Fielding’s mildly critical allusion in the Covent Garden Journal (1752) to Don Quixote as a series of “loose uncon­nected Adventures of which you may transverse the Order as you please, without any Injury to the whole”¹ implies that his own works, at least ideally, have possessed a closer structural unity. Yet, in Fielding’s own words, Joseph Andrews was “Written in Imitation of the Manner of Cervantes, Author of Don Quixote”; and so it is ironical but, at the same time, understandable that some of the devices Fielding used in Joseph Andrews to achieve this unity are like devices found in Cervantes’ work. Likewise, Fielding’s praise in Joseph Andrews of Cardenio’s madness and the perfidy of Ferdinand (seeing them as examples of fidelity to nature) is ten years later in 1752 belied by his criticism of the stories of Cardenio and Dorothea as “ex­travagant and incredible” tales in which Cervantes “approaches very near to the Romances which he ridicules.”² Despite these two contradictions—quite understandable as changes of attitude over a period of ten years—the fact remains that at the time Fielding published Joseph Andrews in 1742 his subtitle suggests his intent to imitate Don Quixote, and his text³ indicates his admiration of the tales of Cardenio and Ferdinand as true to nature. It should be noted here in addition that Fielding had written in the late 1720s a farcical play called Don Quixote in England, attesting to the early and significant influence of Cervantes on Fielding’s imagination. A large number of discussions of the structure of Joseph Andrews already exist, but I believe fresh light may be thrown on the novel by examining the structure of the book in several new ways, one of them being as a direct descendant of the structured Don Quixote.⁴
Two very sound studies of form in *Joseph Andrews* are those of Maynard Mack and Andrew Wright, and my intention in this chapter is to supplement rather than to question or attempt to supplant the work of these two critics. Mack discusses in his introduction to the Rinehart edition of *Joseph Andrews* the way (as in a play) structure articulates theme. He shows how the action alternates between country and city and at the same time how the two poles of value (honesty and hypocrisy) are defined by life in the country and in the city; and he notes the tripartite system—country, road, city—that is used to provide setting for Fielding's characters. These are useful ways of defining thematic issues in the book, although it should be noted that honesty is not entirely confined to country life nor is hypocrisy to the city. Fielding was too fine an artist to clothe thematic issues in black and white, or to encircle them with city walls.

Andrew Wright develops his theories of the four-part division in *Joseph Andrews* in some detail, making telling points in favor of Fielding's consciousness of structural unity, such as the prefiguration of Parson Adams in book one and the opening and ending of book one, both on the subject of chastity—the theme at the cohesive center of this book. The remaining three books are described by Wright as centering on Parson Adams, education, and marriage, respectively. More will be said later on alternate themes and about the way in which the inner movements of the books parallel the themes, for Wright's analysis of chapter lengths and number of chapters leaves the matter of mechanical structure simply at the point of departure.

And finally, Maurice Johnson's chapter on "The Art of Comic Romance" must be mentioned. Johnson suggests that Fielding's subtitle is a clue to the general structure of *Joseph Andrews*. As in *Don Quixote*, which opens with a "burlesca movement" to introduce themes that become good comic prose, so Fielding's preface, which burlesques "commercial romance," sets the stage for the "good" romance to follow. Johnson develops this thesis at some
length in each of the four books, concluding that "the tradi-
tion established by Don Quixote continued in a type of
novel which looks at a romantic situation from its own
point of view so that the conventions of the two forms
make up an ironic compound instead of a sentimental mix-
ture." What is particularly valuable about Johnson's dis-
cussion, both here and in his following chapter on poet
and player, is his recognition of the part played by juxta-
position of opposites in Fielding's work and of Fielding's
complex use of counterparts, ironic and otherwise, gener-
ally ignored by his critics. It is the purpose of this chapter
to explore in Joseph Andrews these counterparts and ten-
sions (of which Don Quixote is full) at somewhat greater
length than Johnson does.

II

Both the 1605 and 1615 editions of Don Quixote were
originally published in four parts, and it is of interest to
observe the ways in which the four parts of these two
novels compare with the four parts of Joseph Andrews, also
originally divided into two volumes. To begin with, the
sally-withdrawal pattern that punctuates Don Quixote
(1605) and shapes each section is the essence of Joseph
Andrews as a whole, which describes the abortive sallies of
both Adams and Joseph and their return to the parish from
which they started. As Leon Gottfried writes, "'Literary
motif' is interwoven with the common three-part structure
of home-road-home" in Don Quixote as it is in Fielding's
Joseph Andrews. Although the number of chapters in each
book and the length of parts are far more uneven in Don
Quixote than in Joseph Andrews, both works contain at least
one book in which travels cease and the picaresque mode
is abandoned. Thus book four of the 1605 Quixote is largely
set at an inn where resolutions and reconciliations of the
kind that take place in book four of Joseph Andrews occur,
and book three of the 1615 Quixote is set at the castle of the
Duke and Duchess (alternating with the ironic and coun-
terironic counterpart of the "isle" on which Sancho is fulfilling his governorship) as book three of *Joseph Andrews* is partly set at the home of the Squire who, like Duke and Duchess, delights in playing practical jokes. Thus neither *Don Quixote* nor *Joseph Andrews* is picaresque in the strictest sense of the term, nor is Adams or Don Quixote a picaro—defined by one critic as "an offender against moral and civil laws" and as a person "low, vicious, deceitful, dishonourable and shameless."

