

1979

Fielding's Clergymen

Kathleen Marie Puhr

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [English](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Puhr, Kathleen Marie, "Fielding's Clergymen" (1979). *Masters Theses*. 3163.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3163>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

April 18, 1979
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

pdm

Fielding's Clergymen

(TITLE)

BY

Kathleen Marie Fuhr

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1979
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

3/17/79
DATE

3/17/79
DATE

FIELDING'S CLERGYMEN

BY

KATHLEEN MARIE PUHR

B. A. in English, Eastern Illinois University, 1976

ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in English Education at the
Graduate School of Eastern Illinois University.

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1979

Abstract

Henry Fielding presented more clergymen in his fiction than any other major novelist except Trollope, and his non-fictional writings--notably articles in his journal, The Champion--also reflect his interest in the status of the clergy in eighteenth-century England. In his series of articles entitled "An Apology for the Clergy," Fielding establishes the criteria by which he feels clergymen should be judged and lists the qualities of the "true" and "false" clergymen.

This study reveals that while Fielding in his non-fictional works clearly explains the traits of the true clergyman, his fiction does not contain a clergyman measuring up to his standards. The study consists of a detailed examination of the clergymen in Fielding's five works of fiction--Shamela, Joseph Andrews, Jonathan Wild, Tom Jones, and Amelia--an assessment of their character traits, and an indication of their shortcomings when compared with the true clergyman defined in his journal articles.

The opening sections of this study explain Fielding's views about religion and the clergy, and discuss Fielding's satiric technique, since satire is the vehicle he uses to demolish clerical pretenders and to accentuate the flaws of more sincere or "almost true" clergymen--notably Parson Adams

in Joseph Andrews and Dr. Harrison in Amelia. The longest section discusses the false clergymen in the novels and the kinds of behavior that earn them Fielding's contempt. His obviously flawed false clergymen are guilty of vices such as perverted reasoning, exhibited by Parson Tickletext and Parson Williams in Shamela; uncharitable hypocrisy, shown by Parsons Trulliber and Earnabas in Joseph Andrews; vanity, seen in the Ordinary of Newgate in Jonathan Wild and in the young clergyman in Amelia; malevolence, peculiar to Parson Thwackum in Tom Jones; parasitical behavior, Parson Supple's mode of conduct in Tom Jones; and manipulation and duplicity-- especially by those adhering to the detested sect of Methodism-- exhibited by Williams in particular as well as by other false clerics. The last section examines the two superior-- though still flawed--clergymen, Parson Adams and Dr. Harrison.

While Fielding is unquestionably successful in presenting the false clergyman--in his numerous incarnations--whom he describes in "An Apology for the Clergy," the study establishes that he does not present a true clergyman. Parson Adams is deficient because of naivete and the inability to be a dignified leader; Dr. Harrison is overly suspicious, impatient, vain, and unable to inspire his parishioners to follow his example of kindness and charity. Thus even these two "good" clergymen are inferior when compared with Fielding's non-fictional model.

Fielding's Clergymen

I. Introduction

Two major trends have characterized twentieth-century criticism of Henry Fielding's works, one dealing with Fielding as moral spokesman for his age, and the other examining Fielding as a satirist. Among those critics in the first group, Sean Shesgreen has stated that "Fielding's aesthetic imagination cannot be separated from his moral vision,"¹ while Ronald Paulson notes that "Fielding is one of the most civic-minded of English writers, a living example of the Augustan ideal of the public man."² Their critical assessments have characterized the tone of most modern Fielding criticism. Numerous critics have emphasized Fielding's moral system and his beliefs about religion, perhaps in order to prove that Fielding was hardly the immoral rake and bawdy writer that some nineteenth-century critics believed him to be.³ Reflecting the second trend in Fielding criticism, other commentators, notably Paulson and Frans Pieter Van Der Voorde, have discussed Fielding as eighteenth-century satirist, yet one can easily reconcile the two major directions of Fielding criticism if one accepts the idea that satirists--particularly of religion and religious figures--are primarily moralists anyway.

Though many critics have evaluated Fielding's moral standards, few have dealt with the articulation of those standards

in his non-fiction writings and the way in which he succeeded-- or failed--in embodying them in his works of fiction. In one particular area--Fielding's writings about the clergy--there exists a clearly delineated topic for study and an obvious area for questioning Fielding who, though he frequently wrote about the traits belonging to the "true" as opposed to "false" clergyman, did not translate the qualities of a true clergyman into a model cleric in his fiction--either because he was unable to do so, or simply because he did not choose to do so. The breakdown between Fielding's articulation of positive clerical traits, and his embodiment of them in a fictional model, will be the primary focus of this study. In addition, I will pay particular attention to Fielding's unquestionable success in portraying "false" clergymen and his use of satirical techniques in accomplishing this end. Though he wanted to depict for his age the model clergyman, it is Fielding's false clergymen--with the exception of Parson Adams, who is most lovable, and Dr. Harrison, who comes closest to being the model cleric--that are most memorable. While these negative portraits of course imply their converse--a positive model--one wonders why Fielding never produced in his fiction the model cleric that he discussed in his non-fiction.

In the eighteenth century, religion and religious questions were regarded quite seriously, and Henry Fielding, as an intelligent eighteenth-century figure, certainly reflects in his fiction this interest in religious matters, and especially

in the status of the clergy. The English Church in the eighteenth century was characterized by "worldliness and lethargy," and its clergymen were often models of corruption rather than of virtue.⁴ R. B. Mowat has divided the clergy into three classes. The first consisted of the intellectuals, who were usually affiliated with a university and who were "scholars first, and clergymen afterwards."⁵ Another class contained clergymen who could not get university positions and who became chaplains to noble families. Mowat notes that these clerics "accepted the career of chaplain to a rich family, where easy circumstances and the pleasures of country-life could be secured so long as the chaplain was complaisant and did not quarrel with his employer."⁶ A third class included the country parish clergymen who were often beloved figures in England and who were above average in intellect and education.⁷ Frans Pieter Van Der Voorde indicates that though these lower clergy may have been "beloved" by some, they were often quite poor:

These poor clergymen were especially found in the country. A large number had no benefices and lived at the houses of laymen; some were fortunate enough to find shelter at the houses of gentlemen, others had to put up with the coarse treatment of fox-hunting squires. When they accepted a benefice and married, the worst troubles were in store for them, for, being wretchedly paid, they could not make both ends meet without breeding pigs and working on a plot of ground. Their children had to go out to service and married below their station. At the houses of the great they were welcomed to be entertained in the kitchen. Small wonder that they prided themselves on their office, this being the only⁸ thing that raised them above their parishioners.

Certainly not all of the clergymen were poor; indeed, many of the unscrupulous clerics made themselves wealthy through the practice of pluralism, by which many parishes were lumped together, resulting in "absentee pastors" and unsatisfactory moral leadership, and forcing the impoverished clerics into even more severe financial straits:

There are far too many instances of ... willful neglect of duty--of the wealthy pluralist doing nothing or next to nothing and leaving his work to be done by a curate who subsisted as best he could on a miserable pittance.... Existence in such indigence was almost bound to be squalid, and the wretches who were prepared to accept it were usually only the spiritless and ill-educated.⁹

Clerical poverty and pluralism, coupled with immoral and unethical clerical conduct, caused eighteenth-century people to regard clergymen with disdain, as Martin C. Battestin points out in his influential work, The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art. Battestin indicates that the clergy were frequent objects of ridicule in numerous plays and articles.¹⁰ In many cases, eighteenth-century clergymen were deserving of censure because, as Van Der Voorde notes, "The laxity of morals among laymen may in a measure be attributed to the indifference to things spiritual that was prevalent among the clergy."¹¹ Still, clergymen were often victims of unfair attacks, and Battestin contends that Fielding, in his fiction, intended to challenge those who were illogically labelling all clergymen bad just because of the deficiencies of some members of the profession. According to Battestin, "Unless the good reputation of the

clergy could be preserved, he [Fielding] reasoned, the religion they represented would fall into contempt with them. Moral anarchy would result."¹²

Two major forces influenced eighteenth-century religion and Henry Fielding--Methodism and Latitudinarianism. Methodism emerged from George Whitefield's pronouncements about the superiority of faith to good works, and it attracted members of the middle class. R.B. Mowat states:

The Methodist revival had an immense effect upon the social life of England and was particularly strong in the parts of the country where, under the Industrial Revolution, the people were increasing in number and where, therefore, the ordinary parish organisation was not sufficient to deal with them. The function of Methodism was not to displace the Church of England, nor even to compete with it in old centres of population, but to supplement it in the new industrial areas where the church was 'behind the times.'¹³

Even though Methodism was not designed to replace Anglicanism, Fielding abhorred the new religion, and Battestin explains his aversion to this creed:

The tenets of natural depravity, enthusiasm, and salvation by faith and the imputed righteousness of Christ served ... as a too comfortable rationalization for self-indulgence, and dangerously subverted public morality.... Methodism was the invariable target of his satire and the perfect foil to set off the practical advantage of the benevolist ethic to society.¹⁴

Battestin adds that "For Fielding, Whitefield, more than any other Englishman of his time, was the Enemy, his doctrine a convenient rationale of the selfish and hypocritical."¹⁵

Fielding felt that Methodism promoted hypocrisy and demoted the virtue he valued most highly--charity. In his fiction, Fielding denounces this "scourge of England," and mocks those who have succumbed to the Methodist revival.

The other force, Latitudinarianism, was a popular version of Anglicanism, and the general trend of Latitudinarianism was "to reduce Christianity to a few basic imperatives. Revelation and the supernatural element were much less stressed. Works were considered far more important than faith."¹⁶ Since this trend was diametrically opposed to Methodism, Fielding adopted it. Latitudinarianism can be summed up in two phrases--benevolence and active charity--and it was further identified by "little mystery, an absence of emotion and a minimum of doctrine."¹⁷ Fielding was attracted to this particular version of Anglicanism because of its emphasis on charity, a point which Morris Golden makes:

In general, Fielding sees charity as the essence of religion and morality: the act most symbolizing movement from within the enclosed self out to another. Where religion is used to support repression, or where it is not seen to center in charity, it is at best a lazy mouthing of clichés and more usually a mask for selfish motives.¹⁸

Besides Latitudinarianism and an aversion to Methodism, Fielding was also affected by the writings of the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, who pointed to man's essential goodness and who inspired the technique of ridiculing vices in order to "portray the virtuous and moral."¹⁹ Shaftesbury's influence is particularly pronounced in Fielding's Joseph Andrews, the

Preface of which expresses Fielding's idea that follies can be "laughed out of countenance," and that ridicule is the test for truth. Ronald Paulson indicates that Fielding's satiric technique comes from Shaftesbury:

Fielding could adopt without any difficulty Shaftesbury's doctrine of ridicule as a test for truth, which was not very different from the views in the conventional satirists' apologies.... [Ridicule in the satirist's hands is a way to blow away the false and pernicious, which is insubstantial, without harming the good, which is real.]²⁰

The technique of light-hearted ridicule worked for Fielding for most of his writing career, but toward the end of his life his beliefs underwent transformation, and his writing technique changed. Due to illness and personal tragedies at the time he was writing, his last work of fiction, Amelia, is less optimistic, less convincing about man's essential goodness, and less buoyant than his previous two novels, Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. Nevertheless, Fielding's devotion to the ideals of charity and goodness never waivered, and he continued to insist on proper conduct of clergyman, motivated by charity and manifested in benevolent social action, so that clergymen would once again earn the respect from others that Fielding felt to be their due.

II. "An Apology for the Clergy"--The Champion, March 29,
April 5, April 12, April 19, 1740

Clergymen occupy prominent positions in Fielding's fiction; in fact, he featured more of them than any other major novelist, except Trollope.²¹ Fielding also wrote of them often while working as a journalist, and one of his journals, The Champion, published from 1739-1740, contains a four-part series entitled, "An Apology for the Clergy," in which Fielding explains his feelings about the clergy and establishes the criteria by which the clergy are to be judged. In the first article in this series, Fielding emphasizes two points: first, that he does not intend to attack the clerical profession as a whole just because of some of its members; second, that merely because a person happens to be a clergyman does not mean that he is automatically good, nor that he should be allowed to hide behind his job. He proclaims his mission to attack corrupt individuals within the profession, and adds that this is a difficult task because often the corrupt clergymen are the ones who try to garner support from others in the profession and accuse the attacker of anti-clericalism:

I have already condemned the custom of throwing scandal on a whole profession for the vices of some particular members. Can any thing be more unreasonable than to cast an odium on the professions of divinity, law, and physic, because there have been absurd or wicked divines, lawyers, and physicians?

But there is an error directly opposite to this, which may likewise deserve correction. I mean that protection which some persons would draw from their professions, who, when they are justly censured for their actions, retreat ... behind the walls of their order, and endeavour to represent

our attacks²² on the individual to be leveled at the whole body.

Fielding points out that society does not like attacks on individuals in the Church, viewing the Church as above censure; however, if people respect Christ and his church, they should want to eliminate perverters of Christianity:

It is well known ... if you had given a hint that any particular person in holy orders had misbehaved himself, a cry would have been immediately raised that the Church was in danger, and you would have been arraigned for spreading such invectives, with a malicious design of bringing the whole body of the clergy into contempt.

