortune dresses men for their appearance on earth, after the show is over all are again alike.
The outward appearance of false greatness is again satirized through Julian as he states that if men’s lives were judged by inner rather than external standards the beggar’s situation to which he was reduced would be found more desirable than that of men motivated by ambition to dangers and villainy (I. xix; Misc., II, 90). Julian of course cannot be equated with the author, but his tale, like the portion of the narrative related by Fielding, serves his purpose of exposing the falsely great. In Julian’s account, like the narrator’s, emphasis is placed on the pride that leads men to attempt to achieve spurious greatness. Julian makes the same point that Fielding makes, more elaborately, in Jonathan Wild. The greatness gained by the good man not only is meaningless; it also fails to bring its possessor the happiness or satisfaction available to the worthy man.

To turn from the Journey to Jonathan Wild is to turn to a much more unified, much more complex treatment of false greatness. This work, which Keuffel sees as the culmination of satire on false greatness, has such a deceptively simple appearance in its attempt to allegorize the type of greatness that Fielding shows to be synonymous with roguery that Allan Wendt has said that it has "all the simple directness of a medieval morality play." Surely, however, Wendt has not overlooked the intense irony of the story which makes it less simple than it seems. Indeed, though Fielding’s basic plan is clear from the beginning, even from the Preface, critics have shown the affinity of the work to varying traditions and genres. It is frequently in its relation to these varying traditions that the portrayal of the great man becomes particularly significant.
The basis of the narrative is the tradition which equated the great man, or man of high position, and the thief. The effect of such an equation in Jonathan Wild is to suggest a common motivation and a resemblance in character as well as the parallel in action. Here the criminal conqueror is given his share of abuse as the suggestion is made of a parallel with Wild, a parallel that was frequently made but was developed by Fielding. The well known story of the encounter between Alexander and the pirate suggested that the actions of the two were different only in degree -- and that, accordingly, Alexander was considered a hero and the pirate a thief. The parallel is frequently used to pass ironic judgment on Wild. For instance, in the phrase characterizing Wild, "whose moderation we have before noted," as it is pointed out that on a particular occasion he wished to have only one man killed. The parallel is pointed up as Fireblood is first called the "Achates of our Aeneas" and Fielding then corrects himself, "or rather the Haephestion of our Alexander" (III. iv; Misc., III, 210). We are early informed of Wild's admiration for Alexander and Charles XII (I. iii; Misc., III, 18), an admiration that suggests judgment on Wild as well as on the conqueror. The parallel is pointed up too in Wild's own statement of respect for Alexander as he says concerning his villainy that "I ought rather to weep, with Alexander, that I have ruined no more, than to regret the little I have done" (IV. iv; Misc., III, 314). The slight change from the usual phraseology of the famous quotation -- the change from conquered to ruined -- reveals the attitude Fielding takes toward Alexander. And the entire speech is made up of statements about
allusions to the damage done by conquerors, called "that first class of GREATNESS, the Conquerors of Mankind." As Wallace points out, Fielding's portrayal of Wild's feeling of remorse on hearing of the arrival of Heartfree's "dead-warrant" is similar to Adlerfield's portrayal of Charles' grief at the death of his sister in the Military History of Charles XII, in the translation of which Fielding had probably been involved in 1740. Fielding referred to the scene portrayed by Adlerfield in Amelia (III. viii; Henley VI, 147), and he may be parodying it in Jonathan Wild. Finally, a parallel between thief and conqueror is suggested as the narrator feigns respect for Alexander in reference to Wild's death, saying that his esteem for the conqueror would not have been diminished had he met a similar death (IV. xiii; Misc. III, 383). The implication is the same as it had been in many of Fielding's precedents: that Alexander deserves the same fate as the thief who plunders on a smaller scale. Fielding's attitude toward the types of the ancient and modern conquerors is clearly indicated in his Journey, where he sees the two attending the Emperor of Death (I. iv; Misc., II, 37); and any reference to the "hero" of Jonathan Wild can suggest the analogy with the criminal conqueror.

But the great man who is satirized is more frequently specifically the politically great man. The chapter "Of Hats" (II. vi; Misc., III, 139-142) is clearly a reflection on the principles involved in the formation of political parties; the statement that they can be changed as easily as hats suggests an attitude similar to that in many of Fielding's plays -- in particular, for instance, the Historical Register for the Year 1736, in which the patriots
are shown changing sides with only the encouragement of a bribe. But
throughout the story, Wild is shown as a politician—a politician in the broad
sense of the term which Fielding defines here and uses throughout his work
as a synonym for the falsely great. Fielding, praising Wild for his
success in having Fierce convicted, states that he was adept in his use of
"those great Arts" which "the Vulgar call Treachery, Dissembling, Promising,
Lying, Falsehood, etc., but which are by GREAT MEN summed up in the
collective Name of Policy, or Politicks, or rather Politricks; an Art of which
as it is the highest Excellence of Human Nature, so perhaps, we our GREAT
MAN the most eminent Master" (II. v; Misc., III, 138). Jonathan Wild
himself suggests the judgment on politicians as he discusses those who
"employ Hands for their own Use only," the great and noble part of humanity
whom he classes as "Conquerors, absolute Princes, Prime Ministers, and
Prigs" (I. xiv; Misc., III, 90). The anti-climactic listing points up Fielding's
ironic judgment. And, of course, a mere mention of a great man was, as in
the plays and journalism, sufficient to suggest the political great man. One
should note here that the classing of "absolute Princes" among the falsely
great is uncommon in Fielding's work, though not surprising in view of his
Whig principles. References to prime ministers are much more common in
Jonathan Wild as well as in the plays. In the speech in which Wild placed
conquerors first in rank among the great, he referred also to the people who
have been ruined by "that second order of GREATNESS the Ministerial!!"
There is some inconsistency in such rankings: for Fielding would place all conquerors among the falsely great, but not all prime ministers -- only those who misuse their power. He was, of course, motivated in his emphasis on the prime minister as symbol for any falsely great man in politics by his wish to include a specific target, Walpole.

But there was again a specific target in Fielding's mind as he formulated the political satire. W. R. Irwin has carefully traced the historical background of Fielding's satire of Walpole through Jonathan Wild, pointing out that after 1725, the date of Defoe's *Life and Actions of Jonathan Wild*, allusions to Wild were usually political in nature, Wild as a symbol of evil having become equated with Walpole. Irwin points out too that though "The name of Jonathan Wild is not used in this anti-Walpole crusade as often as one might expect," his reputation probably was recalled by the reader of any work in which the parallel between a politician and a thief was suggested. 17

Be that as it may, it is clear that in Opposition literature, and in particular in journalism, the reference to thievery was enough to call Walpole, if not Wild, to mind. Seen in its most popular form in the *Beggar's Opera*, 18 satire by suggestion of Walpole's roguery through portrayal of lesser rogues had been created by Fielding too -- most obviously in *The Grub-Street Opera*, in which the thieving servant Robin was clearly Walpole, and also in many statements concerning the great rogue who lived in state while lesser rogues were hanged. Perhaps, too, after the Licensing Act Fielding had taken part in the warfare of Opposition journalists who drew the thief-prime minister parallel. As Irwin has pointed out, the comparison is especially frequent in
Common Sense; or, The Englishman's Journal, begun in 1737 by Chesterfield and Lyttelton. 19 Not only does this periodical owe its name to Fielding's Pasquin, to which there is reference in the first issue, 20 but Fielding's name has also been associated with it. The open letter of May 21, 1737, signed "Pasquin" was almost surely Fielding's own defense of the play; and Cross states, without exploring the matter, that Fielding may have contributed further to the journal.

Both Hessler and Irwin assume that Fielding contributed to Common Sense after the Licensing Act blocked his dramatic activities, and Irwin records a temptation to suggest Fielding as writer of the article on Jonathan Wild that appeared in the periodical in 1737. Irwin notes, however, that stylistic evidence points away from Fielding. 21 But Fielding may have written one of the articles which is a forerunner of Jonathan Wild in its satire of Walpole through an ostensible attack on the highwayman Dick Turpin: in the issue for Saturday, July 30, 1737, there is an article introduced with the statement that "The following Letter is from a Country Correspondent, whom we should be glad to hear from again, as often as matters occur to him which may be of publick Use." The evidence, though not conclusive, suggests Fielding's authorship: Fielding was in the country at the time the letter appeared, and the word-usage is characteristic of him. 22 The warning in the letter to the people of England to stop the activities of the thief in their midst has its parallels in veiled warnings in the Champion about Walpole's activities, though it must be admitted that such warnings were commonplace in the writing of the Opposition. There is of course the obvious parallel to Jonathan Wild, though the article makes no suggestion that Turpin is a great man.
The political situation had changed since Fielding had written his dramatic satire, and Walpole had fallen by the time Fielding had published the *Miscellanies*; as Hessler points out, the parallel between the end of the thief and the fall of the great man was now complete. Hessler has pointed out too the qualities that Fielding portrays in Walpole through the picture of Jonathan Wild: "selfish ambition, rapacious avarice, hostility to the idea of liberty, ingenuity in plotting, and confidence amounting to impudence." These are the same qualities that Fielding had satirized in the plays and that were being satirized by the Opposition writers as a whole. There are specific personal allusions, which have been pointed out by Keuffel. Yet, despite the many allusions and correspondences to Walpole's life, the fact that when many of these allusions were removed in the 1754 edition the satire of the political great man remained, reveals that satire of Walpole was only one of many of Fielding's aims in the narrative and that it was only a part of Fielding's larger purpose, which includes a revelation of political false greatness. In the general parallel, then, between the falsely great man of high position and the thief there is the "under-current of social and political satire" that Cross commented on as he showed that Fielding retained only an outline of the facts of Wild's life in his attempt to create an imagined rather than a real biography.

In exploring the social implications of the correspondence between "hero" and thief, Fielding does not forget the ridicule of the low characters. The ironic elevation of the thief serves in general to suggest that his position is
properly a lower one. The mock-heroic mode in general, so frequently employed by Fielding, gave ample precedent for ridicule of low characters by ironical elevation. In addition, Gay's *Beggar's Opera* was a specific source for such elevation of criminal characters. In *Jonathan Wild*, the continual references to "our Hero" and "the Great Man" suggest not merely the debased character of those of high rank but also Wild's lack of any claim to either external signs or internal assurance of greatness except in the limited meaning Fielding has established for the term. Too, the lofty terms of Wild's speech on honor (I. xiii; Misc., III, 79) suggest his own affectation of a false greatness. Similarly, the soliloquy on human greatness, in which Wild decides that the knowledge of being a villain (or, "great man") is sufficient reward for his efforts despite the uncertainty of material reward, is couched in heroic terms that reflect Wild's attitude (II. iv; Misc., III, 124–127). As Wild ends his life on the gallows, Fielding insists that he has received the reward appropriate for falsely great men; but such a death, Fielding suggests, is the proper reward for him too (IV. xvi; Misc., III, 419). A. R. Humphreys sees Wild's speech as "a potent means of implying the equivalence of court and gaol"—and one should not forget that they are thereby a commentary on the gaol, a means of showing the gaol as well as the court in perspective. Fielding's statement in the Preface that "the splendid Palaces of the Great are often no other than Newgate with the Mask on" in no way suggests a condoning of Newgate.

But, as is usual with Fielding, he is not concerned only with the social
and political implications of his work, but with the moral questions involved — and here is where he goes one step beyond many of his predecessors: for it is very easy to make Jonathan Wild fit into the tradition of rogues' lives or political journalism. What is outstanding in Fielding's portrayal is the manner in which he utilizes literary satire to attempt to correct an attitude that he sees as false in its moral basis. Fielding had done this already, most notably in Tom Thumb. In Shamela and Joseph Andrews, too, he includes moral criticism in satire of literary works. In Jonathan Wild, he follows the pamphleteers who had ironically portrayed Wild's greatness, at the same time, there is satire of the criminal pamphlets in which villainy was glorified. As Irwin points out, Fielding presents the mock-heroic biography to show his contempt for Newgate lives in particular with their glorification of the worthless criminal. Thus too he follows those writers who made the conqueror-thief analogy, but at the same time he satirizes those works, especially biographies, in which the conqueror is uncritically portrayed as a great man. In particular, Fielding perhaps has in mind Adlerfield's portrayal of Charles XII, with its praise of the qualities that Fielding saw as indicative only of false greatness. The phrase that follows the story of the death of Charles' sister may have been in his mind, for Adlerfield states that Charles "soon recovered that greatness of mind, which he had always shown on all occasions" and went about his usual affairs. And more generally, as Fielding presents Walpole as a rogue in the tradition of the Opposition, he is also mocking any heroic presentation of false greatness.

The key word in this connection is "hero" — a word which Fielding was to
use frequently in connection with his central characters, but never again in
the savagely ironic tone that he adopts here. The suggestion of the correspondence
between hero and great man comes even in the first chapter, as Fielding draws
the distinction between Greatness and Goodness, claiming in slight deviation
from the definitions of the preface that "Greatness consists in bringing all
Manner of Mischief on Mankind, and Goodness in removing it from them."
Fielding claims on this basis that one who draws a hero must show him to be
perfect in greatness, and should not combine instances of goodness in his
account -- already the parallel between literary "hero" and "great man" is es-
established (Misc., III, 4-5). Again as Fielding comments on the "GREAT and
exemplary Conduct of our Hero" (II. xiv; Misc., III, 199) he suggests the
nature of the exemplary conduct he has seen in others who have been portrayed
as heroes. The chapter heading "More and more GREATNESS, unparalleled
in History or Romance" is an ironic commentary on the type of false greatness
which he sees as being upheld in the works of other writers. The satire
becomes explicit again as Fielding explains that Wild's deficiency in writing
is no blemish to his "sublime GREATNESS," for "if these sort of GREAT
Personages can but complot and contrive their noble Schemes, and hack and
hew mankind sufficiently, there will never be wanting fit and able persons who
can spell, to record their Praises" (III. vii; Misc., III, 228). After he has
through the portrayal of the life of Jonathan Wild presented a comprehensive picture
of false greatness and thereby revealed the nature of those who are falsely
presented as heroes by other writers. He suggests that the death which was
appropriate to Jonathan Wild's life is also "a Death which hath been alone wanting
to complete the Characters of several ancient and modern Heroes, whose
Histories would then have been read with much greater Pleasure by the wisest in all Ages" (IV. xv; Misc., III, 407).

Fielding in ridiculing the biographies in which rogues, whether of high or low class, are presented as heroes, is continuing his moral as well as social and political aim: to expose the false greatness that is worshipped instead of the true. For this purpose he poses Wild against his foil Heartfree, who possesses not greatness but the goodness that Wild lacks. According to Allan Wendt, Fielding is attempting to show the shortcoming of pure goodness without greatness as well as of greatness without goodness: Wendt argues that Hearfree's imperfections, like Wild's, are pointed up. It is surely true that Heartfree is not the "true Sublime" of human nature, but to say that his weaknesses are exhibited through the irony is to misstate the issue. For, as Fielding suggested in the preface, Heartfree is intended to move one to love, though not to wonder or delight. Thus, though Heartfree lacks the "parts" and "courage" necessary for true greatness, Fielding does not anywhere suggest that the lack is to be considered weakness in him. Wendt argues that in the designation of Heartfree as "silly," the truth is "ironically concealed in a passage which is full of truths—in-reverse." 31 But, if the ironical praise of Wild must be understood as condemnation, then the ridicule of Heartfree must be understood as intended praise -- even if, as A. R. Humphreys suggests, such irony does not prove artistically satisfactory. 32 Wild is great, from his own point of view -- and only from a similar point of view is Heartfree silly. Again Fielding is not attempting to exhibit true greatness, but to reveal the false. In addition, he here, as in other works, wishes to uphold the good,
not to ridicule it.

Here then is a clear cut distinction between the two qualities which will be carried on, with some modification, in the later novels. It might seem that with Fielding's specific attacks -- on the conqueror and the politician, and on Walpole -- the satire is not as inclusive as that in, for instance, "Of True Greatness." This impression, however, is misleading, for though Fielding has concentrated his aim on a few outstanding examples, the comments made both by the narrator and by Jonathan Wild usually reflect on any form of false greatness. The conclusion, for instance, is a general statement (reminiscent of the Preface and the Journey) of the cares which attend the road to false greatness. In Jonathan Wild, the method of exploring the relation between false greatness and goodness is chiefly ironic: Fielding recommends, as he did in Tom Thumb and the "Essay on Nothing," that which has nothing to recommend it, the difference between claim and reality pointing up the falseness of the greatness that is presented. In Jonathan Wild Fielding carries out the aim he stated in his preface. A statement on pride in the "Essay on Conversation" is pertinent too. Fielding says that some see pride as being the "universal Passion," but counters with his objection:

There are others who consider it as the Foible of great Minds; and others again, who will have it to be the very Foundation of Greatness; and perhaps it may be of that Greatness which we have endeavoured to expose in many Parts of these Works: but to real Greatness, which is the Union of a good Heart with a good Head, it is almost diametrically opposite, as it generally proceeds from a depravity of both, and almost certainly from the Badness of the latter.

(Misc., I, 245)
Fielding, showing his awareness of the prominence he has given false greatness in his attempt to educate men through the varied works of the Miscellanies, and suggesting the prominence of pride in the character of the falsely great man (a characteristic he will be concerned with in the later works), makes one of his clearest statements concerning true greatness, the "Union of a good Heart with a good Head."
NOTES

1. George Sherburn, "Fielding's Social Outlook," PQ, XXV (1956), 7, points out that "This remark may well serve to sum up Fielding's prejudice with regard to 'polite' society. He believes in the potentialities of human nature, but he has no faith in the palaces or the activities of 'the great.' On the other hand, he cannot tolerate vagabonds, in spite of a burning sense of the unhappiness of the poor."

2. Miscellanies (London, 1743), I. xx-xxi. (All references are to this, the second edition.) There is here probably too a specific allusion to the hanging that Opposition writers portrayed as Walpole's proper reward.

3. Cf. Miller, p. 53, who points out that "This was the ultimate irony -- and the tragic comedy -- of greatness." Miller's study of the first volume of the Miscellanies provides admirable general commentary on individual works, including the Preface.


6. For Fielding's attitude toward Alexander see the Champion (Saturday, Nov. 17, 1939), I, 8, and the discussion in this chapter of Fielding's Dialogue.

7. Quoting the lines from "Of Good-Nature" which Fielding had included in the Champion, Miller, p. 59, suggests that "one wonders whether the poem in its original form might not have dealt more at large with such antitypes of good-nature as envy and censoriousness and less with the virtue of opening one's pockets to worthy men in need."

8. Miller, p. 144, though his statement of cause and effect is questionable, states well the purpose of the essays as follows: "I have previously argued that from Fielding's examination of 'Bombast Greatness' and its shocking success in the world arose a dual conviction: namely, that people at large do not recognize their own proper interests, and that good men are by their very nature easy victims of deceit and hypocrisy. This essay consequently is an attempt to achieve the corrective end that the plays and novels effected through a vigorous humor and through character in action -- to rip the mask from the face of pretense by exposing the real motives behind human actions and by educating the 'undesigning part of mankind' in the subterfuges and disguises of evil and malicious men."
9. Cf. Keuffel, p. 171, who argues that allusions to a "sneering smile," loud chuckle," "suppose a person well-drest should tumble," and even "promises of political great men" as well as the comments on marital infidelity are veiled allusions to Walpole.


