

MAIN LINES OF CRITICISM OF FIELDING'S *JOSEPH ANDREWS*, 1925-1978

H. GEORGE HAHN

Unlike the inferences of a vicious Fielding that the critics draw from *Shamela* or a gloomy Fielding from *Jonathan Wild*, those from *Joseph Andrews* uniformly depict him as a cheerful man highly conscious of his art. This emanation of Henry Fielding emerged from the criticism that focused its attention on its comic structure and its morality.

Earlier critics believed that Fielding had begun the novel simply with the intention of burlesquing *Pamela* until, growing fond of his characters, he abandoned the parody after ten chapters and stumbled on to his own story. Yet as Ernest Baker noted in 1936¹ stumbling by accident into a masterpiece, if not incredible, is highly unlikely. And Charles B. Woods, ten years later, reasoned that because *Shamela* had sufficiently ridiculed Richardson's novel, there was no need for Fielding to replay the prank in *Joseph Andrews*² By these rationales Baker and Woods suggested that Fielding's novel was not another burlesque of *Pamela* but a positive comic and ethical contrast to it. More importantly, they opened *Joseph Andrews* to examination as a conscious work of art in its own right.

Important also in stimulating critical discussion of *Joseph Andrews* were the studies of Fielding's theory. In the 1930s E. Margaret Thornbury³ and Frederick O. Bissell, Jr.⁴ specified the literary influences on his works and from them extrapolated a theory of the comic prose epic. Since then, other critics have found literary values inherent in the ingredients of the epic form that Fielding used. In 1946, for example, W. L. Renwick suggested that Fielding found in the borrowed epic form a powerful source of pleasure, realism, narrative motifs, and ethical content.⁵ E.T. Palmer concurred, arguing that the comic prose epic form sanctioned the morality of, and validated the depiction of, manners and customs in *Joseph Andrews*.⁶ Likewise, in 1972 Leon Gottfried suggested that the *Odyssey* provided a model for seven structural devices in *Joseph Andrews*.⁷ Other critics, however, argued for the main influence of the romance form

on the novel. Sheridan Baker in 1960 maintained that *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* were indebted to the romance tradition in their language, characters, and motifs. Yet, Baker concludes, they "deal with romances in two opposite ways, often managing a synthesis: they accept courtly love and much of its romantic sublimity and they mock heroic adventure as the picaresque scuffling of low life."⁸ The next year Maurice Johnson showed that the novel fuses a burlesque beginning and a romance culmination.⁹ He stresses especially Fielding's transformation of the botts of Book I into the complex human beings of Book IV.

Both Baker and Johnson, however, while noting the romance influence still recognize the presence of the satiric in *Joseph Andrews*. On this point in 1967 Ronald Paulson would also agree,¹⁰ but whereas Baker and Johnson imply that a general mood of comedy emerges from the romance-satire mix, Paulson concludes that Fielding was still struggling between the satiric and romantic intentions and would not commit himself until *Tom Jones*. In the same year Michael Irwin expressed his belief that the "loose-leaf" structure of *Joseph Andrews* caused a problem of unity as Fielding wavered between interest in the narrative plot of Joseph and the moral plot of Adams.¹¹

Homer Goldberg in 1964 and again in 1969 collected Fielding's sources and models to show their influence in *Joseph Andrews*.¹² He argued that Fielding's intentions were not derived from *a priori* literary doctrine but rather from his close reflection on other species of fiction that eventually he fused in *Joseph Andrews*. Critical discussion such as this on Fielding's models and his intentions in using them ultimately are related to problems of structure.

