Studies in Linguistics and Literature
ISSN 2573-6434 (Print) ISSN 2573-6426 (Online)
Vol. 6, No. 4, 2022
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/sll

Original Paper

Linguistic and Philosophical Features of Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones

Hosni Mostafa El-daly[1*]

[1] Department of Cognitive Sciences, United Arab Emirates University, P.O.Box: 15551, Al-Ain, U.A.E.

[*] Hosni Mostafa El-daly, Department of Cognitive Sciences, United Arab Emirates University, P.O.Box: 15551, Al-Ain, U.A.E.

Received: October 10, 2022 Accepted: October 22, 2022 Online Published: November 1, 2022

doi:10.22158/sll.v6n4p40 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/sll.v6n4p40

Abstract

Henry Fielding was one of the great novelists of the 18th century. Today, he is universally acknowledged as a major figure in the development of the novel. His literacy works have been evaluated by many critics. He proved exceptionally controversial and his reputation has variously soared and crashed in the course of three centuries. This study, first, attempts to scrutinize and perfectly judge the real value, essential nature and intrinsic aspects of Fielding's two classics, Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. It is claimed that on examining the works of Henry Fielding, concentration should be given to exploring the extent of the foreign influence on his works. Some critics are of the opinion that they are not incorporated within the framework of the picaresque novels. This study underscores the picaresque elements in the two classics, and stresses the similarities and points of resemblance between the English and Spanish picaresque novels. Second, this study examines the various stylistic features of Fielding's narrative technique, and his use of satire to discuss important concepts such as chastity and charity. Third, it attempts to show Fielding's philosophy of human nature, and to what extent his writing unfolds the basic philosophical characteristics of the 18th century lines of thinking. It concludes, among other things, that no narrative devices are worked out haphazardly or merely for amusement; rather, they are used for both didactic and artistic purposes. In this sense, then, the mark of shame bestowed by earlier critics on Fielding as intrusive narrator is eliminated on the account that his presence within the text is directed for teaching purposes. Goodness in his philosophy consists of the twin virtues of charity and chastity, and the latter is a symbol of the national control of passion.

Keywords

Stylistics and literary studies, Picaresque novels, Narration/point of view, Ironic technique, Fielding's philosophy, moral technique and his innovation

1. Introduction

Henry Fielding's literary works have been evaluated by many critics (Alter, 1964; Apostoli, 2004; Ardila, 2010, 2015; Claude, 2007; Eisenberg, 2018; Jakubjakova, 2017; Mancing, 2015; Tomoiaga, 2012; Wicks, 2002; Birke, 2015; Iser, 1978; Preston, 1968; O'Halloran, 2007). At present, there are, also, a number of political readings of Fielding's Tom Jones (Downie, 2009; Stevenson, 2005; Stevenson & Paulson, 2000; El-dali, 2021; Fleming, 2019).

Henry Fielding was one of the great novelists of the 18th century. For fully two hundred years, Fielding was usually seen as the great structuralist and technician and contrasted with Richardson "the great novelist". He was, sometimes, condemned for being crude and immoral; sometimes praised for realism, and sometimes defended, but hardly anyone saw him as a writer whose philosophical concern was moral instruction. The radical reorientation that occurred in the ways Fielding was read and understood is largely associated with Battestin's "The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art" (1959). For a majority of the critics of the last half century, moral sermonizing is what has been taken as "most characteristic" of Fielding. In this regard, Hume (2010) reminded us of two major issues: (1) just how wildly views of Fielding have varied, early and late; and (2) how radically the dominant late twentieth century reading contradicts 18th century assessments of Fielding and his work. Fielding's reputation, according to Rawson (1990), "always suffered from the 18th century cult of sensibility which professed itself too refined for scenes of coarse or low life, and too tender-hearted for satire". His disorderly personal life put ammunition into the hands of his literary enemies, who seized on the lowness of his fictional subjects with spiteful glee. In this regard, Hume (2010) points out that Fielding proved exceptionally controversial and his reputation has variously soared and crashed in the course of three centuries. For his time, he was much more radical writer than most readers now realize. His work features bastards and fornicators, the world of crime and squalor depicted even in the relatively exemplary Amelia bothered many of his genteel readers. He wrote about low subjects and did not always preserve the dignity of the clergy.

Today, Fielding is universally acknowledged as a major figure in the development of the novel, although there is still niggling about whether he or Richardson is the "father" of the British novel. According to Hume (2010), Fielding's writing has three major characteristics. The first is that he is experimental; in the sense that he is not trying to associate himself closely with predecessors and traditions. That is, he experiments, innovates, and takes chances. He does not stick to one or two models in drama or fiction and his debts to earlier writers are usually minimal. A second major feature of Fielding's writing is that it is circumstantial. He deals with and reacts to the events, issues, politics, quarrels, social problems, and stresses of his place and time. He does not imagine alternative worlds, idealized worlds, or past worlds. A third characteristic, according to Hume, is that Fielding's writing is didactic:

> I say this with some hesitation, because didacticism is not a positive

> quality for most present day readers, academic or otherwise, who regard it as boring, irritating, and preachy (Hume, 2010, p. 259).

The present study claims that a close reading of Henry Fielding can help illuminate intriguing aspects of his novels and its relationship with its philosophical and intellectual context; the role of contextualization in the creation of meaning; the idea that ideal character is of mixed nature, and the use of satire and irony and main features of Fielding's style, through which he attempts to capture the dual understanding of concepts such as "charity" and "chastity". In this sense, this study attempts to scrutinize and perfectly judge the real value, essential nature and intrinsic aspects of Fielding's "Joseph Andrews" and "Tom Jones". Relatedly, it attempts to show Fielding's philosophy of human nature and to what extent his writing unfold the basic philosophical characteristics of the 18th century lines of thinking. In this connection, Hume (2010, p. 260) made it clear that if we are trying to make sense of literature as it was written in the middle of the eighteenth century, we have to understand that most authors—Fielding prominent among them – genuinely wanted to change the thinking and behavior of their readers. They attempted to influence specific attitudes and actions related to particular events, persons, and ideas, as well as more general loyalties. They sought to persuade in personal, moral, and political terms. Relatedly, Battestin (1989) concurred in finding Fielding "fundamentally a moralist", but he insisted that "what is most memorable about Fielding is not his morality or his religion, but his comedy—the warm breath of language that animates his fiction. Fielding's writing is didactic but it is not preaching and there is a major difference. He presents us with "realistic" lives and characters; realistic in his terms, not in ours, and he wants us to sympathize, criticize, enjoy and ultimately judge.

Moreover, some critics are of the opinion that Fielding's two classics, "Joseph Andrews" and "Tom Jones" are not incorporated within the framework of the picaresque novels. This study underscores the picaresque elements in Fielding's two classics and stresses the similarities and points of resemblance between the English and Spanish picaresque novels. The rationale, here, is that on examining the works of Henry Fielding, concentration should be given to exploring the extent of the foreign influence on his works.

2. Theoretical Background

If one were to take an informal survey among non-linguists regarding the primary function of human language, the overwhelmingly most common answer would be, language is used for communication (Van Valin, 2001, p. 319). However, some of the most prominent linguists in the field reject this view, and many others hold that the fact that language may be used for communication is largely, if not completely, irrelevant to its study and analysis (Evans, 2018; Simpson et al., 2018; Mooney et al., 2011). This means that the majority of professional linguists used to adopt a view of language which is at odds with the view held by non-linguists (Carston, 1988; Chomsky, 1965; Johnson, 2002). Accordingly, the phenomenon of communication has often been thought of as peripheral in linguistic

research. This low status attributed to communication is challenged by different pragmatic approaches to language.

The idea of extending linguistic analysis to include communicative functions was, first, proposed by Czech linguists (see Van Valin, 2001). Some of the most important and coherent attempts of communication—relevant approaches to language are (1) Soviet Semiotic Dialogism, (2) The Prague School, and (3) Functionalism (Mc Houl, 1994). Moreover, the extraordinary growth of sociolinguistics in the last decade or so has shown convincingly that language is closely linked to its context and that isolating it artificially for study ignores its complex and intricate relation to society. On the other hand, since the emergence in the 1960s of English language as a university subject in its own right, the relationship between the study of literature and the study of language has often been one of bitter rivalry. That is, literary critics have railed against the "cold", "scientific" approach used by scholars of language in their analyses of literary texts, whilst linguists have accused their literary colleagues of being too vague and subjective in the analyses they produced (see Mc Intyle, 2012, p. 1). As Fowler (1971) points out, the relationship between literature and language has, for the most part, been an unhappy one. However, in the 1970s and 1980s the growth of communicative language teaching methods led to a reconsideration of the place of literature in the language classroom with recognition of the primary authenticity of literary texts and of the fact that more imaginative and representational uses of language could be embedded alongside more referentially utilitarian output. Kramsch and Kramsch (2000, p. 567) term this the "proficiency movement" and underline how it saw in literature "an opportunity to develop vocabulary acquisition, the development of reading strategies, and the training of critical thinking, that is reasoning skills".

It is possible to bridge the divide between language and literature by using the analytical techniques available within the sub-discipline of language study known as stylistics. Taking a linguistic approach to the analysis of a literary text does not have to mean disregarding interpretation. Stylistic analysis can often illuminate just why a particular literary text is regarded so highly. Stylistics acknowledges the skills of the writer by assuming that every decision made in the production of a text is deliberate, despite whether this decision was made consciously or unconsciously. Consequently, stylistics aims to explain the link between linguistic form and literary effect, and to account for what it is that we are responding to when we praise the quality of a particular piece of writing.

According to Mc Intyre (2012, pp. 1-2), "it is good idea to start [our analysis] with [our] initial thoughts and feelings about the text [we] are to going to analyse. Then when we do the actual analysis, we can see if we were right or wrong in our initial interpretation. The linguistic structure of the text, sometimes, does not support our interpretation, in which case we may have to reconsider this in the light of our analysis. This is why statistics is useful as a method of interpreting texts. Short (1986, p. 158) states that the stylistic analysis has to do with criticism, through which evaluation, interpretation and textual description of a literary work are identified. In this regard, Levine (1996) points out that we

have to understand that if there is no literature, there is no profession of literary studies. Chapman (1973, p. 11), also, states that the distinctive usages of language are known as styles; and that the linguistic study of different styles is called stylistics.

Stylistics, which is a branch of linguistics, investigates the relationship between style and literary function. The word "style" indicates the route in which language operates in a given context. In its wide sense, it covers the way of writing of any author, and it is an instrument by virtue of which, a linguist could examine the choices of worked out by an author in a particular context. In this regard, Leech (1982) states that style is the linguistic characteristic of a particular text. He, also, adds that style is a property of all texts.

Conducting a study of literary language by means of linguistics has taken the form of "Discourse Analysis". There are three main approaches to discourse, and its analysis in contemporary scholarship: (1) the formal linguistic approach (discourse as text); (2) the empirical sociological approach (discourse as conversations) and (3) the critical approach (discourse as power/knowledge). For comprehensive discussions on these approaches, see Harris (1952); Mitchell (1957); Georgakopoulou and Goutsos, (1999); Van Dijk, (1972); De Beaugronde (1980, 1984); Slembrouk (2003); Hart (2020); Boisvert and Thiede (2020); El-dali (2021); Fair Clough (1992); Campbell and Roberts (2007); Van Dijk (2006, 2008a, 2008b). It may be worth-mentioning to say that while it is correct to say that discourse analysis is a sub-field of linguistics, it is, also, appropriate to say that discourse analysis goes beyond linguistics as it has been understood in the past. It is a cross-discipline and, as such, finds itself in interaction with approaches from a wide range of other disciplines. As Slembrouk (2003, p. 1) states:

> Discourse analysis is a hybrid field of enquiry. Its "lender disciplines" are to be found within various corners of the human and social sciences, with complex historical affiliations and a lot of cross-fertilization taking place.

3. Foreign Influences on Fielding's Literary Works

On examining the works of Henry Fielding, concentration is always given to exploring the extent of the foreign influence on his works. The picaresque technique, which is traced in Spanish novels, is so popular, to the extent that many of these works have been subject to translation into other languages. Some critics, among them Chandler (1907, p. 301), are of the opinion that Fielding's Jonathan Wild, Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, are not incorporated within the framework of the picaresque novels. Chandler states that: "…for all its practical jests and Spanish inspiration Joseph Andrews is not picaresque…only in the story of Joseph's father is there an approach to a career of rascality". The present study underscores the picaresque elements in Fielding's two classics. It stresses the similarities and points of resemblance between the English and Spanish picaresque novels. Both emphasize the representation of country life as a repose of virtue and city life as a repose of vice, both build their novels on the adventures technique, both introduce a variety of characters and a large number of

incidents and both depict the course of narration within the framework of an episodic structure, Fielding's books describe the biography of a travelling picaro who is not a rascal by nature in comparison with the picaros of the Spanish novels. Fielding's depicted picaros are those who fall in the hands of rogues and are either raised as gentlemen or are born gentlemen. Fielding's attempt is to introduce interpolated tales within the fabric of narration whose function is to enhance the main plot. The interference of fate and coincidence are among the features which underline Fielding's employment of the picaresque elements. The successive episodes which build the structure of Fielding's two classics are linked together by the picaro's significant role.

3.1 The Term "Picaresque"

The term picaresque in the strict sense of the word, belongs to, or is a characteristic of the picaresque novel, in which the rogue-hero and his reckless adventurers are presented with broad realism and satire. Fielding's adoption of the picaresque trait in his two books, Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones impel the reader to explore such technique which embraces the idea that the novel in general, may play a functional role in giving a panorama of the different social statue families. Sherburn (1967, p. 796) indicates that the confusion which results in identifying the term Picaresque, is taken from attempts initiated to apply a specific definition to all works which are incorporated within the framework of this genre. Picaresque, according to Murray (1933, p. 816) in the Oxford English Dictionary, is identified as: "Belonging or relating to rogues or knaves: applied esp; to a style of literary fiction dealing with the adventures of rogues, chiefly of Spanish origin". According to Drabble (1985, pp. 762-763) picaresque is, "...a wily trickster; ...which relate the histories of ingenious rogues, the servants of several masters, who eventually repent the error of their ways; ...Nowadays the term is commonly and loosely, applied to episodic novels especially those of Fielding, Smollett and others of the 18th cent, which describe the adventures of a lively and resourceful hero on a journey".

The picaresque trait consists of six elements. The first is relevant to the characters who are to be described in accordance to their social or political status, occupation and activity. The second element ranges between smaller and greater crimes, including thefts, and tricks. The third element is concerned with setting as most of the English and foreign picaresque works take place at inns, as is the case in both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. Inns have been the centres of gathering for all classes, as from the middle ages to the mid-nineteenth century. They have been meeting places for lovers, travellers, pedlars who could take their meals with the servants around the kitchen-fire. The fourth element is connected with the picaresque episode especially that concerned with disturbances in the night, in which someone always gets into a wrong room and consequently in a wrong bed. The typical example of this case appears in Joseph Andrews when Parson Adams enters the room of Mrs. Slipslop. The fifth of the elements is the rude host of an inn who treats guests unkindly. The sixth is satire, as the English picaro is entitled as an observer to satirize the hypocrisy and folly of classes with which he comes into contact. Sieber (1977, p. 646) states that the "Picaro was an anti-hero, who satirized and victimized a

corrupt society". Chandler (1907, p. 78) views that satire has been introduced in the English novel by Fielding: "it was through Fielding, ...that satire entered the English romance of roguery, which before his day had been peculiarly devoid of it". Although satire does not appear in Defoe's novels, yet it should not be taken for granted that Chandler's view is unquestionably accepted. Satire in either the European or the English novels is directed at priests, physicians, judges and lawyers and landlords.

3.2 The English Picaresque Novel

An assumption has been widely conceived, that the English picaresque novel is the outgrowth of the Spanish novel. Sieber (1977, p. 3) states that Christine Whitebourn locates the roots of the picaresque in the fourteenth and fifteenth century Spanish works. Furthermore, Chandler (1907, p. 198) points out that the "direct current of the literature of roguery flowed from Spain through France to England". Tackling the origin of the literature of roguery which has been broadly used during the renaissance period, Chandler proclaims that: ...the literature of roguery ...deals essentially with the occasional criminal who is tending to become professional, or with the professional criminal who stops short of villainy. It depicts the occasional criminal lured farther and farther into the mazes of habitual crime, ..." (p. 1 98). Allen (1959, p. 32) suggests that the hero of the picaresque novel: "takes a journey whose course plunges hi m in all sorts, conditions, and classes of men". Moreover, Sieber (1977, p. 3) quotes Claudio Guillen who confines the picaresque narrative to the "confessions of a liar".

Chandler (1907, p. 5) goes forward to give a further characteristic of the picaresque novel, indicating that novels of such distinctive class of literary composition are generally written as the biography of a travelling rascal. He writes: "the picaresque novel is the comic biography ... of an anti-hero who makes his way in the world through the service of masters, satirizing their personal faults, as well as their trades and professions. It possesses,... two poles of interest, one, the rogue and his tricks; the other, the manners he pillories". Bjornson (1977, p. 34) indicates that the rascal or a rogue always comes from a lower class and he tries to earn his living through illegal channels. His behaviour is void of uprightness, honesty and probity and it is his desire to satisfy his elementary needs especially those of hunger, which pushes him to steal, betray and mislead others. Chandler (1907, pp. 1-6) distinguishes the picaro from a villain; while the latter is viciously wicked and criminal, the former commits crimes which are not arranged in advance and thus he reforms, if the chance is available for him.