11. See also I, vii; Misc., III, 51, in which lots are said to be equalled out through the combination of destinies: thus the Prime Minister's lot carries "Disgrace" along with it, and another lot carries the combination "Patriot" and "Glory." For a discussion of political satire in the Journey, see Keuffel, pp. 179-182.


15. Robert M. Wallace, Henry Fielding's Narrative Method (Unpublished) Ph. D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1945, p. 268, quotes Adlerfield's Military History, p. 275, concerning the death that others "saw with astonishment, in this occasion, what an effect the tenderness for a sister so much beloved could have on a heart otherwise the most firm and magnanimous, that perhaps was ever known. In a word, this death even cost him tears, the only ones he had ever shed in all his reign." For a discussion of Fielding's part in the translation, see John Edwin Wells, "Henry Fielding and the History of Charles XII," JEGP, XI (1912), 603-613.

16. See the Champion, Dec. 15, 1939 (I, 97-102) in which Fielding uses the image of fishing for politics.

17. For Wild's reputation, see Irwin, Making, pp. 11-32, who quotes copiously from Opposition literature to establish the parallel. The quotation is from page 28. Particularly good evidence for the parallel is in the lines in Pope's Epilogue to the Satires. Dialogue II, in which the "Friend," trying to advise Pope concerning objects that he may satirize in safety, says, "Yes, strike that Wild, I'll justify the Blow," and Pope replies pointedly, ""Strike" why the man was hang'd ten years ago: /Who now that obsolete Example fears?" (Twickenham ed, IV, 315, lines 54-56).

18. Fielding refers to the Beggar's Opera in IV, vi; Misc., III, 440.
19. Irwin, Making, p. 29.


21. The Pasquin letter is in Common Sense, I, 114-118. Cross, II, 239, assumes that the letter is by Fielding, but says none of the other articles can definitely be attributed to Fielding. Dudden, I, 206, merely says that the writer of the letter may have been Fielding. Hessler, p. 171, and Irwin, p. 117 (note 142), comment on Fielding's association with Common Sense.

22. Though Irwin, Making, p. 28, cites the article, I have seen no attempt to attribute it to Fielding. According to Cross, I, 239, and 242, Fielding retired to his farm at East Stour after the Licensing Act closed the Little Theatre, and returned to London at the end of the hunting season. Dudden, I, 234 and 237, too states that Fielding remained at East Stour after the closing of the theater until the next autumn. Cross notes, I, 205, that Fielding usually spent late summer and autumn on his farm, and his return to London early in 1736 had been noted publicly, as Cross, I, 195, notes, in the Prompter of April. There had been an advertisement asking for Common Sense, who was said to be lurking in a distant part of the country, as early as April 29, 1734; the correspondent "Verax" later commented that he had found her in the country and would keep her there until the theaters were ready for her; after seeing Pasquin, Mr Prompter reported that "Verax" must have been Fielding himself, who had brought her along to London after spending a year in the country.

The Word-test is obviously not in itself evidence that a work is Fielding's, but Hath, which is used in the articles, seldom occurs in the writing of the eighteenth century, Fielding being the only major writer who used it. Other stylistic devices which Miller, 157-161, notes as being characteristic of Fielding are found: the "as...so" construction, pleonastic word-pairs; frequent use of sequences of words, phrases, and clauses; the frequency of parenthetical expressions. A comparison of the long sentence composed of if -- clauses on I, 184, with the similarly constructed passage in Jonathan Wild (IV, xvi; Misc., III, 415) suggests common authorship. Finally, one might note that Turpin's name was significant enough in Fielding's mind that he engaged in word-play on it in Joseph Andrews (II, xi; Henley I, 68).

23. Hessler, 143.

24. Keuffel, pp. 204-229. Despite the large amount of detail he mentions, Keuffel's concluding statement of the portrayal of Walpole is an echo of Hessler's commentary cited above.
25. See George Sherburn, "Fielding's Social Outlook," PQ, XXXV (1956), 16-17, who says that the book "seems more truly to be directed against the political abuses of the system in which Walpole was deeply involved."

26. Cross, I, 415. See also Dudden, I, 456-458, who traces in detail the facts which Fielding retains, and Digeon, pp. 110-111, who stresses Fielding's retention of facts that bring out his conception of the great man.


28. See Keuffel's citation, pp. 74-75, of the 1725 pamphlet The Life of Jonathan Wild, attributed to Defoe, and two additional anonymous pamphlets.

29. See also Frank Wadleigh Chandler, The Literature of Roguery (New York, 1907), II, 302-303, who says that "the burlesque of the criminal pamphlet . . . no doubt gave rise to the satire upon greatness divorced from goodness."


CHAPTER FOUR

SHAMELA, JOSEPH ANDREWS, AND TOM JONES

When Samuel Richardson's Pamela appeared in 1740, Fielding was one of many to whom its morality, despite Pope's recommendation that "it will do more good than a great many of the new sermons," seemed at best dubious. ¹ Richardson's subtitle, Virtue Rewarded, appeared to be an unsatisfactory explanation for the fortune of the servant girl whose design was to become the wife of her master, the young squire. Fielding responded by writing Shamela, in which he showed Pamela in the form he thought she really ought to be portrayed. In the Covent-Garden Tragedy, Fielding had suggested that despite their positions of nobility, the characters of Philips' The Distrest Mother were actually much like the persons to be found in a bawdy house. Here he is suggesting the same thing about Richardson's characters: they are not what Richardson thinks they are.² And this main point is directly related to his concern with false greatness: he suggests that Pamela is not virtuous for the love of virtue, but for her own gain -- and the gain for which she is striving includes the outward signs of a high position, of status as a great lady. Shamela does not, of course, contain the sustained satire of attempts to achieve spurious greatness that characterized Jonathan Wild; rather, the satire is included in a general condemnation of what Fielding considers to be an inadequate moral view.

Such satire is suggested as Fielding has Shamela herself state her in-
tentions in a letter to her mother. Relating that Mrs. Jewkes assures her that she will become "Mistress of the Family" shortly, Pamela continues: "I am resolved now to aim at it. I thought once of making a little Fortune by my Person. I now intend to make a great one by my Vartue." She too is convinced that Booby will marry her, if she plays her game correctly; in the same letter, after quoting Booby's letter to her, she looks forward to the pleasures not so much of being virtuous as of being rich:

O! Bless me! I shall be Mrs. Booby, and be Mistress of a great Estate, and have a dozen Coaches and Six, and a fine House at London, and another at Bath, and Servants, and Jewels, and Plate, and go to Plays, and Opera's and Court; and do what I will, and spend what I will. "

Shamela's mother replies appropriately: "I am in hopes of seeing you a great lady." Shamela's name as well as the words Fielding has her utter suggests Pamela's true nature, as Fielding sees it; and in his opinion the name is, unlike Pamela's, one that has "some Reference to her Character," as the anonymous writer of An Essay on the New Species of Writing Founded by Mr. Fielding commented on Fielding's names in general. Ian Watt, pointing out that Pamela's name suggests romance and that it indicates social pretentiousness on the part of her parents, states that Fielding calls attention to this characteristic of the Andrews family by giving Pamela's mother a string of names (Mrs. Henrietta Marie Honora Andrews). Shamela's use of the name Pamela in Fielding's work then underlines her desire to be greater than she is.

To suggest the nature of Pamela's character, too, Fielding endows her with
a label that had become for him the symbol of one who dishonestly attempts to achieve spurious greatness: Pamela is a politician. Her various manipulations are included under the phrases on the title page which state that "all the matchless ARTS of that young Politician" are "set in a true and just Light." As F.H. Dudden points out, an advertisement of the Miscellanies in the Daily Post (June 5, 1742) promises that in Jonathon Wild "not only his character, but that of divers other great personages of his time, will be set in a just and true light."

Not only Pamela is shown to be a politician, but also her friend Parson Williams, and throughout the story Fielding points to their duplicity in attempting to maintain the favor of Booby. Already in the letter from Parson Oliver to Parson Puzzletext, there is a comment on the proper relation of greatness to the clergy. Oliver replies to Puzzletext's praise of Pamela for teaching men to honor the clergy, saying he is sorry to see the clergy concerned with the worldly honor that their primitive predecessors neither had nor wanted. Before Fielding is apparently stating his own attitude as he warns the clergy against wishing for worldly honor:

But for worldly Honours, they are often the Purchase of Force and Fraud; we sometimes see them in an eminent Degree possessed by Men, who are notorious for Luxury, Pride, Cruelty, Treachery, and the most abandoned Prostitution; Wretches who are ready to invent and maintain Schemes repugnant to the Interest, the Liberty, and the Happiness of Mankind, not to supply their Necessities, or even Conveniences, but to pamper their Avarice and Ambition.

In the parody Williams is shown trying to achieve these honors by fraud; he flatters Squire Booby as he asks to be reinstated in his favor. Next to God, "whom the Great themselves must bow down before," Williams says, he would bow to no one "with more Lowliness" than "your Honour."
In this particular passage Fielding allows all to be touched by the irony: Squire Booby is classed among the great despite the view Fielding has given of his lack of true greatness. Williams means nothing of what he says: he bows to neither God nor the squire except to further himself. And as Shamela comments in her letter on "the Fate of poor Mr. Williams," she quotes the Beggar's Opera, "Nothing moves one so much as a great Man in Distress"; and we are invited to see again Williams' lack of greatness. In addition, Shamela's readiness to call him a great man indicates her shallow view of greatness. Shamela is able to mouth the correct phrases concerning greatness, as she does again in one of the italicized moral statements in her letter: "Sure Women are Great Fools, when they prefer a laced Coat to the Clergy, whom it is our Duty to honour and respect."11 Her conception of the greatness of the clergy is in no way, of course, based on moral grounds. Aside from such comments, however, Shamela's postscript to her last letter suggests again Fielding's view toward the greatness portrayed in Pamela. Shamela, telling of Booby's decision to have a book written about Shamela and himself, says that Parson Williams has recommended "a Parson who does that Sort of Business for Folks, one who can make my Husband, and me, and Parson Williams, to be all great People; for he can make black white, it seems."12 At the same time that this statement reveals Shamela's delight in being great and her lack of concern with virtue, it also suggests the lack of foundation of Richardson's claim for the virtue of his characters as well as their greatness.13
In Joseph Andrews the literary satire, partially a continuation from Shamela, includes a ridicule of what Fielding considered to be false greatness as he mocks those who presented claims for themselves on the basis of their literary accomplishments. Richardson's, Cibber's, and Middleton's works had been ridiculed in Shamela, and so they were in Joseph Andrews. The personal satire of Cibber and Richardson, though, becomes significant as satire of false greatness. Cibber had been a favorite aim of attack and only in Fielding's plays: his Apology for His Own Life when it appeared in 1740 had given rise to extended comment in the Champion. In particular, Fielding had ridiculed him for comparisons of himself with the types of the falsely great, saying that "Soon after his Ascendant on the Stage, he was possess'd by so full a Vanity and Content, that he stands compared in the Apology, to Alexander the Great, and Charles the XIIIth."

Later in the same issue Fielding comments again on the comparisons in the following manner: "Not to mention our Author's Comparisons of himself to King James, the Prince of Orange, Alexander the Great, Charles the XIIIth, and Harry IV. of France, his favorite Simile is a Lion......" In addition, Fielding ironically refers to Cibber as "this great man" and, more frequently, a "great writer," the latter title being given him as Fielding demonstrates that Cibber can neither read nor write. In Joseph Andrews, he similarly ironically praises the "great person himself," or the "great apologist," for his attitude toward greatness by suggesting Cibber's pride in his position: "How artfully doth the former (Cibber), by insinuating that he escaped being promoted to the highest stations in Church and State, teach us a contempt of worldly grandeur!" (I. i; Henley I, 26) Twice
in the novel, too, Fielding alludes in mock heroic terms to similes of lions, with a probable recollection of the similes he had commented on in the Champion. The mention of "those that describe lions and tigers, and heroes fierceer than both" suggests Fielding's ridicule of Cibber's conception of his own greatness, as does the phrase concerning "some great men living, ... brave as lions, aye, as tigers ..." (III. vi; Henley I, 273, 269).

Similarly, praise of Richardson is followed by an ironical statement concerning the "excellent essays or letters prefixed" to Pamela which reveal what readers are taught by the book (I. i; Henley I, 26). (Fielding had already mocked Richardson's "puffs" by his imitation of them in Shamela). But Fielding satirized what he saw as a false attitude toward greatness largely through a treatment similar to that of Shamela, though without the unpleasant tone of the earlier work. Though Pamela remains Pamela, again it is revealed that the greatness she has attained is bombast greatness, that it is not virtue that has been rewarded.

But, in his ridicule of false greatness, Fielding goes beyond Pamela as an object of satire. Professor McKillop has suggested, on the basis of Lady Booby's being called "the heroine of our tale" (I. vii; Henley I, 47), that Fielding may have considered making Joseph Andrews "a sustained satirical treatment of high life, just as Jonathan Wild was a sustained ironical treatment of a criminal career."16 There is a great deal of satire of high life in the novel, and much of this satire is related to Fielding's earlier treatment of greatness. For, as in the plays and Jonathan Wild, when Fielding satirizes "the great"
rather than restricting his attack to the "great man," he is writing of a class.

This satire of greatness then converges with satire of high life. Whatever
Fielding's intention, in Joseph Andrews such satire is included as part of a
broad view of the follies (and merits) of mankind.

In Jonathan Wild, the satire is accomplished through ironical application
of the term great to a criminal; in Joseph Andrews, by exhibition and
ridicule of the moral frailties of the social class commonly termed the great.
But the ironical treatment is familiar as Fielding praises those unworthy of
his words, and the mock-heroic mode is used to reveal the shortcomings of
this class. Such passages as the following introduction to Lady Booby are
characteristic for Fielding's treatment of the upper classes in Joseph Andrews:

But as it becomes us to preserve the character of this lady, who is
the heroine of our tale, and as we have naturally a wonderful tenderness
for that beautiful part of the human species called the fair sex,
before we discover too much of her frailty to our reader, it will be
proper to give him a lively idea of the vast temptation which overcame
all the efforts of a modest and virtuous mind, and then we humbly
hope his good nature will rather pity than condemn the imperfection
of human virtue.

(I. viii; Henley I, 47)

Satire on Richardson's portrayal of greatness is evident on first glance: Lady
Booby corresponds in her role in the plot to the Mr. Booby of Shamela and is
therefore "the heroine," as Fielding pretends to try to give a fair picture of
her before he presents the seduction scene in which the extent of her modesty
and virtue is revealed. Fielding has heightened his satire by giving Lady
Booby a title -- something lacking in both Richardson's and Fielding's earlier
heroes -- and increasing the discrepancy between position and character. At
the same time Fielding's words suggest the discrepancy between Lady Booby's conception of herself and her true nature; she sees herself, Fielding hints, overcome by vast temptation. (Previously we have learned that her husband has been dead six days.) She sees herself too as being properly an object of pity rather than of condemnation. This conception is expressed in the following pages not only in the scene with Joseph but in the mock-heroic utterances beginning "Whither doth this violent passion hurry us?" in which Fielding reminds the reader of her role as heroine and as great lady (I. viii; Henley I, 51), thereby pointing up her shortcomings. But Fielding is pointing up too her feeling that she is a heroine, debating between love and honor. Maynard Mack's comment on Fielding's method makes the point admirably:

As Fielding's preface shows, he was quick to see that the tradition of mock-heroic offered one of the best positions from which to underscore those modes of the ridiculous that arise from affectation. Affectations being, on one possible way of looking at them, the adoption of heroic stances by persons not entitled to them (the pretense that our natures, passions, acts are profound, irresistible, deliberate, like those of heroes), the easiest way of deflating them is to let them, like Aesop's frog, inflate themselves a little more. Fielding accomplishes this inflation, like all the great practitioners of the mock-heroic, primarily through his style. He includes, of course, for what he calls his classical reader, a multitude of explicit mock-epic jokes -- ranging from Homeric similes through the epic genealogy of Joseph's cudgel to the hilarious and surprisingly circumstantial travesty of Oedipus at the close -- where the humor is largely at the expense of epic forms and the heroic attitude toward life. But the subtler and more characteristic type of mock-heroic in Fielding is that which is illustrated in passages like the following: "Curse his beauties," says Lady Booby of Joseph, "... which can barely descend to this despicable wench, and be ungratefully deaf to all the honours I do him. And can I then love this monster?" In passages of this sort, the mock-heroic style is fully functional, enabling the author to put before us in a single dimension both the character as it understands itself and as he wants us to understand it. 17
Fielding subjects the reader to Lady Booby for only relatively brief sections at the beginning of the novel and again at the conclusion, but he again takes opportunity toward the conclusion to point up Lady Booby's heroic conception of herself. The speech cited by Mack ends, "Yes, I thank Heaven and my pride, I have now perfectly conquered this unworthy passion; and if there was no obstacle in its way, my pride would disdain any pleasures which could be the consequence of so base, so mean, so vulgar --." But Slipslop interrupts to tell her that Fanny and Joseph have been found to be brother and sister, and the "admirable resolutions" are forgotten. Such, Fielding hints, is the nature of the moral attitude of the great -- and, perhaps, particularly of Richardson's characters.

Satire of the great is important not only in the opening section in London, but also in the latter portion as the high as well as the low characters return to the country, where Lady Booby's struggle with herself continues. Additional satire is introduced with the arrival of Beau Didapper. This satire may not be associated directly with the satire of Pamela, though the Beau's attitude and actions toward Fanny are similar to Mr. B----'s toward Richardson's heroine. Perhaps Fielding wished to give Fanny a chance to show that she, like Joseph and unlike Pamela, is impervious to the power of riches. Not only is the beau a ridiculous figure, but he is shown to share in the moral corruption of those of high position with whom he is grouped; and after his initial attempt to assault Fanny she associates him with the great. The beau departs, leaving his servant with Fanny; to the servant's immediate offer to make her mistress of his fortune, "She answered, if the master himself, or the greatest lord in the land would marry her, she would refuse him" (IV. viii; Henley I,
Fielding himself suggests the likeness of Didapper to his other falsely great man in the appellation "the little person, or rather thing," and by his picture of Didapper's subservience to other great men.  

Now, to give him a dash or two on the affirmative side: though he was born to an immense fortune, he chose, for the pitiful and dirty consideration of a place of little consequence, to depend entirely on the will of a fellow whom they call a great man; who treated him with the utmost disrespect, and exacted of him plenary obedience to his commands, which he implicitly submitted to, at the expense of his conscience, his honor, and of his country, in which he had himself so very large a share.