Now it seems to me a most apparent truth that the greater the honour which we entertain for our Creator, the greater abomination we shall have for those who pervert His holy institutions, and have the impudence to wear the living of His more immediate service, whilst they act against it. (p. 261)

Furthermore, Fielding believes that the body of the clergy should seek out defective members in order to purge the profession of evil:

If ... a few unworthy members creep in, it is certainly doing a serviceable office to the body to detect and expose them; nay, it is what the sound and uncorrupt part should not only be pleased with, but themselves endeavour to execute, especially if they are suspicious of, or offended at contempt and ridicule which can never fall with any weight on the order itself, or on any clergyman, who is not really a scandal to it. (p. 262)

This is especially true because the role of the clergy, which involves the care of the soul and the eternal concerns, is more important than the care of the temporal body; in Fielding's

eyes, clergymen bear a tremendous responsibility:

As the souls of men are ... of infinitely more consequence and dignity than their bodies, as eternal and perfect is infinitely more valuable than imperfect and finite happiness; this office which concerns the eternal happiness of the souls of men, must be of greatly superior dignity, and honour to any of those whose business is at most the regulation or well-being of the body only. (pp. 263-264)

In a later article, Fielding enumerates the duties of the clergy and the privileges which members of the clergy have. He lists the duties of clergymen as these: "To offer up prayers and praises in the name, and for the use of us all, and to point out and lead men into the ways of virtue and holiness by the frequent admonitions of their precepts, and the constant guide of their examples" (p. 274). He adds that clergymen must not only preach, but must practice moral conduct, set good examples, and thus live up to their vocations: "The name of clergyman itself ... is a title of the highest honour..." (p. 274). Moreover, clergymen should not be distracted by worldly concerns:

So careful is the law, that the clergy should not be any ways hindered or disturbed in their spiritual office, that they are forbid to take any lands for farm or to buy and sell in markets, &c., under very severe penalties, that nothing might prevent them from discharging their duties to the souls of men. (p. 278)

With these general statements serving as the foundation for his views about clergymen, Fielding goes on to make his most specific comments about the characteristics and behavior

of false and true clergymen, statements with which this paper is primarily concerned because they establish the standard for evaluating all clerical characters in his fiction. One can extract from Fielding's catalogues of vices and virtues those traits which are most pronounced in the numerous clergymen whom he depicts. In another Champion article, Fielding delineates his own character sketches which inspire the false and true clergy portraits in his novels. His definition of the false clergyman is the longer of the two and generates the larger number of false clergymen that appear in his fiction. Some of his false clergymen are guilty of only one of these vices; some are guilty of most of them:

Let us suppose then, a man of loose morals, proud, malevolent, vain, rapacious, and revengeful; not grieving at, but triumphing over the sins of men, and rejoicing, like the devil, that they will be punished for them; deaf to the cries of the poor; shunning the distressed; blind to merit; a magnifier and spreader of slander; not shunning the society of the wicked for fear of contamination, but from hypocrisy and vain glory; hating not vice but the vicious; resenting not only an injury, but the least affront with inveteracy. Let us suppose this man feasting himself luxuriously at the tables of the great, where he is suffered at the expense of flattering their vices, and often too, as meanly submitting to see himself and his order, nay often religion itself, ridiculed, whilst, that he may join in the Burgandy, he joins in the laugh, or rather is laughed at by the fools he flatters. Suppose him going hence (perhaps in his chariot), through the streets, and contemptuously overlooking a man of merit and learning in distress.... Is this a Christian?--Perhaps it will be said I have drawn a monster, and not a portrait taken from life. God forbid it should; but it is not sufficient that the whole does not resemble; for he who hath but an eye, a nose, a single feature in this deformed figure, can challenge none of the honours due to a minister of the Gospel. (p. 285)

Fielding makes quite clear that a clergyman who has even one of these major defects is a disgrace to the profession and is undeserving of the respect normally accorded the profession. He is emphatic in his belief that the clerical profession ranks highest and that those people who enter into it are expected to be superior to other men. He answers the question as to why clergymen who are bad should be subject to stronger censure than bad members of other professions by stating: "A clergyman is immediately set apart for the service of his Creator.... And surely no one will insinuate that piety and Christian virtue are less necessary to the discharge of the Christian ministry.... [A] bad clergyman is the worst of men" (p. 285). Of particular importance to Fielding is that clergymen set good examples for their followers, and those who lead others astray because of the bad example they set will suffer for their sins and for those of their flocks. Thus a very heavy burden is thrust upon anyone who proclaims himself a clergyman. Fielding closes this article with his proclamation: "As nothing can hurt religion so much as a contempt of the clergy, so nothing can justify, or indeed cause any such contempt but their own bad lives" (p. 287). His fiction abounds with these corrupt clerics--clergymen who, when measured against clerical standards, are far too small and inadequate to merit anything but disdain.

Fielding's definition of a true clergyman is succinct, and keeping in mind his statement that even one negative quality disqualifies a clergyman from the category of the "true" or "model" cleric, it becomes clear that none of the clergymen

in Fielding's fiction live up to the clerical model he presents in the Champion article. Here Fielding gives the traits of the model cleric, yet nowhere does this model emerge intact in the novels:

A clergyman is a successor of Christ's disciples: a character which not only includes an idea of all the moral virtues, such as temperance, charity, patience, &c. but he must be humble, charitable, benevolent, void of envy, void of pride, void of vanity, void of rapaciousness, gentle, candid, truly sorry for the sins and misfortunes of men, and rejoicing in their virtue and happiness. This good man is entrusted with the care of our souls, over which he is to watch as a shepherd for his sheep: to feed the rich with precept and example, and the poor with meat also. To live in daily communication with his flock, and chiefly with those who want him most (as the poor and distressed), nay, and after his blessed Master's example, to eat with publicans and sinners; but with a view of reclaiming them by his admonitions, not of fattening himself by their dainties. (p. 283)

Two simple actions or modes of behavior make for the ideal cleric, in Fielding's eyes: fulfilling Christ's precepts and following Christ's example, and thus being a dignified leader to those in his flock. None of his fictional clergymen meet his standards.

III. Fielding's Approach to Satire

Fielding uses the literary manner of satire in order to expose to ridicule those clergymen who embody the vices he outlines in "An Apology for the Clergy," and to imply, or state explicitly in his fiction, their converse--the model clergyman. Those critics who explore Fielding as satirist almost universally acknowledge him as a gentle satirist, one "always concerned with showing humanity how to act rightly...."²³ Thus, even his negative portraits--his false clergymen--involve clergymen who are, if not very admirable, at least not utterly detestable. Fielding himself expresses clearly what he feels to be the satirist's job in a March 27, 1740 article in The Champion:

Satire on vice or vicious men, though never so pointed, is no more a sign of ill-nature than it would be to crush a serpent, or destroy a wild beast.... If the mind be only tainted with one particular vice, this is but a portion given to our disease; and though it may be attended with some pain in the operation, the satirist is to be regarded as our physician, not our enemy; but if the mind be totally corrupted, if it subsists a nuisance and infection only to others, such a man ... hath little reason to complain that the satirist attacks him instead of the executioner....
(p. 259)

Fielding sees himself as physician, diagnosing society's illnesses and also prescribing the cures. As Van Der Voorde notes, Fielding's aim is "to correct the vicious tendencies of his time," and he is motivated by love for his country.²⁴ Van Der Voorde adds that Fielding's purpose is not only exposure

of vices and follies, but correction of these defects:

From the very beginning of his career he had expressed his design not only to expose vice, but also to laugh mankind out of their follies.... Satire with him became more and more the medium through which his teaching was conveyed, and in his mature works we become aware of the increasing moral earnestness of the teacher, who holds that, when no moral is conveyed, the 'value of the literary work is null and void and its author a buffoon,' and who expresses his desire to enlist our self-interest on the side of virtue....²⁵

Van Der Voorde sees Fielding as supremely charitable and genial, and undeniably optimistic; therefore his satire could never be malicious or vindictive--not even in his portraits of a type he detested--the false clergyman.

Another point about the nature of satire should be made here. Mary Claire Randolph, in her article, "The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire," indicates a structural model which can be applied to almost all works of satire, and certainly to Fielding's fiction. When speaking of the formal verse satires, Randolph explains their bipartite structure: "Some specific vice or folly, selected for attack, was turned about on all its sides in Part A ... and its opposing virtue was recommended in Part B."²⁶ This "Part B" or positive portion of the satire--if indeed it is spelled out--is invariably shorter than the "Part A" section since "in the very act of presenting the negative or destructive side of human behavior the satirist is establishing a positive foundation on which he can base his specific recommendation to virtue."²⁷ In keeping with the Randolph conception of satire, then, Fielding's

mission was two-fold: to satirize those clergymen deserving of criticism for vices ranging from promiscuity to hypocrisy (Part A), and to present an ideal or model clergyman--a man possessing all of those virtues that Fielding lists as necessary for every clergyman to possess (Part B).

Fielding is adept at presenting negative portraits, and I will explore the categories of bad clergymen that Fielding examines--the Methodists, perverters of reason, uncharitable hypocrites, vain clerics, malevolent clerics, clerical parasites, and clerical manipulators. One could, of course, translate these negative portraits into positive ones, but because Fielding devoted a four-part article to the need for a model clergyman who would set a good example and upgrade the quality of religious life in England, it seems not unreasonable to be disappointed in Fielding himself for not presenting the model clergyman to his readers.

IV. "Unholy Spirits"

Clergymen, realistically or not, are usually considered to be above base desires, petty vices, and the vanity and selfishness that characterize the personalities of the laity; yet at the same time, they are viewed as being aware of the problems of human nature and the world without being so caught up in them that they become cynical and disillusioned. To borrow from Goethe, one could say that clergymen are to know man and yet to love him. In his five works of fiction--Shamela, Joseph Andrews, Jonathan Wild, Tom Jones, and Amelia--Fielding points out, however, that sometimes clergymen are corrupt, and even worse, that they try to hide behind their clerical robes. His refrain in these works is that "Holy garb does not a cleric make, nor talk of charity, the deed."

The chief clerical vices that Fielding satirizes in his fiction are vanity, hypocrisy, and selfishness. Several clergymen bear the brunt of Fielding's attack on these vices because they are men who are supposed to be models of honesty and unselfishness, but who instead are models of dishonesty and selfishness; men who are supposed to represent what is admirable in human beings, but who instead represent man's worst traits. Not only are they bad men, but they are bad clergy men. Fielding states in The Champion that "the name of clergyman itself is a title of the highest honour" and that "a bad clergyman is the worst of men" (p. 274, p. 285); therefore, bad clergymen are judged more harshly, and rightly

so, in Fielding's satire. A notable quality of many of these bad clergymen is their devotion to Methodist doctrines, and for the Latitudinarian Anglican Fielding, Methodism is the devil's own creation and deserves nothing but ridicule, if we judge from the way these Methodist clerics are presented. Indeed, according to Fielding, if it be madness, there must be "Methodism" in it.

Through an abundance of reduction images, and by emphasizing dullness, animality, and cruelty, Fielding destroys the image of the "holy spirit" commonly associated with even unworthy men of the cloth and exposes these frauds for what they are, placing them not only lower than the laity, but on the level of beasts--fascinated with sensual pleasure, addicted to vices of all kinds, and possessing a reasoning process that is corrupt and degrading to human beings. These traits characterize Parsons Tickletext and Williams in Shamela, Barnabas and Trulliber in Joseph Andrews, the Ordinary of Newgate in Jonathan Wild, Thwackum and Supple in Tom Jones, and the young clergyman, Tom, in Amelia.

A. Perverters of Reason/Methodists

Fielding's strongest, most vituperative, and most concentrated satire of the clergy is found in Shamela, and one of the leading vices that he censures in this parody is sexual misconduct justified through reason, of which both Parson Tickletext and Parson Williams are guilty--Williams's guilt emerges in the action of the parody, while Tickletext

exposes his through two letters to Parson Oliver. In addition to their sexual misconduct, Fielding especially lambasts the clergy's stupidity and gullibility in proclaiming the greatness of Samuel Richardson's Pamela. Fielding hated the fact that so many clergymen throughout England were declaring that Pamela, because of the important lesson about charity that it taught, could almost replace the Bible as the moral code of England. Fielding indicates in "An Apology for the Clergy" that clergymen are supposed to "lead men into the ways of virtue and holiness by ... the constant guide of their examples," but clergymen who were promoting Pamela were setting a bad example and leading their flocks astray.

Parson Tickletext is one of Pamela's strongest supporters, and in his letter to Parson Oliver, Tickletext's oft-repeated refrain, "I feel an emotion," indicates his arousal from the sexual incidents in Pamela and serves as a highly effective satirical reduction device, for one is given the impression of a respectable country parson sipping tea and excitedly contemplating a naked, though virtuous, Pamela. Tickletext mentions the obsession he and other clergymen have with Pamela, plus the numerous dreams he has had about Pamela and their effects on him:

For my own part (and, I believe, I may say the same of all the clergy of my acquaintance) 'I have done nothing but read it to others, and hear others again read it to me, ever since it came into my hands; and I find I am like to do nothing else, for I know not how long yet to come: because if I lay the book down it comes after me.

When it has dwelt all day long upon the ear, it takes possession all night of the fancy....' Oh! I feel an emotion even while I am relating this: methinks I see Pamela at this instant; with all the pride of ornament cast off.²⁸

Fielding obviously ridicules Tickletext's duplicity in praising Pamela's moral qualities when, in fact, he is pleased not by her virtuous character but by the thought of her desirable young body. His days and nights are so occupied with thinking and talking about this "virtuous" maiden that he and his fellow clergymen neglect their ministries, and it is for this that Fielding faults him. People in parishes throughout England are thirsting for the guidance and comfort that the clergy can provide, but the clergy occupy their time with thoughts of Pamela--stripped of pride and of everything else. Tickletext is not only sexually obsessed, but he is leading his parishioners away from true religion and good moral conduct.

More than for anything else, Fielding satirizes the clergy for their belief that Pamela is the only book needed to teach morality, and he shows the ridiculousness of this idea by having the fool, Tickletext, express it: "Thou Famela alone art sufficient to teach us as much morality as we want. Dost thou not teach us to pray, to sing psalms, and to honour the clergy? Are not these the whole duty of men?" (p. 305) Fielding implies that if the sum of Christian morality and Christian duties is contained in Pamela, as Tickletext and other clergymen would have one believe, then the world is in trouble.