The differences in the quadripartite structures of Cervantes' books and *Joseph Andrews* lie in other considerations. As I have noted, the structure of Fielding's book is neater, sections being roughly of the same lengths, whereas Cervantes varies the lengths of his sections, one consisting of six chapters, another of twenty-four, a third of twenty-seven. Furthermore, Cervantes' numerous digressions in the 1605 *Quixote* are replaced in *Joseph Andrews* by three main digressions set in relatively similar positions in each of the last three books. The sally and withdrawal pattern, which is used by Cervantes to depict the alternating mania and depression of his hero's temper, is used by Fielding in a much different way. For example, Adams sets forth from his parish in order to sell his sermons so that he can better support his family, and Joseph (somewhat like Sancho) goes forth merely in servant capacity in the retinue of Lady Booby. Their withdrawal to their parish is not in the nature of a retreat or defeat in purpose: Adams returns because he finds he has left his sermons at home (as Don Quixote has left at home his purse, some clean shirts, and a box of ointments in his first sally in the 1605 *Quixote*, a sally that does not mark an inner turning point for the don), and Joseph returns to see his beloved Fanny. All of this emphasizes Fielding's adherence to outward symmetry, polish, and consistency in comparison with Cervantes' structure, which is almost always closely tied in with the inner and often chaotic motivations of his characters; for Don Quixote's sallies are spurred by an inner sense of wrongs that must be righted, of moral responsibil-
ity, of "deliberate choices made by the wills of individual human beings" and of "influences that men exercise upon one another," and such motivations become for Cervantes the basis of his artistic unity. As A. A. Parker has pointed out, what happened to Fielding between *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones* was that "he came to apply the rules of epic structure to the novel so that no incident could be introduced not connected with the main action, all incidents must be bound together, and no action should be complete in itself." Even in 1742 in *Joseph Andrews*, however, one sees Fielding's tendency and talent for "the perfectly coherent story" beginning to emerge. For example, the madness that informs Sancho's unerring devotion to his master is nowhere found in Joseph, whose actions are described in strict adherence to the code of behavior found in the typical hero of the romance and whose love for Adams falls short of enabling him to follow Adams to the city to sell the sermons; rather, he is concerned with returning to his Fanny (p. 64). In other words, the sallies and withdrawals of Adams and Joseph are motivated by logical consideration in the tangible world of possessions and friends whereas those of Don Quixote and Sancho are motivated by an illogical ideality, based on an inner reality and its form.

Finally, in connection with the four-part structure, it is significant to note that Fielding opens three of his four books with discourses on various aspects of the art of writing. Each of these prefatory chapters sets the tone for its book and becomes the unifying statement behind it. Cervantes, on the other hand, uses different means to obtain unity in each of his books, arranging incidents by type in polar opposition or in climactic order as they parallel the growing intensities of his hero. Fielding's disquisition on "lives" as communicating valuable patterns for readers leads naturally into the discussion of Joseph's chastity, the subject that dominates, begins, and ends book one of *Joseph Andrews*. The subject of Marcela's chastity, which concludes part two of the 1605 *Quixote*, provides both
contrast and parallelism, the ambiguous play of similarities and opposites provided by the knight’s own “chastity” on a quite different plane. By developing two figures who illustrate “chastity” in different ways, from different motives, and in different situations, Cervantes is able to give depth and complexity to the fabric of his novel, perhaps more than Fielding creates with his brief introductory chapter on male chastity and his adherence to the formula of the comic romance, of which chastity (or its reverse) is a traditional component in building dramatic tension.

All of this leads us to Fielding’s second book, which opens with a discussion of chapter divisions as resting places or inns where the traveler may stop and take a glass and which prefaces very neatly and logically a book that describes a long series of stops at a multitude of inns. In the matter of chapter divisions, Fielding and Cervantes are in agreement, for Fielding’s chapters, like Cervantes’, sometimes do not end at logical stopping places. Some of his chapter divisions are no endings at all, but made simply to lure the reader on into the next chapter. Thus chapter seventeen in book one ends with the sudden discovery of Betty and Mr. Tow-wouse in bed together, a subject that continues into chapter eighteen and is expanded on therein. Likewise, chapter nine in book two leaves matters in medias res with Adams meditating in the dark on what he fears is his murder of his opponent. Numbers of similar examples may be cited. Thus Fielding’s opening remarks in book two on chapter divisions as resting places are partially ironic, for, in practice, he is quite aware of other functions of the chapter. Like Cervantes, he may recognize that the sense of the flow of time is strengthened by mechanical chapter divisions that do not coincide with the normal divisions of the narrative and serve thus to stress the existence of another time sequence, the real time, that of the mind. Later, in Tom Jones, Fielding is explicit on this matter, seeing himself as “the founder of a new province of writing” and “at liberty to make what laws I please therein,” and stating that he does not feel obliged “to
keep even pace with time." Cervantes felt even less obliged "to keep even pace with time," but accompanied his practice of this point with no critical comments.