Despite of the fact that the English picaresque novel is influenced by the Spanish picaresque traits, yet it is modelled in accordance with the native English circumstances, conditions, characters, setting and form. The English picaro differs from the Spanish picaro as the latter should be of a low origin; the former might be a gentleman. Joseph Andrews, is the child of gentle parents and Tom Jones turns out to be a gentleman at the end of the novel. In the English picaresque novel, the necessity to satisfy the elementary needs of the picaro does not push him to commit evil deeds. The English picaresque novel does not differentiate between picaros and rascals. English writers have been inclined to depict a mixture of good and evil. This tendency has taken place even before Chaucer, as being depicted in the

medieval English morality plays, which have been acted on stage in the last years of the sixteenth century and the late eighteenth century. No social conditions force the English picaro to embark upon evil deeds, but it is rather the curiosity and the love of adventure which stimulate the picaro into such deeds. Another point which draws a line between the English and Spanish picaresque novels, is the service of masters which plays no vital or major role in the English picaresque traditions. Joseph Andrews, for example, has spent most of his career out of service.

The picaresque trait is associated with realism on the account that it is opposed to the heroic and romantic deeds even when it appears in literary composition which is romantic like Don Quixote. The English picaresque tradition has produced the anti-hero who does not come from the lowest class but he is forced to be temporarily placed among members of such class. Sieber (1977, p. 55) points out: “even though some of them were unaware of “their advantages” at the beginning they usually discovered their middle class or noble ancestry. At the end of their lives, far from being haunted fugitives or social outcasts, they had improved their situations considerably, whether country gentleman prosperous planters or pilgrimhermits, they had advanced beyond the level of mere survival”.

Although deceptive actions and cheating are characteristics of the picaresque tradition, yet, they are not essential aspects for the anti-hero, as is the case in Tom Jones’ career. Parson Adams seems to have picaresque features represented in his lack of perception as well as intuitive judgment which, all work to leave him a prey for rascality. In the English picaresque novel, the anti-hero is a picaro who plays the most vital role in the course of events. He is either well-born or brought up as a gentleman and his behaviour is always in conformity with his class. He is a traveller whose behaviour generally opposes the accepted rules of conduct prevailing the society during his time, and he himself might suffer from such opposition. For this reason, Tom Jones has been condemned as a villain infringing the social codes despite the noble sentiments which he possesses and despite his good heart.

The English picaresque tradition differs from other forms of picaresque and that is why the English have never given due consideration to the low born rogue which Chandler considers the central figure in the picaresque tradition. Baker (1950, p. 54) states, in his discussion of the influence of the Spanish picaresque stories on the English novel that Fielding is indebted to Cervantes in his formation of his novels. The likeness between Joseph Andrews and Don Quixote is enhanced by Fielding’s own statement on the title page of the book, that, it is written in imitation of Cervantes”. Fielding’s presentation of Partridge in Tom Jones who uses humorous proverbs after the manner of the Squire, Sancho Panza in Don Quixote, emphasizes the idea that Fielding has imitated Cervantes. Partridge points out: “...Festina lente is a proverb which I learnt long before I ever touched a razor” (Fielding’s Tome Jones, p. 374, Ch. 4). Furthermore, Fielding in the introductory lines of book 8, ch. 4 mentions Don Quixote, stating that: “the barber of Baghdad, nor he in Don Quixote not excepted?” (p. 374)

The success of Fielding’s picaresque novel is ascribed to two reasons; the first is that he has been affected by the greet picaresque writer of the seventeenth century such as Cervantes, Bunyan and

Neshe; the second is that Fielding has been influenced by humorous aspect of the renaissance period, jest books. Chandler states that: “the jester, like the anti-hero of legend, emerged from folklore. He is career, however was both longer and merrier, and he contributed more directly to the development of picaresque fiction” (Chandler, 1907, p. 59).

3.3 The Picaresque Plot

The plot of a novel is an outline of its overall form. It is also relevant to the arrangement of the actions and incidents of a novel. The term plot mirrors the changes in the human relation during the course of events. As long as the plot is concerned with the change in the human relationship, then the climax of the plot, is to be concerned with changes in moral relationships. It is often through such moral change, that the protogonist’s conception of his own situation is clarified and indicated (see Evans, 2018; Simpson et al., 2018; Mooney et al., 2011; Hammudin, 2012).

The episodic structure is a remarkable picaresque feature in the picaresque plot. Plot having an episodic structure, may include themes about folktales and rituals and may depict the life of a hero starting from birth to death in a chronological order. The picaresque plot provides a series of deeds, undertaken by the anti-hero who links the various episodes. In this connection, Schole and Kellogy (1966, p. 209) point out that: “The picaresque episodic plot is the most primitive form of plot employed in the novel, but it has retained its vitality and till flourishes today”. Miller (1967, p. 13) comment on the episodic nature of the picaresque plot: ...most of the major picaresque novels are episodic with a vengeance, and those countervailing plot pattern that we find do not substantially change the tone of the picaresque. They merely tease us with the hope of finding structure in the picaresque world”. He further comments on the hero of the picaresque novel saying that”... The protagonist does not seek any suitable relation between himself and another ...If he does, he is usually frustrated ...In the picaresque plot ... nothing strictly happens. The picaresque plot merely records fragmental happenings” (Ibid, p. 12). The picaresque plot seems to violate the Aristotelian concept of plot. Dorsch’s translation of Aristotle’s view indicate that Aristotle’s idea of plots: “must be of reasonable length, so that they may be easily held in the memory ... a length which as a matter either of probability or of necessity allows of a change from misery to happiness or from happiness to misery is the proper limit of length to be observed” (Dorch, 1965, p. 42). The picaresque plot breaks down the Aristotelian concept of plot and in this respect Miller (1967, p. 10).

3.3.1. Two types of episodes

Two kinds of episodes may be depicted in the course of the narrative account. The first kind is that introduced for enhancing the main action of the novel or the biographical account concerning the life of the protagonist. Examples of this kind of episodical digression is Joseph’s meeting with Mrs. Sliplop on the road in Joseph Andrews and Tom who has encountered Mrs. Waters on the road in Tom Jones. The second kind of episodical digression is concerned with the interpolated tables which have nothing to do with the main action or the characters and they are merely narrated for amusement or entertainment.

Examples of this kind, is “The History of Leonora” in Joseph Andrews and “The Man of the Hill” in Tom Jones. Critics’ perspectives, as regards the importance of such tales differ greatly. Some disagree about their existence and others approve. Fielding, in Tom Jones has feared that the readers would disapprove the interpolated tales in his novel and thus he has warned them against speedy judgment. He states in Tom Jones: “we warn thee not too hastily to condemn any of the incidents in this our history as impertinent and foreign to our main design, because thou dost not immediately conceive in what manner such incident may conduce to that design (Fielding’s Tom Jones, Bk. 1, Ch. 1, p. 467).

Robinson (1973, p. 93) sees that the interpolated tales in Tom Jones boost the central themes of the book and are not regarded as digressions. For example, the story of “The Man of the Hill” is drown up to coincide with parts of Tom’s own history. The old men have made a journey from his home to London and then, being back home. Of course, this journey goes in line with Tom’s adventures. Both, the old man and Tom are deceived by their brothers and both are being expelled by their fathers. The old man is betrayed, as Tom is betrayed, by Lady Bellaston. Unlike Tom, the old man’s experience bestows embitterment on him, while, Tom learns from his own experience and becomes prudent. Meanwhile Mrs. Fitzpatrick’s story is parallel to Sophia’s situation. Its function is to notify and warn against imprudence find to call for discretion. Some critics are of the opinion that the interpolated tales in Joseph Andrews, including tale of Leonora, Mr. Wilson Paul and Leonard are not depicted as digression. This is due to the fact that the stories are there to expose vanity and hypocrisy which align Fielding’s intention to disclose affectation.

Brooks (1968, pp. 208-213) claims that interpolated tales in Joseph Andrews are part and parcel of the novel and sometimes they are parallel to the main action or the narrative account. For example, Leonora resembles Fenny, except for her vanity which contrasts with Fanny’s humility. It is clear that Leonora’s tale boosts the theme of vanity and hypocrisy and it is through this tale and other interpolations that a didactic lesson is conveyed to instruct proper behaviour to both characters, who always miss the target behind these tales, and the reader who are expected to apply fully these didactic lessons. Meanwhile, Sacks (1964, p. 121) claims that Tom Jones is both episodic and continuous which is ascribed to the fact that, most of the digressive episodes in the book are of a significant function. Unlike Joseph Andrews, Sacks sees that the episodes in Tom Jones are not interchangeable: “The episodes in Tom Jones can not for the most part be interchanged; since what comes before in some way prepares us for w at is to come next”. Sacks further suggests, that in case that the first episode of each book is omitted, then the whole novel would be affected, but: “no expectations raised in previous episodes would be unresolved and no future episode would seem unmotivated because of its exclusion (Ibid, p. 208). In fact, all the episodes in Tom Jones are well constructed, arranged in chronological order and work as a whole to the union of the plot.

Fielding’s book Joseph Andrews is modelled on Cervantes’ Don Quixote; as the front page of the book explains that it is “written in imitation of the manner of Cervantes, author of Don Quixote”. Blanchard

(1966) states that Lord Dacre classifies Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones with Don Quixote and Gil Blas. One should keep in mind that both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jone are not autobiographies but biographies. It is remarkably noticed that the picaro in a picaresque plot is forced under some difficult circumstances to start out a journey which he is unaware of its ultimate end, as is the case of both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. The picaros Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones are forced to leave their lodgings and undertake a long journey to start a new career and in search of a new job. The picaresque plot seems to bring in conjunction the Christian view, that life is a journey, together with the urgency of making the picaro sets out for t ravel. The picaresque novel displays two elements, one is concerned with the narrative account of the journey technique and the other is concerned with the arranged record of the biographical form. Sometimes the picaresque plot makes the picaro sets out a long journey in quest of security, love, satisfaction or any other thing, which varies in accordance with the picaro's view of his essential needs. Changes in the direction of plot, suggest that the picaresque plot in particular and all plots in general are subject to sudden change (see Gibson, 2007; Guillen, 1971; Hanlon, 2014; Apostoli, 2004).

What is very important to mention is the episodic structure in the novel. Novel is told by the author with the first-person narrator as he interrupts the story with his comments very often. Apart from that, the narrator is omniscient and provides the reader throughout the whole story and honestly cares about him. The author also uses a retrospective style in order to mix the situations and create a free tangle of episodes so we can hardly see a connection between the chapters, apart from the hero himself (Jakubjakova, 2017, p. 37).

Apart from the episodic structure of the picaresque plot, it is always about the biography of a picaro covering a long period of his life. No calculated end are devised in the picaresque plot, in which fate plays a functional role, by generating constant fresh incident. The picaresque plot is provided by a sequence of episodic structure in which the protagonist's vital role links the event of these episodes. The only proof to demonstrate that the inclusion of any additional incident is justified is the participation of the protagonist in this incident by one way or another. The eighteenth century novel differs from the modern novel which has no defined line of events in comparison with the former. The eighteenth century novel aligns the Aristotelien concept of the well-constructed novel, which Dorsch (1965, p. 41) indicates with him the framework of Aristotle's view that it: "is that which has a beginning, a middle, and an end". Thus, the novelist in the biographical form takes the birth and death of the protagonist to be the limits of his work. However, most of the picaresque novels are either biographical or autobiographical which are similar in the formation of the plot but are different in their ways of the viewpoints. The sudden stoppage in the narrative account of the autobiographical form is one of the negative aspects of this form, resulting in open-endedness.

Moreover, fate plays a vital role in affecting the fortune of the picaro in the picaresque novel. Change in the picaro's fortune are directed by fate. The author always employs fate which brings reversals in

the fortune of the picaro. Changes of fortune are a mong the major element of the picaresque plot and fate which highly influence it, has two functional roles. Firstly, it violates the logical sequence of events, causing a destruction in the incident link. Secondly, it diverges the action on from its natural course and direct it to a different channel and this results in the insecurity of the picaro. These such interpolated tales are not stuffed in the main action, but rather illuminate it. The changes of fortune as a result of the interference of fate and coincidence which are characteristics of the picaresque plots are also emphasized in both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. The author who is the creator of the fictional world, shapes the fate which affects the life of the protagonist. Fielding himself in Joseph Andrews admits that he is in full control of the fates and actions of the characters: “we shall ... imitate the wise conductors of the stage, who in the midst of a grave action entertain you with some excellent pieces of satire or humour” (Fielding’s Joseph Andrews, Bk III, Ch. 10, p. 246).

Contrasting opinions by various critics have been delivered, as regards the introductory chapters in both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones; some regard such introductory chapters as mere digressions and other consider them worth to be written. Cross (1963, p. 221) indicates that Tom Jones is considered as a respectable art form in the eighteenth century and in the light of this view, Cross suggests that the author is entitled to express his own designs and the basis of his moral codes. Bliss (1963, p. 236) claims that the introductory chapters are part and parcel of the novel and it is through them that the author presents a set of moral codes to be perfectly scrutinized by the reader.

The interpolated tales are not haphazardly stuffed in the central action of the novel, but rather, they contribute to the elucidation and illumination of the central incidents, especially those connected with the changes of fortune of the character of the protagonist. Among the most important aspects of the picaresque plot, is the changes in the fortune of the protagonist. The difference between Fielding’s picaresque plots in Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones and the former picaresque novels, lies in the significance of the interpolated tales, while the former consider the interpolated tales integral to the overall action, the latter stuff digressions and interpolated tales which are not essential to the whole action and have no relations to the main plots.

The biographical form is another picaresque feature, exploited in the plots of Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. The picaresque novels trace the life of the heroes from a very early stage and cover a long span of it. The novelist resembles the historian who attempts to present the truth and gives a realistic view of the world. Sticking to the biographical or the autobiographical form, then the novelist, follows the path of the historian, puts the truth as he sees it. Moral values which are highlighted in Fielding’s biographies in both Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones rank his novels in a unique position in comparison with the early picaresque biographies which do not pay heed to the moral aspect. Unlike the earl y Spanish and English picaresque biographies which focus on the protagonist, Fielding’s biographies shed light on the protagonist as well as various actions.

The resemblance between the plots of Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones and other picaresque plots is the

journey narrative, as all the protagonists are forced by circumstances to start out on a journey. Joseph, for example is forced to work as a footman at Lady Booby's home and is forced also to start out a long journey when being dismissed by her. Parson Adams, on the other hand, is compelled by his shortage of money to set out to London to sell some of his sermons. Meanwhile, Tom in "Tom Jones" is compelled to set out for a journey when being banished by Mr. Allworthy for a misunderstanding with him and Blifil. The importance of the moral values is emphasized in the course of the journey from town to country in Joseph Andrews. Joseph's travel from the city to the country is a travel from a corrupted life to a simple life. Of course, this suggests a contrast between the simple life of the village and the complex life of the city. Fielding presents simple people living in the country who are introduced to the fashions and corruption of the city and it is their role to try to overcome the immoral codes being in force by such society. The courteous behaviour which is an earmark of the picaresque plots is also underscored in Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones. Parson Adams with his magnanimity and gallantry seems to be a comic figure and Tom in "Tom Jones" who is brave and has a chivalrous attention toward women has no quest except to be united with Sophia.

Coincidence plays a functional role in "Tom Jones" and Joseph Andrews. Fannny, for example, meets Parson Adams by chance in the particular place where he has rescued her. It is also out of accident that Joseph's whole life has been changed; Mr. Wilson who has met Joseph by chance on the road, is informed by chance of Joseph's history and the birthmark which lead up to his discovery that Joseph is his lost child. Of course, these events have inverted Joseph's fortune. It is also investigated, that in Tom Jones, Tom's fortune has been subject to reversals. The most important change is that which contributes to the unfolding of the main plot, namely, the discovery that Tom is Allworthy's nephew. Critics opinions as regards Fielding's use of coincidences, varied greatly. Some approve that style and others disapprove. Goldknoph (1969, p. 264) claims that the inadequacy of the plot is suggested by Fielding's use of coincidences. In his view, the plot's "degree of perfection can be estimated finally, only by how much and how well it contributes to the overall sense of the work". But as long as coincidences contribute to the weakness of the plot, then it should not be generally accepted that the plot is perfectly constructed.

Fielding's adoption of the coincidence technique, proves that he does not only underline the relationship of incidents, but also the relationship between the characters and the protagonist. As illustrated previously Fate which plays a functional role in Fielding's two books, shows that the characters are governed by it. Fate and coincidence which are characteristics of the picaresque tradtion and which are underscored in Fielding's Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, indicate that he has been influenced by that tradition.

The development of plot in Fielding's two novels, is largely consolidated by the changes of fortunes of the protagonists as well as the other characters. Of course, this feature is also an aspect of the picaresque riot. To cite an example of the chance of fortune in relation to the protogonist in Joseph

Andrews, is clearly unearthed in Lady Booby's attempt to presrve her social status, when deciding to abandon the footman, Joseph, on the account that he can not get married with Fanny, because they are siblings. Yet, Lady Booby has changed up her mind and decided to get married with Joseph because it has been turned out that he and Fanny are not a brother and a sister. The sudden reverse in Lady Booby's opinion, proved that she is dominated by low impulses, namely Jealousy. In conclusion, the various incidents incorporated in the plots of Fielding's two novels, do not only give a panoramic view of English society but also present an overall view of human nature.