(IV. ix; Henley I, 356)

While there is a hint in this description of the social aspect of the great man's attitude ("at the expense of . . . his country"), the chief emphasis in the portrayal of both Lady Booby and Didapper is moral. In the portrayal of Slipslop, this emphasis is continued, but Fielding turns also to a consideration of the relation of the low and high, or little and great, in society. Slipslop is present in both the opening and closing portions of the novel, in a situation of subservience to Lady Booby something like that held by Beau Didapper in relation to the great man. And though the chief falsely great figures remain out of sight during most of the journey, Slipslop, a lesser representative of the company is a reminder of their existence and, as she reappears at about the middle of the book gives Fielding opportunity to return to his satire of the great whom she imitates. She is, in addition, very much concerned with asserting her social position. The meeting with Mrs. Grave-airs, for instance, leads to a dispute about which of the two is superior, of which is the "betters," Slipslop claiming that "Her lady was one of the great gentry ---."

The moral emptiness of claims to greatness is shown here on a low scale, and
the implication is heightened by the information that follows as the coachman relates that Mrs. Grave-airs is no better born than he is, but that her father drove the squire's coach while the coachman's father was postillion. Now Mrs. Grave-airs' father has become a steward, "and a great gentleman." Adams' reply is that he thought "she was some such trollop" (II. v; H I 142-3).

Slipslop's affectation of greatness is revealed too in the incident in which Fielding reports that she failed to recognize Fanny. More important, this minor incident is taken as an excuse for the chapter, "A Dissertation Concerning High People and Low People, with Mrs. Slipslop's Departure in no Very Good Temper of Mind, and the Evil Plight in Which She Left Adams and His Company" (II. xliii; Henley I, 179). Here "great" and "high" are used interchangeably as Fielding humorously states that the world is made up of two classes, high people and low. The high, he says, are not actually larger in size than others, nor of exceptional character or ability; rather, "High people signify no other than people of fashion, and low people those of no fashion."

Fielding returns here to his concern with the meaning of words as he points out that the word fashion has lost its meaning, for though the word suggests "birth and accomplishments superior to the herd of mankind," it really meant and still means a person dressed in the fashion of his time. He continues by claiming that a contention arose between the two parties, and resulted in their agreement not to notice each other. The people of fashion, he states, by their position exalt themselves at church but debase themselves at the playhouse -- that is, the kind of greatness he describes is relative. The relativity is further stressed in the description he gives of the "picture of dependence like
a kind of ladder." Almost a parody of the chain of being, the ladder begins with the postilion who brushes the clothes of John the footman and ends with the favorite paying homage to his sovereign. No step, Fielding points out, is greater than the distance from the first to the second in the ladder: "so that to a philosopher the question might only seem, whether you would choose to be a great man at six in the morning, or at two in the afternoon." In conclusion, Fielding asks pardon for the digression, which, he claims, was necessary to "vindicate the great character of Mrs. Slipslop from what low people, who have never seen high people, might think an absurdity . . ." (II, xiii; Henley I, 180–182). This digression is made immediately after the high point of Joseph and Fanny's reunion, placing in contrast to the natural goodness of the lovers the affectations of those who belong, or who consider themselves to belong to the great. These characters are thus viewed in perspective as it is shown that even Mrs. Slipslop, according to the picture drawn, can consider herself great: greatness, like fashion, is an empty word.

In an article in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 27, Fielding later returns to the subject of high and low, using Mrs. Slipslop's term betters and calling it "An Appelative which all the rich usurp to themselves." He suggests that the lower class is in many ways best qualified for the term, and recalls Joseph Andrews as he points out facetiously that the mob at the theater sits above the beaus. He notes too that if betters is the comparative of good, it is improperly applied to the rich. 19 In Joseph Andrews, Betty the chambermaid makes the point more simply as she replies to Mrs. Tow-wouse's accusations.
with the statement: "My be-betters are wo-worse than me" (I. xvii; Henley I, 98). 20

Aside from satire on the Boobys and their group and from incidental satire on the road, the three stories in Joseph Andrews which are interpolated near the center of the novel provide not only a running reminder of the methods and manners of persons of high position but also a serious view of the falsely great which contrasts with the comic view of the main narrative: the story of Leonora, "the unfortunate jilt"; the story of the squire who makes promises without intending to grant them; and the life story of Mr. Wilson. Though readers who look for unity in Joseph Andrews have been disturbed by these portions of the book (especially the stories of Leonora and Mr. Wilson), it seems clear that one of the points the stories have in common is their commentary on the folly and danger of reliance on the great. Joseph rejects the overtures of Lady Booby, but here the central characters of the tales are deceived by those who are in their individual ways falsely great. In the story of Leonora, the central character trusts to the greatness of Bellarmine to make her happy, largely through possession of such items as the coach and six, the longing for which is often seen in Fielding as a sign of undue aspiration (II. iv, vi; Henley I, 118–135, 145–149). Her downfall comes then with the revelation of the moral emptiness of the man whom she had admired for his greatness. The next lengthy discourse comes from the host, who has experienced the falseness of the Squire who had made promises of any necessary assistance and of a living to Parson Adams, only to leave Adams to pay for the bill at the inn himself.
Much of the chapter consists of the host's relation of incidents in which many, including himself, were ruined by the failure of the squire to fulfill his promises (II.xvii; Henley I, 205-208). The climactic commentary on the falsely great in the middle section comes in Wilson's story. There is some satire early in the story as Wilson points out that not only the wits have title to vanity but that one who is overly concerned with dress or who "thinks himself paid for self-denial, labor, or even villainy, by a title or ribbon" is as much subject to vanity as the wit who wishes to read his poem or play in company. More intensive criticism comes though with Wilson's reflection on his own experiences with the great as he tells of his way of life in London. His comment, "I now experienced what is worse than poverty, or rather what is the worst consequence of poverty -- I mean attendance and dependence on the great," suggests a point of view expressed similarly in the Modern Husband and emphasized in Amelia. Wilson goes on the recall watching beaus, pimps, and buffoons being admitted while he waited in vain to see the great man. When by chance he was admitted, the great man merely excused himself by saying he was "tied up" (III. iii; Henley I, 242-245). Adams makes Fielding's point as he says that one who fails to encourage men of merit ought to be tied. Virtue is not necessarily rewarded, Fielding points out in each of these instances, by attempting to align itself with those of high position. Though Lady Booby is out of sight in the central portion of the novel, satire on the false promises of the great remains,

In a passage of Joseph Andrews Fielding suggests his awareness of the
prominence he has given false greatness in the work. The famous Apostrophe to Vanity at the close of I. xv consists, indeed, largely of comment on the kind of false greatness that Fielding was revealing in this novel as well as in his other works"

O Vanity! how little is thy force acknowledged, or thy operations discerned! How wantonly dost thou deceive mankind under different disguises! Sometimes thou dost wear the face of pity, sometimes of generosity; nay, thou hast the assurance even to put on those glorious ornaments which belong only to heroic virtue. Thou odious, deformed monster! whom priests have railed at, philosophers despised, and poets ridiculed; is there a wretch so abandoned as to own thee for an acquaintance in public? --yet how few will refuse to enjoy thee in their lives. The greatest villains are daily practised to please thee; nor is the meanest thief below, or the greatest hero above, thy notice. Thy embraces are often the sole aim of the private robbery and the plundered province . . . . All our passions are thy slaves.

(I. xv; Henley I, 82-83)

Though Fielding mentions several forms which vanity may take, he discusses the power that vanity holds over all men, both little and great, in terms that suggest the analogy made in Jonathan Wild between the "mearest thief" and his "private robbery" and the "greatest hero" and his "plundered province." This same aspect of vanity had been satirized in the Champion for May 3, 1740, in which Fielding points to the wish for fame ("the ridiculous Vanity") as comfort for the criminal about to be hanged and as motivation for conquerors "from Cyrus down to Charles the X11th of Sweden, the last Hero, except the present Persian Madman, who hath infested, or I hope, will infest the Earth. 21 Dudden comments on Fielding's essay by saying that "Vanity is thus connected with that maleficent and diabolical 'greatness' which has been the curse of mankind and which Fielding was later to expose in Jonathan Wild." 22 Fielding had already
of course suggested in his drama the vanity of characters who attempted to achieve spurious greatness. This vanity Fielding had defined in the Preface to Joseph Andrews as that which "puts us on affecting false characters, in order to purchase applause," showing it, along with hypocrisy, to be a proper subject for ridicule (Henley I, 22-23). In general in the novel Fielding maintains his concern with affectation which proceeds from vanity and hypocrisy, but in the Apostrophe to Vanity he includes the "great vices" which "are the proper objects of detestation," thereby indicating his inability to separate clearly the greatness that is vice and that which is folly. In the digression in which Fielding comments on his role as biographer, for instance, he discusses the "high people" he portrays in terms that show that he is not concerned merely with affectation but also with vices of the great. Dropping his mocking mask, he maintains that he describes not individuals but a species, and that in the portrayal of high people he does not include "those who are an honor to their high rank but rather "a set of wretches who, while they are a disgrace to their ancestors, whose honors and fortunes they inherit (or perhaps a greater to their mother, for such degeneracy is scarce credible), have the insolence to treat those with disregard who are at least equal to the founders of their own splendor." He continues by showing the lack of moral basis for positions of external grandeur: "It is, I fancy, impossible to conceive a spectacle more worthy of our indignation than that of a fellow, who is not only a blot in the escutcheon of a great family, but a scandal to the human species, maintaining a supercilious behavior to men who are an honor to their nature and a disgrace to their fortune" (III. i; Henley I, 217). Such commentary
is not in accord with the intentions expressed in his Preface, in which Fielding points out that the "comic epic in prose" which he is creating should be light and ridiculous in both fable and action, rather than grave or solemn. The diction too, according to the Preface, should be ludicrous, and the characters inferior in rank and manners. Fielding's basic moral concern with the great is evident in the fact that he introduces them at all into a novel supposedly concerned with the low and that his commentary on them is not always in accord with his proposed theory.

But it is not only in his treatment of the high and their imitators that greatness is an issue: rather in Joseph Andrews we see the beginning of Fielding's attempt to suggest a kind of true greatness in his low characters. This quality is not that of station, nor is it the spurious greatness of those possessing affectation. Rather, it is a nobility achieved through goodness. Heartfree is in no way the hero of Jonathan Wild, but Joseph is frequently called a hero. The fact that he is called a hero does not merely signify that he is the central character; Adams at times too is considered in heroic terms, and Booth in Amelia is not called a hero despite his central role. Fielding does not call Joseph a great man -- this term was too closely associated with high position or such ambition as stirs to worldly glory, not to mention a maturity beyond Joseph. Rather, through calling Joseph the hero Fielding can suggest a complex attitude toward him, as he does by calling Lady Booby the heroine of the tale. Joseph is frequently shown, in action or comment, in contrast with the falsely great, and thereby his superiority is indicated. On the other hand, the name Joseph is
a continual reminder not only of the goodness of his biblical predecessor but also of his failure to measure up to the man who was, as Marin Battestin has shown, considered to be a Christian hero.24 (Therefore, according to the subtitle of Steele's *Christian Hero*, the predecessor was also a great man.)

The introduction of Joseph illustrates the method. Fielding opens his chapter with a statement of the observation that examples are more effective than precepts, and he continues, "if this be just in what is odious and blameable, it is more strongly so in what is amiable and praiseworthy." We are, he continues, inspired to imitate that which we admire, and "A good man therefore, is a standing lesson to all his acquaintance, and of far greater use in that narrow circle than a good book." Here he is absolutely serious, and he continues by expressing a view that surprises no one: that the biographies of "great and worthy persons" are nevertheless valuable for recording the actions which otherwise would not be widely known. But Fielding soon goes from praise of Plutarch and Nepos to his ironical praise of Cibber and Richardson for the exemplary lives which they have written. The "excellent pattern of his sister's virtues" is then cited as that which enabled Joseph to remain pure amid great temptations (I. 1; Henley I 26–27). Joseph's history is introduced in the second chapter with the words that "Mr. Joseph Andrews, the hero of our ensuing history, was esteemed to be the only son of Gaffer and Gammer Andrews, and brother to the illustrious Pamela, whose virtue is at present so famous"; the mock-serious tone prevails and there is a hint that Joseph, being brother to Pamela, is not qualified for the role of hero (Henley I, 27). The context works to reflect too on
the opening statements which suggest that a noble character is to be presented.

On the other hand, Fielding soon suggests Joseph's superiority to men who possess external greatness without moral basis as he questions whether Joseph should be entitled to greatness even if he had no ancestors: "Would it not be hard that a man who hath no ancestors should therefore be rendered incapable of acquiring honor, when we see so many who have no virtues enjoying the honor of their forefathers?" (I. ii; Henley I, 28) Nobility is also suggested in the passage in which Fielding describes Joseph's physical appearance, though the emphasis in the statement that he had an air which "to those who have not seen many noblemen, would give an air of nobility" is on the satiric comment about those considered to be noble (I. viii; Henley I, 48). But the nature of Joseph's nobility is called into question soon thereafter, at the close of the next chapter, as Lady Booby's struggle with her passion is related. Carrying on the mocking tone partially by his clearly unnecessary concern for the hero who has escaped without great difficulty, Fielding states that "We shall therefore see a little after our hero, for whom the reader is doubtless in some pain" (I. ix; Henley I, 56). The next chapter begins with satire of Richardson as the "hero" Joseph sits down to write a letter in praise of Pamela's virtues, which he says he will imitate and "maintain my virtue against all temptation." Similarly Joseph's expression of admiration for Pamela is followed, in another chapter, by his statement that a humble situation would have been paradise with Fanny, and that with her he would not have envied any man's palaces, dainties, or riches (I. xiii; Henley I, 70–71). The serious and the humorous comment on greatness mingle in this passage. Such a technique is again used later in the book as
Joseph is called "the heroic youth" as he assists Parson Adams in an attack by hunting dogs. But the whole passage is mock-heroic (Fielding has even invoked the muse of biography, giving ironic praise of Middleton and Cibber.), and Fielding exclaims "Let those that describe lions and tigers, and heroes fiercer than both, raise their poems or plays with the smile of Joseph Andrews, who is himself above the reach of any simile" (III. vi; Henley I, 270-271). The humor suggests Joseph's shortcoming as a hero at the same time that a positive trait in his character, his courage, is mentioned -- a courage shown to defy even that of great men as Joseph in reply to the Squire's question of why he assaulted the dogs says that, since they first attacked his friend, he would have treated them as he did had they belonged to "the greatest man in the kingdom" (III. vi; Henley I, 273). Interpretation seems more difficult in the passage in which Fielding tells us that Joseph's eyes as he mourned the death of Fanny were filled with tears, "which would have become any but a hero" (III. xi; Henley I, 298). Maurice Johnson, calling the line ironic, finds it to be a deliberate refutation of Steele's view "that a sentimental tear is preferable to vulgar laughter." More to the point is his statement that Fielding is having serious fun with Joseph, and that "Joseph is no hero: he is a man."²⁵ Here Fielding himself poses as advocating a false kind of heroism and thus stresses Joseph's failure to attain it. Finally, Joseph is praised by two of the falsely great themselves, Lady Booby and Slipslop, both of whom are concerned with Joseph's qualifications for greatness. Lady Booby shows that had he been a gentleman, his wife would have a great blessing. Mrs. Slipslop agrees, adding her wish to be a "great lady" so that she could
raise him to the status of gentleman (IV. vi; Henley I, 338). Fielding allows these women to show Joseph's suitability for great station -- at the same time, he leaves open the possibility that they are prejudiced in their point of view, and unqualified to judge properly. And, though Fielding suggests Joseph's moral superiority to those who are his social superiors, he does not use the term great to refer to him. Fielding is not attempting to redefine terms in the novel; Joseph has the goodness necessary for true greatness, but is not a great man in the usual meaning of the term. Pamela, Fielding suggests, becomes unworthily great through her marriage; Joseph achieves no elevated position, but remains good.

The same is true of Parson Adams. Aurélien Digeon attempts to make a hero of him, stating that the reader's laughter in no way diminishes him during his ridiculous adventures. Digeon claims too that Fielding's lesson is that a poor and humble man may play a hero's part, and that Adams is a hero in his opposition to Lady Booby and his defense of his religious views. But the case for Adams as hero is even more difficult than for Joseph: no one would deny Adams' basic goodness, but this characteristic alone, in the terms of the novel, does not make him a hero -- and when he is called a hero, it is not necessarily because of his exhibition of this quality. Johnson notes that Adams' code is for him a kind of affectation, as are his attempts to quote from Seneca and Boethius. Dudden points out Adams' "three innocent vanities": his pride in his knowledge, acquired from books, of human nature and life; his pride
in his sermons, in particular the one on vanity; and his pride in his competence as a schoolmaster. Fielding stresses the last of the three points, which may include the others, for it is in his view of himself as a teacher that the other vanities appear. Fielding says: "Indeed, if this good man had an enthusiasm, or what the vulgar call a blind side, it was this: he thought a schoolmaster the greatest character in the world, and himself the greatest of all schoolmasters, neighter of which points he would have given up to Alexander the Great at the head of his army" (III. v; Henley I, 263). This harmless vanity of Parson Adams is perhaps best revealed in the scene at the home of the squire who is diverting himself and his company. Clearly Adams is shown in a sympathetic way as he is set against the claimant to greatness and his fellows, but he does not quite escape ridicule. The humor works in a way similar to that created by Fielding's naming him for the patriarch of the Old Testament: both his short-comings and his virtues are pointed up. Battestin, showing that Abraham, like Joseph, was used as an example of the good man in the Christian literature of Fielding's day, points out in particular that in one of Isaac Barrow's sermons, Abraham's achievements were shown to be superior to Alexander's. Abraham had become the truly great man in contrast to Alexander, the type of the falsely great. In the scene at the Squire's, another comparison is suggested as Adams agrees with the doctor's feigned disapproval of levity of conversation, and, more generally, mirth. The doctor claims to have a Greek manuscript in which one of Socrates' favorite diversions is recorded, and goes on to describe the activity: Socrates appeared in the guise of an ambassador, and addressed
the monarchs in "some grave speech, full of virtue and goodness and morality, and such like; thereafter he was seated between the king and queen, and entertained royally." Adams replies that "It was indeed a diversion worthy the relaxation of so great a man," and preferable to the activities of the modern great men, but adds that "The Christian religion was a much nobler subject for these speeches than any Socrates could have invented" (III. vii; Henley I, 282–283). These statements, both in their estimation of Socrates as a truly great man and in their opinion of the superiority of Christian over pagan doctrine, are in no way exceptional to the traditional conception of Christian greatness and Socrates' relation to it. The divines, too, cited Socrates as an example of a pre-Christian great man in their sermons. But as Adams agrees to undertake the role of this great man in the imitation of the ceremony described, Digeon's statement that Adams' adventures do not diminish him is not adequate to the situation. For Adams' sousing, after he has read his sermon and approached the "majesties" (the squire and the captain), is not quite undeserved. Adams has succumbed to his vanity, his confidence in himself as a teacher, in undertaking the role of the great Socrates. Adams is indeed like Socrates in his courage in speech, but by placing himself in the position of the great man he is indulging his own pride. He is not, it is implied, much like Socrates after all: he cannot even discern the ruse prepared for him, and does not even see that the imitation of Socrates is false in its foundation.