Generally it is the comic structure that is basic to these discussions. In 1948, for example, Maynard Mack removed emphasis from the parodic effects in *Joseph Andrews* by stressing its comic pattern.¹³ He identified the basic structure as that of the comic curve of self-exposure plotted out on an imposed and calculable tripartite system of country-road-city designed to house and interrelate a wide range of

comparatively undeveloped characters. The effect of the flat characters and the imposed plot is to present life as a spectacle rather than as an experience, Mack argued, and, he goes on, watching from above with Fielding, we laugh with him at the folly below. Mack also called attention to the dramatic in Fielding's structure, noting that Books I and IV illustrate simply the comedy of manners and stage farce while the medial books divide into scenes that allow for neat thematic juxtapositions. These juxtapositions bespeak generally the value systems emblemized in the novel by the corrupt city and honest country. Thus Mack demonstrated the organic unity of comic view, narrative structure, and the ethical theme.

Mack's influence may be seen diversely in the work of Mark Spilka in 1953, of Irvin Ehrenpreis and Robert M. Jordan in 1960, and of Johnson in 1961, all other important commentators on Fielding's comic structure. Analyzing the impact of the climactic scenes at Booby Hall, Spilka showed how having the endearing character of Parson Adams blunder into Mrs. Slipslop's and Fanny's beds illustrates the theme of the benevolence of true chastity.¹⁴ Agreeing with Mack on the relationship between comedy and morality, Spilka nevertheless shows that Mack's disparagement of Book IV as simple farce was not quite to the mark and that his belief that the source of Fielding's comedy derives from the reader's and narrator's detachment was not wholly tenable. Spilka instead argues for the reader's sympathy and identification with Adams as the source of benevolent comedy.

Like Mack, Jordan¹⁵ recognized Fielding's comic detachment but contended that it produces not sympathy with the narrator (as Mack held) nor even sympathy with the characters (as Spilka argued). Instead, Jordan claims that the narrative structure produced a double illusion: the story of the narrator and that of Joseph, Fanny, and Adams. And he argues that the ridicule ultimately fell on Fielding's narrator, a foolish, naïve historian. Ehrenpreis also continued the explanation of Fielding's comic structure by detailing the ironies, exposures, conflicts, and reversals that form a tight pattern.¹⁶ His specification of recurring motifs such as attempts at rape, formulae such as unexpected meetings, and plot movements makes Ehrenpreis a major critical source on the unity of the

novel.

Likewise, Johnson agreed with Mack on the burlesque quality of Book I but revealed instead that it was not purely parodic.¹⁷ He shows that, while mocking *Pamela*, this section also established the important positive themes of chastity and charity that are amplified in the last three books. Johnson therefore reveals that the early burlesque structure evolved into the pattern of romance. In another study, Johnson illustrated Mack's observation of the juxtaposed scenes in the medial books by showing how the discourse on art between the poet and player of Book III, 10, juxtaposes Joseph's and Adams's discourse on life in the next chapter.¹⁸ The chapters contrast Adams's and the poet's preachments on the ideal with the psychologically realistic perspectives of Joseph and the player.

But it was Andrew Wright's *Henry Fielding: Mask and Feast* in 1965 that stated the case at full length for Fielding's conscious art of comedy.¹⁹ In it Wright argues that Fielding's interest is to provide cultivated delight for a cultivated audience. Consequently, for Wright the comic effect eclipses that of the satiric and moral in the novels. Indeed, he uses *Joseph Andrews* to illustrate Fielding's avoidance of writing even what might be called a realistic work by showing that Fielding's stress is on art as art, most especially indicated by his jubilant insistence in the prefaces on artifice and by his mocking "intrusive" comments. Such a festive stance by the narrator implies an essentially comic and knowable world, so predictable that the reader is drawn more to the delightful narration than to the narrative itself. Thus, the cultivated delight in the uses of style and language.

Nevertheless, Wright does not disparage the story. He highlights its structure by showing the intricately designed scenic and thematic interplay and the usage of narrative pace in the novel, especially the alternating between utterly static and utterly frenetic scenes. Throughout the story, Wright records the exuberant mood that embellishes Fielding's description of the characters' acting through some of the chief themes of male chastity, charity, education, and marriage. For Wright, *Joseph Andrews* is not only a comic novel but also a "jubilee book" revealing Fielding at his most cheerful.