The structure of book three of *Joseph Andrews* is similar in principle to the structures of books one and two. In book three we discover an opening chapter on biography wherein Fielding mentions *Don Quixote*, renowned because it is "the history of the world in general." The chapter discusses patterns and prototypes in biography, setting up the scaffolding for the story of Mr. Wilson, which follows, the prototype of all young men who sow wild oats, reform, and live to a productive and peaceful old age. In contrast, the country squire is the prototype of the thoughtless and irresponsible idle rich, given to practical jokes and cruel folly. The peripatetic and staccato movement of book two fitted its subject matter (human diversity) as the more static form of book three fits its subject, two types of landed gentry in their homes. Furthermore, the Squire in Mr. Wilson's story logically complements the Squire who appears just afterward and whose dogs attack Adams. The conclusion of the book, in which Peter Pounce, steward to a squire, appears, fills out the whole subject of squires and rounds off the book. (In the same way, book one on Chastity was rounded out by the actions of Betty and Mr. Tow-wouse in the bedroom of the inn.) A fine dialogue is thus established in book three between two prototypes, the good and the evil country gentleman, for Fielding is aware that vice is not the sole property of city folk. What must be noted is the thematic unity of each book, a unity undergirded and defined by each of the three opening disquisitions. Cervantes' unity, as it derives from the participation-withdrawal pattern in the 1605 *Quixote* and from the mirror images in the 1615 *Quixote*, as noted in the Introduction, seems to me more integral to the inner world of his main character. Fielding's unity, on the contrary, derives from unifying exterior elements and subjects—exterior, that is, to the character of Joseph. These subjects—the rules of society (chastity) and of literature
(chapter divisions and literary types)—form the scaffolding
of *Joseph Andrews*. Fielding’s fourth book is, of course, the
denouement for all the preceding entanglements and
needs no preface, having already been prefaced three
times.

***

The frequent interruptions to the plot found in *Joseph
Andrews* are another means the author takes of shaping
time to his own uses and demonstrating its subjective
quality. They are means often discovered in *Don Quixote*.
Many of them can be found in book two, the peripatetic
and spasmodic character of which has already been noted.
An interruption we are familiar with in *Don Quixote* is that
of the uproar, found first in *Joseph Andrews* in book one,
when in chapter seventeen Mrs. Tow-wouse (her very
name connoting uproar) discovers Mr. Tow-wouse and
Betty together in bed. Adams, Mr. Barnabas, and the
bookseller (in the tradition of *Don Quixote* and the
Canon) are in the midst of an argument on whether a
book should be judged good because of its popularity or
because of the virtue and good instruction it conveys.
Adams, who takes the latter opinion, violently offends Mr.
Barnabas, who now believes he is in the company of the
devil. His belief is reinforced when at that moment a “hid­
eous uproar” is heard. Mrs. Tow-wouse’s voice booms
forth “like a bass viol in concert” (p. 69). Although the
discussion among the three men has been broken off, it is
obvious that on another level the chapter maintains its
unity, an inner unity, since the movement progresses from
the dissension among the polemicists to the domestic dis­
sension at the inn. The larger subject of the entire scene,
the inconstancy of human nature, is thus amply illustrated
by both the fickleness of Mr. Barnabas and the faithless­
ness of Mr. Tow-wouse. In the same way, *Don Quixote*
interrupts the reading of “The Tale of Foolish Curiosity”
with his violent slashing of the wineskins belonging to the
innkeeper, and Cervantes thereby illustrates two differ-
ent means of appropriating the property of one's neighbor, one idle, the other foolish. So, in one sense, the so-called interruptions are not interruptions at all but a method of sharpening a point and of adding variety to the plot.

Other violent interruptions in *Joseph Andrews* are the mock epic melee in book two, chapter five, among Adams, the innkeeper, and his wife, and later between Mrs. Slip-slop and the wife, that interrupts the history of Leonora; the fight between Joseph and Didapper that brings the reading of the tale of Paul and Leonard to an end; or the stamping and bewailing of Adams, when he hears of the drowning of his son, that interrupt his sermon on patience in the face of adversity. All of these interruptions possess a thematic thread in common with, or in contrast to, the scene that they interrupt; and the very violence of their nature makes us take note of their purpose: to act either as mirror or foil.

Another interruptive device employed by both Fielding and Cervantes is the abrupt change of subject, particularly useful when the main characters are involved in an apparently insoluble dilemma. Thus in the midst of chapter eight (book one), Don Quixote and the Basque, swords aloft, are about to demolish one another when it is discovered that the author can find no more records at this point in the story. Six long paragraphs are spent in describing the search by the second author for the missing sequel. Similarly, in book three, chapter ten, of *Joseph Andrews*, Joseph and Adams are left tied to the bedposts while Fielding interposes an ironical argument between the poet and the player. To begin with, such a device maintains the interest of the reader by heightening the suspense. It also establishes a kind of friendly but teasing complicity between author and reader, the latter agreeing, so to speak, to being tricked. Fielding himself mocks such mockery when he writes in book three, chapter nine, that such interruptions are like dances, done by persons whose heads lie in their heels, to break in upon the action of a stage tragedy. Perhaps he is only half right, for they are interruptions only in
a mechanical sense, and serve at the same time to establish the collaboration of the reader and the author.

A device closely akin to the preceding one is used by Fielding in book two, chapter two, when Joseph is stranded at the inn and unable to pay for his horse's board. Fielding simply changes the subject and turns to Adams farther ahead on the road. Again in book two, chapter seven, when the people in the coach attempt to catch up with Adams to tell him he has forgotten his horse, Fielding shifts the scene to Adams, who, unaware of his followers, has taken the wrong turn and sat down to read his Aeschylus. Characters may get themselves into such predicaments that even their creators must abandon them temporarily. Characters thus come to possess lives of their own, apart from the narrator, and are capable of involving the author in fictional cul-de-sacs, at which point the author can only glance toward the reader with a helpless shrug. As a result, reader and author together become involved in extricating characters from entangling situations, and a three-way relationship (among author, character, and reader) is established. It should be noted also that such interruptions as they are used by Fielding often juxtapose parallel predicaments. For example, the argument between poet and player (book three, chapter ten) may be compared to the discussion between Adams and Joseph in the next chapter. Tied to the bedposts, back to back—that is, in polar opposition—their utterances symbolize the theory and the practice represented by the poet and the player.