Tickletext, obsessed with sex, marred by shallowness and dullness, is hardly the worst of Fielding's false clergymen, but he is guilty of preaching wrongly and of abusing the word of God; as his name indicates, he is both one who is "tickled" and one who "tickles" others through his use of language, and clergymen should not use words dishonestly.²⁹

Furthermore, Tickletext is guilty of favoring a Methodist theological posture in his comment about the hero of the novel, Parson Williams: "Besides speaking well of a brother, in the character of the Reverend Mr. Williams, the useful and truly religious doctrine of grace is everywhere inculcated" (p. 304). "Grace," one of the key words in Methodist doctrine, enraged Fielding. Though he objects to Tickletext's Methodist tendencies, Fielding's most direct attack on the pernicious doctrine of Methodism occurs in his portrait of Parson Williams, whose Methodism has made him a thoroughly despicable individual and the epitome of the "false" clergyman. Indeed, in Parson Williams, Fielding has created a composite of every trait a clergyman should not have; it is almost as if Williams had read the section on false clergymen in "An Apology for the Clergy" and modeled his life after the traits Fielding describes. This one portrait does more to attack false clergymen than if Fielding had created a dozen separate portraits, and as Parson Oliver, Shamela's good clergyman, explains: "If a clergyman would ask me by what pattern he should form himself, I would say, Be the reverse of Williams ..." (p. 338).

Parson Williams's most un-clerical feature is his sexual

promiscuity, which reduces him and his mistress, Shamela, to the level of animals. Williams, by corrupting reason and theology, maintains that it is perfectly all right to engage in illicit sexual relations if one's heart is pure and if one has faith. Along with sexual promiscuity, another of Williams's unprofessional traits is his heavy drinking, and again, over-indulgence in alcohol is something that clergymen should avoid. Williams writes to Shamela about a drinking party that he plans to attend, and in a passage containing heavy sexual, specifically phallic, imagery that reduces him again, states: "I am obliged to sojourn this night at a neighbouring clergyman's; where we are to pierce a virgin barrel of ale, in a cup of which I shall not be unmindful to celebrate your health" (p. 317). Williams certainly has good cause for toasting Shamela, because she is one of the virgins he has pierced, and by whom he has fathered a child. Williams is not the only clergyman in the area piercing virgin barrels; this seems to be a regular communal activity, which Fielding attacks because such events cause clergymen to focus on sensual pleasures rather than on spiritual concerns.

The parson's dishonesty and selfishness, other traits that should not be components of a clergyman's character, are shown in numerous passages: he poaches game on Squire Booby's land, a heinous offense in the eighteenth century for any individual; he practically seduces Shamela while they are riding in Squire Booby's coach, with Squire Booby, who had given up his coach seat out of respect for Williams, riding

outside; he states that if Squire Booby will not hire him as his parson, he will vote for the other party and expose Booby's corruption, even though Booby had been good enough to lend him a large sum of money. His deviousness and ambition, even to the extent of hiring a spy, are seen in this letter to Shamela:

I have prevailed on myself to write a civil letter to your master, as there is a probability of his being shortly in a capacity of rendering me a piece of service; my good friend and neighbour, the Revd. Mr. Squeeze-Tithe, being, as I am informed by one whom I have employed to attend for that purpose, very near his dissolution. (p. 318)³⁰

Of all vices, however, Fielding is most critical of Williams's Methodist theological beliefs and his corruption of reason through them. Williams is a dangerous man to both Church and society not only because of his lechery, but because of his Methodist-inspired "doctrinal division of Flesh and Spirit."³¹ Williams has perverted reason by reassuring Shamela that she is not doomed to hell for having illicit sexual relations, and thus is able to satisfy his sexual desires and to justify his actions to himself and to Shamela. Williams tells Shamela several times that their having sexual relations outside of marriage is only a "venial sin" and that if she keeps reading holy books and repents of her failings, she will be saved. Fielding obviously detests this notion, this "madness with Methodism in it," which in effect says that a person can do anything he pleases as long as he is sorry for it. He can commit sins intentionally, and with malice aforethought,

but if he is sorry and repents, God has no grounds for condemning him. Battestin indicates that Williams is Fielding's arch-Methodist:

Into the character of Williams ... go all the popular accusations against the licentious doctrine of the Methodists--their alleged claims of a special dispensation of grace, exempting them from good works and excusing sinful self-indulgence since salvation is a matter of confidence, not performance.⁵²

In one of the finest satires of Methodism in Fielding's fiction, and in an excellent example of situational irony, Williams delivers a sermon one Sunday on the text, "Be not righteous over-much," which he enjoys preaching and which Shamela enjoys hearing because both of them are looking forward to the pleasures of the flesh of which they will partake soon after the service, pleasures that will make them anything but overly righteous. One can almost picture both of them in church contemplating their upcoming sexual delights, with the smiles on their faces being misinterpreted by the other parishioners as signifying joy in the Lord when all they really signify is joy in the bed. Shamela's letter to her mother is the vehicle of satire directed against Williams and the Methodists:

He showed us that the Bible doth not require too much goodness of us, and that people very often call things goodness that are not so. That to go to church, and to pray, and to sing psalms, and to honour the clergy, and to repent, is true religion; and 'tis not doing good to one another, for that is one of the greatest sins we can commit, when we don't do it for the sake of religion. That those people who talk of vartue and morality, are the wickedest of all persons. That 'tis not

what we do, but what we believe, that must save us, and a great many other good things; I wish I could remember them all. (p. 319)

By having Williams state that true religion is everything but Christian charity, and that charity itself is a sin, Fielding is using the reductio ad absurdum technique. According to Fielding, the Methodist clergy feel that faith is all important; therefore, its opposite, good works, must be sin to Methodists like Williams. Such thinking is both unexpected and twisted for everyone except, naturally, Methodist clergymen and their followers. Williams himself certainly does not practice charity, and he shows his lack of charity by stating: "A contempt of the clergy is the fashionable vice of the times; but let such wretches know, they cannot hate, detest, and despise us, half so much as we do them" (p. 318).

Another example of Williams's illogical and corrupt Methodist theology occurs when he and Shamela are riding in Squire Booby's carriage, after Williams has pressured her into revealing what happened on her wedding night:

He began to discourse very learnedly, and told me the Flesh and Spirit were two distinct matters, which had not the least relation to each other. That all immaterial substance (those were his very words) such as love, desire, and so forth, were guided by the Spirit; but fine houses, large estates, coaches, and dainty entertainments were the products of the Flesh. Therefore, say he, my dear, you have two husbands, one the object of your love, and to satisfy your desire; the other the object of your necessity, and to furnish you with those other conveniences. (I am sure I remember every word, for he repeated it three times; Oh he is very good whenever I desire him to repeat a thing to me three times he always

doth it!) As then the Spirit is preferable to the Flesh, so am I preferable to your other husband, to whom I an antecedent in time likewise. (p. 334)

Williams, by perverting reason and morality, is leading astray whomever he can, and he justifies his actions with arguments couched in piety and morality. Williams is not only an immoral human being but an immoral clergyman who has ruined those parishioners who have placed their trust in him. As "leader of men," Williams is only leading them the wrong way.

Two of Fielding's other works also contain some insults to Methodism, though neither, of course, contains the strong assault that pervades Shamela. In Tom Jones, Tom and Partridge arrive at an inn at Gloucester owned by relatives of George Whitefield, and in describing the owner, Fielding states that he is "brother to the great preacher Whitefield, but is absolutely untainted with the pernicious principles of Methodism, or of any other heretical sect."³³ Speaking about Whitefield's sister, Fielding indicates that the woman has recently broken free from any Methodist inclinations, though previously she was taken in by her brother's teachings:

She freely confesses that her brother's documents made at first some impression upon her, and that she had put herself to the expense of a long hood in order to attend the extraordinary emotions of the Spirit; but having found during an experiment of three weeks, no emotions, she says, worth a farthing, she very wisely laid by her hood, and abandoned the sect. (v.2, pp. 92-93)

One of the major characters in Tom Jones, and the villain at that, by the end of the novel is said to have "lately turned Methodist, in hopes of marrying a very rich widow of that sect..." (v. 3, p. 371). Perhaps conversion to Methodism is useful after all, if only for villainous purposes.

In Amelia, no major Methodist characters appear, but early in the novel, a man named Cooper, in prison with Booth, makes several speeches about grace, then steals a box from Booth's pocket. Later, when his crime is discovered, he tells Booth: "'No man can be wicked after he is possessed by the Spirit. There is a wide difference between the days of sin and the days of grace. I have been a sinner myself.'"³⁴ Fielding would add, "And so have all people who subscribe to Methodism."

B. Uncharitable Hypocrites

Since charity is for Fielding the most important virtue that a clergyman--or any person--can possess, those who are uncharitable incur his wrath. Certainly Williams, Thwackum, the young clergyman in Amelia, and other of Fielding's clerics are uncharitable, but two characters in Joseph Andrews stand out as the most uncharitable of all Fielding's clergymen--Parson Trulliber and Parson Barnabas. As Fielding points out in "An Apology for the Clergy," the true clergyman is one who follows Christ's precepts and example, and since Christ was the embodiment of charity, Barnabas and Trulliber are not followers of Christ, therefore earning the title of false clergymen. Battestin terms these two characters "lively

dramatizations of the negligent, worldly, and hypocritical persons who were subverting the function and dignity of the Church."³⁵

Parson Williams has his counterpart in Joseph Andrews in the character of Parson Trulliber who, while not sexually promiscuous, has corrupted true Christian belief by adhering to Methodist heresies and by failing to practice charity. Trulliber's vices degrade the concept of clergyman: he is uncouth, selfish, cruel, unchristian, hypocritical, and vain, and his supreme arrogance hurts and angers a good clergyman, Parson Adams, whose encounter with Trulliber is Fielding's means of satirizing the uncharitable clergyman. The basis of Trulliber's problem is that he really is not a clergyman; instead, he is a farmer who cares for the spiritual welfare of his parishioners only one day a week, and that reluctantly. One of the ideas that Fielding emphasizes in "An Apology for the Clergy" is that clergymen should not be diverted from spiritual concerns, and that they should "live in daily communication with their flocks," yet Trulliber is more interested in the feeding of hogs than in the spiritual feeding of souls. Trulliber's love for animals, especially hogs, is appropriate, for he resembles these animals in appearance and attitude, and through physical description Fielding skillfully reduces him.³⁶

The saying, "Charity begins at home," applicable to clergymen as well as to lay people, is put to shame by Trulliber's conduct toward his wife, whom he mocks, ridicules, and detests.

The poor woman, completely brow-beaten, worships her husband and believes him to be perfect, since she has heard him often proclaim his greatness. Further evidence of Trulliber's lack of charity at home is shown by the way he treats his guest, Parson Adams.³⁷ Trulliber pushes Adams into a pig-sty; then will not let his wife draw a basin of water for Adams so he can wash off inside, but instead makes Adams clean up outside. He commands his wife to serve Adams the poorest ale, and when she is bringing Adams a second glass of ale, snatches it away and downs it in one gulp, exclaiming, "I caal'd vurst," (p. 139) thus showing his greed.

Ironically, this wreck of a cleric is most insistent about the "dignity of the cloth," chastizing Parson Adams for walking to see him rather than riding his horse; in this, he is similar to Williams, who takes offense at any disrespect shown to clergymen, even though he himself has earned no respect. Trulliber's and Williams's obsession with external appearance points back to Fielding's observations in "An Apology for the Clergy," that often inferior members of the profession like to hide behind the "walls of their order"-- in other words, behind the "holy garb" which enables them to feel pious and to be regarded with respect, despite their corruption as individuals.

The key component of the satire directed against Trulliber occurs in his exchange with Adams over giving Adams a charitable loan, an exchange through which Trulliber's Methodist views are revealed along with his corrupted version of the meaning

The poor woman, completely brow-beaten, worships her husband and believes him to be perfect, since she has heard him often proclaim his greatness. Further evidence of Trulliber's lack of charity at home is shown by the way he treats his guest, Parson Adams.³⁷ Trulliber pushes Adams into a pig-sty; then will not let his wife draw a basin of water for Adams so he can wash off inside, but instead makes Adams clean up outside. He commands his wife to serve Adams the poorest ale, and when she is bringing Adams a second glass of ale, snatches it away and downs it in one gulp, exclaiming, "I caal'd vurst," (p. 139) thus showing his greed.

Ironically, this wreck of a cleric is most insistent about the "dignity of the cloth," chastizing Parson Adams for walking to see him rather than riding his horse; in this, he is similar to Williams, who takes offense at any disrespect shown to clergymen, even though he himself has earned no respect. Trulliber's and Williams's obsession with external appearance points back to Fielding's observations in "An Apology for the Clergy," that often inferior members of the profession like to hide behind the "walls of their order"-- in other words, behind the "holy garb" which enables them to feel pious and to be regarded with respect, despite their corruption as individuals.