This critical attention directed specifically at Fielding's comic structure between Mack's essay of 1948 and Wright's book of 1965 established *Joseph Andrews* as a work of conscious art. The insistence of this criticism on Fielding's artistry was aided by the high visibility of the studies themselves. With the exception of Jordan's, none are "lost" in the bound volumes of the journals. Instead they reach a wide audience by being far more easily available. Mack's essay has been continually in print since 1948 as the introduction to the Rinehart edition, and Ehrenpreis's since 1960, as the afterword to the Signet edition, both popular and classroom texts of *Joseph Andrews*. Johnson's essays are preserved and easily available in his book, *Fielding's Art of Fiction*, and Wright's book, in print since 1965, now enjoys even paperbound publication making it still more accessible. These works may be said to offer a solid foundation on which refinements and extensions could be mad.

The refinements, however, have often been strained. B. L. Reid in 1967 argued that Fielding organizes his novel by the journey motif that embodies the moral values Heid perceives in the three kinds of travel-pedestrian, equestrian, and vehicular.²⁰ Howard Weinbrot in 1967 saw a main thematic structure in another tripartite division, that of the attempts at seducing Joseph.²¹ Maintaining that Joseph's rejection of the women suggests the theme of prudence as well as chastity, he shows that the liaisons would destroy order. Succumbing to Lady Booby would impair the class system, to Mrs. Slipslop would suggest incest (she is a "bovine mother figure"), and to Betty would endanger health (she is promiscuous and diseased). And in 1973 Douglas Brooks contended that the novel's structure is an intricate and expansive system of chiasmus, number symbolism, and Christian-epical and biblical associations.²² Such criticism is at a far distance from the Victorian picture of Fielding as the hasty scribbler, but is also at as great a distance from Mack's original point that stressed the novel's comedy as basic. The critical movement was toward the moral in *Joseph Andrews*.

That movement in general studies of Fielding began with James A. Work's seminal essay of 1949, "Henry Fielding: Christian Censor."²³ Its culmination was ten years later in Martin C. Battestin's study, *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art: A Study of*

"*Joseph Andrews*."²⁴ Battestin set out to identify its main themes, to relate its ethics to the contexts of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century latitudinarian Christianity, and to examine the novel as an artifact given pattern by its ethics. Battestin carefully specifies the benevolist writings of the Low Church divines – Barrow, Tillotson, Clarke, and Hoadly – as influential on Fielding's moral thought, especially their beliefs in the essential goodness of human nature and in the doctrine of salvation by good works. Indeed, Battestin claims, Fielding's latitudinarian picture of the good man as charitable (selfless) and chaste (temperate) raises him to the status of a Christian hero.

Battestin further suggests that Fielding deepens his ethical characterization by associating Joseph with his Old Testament prototype, who withstands the seductive advances of Potiphar's wife, and by associating Adams with the patriarchal Abraham. By such symbolism, Fielding renders *Joseph Andrews* a moral allegory, its Christian heroes on a pilgrimage from corruption (the city) to innocence (the country). In terms of that structure, Battestin reads the Wilson episode as an epitome of the novel in its treatment of the main themes of morality, vanity, rural retirement, and providence *vs.* fortune.

Chapters on Fielding's ethics and his attitude toward the clergy's plight round out Battestin's thesis. Though Fielding did not admit in any absolute sense the innate goodness of man, he did allow that through wholesome education and religion, man could achieve a high degree of moral excellence. Battestin likewise shows that one of Fielding's main concerns was the contemporary disdain of the clergy and their poverty and ignorance. So in the novel we are shown reasons for the general scorn in which the clergy was held: The six clergymen contrasted with Adams reflect Fielding's belief that though no other type of person could be so effective for social good, too often the priest was remiss.

If Battestin, going beyond the critics we have just reviewed, seems to make Fielding more a moralist than a comic novelist, the result is nevertheless worthwhile, for it details a side of Fielding and his art that had often been glossed over. Few had ever doubted the comedy of *Joseph Andrews*, but the case had

to be made for its morality.