A third use of interruption as a unifying method involves characters who interrupt one another. Don Quixote is continually interrupting the stories of others and sometimes, as at the puppet show, disrupting an entire performance. Likewise, Parson Adams, in the three main digressions, is perpetually inserting his own comments, opinions, and suggestions. This device, however, serves to unite the intruding tale with the main plot and helps remind the reader of the situation in which the digression has developed. It also provides a kind of counterpoint ef-
fect, for, in the tale of "the unfortunate Leonora," Adams, Slipslop, and Mrs. Graveairs (with their asides) combine to create a kind of play-within-a-play; and, in the tale of Mr. Wilson, Wilson's interpolation on vanity, encouraged by Adams's interruption begging him to proceed, is concluded by another interruption by Adams, who is searching fruitlessly for his own sermon on vanity, which he is confident that Wilson will admire (p. 206). Thus Adams through his interruptions unwittingly provides the illustration for Wilson's theory. And finally Adams's corrections of his son's pronunciation and reading in the digression on Paul and "Lennard" provides the illustration of the moral of that story, that is, to mind one's own affairs.

In *Don Quixote* the same kind of counterpoint is created. The puppet show itself is a play-within-a-play, a melodrama mirroring the melodrama of Don Quixote's own behavior. Don Quixote's identification with its leading character, Sir Gaiferous, enables us to contrast the relatively productive actions of Sir Gaiferous with the unproductive ventures of Don Quixote, who succeeds, in this instance, in demolishing only some cloth and wooden figures, despite his glowing idealisms about helping those in distress.

Critics have called the three main digressions in *Joseph Andrews* "analogues" and "negative analogues" and "exempla." In my introduction to *Don Quixote: The Knight of La Mancha*, I point out how the various digressions in the 1605 *Quixote* provide parallel and contrasting situations, offer commentary, establish counterparts, subplots, counsel, and conclusions, thereby creating more complexity and profounder meaning as a result of their juxtaposition with the main plot.

It is also clear that the digressions in books two, three, and four of *Joseph Andrews* are tightly integrated with the main plot. Thus the story of the unfortunate Leonora in book two acts as a foil for the faithfulness of both Joseph and Fanny. At the same time, Lenora's shifting affections parallel the rapidly shifting scenes described in the book as
Joseph and Adams travel from inn to inn, shifts in scene that foil Joseph's inner steadfastness. If the subject of the book as a whole is human folly, amply illustrated at every stopping place and inn, then Leonora's folly only adds to the multiple examples. The tale of Leonora is, furthermore, told in transit, by a lady within a moving coach, thus reinforcing the sense of the transiency of human affections. The sense of change, of process, that characterizes the entire book is only strengthened by the story of Leonora's fickleness.

On the other hand, the tale of Mr. Wilson reinforces the sense of stability and of status quo to be found in book three, centering upon the landed gentry. In a sense Wilson's story takes up where Leonora's left off and provides us with an alternative to the solitary confinement chosen by Leonora after her jilt. After his early escapades, Wilson meets and marries Harriet Hearty, and together they "live happily ever after" with attention only for their garden, their children, and each other. The country squires who also populate the area are polar opposites to Wilson. In a book that opens with a chapter on "Lives" in order to provide "valuable patterns," Wilson's reformation, as well as the possibility of reformation itself, is instructive. Instead of action set in an endless succession of inns, as in book two, the actions of this book are divided among Wilson's home, the Squire's home, and one inn. Furthermore, the tale of Mr. Wilson may be seen to be no digression at all since Fielding links it with the main plot, through Wilson's lost son, with a strawberry mark on his left breast, later, of course, to be identified as Joseph. This so-called digression becomes then an integrated counterpart of the book as a whole.

Of further interest is the scarcity of paragraphing in the chapter on Wilson; in other words, there are few inns at which the reader may stop to rest, unlike book two. It is clear that Fielding manipulates his chapter endings and paragraphing to suit his subject matter. Lack of paragraphing suggests the rapt attention of the audience (except, of
course, for Adams's exclamations of distaste at the begin­ning and his mention of his own sermon on vanity, mak­ing him seem all the more vain, since no one else sees fit to interrupt). Wilson's earnestness is also communicated by the sparse paragraphing, for the run-on character of the prose lends speed and intensity to the digression. The interruption provided by poet and player in book two lacks paragraphing with the same effects.

In book four the fact that the story of Leonard and Paul is not completed is a clue to its role. To begin with, the unre­solved story of Leonard and Paul acts as a foil in a book full of conclusions and resolutions. But a close look at the chapter that succeeds this tale shows that Didapper and Joseph take up the roles of Paul and Leonard exactly where they were left off, and Joseph gives a sound reminder to Didapper of what happens to those who interfere in the love affairs and the marriages of others. In other words, the story does not need to be concluded, although one sees at once that Leonard is no more lion than Leonora had been lioness and that Joseph (the Joseph who refused the wife of Potiphar, that is) would never have become in­volved in folly to begin with to the extent that these two “lions” of the human world have allowed themselves to become involved.