The key component of the satire directed against Trulliber occurs in his exchange with Adams over giving Adams a charitable loan, an exchange through which Trulliber's Methodist views are revealed along with his corrupted version of the meaning

of charity. Glenn Hatfield points out that Trulliber "as a clergyman, must profess charity not because he sincerely believes in it but because clergymen are by definition professors of religion...."³⁸ This requirement causes Trulliber to be a hypocrite, yet the fact remains that Trulliber should not have become a clergyman unless he intended to profess the true meaning of charity. When Adams first broaches his request for a loan, Trulliber responds with a mock-pious declaration that because his heart is in the Scriptures, he is not interested in laying up an earthly treasure:

'To be content with a little is greater than to possess the world; which a man may possess without being so. Lay up my treasure! What matters where a man's treasure is whose heart is in the Scriptures? There is the treasure of a Christian.' (p. 140)

Unfortunately, Trulliber's heart is in his material possessions, not in the Scriptures, as Adams soon finds out. He first misunderstands Trulliber's remark, however, rejoicing at Trulliber's generosity and asking for the money, which Trulliber, in keeping with his uncharitable nature, refuses to give, accusing Adams of trying to rob him and of impersonating a clergyman. They then launch into a discussion of Christian charity which makes for good satire of the vain, hypocritical clergymen like Trulliber. Adams tries to impress upon Trulliber his need to show charity, stating: "'I forgive your suspicions ... but suppose I am not a clergyman, I am nevertheless thy brother; and thou, as a Christian, much more as a clergyman, art obliged to relieve my distress,'" to which Trulliber

replies, "'I shall not learn my duty from such as thee; I know what charity is, better than to give to vagabonds'" (p. 141). Trulliber does not know what charity is, as the hostess at an inn in Trulliber's parish so clearly points out: "He had not only a very good character as to other qualities in the neighbourhood, but was reported a man of great charity; for, though he never gave a farthing, he had always that word in his mouth" (p. 143).

Trulliber's hypocrisy and his Methodism, indicated by his protestations of Christian faith and charity but his refusal to perform charity, along with his selfishness and vanity, are the targets of Fielding's satire. Saddest of all, in Fielding's eyes, is the fact that Trulliber's parishioners are in awe of him, deceived by his exterior of Christian virtue and failing to see that he is all talk and no action: "Mr. Trulliber had, by his professions of piety, by his gravity, austerity, reserve, and the opinion of his great wealth, so great an authority in his parish, that they all lived in the utmost fear and apprehension of him" (p. 143). That clergymen such as Trulliber can even be in charge of parishes and souls in England appalls Fielding, for Trulliber sets an example of evil that can only further disgrace the name "Christian clergyman." One of Fielding's purposes in writing "An Apology for the Clergy" was to call upon people to recognize defective members of the clergy:

If ... a few unworthy members creep in it is

certainly doing a serviceable office to the body to detect and expose them ... contempt and ridicule ... can never fall with any weight on the order itself, or on any clergyman who is not really a scandal to it. (p. 262)

He presents his portrait of Trulliber to illustrate a perfect example of a fraud hiding behind his order, a "hog fraternizing with hogs."³⁹

Though his uncharitable attitude and hypocritical behavior are not as obvious as Trulliber's, Parson Barnabas too can be placed in the category of "uncharitable hypocrites" by virtue of the way he treats Joseph Andrews. One of the most important duties of a clergyman is to comfort the sick and the dying, to stay near them as they experience pain and to speak words of consolation; however, Barnabas, when summoned to the bed of a very sick Joseph Andrews, takes his time coming to see him and before reluctantly ascending the stairs to Joseph's room, shares some punch and conversation with the people assembled downstairs, since sharing punch is his favorite pastoral duty. After finally arriving at Joseph's room, Barnabas hears the sick man hallucinating and hastily retreats to the party downstairs rather than trying to comfort his fellow Christian. A second time, Barnabas is summoned to Joseph's bedside, and grudgingly enters the room, where he asks Joseph to repent of his sins and forgive those who have wronged him. In yet another example of perversion of reason, which most clergymen in Fielding's works seem to have mastered quite readily, Barnabas informs Joseph that it is lawful to

kill the thieves who attacked him as long as Joseph remembers to forgive them. This scene is analogous to Parson Williams's advice to Shamela regarding their sexual activities; Barnabas, like Williams, advises Joseph that all he need do is repent of his sins, which Joseph does. After this, Barnabas concludes the visit:

Barnabas said that was enough, and then proceeded to prayer with all the expedition he was master of, some company then waiting for him below in the parlour, where the ingredients for punch were all in readiness; but no one would squeeze the oranges till he came. (p. 49)

In "An Apology for the Clergy," Fielding speaks of the false clergyman as "deaf to the cries of the poor; shunning the distressed ... feasting himself luxuriously at the tables of the great"; he is speaking of Barnabas, and implies that the Church will be better off, and the standards of the clergy will be raised, if men like Barnabas stick to squeezing oranges instead of making a sham of the ministry.

C. Vain Clerics

In addition to a tendency toward Methodism and uncharitable hypocrisy, another vice that Fielding detests is vanity.

Joseph Andrews consists essentially of a condemnation of the vices of hypocrisy and vanity, and the clergymen in this work, plus Williams in Shamela, are marred by vanity. Even good Parson Adams, one of the two clergymen who come closest to Fielding's clerical model, is somewhat vain about his learning and his sermons. Perhaps vanity serves as a screen behind

which the insecure and poverty-stricken clergymen can hide; Van Der Voorde makes this point, as I mentioned in the introduction, noting that because of the low social status of many eighteenth century clergymen, their only source of pride was their clerical title. Therefore they tended to build up their own egos because no one else would bother to do so. Nonetheless, Fielding condemns vanity in "An Apology for the Clergy," indicating that clergymen should be "humble ... void of pride, void of vanity" even though they are inclined to want attention. Three clergymen whose leading trait is vanity stand out in Fielding's fiction: Barnabas in Joseph Andrews, the Ordinary of Newgate in Jonathan Wild, and the young clergyman, Tom, in Amelia.

Unquestionably, the first of these men, Barnabas, is a self-centered individual, and coupled with this trait is, of course, his vanity--shown in his numerous debates with the doctor about legal matters. These legal debates, supposedly prompted by altruism, instead enable both men to show off their knowledge: "To display their parts, therefore, before the justice and the parish, was the sole motive which we can discover to this zeal which both of them pretended to have for public justice" (p. 57). The Christian virtue of humility seems to have disappeared from Parson Barnabas, only to be replaced with vanity and hypocrisy which emerge again in his discussion with Parson Adams about publishing sermons. The practice of clergymen trying to get their sermons published in an already overcrowded market is satirized in

this exchange. Barnabas has tried to have his sermons published to bring honor and glory to his name, rather than to Christ, whom he is supposed to be serving. Barnabas's sermons have been rejected, but in an explanation prompted by jealousy of Adams, he explains: "'I will not be vain: but to be concise with you, three bishops said they [the sermons] were the best that ever were writ ...'" (p. 63). Obviously, "vain" is exactly what Barnabas is in this statement.

One of the more humorous and ironic satirical incidents in this novel occurs when Adams offers to read Barnabas one of his sermons, but Barnabas, repelled by the thought of listening to a sermon, persuades him not to do so. Still, like Williams and Trulliber, Barnabas proclaims the honor he has for the cloth and his respect for his fellow clergymen.

Linked with vanity is Barnabas's dishonesty. His tendency to lie is seen when he suggests to Adams that if he really wants his sermons published, he should submit them as original sermons, never before delivered, even though they are not original. Furthermore, he leaves Adams in order to preach a funeral sermon for an evil man, explaining to Adams that he will lie about the deceased by making up some good qualities for him--though he had none. Perhaps it is less easy to despise Barnabas than it is to despise Trulliber, but Barnabas remains an illustration of several traits of the false clergyman, particularly vanity.

Only one clergyman is mentioned in Jonathan Wild, Fielding's concentrated political satire of Robert Walpole,

and this clergyman, the Ordinary of Newgate prison, makes his appearance on the night before Wild's (Walpole's) execution to "comfort" Wild and encourage him to repent. The Ordinary is far from being as vain as Barnabas, Trulliber, Williams, and some of the other clergymen, but he still is intent upon preserving his image and bolstering his ego. When Wild makes some disparaging comments about the clergy, the Ordinary takes offense, but Wild soothes his anger by telling him those clergymen in particular he is reviling:

'I revile only the wicked ones, if any such are, which cannot affect you; who, if men were preferred in the Church by merit only, would have long since been a bishop. Indeed, it might raise any good man's indignation to observe one of your vast learning and abilities obliged to exert them in so low a sphere, when so many of your inferiors wallow in wealth and preferment.⁴⁰

The Ordinary tries not to pounce on this compliment, but instead tells Wild: "'I must own I might have expected higher promotion; but I have learnt patience and resignation....'" (p. 193). Yet a few minutes later, he proclaims to Wild that Wild need not worry about his soul, since the Ordinary has everything under control: "'Never mind your soul--leave that to me; I will render a good account of it, I warrant you'" (p. 195). This statement out of the Ordinary indicates that the clergyman is rather sure of his connections with the Almighty.

Shortly after this, in an attempt to console Wild, the Ordinary decides to read one of his sermons to him. He

prefaces his action with the statement: "'I do not value myself on the talent of preaching, since no man ought to value himself for any gift in this world. But perhaps there are many such sermons. But to proceed, since we have nothing else to do till the punch comes'" (p. 195). If the Ordinary's primary purpose in delivering a sermon is to help Wild relax, he is unquestionably successful, for as the clergyman explains in detail the "foolish philosophy" of the Greeks, Wild falls asleep and snores in accompaniment to the Ordinary's words. The clergyman, so caught up in admiration of his sermon, does not even notice that his audience is paying no attention to him.

A third clergyman, the young man, Tom, in Amelia, is vain not so much about himself personally as about clergymen in general. He voices the argument that Fielding refutes in "An Apology for the Clergy" that no clergyman should ever be criticized; that all clergymen are perfect human beings. One could probably attribute the young clergyman's feelings to his newness in the profession and to his idealism, but it is more likely that he wants the instant respect and honor which he will receive by hiding behind his clerical gown, respect that he will not have to earn if all clergymen are automatically respected. The young clergyman directs his outrage against any clerical criticism to Dr. Harrison, the most nearly perfect of Fielding's clerics, by stating:

'It is a scandal ... to the government that they do not preserve more respect to the clergy, by punishing all rudeness to them with the utmost severity.... [T]he lowest clergyman in England is

in real dignity superior to the highest nobleman. What then can be so shocking as to see that gown, which ought to entitle us to the veneration of all we meet, treated with contempt and ridicule? Are we not, in fact, ambassadors from heaven to the world? And do they not, therefore, in denying us our due respect, deny it in reality to Him that sent us?' (v. 2, p. 173)

Dr. Harrison--echoing Fielding's thesis in "An Apology for the Clergy"--argues that the clergy themselves are partly to blame for the maligning they receive, but the young clergyman will not accept this argument. Harrison points out:

'There are very few or none of the clergy whose lives, if compared with those of the laity, can be called profligate; but such, indeed, is the perfect purity of our religion, such is the innocence and virtue which it exacts to entitle us to its glorious rewards and to screen us from its dreadful punishments, that he must be a very good man indeed who lives up to it.' (v. 2, pp. 174-175)

The young clergyman emphasizes that clergymen are only men and are subject to sin and impurity, but Harrison states that they must be as good as possible, and hitting very close to home, that clergymen must never be proud: "'There is not in the universe a more ridiculous nor a more contemptible animal than a proud clergyman; a turkey-cock or a jackdaw are objects of veneration when compared with him'" (v. 2, p. 176). From this remark, the young clergyman concludes in his vain way that Harrison is a fool.

D. Malevolent Clerics

The most vicious of the clergymen in Fielding's fiction

is the Reverend Roger Thwackum. Tutor of Tom Jones and Master Blifil in Tom Jones, Thwackum, as his name implies, is truly a malevolent man and is "the most heinous of Fielding's characters."⁴¹ Thwackum, along with the other tutor, Square, derives pleasure from tormenting Tom for his many "sins" and Thwackum in particular enjoys whipping the boy in order to make him repent, a point which Fielding makes succinctly in his wonderfully satirical statement, Thwackum's "meditations were full of birch ..." (v. 1, p. 120).⁴² Sean Shesgreen states that "Thwackum's character is established and developed as an allegorization of 'the allurements and terrors of religion,' the second part of Fielding's antithesis in his definition of benevolence.... His name alerts us to his devotion to punishment and terror...."⁴³

The reader's introduction to the Rev. Mr. Thwackum occurs when he is whipping Tom in order to force him to repent for shooting illegal game--a deed which Tom has not done. Thwackum whips Tom so severely, in fact, that Mr. Allworthy, Tom's foster "uncle," regrets the beating and apologizes to Tom for his suspicions about him, thus only serving to make Thwackum angry at Allworthy:

Thwackum did all he could to persuade Allworthy from showing any compassion or kindness to the boy, saying, 'He had persisted in an untruth;' and gave some hints that a second whipping might probably bring the matter to light. (v. 1, p. 113)

Like Shesgreen, Morris Golden points out that Thwackum, "enclosed within the dogmas of a sectarian faith ... repudiates the

charity central to Fielding's Christianity."⁴⁴ Certainly Thwackum is violently opposed to charity; he has overturned the law of love and returned to the Old Testament philosophy of vengeance, insisting that evil deeds (evil as he defines it) must be punished by physical abuse. Therefore, every time Tom does something that is prompted by charity, Thwackum contrives his action to be bad: Tom takes the rap for Black George when Thwackum whips him; later, Tom sells his horse and his Bible and gives the money to Black George and his family, and again Thwackum wants to whip Tom, but Allworthy forbids him to do so: "The pedagogue was obliged to obey those orders; but not without great reluctance, and frequent mutterings that the boy would certainly be spoiled" (v. 1, p. 121).

Later Thwackum, hearing that Tom has supposedly gotten Molly Seagrim pregnant, becomes angry at Tom, and tells Allworthy how sinful Tom is. Allworthy tells Thwackum that he believes Tom will repent, and Thwackum is frustrated and angry: "As the days of whipping were at an end, the tutor had no other vent but his own mouth for his gall, the usual poor resource of impotent revenge" (v. 1, p. 128).