Battestin and Wright, then, provided the major statements, respectively, for *Joseph Andrews* as a moral document and as a comedy. We have seen that Wright's study was a culmination of some twenty years of commentary on Fielding's conscious comedy. In terms of critical study, it may be said that Battestin, by the thoroughness of his examination, obviated any further original work on the morality of the novel. Like Mack's, Battestin's pronouncements have often been repeated in the numerous introductions and literary histories since 1959. The merger of the comic and moralistic Fielding has shown that the author and his novel are far more complex than one thought, and, just as important, that the easy coexistence of comedy and moralism illustrates well that comedy can be deadly serious and morality delightfully humane. It seems odd that the artistry of this merger has never been cited as a major contribution of Fielding to the English novel.

With Fielding's comic and moral orientation validated, most other recent criticism then looked to two smaller but important single issues: the characterization and the "digressions" of *Joseph Andrews*. To critics before the 1960s, the novel's achievement of character had been seen to be largely found in the "lively type." In 1925, for example, Aurélien Digeon called attention to Fielding's "great collection of country types" brought to liveliness by brief but sharp descriptions and characteristic dialogue.²⁵ But Digeon also noticed Fielding's method of "psychological realism" that allows him to reveal motive through actions and to present character gradually, each chapter providing a new trait framed in an action. Thus Adams, beheld early as a poor curate, progressively emerges as absentminded, gullible, childlike, vain, exuberant, pious, and pedantic. Still, in acting out all these features, his motive is always charitable. In this way, Digeon shows Fielding creating a complex character.

Subsequent criticism on Fielding's characterization has embellished but has not surpassed Digeon's reading of Fielding's dramatically psychological portrayal of character. In 1961, for example, William Freedman showed how Fielding "concretized" his character by clothing as emblematic, and ten

years later, he noted Fielding's use of animal imagery as a technique of character depiction.²⁶ In 1968, M. Elizabeth MacAndrew showed that three classes of names in *Joseph Andrews* – the parodic, the typical, and romantic – served as signals of characterization.²⁷ That same year Douglas Brooks commented on Fielding's use of allusions to the *Odyssey* as a means of depicting Adams and Trulliber.²⁸ Other speculation on characters' names as indicative of character has been made by Battestin,²⁹ McCullen,³⁰ and Eaves and Kimpel.³¹ In 1972 Sean Shesgreen argued that Fielding achieves his characterization in *Joseph Andrews* by his use of literary portraits, physionomical renderings of individuals that bear affinity with Hogarth's techniques.³² All such criticism is useful but not influential.

Since Digeon, the most important readings of character have been by Ronald Paulson and Robert Alter. Both focused on the moral usage of character. In 1967 Paulson showed that Fielding in *Joseph Andrews* departed from the Augustan satiric tradition that placed the villain at the center of the fiction, as Fielding himself had in *Jonathan Wild*.³³ Yet with the innocent Adams as central, Fielding still used the satiric method to render morality. By making Adams a touchstone, Paulson argues, Fielding exposes the vanity and hypocrisy of others who, in their association with the parson, unwittingly reveal the difference between their profession and performance. And in 1968 Alter called attention to Fielding's "integration of character" or his strategies of relating his characters to one another and to the novel's larger moral vision.³⁴ Alter notes the juxtaposition of opposite characters and Fielding's irony as two means of revealing personality. Thus Fielding's juxtaposition of Joseph's three temptresses is granted even more meaning, for instance, by Fielding's revealing Mrs. Slipslop as not only bestial but also as human as seen in her unconsciously sensual language that shows her need as well as her lust.

As to the designation of the main character, the only recorded modern critic to argue against Parson Adams is Dick Taylor, Jr., who presents an interesting case for Joseph's centrality.³⁵ Taylor sees Joseph's growth and maturity in his ardor, his common sense, his willingness to argue with Adams (along with his respect for him), his knowledge of the world, his

courage, and his sense of balance. This view, however accurate, has not been influential. Perhaps the subtlety (or weakness) of Fielding's revelation of these traits in Joseph is the cause, or perhaps the overwhelming interest in the moral and the comic elements of the novel has submerged the narrative prominence of Joseph's story.