In conclusion the essayistic interruption in *Joseph Andrews* and in *Don Quixote* must be mentioned briefly. In comparing Thomas Mann with Fielding and Sterne, Herman Meyer has said: “Like them, he integrates the essayistic digression on the narrative process into the en­tire narrative sequence by means of a sublimely compli­cated system of interlocking.”21 We have already noted ways in which the introductory chapters on literary mat­ters are tightly locked into the structures of books one, two, and three. But there are also essayistic interruptions dealing with nonliterary subjects within the books them­selves. Thus in chapter thirteen of book two, Fielding di­gresses to discuss the social ladder, on which fashionable and unfashionable people are ranked, in order to “vindi-
cate" Slipslop's distaste for Fanny. Only at church and in the playhouse are social groups segregated (in church, people of fashion sit in the balconies; in the playhouses, in the pit). Furthermore, sometimes people of fashion in one place become boors in another. The irrational and fluctuating character of the social ladder is, of course, one of the main topics of the entire book, for at the end, Fielding shifts his characters about on the ladder almost at will. But, more important, Fielding is commenting on the whole matter of rank in any human situation or endeavor—that it is often illusory and that distance between rungs varies according to perspective. In matters of literary structuring likewise, Fielding is aware that structure may be manipulated to one's own purposes and that an ideal structure is illusory, as we have already seen. In discussing the classics with Mr. Wilson in book three, chapter two, Adams suggests that although the Iliad possesses unity, that unity must be perfected by "greatness"; and he defines "greatness" as "Harmotton" or "the agreement of his action to his subject" (p. 189). At the same time, the story of Mr. Wilson, which follows this discussion, acts digressively at this point in the novel and thus mocks Aristotelian unity or any formula or hard-and-fast rule one may conceive. As we have noted, Fielding wrote in Tom Jones, book two, chapter one: "for as I am, in reality, the founder of a new province of writing, so I am at liberty to make what laws I please therein." The whole matter of structure is, however, of crucial importance both to the action and to the meaning of his book, so Fielding's digression on the social ladder is no digression at all; for like the social ladder, the structure of the book, the author has shown, is largely a matter of point of view.

In the same way, it has been demonstrated how the discourse on arms and letters in Don Quixote (1605; chap. 38) undergirds the structure and meaning of the book in ironic and inverse ways. Thus Don Quixote, one whose triumphs are in the realm of the spirit and of good intentions and whose failures are in the world of arms, defends
arms against letters, thereby establishing a paradox that is borne out again and again in the complex contrasts continually provided by the digressive materials in the book. On the other hand, defense of arms in the Renaissance tradition can be associated with a "humanism of arms," that is, with the belief in their worthwhile purpose. And so we can conclude that the discourse on arms and letters is no digression at all, for it both denies and affirms Quixote's idealisms in the same way that his adventures do, showing the interpretation of his character as largely a matter of point of view, like the interpretation of Fielding's social ladder.

IV

Another structural consideration significant in both Don Quixote and Joseph Andrews is the dialectic created between life and books. As Mia Gerhardt has pointed out, Don Quixote is the hero of his own novel, already published. We cannot say the same, however, of Parson Adams, even though the skirt of his cassock, dangling from beneath his coat, may remind us mockingly of the tunic of classical times, in which he is well-versed. In fact, it is in the area of the tension between the inner and the outer man, spirit and body, that the widest divergence between the two books occurs. Furthermore, it is this difference that separates the centuries that produced these two novels. We have already noted in Part Two of this chapter the neater and less ambiguous structure of Joseph Andrews as compared with Don Quixote; at the same time, we have noted in Part Three Fielding's ability to manipulate and to experiment with his structure for artistic ends, and to make his own laws. In this connection we find him setting up tensions and establishing commentary "by juxtaposing the literary and the living as counterparts." Maurice Johnson's "The Poet and the Player" explains the juxtaposition of two chapters in book three (ten and eleven) as illustrating this tension between the literary and the living.
As the quotation by Epictetus, used by Johnson as an epigraph, notes, “the World is a Theatre, and your Part in this Play of Life is determined by the Poet.” Your part is God’s business, but the playing of the part “depends upon yourself.”

The \textit{theatrum mundi} theme is one that permeated Renaissance writing (“All the world’s a stage, / And all the men and women merely players”); one can trace the use of this theme back to Plato’s \textit{Laws}. Various kinds of actors in life are denoted in the 1615 \textit{Quixote}; for example, in chapter eleven when the wagon of players is followed by the appearance, shortly afterward, of Sampson Carrasco, dressed like a knight. Contrasting with them is Don Quixote himself, an actor of still another stripe. We act out our plays, Cervantes says, for different reasons and from different motives, first as a means of livelihood, next as a game, and third because we may be “holy madmen.” In the first instance the poet writes the play, but in the second and third instances, the actor composes his own part. Here the quotation from Epictetus is relevant to \textit{Don Quixote}, for the failure to recognize that “your part is God’s business” suggests a hubris that leads to Don Quixote’s downfall.

The tension between poet and player (that is, between Adams and Joseph), between books and life, is somewhat different in \textit{Joseph Andrews}. Adams writes no script, does not assume the place of God, and, unlike Quixote, does not compose his own part. His reading in the classics, particularly in the works of Aeschylus, has not turned his wits but simply given him a rather bookish set of values, and he does not identify with any figure in classical epic or drama. Poet and player in \textit{Joseph Andrews} are contraries, tied to opposite bedposts, and, in keeping with Epictetus’ statement, they perform separate functions. For Don Quixote, however, who has identified with heroes of the chivalric romances, poet and player are one. (The same is true of Sampson Carrasco, his ludicrous mirror image.) Only the actors on the wagon are not also poets, and Don Quixote calls them “phantoms.” But Cervantes himself
does not agree with his hero that poet and player merge into one, for he calls himself only the stepfather of his book, suggesting the divine origin of genius. Furthermore, the elaborate schemata of narrators in *Don Quixote*—Cide Hamete, the translator, and Cervantes himself—establish wide gaps between poet and player. On the other hand, Cervantes is also quite willing to acknowledge that sometimes poet and player do combine forces. As Thomas Mann has said, the only real life is “the lived life,” meaning that the only reality is a living recognition of one’s own historical role. Don Quixote is involved in the community of man, and his historical role defines his everyday life. Thus, according to W. H. Auden, he is “holy.” Cervantes asks us a simple question: Is this madness of caring better than Sampson Carrasco’s triviality or the players’ professional motives?