Robert Alter suggests that Thwackum whips Tom not only because of religious indignation and a desire to punish sin, but to channel his sexual energy and enact sadistic tendencies.⁴⁵ Thwackum certainly is concerned about Tom's sex life, and at one point has the chance to show just how concerned he is, when he and Blifil encounter Tom and Molly in the bushes:

The parson, who was not only strictly chaste in

his own person, but a great enemy to the opposite vice in all others ... desired Mr. Blifil to conduct him immediately to the place, which as he approached he breathed forth vengeance mixed with lamentations; nor did he refrain from casting some oblique reflections on Mr. Allworthy, insinuating that the wickedness of the country was principally owing to the encouragement he had given to vice, by having exerted such kindness to a bastard, and by having mitigated that just and wholesome rigor of the law which allots a very severe punishment to loose wenches. (v. 1, p. 259)

Since Allworth has been negligent in his duty, Thwackum charges forward to fight with Tom who, though now too old to be whipped, can still be punched, and Thwackum, a skillful boxer, is able to punch Tom quite effectively.

Besides using violence in order to promote Tom's repentance, Thwackum also uses the tactic of long, frightening lectures. One such lecture occurs while Tom is lying in bed trying to recover from a fall from a horse, and this lecture shows Thwackum's "narrow-minded observance of the letter of divine law, and a total disregard of the spirit."⁴⁶ Thwackum tells Tom:

'That he ought to look on his broken limb as a judgment from heaven on his sins. That it would become him to be daily on his knees, pouring forth thanksgivings that he had broken his arm only, and not his neck, which latter,' he said, 'was very probably reserved for some future occasion, and that, perhaps, not very remote. For his part,' he said, 'he had often wondered some judgment had not overtaken him before; but it might be perceived by this that Divine punishments, though slow, are always sure.' Hence likewise he advised him 'to foresee, with equal certainty, the greater evils which were yet behind, and which were as sure as this of overtaking him in his state of reprobacy. These are,' said he, 'to be averted only by such

a thorough and sincere repentance as is not to be expected or hoped for from one so abandoned in his youth, and whose mind, I am afraid, is totally corrupted. It is my duty, however, to exhort you to this repentance, though I too well know all exhortations to be vain and fruitless.... I can accuse my own conscience of no neglect; though it is at the same time with the utmost concern I see you travelling on to certain misery in this world, and to as certain damnation in the next.' (v. 1, p. 211)

With consolation such as this, Tom's recovery is certain to be pleasant. Thwackum's concern with hell and damnation is a bit much for a clergyman, as Fielding points out, because it leaves no room for benevolence and active charity.

People concerned with the salvation of their own souls do not have time for others. Thwackum is only interested in others as their ever-present punisher and condemner, not as someone helping them to lead happy lives bounded by the principles of Christian love and concern. Thwackum is a malevolent, self-righteous prude who, though seemingly guided by Christian principles, is really a false clergyman, guided by vengeance and devoid of love.

E. Clerical Parasites

Several times in "An Apology for the Clergy," Fielding comments that clergymen should never become flatterers of the rich, denying their own best judgment or refraining from pointing out defects in their patrons for fear of losing their jobs. In Tom Jones, Fielding creates a clergyman who represents the type of "clerical parasite" that he condemns.

This clergyman is Parson Supple, right-hand man (or more accurately, footstool) to Squire Western who depends on Squire Western for a living and who socially ranks "hardly higher than a peasant."⁴⁷ Several people whom Supple encounters recognize his dependence on Squire Western as his reason for failing to stand up to the Squire. One of them, Mrs. Honour, talks to Tom about the Supple-Western situation:

'To be sure I wishes that Parson Supple had but a little more spirit, to tell the squire of his wickedness in endeavouring to force his daughter contrary to her liking; but then his whole dependence is on the squire; and so the poor gentleman, though he is a very religious good sort of man, talks of the badness of such doings behind the squire's back, yet he dares not say his soul is his own to his face.'
(v. 3, p. 170)

This is the very situation Fielding cautions against in his article, because it only serves to degrade the clerical profession.

Supple tolerates Western's dominance because Supple is a great fan of food and drink, which Western readily provides for him if he stays in his place. Fielding describes Supple as "a good-natured, worthy man, but chiefly remarkable for his great taciturnity at table, though his mouth was never shut at it. In short, he had one of the best appetites in the world" (v. 1, p. 180). Supple's fondness for food is seen at one point in the novel, when he arrives with some important news to share with his patron; as soon as he sees the roast beef, however, he forgets the news: "The sight of the roast

beef struck him dumb, permitting him only to say grace, and to declare he must pay his respect to the baronet, for so he called the sirloin" (v. 1, p. 180). The big news takes second place to the food. Drink also causes him to become a virtual slave to Squire Western, and they have many drinking bouts during which Western expresses his political and religious opinions, to which Supple readily assents because Supple insists he knows only about his own parish and not about national affairs--which he leaves to Western's judgment:

There now ensued between the squire and the parson a most excellent political discourse, framed out of newspapers and political pamphlets, in which they made a libation of four bottles of wine to the good of their country.... (v. 1, p. 183)

Both men are remarkably patriotic.

On several occasions, Supple takes his life into his own hands by daring to challenge or to try to calm down Squire Western when Western's daughter, Sophia, is involved. Usually when Supple attempts to soothe Western, however, Western reminds Supple of his position--a rather precarious one. In London, Western, irate after walking in on Sophia and Lord Fellamar, violently chastizes his daughter while Supple tries to restrain him, but Western tells Supple: "'At'n't in pulpit now? When art a-got up there I never mind what dost say; but I won't be priest-Ridden nor taught how to behave myself by thee'"--comments which cause Supple to back down (v. 3, p. 162). In another instance, Western becomes

angry at Sophia and locks her away until she agrees to marry Blifil, and Supple again protests, saying things to Western which are "sufficient to throw the squire into a violent rage, and into many indecent reflections on the whole body of the clergy ..." (v. 3, p. 208). Once again, Supple lacks the courage to speak out emphatically against his patron.

Generally, Supple will do whatever Western wants, even if he himself does not enjoy it. While chasing after Sophia, for example, they encounter a hunt, and when Western starts riding after the hounds, Supple, naturally, follows him: "The parson, after having expressed much astonishment, in Latin, to himself, at length likewise abandoned all further thought of the young lady, and jogging on at a distance behind, began to meditate a portion of doctrine for the ensuing Sunday" (v. 2, p. 306). Only in the pulpit does Supple feel safe in condemning Western's actions, thereby salving his conscience. A double standard, bought by food, drink, and security, operates with Parson Supple, and his conduct as parasite and moral compromiser makes him unfit to wear clerical garb.

F. Clerical Manipulators

In contrast to clerical parasites like Supple, Fielding presents those clergymen who, by virtue of double-talk and hypocrisy, are able to manipulate their parishioners into thinking the way they do and who are able to justify or rationalize their own immoral actions. Several of these clergymen have been discussed in detail already, and can

usually be identified with one key phrase that they often use in their manipulative tactics to "magnify and spread slander" or to propagate heresies, behavior which Fielding condemns in "An Apology for the Clergy." Several of these manipulators are Methodists, notably Williams, who cautions his parishioners to "be not righteous over-much" and who proclaims the superiority of faith to good works. Parson Barnabas, too, picks up the word "grace" and manipulates it. In his conversation with Joseph, Barnabas encourages him to rid himself of all carnal desire and "fix his heart above," and when Joseph asks for ways to accomplish this goal, Barnabas tells him that by "prayer and faith" he can acquire the "grace" he needs to combat earthly desires (p. 49). Parson Trulliber forever dwells on the idea of "charity," a word always in his mouth though never apparent anyplace else as he continues to practice his decidedly unchristian version of charity. Thwackum's favorite words (besides "Give me the birch, and drop your pants") are "honor" and "Divine grace," which he feels cannot exist outside of religion--specifically, the Church of England. Thwackum, emphatic in his views about the nature of honor and divine grace, tries to convince Tom, Allworthy, and his nemesis, Square the Deist, of the rightness of his thinking. Furthermore, as Sean Shegreen explains, though Thwackum believes in terror, he is more strongly devoted to the saving power of grace: "He believes man is a sink of iniquity, capable of being redeemed only by religion's (the Church of England's) power. Outside the fold of grace, Thwackum preaches, there is only eternal

damnation."⁴⁸ Thwackum's well-ordered system of rules for the game of life enables him to live simply--and evilly.

Though he does not use violence or justify his conduct by proclaiming himself a crusader for the Church of England and its version of Divine grace, the young clergyman in Amelia is perhaps even more deadly than Thwackum and more to be feared, because he can manipulate many words to argue with apparent logic for blatant unchristian and unclerical conduct. This talent is seen in his discussions with Dr. Harrison regarding the dignity of the clergy, and also when he and Harrison discuss the meaning of the scripture passage, "'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you'" (v. 2, p. 163). The young clergyman, lacking in a desire to be charitable and benevolent, argues that to follow the scriptural idea literally will result in an end to justice and an undermining of the legal system, but Harrison tells him that if the legal system is being used as a means of attaining revenge, then it ought to be abolished anyway. He scores a strong point against the young clergyman when he chides him: "'May not a Christian ... be well ashamed of making a stumbling-block of a precept which is not only consistent with his worldly interest, but to which so noble an incentive is proposed?'" (v. 2, pp. 165-166) The young clergyman, self-interested and egotistical, however, does not accept Harrison's opinion, and continues to interpret the Bible in the light of whatever will be most convenient for him. He, like all the other false clergymen whom Fielding condemns, is a self-centered person.

V. "Holy Spirits"

The false clergymen occupy many pages in Fielding's five longer works of fiction, and in his portraits of false clergymen, Fielding is able to translate all of the clerical vices he describes in "An Apology for the Clergy" into fictional models. He is not as successful, however, in translating his qualities of the true clergyman into a strong fictional model, and nowhere in his fiction does there exist a clergyman to whom one could point and say, "This is the one--this is the ideal clergyman." Fielding comes closest to presenting the model cleric in the portrait of Dr. Harrison in Amelia, yet even Harrison is flawed, as I will indicate later in this section. Other characters in contention for possible consideration as ideal clerics are Parson Adams in Joseph Andrews and Parson Oliver in Shamela. Yet these characters are in some way inadequate--all of them come up short when measured against the standards Fielding himself established.

Sheldon Sacks terms Parson Adams and Dr. Harrison "fallible paragons," pointing out that while they are the superior characters in the novels in which they are featured, they are nonetheless "fallible" or flawed in some way. Sacks adds that their errors often contribute to important plot complications, but that on the whole, "when they speak ex cathedra, as it were, their word will be the law of the novels in which, though fallible, they remain paragons."⁴⁹ Though the paragons remain the moral centers of their novels, their fallibility makes them less than models of human perfection.

and less than the ideal clerical models that Fielding writes about in "An Apology for the Clergy." As leaders of men, these clergymen often go astray. Another trait of the fallible paragons is that because of their goodness, they are more gullible than the bad characters; as Glenn Hatfield observes, the "holy spirits" are "victimized by hypocrites because their own goodness makes them in one degree or another blind to the wickedness of others."⁵⁰ Harrison comes closest to recognizing the true nature of others, but he is also one of the most suspicious of Fielding's characters. Adams, Harrison, and Oliver are good persons, but due to one or more flaws, fall short of the "true clergyman" portrait Fielding draws in "An Apology for the Clergy."

One character who comes close to being the model cleric is Parson Oliver, whose perception and intelligence in Shamela make him a foil to both Tickletext and Williams. Hamilton Macallister states: "It is the business of Parson Oliver to stand for the best type of clergyman."⁵¹ Fielding uses Oliver's correspondence with Tickletext to satirize the clergy directly in Shamela. Oliver ridicules his many fellow clergymen who have adopted the Pamela fad and who have begun preaching the idea of preservation of virtue rather than the gospel message of Christian charity.

Oliver points out that Pamela is hardly a sufficient resource for teaching morality and that clergymen are kidding themselves and neglecting their responsibilities to the faithful if they think it is: "Is it possible that you or any of

your function can be in earnest, or think the cause of religion, or morality, can want such slender support? God forbid they should" (p. 306). He further ridicules the rather titillating portions of the novel and expresses doubt that any clergyman could be unaffected by them, though many clergymen maintain they are able to retain their objectivity even when Pamela has "all the pride of ornament cast off." Parson Tickletext's frequent references to the "emotion" that the novel produces in him exclude him from the category of objective readers, and Fielding, through Oliver, indicates that the majority of clergymen probably are affected as intensely as Tickletext, though they nonetheless extol Pamela's modesty:

And notwithstanding our author's professions of modesty ... I cannot agree that my daughter should entertain herself with some of his pictures; which I do not expect to be contemplated without emotion, unless by one of my age and temper, who can see the girl lie on her back, with one arm round Mrs. Jewkes and the other round the squire, naked in bed, with his hand on her breasts, &c., with as much indifference as I read any other page in the whole novel. But surely this, and some other descriptions, will not be put into the hands of his daughter by any wise man, though I believe it will be difficult for him to keep them from her; especially if the clergy in town have cried and preached it up as you say. (p. 307)

Not only are the clergy being corrupted by some of the explicit parts of the novel, but they are encouraging the corruption of others, especially young maidens--by reading the novel to them and preaching it from the pulpit.

Oliver's well-reasoned arguments are the marks of a good clergyman; furthermore, Oliver is untainted by Methodism and

undeceived by the opinion of the majority of other clergymen who are blindly praising a worthless book to the detriment of their clerical office. Though he appears to be a good man, all we know of Oliver is what we perceive through his letters, so that it would be difficult to consider him seriously as the model cleric in Fielding's fiction, just as one cannot point to Tickletext as the most corrupt clergyman since his personality, too, emerges only through two brief pages of his correspondence.