Parson Adams is similarly associated with great figures in an earlier
passage in which his flight from the Squire's dogs is related. In humorous commentary, Fielding pleads that the reader not see the action as detracting from the parson's bravery but rather to consider the circumstances. If flight under any circumstances is considered inadmissible by any reader, he says, that reader is ignorant of Homer and Virgil as well as of "the history of some great men living, who, though brave as lions, aye, as tigers, have run away, the Lord knows why, to the surprise of their friends and the entertainment of their enemies" (III. vi; Henley I, 269). The ironic method here lets the reader consider Adams from two points of view: he has little resemblance to Homer's great characters who run away from great battles in this flight, but he is indeed superior to the "great men" whose false greatness is suggested. This same superiority is suggested in Fielding's statement that Adams' raptures on learning from the peddler that his son Jacky is alive were not those which two courtiers feel in one another's embraces; not those with which a great man receives the vile treacherous engines of his wicked purposes; not those with which a worthless younger brother wishes his elder joy of a son, or a man congratulates his rival on his obtaining a mistress, a place or an honor. (IV. viii; Henley I, 353)

The superiority is implicit too in Fielding's contrast of the ostentatious return of Lady Booby in her coach and six to the parish and that of Parson Adams, immediately thereafter, on foot. Lady Booby enters "amidst the ringing bells and the acclamations of the poor" whom she has been impoverishing, and Adams is greeted with affection. Yet Adams, like Joseph, remains a good man; he is a man of "worthy inclinations," as Fielding says in the preface (Henley I, 24).

A presentation of the true greatness which Fielding defined in the Miscellanies,
then, does not fit into Fielding's comic method in Joseph Andrews -- rather
the negative is stressed, as the falsely great are satirized for their affecta-
tions and as even the lowly become humorous when they attempt to imitate a
false greatness. A positive greatness, the combination of abilities and goodness
is only mentioned as a balance to the picture given here, both in the names
given the chief characters and in brief passages on the truly great. It is in
these passages that the moral and social aspects of the theme are most clearly
combined. In Fielding's introductory chapter to Book III, as he comments on
his definition of the high people, he points out that there are many exceptions
to the general picture he has drawn; and for this reason, "in our description
of high people, we cannot be intended to include such as, whilst they are an
honor to their high rank by a well-guided condescension make their superiority
as easily \text{sic} \text{ as possible to those whom fortune chiefly hath placed below
them." He continues by describing both a "peer no less elevated by nature than
by fortune" and "a commoner, raised higher above the multitude by superior
talents than is in the power of his prince to exalt him" (III. 1; Henley I, 216–217).\textsuperscript{30a}
The praise of the peer stresses his essentially great nature as well as his
fortune, and stresses too his manner of acting both as a patron and friend in his
generosity. Similarly, Fielding comments both on the "inherent greatness
in . . . manner" of the commoner and on his affable manner of giving assistance.
Allen's basic goodness and his charity are again praised by Joseph in the chapter
entitled "Moral Reflections by Joseph Andrews . . . ." Discoursing on the "so
few instances of charity among mankind, Joseph points out that "one great act"
of charity creates more honor than man's attempt to purchase it. To Fanny's
question, "Are all the great folks wicked then?" Joseph replies that "some
gentlemen of our cloth report charitable actions done by their lords and masters" and that he has heard Pope tell the story of "Al--Al--I forgot his name" (III. iv; Henley I 266). Similarly, Harriet Hearty's manner in generosity brings praise from Wilson for her "unfeigned greatness of mind" (III. iii; Henley I, 250).

Harriet is the character in the novel who comes closest to possessing true greatness, but her role is a minor one, for Fielding is still more concerned with presenting a comic view, which requires imperfection, than with portraying true greatness. As Joseph points out, good actions cannot be turned to ridicule (III. iv; Henley I, 266).

Wolfgang Iser cites Fielding's comment on the high people in III. ii in corroboration of his statement that a new view of man is given in Joseph Andrews, as Fielding portrays man in the everyday world: "Das manifestiert sich nicht zuletzt in der beurteilung der high people, die Fielding nicht mehr als eine homogene Klasse von Libertins betrachtet, sondern die er durchaus unterschiedlich wertet und beurteilt."31 Iser's statement is misleading in giving the impression that Fielding was aware of only the falsely great before he wrote Joseph Andrews -- a statement that fails to take note of his "Of True Greatness" and of differentiation among the characters of the plays. In its bare outlines Joseph Andrews is like Fielding's earlier works, with the essential contrast between the falsely great and the worthy characters. But in the novel he can take the opportunity to include comments on, for instance, those who possess true greatness. Significant here is Professor McKillop's comment that in the novel Fielding has a chance to expatiate as he could not in the plays.32
For the outline serves as a framework for the portrayal of the everyday world to which Iser refers.

In Fielding's Dedication to Tom Jones, he states his intentions in the novel: to recommend innocence and goodness; to show not only that virtue is beautiful but that it is to man's interest to pursue it, since acquisitions of guilt cannot compensate for the loss of "inward comfort of mind" and such acquisition is frequently accompanied by danger; and to show that virtue "scarce can be injured but by indiscretion." The last, he says, is most likely to be successful, for "it is much easier to make good men wise, then to make bad men good" (Henley III, 12).

As is suggested in Fielding's introductory comments, there is little room in Tom Jones for social commentary, nor is there any obvious intent to reform for social purposes -- moral questions, rather, are again of chief interest for Fielding. One of the ethical problems with which he deals is the relation of greatness and goodness. Professor McKillop has pointed out the correlation between moral system and plot structure in the novel, in which the basically good characters help Tom and the evil or vicious characters oppose his action. Related to this moral system and supporting it is Fielding's attribution of false greatness to the evil of vicious characters. Of these the chief is of course Blifil, the character first set in opposition to Tom as Fielding presents the general opinion of Tom's and Blifil's comparative merits, with the favor greatly on Blifil's side. Blifil is then shown in his actions in
which he successfully attempts to drive Tom from Allwaorthy's house. Tom's
estimate of Blifil's character results directly from his observations and ex-
periences as he suggests to the lawyer Dowling Blifil's unworthiness for the
position he has inherited. Dowling, whom Tom has met on his journey,
proposes to drink to the health of Allworthy and Blifil, and Tom states that
he has joined two people together improperly, "for one is the glory of the human
species, and the other is a rascal who dishonors the name of man." As Tom
in the same passage gives Dowling his opinion of Blifil, he uses terms that
suggest the false greatness of Blifil, who "hath the cunning of the devil himself"—
Blifil is, Fielding suggests, like the falsely great men of whom the devil was
shown to be the prototype by Christian moralists. Tom continues with a moral
judgment: "I thought he wanted that generosity of spirit which is the sure
foundation of all that is great and noble in human nature. I saw a selfishness
in him long ago which I despised." Dowling, not Tom, is the one who comments
that it is a pity Blifil should inherit the "great estate" of Allworthy (XII. x; Henley
IV, 242–243). Fielding himself here avoids making a moral judgment, but the
stress on Blifil's cunning in this and other passages suggests his likeness to,
for instance, the great man Jonathan Wild. 34 It is Allworthy who finally tells
Sophia that Blifil is a villain, and he repeats the statement to Tom (XVIII. ix;
Henley V, 338. XVIII. xi; Henley V, 354). Blifil has the "parts," but lacks
the virtue necessary for true greatness. Professor McKillop has shown that
"Like Lovelace, he engineers a conspiracy which is technically the mainspring
of the plot, but unlike Lovelace he is not betrayed from within." 35 Similarly,
he is like Jonathan Wild, who could not be betrayed from within. Blifil
cannot stand to demonstrate Fielding's thesis that the loss of inward comfort
of the mind does not compensate for the acquisitions of guilt: rather, he is a
living reminder of the repulsiveness of evil. As Irwin has pointed out, one
of his traits, hypocrisy, is ridiculed, for it comes under the dominion of
comedy, but Blifil's crimes, his vice, are not ridiculed; Irwin's statement,
"Perhaps Fielding did not trust comedy to recommend virtue and condemn
vice as fully and plainly as they should be condemned," is pertinent. Perhaps
Fielding saw too that such villainy as that of the falsely great man is a part of
the world he is depicting. Blifil has come close to achieving a "great estate"
as a result of his villainy. He is indeed falsely great, having achieved his
position falsely, and his character is revealed fully in conclusion as he falls
from the pinnacle of greatness.

In league with Blifil and similar to him are Square and Thwackum, the
two characters who are like those who haunt the levees of the great in their
preying on Allworthy and the nephew who seems destined to inherit the fortune.
These are the falsely great representatives of philosophy and religion, those
who use their doctrines chiefly for the purpose of advancing themselves. They
too are allowed to reveal themselves, especially their concept of greatness, at
the time at which they learn of Allworthy's legacies. Square, blaming
Thwackum for his own small share, states that Allwarth's will is based on
"those narrow principles" Thwackum has been attempting to inculcate "in
contempt of everything which is great and noble" (V. viii; Henley III, 246). This
is what Thwackum has tried to do, but Square's own narrow views are revealed by the statement: and, ironically, the statement points to the greatness and nobility Allworthy evidences without any assistance from these two.

But aside from the basically vicious, Fielding has characters who are presented sympathetically but who are still guided by false ideas of greatness and are therefore a threat to Tom. One of these is Squire Western, who in his failure to be aware of the situation in his home is like the politician of Rape upon Rape. (He has some similarity too to the apothecary in the Man of the Hill's story, "one of the greatest politicians of his time" who was delighted with any news, but whose reports were usually inaccurate. VIII. xiv; Henley IV, 142). This is pointed up by Mrs. Western's sarcastic statement that "so great a politician" should be able to find out whom Sophia loves -- and shortly thereafter Fielding points out that in many ways the Squire is "a perfect politician, for he knows the value of laying up money" (VI. ii; Henley III, 277, 279). Even his specifically political "greatness" has, according to Fielding, an improper basis for Jacobitism is a kind of false greatness. This view is developed in the Jacobite's Journal, which Fielding produced in 1747 and 1748 against what he saw as the Jacobite threat. He closes the leader of the first issue, in which he takes up the pose of a Jacobite, with the statement that he hopes the paper "may be of so much consequence to the Cause of the Truth which it espouses, and which I hope will, in the End, reduce all Men to be as great and as sincere Jacobites as myself."\(^{37}\) Western's false conception of political greatness is related to his failure to judge personal greatness properly, and his insistence on providing what he sees as "one of the greatest matches in all England" for his daughter is based on his prejudice rather
than selfish motives (XV. v; Henley V, 159). He gains sympathy by his treat-
ment of those who are respected merely for their titles, but he is unwilling
to see that his judgment can be as false as theirs. Thus he is as willing to
accept a country gentleman as great on the basis of fortune along as his sister
is to accept a lord. The limited nature of his viewpoint is revealed in his
attitude toward Tom: he is so fond of him that he wishes he had a son with
Tom's abilities. (Tom recommends himself by "leaping over five barred gates,
and by other acts of sportsmanship.") Tom, he declares, "would certainly
make a great man, if he had but sufficient encouragement" (III. x; Henley III,
140). Still, when the question of the marriage of Sophia arises, consideration
of abilities and character are forgotten, and Blifil's fortune along is
sufficient to recommend him in preference to Thom, who becomes "a beggarly
rascal" (XV. v; Henley V, 159). Western's view is so distorted that his
stereotyped views in which "any of your lords" are contrasted with "an honest
country gentleman" cannot be affected by the partially known facts of Blifil's
nature (XV. v; Henley V, 161).

Western's sister is shown to have some of her brother's traits, especially
his conception of himself as a great politician. But though her political ideas
are in some ways nearer to Fielding's own than her brother's, she is portrayed
in a less sympathetic way — largely, probably, because she is actually a
better "politician" than her brother, aware always of social conditions and
customs, in her attempt to rise in greatness herself. Her comparison of
herself to the "wise king of Prussia" indicates too a pride unlike Western's
(XVII. viii; Henley V, 285). More specifically, her willingness to ally herself with her London associates in the matter of Sophia's marriage evidences her lack of moral standards in her worship of outward signs of greatness. Western may be mistaken, but he hates lords and will not ally Sophia with one he despises. The contrast in the two characters is pointed up as Mrs. Western tells her brother that "deeper politicians, who see to the bottom, discover often a very different aspect of affairs from what swims on the surface," and that decorum must be used with such a woman as Lady Bellaston. Western, she points out, "is not a fit minister to be employed at a private court"

(XV. vi; Henley V, 165, 167). Western's redeeming quality is that while he wishes to provide "one of the greatest matches in all England" for his daughter because of his prejudice, he can, because of the same prejudice, be scornful of "one of the greatest matches in England" which his sister and cousin are trying to persuade him to arrange (XVII. iii; Henley V, 254). Parson Supple, whose name is enough to indicate that Fielding saw him as suited for politics, is an extreme version of the kind of attitude expressed by Mrs. Western. Though he has only a minor role, his basis for reproving Western for the abuse of Sophia (whom Lord Fellamar has just attempted to assault) is enough to indicate his character: "For heaven's sake, sir animadvert that you are in the house of a great lady" (XV. v; Henley V, 158).

When Jones and Sophia get to London, then, it is the falsely great who almost bring about their downfall and who keep them from each other, and who are
accordingly shown to be lacking in true greatness. One of these is the Irish peer, who gives Fielding the opportunity to comment on the method of being known during one's lifetime: the possessing of a title to honor or estate. This is true greatness, he suggests ironically. The lack of foundation of modern greatness is suggested also in Fielding's comment concerning the "happy mansions where fortune segregates from the vulgar those magnanimous heroes, the descendants of ancient Britons, Saxons, or Danes, whose ancestors, being born in better days, by sundry kinds of merit, have entailed riches and honor on their posterity" (XIII. ii; Henley V, 35). The statement is ironic largely because of what has already been revealed of peer's character. There is even a hint of the relation of the world of the great and the underworld as Fielding comments that he has often thought that by the description of Cerberus, Virgil might have been satirizing the porters of the great in his day, though the point is not explored as Fielding goes on to point out that "those who have the honor to attend at the doors of our great men" also must be bribed (XIII. ii; Henley V, 37). And though there is simply light irony as Fielding refers to the "great personages," the peer and Lady Bellaston, who are visiting Mrs. Fitzgerald, and compares their conversation with the "several dainties of French cookery, which are served only at the tables of the great" (XIII. iv; Henley V, 46-47); Fielding's statement that the chief characteristic of the beau monde is folly rather than vice and that it is deserving of the word frivolous, is not quite convincing. For folly would lend itself to humorous treatment; and Fielding goes on to say that the life is dull, lacking in variety
and humor that characterized the treatment of the Boobys (XIV. i; Henley V. 95). 38

True, there is humor in Fielding's revelation of the folly of Lady Bellaston, folly which reveals her to be less than great. Fielding's introduction to the "world" of gossips helps to show Lady Bellaston in perspective:

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 honorable society which not long since flourished in this kingdom.

(XV. iii; Henley V. 148)

And the passage in which Lady Bellaston, referred to by Partridge, Fielding suggests, as "the great lady," visits Tom reveals her likeness to those of lower rank through her actions as she attempts to join Mrs. Honour under the table. As she walks out, "very majestically," Fielding makes the point that there is "a kind of dignity in the impudence of women of quality, which their inferiors vainly aspire to attain in circumstances of this nature" (XV. vii; Henley V, 171, 175). But when Lady Bellaston or Lord Fellamar is attempting vicious plotting, there is no satiric commentary on their greatness.

In general, rather, Fielding mocks the attempted greatness that he sees in the lower classes. The viciousness of those of high position is seen as potential danger, while affectation among the lowly is seen as generally harmless to others, and a matter for humor. This distinction, rather than the strict one between vice and folly, seems to guide Fielding's pen in the treatment of the great in Tom Jones. 39 Thus Molly's attempt to imitate the great in attire brings forth a commentary that, in its satire of the affectation of the lowly, is an appropriate introduction to the mock-heroic battle that follows. Fielding maintains an ironic tone as he ostensibly approves of the qualities that he finds: "The great are deceived if they imagine they have appropriated ambition and vanity to
themselves. These noble qualities flourish as notably in a country church and churchyard as in the drawing-room or in the closet." He goes on to point out that not only schemes, plots, and party of the lower class are equal to those in high places, but that such "feminine arts" as ogling and scandal, in short, everything which is common to the most splendid assembly or politest circle" can be found among the lower classes (IV. viii; Henley III, 169). The mocking terms of the battle then work to point up the nature of the participants. A similar parallel is drawn in XII. ix, as Fielding comments, "Here we cannot help observing that, as there is so much of policy in the lowest life, great men often overvalue themselves on those refinements in imposture, in which they are frequently excelled by some of the lowest of the human species" (XII. ix; Henley IV, 339). In miniature, the crimes of the great are humorous. Social implications are evident here, but they remain subordinate to the moral scheme in which plotting and hypocrisy belong to the falsely great.

Turning to the other side of the scheme, one finds already in the Preface a concern with one of the characters of the novel who is to aid in the recommendation of goodness, as Fielding draws attention to the virtues of the Duke of Bedford, to whom the work is dedicated, and who is called "one of the greatest and noblest, not only in his rank, but in every public and private virtue." In addition Fielding calls attention to Lyttelton and "a particular acquaintance of yours" (evidently Ralph Allen), whom he calls "two of the best and worthiest men in the world." If there is, he says, "a stronger picture of a truly benevolent mind" in the work than in any of his others, it is because these men are responsible, and because it is copied from them (Henley III, 12, 10). In an introductory chapter
then Fielding points out that as a writer of "private character" rather than of history he must stay within the limits of possibility and probability too, "especially in painting what is truly great and amiable." He goes on to describe a man in glowing terms, concluding "I know a man who is all I have described;" 40 (VIII. i: Henley V, 62). One such instance, he claims is not sufficient to justify his inclusion in a work addressed to thousands who have never heard of the person. Thus the picture of Allworthy, modeled on the truly great men alluded to by Fielding, has some of their characteristics, and as he is introduced he is shown to have the qualities Fielding has described in these men: "Bust as to his power, he never used it, and as to his benevolence, he exerted so much that he had thereby disoblged all his neighbors; for it is a secret well known to great men, that by conferring an obligation they do not always procure a friend, but are certain of creating many enemies" (I. ix; Henley III, 45). 41 And, though it is carefully pointed out that Allworthy is not perfect, Fielding immediately sets up a distinction between Allworthy and the men who falsely claim greatness -- Allworthy is charitable because of his basic goodness, not for any selfish political motives. Allworthy is characterized by benevolence, not mere outward generosity but an attitude of mind lacking in the selfish men of high position and the proud characters who see themselves as great.

In a later chapter, Fielding's introduction of Allworthy is recalled as an implicit contrast is made with Dr. Blifil, whose concern for the ingratitude of his brother, the captain, is discussed. Fielding points out that ingratitude is never so much a cause of pain as when it comes from those for whom one has been guilty of transgressions. In contrast, he states, "Reflections on good and great actions, however they are received or returned by those in whose favor they
are performed, always administer some comfort to us" (I. xiii; Henley III, 61).