To sum up this section, it may be pertinent to refer to Jakubjakova (2017, pp. 36-37) who argues that Tom Jones is a realistic novel with characteristic picaresque features. Alread y from the beginning we recognize a boy being abandoned in the bed sheets of Mr. Allworthy. As the orphanhood is one of the most significant features of the picaresque, this novel unconditionally fulfills this aspect of the genre. As an orphan, Tom has a very hard life, fails to receive a proper upbringing and he often behaves in a roguish way. It is not only Tom who bears the roguish characteristics, but also many other characters that are trying to trick other people throughout the whole novel. Being roguish is probably the most significant feature of the "picaro".

3.3.2 Picaresque novels and concentration on the protagonist

Concentration in the picaresque novels, is always focused on the protagonist who is rogue or a prey who has fallen in the hands of rogues. However, the full title of as was suggested in 1742 by Fielding is The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andres and of His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams. The novel seems to be the sole which includes the names of two prominent characters in the title page. Joseph is depicted as a virtuous footman whose innocence is related to a slow discernment and apprehension as being reflected in the attempted seduction scenes of Lady Booby and Mrs. Slipslop with him. In addition to that, Joseph is also presented as a simple countryman; all of which are characteristics of the picaresque tradition. Depicting Joseph's behaviour in a corrupted society, he is shown stript of his livery and is forced to set out for a long journey to the country estate of the Booby family. He is never seen subject to ridicule, on the account that his knowledge is contrasted with others who have acquired wordly knowledge. For some times, Joseph is seen a victim of rogues. This is indicated, when, he is beaten by highwaymen who have left him half-dead beside the roadside ditch and when he is attacked by the servants and captain of the hunting squire who have carried Fanny away; in addition to that Joseph has been put in Bridewell jail by Lawyer Scouts who arrests him and Fanny, in response to Lady Booby's request under the pretext of cutting a hazel twig from one of discovering the true parentage of Joseph at the closing chapters of the book, then it is also unveiled that he assumes the role of a footman hero, and in this view, he is considered an anti-hero. Falling a victim of rascals does not suggest that Joseph possesses anti-heroic elements solely, but in further connections, he seems to possess heroic elements. Joseph is presented brave defending Parson Adams from the hunting dogs and Fanny against the would-be abductors. Fielding also praises Joseph's heroic potentials while carrying

Fanny in his arms down a hill: “Learn hence, my fair country-women, to consider your own weakness, and the many occasions on which the strength of a man may be useful to you and duly weighing this, take care that you match not yourself with the spindle-shanked beaus and petit-maitres of the age, who, instead of being able, like Joseph Andrews, to carry you in lusty arms through the rugged ways and downhill steeps of life, will rather want to support their feeble limbs with your strength an assistance” (Fielding’s Joseph Andrews, Bk III, Ch. 2, p. 189).

Joseph presents the low characters morally superior to the high figures. This is seen by describing the low origin characters in classical language and the high people in low language. Parson Adams is the reel anti-hero of the novel and the influence of Don Quixote is epparent in the comic character of Parson Adams. Allen states that the “Quixote” figure is “Adams”, which justifies Fielding’s statement early in the book of Joseph Andrews, that it is “written in imitation of Cervantes (Allen, 1959, p. 56).

Parson Adams is absent-minded and that is indicated in his paying of the reckoning at the two Wouse inn and his hasty mounting of his horse expecting Joseph to follow on a horse, apart from his throowing his most sacred copy of Aeschylus into the fire. Parson Adams has also faced some embarrassments. For example, he has a pot of hog’s blood thrown, in his face by a landlady; he has taken part in the fight with Fanny’s first adbuctor and he is accused by the latter abductor of attempted robbery as well as murder. Both Adams and Fanny would have been placed in jail, it is only for the fact that one of the members of the house of justice has recognized them, that they have been set free. He is also thrown in the mud by the hogs of Parson Trulliber. He also loses his footing and rolls down a hill, when Joseph and Fanny attmpt to flee from the sheep stealers. He is attscked by the dogs of the hunting Squire and is plunged into a tube of water to be the subject of ridicule by the Squire. Meanwhile, while Joseph and Parson Adams are struggling with the servant of the Squire, Joseph empties a chamber port in their face and unfortunately Parson Adams recieves by accident part of the deluge. It is also Parson Adams who rushes into the roo of Mrs. Slipslop who cries for help against rape, and he is caught by Lady Booby at this moment.

Such humiliating scenes to which Parson Adams is exposed prove that he is an anti-hero and has an influnce of Don Quixote. Allen points out that: “Parson Adams…is a creation of pure humour…he owes something to Don Quixote” (Allen, 1959, p. 56). Parson Adams, surpasses the picaresque type by his obvious nobility, dignity and honesty which enable him to restore his restore his dignity which has suffered humiliation during the embarrassing scenes to which he has been exposed. Parson Adams’ probity hinders him to obtain his curacy. His rector warns him , that in case, he would not persuade his alderman nephew to vote for Colonel Courtly he will not remain in his cure. But Adams, has his nephew supported Squire Fickle whom in his view is the better man and in consequence, Adams loses his curacy. Squire Fickle who has been supported by Adams, gives him no regard and makes his way to London in an attempt to receive a government position. Meanwhile, Colonel Courtly takes part in a furtl1er election and is supported by Fickle, while Adams lives for a whole month on the fee of a single

funeral sermon. After that incident, Sir Thomas Booby has promised Adams a living if his nephew supports another election, yet the alderman-nephew dies and thus Adams becomes of no value and the living has gone to another man. Later on, Parson Adams is asked by Lady Booby to stop publishing the banns of Joseph and Fanny's marriage and in return, Parson Adams will have his daughter appointed in replacement of Mrs. Slipslop and his second son an exciseman. Parson Adams rejects to align Lady Booby in her request streaming from his belief that no action is to be undertaken without a reasonable reason.

On the other hand, Fielding's Tom Jones presents the protagonist in a different view from the traditional picaresque type. He is raised as gentleman and is proved later to be born gentleman as well. Of course, Fielding's technique in Tom Jones is similar to his technique in Joseph Andrews, as he combines in the protagonist the characterizations of both the hero and the anti-hero, depending on the idea that human nature is a combination of virtue and vice. Tom Jones, the protagonist possesses some heroic traits, represented in courage and bravery. In his childhood, he is beaten by Thwackum without grumbling in another situation, he risks his life for saving Sophia who misses the saddel of horse and falls on the ground. He also attempts to enter the armed forces voluntarily to defend protestantism against catholicism which seems to prevail in England. He also rescues Mrs. Water against the attept of rape to which she has been exposed by Ensign Northerton. He also attempts to rescue the old Man of the Hill when being attacked by robbers. His bravery is also indicated in an attempt to deprive a highwayman of his weapons and in his prearranged combat with Mr. Fitzpatrick (see Jakubjakova, 2017; Eisenberg, 2018; Ardila, 2015).

Self interest which is a characteristic of the anti-hero, does not exist in Tom Jones' character; in addition to his honesty and generosity, he is unselfish. The prime source of the odversities to which Tom is exposed, proceeds from his inability to protect his own interests. It is his inability to protect himself against roguery, which makes him a victim of it. It is his attempt to preserve the happiness and prosperity of the Seagrim family which leads him to keep a dishonest relation with Molly Seagrim. It is also his inability to clarify the real bases of his relaiton with this family that gives Blifil and Thwackum an opportunity to demolish his relation with Allworthy. The sufferance which Tom Jones incurs to be united with his beloved Sophia, could has been saved, if his mother has revealed his true parentage before her death. Tom's protection of Mrs. Waters possibly contributes to bring his relation with Sophia to a critical phase and maked him angry for believing that he has lain his own mother.

Tom Jones also seems to have tender feelings and benovalence represented in his assistance to Mr. Anderson and Nancy Miller to get married. Crane points out, "that the identification of virtue with acts of benevolence on still more with the feelings of universal good-will…are the natural and spontaneous growth of the heart of man uncorrupted by habits of vice" (Grane, 1934, p. 205). Tom's honour is reflected in his true love towards Sophia and in his refusal of Mrs. Hunt's proposal to flee with Sophia when he has been on the verge of losing her forever. Tom has no intention to defend himself against the

accusations directed against him by Blifil and his two tutors, but all he has to do is not to raise an appeal to the court of justice but rather accept his grief. He sets out and is robbed by Black George whom he assists starting from his childhood. He is saved from Fellamar's attempts to kidnap him, which come in response to Lady Bellaston's stimulation. It is by falling into a bad misfortune through his duel with Mr. Fitzpatrick, that he is saved. At the end, he is raised to good fortune by the help of others.

Alter (1964, p. 103) emphasizes the idea that Tom Jones has a connection with the picaresque tradition and that the hero is transformed from a rascal to a moral man who does not belong to the low society; "Fielding's use of the picaresque novel in Tom Jones represents a characteristically neoclassical enterprise oftransformation. The neoclassicist…took pride and pleasure in a skillful and decorous adaptation of presumably alien genres to the epic".

Fielding's presentation of Tom as a hero is condemned on one hand and is accepted on the other. Perhaps such denouncement is suggested on the basis that Tom Jones shares the same characteristics of other heroes in Fielding's plays such as The Universal Gallant. The failure of the heroes of these plays is attributed to the fact that they receive inadequate condemnation for acts which deserve rebuke and are blameworthy. Their punishment seems to be little in comparison with their rewards which seem to be great. They are treated as heroes, while in fact their behaviour suggest that they are rascals.

Fielding's influence by the Spanish novelists is reflected in the contrast changes of scenes, which allow him to introduce a great number of characters, a variety of incidents and an overall view of life in general. The stories of Leonora and Horatio, in Joseph Andrews and "The Man of the Hill" in Tom Jones set out examples of these changes of scenes. Fielding unlike Spanish authors, whose aim is to suggest interpolated stories that possibly contribute to enhance the main plot, as it is the case of Mr. Wilson's story which plays an important role in unfolding the confusion of Joseph Andrews' parentage; while the Spanish writers propose interpolated stories that are irrelevant to the main plot and thus might be considered as mere digression (see Ardila, 2010, 2015; Staves, 2016).

The story of Leonora and Horatio is sugoested to take away the tediousness felt by the passengers during their long journey and Mr. Wilson's story is proposed to fill in the interminable duration of the night, while that of the Man of the Hill is narrated to warn Tom in advance of the evils of the town and to keep Tom's presence for rescuing Mrs. Waters from Ensign Northerton more natural. Not only, does Fielding design his works in imitation of the Spanish forms but also his works have been influenced by French works. Hartwig (1972, p. 45) proclaims that Fielding has been affected by Lesage and a line of similarity is drawn up between Joseph Andrews and Gil Blass. He has also underlined some similarities between Joseph Andrews and Marivaus's Pharsamon. He further states that the principal figures in both books are like each other in appearance and histories. In Hartwig's view, Fielding and Merivaus use irony as a way through which they could direct their tools for criticism. Fielding's influence by French writers is consolidated by his translations from the French language. Fielding seems to have modelled

his works in consistency with the flux of the English life and he has taken from foreign works only the traits which have parallels with the English tradition and those which are strange are excluded from his works. The typical example of this view is the satire which is treated in Fielding's works in humorous and gentle manner, on the one hand, and on the other, it is tackled in some European works in a severe and rough way. Moreover, Partridge who resembles Sancho Panza, seems to owe much to the English tradition, the simple countryman and the foolish servant. Fielding seems to be influenced by the popular literature which has abundancy in episodes, satire and cheats; all of which form the substance of the English picaresque. The bulk of Fielding's work proposes that Fielding has taken only suggestions from foreign influences and through his efforts the outcome is far different (see Claude, 2007).

Fielding's adoption of the journey technique for both, Parson Adams and Joseph Andrews through the countryside, is modelled on Sancho Panza's example who travels through the country. If it is taken for granted that Fielding's Joseph Andrews is done in parody of Richardson's Pamela, it is also conceded that the picaresque trait adopted I the book is also influenced by Cervantes' Don Quixote. There is similarity between Don Quixote and Joseph Andrews, as the opening chapters of the latter are a parody of Pamela's chastity. Tom Jones on the other hand, backs the view that Fielding has been influenced by Spanish writers, as he mentions during the course of his narrative account, the name of the Spanish writer of picaresque fiction, Francesco Gomez de Queveda.

On examining the episodic actions in the light of the role of the minor characters, then it is to be revealed that such actions differ from the continuous actions, on the account that the function of the minor characters does not contribute to the whole action, but only "to the episodes in which they are introduced. The man of false courage, the coach passengers and Parson Trulliber are minor characters in Joseph Andrews who disappear as soon as they perform their roles. This aspect, however, ranks the plot of Joseph Andrews as partly episodic although the plot as a whole is not considered completely episodic. Stevenson (1960, p. 83) states that "…Though the larger part of Joseph Andrews is in simple episodic sequence, as Joseph moves through a series of odd characters, the story does have a certain structure" (see Tomoiaga, 2012; Wicks, 2002).

Although the adventures of Joseph Andrews are very entertaining, yet they do not contribute to the denouement and have no influence on the whole action. Battestin (1959, p. 87) is of the view that critics who do not recognize the unity of Fielding's Joseph Andrews, are possibly ignorant of Fielding's moral basis. In Battestin's view the journey technique adopted in the book is not mere astray in the system of writing, a stuffing pursuit or a sole device for introducing a series of adventures. In fact, it is a method through which the author could be able to expose the vanity and hypocrisy of the people in the society (Ibid, pp. 118-129). Sacks (1964, p. 209) confirms Battestin's view, indicating that: "throughout much of the middle section of Joseph Andrews long and obviously important episodes are interchangeable. It matters little in what order we see Adams argue with Barnabas, the man of courage,

the sailor—become innkeeper, or Trulliber…though some episodes can be interchanged, each one makes a precise contribution to the whole to say that chronological order is not as important in this novel as in some others is not to say that the novel is structureless".

Although Joseph Andrews resembles the picaresque tradition in being episodic, yet it has some kind of structure which adds precision to it. In this view, it is revealed that despite the fact that the structure is interwoven under a sequence of successive episodes which bring looseness to the plot, yet they are not haphazardly worked out but are designed to tighten the overall action and events of the book, in addition to serving its prospected end. (see Mancing, 2015; Peterson, 2014; Sherrill, 2000).

4. Fielding's Narrative Techniques

4.1 Narrator/Point of View

Choosing a narrative point of view is perhaps the most important and most difficult decision a writer of a story can make. Point of view, like plot, character, setting, and language is a creative decision; however, it is also very much a technical decision. Someone has to tell the story. That someone is called the narrator. The question is who will that narrator be and what does that narrator know. Abrams (1981, p. 142) identifies the point of view, saying that it "Signifies the way a story gets told, the mode or perspective established by an author by means of which the reader is presented with the characters, actions, setting and events which constitute the narrative in a work of fiction".

The point of view in a literary composition represents the aspect from which the story telling and seeing is calibrated. It does not only represent the dimension from which the author projects his scene but also sets out the aspect from which the reader is to view it. Point of view is the perspective from which a story is narrated. Every story has a perspective, though there can be more than one type of point of view in a work of literature. The choice of the point of view from which to narrate a story greatly affects both the reader's experience of the story and the type of information the author is able to impart. First person creates a greater intimacy between the reader and the story, while third person allows the author to add much more complexity to the plot and development of different characters that one character wouldn't be able to perceive on his or her own. The point of view in an artistic work represents the significance of its overall form. Tackling the significance of the point of view, Allot (1959, p. 181) indicates that the most complicated matter in the craft of fiction is "…to be governed by the question of the point of view—the question of the relation in which the narrator stands to the story". Point of view is very closely linked with the concept of a narrator. Point-of-view impacts how close the reader feels to what's happening in the story. The narrator acts, as a proxy for the reader and how close the narrator is to the story is how close the reader will be to the story (see Peck, 2011; Hardvell et al., 2017).

The narrators of Fielding's Tom Jones focus on the omniscient point of view in which the third-person narrative is outside the story referring to characters either by their name or by the pronouns, "he, she

and they". An omniscient narrator is more able to present a complete and unbiased story. We can learn not only what a character does, but also what other characters do when the main character is not present. Abrams (1981, p. 143) sees that the narrator of the omniscient point of view "knows everything that needs to be known about the agents and events; that he is free to move as he will in time and place, and to shift from character to character, reporting …what he chooses of the speech and actions; and also that he has privileged access to a character's thoughts and feelings and motives, as well as to his overt speech and actions". The narrator begins Joseph Andrews: "Mr. Joseph Andrews, the hero of our ensuing history, was esteemed to be the only son of Gaffer and Gammer Andrews…whose virtue is at present so famous" (Book 1, Ch. 2, p. 41). It is also the way that the narrator of Tom Jones starts "In that part of the Western division of this kingdom which is commonly called Somerset-Shire, there lately lived, and perhaps still lives a gentleman, whose name was Allworthy …" (Book 1, Ch. 2, p. 53).

The narrator tends to put the overall work into a well-being form; he plays the God-like role and the ruler who presides over his fictitious or real formation. The narrator spells out the function he undertakes "The writer may be celled in aid to spread their history farther, and to present the amiable pictures to those who have not the happiness of knowing the originals; and so by communicating such valuable patterns to the world, he may perhaps do a more extensive service to mankind …" (Book 1, Ch. 1, p. 39). The writer in this respect seems to have almost cognizance of the historical aspects and thus he presents just those patterns which are of vital importance to the service of mankind. Allot (1981, p. 188) states that the eighteenth century writers among them Fielding, attempt to adopt the first person narrative view-point within the context of an exterior third person narrative. This is of course, clearly hinted in the digressive tales of the two books which according to Hardy (1975, p. 166) are merely old methods of narration.