The most memorable of Fielding's clergymen and perhaps of all his characters is good Parson Adams. He remains a controversial figure among critics even today, who dispute whether Adams's innocence is a virtue or a flaw--an issue that I will explore at length in this section. Robert Alter sums up this controversy by stating that Adams "can still be fairly described as one of the few completely engaging representations in fiction of a good Christian, a character of perfect simplicity," but Alter adds: "Much of his moral and psychological credibility derives from Fielding's artistic awareness that even perfect simplicity has its necessary complications, its ambiguities."⁵² Indeed, Adams is an ambiguous character, regarded by some as a fool and by others as a candidate for sainthood.

Certainly one could not dispute the fact that Adams is supremely a man of charity who not only has the word in his mouth, as does Trulliber, but who takes every opportunity to show kindness to those he encounters and to condemn those who

fail to practice Christian charity. In his conversation with Trulliber, Adams recognizes Trulliber's hypocrisy, accusing him of not following the Scriptures and of being an advocate of faith alone rather than a practitioner of good works, and Trulliber replies that Adams has no right to disparage faith and the Scriptures. This comment does not suppress Adams, who states that Trulliber must disbelieve the Scriptures because of the way he is acting:

'Their commands are so explicit, and their rewards and punishments so immense, that it is impossible a man should steadfastly believe without obeying. Now, there is no command more express, no duty more frequently enjoined, than charity. Whoever, therefore, is void of charity, I make no scruple of pronouncing that he is no Christian.' (pp. 141-142)

Adams sounds as if he were reading directly from "An Apology for the Clergy" when expressing these sentiments to Trulliber. Unquestionably, Adams is the most charitable of Fielding's clergymen, and since Fielding values charity above all other virtues, Adams earns a high score in clerical conduct. Throughout Joseph Andrews, Fielding presents us with examples of this virtue at work through Adams. Adams willingly offers to give an impoverished Catholic priest his last coin--until he discovers that the cruel squire has robbed him of it--and Adams tells the priest: "'If I had the greatest sum in the world--ay, if I had ten pounds about me--I would bestow it all to rescue any Christian from distress'" (p. 215). In other charitable actions, Adams starts on a difficult journey

to London to sell his sermons so that he can give the money to his family; he shares everything he owns with Joseph and Fanny; and in the spirit of the early Christian apostles, expects everyone to show charity toward him, from fellow clergymen to innkeepers along the road.

Because he practices charity and believes strongly in it, Adams is adamant in his dislike of Methodists. He states his opinion of the faith versus good works doctrine of the Methodists by commenting on George Whitefield:

'When he began to call nonsense and enthusiasm to his aid, and set up the detestable doctrine of faith against good works, I was his friend no longer; for surely, that doctrine was coined in hell, and one would think none but the devil himself could have the confidence to preach it. For can anything be more derogatory to the honour of God than for men to imagine that the all-wise Being will hereafter say to the good and virtuous, 'Notwithstanding the purity of thy life, notwithstanding that constant rule of virtue and goodness in which you walked upon earth, still, as thou didst not believe everything in the true orthodox manner, thy want of faith shall condemn thee!?' Or, on the other side, can any doctrine have a more pernicious influence on society, than a persuasion that it will be a good plea for the villain at the last day: 'Lord, it is true, I never obeyed one of thy commandments, yet punish me not, for I believe them all!?' (p. 67)

This reductio ad absurdum is effective in satirizing Methodism and in making Latitudinarianism seem attractive. Adams and Fielding believe that a person's actions, if virtuous, are more important than faith in securing everlasting life, and if this is so, Adams will be one of the few clergymen in Fielding's fiction to enter heaven.

Besides an unwavering commitment to charity, Adams is intent upon preserving the good reputation of clergymen, and for this to occur, he, like his creator, Fielding, insists that certain standards be maintained for one to merit consideration as a true clergyman. Adams describes the kind of clergyman Fielding hates--men like Barnabas, Trulliber, and Williams in particular--as "'some few designing factious men, who have it at heart to establish some favorite schemes at the price of the liberty of mankind, and the very essence of religion ...'" (p. 68). At one point, Adams is called upon to counter the argument of a squire who, before tricking Adams and his party, comments for Fielding on the vanity and conceit of clergymen he knows:

'The parson of our parish, instead of esteeming his poor parishioners as a part of his family, seems rather to consider them as not of the same species with himself. He seldom speaks to any, unless some few of the richest of us; nay, indeed, he will not move his hat to the others.... But if such temporal pride is ridiculous, surely the spiritual is odious and detestable; if such a puffed-up empty human bladder, strutting in princely robes, justly moves one's derision, surely in the habit of a priest it must raise our scorn.' (p. 146)

Though the speaker is himself deceptive and cruel, what he says is nonetheless valid, and Adams too is disgusted by such unholy men in holy garb. His rebuttal to the squire's diatribe shows his lack of pretention and his sincerity:

'I should be ashamed of my cloth if I thought a poor man, who is honest, below my notice or my familiarity. I know not how those who think

otherwise can profess themselves followers and servants of Him who made no distinction, unless, peradventure, by preferring the poor to the rich.' (p. 165)

For Adams, and for Fielding, vanity is a serious flaw, and Adams, in large measure, is devoid of it.

To further define the qualities of a good clergyman, Adams conceives of a clergyman as a "father" to his parishioners, and through him Fielding reiterates the functions of a true clergyman mentioned in "An Apology for the Clergy":

'Who clothes you with piety, meekness, humility, charity, patience, and all the other Christian virtues? Who feeds your souls with the milk of brotherly love, and diets them with all the dainty food of holiness, which at once cleanses them of all impure carnal affections, and fattens them with the truly rich spirit of grace?' (p. 156)

Adams can honestly answer that he fulfills all these fatherly functions, as seen especially in the beautiful incident in the novel when Joseph and Fanny are reunited. Adams is so overjoyed to see his "children" together that he tosses his favorite book, Aeschylus, into the fire and thinks nothing of it until later. As Fielding observes: "Some philosophers may perhaps doubt whether he was not the happiest of the three: for the goodness of his heart enjoyed the blessings which were exalting in the breasts of both the other two, together with his own" (p. 131). Adams's conduct is an example of what Fielding admires in a clergyman: kindness, unselfishness, and joy in another's joy. Certainly Adams's parishioners welcome his goodness and his fatherly qualities, for upon

his return to the parish they behave in this manner:

They flocked about him like dutiful children round an indulgent parent, and vied with each other in demonstrations of duty and love. The parson on his side shook everyone by the hand, inquiring heartily after the healths of all that were absent, of their children and relations; and express a satisfaction in his face which nothing but benevolence made happy by its objects could infuse. (p. 236)

Robert Alter questions Adams's relationship with his parishioners, however, by pointing out that "though Adams has the affection of his parishioners, he is in many ways painfully alienated from the world they inhabit."⁵³ This might be true but it does not detract from Adams's effectiveness as a clergyman. Obviously, he is doing something right, or he would not receive the kind of reception that his parishioners give him, and what he is doing is setting a standard of kindness for all to follow.

Besides humility (most of the time), charity, fairness, dedication, and the ability to inspire his parishioners to love him, Parson Adams has two other positive qualities that contribute to his assets as an "almost true" clergyman: he is relentless in following God's law and his conscience rather than the unfair and unlawful demands of others, and he has a deep devotion to the sacraments. The first positive quality is most evident when Lady Booby orders Adams not to publish the nuptial banns of Joseph and Fanny, pointing out that Adams owes her his service, to which Adams angrily replies: "'I know not what your ladyship means by the terms 'master' and 'service.' I am in the service of a Master who will never

discard me for doing my duty ...' (p. 241). This is no cowering Parson Supple speaking, but a man who refuses to become a clerical parasite. Adams articulates--as Supple fails to do--some important concepts: that there is a higher law beyond earthly law by which people should abide--even if it means the loss of earthly possessions, and that one should be true to his values in spite of pressures to conform to another's viewpoint. This attitude should be important to all people, but especially to clergymen who, as Adams rightly points out, serve a Master higher than any earthly figure--a point that Fielding repeatedly makes in "An Apology for the Clergy."

Adams's other asset--his deep devotion to the sacraments--appears at the marriage of Joseph and Fanny, and for his performance Adams receives the highest tribute that Fielding gives to any of his clergymen:

Mr. Adams performed the ceremony; at which nothing was so remarkable as the extraordinary and unaffected modesty of Fanny, unless the true Christian piety of Adams, who publicly rebuked Mr. Booby and Pamela for laughing in so sacred a place, and so solemn an occasion. Our parson would have done no less to the highest prince on earth: for, though he paid all submission and deference to his superiors in other matters, where the least spice of religion intervened, he immediately lost all respect of persons. (p. 296)

Having considered all of Adams's many assets as a clergyman, it is now necessary to look at those defects that remove him from the category of model cleric according to Fielding's standards in "An Apology for the Clergy." Adams is flawed

in several areas. Sean Shesgreen notes that Adams is "vain about his learning, unrealistic about its relevance and, like most of Fielding's heroes, is naive about his own nature and human nature in general...."⁵⁴ Hamilton Macallister adds that Adams is "humourless, prosy, vain ... has no ability to gauge the person he is talking to; to adopt himself to his surroundings. He has no knowledge of the world--he assumes naively his sermons will be a gold-mine. He is taken in by everybody he meets."⁵⁵ A successful clergyman cannot be gullible, cannot be taken in by far-fetched stories or acts of false kindness; he must retain a balance between an awareness of the world's problems and the failings of humanity, and a tendency to become too cynical. Fielding makes these points in "An Apology for the Clergy" when he states that a clergyman "must be of greatly superior dignity, and honour to any of those whose business is at most the regulation or well-being of the body only!" (p. 264). Furthermore, a clergyman must be able to "point out and lead men into the ways of virtue and holiness by the frequent admonitions of their precepts, and the constant guide of their examples" (p. 274). Throughout Joseph Andrews, however, Adams tends to react to adverse situations by using violence, always being ready to subdue an enemy with his fists, while his love for drinking and for the companionship of the tavern make him hardly an example of temperance and moderation; thus Adams's constant guidance is not always in the right direction, nor is it reinforced with consistently good examples. Moreover, Adams,

as "first man" trying to learn how to cope with the world, remains a somewhat naive bumbler, and perhaps this behavior can be attributed to his unyielding devotion to books as the source of all knowledge--a devotion that makes it difficult for him to recognize the follies of men and the treachery of the real world. He believes books and private tutoring to be the only important means of improvement and therefore learns little from experience. Such blindness to the real world can cause a clergyman to suffer personally and to be somewhat ineffective in helping people to face and to overcome their problems, because one must acknowledge the problems of the world and of humanity before one can help alleviate them. Adams does a remarkable job of helping people in spite of his innocence, but he could do a far better job were he not so gullible, not so ready to trust every person, not so easily deceived and consequently so easily hurt. Morris Golden states that Fielding has "contempt for the completely innocent":

Aside from the absurdity of Adams, Fielding's other ambivalent references to quixotism show that however he admires a mind virtuously insulated against the world, he nonetheless sees it as ridiculous and self-defeating in its refusal or inability to understand how to cope with actuality.... Holy idiots, men who are good without the qualifications of greatness, seem to Fielding almost babies, and babies cannot act effectively.⁵⁶

Robert Alter further condemns Adams by pointing out that he is "astonishingly unseeing for a faithful guide...."⁵⁷ Several incidents in Joseph Andrews show Fielding satirizing Adams for his gullibility. At one of the numerous roadhouses at

which Adams stops on his journey, he overhears two men presenting different opinions about the same man, one of them obviously lying, and Adams cannot believe that anyone would deliberately tell lies because of a grudge toward someone, as he proclaims to the innkeeper:

'Out of love to yourself, you should confine yourself to truth ... for by doing otherwise, you injure the noblest part of yourself, your immortal soul. I can hardly believe any man such an idiot to risk the loss of that by any trifling gain, and the greatest gain in this world is but dirt in comparison of what shall be revealed hereafter.' (p. 81)

While Adams's beliefs are admirable, they are hardly realistic, because lying is a prominent part of everyday life and an activity in which people engage without thinking about the afterlife, as Adams believes they do. Later, Adams is easily taken in by the rich squire's profuse offers of hospitality, never entertaining the least suspicion toward him because he does not believe people would lie intentionally, though Joseph and Fanny suspect the squire from the start. Joseph, familiar with the deceitful tactics of rich men, explains the squire's plan to Adams, who is shocked. If Adams were more aware of the ways of the world, he would not be hurt as easily or cause others to be hurt, and he would be the faithful guide that Fielding expects a clergyman to be according to "An Apology for the Clergy."

Related to his naivete is Adams's impracticality and his absent-mindedness, traits for which Fielding satirizes him repeatedly, though these traits are far from being as serious

as other clerical vices. Adams, wrapped up in Aeschylus or thoughts of God, forgets his sermons, his horse, and his traveling companions, and one might be led to wonder if sometimes he even forgets to go to the church on Sunday to lead the services. Furthermore, his lack of common sense makes him unable to extricate himself and his companions from perilous situations. He seems to lack an ability to explain clearly what has happened, and Fielding pokes fun at him in one particular scene after Adams and Fanny have been arrested for allegedly committing robbery. Adams is unable to tell the justice the truth about what happened and when his authenticity as a clergyman is questioned, he lacks the common sense to prove his knowledge of Greek and Latin--and thus his clerical identity--leading everyone to suspect he is a fraud and almost resulting in the imprisonment of him and Fanny. A good clergyman, as someone able to "lead men ... by the constant guide of their examples," would be able to look at such situations and decide on effective tactics for coping with them, but this is something Adams is rarely able to do.