The confidence of the Renaissance in the ability of man to bring Christ to earth had been translated in the eighteenth century into a less ambitious and more cautious project. Adams, for all his idealisms, does not live them out in the same way that Don Quixote does. When Joseph and Beau Didapper fight, Adams picks up a pot lid for protection and steps between them; but he is under no illusion that this pot lid is a knight’s shield. In other words, his life of Christian idealism is simile and not metaphor. It is of interest to note that Hamlet, like Don Quixote, wrote his own play, both at Elsinore and in the play-within-a-play. But the eighteenth-century rage for order and for logical chains of being made such a merging inconceivable. God, having been brought to earth, could not be returned to heaven, but at least He could be elevated to the top rung of the ladder, whence, as gentleman deity, He could mete out justice and genius. Mia Gerhardt discusses in detail the different kinds of readers in *Don Quixote*. In *Joseph Andrews* only one kind of reader exists; although Joseph and Adams have different tastes and read different books, both remain at a distance from the subject matter. It is Fielding, not Joseph himself, who clothes Joseph in the
garb of romance hero. In the Renaissance reality and illusion serve one another; in the eighteenth century they tend to act as opposites. Don Quixote’s illusions are in the service of the realities he hopes to establish; Adams’s ghosts and apparition are simply the vagaries of a sometimes credulous parson and are seen as polar opposites to Mr. Wilson’s good sense in confronting the shepherds and their prisoners, the sheep-stealers (book three, chapter two). All of this illuminates one of the important and basic structural differences between these two books, and it comments tellingly on the two centuries from which they spring.

Another central structural issue is the dialectic established between Don Quixote and Sancho. Fielding may have attempted to create a similar spirit-nature pair in Adams and Joseph, but the results differed for a number of reasons, all inherent in the century in which he lived. To begin with, if Adams is an eighteenth-century Don Quixote, we find him, in Fielding, relegated to second place, appropriate in a century in which reason reigned and in which the common man was to emerge by means of two political revolutions in the Western world. The title of the eighteenth-century work is that of Joseph, that is, Sancho, a rustic and a man of the soil, the son of Gaffer and Gammer Andrews. Furthermore, Don Quixote is now a parson, in the service, more or less, of a structured religious establishment, rather than a hidalgo, an impoverished Spanish nobleman, at leisure to pursue his own religious leanings. Don Quixote is a parody of the ideal hero of myth and legend, whereas Adams is a parody of the ordinary, rather than of the extraordinary, parson. Yet neither fulfills his ideals. Adams finally succeeds in the world whereas Don Quixote eventually fails in the world, but succeeds in inspiring the love of the reader, partly because of his failures. Adams is fatuous; Don Quixote is mad. One is the product of an eighteenth-century "comic epic poem in
prose," the other of a Renaissance mock chivalric tragedy. Thus Adams's success, the living given him by Mr. Booby, is largely part of the machinery of the comedy whereas Don Quixote's failure springs from his tragic inner delusions. The differences between Joseph and Adams are likewise part of the comic pattern whereas the differences between Don Quixote and Sancho spring from deeper psychological sources.

Furthermore, although the hero of the eighteenth-century novel, Joseph, is invested with a literary garment, that of the hero of a romance (rather than the chivalric romance), he wears it at the insistence of Fielding, not as a result of his own reading of romances, a genre that he avoids. Instead, he reads the Bible, *The Whole Duty of Man*, Thomas à Kempis, and the *Chronicle of the Kings of England*. And Adams, who is described like Joseph as "entirely ignorant in the ways of this world as an infant" (p. 6) (we note in this connection his "unworldly" namesakes Abraham and Adam), reads the Bible, but principally the classics, that is, Aeschylus. The differences between Adams and Joseph are not established, then, in as sharp and dramatic a way as they are between Don Quixote and Sancho. In fact, although we have discussed Adams as the descendant of Don Quixote and Joseph as the descendant of Sancho, we could also say that the chivalric knight is the forebear of the romantic lover or that the gullible Sancho is the forebear of the credulous parson. Fielding's characters are, therefore, less prototypical than Cervantes'

Adams's classical background is, of course, appropriate to the "neoclassical" period as well as being his own distinguishing mark. It is this background that differentiates him from Quixote, who is grounded in the chivalric romance. Used by the ancients to describe the pitfalls of pride and lust, the classical drama and epic in which Adams is versed were replaced in the medieval period by the matter of the metrical romance, fantasies far removed from feudal reality. As in the medieval church, body and soul, earth and heaven, are separated in the romance by
immeasurable distances to be dispelled only on Judgment Day. This is the point of medieval theology that Cervantes is parodying in creating Don Quixote and Sancho. Don Quixote is a knight who attempts to put his idealisms to practice on the highroads and byways and in the inns of sixteenth-century Spain. Don Quixote's armies are herds of sheep, his giants are fulling mills, and his knightly opponent a poor bachelor of arts from Salamanca.