It was very possibly the tenuousness of the narrative structure that led earlier critics to dismiss Fielding's three interpolated stories as digressions. This view was compactly stated by Arthur Sherbo as recently as 1969: "*Joseph Andrews* is a loosely episodic, catch-as-catch-can sort of a novel, with some rather unnecessary digressions."³⁶ Most scholars, of course, had recognized that Fielding's use of interpolated tales had its sources in Cervantes, Lesage, and Marivaux, but not until 1956 were they seen as part of the novel's overall design. In that year I. B. Cauthen, Jr. showed that they were variations on the novel's basic theme: the exposure of vanity and hypocrisy.³⁷ He interprets the history of Leonora (II, 4 and 6) as a fable of her vanity and Bellarmine's hypocrisy. Second, he shows Wilson's story (III, 3) to be an autobiography of a once vain wit and hypocritical fop. And last, Cauthen reads the history of the two friends (IV, 10) as a dramatization of the vanity of being correct. Thus linking the stories thematically to the novel, Cauthen then suggests that they paced the narrative line as well by successively dealing with courtship, a young man's entry into life, and marriage: three important concerns of Joseph Three years later Battestin explained Wilson's story as an epitome and philosophical core of the novel in its presentation of the theme; of morality, vanity, rural retirement, and the providence vs. fortune question.³⁸ In 1968 Brooks noticed that two of the interpolated tale; are related to the narrative proper in another way.³⁹ However improbably, he suggests that Leonora's concern for Bellarmine parallel, Mrs. Slipslop's for Joseph and that the duel in the tale reflects Adams's defense of Joseph. Moreover, he sees the history of the two friends as a part of the "marriage spectrum" of the novel, composed of the relationships of the Boobies, the Tow-wouses, the Trullibers, the Adamses, the Wilsons, and Joseph and Fanny.

As Cauthen, Battestin, and Brooks interpreted the interpolations as *exempla* complementing themes and narrative movements,

other critics saw them supporting other purposes of the novel. In 1966 Goldberg attempted a convoluted reading that saw the stories as ironic inversions of romantic tales inset in *Don Quixote*.⁴⁰ He claims that Fielding flattens Cervantes's ideals of romantic courtship, marriage, and literary aspiration into sterile rendition of them in the tales to denigrate the quality of English life. Four years later Weinbrot, in a similar vein, allowed that Fielding's stories in their respective depiction of violence, loneliness, and separation were windows to the real world from which the main story of *Joseph Andrews* was a happy escape.⁴¹ In 1968 Leon Driskell suggested that the tales are "essentially dramatic in function, and their circumstances of narration are more important than their content."⁴² Thus Driskell argues for Fielding's subtle method of characterization in that Mrs. Slipslop identifies herself with Leonora, thereby announcing to the reader her misconception of herself. Likewise, Adams reveals his vanity in his comments about Wilson's story and that of the two friends. And in the last direct statement about the interpolated tales, John M. Warner in 1973 suggested that their opposition to the main story produces an epistemological uncertainty, a wavering between, for example, Wilson's inductive knowledge of the real world and Adams's deductive comprehension of it, an uncertainty that moves *Joseph Andrews* toward modern fiction.⁴³

This flux specified by Warner is indicative of the latest theme in Fielding criticism. As we see in *Tom Jones*, it concerns a newly perceived innovation on Fielding's part—that of letting the reader produce the meaning of the novel from the diverse materials Fielding provides. Claude Rawson and J. Paul Hunter in 1972 had each called attention to the growing uncertainties in the 1730s and 1740s that were affecting Fielding. Rawson noticed the breaking up of the social, moral, and aesthetic harmonies of the Augustan Age that drove Fielding to a tentative and *ad hoc* use of genre.⁴⁴ And Hunter, perceiving much the same, noticed that *Joseph Andrews* is shaped and colored partly by contemporary controversies such as the deistic dispute and the "holiness movement" that Fielding uses to produce the reader's expectations in the novel.⁴⁵ Hunter also suggests that Fielding's use of the journey motif in his metaphors of wandering and stopping at "inns" or prefatory chapters are dramatizations of one of the real concerns of *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*, the human learning