4.2 Fielding's Philosophy of Human Nature

According to Flohr (1994), "there is not much doubt that philosophy in the eighteenth century has an immense influence on the culture of its time. For example, the widely read journal "The Spectator", edited by Addison and Steele, intended to bring philosophy out of the libraries into the coffee house, to make philosophy part of the general cultural discourse" (p. 1). This might indicate, according to Flohr, that a proper understanding of the literature of this era depends on a proper knowledge of the philosophical discussions which constituted part of the intellectual and cultural life. For full discussion of the main three philosophers of the 18th century (Locke, Bekeley and Hume), see Sambrook (1986); Cassirer (1951); Harris (1968) and Yolton (1993). As Flohr points out, the interaction between philosophy and literature, they are not of the kind that permit us to discover "in" a novel or poem the philosophical ideas it "is based" on or "influenced by". For him, literature is not a translation of philosophy into another medium.

In the 18th century, most philosophers started out from moral questions; however, they were forced, first, to deal with problems of perception and epistemology in order to establish some certainty of

knowledge on which decisions could be based. This problem occurs and is created by an increasing secularisation of philosophy. Concepts of the self-became more and more important as the link which creates a moral person out of the knowledge in the mind. Philosophical writing incorporates three methods of writing namely, expository, performative and reflexive. Lang (1983) points out that the difference between the three methods is stressed in the author's conception of his addressed readers and in the aim which a viewpoint serves to achieve. Through the expository method, the author exposes a subject through his writing and he does not like to introduce himself in order to be detached. When the reader understands what the author has introduced, then the author seems to prove success in communicating his subject. The performative method asserts the presence of the author who proves himself to be subjective. The writer offers through this method a personal and individual construction. The reflexive method of writing is an intermediate between the two other methods. It attempts an ambivalence in the presentation form. The operational viewpoint within a fictional world entitles the creator of the work to operate some critical conditions such as irony.

The satire of the18th century fiction is relevant to the deceptive and defrauded image of man. In this connection, Fielding is convincing the reader that one of his distinguished characteristics which mark his humanity "speech", is a mere behaviour possibly imitated by a parrot or a mechanic response to a certain attitude which is an identical response from a machine. Thus, words like "reason" and chastity would only maintain a slight value. Fielding's satire of the professional jargons suggests, despite the ideas advocated by Locke and others, that language which is precise, informative and free of ambiguity may be used to distort rather than clarify. He also underlines the importance that such language which is aspired by Locke and his associates to be used is not his ultimate aim, since the success of words in communicating facts cannot determine the value of language, it is rather the ability of linguistic contexts to fit with the circumstances proposed, which is sought by him. I share Fielding's ideas that language has a productive and creative function. He also suggests that attempts of the seventeenth century philosophers to achieve clarity by setting up rules for language are merely divergence from the linguistics trend! "It might be more appropriate to see Locke's and Wilkins's concentration on word-meaning as a brief atomistic aberration, in a period when atomism was fashionable also in physics and political theory, rather than as a classical norm from which modern logic and linguistics had to liberate themselves" (see El-dali, 2011, 2012, 2019a, 2019b; Boisvert & Thiede, 2020; Hart, 2020).

From the very beginning of Tom Jones, the reader is acquainted with the fact that the story will be formed in proportion to the self-conscious caprice of an individual, pertaining to the outward existence of the world of the book. The work is categorized as an art as much as a reflection of life. The book begins with the introduction of the author as regards the narrative role. The course of events is worked out by a skilful artist and the progress of the novel's picaresque episodes are not known in advance. Fielding's technique in his novels is dissimilar to that adopted in Richardson's novels, mostly

undermines the existence of genuine suspense, “what will happen next?” Although heroic persons and sublime thoughts are major components of characters and sentiments in the epic genre, they are undermined in Tom Jones. As for the epic diction, it is highly used in burlesque form. Fielding’s marked imitation of the epic action is the mock heroic battles with obvious realism and with the life of the time. A distinction has been drawn between burlesque and comedy, while the former makes a subject appears ridiculous by treating it in an incongruous style as by presenting a lofty subject with vulgarity, the latter makes a subject appear humorous in its treatment of theme and character. Incongruity and absurdity are the sources from which we derive our delight at burlesque. They are also the essence of our delight at affectation, being the representation of the ridiculous. On attempting a distinction between burlesque, or its synonym ridicule, and comedy, Fielding is rectifying what has been said by Locke about the “abuse of words”, which is manifested in a gap between word and things. “An author ought to consider himself, not as a gentleman who gives a private or eleemosynary treat, but rather as one who keeps a public ordinary, at which all persons are welcome for their money” (Fielding’s Tom Jones, Bk 1, Ch. 1, p. 51). Meeting the narrator early in the book before the hero, is significant; since the narrator is neither objective nor omniscient, but rather a deliberate awareness whose relationship with the reader influences his interpretation and judgment of what is going on.

James (1968, pp. 13-14) has felt sorry that Tom, the hero, has fallen a prey to clouds of mind, perplexity and confusion, although a hero in his own eyes ought not to be in such a situation. He suggests that the author of Tom Jones: “handsomely possessed of a mind, has such an amplitude of reflexion for him and round him that we see him through the mellow air of Fielding’s fine old moralism, fine old humour and fine old style, which somehow really enlarge, make everyone and everything important”. Werner (1973, p. 71) points out that Fielding’s narrative technique is indeed complex. Miller indicates that his rhetoric is carefully calculated to achieve specific ends. All these are indicators that Fielding, unlike Richardson, does not explore the depths of human nature but registers the external surface of the human behaviour (Miller, 1966, p. 209). Fielding’s most successful works stand closely with swift rather than Richardson. Fielding resembles swift as both stress the importance of the uses of language. Accordingly, the narrative consciousness becomes important; it does not only project awareness but also affects the response of the reader and his reappraisal of the presented material.

4.2.1 Joseph Andrews

In Joseph Andrews, the satire is discreted at Parson Adams, Parson Barnabas, Parson Trulliber, the surgeon who has been summoned to treat Joseph, Lawyer Scout, Mr. and Mrs. Tow-Wouse, the owners of an inn. In Tom Jones the satire is addressed to Mr. Allworthy, Doctor Bilfil, Lawyer Dowling and a landlady, owner of an inn. Fielding’s aim in this satire is to expose the folly, wickedness, and affectionations of the characters rather than their dishonesty and trickery.

Joseph Andrews is considered a satirical novel, on the account that it depicts characters with such traits as hypocrisy, vanity and affectation. Elliot has pointed out that the roots of satire are in primitive ritual

and magic (Elliot, 1968). Satire exposes folly and wickedness as Sapcks (1971, p. 364) says: "(The satirst) depicts a universe full of unresolved problems…; as our insight increases, we see ever more sharply pur own involvement in tangles which it is our responsibility to unravel. In the most powerful satire…we identify the victims as others and feel our superiority, only to find ourselves trapped a moment later, impaled by the scorn we have comfortably leveled against the rest of the world".

Affectation which is associated with satire is being defined in the narrow sense as pretence or any artificial behaviour or mannerism adopted to impress others. Vanity and hypocrisy are the chief sources from which affectation springs. The two ought to be distinguished; vanity is related to excessive pride in one's appearance or accomplishments. By virtue of vanity, man attempts to be something more than he really is. Hypocrisy is concerned with the feigning of beliefs, feelings, or virtues that one does not hold or possess. By virtue of hypocrisy, man attempts to be something, which is quite the reverse of what he really is. Through satire, Fielding exposes the defects of man's character, and calls the reader upon judging his abilities and traits. The roots of satire proceed from the art of arriving at the truth and from its dialectic nature with the reader which discloses faults or contradictions. Fielding argues that the satire undertaken in Joseph Andrews is not directed at any one on particular: "And here I solemnly protest, I have no intention to valify or asperse any one: for tho" every thing is copied from the book of nature, and scarce a character or action produced which I have not taken from my own observations and experience, Yet I have used the utmost care to obscure the persons by such different circumstances, degrees and colours, that it will be impossible to guess at them with any·degree of certainty; and if it ever happens otherwise, it is only where the failure characterized is so minute, that it is a foible only which the party himself may laugh at as well as any other". The main object of satire seems to work on two possible sides, either to satirize the pretensions of a lady or to support a conservntive social view, that a lady will not ride with a footman. The prese tation of the concepts of chastity and reason is rather different from that presentation of the concept of gentility. The former, impels the reader to examine and then judge to how extent is the character accused; while the latter leaves the reader in a puzzle, as scrutiny followed by eveluation is not sufficient on the account that inconsistency lies in the narrative voice which brings about complicaitons in interpretations (see Le Boeuf, 2007; Watson, 2011; Gibbs, 2007).

The ways through which Fielding investigates the usefulness of language in communicating knowledge are expressed with consummate excellence. Sometimesjudgment is hampered by complicating elements represented in oddity inherent in a single word or a whole sentence. Rhetorical elements including verbal extravagance and eloquent speech function in double directions; assisting the reader to elicit the exhibited informaiton and in the meantime, elucidating for him the implications of meaning. The scene in which Lady Booby is overwhelmed by two opposite passions, love and honour on the one hand and pride and revenge on the other, is depicted by similes of two serjeants who because they are equally corrupt manage to settle the issue with equal skill: "Till at last all becomes one scene of

confusion in the tortured minds of the hearers…and neither judge nor jury can possibly make anything of the matter; all things are so enveloped by the careful serjeants in doubt and obscurity" (Bk. 1, Ch. 9, pp. 62-63). "The distraction of Lady Booby's mind represented in legal battle between the two serjeants becomes in the simile, a heap of dount and obscurity". The two opposing passions are further illustrated: "or as it happens in the conscience, where honour and honesty pull one way, and a bribe and necessity another…if it was our present business only to make similes, we could produce many more to this purpose; but a simile (as well as a word) to the wise" (Ibid, p. 63). The struggle is between honour and honesty on one hand and bribe and necessity on the other. Bribe is relevant to Lady Booby's plan to bribe Slipslop for maintaining secrecy as regards Lady Booby's affection for Joseph. Necessity is relevant to need or the condition of being in difficulty.

4.2.2 Satire in Tom Jones

Arriving at the truth is a focal point on the level of the plot of Tom Jones. The story begins with an esoteric and obscure birth and ends with the unraveling of this mystery. When the truth is revealed the book has given a line of unity. The theme of the novel is marked by ways of unfolding truth and divulging deceit. Irony which, is used throughout the book enhances this theme, since it is built on double meaning, and on this account one attempts to seek the truth which, lies behind the false appearance. Hatfield claims that Fielding: "Takes a word which, by virtue of the abusage of "custom" has already a kind of built-in ironic potential, and playing this ironigenic corrupt sense against the "proper and original" meaning of the word that is developed in the definition of action, seeks to restore the word to its rightful dignity of meaning" (Hatfield, 1968, pp. 191-192). Irony relies on double connotations of meaning which, are to be supplied by the narrator, but this does not suggest that it is based on custom. A further point, Fielding does not intend by writing a novel to restore a word to its rightful dignity of meaning, unless it is meant by Hatfield that he attempts to eliminate any corrupt use of a word. Hutchens (1965, p. 111) proposes that irony is produced by a gap between the accepted meaning of a word and its meaning in the context it occurs. However, Hutchens seems to be like Levine, as both consider irony not only a means through which, the nature of the characters is exposed but also it serves as a means of establishing truth. Hutchens states that: "The…techniques, of connotative irony…by suggesting what is not true or good or appropriate, throw into sharp relief what is" (Ibid, p. 146).

Irony as one of the distinguished devices exploited in Tom Jones, mainly unravels connotations of meanings and the nature of the characters. Irony in the limited sense of the word is relevant to the use of words for conveying the opposite of their literal meaning; or it might be identified as an expression or utterance marked by a deliberate contrast between apparent and intended meaning. The aim behind these contrasts of meaning is to initiate humours or rhetorical effects. It might be notable as well that incongruity arises between what might be expected and what actually occurs. Fielding's target for fully exploiting the device of irony in Tom Jones is to delineate characters' behavior and conduct. Fielding's

technique sheds light on the significance of irony end underlines the fact that language is not merely an inflexible conveyer of information but rather the reader's mind has to be more flexible end capable of grasping shades of meaning. Fielding's technique of irony also destabilizes the reader's assurance of his unscrutinized notions. It is the attitudes of the reader as much as those of the characters that are being subject to examination by the novelist (see le Boeuf, 2007; Gibbs, 1994; Attardo, 2000; Chen, 1990; Barbe, 1995; Kruez & Roberts, 1993; Clark & Gerrig, 1984).

Irony is largely exploited and the distinction between "love" and "lust" is also voiced throughout the book. "Justice" and "mercy" as abstract values are also examined. The shifts in the narrative voice impels the reader to derive information either, from relying completely on the narrator or, from depending upon his own potentials for measuring the value of the narrator's claim, to know a particular fact or not. Empson (1982, p. 142) indicates that double irony is a means through which, the narrator, instead of adopting one level of meaning by exposing the flaws in another, "may hold some wise balanced position between them, or contrariwise may be feeling a plague on both your houses. Empson seems to initiate a third indicator, namely "qualified irony" in which, the narrator asserts that there is merit on both sides which, is one method of explaining the prudence of Mrs. Adams. Thus we can say that the basis of judgment of characters is gone under complex attempts. Irony was used in Tom Jones as a means of satirtic characterization. He concentrates on the way through which the characters are presented, but my concentration will be on the way through which, the nature of the characters is unfolded. Their nature shares some aspects of the reader's nature and thus the reader is invited implicitly to re-evaluate and perfectly judge the real aspects and qualities of the characters themselves as well as those of himself.

Irony is one of the four kinds of humour which might be operational in a fictional world. Satire, romance and farce are also regarded as types of humour. The difference among the four kinds could be reflected in the actions they represent. Lang (1983) says that farce emphasizes a kind of comedy characterized by loud, noisy and rough behavior. It leaves people at its end as they were at its beginning. The repetition which the farce suggests is the point which increases attraction to it. Romance often brings agreements in feelings, always in the form of marriage. Satire suggests ridicule and a form of mockery aiming to bring about a conflict. While farce depends upon the physical use of power and romance upon hopes and expectations, satire is designed to serve its end without elaboration.

Irony has a doubling effect, a surface level and a real depth, weakness and strength, affirmation and denial, all are included within an ironic view. The doubling effects of irony are forced on the investigator and it is his part to recognize the hidden ground. Irony is the major form of humour found in Fielding's discourse of his classics. Leech (1981) says, basing his view on Booth's (1974) ideas that irony represents some kind of "secret communion" between the author and the reader. In case that such communion is undermined, then it is to be the author's inability to bring the reader in line with him, and not the reader's deficiency to comprehend the values presented by the author. Irony which

represents contrasts in values within the framework of two different viewpoints could take place either in one sentence or in a comprehensive work. To depict the heroes and their companions with these changes in their characters, the author has employed ironic devices in his work to illuminate it. The importance of employing ironic techniques is to set up two opposite meanings for reinforcing the style and for urging the readers to understand properly the characters' behavior.

Fielding's Tom Jones, which is built on satire, tackles also two important concepts namely, charity and chastity, and it is through connotations of meaning that the author makes it difficult for the readers to make a simple judgment and thus complications arise for the evaluation of characters. Some puzzling questions are set up; do mercy, compassion and forgiveness contradict justice or not? But whether they contradict justice or whether they do not, are they regarded as virtues or vices? Do mercy, compassion, and forgiveness cause harm or reconcile? The problem is incorporated in the fact that the Christian religious doctrine asks for forgiveness, while the laws of justice ask for punishment; a culprit should get his deserts. The problem is also incorporated in the fact that it is difficult to know which cases deserve forgiveness and compassion and which do not. Those who wish to be charitable with either encourage vice and infringe the laws of justice or fulfil the laws of justice and condemn others. In both cases, no assertions of judging correctly are underscored as long as the evidence is not sufficient to communicate the truth. A judge has to avoid hasty judgment as long as judgment constitutes a major significance. He has to judge not only in accordance with the laws of justice but also in accordance with the laws of the religious doctrine.

The concept of chastity seems to be baffling in examination as much as the concept of charity. The narrator is aware to differentiate love from lust, thus allowing the reader to excuse the beahviour of some characters and denounce the behavior of others. Empson proposes that the reader may: "get to the point of reading Tom Jones with fascinated curiosity, baffled to make out what (the narrator) really does think about…(among other things) the Christian command of chastity" (Empson, 1982, p. 124).