Fielding also gently pokes fun at Adams for the kind of pastoral advice he gives Joseph on several occasions, for this advice is a little too unrealistic and is even difficult for Adams to follow when he faces his own tragedy in the "drowning" of his son. Adams's first bit of unrealistic, though highly moral, advice to Joseph is presented after Fanny is kidnapped, and it should in some parts remind one of Thwackum's speech to Tom Jones while Tom is recovering from his accident:

'You are to consider you are a Christian; that no accident happens to us without the Divine permission, and that it is the duty of a man, much more of a Christian, to submit. We did not make ourselves; but the same Power which made us rules over us, and we are absolutely at his disposal; he may do with us what he pleases, nor have we any right to complain. A second reason against our complaint is our ignorance, for, as we know not future events, so neither can we tell to what purpose any accident tends; and that which at first threatens us with evil may in the end produce our good.... You are a man, and consequently a sinner; and this may be a punishment to you for your sins.... Thirdly, our impotency of relieving ourselves demonstrates the folly and absurdity of our complaints; for whom do we resist, or against whom do we complain, but a Power from whose shafts no armour can guard us, no speed can fly? A Power which leaves us no hope but in submission.' (pp. 224-225)

All of this causes Joseph to exclaim: "'O! you have not spoken one word of comfort to me yet!'" (p. 225). Adams has done little to comfort Joseph, but has only mouthed pious, trite phrases. Later, Joseph, anxious to marry Fanny, asks that Adams marry them without a license. Adams chides Joseph for his impatience and fear of losing Fanny and urges him to sacrifice, to be patient, to stifle his passions--since it is foolish and unchristian to grieve--and to trust in God's will:

'When any accident threatens us, we are not to despair, nor, when it overtakes us, to grieve; we must submit in all things to the will of Providence, and not set our affections so much on anything here, as not to be able to quit it without reluctance. You are a young man, and can know but little of this world; I am older, and have seen a great deal. All passions are criminal in their excess; and even love itself, if it is not subservient to our duty, may render us blind to it. Had Abraham so loved his son

Isaac as to refuse the sacrifice required, is there any of us who would not condemn him? ... Now believe me, no Christian ought so to set his heart on any person or thing in this world, but that, whenever it shall be required or taken from him in any manner by Divine Providence, he may be able, peaceably, quietly, and contentedly to resign it.' (p. 265)

With Adams's advice still fresh in Joseph's mind, the most amusing scene in the novel takes place, and in it Fielding directs a strong satirical attack against Adams for failing to guide through example, a clerical prerequisite. Like Abraham, the Jewish patriarch whom Adams himself has mentioned in making his point to Joseph, Abraham Adams is called upon by God to make a sacrifice, but unlike Abraham, Parson Adams is unable to do God's will. The irony is that all through the novel, when any misfortune befell another person, Adams would console this person with Christian doctrinal arguments, urge resignation and sacrifice to the will of God, and stress that grief is unchristian. Such preaching was fine as long as Adams himself was not a victim of misfortune, but when Adams learns that his youngest and favorite son, Dick, has "drowned," he is overwhelmed by grief, and Joseph now assumes the role of comforter:

Joseph, who was overwhelmed with concern likewise, recovered himself sufficiently to endeavour to comfort the parson; in which attempt he used many arguments that he had at several times remembered out of his [Adams] own discourses, both in private and public ... but he was not at leisure now to hearken to his advice. (p. 265)

Adams sincerely believes in the idea of complete acceptance

of whatever fate God ordains for people, but when he is assigned his own personal tragedy, he cannot suppress his emotional response of grief no matter how much he has preached this very action.

Luckily, Adams's "tragedy" is not a tragedy after all, for his son miraculously survives the drowning and walks into the house dripping water; this unexpected event causes another humorous transformation in Adams, who now advises Joseph: "No, Joseph, do not give too much way to thy passions, if thou dost expect happiness" (p. 266). Understandably, Joseph is forced to reply sarcastically to this turnabout:

The patience of Joseph, nor perhaps of Job, could bear no longer; he interrupted the parson, saying, 'It was easier to give advice than to take it; nor did he perceive he could so entirely conquer himself, when he apprehended he had lost his son, or when he found him recovered.' (pp. 266-267)

In one final area Adams is deficient as a clergyman. In "An Apology for the Clergy," Fielding stresses that a clergyman "must be of greatly superior dignity, and noncur...." Yet on several occasions, Adams emerges as a very undignified buffoon, and as a comic figure rather than a figure of dignity. In one scene, he and Joseph are covered with blood dumped on them from a tub in an inn kitchen, and one could hardly call Adams dignified as he stands there with blood dripping from his body. Later, in the famous "musical beds" scene, Adams's clerical dignity is further reduced when Mrs. Slipslop, among others, becomes his bed partner. If Fielding

sincerely intended for Adams to be the clerical model he defines in "An Apology for the Clergy," one can only wonder why he presents him in so many situations that destroy his dignity and cause him to be an occasionally misguided leader of others--situations that focus on his impracticality, absent-mindedness, tendency to give unrealistic advice, and naivete. If Adams were intended as the model, it seems that Fielding would have streamlined his character, removing all the ambiguities and at least a few more of the flaws. Even so, he remains the most lovable of all Fielding's clergymen..

In "An Apology for the Clergy," Fielding calls for a clergyman of "greatly superior dignity and honour," and one who will "point out and lead men into the ways of virtue and holiness by the frequent admonitions of their precepts, and the constant guide of their examples." Based on this description, one could label Dr. Harrison in Amelia as Fielding's model cleric. Indeed, Harrison comes closest of all the clergymen to living up to Fielding's standards. The first mention of Dr. Harrison's name in Amelia is in a favorable context, when Miss Matthews, speaking to Booth in prison, tells him that Harrison is "'one of the best men in the world ... and an honor to the sacred order to which he belongs'" (v. 1, p. 79). Harrison is quite concerned with the members of his flock, notably Amelia, whom he guards as a jealous parent against the assaults of men such as Booth. Once recognizing

in this advice, a request which Harrison readily obliges. When Amelia explains to Harrison James's true motives for wanting Booth out of the country, Harrison tells Amelia that he has been used:

'I believe my own vanity is a little hurt in having been so grossly imposed upon. Indeed, I had a very high regard for this man; for, besides the great character given him by your husband, and the many facts I have heard so much redounding to his honor, he hath the fairest and most promising appearance I have ever yet beheld. A good face, they say, is a letter of recommendation. O Nature, Nature, why art thou so dishonest as ever to send men with these false recommendations into the world?' (v. 2, p. 144.)

In this speech, one should be reminded of Parson Adams at his most gullible, but this is one of the rare occasions on which Harrison is deceived. In fact, Harrison has a tendency to be too suspicious, a flaw which lessens him in comparison to Fielding's ideal clergyman who should be "humble, charitable, benevolent, void of envy, void of pride, void of vanity ..." (p. 283). Because he is so suspicious of the motives of others, he sometimes makes rash judgments---motivated by his own vain sense of the accuracy of his interpretation. The most notable incident of Harrison's suspicious nature involves his sending Booth to prison because of Booth's large debts to him. Harrison hears from his parishioners that the Booths are squandering the money he lent them on frills and pleasures. Harrison accepts his parishioners' account, and hastens to London where he visits Amelia. There he sees a

gold watch and some trinkets that he assumes the Booths have foolishly bought, but which in reality have been given them by a nobleman who likes Amelia. Harrison is outraged at his discovery:

This account tallied so well with the ideas he had imbibed of Booth's extravagance in the country that he firmly believed both the husband and wife to be the vainest, silliest, and most unjust people alive. It was, indeed, almost incredible that two rational beings should be guilty of such absurdity; but, monstrous and absurd as it was, ocular demonstration appeared to be the evidence against them. (v. 2, p. 124)

Harrison is so convinced--in his narrow, suspicious way--that he is correct in his judgment of the Booths that he does not even ask them about the trinkets, but instead hastily orders Booth's arrest. Fielding implies that a true clergyman would have been more careful and would have checked his sources a bit more circumspectly rather than automatically passing judgment based solely on "ocular demonstration." In his portrait of the model cleric, Fielding states that a clergyman should be "truly sorry for the sins and misfortunes of men," yet Harrison seems to clasp his hands in glee as he orders Booth's arrest, feeling that his opinion has been justified, that he has seen with his own eyes Booth's sins and errors. Then Harrison begins thinking about the terrible burden he has placed on Amelia and the children by having Booth arrested, but convinces himself that all the blame should fall on Booth:

The children, who were to be utterly undone with their father, were entirely innocent; and as for Amelia herself, though he thought he had most convincing proofs of very blamable levity, yet his former friendship and affection to her were busy to invent every excuse, till, by very heavily loading the husband, they lightened the suspicion against the wife. (v. 2, p. 124)

When strong evidence of Booth's innocence begins to emerge, Harrison realizes that though he still distrusts Booth, he must support his release from prison since Amelia seems to want it:

This worthy clergyman, who was not desirous of finding proofs to condemn the captain or to justify his own vindictive proceedings, but on the contrary, rejoiced heartily in every piece of evidence which tended to clear up the character of his friend, gave a ready ear to all which Amelia said. To this, indeed, he was induced by the love he always had for that lady, by the good opinion he entertained of her, as well as by pity for her present condition than which nothing appeared more miserable.... (v. 2, p. 125)

Harrison, so convinced of the accuracy of his judgments about Booth, would probably have allowed the man to rot in prison, had it not been for Amelia's power over him. One can hardly admire a clergyman who plays favorites so readily.

In one sense, Harrison's suspiciousness can be said to be a good quality, for it enables him to avoid being made a fool--a fate which Parson Adams is often unable to avoid. Harrison knows the world, and for the most part judges people accurately, which helps him to gain respect for his clerical office from those who normally regard the clergy

as naive bumblers. In one instance, Harrison goes to visit a nobleman in order to recommend Booth to him and to ask for his help. The nobleman tells him:

'He would promise nothing, and could give him no hopes of success; but you may be assured ... I shall do him all the service in my power.' A language which the doctor well understood; and soon after took a civil, but not a very ceremonious leave. (v. 2, p. 253)

Harrison knows the political ropes and unlike Adams, is not taken in by empty promises.

In most instances, Harrison follows Fielding's model for clerical conduct in the way he treats his parishioners. Fielding comments that a good clergyman "is entrusted with the care of our souls, over which he is to watch as a shepherd for his sheep: to feed the rich with precept and example, and the poor with meat also" (p. 283). Harrison fulfills most of this obligation, as Booth tells Miss Matthews in prison:

'All his parishioners, whom he treats as his children, regard him as their common father. Once in a week he constantly visits every house in the parish, examines, commends, and rebukes, as he finds occasion. This is practised likewise by his curate in his absence; and so good an effect is produced by this their care, that no quarrels ever proceed either to blows or lawsuits; no beggar is to be found in the whole parish; nor did I ever hear a very profane oath all the time I lived in it.' (v. 1, p. 164)

Moreover, Harrison is a man of charity, a quality for which he is sometimes ridiculed--especially by ambitious young clerics such as Tom and Tom's father, who tells his son:

'I never told you he was a wise man, nor did I ever think him so. If he had any understanding, he would have been a bishop long ago, to my certain knowledge. But, indeed, he hath been always a fool in private life; for I question whether he is worth £100 in the world more than his annual income. He hath given away above half his fortune to the Lord knows who.' (v. 2, pp. 178-179)

Fielding also suggests that a clergyman should "live in daily communication with his flock, and chiefly with those who want him most (as the poor and distressed) ..." (p. 283). Harrison does visit his parishioners when he is home, but he frequently leaves them to go on long journeys, and while he is gone, they often seem to forget his Christian example. Indeed, it is they--Harrison's parishioners--who turn on Booth and Amelia as soon as Harrison departs on one of these journeys, and when he returns, these parishioners give him a very biased view of the Booths' conduct, which leads to the incident in London resulting in Booth's imprisonment. A clergyman's duty is to lead by precept and example, yet though Harrison has tried to set a good example, apparently his goodness is not always transferred to his parishioners--as it is in Adams's parish--and for this one can fault him as a spiritual leader. His own spirituality and charity exist, it is true, but charity--at least toward the Booths--is notably lacking in his followers.

Perhaps even more significant than his inability to inspire his parishioners to follow his charitable example is Harrison's sense of obligation to his patron, the Earl, an

obligation which causes Harrison to be absent from the parish. Again, Booth tells Miss Matthews:

'You know, madam, the obligations he had to his patron the earl; indeed, it was impossible to be once in his company without hearing of them. I am sure you will neither wonder that he was chosen to attend the young lord in his travels as a tutor, nor that the good man, however disagreeable it might be (as in fact it was) to his inclination, should comply with the earnest request of his friend and patron.'
(v. 1, p. 167)

In "An Apology for the Clergy," Fielding warns of the danger of such divided loyalties and insists that clergymen abolish outside interests so that "nothing might prevent them from discharging their duties to the souls of men" (p. 278).

Apparently, Harrison is unable to limit his interests; as a result, his parishioners--especially the Booths--suffer.

Two other defects flaw Harrison's character and make him inadequate when compared to Fielding's model: he is quick-tempered, and he is vain, and Fielding specifically calls for a man of "patience" and one who is "void of pride, void of vanity ..." (p. 283). Harrison shows his impatience and quick temper in his treatment of Booth, and his vanity on several occasions. For example, when his letter on adultery is mocked at the masquerade, Harrison displays his pride, and Fielding notes that he is a victim of "the natural jealousy of an author ..." (v. 2, p. 204). He shows even more vanity about his sex when arguing with Mrs. Atkinson about proper conduct for men and women. Harrison and Atkinson en-

gage in verbal dueling throughout the novel, and out of these duels emerge Harrison's jealousy of Atkinson's learning and his stubborn beliefs about masculine superiority. Their encounters provide the finest comic touches in the novel, and illustrate that Harrison is not the "humble" clergyman of Fielding's article.