process. His suggestion that the reader must produce the true knowledge of characters and events was taken up by Wolfgang Iser in 1974, who claims that the reader's perception commands the meanings of the novels by its recognition of character contrasts that themselves produce theme.⁴⁶ Of course, while it may be argued that any reader of any novel will respond in this way, what is important is that these critics have moved away from positing the clear and stable "architectonic" design of Palladian dimensions, with which we began, to the discovery of a more subjective and modern fictive rhetoric on Fielding's part.

With one main exception there has been great equanimity in the modern critical discussion of *Joseph Andrews*. That exception is Sherbo, who, we saw, referred to the novel as loosely constructed and episodic. Indeed, Sherbo is singular enough to form his own category in Fielding studies by virtue of his book, *Studies in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel*, which, while having no thesis of its own, fights a lonely police action against the prevailing trends in criticism of Fielding. With the intention of protecting his graduate students from conversion to these trends, he produced in 1969 a blistering rebuttal of some of the favorite critical themes of *Joseph Andrews*. In every case he subjects the criticism to an intensive scrutiny, focused by an even more intensive scrutiny of the novel's text. For example, he dismisses general thought distinguishing Fielding from his narrator as absurd by listing textual evidence about the narrator and comparing it with our knowledge of Fielding. Also, he disputes Spilka's equation of Adams's nakedness with innocence by showing that Adams is never *stark* naked. And he blasts Battestin's moral reading by accusing him of selective quotation and a preconceived conclusion. Throughout, Sherbo regards the criticism as "haphazard and impressionistic ... unsupported by any evidence whatsoever, or, in some instances, by the very flimsiest of evidence."⁴⁷ If Sherbo can himself be dismissed as the great literalist having no truck with subtleties of technique and effect, his book is nevertheless therapeutic, for even if he does reveal only clay toes on some critical idols, his is a lone corrective voice that needs a hearing.

Sherbo notwithstanding, no great disputes have arisen in modern commentary on *Joseph Andrews*. There is, it is true, a

division concerning the emphasis the criticism places on morality or on comedy, but both concerns ultimately merge into the fabric of each critical discussion, thus rendering the issue academic. Moreover, while it is tacitly acknowledged that the narrative plot of the novel is weak, criticism had diverted attention from that issue to stress instead the design of the work – its balances, juxtapositions, and thematic parallels. Indeed, throughout the critical literature runs a theme of defense for Fielding's version of the eighteenth-century novel of manners against "enemies" such as F. H. Leavis⁴⁸ and Frank Kermode⁴⁹ who, if they saw such novels as time-wasting for their readers may be said to imply even worse for their critics. Nevertheless, whatever its intention, modern criticism has raised *Joseph Andrews* to the status of a classic novel.

NOTES

1. *A History of the English Novel* (London: Witherby, 1936), IV, pp. 77-196.

2. "Fielding and the Authorship of *Shamela*," *PQ*, 25 (1946), 248-272.

3. E. Margaret Thornbury, *Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic* (1931; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966).

4. Frederick O. Bissell, Jr., *Fielding's Theory of the Novel* (1933; rpt. New York: Cooper Square, 1969).

5. "Comic Epic in Prose," *E&S*, 32 (1946), 40-43.

6. "Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*: A Comic Epic in Prose," *ES*, 52 (1971), 331- 339.

7. "The Odyssean Form: An Exploratory Essay," in *Essays on European Literature in Honor of Liselotte Dieckmann*, ed. by Peter Hohendahl et al. (St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1972), pp. 19-44.

8. "Henry Fielding's Comic Romances," *PMASAL*, 45 (1960), 416.

9. *Fielding's Art of Fiction* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961), pp. 47-60.