The narrator explores the wide meaning of love and gives an answer to those who ignore the existence of love. The difference between the narrator's own view of love and the meaning imposed on the word by custom is explored: "… what is commonly called love, namely the desire of satisfying a voracious appetite with a certain quantity of delicate white human flesh, is by no means that passion for which I here contend. This is indeed more properly hunger; and as no glutton is ashamed to apply the word love to his appetite, and to say he loves such and such dishes, so may the lover of this kind…say, he hungers after such and such women" (Fielding's Tom Jones, BK VI, Ch. 1, p. 252). The narrator adds that love is opposed to hunger and is part and parcel of benevolence. The pure love is that which contributes to the happiness of others, and which is "sweetened by the assistance of amorous desires". Thus love is independent of sexual desires which are associated with hunger or more appetite. Sometimes, sexual desires become a part of love and thus they are excusable; but when they become a part of hunger or more appetite, they arouse contempt. The distinction between love and is set out in the example of

Tom's love for Molly Seagrim, in comparison with his love for Sophia. Tom's love of Molly Seagrim is extended from his compassion for the situation of her family and from his gratitude for her interest in him in addition to his desire for her person. Tom seems to act neither for the mere appetite nor for exact love, which becomes clear when being aware of Sophia's affection for him. It is Tom's behavior towards Sophia and Molly which is to be investigated for determining the definition of love. Molly's love of Tom is not of that kind which could give him any feeling of discomfort at her faithlessness. Meanwhile, his love for Sophia is marked with "unbound passions".

Although Tom's emotions are wholly dedicated to Sophia and his affections for Molly are not greatly marked, yet he allows himself to be once again seduced by her, which is no more than a consolation for his quarrel with Bilfil and being drunk, and lonely for Sophia. He hardly loves Molly than she loves him: "Jones probably thought one women better than none, and Molly as probably imagined two men to be better than one" (Ibid, BK V, Ch. X, p. 240). Jones retires into the bushes with Molly because one woman is better than none. Rawson suggests that Tom's love is the outcome of "appetite alone". The effects of appetite seem to align those of benevolence or pure love. The esteem and gratitude, Tom cherishes for both Molly and Sophia are the effect of his attraction to them. Attraction seems to encourage benevolence rather than the latter promotes the former, as being suggested by the essay on love. If love is incorporated with emotions which aim at the happiness of others, then Tom loves both Molly and Sophia. Molly is no more than a whore, like those who marry men whom they dislike and abhor, only for their fortunes. Fielding calls that kind of marriage "legal prostitution for hire". Molly's plan to deceive Tom by convincing him that he is the father of her bastard son, simply proceeds from her fear of losing her generous lover (Rawson, 1959, pp. 400-404). There are two kinds of appetite that are noteworthy; appetite that satisfies itself at any rate and appetite that could be kept under control when its satisfaction would probably cause the misery of others. Tom at the age of sixteen, when he casts eyes of affection on Molly, has been controlled by his principles from pursuing her: "To debauch a young woman, however low her condition was, appeared to him a very heinous crime" (Ibid, BK IV, Ch. VI, p. 169).

There are some people who ignore the existence of love in the human heart and in the meantime, they are incapable of understanding benevolence, since they are only capable of mere appetite. "And love probably may, in your opinion, very greatly resemble a dish of soup". Mrs. Water's affection for Tom ranks her among those group of people: "…She was in love, according to the present universally received sense of that phrase, by which love is applied indiscriminately to the desirable objects of all our passions, appetites, and senses, and is understood to be that preference which we give to one kind of food rather than to another" (Ibid, BK IX, Ch. V, p. 454). Later on the narrator presents Mrs. Waters in a different view, after being rescued by Tom from Ensign Northerton: "women to their glory be it spoken, are more generally capable of that violent and apparently disinterested passion of love, which seeks only the good of its object, than men. Mrs. Waters, therefore, was no sooner apprised of the

danger to which her lover was exposed, then she lost every consideration besides that of his safety" (Ibid, BK IX, Ch VII, p. 463). It is uneasy to bring to consistency, Mrs. Waters' goodness and her sexual freedom. She is Captain Waters' wife and has initiated a close acquaintance with Ensign Northerton, which has worked for the defamation of her reputation. Nothing dictates her conscience as long as, what satisfies her pleasures, does not harm anybody. Her benevolence which has been concealed, is unearthed when Tom is put in jail for wounding Fitzparick, with whom Mrs. Waters has kept company since their departure from Upton. Patridge realizes that Mrs. Waters resembles Benny Joes, as both see it natural to embark upon incest. Yet, it is the discovery that Benny and Mrs. Waters are the same person that adds irony to the matter. It is underlined that Allworthy's condemnation of Jenny Jones has been for her inability to preserve her chastity. "The heinous nature of this offence must be sufficiently apparent to every Christian inasmuch as it is committed in defiance of the laws of our religion, and of the express commands of Him who founded that religion" (Ibid, BK 1, Ch. VII, p. 66).

The above mentioned extract includes the same lesson delivered to Jones when it has been hinted that he is the father of Jenny's bastard son. Despite, the exhortation and the moral lesson given by Allworthy to Tom and Jenny, neither of them seems to obey the exhortation nor respond to the lesson. Mrs. Waters, who has been described early in the novel as a "slut" proves to be a truly benevolent character. Her sexual freedom which unquestionably lay emphasis for denouncing her, seems, after all, one of the elements which underscore her sympathetic nature and benevolence. The man to whom she owes happiness at Upton, is the men to whom she wishes happiness in the arms of another woman. Meanwhile, appetite is only blameworthy, when it impels one to sacrifice another's happiness to one's own. Bilfil's appetites which are, "the common property of all animals" represent such aspect. What is subject to condemnation, is Bilfil's sexual pursuit to Sophia which is heightened by her intense dislike of him, in addition to his thought of keeping Sophia away from Tom as a revenge on Tom's side, which is just a means of separating the two lovers. Tom, in the meantime, whose animal spirits are somewhat stronger than Bilfil's, vows to "sacrifice everything to the possession of my Sophia but Sophia herself". Speaking with Nightingale, Tom points out that chastity is not among his virtues and he admits "I have been guilty with women, I own it, but am not conscious that I have ever injured any-nor would I, to procure pleasure to myself, be knowingly the cause of misery to any human being". Clearly, Bilfil's attempt to establish his own happiness depends upon his desire to undermine the happiness of others, while, Tom's happiness could not be built by demolishing the happiness of others or causing misery to them. Remarkably, Lord Fellamar's tender feelings towards Sophia shares Bilfil's emotions. His affections towards Sophia also share the characterization of Tom's feelings towards Molly, "the nobleman…might now without any great impropriety, be said to be actually in love with (Sophia)". Apart from Sophia's physical charms, Lord Fellamar states to Lady Bellaston, "I should swear she had been bred in a court; for besides her beauty, I never saw anything so genteel, so sensible, so polite" (Ibid, BK XV, Ch. 2, p. 698).

A further distinction between Tom's feeling and those of the nobleman, Fellamar, is that Tom's life when discovering Sophia's passion becomes "a constant struggle between honour and inclination", while Fellamar's life becomes a struggle between "honour and appetite'. Fellamar, at the beginning attempts to prove the success of honour, by approaching. Lady Bellaston and by rejecting the idea of rape, but when he is being accused by Lady Bellaston of lacking courage, he attempts rape as a point of honour and to prove himself a "man of spirit". Building his opinion on a false view of honour, Fellamar continues his relationship with Bellaston, because he feels himself owing much to her kindness. In this connection, Tom's binding emotions with Sophia, have resulted in reformation and wisdom: "The first moment of hope that my Sophia might be my wife, taught it me at once; and all the rest of her sex from that moment became as little the objects of desire to my sense, as of passion to my heart" (Ibid, BK XVIII, Ch. XII, p. 866). Tom's love affair with all amours have something to do with the heart, including Lady Bellaston for she has secured him against starvation. Thus it is the calibration of the quantity of love, neither the kind of love, that strikes a difference between these amours and Tom's passion for Sophia. Chastity seems to suggest "rigid virtue" or excessive modesty incorporated under prudery. Chastity seems to be meaningless as being suggested by Fielding. Molly despite her unchastity seems to be likeable. Square, on the other hand, being an advocator of moral lessons, is degraded in the eyes of the reader for working in the opposite side to his advocacy and proving his weakness on attempting a sexual relationship with Molly. Moreover, Fellamar attempts rape, only to prove his manhood rather than to satisfy an appetite. Jonny Jones is seen in a view less strict than that presented by Allworthy.

In the early chapter in Tom Jones, Fielding's definition of charity aligns that which he has initiated in Joseph Andrews, indicating that deeds are underlined rather than dispositions. In the dialogue between Mr. Allworthy and Captain Bilfil, Bridget's husband, who has known that Partridge is Tom's father, it seems that the Captain attempts to decrease Allworthy's tender feelings towards the child, whom he regards a rival in his quest for Allworthy's fortune. He capitalizes on the chance for doing so through his discussion on the nature of charity: "The Christian religion, she said, was instituted for much nobler purposes than to enforce a lesson which many heathen philosophers had taught us long before…(he said)…a virtue much higher, and more extensive in its nature, than a pitiful distribution of alms, which…could never reach many; whereas charity, in the other and truer sense, might be extended to all mankind" (Fielding's Tom Jones, BK II, Ch. V, p. 101). Bilfil further illustrates that the man who does help others materially is merely encouraging vice to triumph over virtue, as long as such aid is extended to those who do not deserve it. It is notably that Bilfil is talking about Partridge. Allworthy states that his ideas of charity "was interpreted to consist in action, and that giving alms constituted at least one branch of that virtue". According to Allworthy, charity is associated with the way that one diminishes the pressure of distress of another person, and it is by virtue of charity that "we condescend to share some part of them by giving what even our own necessities cannot well spare". Allworthy

proclaims that a small number of cases which let man fall a prey to ingratitude from others or harden his heart against the distress of others cannot destabilize a truly good man from extending generosity to others, as long as “nothing less than a persuasion of universal depravity can look up the charity of a good man and “surely it unfair to argue such universal depravity from a few vicious individuals” (Ibid, p. 103).

Fielding also advocates that charity consists in the relief of suffering, which comes in line with the doctrines of the low-church. Although, the narrator assert that Allworthy is entitled to this virtue namely, charity, and despite the fact that, he fulfills his principles on an accurate basis, yet he is not sufficiently ranked as charitable as it first appears in the reader’s mind. There are cases which reveal Mr. Allworthy less than completely generous. The first case is that which unfolds in the way he deals with Partridge. Being informed by Captain Bilfil about some aspects of Partridge’s paternity, Mr. Allworthy questions Deborah Walkins who affirms the subject of debate. In a further stance, Partridge is proved guilty in the eyes of Mr. Allworthy despite Partridge’s affirmation of his innocence. Mr. Allworthy is convinced by the indictment launched against Partridge by his wicked and wild wife concerning the fact; that Partridge is the father of one of the two bastards brought by Jenny Jones and thus, he decides to postpone judgment until Jenny can appear as a witness. On being informed that Jenny “had left her habitation a few days before in company with a recruiting officer”, Allworthy declares that she is no better than a “slut” whose word is not to be trusted and points out that if she says that truth then: “She must have confirmed what so many circumstances, together with his own confession, and the Declaration of his wife, that she had caught her husband in the act, did sufficiently prove” (Ibid, BK II, Ch. VI, p. 107). According to such circumstances Partridge and his wife are deprived of much of their income which has been taken from their school. Allworthy has not shown callousness but rather intends to supply them with enough money upon which they could be able to subsist, yet on the death of Partridge’s wife, he has left the country threatened with the danger of starving. The next time the reader meets Partridge is when Tom has encountered him at an inn working as a barber. The fate of Partridge has been unknown for the reader within a number of intervening years, until it is only unraveled in the end of the story. A wicked and vengeful neighbour has footmarks for foiling Partridge’s expected success of another school and for being sent to jail for seven years, which are both attributed to the fact that Partridge’s pig has intruded into that man’s property. The magistrate, Allworthy, seems less interested in that issue in comparison with his anxiety to discover the true parentage of Tom, which is a mark of causal injustice. “Well”, says Allworthy, “pass that over till your return to England” (Ibid, p. BK. XVIII, Ch. VI, p. 833).

The nature of Allworthy’s compassion is also examined in the way he handles the issue of Black George. Tom has been seized in company with another man caught while venturing illicitly in squire Western’s property and on being beaten mercilessly by Thwackum to learn the name of his companion, he is forced to divulge such secret and n that account Allworthy has dismissed the gamekeeper from his

service. The justice of this sentence is enhanced by the information that "Mr. Allworthy had given the fellow strict orders on pain of forfeiting his place, never to trespasses on any of his neighbours" (Ibid, BK III, Ch. II, p. 125). Tom assures that George's trespass or intrusion upon the property of squire Western is merely in response to his request and the shooting of the Partridge is migrated for the "covey was originally sprung in Mr. Allworthy's own Manor". As a result of George's dismissal from his service, he and his family, like Partridge, are left to suffer from starvation, it is only due to the good offices of Tom that they are rescued. When Tom manages to acquaint Allworthy of the miserable conditions of the poor family, Allworthy has given the mother "a couple of Guinee" to clothe her children and is convinced by Tom, that he has to think of any means, by virtue of which the family could subsist. Allworthy's good offices are demolished on being informed by Bilfil that the gamekeeper has illegally killed a hare belonging to Western to feed his family. Bilfil exaggerates George's transgression to Allworthy: "Bilfil…considerably altered the story; for he said that George had wired hares. These alterations might probably have been set right, had not Master Bilfil unluckily insisted on a promise of secrecy from Mr. Allworthy, before he revealed the matter to him; but by that means the poor gamekeeper was condemned without having an opportunity to defend himself" (Ibid, BK. III, Ch. X, p. 148).

Once again Allworthy punishes a man on the basis of rumours and hearsay "… there is no zeal blinder…against offenders" (p. 148). If the situation comments on Allworthy's attitude, it also reveals Bilfil's malice. The third case which unravel that Allworthy's compassion is controlled by his sense of justice, is his decision to turn Tom away. Such a horrible deed undertaken by Allworthy is the culmination of suspicions that Tom intends to steal Sophia from Bilfil, which are built on two extremes, namely, Squire Western's notice of Sophia's faint in Tom's arms and Mrs. Western's infringement of Sophia's trust. In addition to that Bilfil out of his malice and ill-intentioned purpose fabricates stories on Tom to distort his image before Allworthy. He has accused him of drinking intoxications during Allworthy's illness and in the meantime, he has claimed that Thwackum has discovered him in the bushes "engaged with a wench in a manner not fit to be mentioned" (Ibid, BK. VI, Ch. X, p. 285). Allworthy maintains that man is guilty until proven innocent, and as long as Tom has been really drinking when he received the news of Allworthy's recovery, followed by the news of Bridget's death, he cannot conceal or deny the indictment levelled against him. Allworthy tells Tom, "that unless he could clear himself of the charge, he was resolved to banish him from his sight forever" (Ibid, p. 286). He further illustrates that he has to act, as justice impels him to: "The world, who have already censured the regard I have shewn for you, may think, with some colour at least of justice, that I connive at so base and harbarous on action…indeed equal to your crimes, and I can think myself justifiable in what I am now going to bestow on you" (Ibid, BK. VI, Ch. XI, p. 287).

Allworthy afterwards dismisses Tom with a sum of money to start a new livelihood. The narrator comments on Allworthy's decision: "The Reader must be very weak, if, when he considers the light in

which Jones then appeared to Mr. Allworthy, he should blame the rigour of his sentence. And yet all the neighbourhood, either from this weakness, or from some worse motive, condemned this justice and severity as the highest cruelty" (Ibid, p. 288). The term "weak" or "weakness" in the above mentioned passage becomes associated with compassion. This, it is the neighbours' compassion which impels them to exaggerate Allworthy's cruelty towards Tom, disregarding to mention that he has been sent with five hundred pounds. The reader should not denounce Allworthy's decision as much as he has to find out reasons behind which he is forced to embark upon this step. First of all, Jones appears in a very bad position, and unfortunately the evidence is against him, thus, the decision for punishing him could not be rejected. On examining these three incidents, it is revealed that Allworthy's character is characterized with both a charitable nature and a sense of justice.

Although, sometimes he attempts hasty conclusions and gives an ear to hearsay and rumours, yet it is out of fear to encourage vice which projects him to such an attitude. It seems in the eyes of Allworthy, that it is better to give alms than to give one a good opinion. Being strict in judgement, followed by a decision to supply the family of the culprit with money to subsist for their life is merely to bring Allworthy's conscience to comfort and it is not an overall sign of his charitable nature. It is worthy to note, that, Bilfil's rejection to the idea of charity, which according to his own view is a means to assist the wicked and to allow vice to triumph over virtue, has actually influenced Allworthy's opinion and has urged him to treat Partridge, Tom and George on strict and severe bases. As long as, Allworthy sees that the three men he judges are unquestionably guilty, he regards it immoral to release them without punishment. Along with Allworthy's complete devotion to severe the basis of justice, there is a flaw in his character in my own view which makes him fall as a prey to deception from clever hypocritical and ostensible characters such as Bilfil who has managed to undermine Allworthy's benevolent impulses.

A distinction is also drawn by Fielding as regards "the passions of the man" and the "principles of the magistrate", "indicating that the latter should take priority over the former in cases of villainy. Probing the characters of Tom end Allworthy as judges is also the focus of excavation. The significant case of Tom's judgement is his meeting with the highwayman who has tried to rob him and Partridge, and on investigating his circumstances, it is unearthed that he is being stript out of his livery and it is the dire need to provide for his almost dead and starving family which forces him to attempt robbery. The highwayman suggests to take Tom to his house to prove the veracity of his story and he has highly agreed when Tom has accompanied him, that Tom no longer doubts him. Tom extends the poor man a couple of guineas as soon as he has felt pity for him. Tom giving the highwayman a sum of money to provide for his family, seems to follow the example of Allworthy giving Black George the same amount of money to serve his family. Similarity worked out by the attitudes of both Allworthy and Tom as regards their financial aid to the poor, seems to be disparity in their disposal, as the former provides money which is excessive to his needs, the latter grants money of which he is in dire need. Neither of these cases prove the extent of the culprit's guilt, yet the judges are ruled by different dispositions.