In the passages there is a comment then on the truly great behavior of Allworthy, in its moral and social aspects. The two are again combined in the praise of Allworthy's greatness near the conclusion of the book, uttered first by Mrs. Miller, then by Sophia, and finally Tom. Mrs. Miller tells of Allworthy's generosity to her, motivated only by his having heard of her distress, and exclaims about "that great, that good, that glorious man" (XIV. v; Henley V, 112). Sophia's exclamation includes a comment on the benevolence so frequently cited in connection with Allworthy: "Oh sir, . . . every word you speak proves you deserve that good, that great, that benevolent character the whole world allows you" (XVII. ix; Henley V, 338). Tom, who has already called him "the glory of the human species" (XII. x: Henley IV, 342), refers to Allworthy as "my great, my noble, my generous benefactor" (XVIII. x; Henley V, 346). These statements of Allworthy's greatness are supported by numerous references to "our good man."42 In Allworthy, then, there is a picture of a great man -- the first truly great man to be made a character in Fielding's novels.

But the emphasis is not so much of the definition of true greatness, or on the presentation of Allworthy's greatness as it is on the picture of Tom Jones -- Fielding is showing the process in which a good man becomes wise. And one of the ways in which Fielding characterizes Tom as he achieves the wisdom necessary for the refinement of his basically good character is by suggesting his relationship to the great. Sometimes the method is that of the ironic depreciation of Heartfree, sometimes the mock-heroic of Joseph Andrews, and sometimes a combination of the two. Too, there is implicit contrast with the falsely great.
And Tom's statements concerning greatness, though they often sound commonplace, serve as a means of characterization.

Fielding's introduction to Tom comes in a chapter entitled "The hero of this history appears with some very bad omens. A little tale of so low a kind that some may think it not worthy their notice. A word or two concerning a squire, and more relating to a gamekeeper and a schoolmaster." Fielding's method differs slightly here from that of Joseph Andrews; he tends to depreciate, in a manner sometimes suggestive of Jonathan Wild, the good characteristics while, through suggestion of false greatness, he exaggerates Tom's vices. The chapter introducing Tom is thus begun with the statement that, being guided by truth, "we are obliged to bring our hero on the stage in a much more disadvantageous manner than we could wish; and to declare honestly, even at his first appearance, that it was the universal opinion of all Mr. Allworthy's family that he was certainly born to be hanged." Fielding continues by agreeing that the reason for this conjecture is that Jones showed propensity to vices, especially that most apt to lead to hanging, in his early years. The statement of his tendency toward robbery is then corroborated by the instances of robbing an orchard, of taking a duck out of the farmer's yard, and of picking Blifil's pocket of a ball. Tom's vices are then contrasted to the virtues of Blifil, and Fielding continues with the statement that Tom, "bad as he is, must serve as the hero of this history" (III. ii; Henley III, 107-108). Ian Watt fails to comment on the irony in the passage as he cites it in corroboration of his statement that Tom is no hero of romance. Fielding is implying that Tom is no hero in the usual sense, but the line stresses rather his goodness than his badness. Tom's unworthiness for the title of hero is
stressed in such phrases as "our poor hero" and "that poor youth" in the early part of the novel (III. vi; Henley III, 130–131). Too, in an ironic manner similar to that of Joseph Andrews Fielding relates of the battle between Molly Seagrim Goody Brown, the mock-heroic tone of which is suggested by the title "A Battle Sung by the Muse in the Homeric Style, and Which None but the Classical Reader Can Taste." Of Tom, Fielding reports, "Having scoured the whole coast of the enemy, as well as any of Homer's heroes ever did, or as Don Quixote or any knight-errant in the world could have done, he returned to Molly . . . " (IV. viii; Henley III, 175). The comparison with Homer's figures suggests a positive view, but this is mocked by the discrepancy between heroic action and Tom's part in the battle. And the comparison with Don Quixote adds additional humor. The reference to "our hero" in a later passage shortly thereafter must be seen in the light of this mockery: and even here the tone is humorous as Sophia's battery of loveliness is said to be aimed at Tom (IV. x; Henley III, 179–180). The point is perhaps more clearly made in regard to another episode, the one in which Tom makes a mock-heroic speech about his love for Sophia just before he escorts Molly Seagrim into the woods (V. x; Henley III, 256–57). Watt has analyzed this scene to show its place in the moral and intellectual scheme of the novel as follows:

The least convincing aspect of the episode is the diction: the speech habits manifested here obviously bear little relation to those we expect of Tom Jones. But, of course, they are a stylistic necessity for Fielding's immediate purpose -- the comic deflation of the heroic and romantic pretenses of the human word by the unheroic and unromantic eloquence of the human deed. Tom Jones is no more than a vehicle for the expression of Fielding's skepticism about lovers' vows; and he must be made to speak in terms that parody the high-flown rhetoric of the pastoral romance to give point to the succeeding wayside encounter
which belongs to the very different world of the pastourelle. 44

In addition, one might point out that Fielding's phrase "no sooner had our hero retired with his Dido . . ." helps to emphasize the unheroic nature of the encounter with Molly (V. x; Henley III, 258). And there are other suggestions of the unheroic in the comparison that follows of Tom's attitude with that of beasts. Even in this context there is one of the many allusions to "our hero" that appear to be deliberately clustered around this episode. 45

During the next portion of the book the infrequent "our hero" has only slightly mocking tones, 46 but as soon as Tom again becomes involved in an unheroic affair the term again becomes more frequent and more ironic. In this way the incident in which Tom rescues Mrs. Waters is similar to the one involving Molly. Tom is called "our hero" without the excessively ironic tone as he has rescued Mrs. Waters, but as soon as the frailties of the two are revealed, there is a comparison to Orpheus and Eurydice. The mock-heroic battle at the Upton Inn follows -- a battle in which even the chambermaid becomes "The heroic Susan." The passage in which Fielding states that "Heroes, notwithstanding the high ideas which, by the means of flatterers, they may conceive of themselves, or the world of them, have certainly more of the mortal than divine about them," continues the mock-heroic attitude, and his commentary that the "greatest prince, hero, or philosopher on earth" must eat leads to a mention of "our hero's ardor in eating. The frequency of the use of "our hero" cannot be accidental in this context (IX. v; Henley IV, 163-179). 47

But before long Jones is pictured in a more positive light, and as he advances, as he is made wiser, Fielding allows him to become spokesman for a view toward the great that is suggested already in the dedication of the book. This is not a
new attitude on Tom's part, but until now he has not been mature enough to utter it:

What is the poor pride arising from a magnificent house, a numerous equipage, a splendid table, and from all the other advantages or appearances of fortune, compared to the warm, solid content, the swelling satisfaction, the thrilling transports, and the exulting triumphs which a good mind enjoys in the contemplation of a generous, virtuous, noble, benevolent action?

(XII. x; Henley IV, 346)

Here Jones has already the attitude necessary for the possession of true greatness, though this is not to say that he is a great man. But references to "our hero" become less obtrusive, and the humorous suggestion of the term is lessened.

For instance, Jones is called a hero as his strength is commented on in his rescue of Nightingale (XIII. v; Henley V, 51). Shortly thereafter Tom is again permitted to voice his sentiments on greatness as he tells Mrs. Miller he has been sufficiently rewarded by his knowledge of having helped her cousin and does not require a "glorious reward." Again the words could be Fielding's: "If there are men who cannot feel the delight of giving happiness to others, I pity them, as they are incapable of tasting what is, in my opinion, a greater honor, a higher interest, and a sweeter pleasure than the ambitious, the avaricious, or the voluptuous man can ever obtain" (XIII. x; Henley V, 79). His words as he expounds on Nightingale's responsibility to Mrs. Miller's daughter express the same contempt for false greatness, "the undeserved praise of millions" (XIV. vii; Henley V, 124). 48

With this background Fielding's mention of "this rogue, whom we have unfortunately made our hero" (XVII. i; Henley V, 248) as Jones' plight in prison
is related is in no way a reflection on his character, but rather a reminder that he is in danger not primarily for fault of his own but because the great have conspired to place him there. And as he remains in prison he gives more evidence of heroism than ever before. It is while he is in prison that he reveals that he is not only basically good, but that his conception of greatness goes beyond even that of moral goodness. Fielding allows Tom to join those in the Christian tradition who had pointed to the greatness of God in contrast to the glory to be achieved on earth; and he exclaims that, because he is a murderer, he has no hope or wish that he will be able to avoid punishment, "but I have some reliance on a throne still greatly superior; which will, I am certain, afford me all the protection I merit" (XVII. ix; Henley V, 287). There is no hint of irony as Fielding says of Jones' next words that he "cried out heroically." Through Tom's development Fielding has shown how a good man may be educated to wisdom -- indeed, the "great goodness of heart" which Fielding sees as Tom's basic character trait, and which is seen in the same way by Allworthy and Sophia (Cf. XVIII. ix; Henley V, 340 and ix; Henley V, 350.), makes possible the change in the protagonist that occurs in the book -- not miraculously at the end, in the manner that Fielding criticized in the comedy of his day. 49

Tom's situation can be illustrated by a passage which can be seen as a metaphor for the entire situation of the novel: the familiar Partridge-at-the-play story (XVI. v; Henley V, 221-225). The use of the stage-world analogy is familiar in Fielding's early works, and it is developed at length in the introductory chapter to Book VII as Fielding points out that the "great theatre of Nature" is being seen behind the scenes. Fielding alludes to Garrick, "whom I regard in tragedy to be the greatest genius the world hath ever produced," as he considers
the variety of roles a man may play and states "for in this instance life most exactly resembles the stage, since it is often the same person who represents the villain and the hero." The analogy is carried on too in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 26, as Fielding discusses the audience at a theater and comments specifically on the fate of a good actor who is outdone in bombast:

    Whoever hath attended our Theatres, and seen our best Plays acted, must have heard many an exquisite Speech of the sedate Kind, delivered most exactly by an accomplished Actor, pass off unregarded in a Kind of cold Silence; while the empty Vociferation of some wretched Performer, hath been soon after rewarded with a thundering Clap of Approbation. 50

In Tom Jones, Partridge stands as a glaring example of one who fails to perceive the worth of Garrick's acting. 51 Partridge is an appropriate character for this incident, for, although he is favorably inclined toward Jones, his reason for following him is not Tom's merit but rather the outward signs of greatness -- the fortune he thinks Tom will inherit from Allworthy. Partridge, however, is not the only character who has failed to discern properly -- Fielding's ironic tacit acceptance of the statement that it was "the universal opinion of all Mr. Allworthy's family" that Tom was born to be hanged and his later statement of Tom's roguery suggest the general "audience" reaction toward Tom, and Blifil's bombast is taken for real greatness on the stage of life. 52

Ian Watt points out that Fielding must have been surprised when the public considered Tom Jones as a pattern of conduct, emphasizing that Tom's name if not Fielding's stated intentions to write a comic work should have made clear that Fielding had no wish to create such a hero. 53 But Fielding did intend to instruct through the story of Tom's adventures. Tom, improved, is not only revealed to be, though young, a man of position, Allworthy's heir -- he is also shown to have
the characteristics of greatness, especially benevolence, which Fielding was to stress as a chief moral requisite of the truly great man; and he is shown to see greatness in perspective, to see a superior Christian greatness above the temporal. In accord with his stated purpose, Fielding has shown how a good man becomes wise. In addition, he has suggested how this wisdom prepares him for greatness.
NOTES


5. *Shamela*, p. 34.

6. *An Essay on the New Species of Writing Founded by Mr. Fielding*, 1751, ed. A. D. McKillop (The Augustan Reprint Society Publication Number 95. Los Angeles, 1962), p. 18. The writer of course was referring to the novels rather than *Shamela* when he said of the names that "the *Dramatis Personae* (if I may venture to use the Expression) were christened not with fantastic high-sounding Names, but such as, tho' they sometimes bore some Reference to the Character, had a modern Termination."


8. Dudden, I, 321. Dudden also cites the passage in *Tom Jones*, I, viii, in which "truly great politician" is applied to the maid–servant. See chapter three above for Fielding's use of the term politician.


13. The fact that Fielding's reference to the parson "who writes lives" is probably a satiric hit at the Reverend Conyers Middleton, as Baker, ed. *Shamela*, p. xxvi, points out, does not lessen the effect of the satire on Richardson. As Baker notes, "Fielding is satirizing bad writing in Cibber, Middleton, and the unknown author of *Pamela*."

14. II, 181, 183 (Tuesday, May 6, 1740). Fielding may have been the author too
of the anonymous An Apology for the Life of Mr. T. . . . . . . C. . . . . , Comedian, published July, 1740. On the question of authorship see Cross I, 282-283.


16. Alan D. McKillow, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence, Kansas, 1956), pp. 100-101, points out too that this intention "might be concurrent with the influence of Marivaux' Paysan Parvenu in the early chapters."


18. The likeness is substantiated by Battestin's exploration of the resemblance of the portrait of Didapper to descriptions of Lord Hervey, a favorite target of Opposition satirists. See "Lord Hervey's Role in Joseph Andrews," Pq, XLII (1963), 226-241. If Fielding does allude to Hervey, his continued concern with the great man Walpole is evident in the references to the "fellow whom they call a great man" to whom Didapper is subservient.


20. William B. Coley, "The Background of Fielding's Laughter," ELH, XXVI (1959), 247, refers to this incident as he discusses Fielding's Champion essay for May 3, 1740, on Rich as pantomimist and creator of a topsy-turvy world. Coley, seeing Rich and his pantomimes as giving "a metaphor of the Augustan condition," seems to take seriously Fielding's parenthetical statement (II, 177) that the lower classes "are mounted (perhaps by the noble Rich for this immediate Purpose) above their Superiors."

21. II, 175. For a similar treatment of vanity see Edward Young's the Universal Passion, from which Fielding quotes in Amelia and the Covent-Garden Journal.

22. Dudden, I, 281. Surprisingly, Keuffel's extended consideration of greatness in Fielding makes no specific mention of vanity.

23. W. R. Irwin, "Satire and Comedy in the Works of Fielding," ELH, XIII (1946), 186, points out in his discussion of Blifil that "Fielding well knew that only in preachers' handbooks are vices and follies rigidly separable. He knew further that the increase of folly is often the source of vice, that the criminal may lie unsuspected in the fool."

25. Maurice Johnson, Fielding's Art of Fiction (Philadelphia, 1961), p. 69, is concerned with showing that "False sentiment is constantly one of the targets of Fielding's wit," and that "There is a discrepancy between the reasonable code of conduct (Adams, Addison, Steele) and the psychological organization of man (Joseph, Shakespeare, Fielding)." This passage seems especially inappropriate for his argument.


27. Johnson, p. 69.


30. See, for instance, Paradise Regained, III, line 96. Socrates is again called "this great man" in II. xvii; Henley I, 209. Fielding cites Socrates and Brutus in the Preface to the Miscellaneies, p. xxvii, as examples of persons who combined greatness and goodness in their characters. Fielding here alludes to Chesterfield and Ralph Allen. See Dudden, I, a 376.

31. Iser, p. 44. Iser points out too that Fielding remains true to his old moral and social purposes.


33. McKillop, Early Masters, p. 126.

34. See, for instance, the statement that "this young gentleman so well knew his own talents, that nothing within the province of cunning seemed to him hard to be achieved," (XVI. vi; Henley V, 228) and the comment that Blifil is "a much more cunning man" than Allworthy and therefore, unlike Allworthy, has "a suspicion of the real truth" concerning Sophia's coleness to him (XVI. viii; Henley V, 237).

35. McKillop, Early Masters, p. 128.

36. Irwin, ELH, 186.

37. Saturday, December 6, 1747, p. 2.

38. McKillop, Early Masters, p. 125, comments on the scarcity of humor in the London setting.
39. See in this connection Fielding's "An Invocation," the introductory chapter of Book XII, in which Fielding asks Fame to tell him that he will be read with honor and that the maiden who reads of Sophia will heave a sigh. He adds a parenthetical comment, in which the light touch of the rest of the chapter is missing: "not thee I call, who, over swelling tides of blood and tears, dost bear the hero on to glory, while sighs of millions waft his spreading sails" (Henley V, 31).

40. For compliments to Allen Lyttelton see also Fielding's invocation to Humanity (XIII. i; Henley V, 33).

41. See Fielding's comment on the failure of Mr. Allworthy's educational plan: "for we do not pretend to introduce any infallible characters into this history, where we hope nothing will be found which hath not been seen in human nature" (III. v; Henley III, 125).


45. For other allusions see for instance V. x; Henley III, 256, 257, 263 and VI. ii; Henley III, 274.

46. For instance, VIII. iv; Henley IV, 74, and XI. iii; Henley IV, 308.

47. See pp. 177-179. As Fielding begins the relation of the attack of Mrs. Waters' charms on Tom, he is called "our hero" three times on one page.

48. McKillop, Early Masters, p. 130, states concerning these statements that "We are certainly expected to take Tom's statements . . . at face value."

49. Cf. VIII. i; Henley IV, 65: "Our modern authors of comedy have fallen almost universally into the error here hinted at; their heroes generally are notorious rogues, and their heroines abandoned jades, during the first four acts; but in the fifth, the former become very worthy gentlemen, and the latter women of virtue and discretion; nor is the writer often so kind as to give himself the least trouble to reconcile or account for this monstrous change and incongruity." See John S. Coolidge, "Fielding and 'Conservation of Character,'" MP, LVII (1960), 245-259.
50. Fielding's world-stage analogy is implied in Tom Jones also in the introductory chapter of Book V, concerning the setting off of beauty by the display of its opposite. Fielding ironically states that Rich, "A great genius among us, the inventor of that most exquisite entertainment called the English Pantomime," exemplifies this method (Henley III, 208). Jensen ed., I, 290. Fielding also discusses the rarity of actors of merit.

51. Johnson, 103-104, draws an elaborate analogy between the situation of Hamlet and that of Tom. It seems to me, however, that an exploration of the Tom-Garrick parallel is both more easily justified on the basis of Fielding's theme.

52. See in connection with this reversal of opinion Dorothy Van Ghent's statement in her The English Novel, Form and Function (New York, 1953), p. 167, concerning the "wheel of fortune curve": "We are confronted in Tom Jones with a picture of social interaction among souls already formed, already stamped with operative character, and out of this gregarious action the conflict between hero and villain is propelled to a resolution in which the rogue who appeared to be a good man is exposed in his true nature as a rogue, and the good man who appeared to be a rogue is revealed in his true good nature with many similar exposures of other people along the way."