10. *Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 52-164.

11. *Henry Fielding: The Tentative Realist* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), pp. 65-83.

12. "Comic Prose Epic or Comic Romance: The Argument of the Preface to *Joseph Andrews*," *PQ*, 43 (1964), 193-215 and *The Art of "Joseph Andrews"* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

13. "Introduction," in *Joseph Andrews*, Rinehart Edition (New York: Holt, 1948), pp. ii-xxiv.

14. "Comic Resolution in Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*," *CE*, 15 (1953), 11-19.

15. "The Limits of Illusion: Faulkner, Fielding, and Chaucer," *Criticism*, 2 (1960), 278-305.

16. "Fielding's Use of Fiction: The Autonomy of *Joseph Andrews*," in *Twelve Original Essays on Great English Novels*, ed. by Charles Shapiro (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960), pp. 21-43.

17. *Fielding's Art of Fiction*, pp. 47-60.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 77-82.

19. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965).

20. "Utmost Merriment, Strictest Decency: *Joseph Andrews*," *SR*, 75 (1967), 559-584.

21. "Chastity and Interpolation: Two Aspects of *Joseph Andrews*," *JEGP*, 69 (1970), 14-31.

22. *Number and Pattern in the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (London: Routledge, 1973), pp. 65-91.

23. In *The Age of Johnson: Essays Presented to Chauncey Brewster Tinker*, ed. by Frederick W. Hilles and Wilmarth S. Lewis (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949), pp. 139-148.

24. (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1959).

25. *The Novels of Fielding* (London: Routledge, 1925), pp. 195-248.

26. "*Joseph Andrews*: Clothing and the Concretization of Character," *Discourse*, 4 (1961), 304-310 and "*Joseph Andrews*: Fielding's Carden of the Perverse," *TSL*, 16 (1971), 35-46.

27. "Fielding's Use of Names in *Joseph Andrews*," *Names*, 16 (1968), 362-370.

28. "Abraham Adams and Parson Trulliber: The Meaning of *Joseph Andrews*, Book II, Chapter 14," *MLR*, 63 (1968), 794-801.

29. "Lord Hervey's Hole in *Joseph Andrews*," *PQ*, 42 (1963),

226-241.

30. "Fielding's Beau Didapper," *ELN*, 2 (1964), 98-100.

31. "Two Names in *Joseph Andrews*," *MP*, 72 (1975), 408-409.

32. *Literary Portraits in the Novels of Henry Fielding* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1972), pp. 72-105.

33. *Satire and the Novel*, pp. 52-164.

34. *Fielding and the Nature of the Novel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 61-98.

35. "Joseph as Hero in *Joseph Andrews*," *TSE*, 7 (1957), 91-109.

36. *Studies in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1969), p. 104.

37. "Fielding's Digressions in *Joseph Andrews*," *CE*, 17 (1956), 379-382.

38. *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art*, pp. 119-129.

39. "The Interpolated Tales in *Joseph Andrews* Again," *MP*, 65 (1968), 208-213.

40. "The Interpolated Stories in *Joseph Andrews*, or 'The History of the world in General' Satirically Revised," *MP*, 63 (1966), 295-310.

41. *JEGP*, 69 (1970), 14-31.

42. "Interpolated Tales in *Joseph Andrews* and *Don Quixote*: The Dramatic Method as Instruction," *SAB*, 33, no. 3 (1968), 5.

43. "The Interpolated Narratives in the Fiction of Fielding and Smollett; An Epistemological View," *SNNTS*, 5 (1973), 271-283.

44. *Henry Fielding and the Augustan Ideal Under Stress: "Nature's Dance of Death" and Other Studies* (London: Routledge, 1972).

45. *Occasional Form: Henry Fielding and the Chains of Circumstance* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972).

46. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974).

47. P. x.

48. *The Great Tradition* (1948; rpt. New York: New York University Press, 1963), pp. 2-4.

49. "Richardson and Fielding," *Cambridge Journal*, 4 (1950), 106-114.