5. Fielding's Moral Teechnique

No narrative devices are worked out haphazardly or merely for amusement; rather they are drawn up for didactic purposes. However, Fielding gives himself the right to comment on characters and incidents. Edgar (1965, p. 65) states that "Fielding reserves to himself also the right to comment on characters and incidents". The purpose of such commentary is to influence the readers' perspectives and to direct their attention to specific attitudes within the artistic work. Fielding's concern is not to present a story for entertainment but also to extend a moral lesson to the reader and to involve him in the work. Lynch (1985, p. 599) claims that the mark of shame bestowed by earlier critics on Fielding as intrusive narrator is eliminated, on the account that his presence within the text is directed for teaching purposes. He emphasizes that those critics who focus on the rhetoric of the novel end undermine ways through which Fielding's narrator "train ethical judgments" of the readers. In the introductory chapters to some books of the novel, namely books six, seven and ten, the narrator initiates a conversetion about good and bad-natured readers, in an attempt to teach readers themselves ways through which they could respond to the events of the book. Lynch (1985, pp. 600-601) syas: "the effects of these intrusions, especially since they came at moments in the novel when we are most apt to doubt the hero's moral worth, is to train our sensibility—our capacity to react sentimentally and yet be aware of the rational limits of feeling".

Friedman (1975, p. 146) says that the introductory chapters in Tom Jones do not only serve as a commentary on the characters' behaviour to unravel their intentions, feelings and actions, but also give the authorial narrator an opportunity to criticize them. Such technique gives a chance to develop an "ironic tension between the mind of the narrator on the one hand and the characters in their situations on the other". For instance, the introductory chapter to book six concentrates on certain ethical aspects, as the narrator attempts an ethical discussion on love, which in itself sets up an ethical difference between good and ill-natured readers. The chapter which focuses on the subject of love, indicates, that "love" is a kind and benevolent disposition, working to endow the "happiness of others".However, this way through which love works coincides with the good-nature, which is a feeling only realized by those who have known its effects. The narrator urges the readers in the closing peragraph of the chapter to accept his definition of benevolent love by resorting to the authority of the heart and not to the authority of the head: "Examine your heart, my good reader, and resolve whether you do believe these matters with me. If you do, you may now proceed to their exemplification in the following pages; if you do not, you have, I assure you, already read more than you have understood: and it would be wiser to pursue your business, or your pleasures than to throw away any more of your time in reading what you can neither taste nor comprehend" (Tom Jones, Bk. VI, Ch. 1, p. 253). This address to the readers implicitly impels them to undertake the position of good-natured readers. The narrator goes on to comment on the ill-natured readers and philosophers who reduce love to an absurd concept and thus they do not understand the true concept of love, as it is in the book: "To treat of the effects of love to

you, must be as absurd as to discourse on colours to a man born blind; since possibly your idea of love may be as absurd as that which we are told since blind men once entertained of the colour red;…love probably may, in your opinion, very greatly resemble a dish of soup, or a sirloin of roast-beef" (Ibid, p. 253). Such debate calls the readers upon postponing their evaluations and judgments as regards characters and situations until they fully be in touch with the proper ethical aspects. When Tom has yielded to Mrs. Waters temptations, he seems to have replaced love for hunger. The result of this is incorporated within two attitudes; his pursuit of Sophia, including his affair with Lady Bellaston; and the indication of his good-nature including his benevolent situation with the highwayman and also his attempt to assist Nancy Miller in her critical situation.

The introductory chapter to book seven sets out a "comparison between the world and the stage". The similarity between human life and the stage suggests ways through which the readers of the novel respond ethically to actions taking place in it. Such similrity also gives a distinction between good and bad-natured readers: "The worst of men generally have the words rogue and villain in their mouths, as the lowest of all wretches are the aptest to cry out low in the pit" (Ibid, p. 302). The point in this connection is that a character might act in contradiction to his good nature and that the reader might denounce such action in itself but not the actor. In the prefatory chapter to book ten, Fielding examines the ethical position in the world of literary criticism. Yet, the narrator in this respect criticizes the ill-natured criticism and tries to draw up the correct path which could redress the course of reading for both the ill and good-natured readers. The narrator also calls upon the readers, to suspend their judgment until they are fully aware of the whole action, even if a character is created with both good and bad temperaments: "…if there be enough of gooddness in a character to engage the admiration and affection of a well- disposed mind, though there should appear some of those little blemishes…they will raise our compassion rather than our abhorrence" (Ibid, p. 469).

On the other hand, Fielding's didactic aim in Joseph Andrews, is to expose the ridiculous of affectation in order to allow the public contemplate such deformity in themselves for correction. The good-natured readers who do not possess vain or hypocritical characteristics are invited to witness objectively the ridiculousness of human affectation. Stephenson (1982, p. 243) suggests that Fielding's aim in the book is not to reflect the folly of human nature, but rather to get readers to discover that they are sometimes vain and at other times hypocritical. It is a direct invitation to the reader to correct the follies within his character, and such didactic purpose is to be found so much in the reading rather than in the narrative skills. Fielding's narrator in Joseph Andrews applies skillful narrative strategies which gives him an opportunity to satirize the reader to educate him. The narrator says, "We consult the advantage of our reader not our own" (Jospeh Andrews, Bk. 11, Ch. 1, p. 99).

Fielding's narrative devices including the narrator as obtrusive, generates in the reader a sense of detachment, as long as the obtrusion interposes between the reader and the event. Within the context of the applied narrative tactics, the narrator allows the reader to assume the role of a spectator praising his

skill as an observer of the action rather than a participant. The narrator sometimes speaks to the reader as a “mere English reader” and in other times he addresses him as the “judicious reader”. This might be one way of examining the reader’s awareness, as being indicated in the attempted seduction scenes of Joseph by Lady Booby and Slipslop. The “mere English reader” might comprehend from these scenes that the effects of love differ in accordance with the social standing, while, the “judicious reader” will observe, that “the operations of this passion of love in the gentle and cultivated mind of Lady Booby” and in the ““less polished and coarser disposition of Mrs. Slipslop” are unquestionably the same (Ibid, p. 53).

One way of inviting the reader to see the action as a spectator, on condition that he has to avoid the hazards involved in the action presented and to accept the fact that there might be some imperfections in the human character that should be corrected, is represented in the event that Joseph and Fanny are convinced by some servants to accept Adam”s offer to mount his horse, while he is to walk home: “Perhaps, reader, thou hast seen a contest between two gentlemen, or two ladies quickly decided, tho” they have both asserted they should not eat such a nice morsel, and each insisted on the other’s accepting it; but in reality both were very desirous to swallow it themselves…for here both parties were heartily in earnest, and it is very probable, they would have remained in the inn-yard to this day, had not the good Peter Pounce put a stop to it” (Ibid, Bk. III, Ch. 12, p. 257).

The reader through this scene is left to doubt some qualities of Joseph and to trust Adam’s sincere charity and love. Through Fielding’s consummate narrative skills, he invites the reader not only to the judgment of the characters’ behaviour, but also to self-evaluation. Most of the profatory chapters address the reader of the significance of his role and his obligation to judge with sagacity. If the readers wish to be among those “upper graduates in criticism” and surely not to be “readers of the lowest class”“, then, they have to follow the rules of the narrator who has “taken care to qualify” them with bits of information and hints about the future developments in the “preceding pages” in order to allow them adopt “harder exercises of judgment and penetration” by speculating and evaluating (Tom Jones, Bk III, Ch. 1, pp. 121-122).

The didactic aims within Fielding’s novels, raise aquestion, about the extent to which education effects the human nature. Henry Knight Miller underlines three educational theories in Fielding’s formations; namely, that man is originally a blank paper but his character is shaped by the early habits and traditions to the extent that education can not alter; that men is originally a blank paper and that education shapes his character; and that man’s character is dependent upon innate qualities beyond the education to change. Fielding in Joseph Andrews used education, not only to clarify a character’s personality but also to provide a kind of irony within the novel. However, the novel satirizes the educational theory arguments within Fieldins’s days. The viewpoints of Joseph and Parson Adams in this connection, summarize these arguments. After contemplating Mr. Wilson’s story, Adams claims that “all that gentleman’s misfortunes arouse from his being at a public school” (Joseph Andrews BK

III, Ch. V, p. 221). While, Joseph says “great schools are little societies, where a boy of any observation may see in epitome what he afterwards find in the world at large”. Adams suggests that the best school is the private one, in which the tutor could be able to keep an eye on his student. Reasonable views about human nature emerge along side with the discussion between Adams and Joseph, as Adams sees that man is born with a blank mind and that education forms his character, therefore, the best education is the private; while Joseph insists that men’s characters are determined by innate “inclinations” and he cites an example: “When was in the stable, if a young horse was vicious in his nature, no correction would make him otherwise, I take it be equally the same among men (Ibid, p. 221).

These views of course, account for ambivalence on Fielding’s part. If education seems to be the sole element which shapes one’s character, then Fielding is to be drawing up a theory of character, but in fact, a character is to be determined by other elements and forces. This is the point that Fielding seems to arrive at, in Tom Jones. He examines the influence of the educational theories on one’s character. Referring to the same educational theories in Joseph Andrews, then Allworthy seems to follow the same assumptions proposed by Adams; that private education is better than public one and therefore he attempts to educate Tom and Blifil at home, but the results have been incorporated within targets missing those, entailed within his expectations. However, the problem lies not in the private education, but in the tutors themselves who have contrary characteristics to those that it is thought tutors should have.

Tom whose education is worse than that of Blifil due to his constant contact with Black George, yet, he emerges as good from childhood in contrary with Blifil who emerges as bad from childhood. However, Tom’s goodness either emerges from innate qualities or from education and this seems to be the point that Fielding endeavours to conceal from the readers, in order to force them to coincide with his view which proclaims that Tom’s goodness stems from innate qualities. Thus, it is indicated that a character is determined independent of education and that it acts upon its own lines. Otherwise, if there is an educational determinism theory, then Blifil’s acts of badness are to be attributed to his education, while in fact they proceed from hie own nature. No one could claim that the reader has no business in an artistic work. He has to exert effort and evoke his imagination in order to perceive the didactic lessons extended to him and to understand what is concealed behind the veils.

6. Fielding’s Innovations in Fiction

Innovations in the technique of fiction have largely contributed by the eighteenth century novelists. Fielding among those novelists has not only discarded the old assumptions, but has also looked for new innovation, inviting the reader who is the perceiver of the artistic work to take part in it. Of course, this gives the clue, to the direct addresses to the reader in the eighteenth century novels. In Fielding’s novels, the reader’s role is not to be induced with the action submitted, but his role is estimated at, the extent to which he puts his thoughts and beliefs in harmony with those of the author. In this connection,

Booth (1961, p. 138) states that: “the author creates, in short, an image of himself and another image of his reader; he makes his reader, as he makes his second self, and the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author and reader, can find a complete agreement”. The reader has to find out the meaning of the novel himself and by this way of unearthing the hidden aspects of the novel, a kind of communication is to be created between the reader and the author. Iser refers to Richardson who admits in one of his letters that the story must leave something for the reader to do. He also quotes Laurence Sterne, in Tristram Shandy: “no author, who understands the just boundaries of decorum and good-breeding, would presume to think all the truest respect which you can payto the reader’s understanding, is to…leave him something to imagine, in his turn as yourself” (Iser, 1978, pp. 30-31).

One way of accelerating the reader’s response to the fictitious world, is to leave him puzzle out sungestions and allusions in the given text. Hardy (1975, p. 31) proclaims that the functions of the tellers and the listeners in Fielding’s Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones are to enhance each other. The more the teller is involved in the narrative account, the more the demanding of the listener increases. Iser (1978, p. 34) states that: “the written text furnishes (the reader’s imagination) with indications which enable it to conjure up what the text does not reveal”. Fielding in Tom Jones underscores the importance of the reader’s participation in a given text: “Bestir thyself…to use the arts of divination to discover our meaning,…thy own attention is required; for thou art highly mistaken if thou dost imagine that we intended…to leave thy sagacity nothing to do; or that without sometimes exercising this talent, thou wilt be able to travel through our pages with any pleasure or profit thyself” (Tom Jones, Bk XI, Ch. 9, p. 546).

The emphasis on the reader’s sagacity aims at stimulating his perception. In the light of this attitude, the reader is to be invited to testing his own faculties. The reader’s own sense of judgment could be enhanced, through his keeness of perception which, in its capacity, gives the reader the chance to comprehend the lessons conveyed to him. Fielding in his preface to Joseph Andrews right through the opening essays in the book focuses his thought and business on the importance of the reader’s function. Following his attempt to distinguish his novel from the traditional writings, he points out: “I shall leave to my good-natured reader to apply my piece to my observations” (Joseph Andrews, Preface, p. 30).

In the light of this view, the novel seems to be a mirror for the reader reflecting through the characters his possible conduct. The novel thus, impels the reader to find out the positive potentials of the false assertions that might be proposed within the text. Fielding himself confirms that the novel assigns the reader the task of self-correction. He declares, his intention is: “not to expose one pitful wretch to the small and contempitable circle of his acquaintance; but to hold the glass to the thousands in their closets, that they may contemplate their deformity, and endeavour to reduce it, and thus by suffering private mortification may avoid public shame” (Ibid, Bk. III, Ch. 1, p. 185). The reader thus is urged through the book to remove the disequilbrium of the characters’ conduct by behaving himself properly. The text itself does not declare the proposed corrected motivation but leaves the reader himself to

puzzle out such motivation by his own perspective. It is through the text that the reader is invited to adjust his conduct and to calibrate the supposed proper reaction of a given stance. If the reader is being able to unveil the concealed reality of the text, then he will be also able to unravel the secret reality of himself.

The omniscence narrative, exclusing the stream of consciousness technique, as Allot (1959) says, endows the reader with a subjective perspective. Meanwhile, Iser points out that it is not the subjective keenness of observation that guides the reader through the text, but it is also the author's designed strategems that illuminate the right path to the reader. One of those maneuvers worked out by author, is a set of negations which shake the reader's expectations about things he knows or things that he presumes to know. Negation, however, arouses the reader's imagination to penetrate through the confusing norms in order to orrive at the meaning of the text. The reader, says Iser (1978), can test his potentiality through the episodes of the novel. He observes the world through the eyes of a given character and sees this character through the eyes of a practical world. The result is diverse views, joineby their negative properties. For instance, Parson Adam's view of the people's conduct seems to he incorporated within selfishness, but in the eyes of Parson Adams seems to lack knowledge in the ways of the world. These two standpoints, do not give any hint as to how people should behave, but such discrepancy in these perspectives casts a shadow over the positive features that are not incorporated within the text, and are to be unravelled through the reading process.

A case of negation is seen, when Joseph refuses to align Lady Booby and Slipslop in their attempted seduction and speaks out loudly for his virtue. Fielding at the peak of this critical situation continues: "Your have heard, reader, poets talk of the statue of surprize; you have heard likewise, or else you have heard very little, how surprize made one of the sons of Croesus speak tho' he was dumb…could you receive such an idea of surprize, as would have entered in at your eyes, had they beheld the Lady Booby, when those last words issued out from the lips of Joseph-' your virtue! (said the lady…) I shall never survive it" (Joseph Andrewws, Bk 1, Ch. 8, p. 58). The narrator in this connection does not provide an explanation of Lady Booby's surprize, and the reader is left to find out the description himself, in the light of the presented indications. The non-description of Lady Booby's surprize does not only break off the narrative but also creates a gap in the text, through which the reader is able to convey for himself whatever the text does not convey. Iser (1978, p. 38) comments on the created gaps within e text by stating that "the deliberate gaps in the narrative are the means by which enabled to bring both characters to life". Lady Booby's seduction scene proposes her unrestrained lust which she attempts to conceal. It also brings about a feeling of pity and sadness as well as an atmosphere of comedy. In a further seduction scene between Joseph and Slipslop, Fielding presents the reader few indications to give him a chance for painting his own picture of the scene. However, the passions of Lady Booby in her capacity as an aristocratic lady is differentiated from the passions of her maid.

The process of reading the book resembles a trip, during which the infrequent illuminations of the

author are considered as resting stations, which function is confined to giving the reader an opportunity to think back about things that have taken place: “those little spaces between our chapters may be looked upon as an inn or resting place where he may stop and take a glass, or any other refreshment, as it pleases him…As to those vacant pages which are placed between our books, they are to be regarded as those stages, where, in long journeys, the traveller stays some time to repose himself…” (Joseph Andrews, Bk.11, Ch. 1, p. 99). Parts which interrupt the narration are called by Fielding “vacant pages”.The function of these is engarved as gaps within the text; they allow the reeder to form his own conceptions, create the meaning of what he is reading and conceive the idea within. Stanzel (1984, p. 49) points out that the degree with which the reader perceives the fictional reality depends upon the process of narration. The reader’s capacity to see and perceive the hidden nature of characters sometimes goes under abmivalence, on the account that, he cannot align himself with the unearthed aspects of the characters’ attitudes and feelings such as hypocrisy, but it is through a sequence of actions he finds that he himself has got equal portions of their views and thus he stands in a state of doubt. Parson Adams, as being hinted before, is seen as naive and lacking knowledge of the ways of the world which is attributed to his moral steadfastness. The question which sets itself is, whether moral steadfastness is regarded a wrong thing to be rejected by the reader? Or does the reader discover through his capacity to see the hidden nature of Parson Adams that he applies a small part of morality? In this respect Iser (1978, p. 44) says: “the reader seems to lack orientaiton which is something Adams has”. Yet the problem could be eliminated obly by realizing the essence of morality. The preformulated deceptive devices by the author within the text foils the reader’s supposition that he could be superior over Adams by rejecting his naivety. Iser (1978, p. 47) points out that the reader could capitalize on chance and unearth for himself through the text considerable familiarization with the surroundings and circumstances taking place.