CHAPTER FIVE

AMELIA

Some similarities between Fielding's last novel, Amelia, and his early plays have been pointed out by Cross, and others can be seen in the portrayal of the great man. In particular, Fielding continues in Amelia to do what he proposed in the dedication to Chesterfield of Don Quixote in England: to represent "the calamities brought on the country by general corruption" Henley XI, 7). But while in Don Quixote he was especially concerned with political corruption, in the novel his social concern is more general, as is suggested by the Dedication to Ralph Allen, which begins: "The following book is sincerely designed to promote the cause of virtue, and to expose some of the most glaring evils, as well public as private, which at present infest the country, though there is scarce, as I remember, a single stroke of satire aimed at any one person throughout the whole" (Henley VI, 13). R. W. Rader, stating that part of Fielding's intention was to refute Mandeville's thesis, "private vices, public benefits," by showing the effects of private vices on society, points out that Fielding presents "example after example of the corruption of social institutions." As Fielding attempts to reveal the public evils which threaten society, however, the falsely great man remains the chief target. Throughout the story it is these men and their followers who threaten Amelia and Billy Booth in their struggle for life and happiness. One after another as they enter the plot these men who are considered great are shown in their roles of parasites and predators rather than in a position of responsible leadership. Like the lords in the Intriguing Chambermaid
who enjoy ruining those below them, and like Lord Richly in the *Modern Husband* who makes use of his status to debase the wives of his acquaintances, they are shown to know no moral restraint to keep them from taking advantage of others. The falsely great men and their subordinates are involved in most of the important events of the plot, and even when they do not participate, their presence in the background cannot be forgotten by either the Booths or by the reader. The first threat is the "noble lord," the cousin of Mrs. Ellison, who is willing to aid Booth only if Amelia will buy his assistance by prostituting herself. Second is Colonel James, who appears to be a true friend and who offers to procure the aid of a great man, but who also is more interested in obtaining Amelia than in helping Booth. Finally Booth tries to achieve aid through the "great man" he has heard of from a friend, only to have the man rob him by taking his money but granting nothing in return. Similar corruption is revealed as Dr. Harrison visits another "great man" in behalf of Booth, only to be told that aid is available only if the doctor uses his position to assure the election of the man's candidate for mayor. This incident, which gives evidence of Fielding's general social concern in the novel, also reveals that he is still aware of the specifically political corruption, that he still wishes to reveal it (The chapter is entitled "Matters Political."), but that he sees it in Amelia chiefly as part of a larger social problem: that of the man who is a menace to society because he possesses power but feels no responsibility for the use of that power (XI. ii; Henley VII, 245).

But Fielding not only allows the reader to see the actions of the great man — in a manner unlike that of the earlier works, he theorizes at length in *Amelia*
about the proper role of the great man in society. George Sherburn, in his
interpretation of Amelia, puts the problem in other terms as he compares Fielding’s
"typical view" in A Proposal for Making Effective Provision for the Poor with
what he sees as a less tolerant attitude in the novel toward the "idle rich, or the
governing classes"; pointing out that in the early part of the story Fielding
illustrates instances of the miscarriage of justice in the courts, Sherburn continues:
"and in the later books he repeatedly exclaims over the callousness of the upper
classes, over their selfishness and lack of benevolence." Inevitably, the comment
is moral in its foundation, as Sherburn's statement indicates, but the emphasis
is on the social result of the character of the great man. And in Amelia, unlike
the earlier works, the method is not chiefly attack on the actions and attitudes of
the falsely great man; rather, Fielding turns to positive comment in which he
recommends the proper action to the great. One of the most pointed recommenda-
tions is in a comment that he adds to Mrs. Ellison's tribute to her cousin the
peer who hopes to win Amelia by promising aid to Booth. Though there is irony
as Fielding has Mrs. Ellison expound on the virtue of the man who in reality
only pays those who have served him, the novelist's own statement is positive and
clear: "She [Mrs. Ellison] afterward launched forth the most profuse encomiums
of his lordship's liberality, and concluded the evening with some instances which
he had given of that virtue which, if not the noblest, is, perhaps, one of the
most useful to society with which great and rich men can be endowed" (Italics mine.
V. viii; Henley VI, 260). This view, which continues the emphasis of Tom Jones
on the benevolence of the truly great man, is consistent too with that expressed in
the second issue of the Covent-Garden Journal, where again Fielding is concerned
with the role of the great man and his relation to society. Ironically praising men
of high position for their charity, he implies that those who are least deserving
are patronized and rewarded by the great. He continues:

Again, when possess of Power, with how noble and disinterested a
choice do our Great Men confer their Favours on others. That they
may avoid the least Suspicion of Partiality, they commonly fill up all
Vacancies with such Persons, that it would be in the highest Degree
absurd to imagine they were the Objects of any man's particular Liking
or Favour; nay, such is the Generosity of these Great Men, that it is
not unusual to bestow very considerable Places on their Footmen: How
much more magnificent is this than that old manumission which was
thought so great a Reward by an old Roman. 4

In a later issue of the Covent-Garden Journal, Fielding was to make a more direct
statement concerning the social responsibility of the great man in which the terms
rogue and robber, earlier used to indicate chiefly the dishonest political great
man, were to be applied not merely to the dishonest but to any of the rich who
refuse to relieve the unfortunate. The assumption that is made here and in Amelia
is, as Professor McKillop has pointed out, a common one in the eighteenth century,
that the great should help the meritorious, that they have a social responsibility
toward the deserving who are less fortunate than they are. 5

Fielding's moral judgment, based on his conception of the great man's re-
sponsibility to society, is clearly made in the portrayal of the men of high position
who are brought into the novel, and who are all remarkably similar to each other
in their viciousness. 6 Booth's first promise of help comes from Colonel James,
who is himself called a great man and who "promised to take the first opportunity
of laying his memorial before a great man" (IV. vi; Henley VI, 205). The failure
of James to be concerned with his responsibility is pointed up by the personal grievances,
always unjustified, that at first keep him from trying to help Booth and lead to the
letter in which he says the great man, "the person he proposed," was occupied
with too many affairs to be able to concern himself with Booth's case (IV. viii;
Henley VI, 214). And soon his wish to possess Amelia determines the course of
his action. The words of congratulation that the "great author" in prison ex-
presses to Booth for possessing "so great, so noble, and so generous a friend"
show merely his obsequiousness and lack of judgment, for James is at this
stage seen by the reader if not by Booth to have none of the stated qualities
except false greatness (VII. v; Henley VII, 90). James' conception of greatness
is revealed through his own words, quoted by Mrs. Atkinson: referring to
Amelia as the "finest woman in the world," he reveals his own feeling for her by
saying, "had he been Alexander the Great, he should have thought it more glory
to have wiped off a tear from the bright eyes of Statira than to have conquered
fifty worlds" (VIII. vii; Henley VII, 97-98). The statement should not be dismissed
as the exaggeration of a would-be lover; because of the common attitude toward
Alexander, we can see that the Colonel's own ruthlessness is suggested in his
implied admiration for the conqueror's actions. He, like Alexander, is great only
in destroying mankind. In phrases which recall the introductory chapter,
Fielding explains at one point that Colonel James has the abilities necessary for
greatness: nature has given him "person, parts, and constitution," and Fortune,
"rank in life and riches, both in a very eminent degree." Yet he is unhappy
because of his envy. Implicit is the statement that Fortune is not ultimately to be
held responsible for the Colonel's situation as Fielding describes it; rather, in
his lust for Amelia, James lacks the "wisdom and virtue" which could cause his
life to be exemplary. The chapter entitled "Containing among many matters, the exemplary behavior of Colonel James," in which James invites Amelia to take refuge in his home and gives her fifty pounds ostensibly to relieve her distress, points up through irony the discrepancy between his appearance of friendship and benevolence and his true nature (VIII. iv; Henley VII, 7-8).

The passage from the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 2, with its ironical praise of the great man's generosity, could almost have been written with James in mind: James cannot ask for a place for Booth, even to remove him from the scene, he tells Mrs. James, for he has gotten places for two of his footmen recently (XI. i; Henley VII, 244). 7

The other characters of high position are similar in their basic moral corruption. The "noble peer," Mrs. Ellison's cousin, similarly promises Booth aid from another "great man," is motivated by lust, and is lacking in true concern for the underprivileged. Mrs. Atkinson makes the judgment, which is supported by the entire novel, in terms that express not only her own attitude but also Fielding's view. Stating that the head and heart are seldom improved by education, Mrs. Atkinson continues: "I have myself, I think, seen instances of as great goodness, and as great understanding too, among the lower sort of people as among the higher. Let us compare your serjeant, now, with the lord who hath been the subject of conversation: on which side would an impartial judge decide the balance to incline? (VII. x; Henley VII, 60-61).

The discussion turns toward a moral judgment as she states, "Of all kinds of pride, there is none so unchristian as that of station; in reality, there is none so
contemptible." Fielding echoes the judgment ironically as he introduces the lord at his next appearance: "And now who should make his appearance but the noble peer of whom so much honourable mention hath already been made in this history?" (XI. viii: Henley VII, 158). Mrs. Atkinson too makes general moral judgments on the falsely great man as she relates her adventures at the masquerade: her comment that the lord, thinking her to be Amelia, began to make love to her rather in the manner of a "great man of the present age" than that of an Arcadian swain again emphasizes that the lord uses his power not for the good of society but rather for his own immoral purposes in offering her his fortune on her own terms (X. viii; Henley VII, 228). The judgment is carried further as she comments on the proverbial falseness of the promises of lovers and of great men. Like James, the lord only wishes to preserve the appearance of morality and social concern; and Mrs. Ellison, who helps him in much the same way as Mrs. James helps her husband, praises a nonexistent liberality (V. vii; Henley VI, 260). Mrs. Ellison is allowed too to show her conception of greatness as she states that Amelia could aspire to the love of any European monarch and as she attempts to refute Amelia's statements that happiness is not closely related to a crown and that she would not wish to exchange her happiness with Booth for the place of a queen. Mrs. Ellison's statement that love is a weakness when it is not accompanied by ambition clearly places her, as do her actions, on the side of the falsely great (VI. iii; Henley VII, 288).

Ambition is significant too as Bob Bound relates to Booth the manner in which Captain Trent has "grown so great" that he no longer speaks to his old
acquaintances. Bound, commenting that he would be ashamed to be great in such a manner as Trent is, explains that the captain is "pimp in ordinary" to the peer who is now in pursuit of Amelia (X. ix; Henley VII, 234–235). But Trent's achievement of this greatness was accomplished by the unwitting aid of his wife, who, Bound suggests, was "not void of ambition" and who succumbed to the rich attire of the lord "arrayed in all the brightness of peerage" (XI. iii; Henley VII, 259).

Together with other passages these comments on the moral nature of the great man lead to the conclusion that Fielding is here setting up a moral structure similar to that of the earlier novels, and especially of the plays and Miscellanies, in which the good are posed against the falsely great and their subordinates. In a manner similar to that of Tom Jones, the major persons of the party of the falsely great are working against Amelia and Billy, and the good for them. That is, the great who have the ability to work for good are shown to be corrupt in their failure to do so. Other, secondary characters fit into this picture. In Mrs. Bennett's history there is a "worthy peer" who ignores the clergyman who was a fellow collegiate, and Mrs. Bennett calls his behavior "diametrically opposite to true honour as well as goodness" (VII. v; Henley VII, 38). Fielding himself is led to an extended statement concerning great men as he relates how Booth is deceived by the "great man" in the War-Office who accepts money on the pretense of having interest with another "great man." Saying that most great men are beset with such persons, Fielding not only points out the social consequence -- that persons of merit are discouraged by them -- but stresses the moral implications of the situation: that the worthy man's interests are sacrificed to the
ambitions of these creatures. The image of the pike used to describe their activities is one which Fielding had used earlier in describing "great subtle knaves" in his Champion essay for Thursday, February 21, on a hospital for fools. The change in the formulation of the image perhaps suggests something of Fielding's changing emphasis. The Champion essay ostensibly counters objections to the erection of the hospital, and as it does so, states that knaves, other than those who would go to the hospital, would not be deprived of their prey, for men with understanding would still be open to "Attacks of cunning and artful Knaves, into whose Snares we are often seduc'd by the Openness and Goodness of the Heart, as by the Weakness of the Head." Fielding continues:

True Wisdom is commonly attended with a Simplicity of Manners, which betrays a worthy Man to a tricking Shuffler, of a much inferior Capacity. Besides, Knaves have the Quality with Pikes, when they can find no other Game of preying on one another; and a great, subtle Knave, and such it is the main Business of a well-order'd Commonwealth to support, will no more fail of his Prey while any little ones are within his Reach, than an over-grown Pike will want Food while there are any smaller Pikes in the same Pond.

In Amelia, Fielding tells of Booth's means of approaching the "little great man" and getting access to him. The interview is recorded as follows:

The great man received the money, not as a gudgeon doth a bait, but as a pike receives a poor gudgeon into his maw. To say the truth, such fellows as these may well be likened to that voracious fish who fattens himself by devouring all the little inhabitants of the river. As soon as the great man had pocketed the cash, he shook Booth by the hand, and told him he would be sure to slip no opportunity of serving him, and would send him word as soon as any offered.

(XI. iv; Henley VII, 267)

In the second form of the image, Fielding has lost the specific political concern with Walpole suggested by the "overgrown Pike," and the concern with the
relations among great men. At the same time he is no longer primarily attempting
to ridicule the great through revelation. Rather, his emphasis is on the social
situation, the view of which, he hopes, will lead to reform of morals on the part
of the great men involved. Therefore there is an emphasis tending toward the
sentimental on qualities which suggest moral evaluations but which are meant to
appeal to the heart: therefore the stress on the fact that the great man is like
a pike, not an innocent gudgeon; therefore also the terms "poor gudgeon," and
"voracious fish" and the allusion to the devouring of "all the little inhabitants."
And, in accord with the aim, Fielding in the next paragraph paints a picture of a
worthy family, reduced to poverty, pampering the falsely great man. The next
paragraph then is a direct appeal, on the basis of this picture, to any reader
who is in a position of power to cease "touching," the practice by which "a set
of leeches are permitted to suck the blood of the brave and the indigent, of the
widow and the orphan." Fielding's attitude toward the great expressed here is
a milder form of Amelia's exclamation, made as she hears of the distress of
Bound's family and the failure of great men to reward him for his meritorious
service: "Good heavens! . . . what are our great men made of? are they in
reality a distinct species from the rest of mankind? are they born without
hearts?" 10 Her basis is a statement she learned from Dr. Harrison, "I am
a man myself, and my heart is interested in whatever can befall the rest of
mankind," and she states her moral judgment in simple terms which evaluate all
of the falsely great men in the novel: "That is the sentiment of a good man, and
whoever thinks otherwise is a bad one" (X. ix; Henley VII, 236–237).
While the preceding characters are shown as vicious in their opposition to Amelia and Billy, and are not ridiculed but decried, there is one character who does not fit this category but who still exemplifies a false kind of greatness. He is, as Booth points out, constantly "the little hero of his own tale" (III. viii; Henley VI, 142--43). Fielding is evidently deliberately alluding to Edward Young's line on fame in the Universal Passion: "It makes Dear Self on well-bred tongues prevail, / And I the Little Hero of each Tale." While Bath is not called a great man (as are the others of the falsely great), he considers himself to be great in his military achievements. His is a bombast greatness, but it comes, Fielding stresses, rather from folly than from vice, from mistaken judgment rather than from a bad heart. Fielding is still concerned in Amelia with exploring the various types of false greatness, and the Major stands in relation to the vicious great much as Politic in Rape upon Rape does to the justice, or as Squire Western to Lord Fellamar. Booth, telling Miss Matthews that Amelia, who has the "truest taste and enjoyment of the ridiculous," is entertained by the colonel, continues by quoting her words about persons who are partially ridiculous and partially amiable: Bath, she points out, is ridiculous in his relation of his exploits, but amiable in his behavior to his sister (III. viii; Henley VI, 142-143). Like James, Bath is shown to have an admiration for those who were characterized as the vicious plunderers of the world, but as he expresses his attitude it is clear that this admiration is at times used, through his own foolishness, as a cover for his goodness. In a passage devoted to a characterization of the general, Booth tells Miss Matthews of his surprise in finding "that it
was possible for a man to possess true goodness, and be at the same time ashamed of it." He recalls visiting the colonel to inquire about his sister's health and of finding him serving as a nurse to her, dressed in a woman's nightgown and flannel cap, a "whimsical attire" -- a term sufficient to hint at Fielding's sympathy for him. 12 The next morning the colonel visits Booth to protest that he was not showing weakness or effeminacy in his attitude toward his sister. Booth's reply, that tenderness for a sister is in no way unmanly, includes reference to the behavior of "manly Brutus" toward his sister and of "the great king of Sweden" at the death of his favorite sister. These examples cause Bath to express his unbounded admiration for Charles XII: "he is a rascal that is ashamed of doing anything which the king of Sweden did." Perhaps the choice of heroes here is significant. Brutus, who was in general looked on as truly great in contrast to Caesar, is mentioned by Booth but not by Bath. The colonel's admiration for Charles, toward whom Fielding had expressed his contempt in The Champion for May 3, 1740, and in The Vernoniad, pp. 67-68 (Henley XV, 43), and his lack of concern with Brutus indicate what Fielding shows as his admiration for the falsely great rather than true greatness. 13 The example of Xerxes, another conqueror who belongs to the category of the falsely great, also serves to comfort Bath (III. viii; Henley VI, 145-147). But Fielding is not content to ridicule the major for his misconceptions: he shows that these too pose a danger, as did those of Politic and of Western: his insistence on duelling with Booth is an instance in which his false conception of honor predominates over his goodness of heart so that in spite of his love for Booth he
must force his friend to defend himself against false aspersions. Dr. Harrison's lengthy argument against duelling counters the colonel's conception of honor, but Amelia puts the matter more tersely as she replies to Booth's recommendation of Bath: "Tell me not . . . . of such good-nature and honour as would sacrifice a friend and a whole family to a ridiculous whim" (V. vi; Henley VI, 253). The chapter heading which follows, "The heroic behavior of Colonel Bath," which concerns Bath's attempt to bring James and Booth together to fight for their honor, becomes a commentary on the narrowness of viewpoint that considers such behavior necessary, and Booth and James are, in contrast, shown as they are reconciled without duelling -- a more heroic behavior, Fielding would suggest. Like the viciously great characters, Bath too can become a threat when he attempts to conform to his conception of greatness or when he attempts to make others conform to it.

As Fielding's dedication to Allen suggests, however, he is concerned in Amelia not merely with exposing "public evils" and "private evils"; more importantly, he wishes to "promote the cause of virtue" as he did in Tom Jones (Henley VI, 13). The dedication in itself suggests then, though he returns to the social concerns of the plays, a broader purpose than that, for instance, of Don Quixote in England, in which he expressed his wish to reveal the "calamities brought on the country by general corruption." Specifically, we can note a distinct change in critical attitude in the reversal of the opinion expressed in the earlier dedication concerning the use of examples: saying that they work better than precepts, he had continued as follows: "This will, my Lord, be
found truer with regard to politics than to ethics: the most ridiculous exhibitions
of luxury or avarice may likewise have little effect on the sensualist or miser . . . ."
(Henley XI, 7). In Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, we have seen a turn toward
ethical concern and an ignoring of the political. At the same time there has been
increased emphasis on the positive rather than negative side of characters.
There is in Amelia a culmination of a change, which has been led up to in the
earlier novels, in artistic method that corresponds with the increased emphasis
on promotion of virtue. The statement in the Champion that we are better in-
structed by examples of vice than of virtue is supported by Fielding's practice
in most of the plays, in Jonathan Wild, and to a certain extent in Joseph Andrews
(certainly in Shamela) and Tom Jones, but it is no longer an adequate statement
of the view that governs the method of instructing in morality in Amelia. 15

In the introductory chapter to the novel Fielding makes a statement concerning the
plan of the novel which is worth quoting in its entirety because of its significance
for the view Fielding gives of greatness in the novel:

The various accidents which befell a very worthy couple after
their uniting in the state of matrimony will be the subject of the follow-
ing history. The distresses which they waded through were some of
them so exquisite, and the incidents which produced these so extra-
ordinary, that they seemed to require not only the utmost malice, but
the utmost invention, which superstition hath ever attributed to Fortune:
though whether any such being interfered in the case, or indeed whether
there be any such being in the universe, is a matter which I by no means
presume to determine in the affirmative. To speak a bold truth, I am,
after much mature deliberation, inclined to suspect that the public voice
hath, in all ages, done much injustice to Fortune, and hath convicted
her of many facts in which she had not the least concern. I question
much whether we may not, by natural means, account for the success
of knaves, the calamities of fools, with all the miseries in which men
of sense sometimes involve themselves, by quitting the directions of
Prudence, and following the blind guidance of a predominant passion; in short, for all the ordinary phenomena which are imputed to fortune, whom perhaps, men accuse with no less absurdity in life than a bad player complains of ill luck at the game of chess.