The classical mode, on the other hand, from which the eighteenth century took its cue, was involved more in form than in formula. By this I mean that the dramatic and epic art of ancient Greece was employed in putting the passions and lusts and ambitions of real life into a framework, wherein they could be viewed to advantage. But in the neoclassical period, form became often an end in itself so that, in point of fact, the eighteenth century like the medieval period divided the ideal from the real and heaven from earth.

Looked at in another way, Don Quixote and Sancho are a parody of the polar opposition found in the metrical romance, for sometimes they serve the same ends and means and even exchange roles on occasion. In fact, often they are not in opposition at all, and the difference between them simply part of the illusion. It is quite clear, for example, that at mealtimes, despite his insistence on talking about a diet of herbs, Don Quixote is no more averse than Sancho to a good fat chicken. In this way Cervantes is able to imitate and at the same time to parody the chivalric formula, the recipe for the way knights should behave, but it is parody that involves two levels. Inwardly Don Quixote and Sancho are often at one; yet outwardly, as madman and realist, they stand in polar opposition.

Classical form, which Adams explains in his disquisition on the Iliad, takes little or no account of polarity as an artistic device. The classical world was one peopled by gods as well as by men, and it was not uncommon for a god or goddess to appear in the guise of a friend or to knock at one's door. In the plays of Aeschylus, there are no
early examples of spirit-nature pairs. Thus Fielding, in attempting perhaps to follow classical form and at the same time to create an eighteenth-century Don Quixote and his Sancho, finds that “knight and squire,” spirit and body, are basically one. It is not opposition but “Harmotton” (in which action and subject combine) that Fielding strives for in his novel; thus Joseph and Adams differ less dramatically than Don Quixote and Sancho on one level whereas, on another, they are poles apart. Raymond Willis has suggested that at Don Quixote’s death Sancho will become “a stranger to himself and an exile in his own land.” But at Adams’s death, the reader can predict no such fate for Joseph. We see him rather as the devoted husband of Fanny and father of their brood, no stranger in any way, and surely no exile. It is clear, therefore, that the whole subject of polarity in the two novels is fraught with complexity, a complexity that Cervantes exploited to the fullest and one that Fielding may have approached only to give up in despair as his novel burgeoned.

It is interesting to conjecture that the attitude of a period toward its gods determines in some way the literary stances of that time. In the classical epic, peopled by both gods and men, there is little use of spirit-nature structures—body and soul, inner and outer man. It was not until James Joyce wrote *Ulysses* that Homer’s Odysseus possessed both soul and psychology. In the pre-Christian *Odyssey*, however, the battles are between man and nature (Poseidon) or between man and man. And even Oedipus is plagued by fate more than by his own tragic flaw. But medieval theology, which divided soul and body, this world and the next, resulted in fiction based on sharp polarities between the ideal and the real. And the Renaissance and Reformation, by bringing Christ to earth, encouraged interaction in *this* world of the ideal and the real, of Don Quixote and his counterparts. The conflicts of heroes in classical and medieval times, therefore, were waged with forces outside themselves in the world of nature or of hell. But in post-Reformation literature, the
arena changes, and Milton writes: "Within him hell." Thus Don Quixote wages battle with his own illusions and Parson Adams with his own comical flaws. Furthermore, such flaws and illusions are the result of the hero's behavior and not the will of fate as in the classical mode. Thus man is perfectible, or capable of improvement, not doomed like Oedipus, and dramatic tension shifts from the problem itself to the solution of the problem. Man wins the power to control fate.

Finally, we must turn to the role of the narrator in the structure of *Joseph Andrews*. Fielding's narrator is not always on the scene, for Fielding sometimes tells us that "he" has not been able to discover a detail or a point of fact from anyone present or from anyone in the village at that time. On the other hand, Cide Hamete, though filtered through a mythical translator, is omniscient and has apparently been present, though invisible, through Don Quixote's and Sancho's wanderings. But Cervantes at one point is unable to discover Cide's manuscript. It is clear, however, that Cervantes establishes more distance between himself and Cide than Fielding does between himself and his narrator. Both authors, nevertheless, establish a narrator not to be identified with the author, since this narrator is "himself an element of the narrative fiction." Mia Gerhardt suggests that Cide represents "la vie écrite" and Don Quixote "la vie vécue," but at the end of the book Cide writes, "For me alone Don Quixote was born and I for him"; and, at another point, Don Quixote asserts that Cide must have put into Sancho's thoughts the title Knight of the Sad Countenance. This interaction and merging of narrator and character at once establishes and yet abolishes the narrator. Cide serves Cervantes in creating the illusion that Don Quixote is the author of the novel of which he is hero.

No such suggestion is made by Fielding in *Joseph Andrews*, although the relation established between reader
and narrator is close. Fielding's narrator is an element of the fiction in the sense that he takes the reader into his confidence, discusses matters of composition with him, delivers homilies to him (such as his advice to young girls to choose husbands with "lusty arms") (p. 185). Still he remains narrator, and Fielding's retention of that role as separate from that of the characters once more underlines the eighteenth-century insistence on form. For Fielding, the narrator is clearly an observer, someone outside the action; for Cervantes, Cide's omniscient presence and participation in the events of the novel marks him as a character in it. Moreover, other characters in the story, as Leon Gottfried puts it, "know about themselves as characters."\textsuperscript{34} They are precursors of the heroes of contemporary metafiction, in which characters rise in revolt and assume roles of their own, despite their authors. This is the ultimate parody of man's power to control his fate. Not only may the author control the outcome of his own novel, but characters, created from his imagination, come alive and demand the same control. Does metafiction thus point to the logical absurdity of human "freedom"?