The difference between Fielding’s Joseph Andrews and previous literary works such as Pamela is that Fielding composed his book on th basis that the reader has to bring forth the meaning of himself. The book unveils its aspects through sets of negations and it foils the reader’s expectaitons and stimulates him to pass into the perplexed norms to create an equal weight to the negativity of the text, while, in the previous literary compositions the meanign is explicitly reveled for the reader. In order to avoid the subjectivity of the reader in finding out the meaning of the text, Fielding has created a dialogue between the author and the reader which adds to the intricacy of the narration. This technique which is greatly exploited in Tom Jones draws up broad lines for the reader on ways through which he views the course of aciton. The reader is to be guided in the text by the directives worked out explicitly by the author or by the complexity drawn up implicitly for displaying the human nature which is to undergo simplificaitons by the stratagems used by the author in an attempt to display it.

Within the context of dialogue with the reader in Tom Jones, Fielding expounds the general basis that gives an overall view to the whole artistic work: “And here we shall necessity be led to open a new

vein of knowledge…This vein is no other than that of contrast, which turn through all the works of the creation, and may probably have a large share in constituting in us the idea of all beauty, as well netura1 as artificia1" (Tom Jones, BK. V, Ch. 1, p. 201). Fielding proclaims thet he is the first to incorporate the contrast rule within his work. This proclamation, of course, is not directedd to moke public announcement for his work, but rather it is a clue to the reader to the narrative technique adopted in the book. The contrast which is identified within Fielding's view as the "reverse", involves contradicted ideas and through such contradiction that the negation uncovers the significance and meaning of a specific event. The negative and positive poles are the stimulants of the reader's imagination to form a convincing view of the exhibited event. Iser points out that this view which the reader forms is always neutral; it does not enhance either the negative nor the positive poles but rather it stands in between both, forming a clear and defined conception of the event displayed. The negative form is operational in two ways; first it sets up a contrast which brings about perplexed forms; second it brings about through these forms an explicit understanding of the idea displayed.

Contrast does not only form a pivotal mainstay in understanding but also represents part of the devices exploited in the book to illuminate the path for the reader and emphasize the point, that the text will be conceived as consistent with the author's claim. Commenting on the contrast within Fielding's literary works, West (1968) points out that the fact that, the reader's emotions are brought about to like or dislike a character is attributed to the contrast breaking out as a result of the diversity between the authorial voice and the characters' behaviour. Iser (1978) states during the course of reading, one is impelled to strike comparisons that do not only deal with the differences between an event and its negative form but also with ideas held in the mind of the reader that allow him to think of the form and content of the former contrasts and that is to create for him an image of what is already there at a specific moment. The contrasts in Tom Jones are different in order to give the reader a chance to guess and think about the various pictures of human nature. Bearing in mind that contrasts are merely stratagems in the novel, the reader should not think that they give a determined and specific identification of the human nature but rather these varieties of contrasts meet at a certain point. Fielding speaks about human nature at the beginning of Tom Jones, indicating that it is proposed at contrasting grounds shall represent human nature to the keen appetite of our reader…and shall hereafter hash and ragoo it with all the high French and Italian seasoning of affectation and vice courts and cities afford. By these means, we doubt not but our reader may be rounded desirous to read on for ever". Contrast sharpens the reader's sense of discernment, To ensure that the reader is activated, the author sets out a clear-cut example of contrast, incorporated within the story of "The Man of the Hill", who resembles the hero, with the exception that his heart as a result of being exposed to sour experience is sharpened against his follow men. His sour experience, in its turn, has allowed him to think of nothing except the badness of human nature. At the moment that the man of the hill thinks that the human is tained and contaminated, the hero gets in touch with the fact that the human nature undergoes change and variety

of forms.

A further example of contrast is hinted when Tom has been in danger, waiting to meet Lady Bellaston. This chapter is preceded by a chapter in which Tom meets the highwayman whom he has rescued his life. The author's intention of including this chapter in between, the chapter dealing with his portentous meeting with Lady Bellaston is to bring forth the reader's awareness to the basis of the hero's goodness which even in critical cases is pictured firm and steadfast. Presenting aspects of the hero's goodness in contrast with aspects of his lapses confirms that the human nature would be lacking completeness if it is displayed with an atmosphere of perfection and within the framework of an excellent and supreme pattern of moral basis. The purpose of the story is to let the reader think, guess and conclude. Fielding indicates that the story contains significant events and that the reader can conjure up through the pauses within: "…that, by these means, we by these means, we prevent him. from throwing away his time, in reading without either pleasure or emolument, we give him,…an opportunity of employing that wonderful sagacity, of which he is master spaces of time with his own conjectures".

Further aspects of the novel are built on contrast; for example, love as regards to Sophia is merely a natural tendency, but it is for Molly Seagrim a way of tempting others to do whatever they do not want to; while it is for Lady Bellaston badness and wickedness in behaviour. Contrast is also underlined in the two characters of Tom and Blifil, while the latter follows the orders of his master and becomes corrupted, the former objects to the inappropriate instructions of his master. William Empson is among those who support Fielding's moral technique in Tom Jones. He suggests that critics like Samuel Johnson search for a strict formula of the novel's morality and in the light of this approach, they seem to be ignorant of Fielding's employment of double-irony, as he poses to choices or possibilities and then ironically subject both to ridicule. Empson claims: "Dr. Johnson and Sir John Hawkins denounced the book as meaning this, and hence implying that morality is no use…Tom's imprudence, and that he did not mean to imply that religion and philosophy are bad because bad men can interpret them wrongly…started from this idea in his first revolt against the ethos of Richardson which made him write…Joseph Andrews" (Empson, 1962, p. 128). Empson adds that Tom's good motives are always ridiculed by Fielding, on the account that he lacks discernment. For example, he is ridiculed when he sells himself to Lady Bellaston because he thinks his honour demands him to embark upon such deed. Fielding, of course, mourns Tom's imprudence. Gide (1962, p. 82) suggests in discussion of the protogonist that Tom's bad deeds are directed to helping others: "…in the novel (Tom Jones) we see Tom Jones but he steels for others not for himsclf. His rewards are reprimands and whippings; to the gamekeeper's family go the stolen apples and duck…then we see Tom lie, but this lies only to protect the same game keeper and to take all the blame for amutual misdeed. Tom threatened with punishment, has asleepless night, but not…because of the anticipated pain but because of the fear that he may weaken and betray…"

Tom's connection with the picaresque tradition is unfolded in the description of his boyhood, and as long as, the raseal's nature is unveiled when being young, then Tom is not excluded from this account: "It was universal opinion of all Mr. Allworthy's family, that he (Tom) was certainly born to be hanged…He had been already convicted of three robberies, viz of robbing an orchard, of stealing a duck…and of picking Master Rlifil's pocket of a ball…Mr. Allworthy would suffer such a led to be educated with his nephew, lest the morals of the latter should be corrupted by his example" (Fielding's Tom Jones, Bk. II, Ch. 2, p. 123).

Jones' behaviour aligns other picaresque heroes, highwaymen and rascals whose interest might focus on theft. He also proves to comply with tendencies of other rogues, such as Black George Seagrim who urges him to steal some apples and a duck. Both Tom and Blifil are educated home and thus they are not in touch with the tricks of the same-age boys, yet tom's own tricks become evident in his hatred feelings toward Thwackum and Squire. Tom's expulsion from his home goes in line with the traditional picaresque traits. Being extended a sum of money and given an advice before leaving the home, as well as, having an unexpected help and meeting rascals throughout his journey, all are characteristics of the picaresque technique. Desertion from military service which is a picaresque feature is stressed in Tom Jones, as Tom after unearthing Sophia's purse, has undermined his military service. Meeting with a company of adventurers on the road, depicting landlords and lawyers in the book and presenting disputes which take place among guests of country inns, are all picaresque chnracteristics. However, Tom's relation with Lady Bellaston has contributed to his sufferance, due to some embrassments to which he has been exposed. However, when Tom decide to marry Bellaston to preserve her honour, the matter has been turned round. Tom sends her a letter urging her to marry him to preserve her honour, while, Bellaston has informed Nightingale of her disapproval of the idea of marriage with Tom, on the basis that his sole aim behind marrying her is to be in possession of her fortune. Tom writes her another letter expressing his shock of her suspicion of him of such low motive and thus decides to break off his relation with her. Planning vengeance, Lady Bellaston, shows the letter to Sophia which has brought the relationship between Tom and Sophia to destruction.

Tom has been placed in other embarrassing situations, Molly Seagrim, despite the fact that she has received a country bringing up, yet she has no possession of the country moral codes. She persuades Tom that he is the father of her unborn child, while, she entertains other lovers. However, the felling of the curtain in Molly's bed room unveils her hidden lover, apart from her low motive. Another example which shows Tom in a further embarrassing situntion, is relevant to Mrs. Waters and her husband Mr. Fitzpatrick , who discovers her at Upton in bed with Tom and she quickly tries to give justifications for his presence in her bedroom. Early in the book, Thwackum and Blifil have seen Tom with Molly sitting under the shade of a group of trees and on hastening to discover them, Tom hears their noise and stands in their way to give Molly a chance to escape. Another embarrassing stance, when Tom fails in his house in London to conceal Lady Bellaston and Mrs. Honour from each other. These situations are

typically festures of lower picaresque traits apart from being characteristics of English tradition or the English picaro. Chandler (1907, p. 308) points out that indeed, though, it could scarcely have come into being without picaresque predecessors.

Eighteenth century critics among them Johnson, maintain that Fielding combines in Tom's character the qualities of a hero and the behaviour of a rascal and thus, he presents vice in a refined manner. The reappraisal of the picaresque hero, has to be done in relation to the other characters, on the account that most of the companions of the protagonist are from low origin and behave in cowardice while, he is born gentleman and it is circumstnncs which place him among rascals and his behaviour io often accompanied by courage. Partridge seems to be the companion of Tom in the book. Early in the novel he has assumed the role of a schoolmaster and then he has married a lady from Mr.Allworthy' kitchen. He has suffered at the hands of his wife and under his supervision he has taught Jenny Jones who has proved to be better schoalar than her professor. He is a neighbour to Squire Western, sixty years ago and on being in town he has worked as a barber. Despite, his old age, he seems to be strong enough to bear the difficulties of the long journey, which he and Tom have made on foot. He seems to be a heavy drinker at Upton and he also proves to be fond of the company of servants as being depicted on the road. Partridge proves to be a typical Picaro whose foolishness and cowardice stress the fact that these views are not there in Tom's character. Partridge, in addition to, acquiring the traits of a teacher, he acquires the charactristics of a simple rustic. In the light of this view, Fielding's humour seems to stem from the contrast in the features overwhelming one's character.

Partridge is also presented a victim of rogues. He is accused by his wife and Blifil to be Tom's father and as a result of such accusation he has lost his school. Deciding to p1ease Mr. Allworthy, the Parson at tempts to deprive Partridge of his job as clerk, at a time when he has nothing to subsist on, but a little inn which comes to him by an unknown person. The death of his wife, in addition to freeing him from his constant sufference also has deprived him of the little inn. He decides to leave his country, where he has no hope of better life and goes to serve two lawyers but on being ultimately able to open another school, a pig which he ownes transgreses into the park of a revengeful neighbour who raises a suit and by the help of two rascal lawyers he wins the case and Partridge is asked to pay damages which he has no money to pay and as a result he is put in Winchester Jail for seven years. When he is set free, he has started his career as a teacher at a school in Ireland and on being back to England, he has assumed the job of a barber for two months at a little town between Bristol and Gloucester where he has an opportunity to meet Tom. He knows that he is not the real father of Tom and thus attempts all the time persuade Tom, be back to Allworthy's home, for the reasons which Tom has explained for his expulsion do not convince Partridge. The injustices which Partridge has received have not hardened his heart but he has shown loyality and faithfulness to Tom. The simplicity with which the protagonists are displayed apart from the prominent roles they play and their relctionship with other companions, all serve to explain the picaresque tradition. Such picaresque elements can not be examined in isolation from other

significant and intrinsic features of Fielding's style such as irony.

Prestson (1966, p. 315) claims that the "moral sense" in Tom Jones is ambiguous, on the on the account that it is not directed, as the reader expects, by the action of the novel, but rather conveyed by the commentary of the narrator. For example, Tom's decision to amend his affection with Molly Seagrim, conducts him to find her in bed with Squire and to find latter on that she has been seduced by Will Barnes. Bearing in mind that the plot centres on fortune, then it is the narrator who undertakes the task of controlling the "moral weight" of the novel and who sets up a positive relationship with the reader, in order to accept his moral viewpoint. Tom's comment on his assumed incest, impels him to speak against fortune and to blame himself: "Fortune will never have done with me till she hath driven me to distraction. But why do I blame fortune ? I am myself the cause of all my misery. All the dreadful mischiefs which have be fallen me are the consequences only of my own folly and vice" (Fielding's Tom Jones, Ch. 2, p. 815). Watt (1957, p. 319) commnets on Fielding's technique as regards his commentary on the moral sense of the story; he exclaims that Fielding's accomplishment is deficient at least in the sens that it was unable to convey this longer moral significance through character and action alone.

7. Conclusion

Henry Fielding's two classics: Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones account for mock-epic formations, largely to reflect picaresque and episodic traits. Picaresque novels have no plots and their heroes are always left to start a long journey on highroads: Fielding's adoption of the mock-epic technique is for the sake of burlesque. Trivial things are treated as if they are significant. However, the order of events in Fielding's two books are interrupted by the constant intrusion of interpolated tales. The order of the characters' thoughts is overwhelmed by an ironic technique largely to invite the addressess not only to judge the characters' thoughts but also their own, in order to redress the follies of mankind at large. The order of the writer's display of information is characteried with the dialogue technique, the free indirect speech to give the characters a chance to voice their thoughts and the third person omniscient narrative view point which force the reader to think about the hidden aspects of the presented discourse. The linguistic devices used in Fielding's works which are reflected through style serve to clarify and provide a better understanding of the artistic activity.

Fielding's adoption of the omniscience narrative serves as an objective device for presenting the action such technique also suggests that the narrator is unbiased to the overall work. The omniscience narrative also omits any doubt or disbelief, on the grounds that it seems to expel the author's commentary and it also seems to exclude any aettempts to divert the mind to any imaginative influences. Not only does the authorial narrator, keep the reader in touch with the ideas, emotions, thoughts and feelings of the characters in a literary work, but also acquaints the reader with his own insight and perception. Thus, the point of view within a literary work is of a paramount significance,

for it does not only shed light on the overall action but it also centres the reader's attention to the course of the story's events. As Jakubjakova (2017) maintained, in Tom Jones we can see social conditions portrayed in many ways. What the author deals with a lot is poverty, which we proved is one of the aspects picaresque cannot be without. Poverty in Tom Jones is not portrayed mainly in Tom's material life, but mostly around him. There is a big influence of the poverty of his friend gamekeeper because as Tom is trying to help, he experiences a lot more misfortunes and roguish behavior which then results in him being the poor picaresque hero. Many of the situations in the novel are portrayed in a satirical way which is also an important feature of the picaresque. What Tom Jones deals a lot with is the behavior of people when influenced by money. We mentioned Mrs. Honour thinking about betraying her mistress, or doctors being unprofessional considering just their payment. We also saw a situation where gentlemen were willing to do anything just to be liked by a superior. Thus, the characters in the novel are then full of changeability and concealing. In order to achieve certain aims mostly connected with money and higher position, they are able to act differently.

Authors and readers are not the only characters taking part in a fictional work, but rather narrators play a pivotal role in the discourse of fiction. However, the narrative devices in Fielding's Tom Jones, vary from the first person narration to the third person omniscience stratagem. Fielding chooses the "I figure" especially in the interpolated tales to give himself the opportunity of speaking out his own viewpoint and addressing the reader directly to make this activity the focus of importance. Fielding also attempts to follow the path of the historian who keeps himself detached from the text. He maintains the principle of objectivity and asserts his role as selector and organizer. The significance of employing the third person is to undermine the part of the addressor in the novel's discourse so as to combine the parts of the implied author and narrator together. The author may behave as a teller, directly addressing the reader and asking questions. He may announce his presence through one of the characters of the artistic activity or through an exposure of an autobiographical experience. The author may also behave as an objective narrator.

Irony as one of the distinguished devices exploited in Tom Jones, and Joseph Andrews mainly unravels connotations of meanings and the nature of the characters. Irony in the limited sense of the word is relevant to the use of words for conveying the opposite of their literal meaning; or it might be identified as an expression or utterance marked by a deliberate contrast between apparent and intended meaning. The aim behind these contrasts of meaning is to initiate humours or rhetorical effects. It might be notable as well that incongruity arises between what might be expected and what actually occurs. Fielding's target for fully exploiting the device of irony in Tom Jones is to delineate characters' behavior and conduct. Fielding's technique sheds light on the significance of irony end underlines the fact that language is not merely an inflexible conveyer of information but rather the reader's mind has to be more flexible end capable of grasping shades of meaning. Fielding's technique of irony also destabilizes the reader's assurance of his unscrutinized notions. It is the attitudes of the reader as much

as those of the characters that are being subject to examination by the novelist.