But if men are sometimes guilty of laying improper blame on this imaginary being, they are altogether as apt to make her amends by ascribing to her honors which she as little deserves. To retrieve the ill consequences of a foolish conduct, and by struggling manfully with distress to subdue it, is one of the noblest efforts of wisdom and virtue. Whoever, therefore, calls such a man fortunate, is guilty of no less impropriety in speech than he would be who should call the statuary or the poet fortunate who carved a Venus or who writ an Iliad.

Life may as properly be called an art as any other; and the great incidents in it are no more to be considered as mere accidents than the several members of a fine statue or a noble poem. The critics in all these are not content with seeing anything to be great without knowing why and how it came to be so. By examining carefully the several gradations which conduct to bring every model to perfection, we learn truly to know that science in which the model is formed: as histories of this kind, therefore, may properly be called models of HUMAN LIFE, so, by observing minutely the several incidents which tend to the catastrophe or completion of the whole, and the minute causes whence those incidents are produced, we shall best be instructed in this most useful of all arts, which I call the ART OF LIFE.

(I. 1; Henley VI, 13-14)

Fielding here proposes to give in his novel a view of life which is more inclusive than that of the early works in which satire predominated: rather he here wishes to include objects of emulation as well as of disparagement, in order to observe the "completion or catastrophe of the whole" as he instructs in the art of life. Referring to himself as a historian, he again suggests, this time without the humorous note of his earlier works, his kinship with the historians whom he praised throughout his career but never so highly as in his later years. One aspect of this kinship is his determination "to describe human nature as it is, not as we would wish it to be" (X. iv; Henley VII, 208). This statement, made as he is
showing Dr. Harrison to have minor faults, is similar to the statement in Tom Jones concerning Allworthy. It is no departure from Fielding's consistent anti-heroic attitude, which he maintains even in the Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon as he states that he "should have honoured and loved Homer more had he written a true history of his own times in humble prose . . . ." (Preface; Henley XVI, 182)¹⁶

But another aspect is his determination to create a model -- a model similar in its purpose to those found in the work of historians.¹⁷ In none of his other works had Fielding made this claim. Indeed, the fact that Fielding had made Tom the "hero" of his novel without making him a model had been the cause of critical comment on the hero's morality by those who did not understand Fielding's aim.

Here he is creating a heroine who is held up as a model -- here for the first time, the introductory chapter suggests, he is creating a central character who ranks among the great. Fielding does not here describe her directly, but, making an association between the art of life and other arts, and stating that critics are not satisfied except by knowing how objects of art came to be great, he implies that he will show in what way his model deserves to be included among the great, that he will show how true greatness is achieved in life, how "great incidents" are created.¹⁸

The association with the other arts recalls of course Fielding's earlier satire on false literary greatness, which is continued in the chapter of Amelia devoted to Booth's meeting the "great author" who is ignorant of literature (VIII. v; Henley VII, 83-90). Here, too, in a sense, is Jonathan Wild in reverse as Fielding presents the history of a model who exemplifies true greatness; the association with other arts recalls the terms of the preface to the Miscellanies: but here indeed Fielding
presents the "true sublime" rather than "bombast greatness." In the preface, too, Fielding had spoken of the sublime, the combination of the great and the good, in terms of a work or art, but the emphasis on creation is lacking: "A perfect Work! the Iliad of Nature! ravishing and astonishing, and which at once fills us with Love, Wonder, and Delight" (Misc., I. xxvii). In Jonathan Wild Fielding had shown the means by which false greatness can be achieved; here, in terms similar to those in which Steele related the change that occurred after the fall of man ("Life . . . became an Art"), Fielding is concerned not so much with the attempt to gain the signs of greatness which Steele discusses but the quality itself. 19 It is in accord with this side of the view of himself as historian that Fielding in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 10, once again expresses his admiration for the "great Triumvirate," Lucian, Cervantes, and Swift, the "great Masters who have sent their Satire . . . laughing into the World" for their attempts to expose folly and vice (He later includes Shakespear and Moliere among the great writers for the same characteristics.), but points out specifically that "when we are employed in reading a great and good Author, we ought to consider ourselves as searching after Treasures, which, if well and regularly laid up in the Mind, will be of use to us on sundry Occasions in our Lives." In this connection then he recommends in particular Plutarch and Seneca, saying that they please more than those who create laughter. In particular, he states his surprise that Plutarch remains "very little known. 20 (There are instances of comedy in Amelia, but such comedy is infrequent in relation to the sober portions of the novel; there is humor in the portrayal of harmless affectation in Colonel
Bath and Mrs. Bennett, for instance, but the tone of the portions concerned primarily with Amelia and the vicious falsely great predominates.) It is the writer who instructs through moral commentary and examples of true greatness, not through satire, that Fielding can recommend and that he evidently sees himself allied with in Amelia as he provides a model of greatness.

But, though he considers himself a historian, Fielding provides a suggestion for Amelia's greatness in the model he chooses for emulation: the epic form, and in particular the Aeneid. As in Joseph Andrews, Fielding is writing an epic in prose, or rather imitating an epic in prose. He is creating a true history of his own times in prose, the kind of work he wished Homer had written. Fielding himself, defending Amelia at court in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 8, claims to have followed the rules in creating his "favorite child": "Neither Homer nor Virgil pursued them [the rules] with greater care than myself, and the candid and learned Reader will see that the latter was the noble model, which I made use of on that Occasion." 21 Recent critics have been fairer than Richardson, who after making disparaging comments about Fielding's lowness, continued by stating that when asked what Fielding meant by saying he had followed Homer and Virgil in Amelia, "I answered, that he was justified in saying so, because he must mean Cotton's Virgil Travestied; where the women are drabs, and the men scoundrels." 22 Wallace, who made the first significant comment on the precedent, pointing out that Amelia lacks such conventional requirements of the epic as great men and events, the intervention of the gods, and a verse form, fails to note the fact that the deviation from these epic conventions is in itself significant. 23 Lyall Powers
approached the problem in a limited way in attempting to show that by adhering to the model of the *Aeneid* Fielding was showing his sympathy for Stoic ethics but in particular the superiority of Christian principles; yet Powers does make the point, without elaborating it, that Fielding "was apparently interested in creating a modern Christian hero."\(^{24}\) Ian Watt finds that though there is no reference to the formula for the comic epic in prose, and though Fielding abandons mock-heroic situations and epic diction, the *Aeneid* serves as a model for *Amelia*, but a model which the reader does not have to recognize to appreciate, the influence of the epic being therefore most fruitful.\(^{25}\) R. W. Rader goes to the opposite extreme, finding that the epic analogy helps to enforce the Christian doctrine of the novel; he points especially to the "socio-religious interpretation of the *Aeneid*" made by Bishop Warburton and suggests that Fielding, agreeing with Warburton, saw in the *Aeneid* a presentation of the pagan mystery religions whose aim was to enforce the social order by instilling religious faith. His thesis thus is that "in the light of Fielding's avowed agreement with Warburton's view of the *Aeneid*, it is not difficult to conclude that he imitated Virgil not only in the structure of his *Amelia* but in what he supposed were its purposes as well."

In *Amelia* then there is a picture of what society ought to be like, but we are also shown the goal of the human soul: "If we remember what Warburton had said about Virgil's attempt to denote, in the descent of Aeneas into hell, the initiation into the mysteries and their beliefs in a future state of rewards and punishments, we are able, I think, to see that Fielding intended in *Amelia* something, in Christian terms, of the same sort."\(^{26}\) Maurice Johnson returns to a listing with interpretation of parallels in the modern fashion, pointing out, for instance, the diminished
state of Dido's feast as it becomes a prison meal and tea-table, but he goes astray in his emphasis on the humor of the Virgilian framework and overtones, which, he says have generally been unnoticed. (Fielding was generally very careful to see that his humor not be overlooked.) Thus he fails to develop his more significant points: citing Northrup Frye's statement that in the Aeneid the theme of return is developed into a theme of rebirth and T. S. Eliot's statement that Aeneas is the prototype of a Christian hero, Johnson states that Amelia is a true Christian heroine, and that Booth becomes "a kind of Christian hero through conversion," though Fielding avoids using the epithet "hero" in connection with him. Johnson here fails to relate what he has said earlier -- that some important episodes and characters seem to have no trace of an echo of the Aeneid. Too, as he discusses what he calls Fielding's mock-heroic method he states that "Mimicry of Virgil's narrative epic serves perhaps as a laughing commentary on the epic form; but it also serves as a means to imply the epic heroism that may show itself in human nature around us." 27

But it is rather the lack of laughter that serves to heighten the point that greatness may exist in human nature around us, and it is rather in the adaptation of the epic pattern, with the introduction of a heroine who has no parallel in the epic, that Fielding exhibits this greatness. For if Fielding is presenting a model of human life, then surely Amelia rather than Booth is the noble model. For though Billy is like Aeneas, no one can doubt that Amelia, for whom, after all, the book is named, is the central character. 28 And when the term heroine is applied to her in the novel, there is no suggestion, as there had been concerning
the "heroes" of the plays and of Jonathan Wild, and even of Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, that the term is in some way inappropriate to her. As Sherburn notes, there is less of the epic, despite the comic-epic label, in the earlier novels than in "the more serious Amelia" with its high class intention. There is nothing of the heroic in her name, but neither is there a suggestion that Amelia is un-heroic, as there is in the names Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. Ian Watt points out that "it is in fact a compromise between the traditional type of heroine's name and the requirements of Fielding's sober theme." And Fielding refers, in commenting on her actions, to "the heroic part of the female character" (IX. ii; Henley VII, 130); he also, by implication, suggests that her "magnanimity of mind" toward her loss of beauty is heroic, that is "surprisingly great and glorious" (II. i; Henley VI, 67). Amelia's true greatness is suggested too in contrast with apparent greatness as Amelia is shown, for instance, at home "performing the office of a cook, with as much pleasure as a fine lady generally enjoys in dressing herself out for a ball" (VI. ii; Henley VI, 284). Booth too is allowed to comment on Amelia's character as he relates to Miss Matthews the story of their courtship and marriage. It is he who comments on her "magnanimity of mind" in her affliction as he compares her firmness of soul with that of a general in the loss of a battle and of a king in the loss of his crown (II. i; Henley VI, 67). Relating of her escape from her mother, too, he says that she performed "the part of a heroine all the way" (II. vi; Henley VI, 89). That she is a particular kind of heroine is stressed in Booth's repetition of Dr. Harrison's statement that Amelia is "the most worthy, generous, and noble of all human beings" (II. vii; Henley VI, 96). Miss Matthews remains unadmirning of Amelia's heroism, but both her
position as rival as well as her lack of integrity turn her mocking "I remember perfectly well the great heroism with which your Amelia bore that misfortune" (II. i; Henley VI, 67) and her "O brave! . . . heroic, I protest" (III. ix; Henley VI, 152) to another tribute to Amelia's greatness. (Similarly her perfunctory "very noble and great indeed" in reply to Booth's praise of Dr. Harrison indicates her lack of concern with the qualities of character Booth is describing. III. x; Henley VI, 158) Amelia's greatness is suggested too by her nurse's comment that she is deserving of a great man for her husband, even of "the greatest lord in the land" (II. vi; Henley VI, 90). Atkinson makes a similar statement as he calls her one of the "best and handsomest" women, and makes the concluding remark: "Indeed, she is worthy of the greatest prince in the world; and, if I had been the greatest prince in the world, I should have thought myself happy with such a wife" (VIII. viii; Henley VII, 101). In a similar vein Booth fears that he has been the obstacle to Amelia's "greatness and happiness," and has caused her unhappiness instead (IV. iii; Henley VI, 185-186). Her lack of concern with outward greatness is revealed especially clearly as she answers that she might have been great if she had married another, but not happy.

The climactic statement on Amelia's character is also made by Booth near the conclusion of the novel. In the scene Amelia has been picturing the future she envisions for them together as they live by means of their labor. Booth, who already knows that Amelia's plans are unnecessary because her right to her mother's fortune has been revealed, listens as Amelia, saying that she does not consider herself "a superior rank of being," but rather of the same nature as the wife of a laborer, insists that there is no reason for her to complain of her lot.
Booth's reply stresses both her heroism and her "greatness of soul":

My angel... it delights me to hear you talk thus, and for a reason you little guess; for I am assured that one who can so heroically endure adversity, will bear prosperity with equal greatness of soul; for the mind that cannot be dejected by the former, is not likely to be transported with the latter."

(XII. viii; Henley VII, 333)

Fielding's last novel seems appropriate to a description given by Plutarch in Lyttelton's *Dialogues of the Dead*, Dialogue XXVIII. Plutarch confesses to a bookseller that histories of illustrious persons and public events may not be as useful as "the noblest model that can be exhibited to mankind, the Idea of a man, who in the silent retired path of Life never deviates into Vice, who considers no spectator but the omniscient Being, and solicits /sic/ no applause but His approbation." He points out that examples of domestic virtue may be especially useful to women. The bookseller replies that some English and French writers aimed at what Plutarch suggests. The reader of *Amelia* is surprised that *Clarissa* and *Grandison* are named, but that the comment about Fielding is that "his works, as I have heard the best judges say, have a true spirit of Comedy, and an exact representation of Nature, with fine moral touches. He has not indeed given lessons of pure and consummate Virtue, but he has exposed Vice and Meanness with all the powers of ridicule." 31

*Amelia*'s character, as revealed by Booth's words of praise as well as by the novel as a whole, is unlike that described in Fielding's poem "Of True Greatness," yet Fielding allows the term to be applied to her. No longer are superior "parts" and position necessary for a person to possess greatness. Indeed, Fielding throughout the novel sets her up as a model for emulation; and here there
is a sign of a new emphasis. Further evidence of the tendency to see greatness as possible for those of all ranks is given in Fielding's portrayal of Joe Atkinson, Amelia's foster-brother, whose actions in saving Booth are shown to be, in Booth's words, "an instance of heroic affection in a poor fellow toward his master" (III. iv; Henley VI. 123-124). Indeed, an instance of his giving financial aid to the Booths provides motivation for a discourse in which Booth replies to Miss Matthew's astonishment at hearing of the action on the part of "so low a fellow." Stating that he was once of the same opinion, Booth continues, "yet I know not, on a more strict examination of the matter, why we should be more surprised to see greatness of mind discover itself in one degree of rank of life than in another. Love, benevolence, or what you will please to call it, may be the reigning passion in a beggar as well as a prince; and wherever it is, its energies will be the same." Booth's next words are almost a repudiation of the usual associations of the word greatness, even in Fielding's earlier works, as he says that the "upper life" is too often complimented at the expense of the lower: Booth continues by saying that as "instances which degrade human nature in persons of the highest birth and education" are not rare, so also "examples of whatever is really great and good have been sometimes found amongst those who have wanted all such advantages" (III. vii; Henley VI, 139). But, though Fielding is willing to use terms that suggest greatness to refer to Atkinson, this does not mean that he considers social distinctions to be meaningless. The significance of the portrayal of Atkinson should, therefore, not be over-estimated; Booth uses the limiting word "sometimes" -- and Atkinson, like most of Fielding's characters, does marry a person of his own rank.
In the mock-heroic terms of Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, Booth too could have been called a hero, but in Amelia this is not possible. Although he is shown to be good-hearted (He has a "truly noble heart," II. i; Henley VI, 67.), he is not a model of virtue; what we see in the course of the novel is a process of education culminating in conversion as he does become, in conclusion, a kind of Christian hero. As Johnson suggests, "Booth's characteristics, experiences, and fortunes take point from those of Virgil's hero, lifting him above the absurd diminutiveness to be expected in mock-heroic." Booth is "the little officer on half-pay," but his experience, Fielding suggests, is of vital significance. The second paragraph of Fielding's first chapter is especially important for a consideration of Booth. By implication, Booth's life can be seen as similar to the Aeneid or the Iliad -- it is a great work, and one which has been deliberately formed. Fielding does not refer to him by name, but Booth is the character of the book who must "retrieve the ill consequences of a foolish conduct" and who must "struggle manfully with distress to subdue it," and he makes "one of the noblest efforts and wisdom and fortune." The comparison with carving a Venus or writing an Iliad takes especial point in the light of one of Fielding's Champion essays in which he discusses greatness and its reward. Pointing to the fact that the soldier usually achieves fame faster than the poet, he cites Alexander as an example of those who gain honor at once for their victories, adding the comment, "and perhaps much more than they deserved." Homer, in contrast, was merely considered to be a ballad singer, Fielding continues, alluding to Plutarch's statement that Homer's poems were virtually unknown until after his death. Yet, Fielding says,
the poet's works will endure longer than the soldier's, "to which we may add Sir
William Temple's Observation, that the World hath produced a thousand equal
to Alexander, but scarce one capable of writing an Iliad." That Fielding chose
to compare Booth's accomplishments in forming his life not to the passing and
therefore insignificant achievements that he saw in the work of conquerors, but
rather to the enduring work of a great writer, helps to suggest the greatness of
the protagonist's actions: the "great incidents" which occur in Booth's life, like
Amelia's, are not mere accidents, but rather, character is capable of producing
them.