Herman Meyer discusses all this from another angle by suggesting that the narrator establishes himself through "the juxtaposition of contrasting textual quotations"\textsuperscript{35} and that Cervantes, Fielding, Sterne (also Rabelais) all used this device. In Cervantes the tension between "the lofty and the lowly" and "the constant play between the stylistic elements proper to these levels"\textsuperscript{36} is expressed through quotation in part. Quotation thus acts contrapuntally to establish unity between style and subject matter. In the same way in \textit{Joseph Andrews}, Latin phrases misquoted by the doctor at the Tow-wouse inn underline the doctor's hypocrisy whereas Adams's frequent classical quotations accompany his high-minded but futile and ludicrous behavior. Tied to a bedpost, Adams quotes several passages from Seneca and from Boethius's \textit{Consolation of Philosophy}. Meanwhile Joseph reinforces his own groans and sighs by quoting Macduff after he has learned from Ross that his
wife and children have been slaughtered. Various purposes, both parodic and serious, are served by such a series of quotations, and through them the narrator makes himself known. Fielding’s own attitude toward his narrator is one of amused indulgence; Cervantes, on the other hand, views Cide as a paragon of creativity, without whom he could not compose another word of his narrative. The whole question of who is the author of the Quixote has been explored still further by Jorge Luis Borges, who sets forth Pierre Menard as candidate. “Historical truth,” writes Borges, “is not what has happened; it is what we judge to have happened.”

In conclusion, then, it is clear that for Fielding in Joseph Andrews Don Quixote is a kind of prototype. Homer Goldberg has shown how various works of fiction (those mentioned, in fact, by Fielding himself in book three, chapter one), such as Don Quixote, Le Roman comique, Gil Blas, and La Vie de Marianne, may have contributed to Fielding’s art. If we are to stress one of these, surely it must be Don Quixote; for innumerable parallels, not only of structure but of plot, incident, and character, abound. Just for examples we could cite: Adams’s inappropriate dress and Don Quixote’s armor; Adams covered with hogs’ blood, Don Quixote with curds; Adams’s stumbling horse and Rocinante; Adams’s rescue of Fanny and Don Quixote’s rescue of various damsels in distress; the bird batters and the group netting small birds in Don Quixote (1615; chap. 58); Adams’s devotion to Aeschylus and Don Quixote’s to Amadis of Gaul; the mock epic melee in the Tow-wouse inn and the mock epic melee in Don Quixote (1605; chap. 45); the battle between the squire’s dogs, Adams, and Joseph, and that between Don Quixote and the sheep; the bedroom scene at Booby Hall and the attic scene in Don Quixote (1605; chap. 16); Slipslop and Maritornes; Mr. Wilson and the Gentlemen in Green; Adams’s witchcraft and Don
Quixote's enchanters; Adams's "roasting" by the Squire and Don Quixote's "roasting" by the Duke and Duchess; Joseph's love song to Fanny and Don Louis's love song to Doña Clara; the story of Paul and Leonard and "The Tale of Foolish Curiosity." In addition, mock epic stylistic devices are common to both books: the mock invocation to the Muse; the mock epic catalogue; the mock epic chapter openings addressed to Aurora, Hesperus, and such; long mock epic similes; various mock epic personifications (for example, Fame blowing her brazen trumpet). And if these likenesses are not sufficient proof of influence, Don Quixote is mentioned directly a number of times in the text of Joseph Andrews. We find it mentioned first in the subtitle; then in book two, chapter sixteen ("the travellers had more reason to have mistaken [this inn] for a castle than Don Quixote") (p. 162); next in book three, chapter one, in praise of Cervantes' universal characters—Chrysostom, Marcela, "the mad Cardenio," "the perfidious Ferdinand," "the curious Anselmo," "the weak Camilla," "the irresolute Lothario"—and of Don Quixote itself, of which Fielding maintains there "is not such a book as that which records the achievements of the renowned Don Quixote, more worthy the name of a history than even Mariana's" (p. 179); and finally in book three, chapter nine, in which Adams is overcome by the Squire's henchmen, looking so black "that Don Quixote would certainly have taken him for an enchanted Moor" (pp. 252-53).

The differences between the two novels, as they have been indicated in this chapter, are, however, perhaps more significant than the similarities, numerous as they are, for the chief difference lies in the ways the two authors have handled the matter of polarization: life and books, real and ideal, Don Quixote and Sancho. We find Fielding in the eighteenth century to be more literal, more logical, and less metaphoric. His structures are more even, the motivation of his characters more reasonable. Adams is not mad, even though he sometimes may be foolish. The spirit-nature pair, who spring from Renaissance humanistic doctrine,
are nowhere to be found in Fielding. Instead we have a
series of characters, a progression of inns, a number of
corrupt gentry, a bevy of corrupt servants. Joseph and
Adams, Wilson and the Squire, Lady Booby and Mrs.
Slipslop are not polar opposites but individuals in their
own right. None of them is artistically dependent on his
opposite. The Renaissance tension between ideal and real,
between mind and body, between inner man and outer
man has changed form in the eighteenth century, a cen­
tury that proclaims, deistically, with Fielding, that "by
observing minutely the several Incidents which tend to the
Catastrophe or completion of the whole, and the minute
Causes whence those Incidents are produced, we shall
best be instructed in this most useful of all Arts, which I
call the Art of Life."39
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