Fielding's two classics, which are built on satire, tackle also two important concepts namely, charity and chastity, and it is through connotations of meaning that the author makes it difficult for the readers to make a simple judgment and thus complications arise for the evaluation of characters. Some puzzling questions are set up; do mercy, compassion and forgiveness contradict justice or not? But whether they contradict justice or whether they do not, are they regarded as virtues or vices? Do mercy, compassion, and forgiveness cause harm or reconcile? The problem is incorporated in the fact that the Christian religious doctrine asks for forgiveness, while the laws of justice ask for punishment; a culprit should get his deserts. The problem is also incorporated in the fact that it is difficult to know which cases deserve forgiveness and compassion and which do not. Those who wish to be charitable with either encourage vice and infringe the laws of justice or fulfil the laws of justice and condemn others. In both cases, no assertions of judging correctly are underscored as long as the evidence is not sufficient to communicate the truth. A judge has to avoid hasty judgment as long as judgment constitutes a major significance. He has to judge not only in accordance with the laws of justice but also in accordance with the laws of the religious doctrine.

Fielding has proved himself not only a successful eighteenth century novelist, but also a master-key to the English novel at large. His capacity as a writer proves that he has abundant knowledge and skills not only revealed in the field of artistic activities, but also in fields of education, social classes "high and low people", law and religious affairs. Such skills and knowledge have enabled him to set up a panoramic view of English life with consummate excellence and success. Most of the delight and success in Fielding's Tom Jones are taken from the power of the narrative voice; the true representation of the English life in the eighteenth century with examples of high and low characters, the well-formed structure of the book, the picaresque elements and various coincidences which enhance the plot and add to the comic features exploited in the novel. Fielding's insistence upon depicting affectation which stems from hypocrisy, probably attempting to deceit and vanity, possibly akin to ostentation is a device to expose vice and ugliness on one hand and virtue and goodness on the other. Such device does not only invite the reader to judge these traits only in the characters but also to explore them in human nature as well as in the depth of his own nature.

The presentation of characters and the irony maintained in the book is not the ultimate investigation but the narrative role and the narrator also contribute to the bulk of the whole work. Irony becomes apparent when the book is re-read and the enjoyment of re-reading the book is not only in questioning and doubting attitudes or disagreeing with assertions or generally accepted conclusions but also in being acquainted with the applied narrative stratagems and the narrator's role which works in a two-way track; creating puzzling characters and functioning in a puzzling way. Authors and readers are not the only characters taking part in a fictional work, but rather narrators play a pivotal role in the discourse of fiction. However, the narrative devices in Fielding's Tom Jones, vary from the first person

narration to the third person omniscience stratagem. Fowler (1966) points out that Fielding chooses the "I figure" especially in the interpolated tales to give himself the opportunity of speaking out his own viewpoint and addressing the reader directly to make this activity the focus of importance. Fielding also attempts to follow the path of the historian who keeps himself detached from the text. He maintains the principle of objectivity and asserts his role as selector and organizer. Commenting on the objective type of narration in Fielding's work, Leech (1982) that the significance of employing the third person is to undermine the part of the addressor in the novel's discourse so as to combine the parts of the implied author and narrator together.

Arguments have been launched to differentiate between narration and description, yet it has been revealed that narration and description are not discriminated and both are placed under the genre of narrative. Through the narrative stratagems, Fielding conveys didactic lessons in an attempt to force the readers to adopt a sound judgment about the actions and the characters. Such didactic lessons set out a question about the extent to which education affects one's character. It has been made clear that there is no educational determinism theory, but is one's character built independent of education and is it only affected by the innate qualities or does education also affect one's character? It is the reader's role to comprehend the lessons directed to him. In case that the reader is being able to disclose the hidden reality of the text, then he will also be able to unveil the concealed reality of himself. The two books of Fielding, namely Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones, reveal their aspects through sets of negations which stimulate the reader to pass through the perplexed norms to form a convincing view of the presented material. The negative form sets up a contrast that brings about these perplexing norms which in their turn set out an explicit understanding of the depicted idea.

Bibliograhy

1742, Fielding, Henry. Joseph Andrews, ed. R.F. Brissenden, Englsnd: Penguin Books Ltd., 1977.

1779, Fielding, Henry. Tom Jones, ed. R.P.C. Mutter, Englsnd: Penguin Books Ltd., 1966.

References

Abrams, H. (1981). *Literature as Social Discourse*. London: Batsford Academic & Educaitonal Limited.

Allen, W. (1959). *The English Novel*. England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Allot, M. (1959). *Novelists on the Novel*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Alter, R. (1964). *Rogue's Progress: Studies in the Picaresque Novel*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.

Apostoli, P. (2004). The european itinerary of The Picaresque Novel and its Traces in 19th Century Greek Literature: Transformation and Continuity. *Neohelicon, 31*(2), 53-61.

Ardila, J. (2010). Introduction: Transational Picaresque. *Philological Quarterly, 1,* 42-59.

Ardila, J. (2015). *The Picaresque Novel in Western Literature: From the Sixteenth Century to the*

Neopicaresque. Cambridge, Cambridge Universityy Press.

Baker, E. (1950). *The History of the English Novel*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Birke, D. (2015). Author, authority and authorial narration: The eightteenth-century English novel as a test case. In D. Birke, & T. Koppe (Eds.), *Author and Narrator: Transdiciplinary Contributions to a Narratological Debate* (pp. 99-111). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Blanchard, E. (1966). *Fielding: The Novelist*. New York: Russell and Russell.

Bliss, M. (1963). Fielding's Bill of Fare in Tom Jones. *ELH, 30*, 236-243.

Boisvert, D., & Thiede, R. (2020). *Language, Mind, and Power*. Routledge & CRS Press.

Bojornson, R. (1977). *The Picaresque Hero in European Fiction*. Wisconsin: The Univ. of Eisconsin Press.

Booth, W. (1974). *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Brooks, D. (1968). The Interpolated Tales in Joseph Andrews. *Modern Philosophy, 65*.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, S., & Roberts, C. (2007). Migration, ethnicity and competing discourse in the job interview: Synthesizing the institutional and personal. *Discourse and Society, 18*(3), 243-271.

Carston. (1988). Language and cognition. In F. Newneyer (Ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, vol. 3: Language: Psychological and Biological Aspects*. Cambridge University Press.

Cassirer, E. (1951). *The philosophy of the enlightenment, translated from the German by Fritz C.A. Koelln and James P. Pettegrove*. Pinceton: Princeton University Press.

Chandler, F. (1907). *The Literature of Roguery. 2 vols*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co.

Chapman, R. (1973). *Linguistics and Literature*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Claude Rawson, C. (1990). *Fielding in the Dock*. London Review of Books.

Cross, W. (1963). *The History of Henry Fielding* (Vol. II). New York: Russell & Russell.

de Beaugrande, R. (1980). *Text, Discourse and Process*. Longman, London.

de Beaugrande, R. (1984). *Text Production*. Ablex, Norwood, NJ.

Dorsch, T. (1965). *Aristotle, Horace, Longinus: Classical Literary Criticism*. England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Downie, J. (2009). *A Political Biography of Henry Fielding*. London: Piekering & Chatto.

Drabble, M. (1985). *The Oxford Campanion to English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford Universiy Press.

Edgar, P. (1965). *The Art of the Novel*. New York: Russell & Russell.

Eisenberg, D. (2018). *Does the Picaresque Novel Exist?*

El-dali, H. (2011). Meaning in language use: Reflections from pragmatics and discourse analysis with special reference to political discourse. *Annals of Arts and Social Sciences, 32*, 5-77. University of Kuwait.

El-dali, H. (2012). *Narration and persuasion in English by Arabic and Spanish speakers* (pp. 1-154).

Lambert Academic Publishing.

El-dali, H. (2019a). Language of consumer advertising: Linguistic and Psychological perspectives. *Studies in Linguistic and Literature*, *3*(2), 95-126.

El-dali, H. (2019b). Perfecting the theory of meaning: The story of pragmatic and discourse analyses. *Advances in Social Sciences and Culture*, *1*(1), 50-89.

El-dali, H. (2021). A stylistic analyis of Henry Fielding's Tom Jones: A socio-pragmatic view. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *8*, 1-21.

Elliott, R. (1968). *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*. Princeton University Press.

Empson, W. (1982). Tom Jones. In R. Paulson (Ed.), *Fielding: A Collection of Essays* (pp. 123-145). USA: Prentice Hall Inc.

Evans, B. (2018). *Language, Societyand Power*. Routeledge & CRS Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fleming, K. (2019). The Politics of Sophia Western's Muff. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, *31*(4), 659-680.

Flohr, B. (1994). *Eighteenth-centry philosophy of knowledge, morals and self as a background to the literature of the period*. Retrieved from http://strangebeautiful.com/other-texts/stein-phil-natl-pbil-17th-cent.pdf

Fowler, R. (1971). *The Languages of Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Friedman, N. (1975). *Form and Meaning in Fiction*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Georgakopoulou, A., & Goutsos, D. (1999). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.

Gibson, W. (2007). Tobias Smollett and Cat-For-Hare: The anatomy of a picaresque joke. *Eighteenth Centry Studies*, *40*(4), 571-586.

Gide, A. (1962). Notes for a Preface to Fielding's Tom Jones in Fieldings. In R. Paulson (Ed.), *A Collection of Critical Essays*. U.B.A: Prentice Hall Inc.

Goldknoph, D. (1969). The Failure of Plot in Tom Jones. In *Criticism* (vol. II).

Grane, R. (1934). Suggestions Towards a Geneology of the Man of Feeling. In *ELH* (vol. 1).

Guillen, C. (1971). *Literature as System: Essays Toward the Theory of Literary History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hammudin, B. (2012). *A Comparative study of politeness strategies in economic journals*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Malaya.

Hanlon, A. R. (2014). Toward a counter-poetics of quixotism. *Studies in the Novel*, *46*(2), 141-158. Doi: 10.1353/sdn.2014.0044

Hardavella, G., Aamli-Gagnat, A., & Frille, A. (2017). Top Tips to Deal with Challenging Situations: Doctor-Patient Interactions. *Breathe*, *13*, 129-135.

Hardy, B. (1975). *Tellers and Listners*. London: The Athlone Press.

Harris, R. (1968). *Reason and Nature in the Eighteenth Century* (pp. 1714-1780). London: Blandford Press.

Harris, S. (1952). Evasive Action: How Politicians Respond to Questions in Political Interviews. In P. Scabbell (Ed.), *Broadcast Talk* (pp. 76-99).

Hart, C. (2020). *Researching Discourse: A Student Guide*. Routledge & CRS Press.

Hartwig, G. (1967). The Restoration and Eighteenth Century (1660-1789). In A. C. Baugh (Ed.), *A Literary History of England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hatfield, G. (1968). *Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from https:// www.researchgate.net.publication/238690386

Hume, R. (2010). *Fielding at 300: Elusive, Confusing, Misappropriated, or (Perhaps) Obvious?* The University of Chicago.

Hutchens, E. (1965). Irony in Tom Jones. University: University of Alabama Press. Quoted from "The Aspect of Language and Style in Henry Fielding's Novels". An unpublished PhD Dissertation by S.M. Abdel Latif. University of Chesterfield, England, 1983.

Iser, W. (1978). *The Implied Reader*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Jakubjakova, M. (2017). *The history of Tom Jones: A Foundling as a apicaresque novel*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net.publication/320267841

James, H. (1968). *The Princess Cassamassima*. New York: Harper & Row.

Johnson, L. (2002). *Meaning and Speech Act Theory*. University at Buffalo, New York.

Lang, B. (1983). *Philosophy and the Art of Writing*. Lewisburg: Bucknell Univ. Press.

Le Boeuf, M. (2007). The Power of Ridicule: An Analysis of Satire. *Senior Honors Projects*, *63*, 1-45.

Leech, G. (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London & New York; Longman Group Ltd.

Levine, G. (1996). Putting the "literature" back into literature departments. *ADE Bulletin*, *113*.

Lynch, J. (1985). Moral sense of the narrator of Tom Jones. In *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* (Vol. 25, pp. 599-614).

Mancing, H. (2015). Guzman de Alfarache and After: The Spanish Picaresque Novel in the Seventeenth Century. The Picaresque Novel in Western Literature: From the Sixteenth Century to the Neopicaresque (pp. 40-59). Cambridge University Press.

Maskell, D. (1993). Locke and Sterne, or can philosophy influence literature. *Essays in Criticism*, *23*, 22-40.

Mchoul, A. (1994). *Discourse*. In R. Asher, & J. Simpson (Eds.).

McIntyre, D. (2012). Linguistics and literature: Stylistics as a tool for the literary critic. *SRC Working* , (1), 1-11.

Miller, H. (1966). Some Functions of Rhetoric in Tom Jones. In *Philological Quarterly* (vo. XIV, pp. 66-110).

Mitchell, T. (1957). The language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica. *Hesperis*, *44*, 31-71.

Mooney, A., Peccel, J., & La Belle, S. (2011). *The Language, Society and Power*. Routeledge & CRS Press.

Murray, J. (1933). *The Oxford English Dictonary* (Vol. VII). Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

O'Halloran, K. (2007). Critical discourse analysis and the corpus-informed interpretation of metaphor at the register level. *Applied Linguistics*, *28*(1), 1-24. Originally published in Picaresque Narratives, Picaresque Fictions: A Theory and Research Guide. Greenwood Press, 1989, pp. 3-16.

Peck, B. (2011). Age-related differences in doctor-patient interaction and patient satisfaction (Vol. 5, pp. 42-52). Hindawi Publishing Corporation.

Peterson, N. (2014). A poor, hungry plot: Lazarillo de Tormes in English trnaslaiton and the episodic structure of the Picaresque. *Philological Quarterly*, *93*(4), 461.

Preston, J. (1966). Tome Jones and the Pursuit of True Judgement. In *ELH* (vol. 33).

Preston, J. (1968). Tom Jones and the Pursuit fo True Judgment. In *ELH* (vol. 33).

Rawson, G. (1959). Professor Empson's Tom Jones. In *Note and Queries* (pp. 400-404).

Robinson, R. (1973). Henry Fielding and the English Rococo. In *Studies in the 18th Century* (vol. II).

Sacks, S. (1964). *Fiction and the Shape of Belief*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Sambrook, J. (1986). *The Eighteenth century: The intellectual and cultural context of English literature (1700-1789)*. London and New York: Longman.

Scholes, R., & Kellogg, R. (1966). *The Nature of Narrative*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Sherill, R. A. (2000). *Road-Book America: Contemporary Culture and the New Picaresque*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

Short, M. (1986). Literature and language teaching and the nature of language. In T . D'heen (Ed.), Linguistics and the Study of Literature. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Sieber, H. (1977). *The Picaresque*. London: Methuen.

Simpson, P., Mayar, A., & Statham, S. (2018). *Language and Power: A Resource Book for Students*. Routeledge & CRS Press.

Slembrouk, S. (2003). *What is Meant by "Discourse Analysis"?* London: Routledge.

Spacks, P. (1971). Some Reflections on Satire. In R. Paulson (Ed.), *Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.

Stanzel, F. (1984). *A Theory of Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Staves, S. (2016). Don Quixote in Eighteenth Century England. *Comparative Literature*, *24*(3), 193-215, 1972. Doi: 10.2307/1769895

Stephensor, R. (1974). Education fo the Reader in Fielding's Joseph Andrews. In *Philological Quarterly* (vol. 61).

Stevenson, J., & Paulson, R. (2000). *The Life of Henry Fielding: A Critical Biography*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Stevenson, J. (2005). *The Real Hisotry of Tom Jones*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stevenson, L. (1960). *The English Novel: A Panorama*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Stuart, M. (1967). *The Picaresque Novel Cleverland*. the Press of Case Western Reserve Univ.

Tomoiaga, L. (2012). *Elements of the Picaresque in Contemporary British Fiction*. Newcastle Upon Tyne. Cambridge Scholars Pvt Ltd.

Van Dijk, T. (1972). *Some Aspects of Text Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.

Van Dijk, T. (2006). Discourse, context and cognition. *Discourse Studies*, *8*(1), 159-177.

Van Dijk, T. (2008a). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. (2008b). *Society and Discourse: How Context Controls Text and Talk*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Vol. 1: Discipline of Discourse*. Academic Press.

Van Valin, R. (2001). Functional Linguistics. In M. Aronoff, & J. Rees-Miller (Eds.).

Watson, C. (2011). Notes on the variety and uses of satire, sarcasm and irony in social research, with some observations on vices and follies in the academy. *Power and Education*, *3*(2), 135-148.

Watt, I. (1957). *The Rise of the Novel*. England Penguin Books Ltd.

Werner, J. (1973). The interpolated narratives in the fiction of Fielding and Smollet: An epistemological view. *Studies in the Novel*, *5*, 271-283.

Wicks, U. (2002). The Picaresque Genre. Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800. In Michael L. LaBlanc (Ed.) (vol. 78). Gale.

Yolten, J. (1993). *Perception and Reality: A History from Descartes to Kant*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.