In spite of occasional outbursts of humor and wit, throughout much of the novel Harrison remains a stiff, somewhat remote character, lacking in Adams's defects, such as naivete and gullibility, yet also devoid of his ingratiating qualities. It is hard to love Harrison, and his remoteness makes it hard to admire him as a clergyman. Andrew Wright states:

Dr. Harrison is a major weakness in Amelia because he is seen too little to be anything much more than a half-deified deus ex machina, whereas he is obviously meant to occupy a position of the same order of centrality as does Squire Allworthy in Tom Jones. The good doctor is the proponent ... the champion of prudence....⁵⁸
But Dr. Harrison's is a prudence gone sour....

Robert Alter too finds Harrison's character unappealing:

"There are scarcely two attempts in the whole novel to show us Harrison's good-humoured jocularly, and one is hard put to think of a character in fiction whose supposed charm is easier to resist."⁵⁹

Personality evaluations aside, Harrison still fails to fulfill all of Fielding's requirements for the true or model clergyman, because in spite of his perception, charity,

ability to lead others, and dignified demeanor befitting a man of the cloth, he remains somewhat myopic, overly suspicious, vain, and proud. Though these defects might seem minor, they nonetheless lower Harrison in the eyes of most readers and cause him to fall short of the standards Fielding established for clergymen in the Champion articles.

VI. Conclusion

Though he comes closest to depicting the model cleric in his characterizations of Parson Adams and Dr. Harrison, Henry Fielding--either because he was unable to do so, or simply because he did not choose to do so--omits from his fiction a character whom we could label the "model cleric." Certainly Adams and Harrison practice the virtue Fielding regarded most highly--benevolent charity--yet both have at least one serious flaw: for Adams, it is naivete and the inability to be a dignified leader; while for Harrison, it is suspiciousness, along with impatience, vanity, and the inability to inspire his parishioners to follow his example of kindness and charity. All of these are defects that Fielding specifically condemns in "An Apology for the Clergy."

One can assume that because Fielding took the time to delineate the qualities of a true clergyman, he felt such a person could, in fact did, exist. Since he was an activist--a man who not only wrote about problems but attempted to do something about them (witness his attempts to reform the English legal system throughout the course of his career as a magistrate)--it would follow that the action he intended to take regarding clerical reform was to present in his fiction--his vehicle for change--a clergyman made in his image and measuring up to his standards. Somehow, between his intention and the end-product, there was a breakdown. I do not think we should conclude that Fielding felt the

"clergyman of his dreams" was too far removed from reality, and that no human being could be as perfect as the model he describes in "An Apology for the Clergy." If he felt this way, he would never have exposed his model to the scrutiny of hundreds of English people. Fielding viewed fiction as a tool not so much for entertaining as for instructing and improving, and as satirist regarded himself as a physician intent upon curing society's ills. He singled out as one of these ills a clerical body filled with defective members, and in his non-fiction articles prescribed the cure--the model cleric: a man of faith and good works who would lead eighteenth century people back to the basics of Christian teaching. Having completed phase one--the blueprint--Fielding needed to bring the design to life--to breathe into it and give it a fictional life so that it would become "real" for the people of his times and therefore be more meaningful to them. Fielding breathed life into several of his clergymen but left them somewhat uninspired and somehow inferior to the blueprint he had developed. As master craftsman in the world of satire and fiction, his supreme creation--his model clergyman--never seemed to materialize. We can only conclude that the articulation of the clerical model was a far easier task than the presentation of this model in a fictional character, or else Henry Fielding, of all writers interested in reform, certainly would have completed the cycle.

Notes

- 1 Sean Shesgreen, Literary Portraits in the Novels of Henry Fielding (Dekalb, Il.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1972), p. 105.
- 2 Ronald Paulson, Fielding: A Collection of Critical Essays (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 1.
- 3 Robert Alter, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 81.
- 4 A.S. Tuberville, English Men and Manners in the Eighteenth Century (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 287.
- 5 R.B. Mowat, England in the Eighteenth Century (New York: Robert M. McBride and Co., 1932), p. 40.
- 6 Mowat, p. 40.
- 7 Mowat, p. 44.
- 8 Frans Pieter Van Der Voorde, Henry Fielding: Critic and Satirist (New York: Haskell House, 1966), p. 162.
- 9 Tuberville, p. 290.
- 10 Martin C. Battestin, The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art (New York, Russell and Russell, 1962), pp. 130-131. Battestin states, "Writers from the Restoration on regretted the low social position of the majority of those in orders, and many tried to explain and rectify it, but disdain of the clergy was still very much in vogue when Fielding undertook the writing of The Champion and Joseph Andrews."
- 11 Van Der Voorde, p. 20.
- 12 Battestin, p. 130.
- 13 Mowat, p. 48.
- 14 Battestin, pp. 83-84.

- 15 Battestin, Twentieth Century Interpretations of Tom Jones (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 10.
- 16 Michael Irwin, Henry Fielding: The Tentative Realist (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 9.
- 17 Hamilton Macallister, Fielding (New York, Arco, 1971), p. 23.
- 18 Morris Golden, Fielding's Moral Psychology (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1966), p. 72.
- 19 Paulson, Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth Century England (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1966), p. 70.
- 20 Paulson, p. 72.
- 21 Macallister, p. 67.
- 22 Henry Fielding, The Champion, ed. William Ernest Henley (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902). All further references are taken from this text.
- 23 Golden, p. 1.
- 24 Van Der Voorde, p. 10.
- 25 Van Der Voorde, p. 185.
- 26 Mary Claire Randolph, "The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire," Philological Quarterly, XXI (Oct. 1942), p. 369.
- 27 Randolph, p. 373.
- 28 Fielding, Joseph Andrews and Shamela, ed. Martin C. Battestin (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961), pp. 304-305. All further references are taken from this text.
- 29 Glenn W. Hatfield, Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 137.
- 30 Hugh Amory, "'Shamela' as Aesopic Satire," English Literary History, XXXVIII (1971), p. 244. Amory goes so far as to suggest that Williams is a political manipulator whom Fielding modeled after Robert Walpole, British prime minister under George I. Amory terms Williams a "Tartuffe" who is "plotting to eliminate the gentry's control of the clergy while availing himself of their patronage." I hesitate to accept Amory's contention that Shamela is primarily a "political romance," but there is no question that Williams is an arch-manipulator.

- 31 Maurice Johnson, Fielding's Art of Fiction (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 35.
- 32 Battestin, The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art, p. 82.
- 33 Fielding, Tom Jones, ed. William Ernest Henley (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902). All further references are taken from this text.
- 34 Fielding, Amelia, ed. William Ernest Henley (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902). All further references are taken from this text.
- 35 Battestin, p. 143.
- 36 Sean Shesgreen indicates that Fielding makes Trulliber an "emblem for gluttony by having the farmer-parson resemble his hogs as closely as natural detail will permit" (p. 92). He adds that Trulliber's name "is a latinized form of the colloquial 'trullibub' ... which means the entrails or innards of an animal, and the word was commonly used as a jeering appellation for a fat man" (p. 92). This is in keeping with Fielding's practice of giving facetious names to low and comic characters. (See I.P. Watt, "The Naming of Characters in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding," The Review of English Studies, XXV (1949), p. 335.
- 37 Douglas Brooks points to the similarities between this scene in Joseph Andrews and the scene in The Odyssey in which Odysseus visits the swineherd, Eumaeus. Odysseus receives charitable treatment from Eumaeus, but Adams is not treated very charitably by Trulliber. Part of Trulliber's uncharitable action derives from the fact that Adams turns out not to be the hog-buyer that Trulliber mistakes him for. Brooks points out that Trulliber mistakenly greets Adams as a hog-buyer, and pushes him into the pig-sty to look over the merchandise: "Trulliber, the hypocritical, farming parson, paints Adams in his own mode of living, a mode which is that of brutishness and intemperance ... Adams symbolically rejects this when, once on his feet, he escapes from the hogs' reach, crying out ... 'I am a Clergyman, Sir, and am not come to buy Hogs.'" Douglas Brooks, "Abraham Adams and Parson Trulliber: The Meaning of 'Joseph Andrews' Book II, Chapter 14," Modern Language Review, LXIII (1968), p. 797.
- 38 Hatfield, pp. 142-143.
- 39 Brooks, p. 798.
- 40 Fielding, Jonathan Wild, ed. William Ernest Henley (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902), p. 193. All further references are taken from this text.

41 Shesgreen, p. 120.

42 Battestin states that Thwackum is "the ferocious and pharisaical upholder of orthodoxy who demonstrates the doctrines of natural depravity and grace by frequent applications of birch to the posteriors of his pupils." Battestin, Twentieth Century Interpretations of Tom Jones, p. 8.

43 Shesgreen, p. 115.

44 Golden, p. 95.

45 Alter, p. 90.

46 Van Der Voorde, p. 164.

47 Van Der Voorde, p. 119.

48 Shesgreen, p. 116.

49 Sheldon Sacks, Fielding and the Shape of Belief (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), p. 133.

50 Hatfield, p. 186.

51 Macallister, p. 59.

52 Alter, pp. 84-85.

53 Alter, p. 82.

54 Shesgreen, p. 90.

55 Macallister, p. 71.

56 Golden, pp. 138-139.

57 Alter, p. 81. Alter goes on to say that Adams, "though genuinely selfless in some ways, is egotistically fixed on his own learning, his own sermons, his own theories about life ..." (p. 83). Yet other critics view Adams's innocence as something good and as Fielding's vehicle for attacking the intricate system of duplicity that characterized his society. Adams almost unconsciously digs his way into the heart of the corruption, and Ronald Paulson believes that "the emphasis of disapproval in a Fielding hero falls more decidedly on the society through which he moves than on the impractical hero himself ..." (p. 120, Satire and the Novel). Shesgreen, supporting Paulson on this point, notes that "we are to see Adams as a plain, blunt person of the highest integrity and also as a naive, other-worldly figure whose idealism is exceeded only by his innocence, which permits him to function in a satiric

role by passing implicit judgments on the immorality around him" (p. 91).

Another critic who enters into the flaw/virtue dichotomy regarding Adams's innocence is Andrew Wright, who maintains that Adams's innocence is a good quality: "To see far, to be profound, to be clever--these are to go down the paths of trickery and deceit; vanity and hypocrisy have an easier time establishing themselves on such soil. The armour of a good man is, to a certain extent, his very inability to see." Andrew Wright, Henry Fielding: Mask and Feast (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), p. 156. Wright adds that Adams "thrives" in his own dream world, a world he has created "in his own image, a world wherein men are kindly, women are virtuous, and sermons publishable" (p. 17).

58 Wright, p. 169.

59 Alter, p. 162.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alter, Robert. Fielding and the Nature of the Novel. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Amory, Hugh. "'Shamela' as Aesopic Satire." English Literary History, XXXVIII (1971), 239-253.
- Battestin, Martin C. The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- . "The Problem of 'Amelia': Hume, Barrow, and the Conversion of Captain Booth." English Literary History, XLI (1974), 613-648.
- . Twentieth Century Interpretations of Tom Jones. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Brooks, Douglas. "Abraham Adams and Parson Trulliber: The Meaning of 'Joseph Andrews,' Book II, Chapter 14." Modern Language Review, LXIII (1968), 794-801.
- Fielding, Henry. Amelia. Ed. William Ernest Henley. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902.
- . The Champion. Ed. William Ernest Henley. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902.
- . Jonathan Wild. Ed. William Ernest Henley. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902.
- . Joseph Andrews and Shamela. Ed. Martin C. Battestin. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
- . Tom Jones. Ed. William Ernest Henley. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1902.
- Golden, Morris. Fielding's Moral Psychology. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1966.
- Hatfield, Glenn W. Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Irwin, Michael. Henry Fielding: The Tentative Realist. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

- Irwin, W.R. "Satire and Comedy in the Works of Henry Fielding." English Literary History, XIII (1946), 168-188.
- Johnson, Maurice. Fielding's Art of Fiction. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Macallister, Hamilton. Fielding. New York: Arco, 1971.
- Palmer, E. Taiwo. "Irony in 'Tom Jones.'" Modern Language Review, LXVI (1971), 497-510.
- Palmer, Eustace. "'Amelia'--The Decline of Fielding's Art." Essays in Criticism, XXI (1971), 135-151.
- Paulson, Ronald. Fielding: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Satire and the Novel in Eighteenth Century England. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Randolph, Mary Claire. "The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire." Philological Quarterly, XXI (1942), 368-384.
- Sacks, Sheldon. Fielding and the Shape of Belief. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Sherburn, George. "Fielding's Social Outlook." Philological Quarterly, XXXV (1956), 1-23.
- Shesgreen, Sean. Literary Portraits in the Novels of Henry Fielding. Dekalb, Il.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1972..
- Van Der Voorde, Frans Pieter. Henry Fielding: Critic and Satirist. New York: Haskell House, 1966.
- Wright, Andrew. Henry Fielding: Mask and Feast. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965.

Secondary Sources

- Allott, Miriam. "A Note of Fielding's Mr. Square." Modern Language Review, LVI (1961), 69-72.
- Booth, Wayne C. A Rhetoric of Irony. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Curtis, Lewis Perry. Anglican Moods of the Eighteenth Century. n.p.: Archon Books, 1966.

- Frye, Northrup. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Hodgart, Matthew. Satire. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.
- Humphreys, A.R. "Fielding's Irony: Its Methods and Effects." The Review of English Studies, XVIII (1942), 183-196.
- Hutchens, Eleanor N. "'Prudence' in 'Tom Jones': A Study of Connotative Irony." Philological Quarterly, XXXIX (1960), 496-507.
- Nowat, R.B. England in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Robert M. McBride and Co., 1932.
- Rawson, C.J. "Fielding's 'Good' Merchants: The Problem of Heartfree in 'Jonathan Wild' (With Comments on Other 'Good' Characters in Fielding)." Modern Philology, LXIX (1972), 292-313.
- Tuberville, A.S. English Men and Manners in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Watt, I.P. "The Naming of Characters in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding." The Review of English Studies, XXV (1949), 334-338.