If then we can see in Amelia, Booth, and Atkinson evidence of true greatness,
if we can see incidents in their lives as great, we can also in the novel see the
origin of this greatness. Fielding's turn to models for emulation, models which
stand not primarily as foils to false greatness, as Heartfree does, but as significant
because of their virtue, is accompanied by an emphasis on the source of this
virtue that shows his concern with the roots of behavior. It is this source that
enables him to adapt the term greatness to his central figures. Central to this
novel as to none of the others in its consideration of greatness is a standard which
sets up a definition of terms different from that of the everyday world. Fielding's
concern with the meaning of words, in particular the word great, is obvious in
all of the works in which great men appear — in particular, of course, in such
works as Tom Thumb in which the word is used ironically. In other works, he is
more directly concerned with the words themselves; the best-known instance is his
Covent-Garden Journal article, in No. 4, in which he defines Great as follows:
"Applied to a Thing, signifies Bigness, when to a man, often Littleness, or
Meanness." But Fielding had already concerned himself with the abuse of words
in a leader for the Champion for Jan. 17, 1739/40. The consideration turns from a citation of Locke’s concern with the abuse of words to the subject of greatness as Fielding states that some words were “first used to designate particular Degrees of Men, but by time immemorial stript of all Ideas whatever.” Included in his list are the terms “Captain, Dr. Esquire, Honourable, and Right Honourable, the last two of which signifies no more than if you should pronounce the above-mentioned Word Barababatha.” Here of course Fielding is satirizing Walpole, but in his next statement he discusses generally such phrases as “depend on me,” uttered by great men, which have meaning perhaps among themselves but not to others.37 Fielding again begins with a quotation from Locke in the Covent-Garden Journal article, in which the Modern Glossary appears, but gives an explanation which, he ironically states, Locke omitted from his consideration of the abuse: “This is That Privilege which Divines and Moral Writers have assumed to themselves of doing Violence to certain Words, in Favour of their own Hypotheses, and of using them in a Sense often directly contrary to that which Custom (the absolute Lord and Master, according to Horace, of all the Modes of Speech) hath allotted them.”38 Pretending to defend the divines, he states that their “ignorance of custom, rather than opposition, is responsible for their use of such words as occur in the writings of Barrow, Tillotson, Clarke, and others, and as are not understood by modern ladies and gentlemen. The Modern Glossary, ostensibly provided for the edification of these writers, could indeed be understood as a reply to Barrow — — and, in particular, to a sermon in which he is concerned with terms dealing with greatness. In the sermon entitled “The Reward of Honouring God,” based on the text “For them that honour me will I honour,” Barrow cites
the "more cool and candid sort of Philosophers . . . who have ranked Honour among the principal of things desireable, and adorned it with fairest eulogies; terming it a divine thing, the best of exterior goods, the most ample fruit and most ample reward of true Virtue." Barrow continues by saying that honor is a virtue which, "next to the spirit of true religion, (next to a hearty reverence toward the supreme Blessed Goodness, and that holy Charity toward Men which springeth thence,) doth life man up nearest to Heaven." In the following pages he is concerned with the foundation of honor, pointing to God as the "fountain of honor" in the world, while the king is his representative on earth. But it is God, he stresses, who "doth himself gratuitously hold forth the most authentic patents, by virtue of which we may all become right honourable, and persons of quality indeed; having not only the names and titles, the outward ensigns and badges of dignity, (such as earthly Princes confer,) but the substantial reality, the assured enjoyment thereof." (Not only, of course, the sermon in which the terms are considered is significant for the view Fielding gives: the Biblical view of heaven as a kingdom is frequently elaborated by the divines. Barrow in another sermon, "No Respect of Persons with God," speaks of the greatest honor of which man is capable, that of being adopted into the royal family of heaven.) Here is a parallel and possibly a source for the attitudes and terms of Amelia. Battestin has written extensively on the influence of Barrow on Fielding's works, but, though he mentions this sermon only in a note, it seems to be particularly significant for Amelia. In general, Barrow's view of the goodness of human nature and his emphasis on charity as an essential ingredient of Christianity are
important for the background of Fielding's thought, and Booth's conversion consists in large part of his giving up the Hobbesian doctrine of self-love as the motivation for all action, benevolent as well as selfish. It is the reading of Barrow's sermons that brings about the conversion, and Booth says of him to Dr. Harrison: "If ever an angel might be thought to guide the pen of a writer, surely the pen of that great and good man had such an assistant" (XII. v; Henley VII, 313). Dr. Harrison agrees, and Fielding too in another passage classes Barrow with the great, relating that besides English plays and poetry Amelia's reading consisted only of "the divinity of the great and learned Dr. Barrow, and . . . the histories of the excellent Bishop Burnet" (VI. vii; Henley VI, 309).

This then is the background of the picture that Fielding gives of true greatness in Amelia. There is, despite the "great men" who abound in the novel, only one source and promise of true greatness -- and this greatness is within the reach of every man. Dr. Harrison is the main spokesman for this point of view, which is already expressed early in the novel as Booth reads a letter in which Dr. Harrison discusses man's ability to be happy despite his afflictions. Alluding to Cicero's ability to show himself superior to fortune, he says the "Christian philosopher" should still less be affected by it. He follows by comparing a wretch on his way to his poor cottage to the man looking forward to a palatial home with the finest entertainment. The latter, he points out, is undisturbed by difficulties, "But in our journey to the glorious mansion of everlasting bliss, how severely is every little rub, every trifling accident lamented!" (III. x;
Henley VI, 155–156) Fielding does not leave such comments to casual mention, but rather, through Dr. Harrison draws a lengthy and impressive comparison between worldly greatness and true greatness that is especially striking against the background of corruption among the men of high position in the novel. This comparison begins as the doctor proposes to the company assembled, his clergyman friend and his son, and Booth's family to carry them to "one of the greatest and highest entertainments in the world," suggesting "Supposing... I should carry you to court." When to his statement, "Ay, suppose I should have interest enough to introduce you into the presence," Amelia replies that he must be joking, he replies in the following terms:

I will introduce you into that presence compared to whom the greatest emperor on the earth is millions of degrees meaner than the most contemptible reptile is to him. What entertainment can there be to a rational being equal to this? Was not the taste of mankind most wretchedly depraved, where would the vain man find an honor, or where would the love of pleasure propose so adequate an object as divine worship? with what ecstasy must the contemplation of being admitted to such a presence fill the mind! The pitiful courts of princes are open to few, and to those only at particular seasons; but from this glorious and gracious presence we are none of us and at no time, excluded.

(IX. ix; Henley VII, 166–167)

As he concludes, the company departs for St. James' church. And as the service ends, Amelia thanks the doctor for his words, stating she will be a better person because of the light in which he had placed Christian worship. The particular terms which show worldly greatness in relation to Christian beliefs had been stated by Tom at the end of Fielding's previous novel, but here there is an insistence on the terms that suggests a new emphasis. 45
In addition, Fielding uses these terms extensively to describe the work of the clergy. Here again he had precedent in Barrow’s sermon on "The Reward of Honoring God." Discussing the manner in which God may be honored, Barrow points to the practice of virtue and piety, showing that the "fishermen" are by their "heroical activity" superior to "those Hectors in Chivalry, those Conquerors and achievers of mighty exploits (those Alexanders and Caesars) who have been renowned for doing things which seemed great, rather than for performing what was truly good." South expressed a similar attitude as he described God as being the fountain of honor, conveying it by the conduit of virtuous and generous actions. Contrasting the manner in which others may attempt to attain greatness through "full Revenues, stately Palaces, Court-Interests, and great Dependances" with "that which makes the clergy glorious," he cites the purity of their lives, their labor in their profession, their courage in opposing Vice "though never so Potent and Illustrious," and their gentleness, courtesy, and compassion. These, he continues, "are our Robes, and our Maces, our Escutcheons and highest Titles of Honour" — through these the clergy is honored because of God’s "eternal Rule and Standard of all Honour deriveable upon men That those who Honour Him, shall be Honoured by Him."  

The scene at Vauxhall which follows the commentary on the "great entertain-
ment" by Dr. Harrison can be seen as presenting a continuation of the theme begun earlier of the greatness of God and its superiority to worldly greatness. When two young men intrude to flirt with Amelia and to make fun of the young clergyman, Dr. Harrison appeals to the one who is a lord and who, according to
his attire, appears to be in the army. Saying that the lord appears to be proud
of his office, Harrison exclaims: "How much greater is the service in which
that gentleman is enlisted than yours! Why then should you object to the pride
of the clergy, since the lowest of the function is in reality every way so much
your superior?" (IX. ix; Henley VII, 70-71). This concern is evident already
in Fielding’s Champion articles on the clergy, and the Doctor’s words recall
not only Barrow and South but also Fielding’s statement that the profession has
more honor and dignity than those concerned only with the state of the body.

Going further in the article, Fielding states that the character of the clergy
should be a copy of their "great Master’s." In maintaining that they should be
humble, Fielding recalls that Christ did not choose to introduce himself into
"the Houses or Families of what we call the Great," but rather disdained
"worldly Grandeur and Honours." Dr. Harrison similarly lectures on the

When we see a man sneaking about in courts and levees, and doing
the dirty work of a great man, from the hopes of preferment, can
we believe that a fellow whom we see to have so many hard taskmasters
upon earth ever thinks of his Master which is in heaven? Must he
not himself think, if he ever reflects at all, that so glorious a Master
will disdain and disown a servant who is the dutiful tool of a court-
favorite, and employed either as the pimp of his pleasure, or some-
times perhaps, made a dirty channel to assist in the conveyance of
that corruption which is clogging up and destroying the very vitals
of his country?

(IX. x; Henley VII, 176)

The discussion of ambition contains the same moral judgment as Fielding’s earlier
works and the same concern with the corruption brought about by it, but the ex-
pression of the religious basis gives a new tone as well as point of view. The same point of view governs Harrison's words that follow on pride, not the confidence of possessing goodness but "that saucy passion which exults in every little pre-eminence over other men," and which, like ambition, causes that its victim "servilely adheres to the great." Such a man, the doctor stresses, cannot have the honor of being employed to serve his "great Creator," nor can he be sure that his ways are acceptable in the sight of "that glorious, that incomprehensible Being" (IX. x; Henley VII, 176-177). Though Dr. Harrison is here speaking of the clergy as he says that true greatness can be accomplished only in the service of the greatest ruler, this same attitude on Fielding's part makes it possible for him to present Amelia as a true heroine, with greatness of soul.

Thus, though we have not seen a major change in Fielding's thought, we have been able to see him at work with an idea. In his plays he uses greatness primarily as a negative term -- he is interested in showing the falseness of claims to it. In opposition there are frequently the good. This basic structure continues throughout his work -- but there is some significant modification. Heartfree is a foil to Wild: preferable because of his goodness but not a great man. Joseph Andrews too is shown to be preferable to the great -- and comes closer to being made a hero than does Heartfree. Tom Jones, faulty though he is, comes closer still to being an example of greatness as he acquires the wisdom that is, for Fielding, a necessary accompaniment to his good nature. Finally there is Amelia, the model upheld in a way that none of the earlier characters are. This does not mean that she is morally superior to all the other good
characters that Fielding has created. Fielding, increasingly concerned with
upholding goodness as an example, comes to equate it with greatness. Thus
the satiric great man labels remain attached to those who are unworthy of them,
but in addition what was earlier shown as goodness in this novel becomes, in
Fielding's Christian interpretation, true greatness. Jonathan Wild may be the
culmination of Fielding's satire on false greatness that Keuffel has stated it
to be: there the satire is most elaborate, most extensive. 49 But to say, as
Winfield Rogers does, "The symbol of the great man was in and out of Fielding's
mind for many years until he brought it to its ultimate development in Jonathan
Wild," is to overlook Amelia and the view of greatness given there. 50 Nor
can one say that the great man was ever really out of Fielding's mind: for in
his work exploration of the great man theme became a characteristic presenta-
tion of the basic moral problem of pride. (We can recall in this connection the
Christian tradition which described Satan in terms of greatness.) And his pre-
sentation of the problem is related to his success as an artist. For when he is
preoccupied with this problem -- when concern with pride as embodied in the
falsely great dominates his mind as it does in much of his dramatic work, in
Jonathan Wild, and in Amelia, his work is effective in only a limited way. The
two novels which by general agreement are considered to be his best work do
not result from such preoccupation. Rather, in Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones
greatness plays a role but is not the major issue in a more comprehensive, and
therefore more satisfactory view of the world.
NOTES


2. Rader, p. 380, says Fielding's is, "all in all, a most devastating reply.


5. No. 39, Jensen ed., I, 357. Fielding's statement is as follows: "Upon the whole, it seems to be agreed by all these great men, that those who want, have by the Laws of Nature A RIGHT to a Relief from the Superfluities of those who abound; by those Laws therefore it is not left to the Option of the Rich, whether they will relieve the poor and Distressed, but those who refuse to do it, become unjust Men, and in reality deserve to be considered as ROGUES AND ROBBERS OF THE PUBLIC." McKillop, Early Masters, p. 144. See also the praise of a great man in the Champion I, 354, Index to the Times for March 11, 1739/40: "Entertainments of the most prodigal, and expensive kind, having been this Season frequent among the Great, a certain noble Lord, who was desir'd to countenance the Frolic in his Turn, had the Courage, Humanity and good Sense to reply. That while there was an Instance of Distress to relieve, or of Merit to reward, he could not answer it to himself to lavish 500 l. in one Night's Riot and Ostentation."

6. As Professor McKillop, Early Masters, p. 144, points out, there is no "benevolent and powerful gentleman like Allworthy or Sir Charles Grandison" in the novel.


8. Cf. also the use of the image in Jonathan Wild (II. i; Misc., III, 96).

9. I, 296. The pike image is included also in the analogy of the art of politics to the art of fishing in the Champion for Saturday, Dec. 15, 1839, I, 100-101. Discussing the way in which the pike, "a very voracious fish," may best be taken, Fielding adds "Nor can I omit one observation . . ., that his throat is the Grave of all the small Fish in the River."

10. Keuffel, p. 9, notes this passage as the most damning of "scattered attacks" on greatness as he points out that the satiric treatment of the great man did not end with the fall of Walpole, but he does not discuss Amelia further.
11. Young, The Universal Passion (London, 1725–1728), p. 7, Satire I, Fielding quoted the two lines in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 60, Jensen ed., II, 84. Fielding owned, according to the catalog of his library, a copy of Young's Poems of 1741 and of the Complaint, or Night Thoughts, of 1750. There is also an unnumbered listing, "Young's 2nd Vol."

12. Cf. Steele's use of the term discussed in Chapter I, and Fielding's in Don Quixote in England, mentioned in Chapter Two.

13. See also the allusion to Charles in the Journey (I. iv; Misc., II, 37) mentioned above in Chapter Three.


15. Tuesday, June 10, 1740, II, 317. On the next page Fielding refers to Walpole as an example of ambition.

16. Robert M. Wallace, "Fielding's Knowledge of History and Biography," SP, XLIV (1947), 90, cites this sentence as he shows that Fielding's tastes leaned increasingly in the direction of history and biography.

17. Fielding's approach is similar too to that of the dramatists who attempted to reform the stage earlier in the century. See John Loftis, Steele at Drury Lane (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1952), especially the discussion of "Reform," pp. 13–25, and of "The Genesis of The Conscious Lovers," pp. 183–193. Loftis notes, p. 188, of exemplary comedy such as Steele's that "it's moral precepts are to be conveyed primarily by providing modes for conduct rather than by making folly ridiculous."

18. Alan D. McKillop, Early Masters, p. 139, cites the last paragraph of the chapter as he discusses the relation of structure and morality in Amelia, pointing out that the novel teaches a morality of consequences.


23. Robert M. Wallace, Henry Fielding's Narrative Method, pp. 426–429. In accordance with his thesis, Wallace tries to relate the novel more closely to biography than to the epic, pointing to such obvious changes in Fielding's style as abandonment of the mock-heroic.
24. Lyall H. Powers, "The Influence of the Aeneid on Fielding's Amelia," MLN, LXXI (1956), 335-336. Powers, who is concerned largely with parallels, considers only the ending of Amelia, which he sees as a Christian denouement, to be a deviation. 


26. Rader, 384-393. Rader continues, pp. 393-396, by pursuing Powers' suggestion of the masquerade as an equivalent of the Lower World scene and adding an interpretation of the Vauxhall episode as "a brief initiatory glimpse into genuine paradise, the heavenly afterlife of Christianity." The parallel, however, will not stand up to close scrutiny; Fielding was very much an artist of this world, and its faults are more than merely evident at Vauxhall. 

27. Johnson, pp. 143-156. It is surprising that in his lengthy discussion of parallels between Amelia and the Aeneid, including a consideration of epic machinery in the Rape of the Lock, he fails to cite the Dunciad and its relation to the Aeneid. Nor does he mention Aubrey Williams' book on the Dunciad (Baton Rouge, 1955), though his own approach is similar to that of Williams. 

28. Johnson, pp. 153-154, states that "Following precedent, Fielding mocks the complete epic form in Amelia, its twelve books dealing with national identity voyages, fights, a gauntlet of trials through which the hero must run, a visit to the Underworld, harangue, intrigues, phantoms, and supernatural machinery to around wonder in the reversal of fortune at the end," but does not note the essential difference. 

29. As Sherburn, "Amelia," p. 4, notes, there is, despite the comic-epic label, less of the epic in Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones than in "the more serious Amelia" with its "high class intention." 

30. Watt, "Naming," p. 337, noting that Amelia lacks the immediate connotations of romance suggested by Clarissa and Pamela, points out in addition that "Fielding went a long way in his struggle against the conventional romantic definition of the heroine," but that calling the novel "Mrs. Booth" would have outraged the public. 


32. See also the comparison of Atkinson and the "noble peer" similar in its implications made by Mrs. Atkinson (VII. x; Henley VII, 60-61). Atkinson, like Amelia, it is suggested, would be worthy of a position of greatness. In V. ii, as Atkinson tells Booth of having received an offer of marriage,
Booth gives his consent to marry any woman: "and the greater and richer she is," he added, "the more I shall be pleased with the match. I don't inquire who she is, "said he, smiling, "but I hope she will make as good a wife as, I am convinced, her husband will deserve."

33. Johnson, pp. 152–153. Johnson says in confirmation that Booth is ridiculous, but not in the way that Tom Thumb, Mr. Booby, and Parson Trulliber are ridiculous. Of course he is not, for he -- and this is always the point with Fielding -- is basically good, while the others are not. Therefore any ridicule must be mixed with sympathy.

34. Johnson, p. 142, comments as follows concerning the comparison: "Fielding thus neatly, amongst his moral observations and genial groundwork for introducing his characters and action, reminds the reader of the conscious artistry about to be experienced."

35. Tuesday, Nov. 27, 1939, I, 34.

36. Jensen ed., I, 156. The next word to be defined is Good, of which Fielding says that it is "but a little used by the Polite."

37. I, 198. The leader closes with a paragraph in which Fielding claims that man is distinguished from brutes not so much by his use as his abuse of words. In another Champion essay, for Saturday, Jan. 12, 1739/40, Fielding writes an ironic article on the change of meaning of words, showing that Turncoat has been perverted in meaning.


40. Barrow, I, 47.

41. Barrow, III, 428. Fielding in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 69 (Saturday, Nov. 4, 1752), Jensen ed., II, 128, cites in his discussion of the "Wisdom of this World" both South and Barrow on the folly of attempting to gain greatness in this world at the expense of future reward.

42. Battestin, Moral Basis, p. 163, note 1.

43. See in particular Battestin, Moral Basis, pp. 14–17. Specific indebtedness is seen in particular, for instance, in the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 29 (Saturday, April 11, 1752), Jensen ed., I, 308, where a letter from "Axylus" quotes Barrow's sermon The Duty and Reward of Bounty to the Poor.
44. For a discussion of Booth's conversion see Sherburn, "Amelia."

45. He had already pointed out in the Champion that a Christian, in contrast to the villain and conqueror who are led to vice by the hope of being known by posterity, requires no such incentive for his virtue, for he expects far greater rewards (II, 174-175). In the Covent-Garden Journal, No. 56 (Saturday, July 25, 1752), Jensen ed., II, 64, Christ is referred to as "the greatest Authority."

46. Barrow, I, 55.

47. Robert South, Twelve Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions (London, 1697), I, 237.

48. March 29, 1740. II, 49. In a later article he draws a general picture of what a clergyman should not be as he imagines one flattering to be allowed to indulge himself at the tables of the great, then overlooking "a Man of Merit and Learning in Distress."


50. Rogers, p. 544.
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