A Spatial Approach to Characters in Henry Fielding's *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling*

Mihaela CULEA
The University of Bacău, ROMANIA

Keywords: *space, design, convenience, harmonizing, character, anti-hero, spatial idiom*

Abstract: The paper presents the literary character as a spatial entity, having as a starting point simon varey's study *space and the eighteenth-century novel*. Our aim is to show that we can learn about a human being's personality features, designs, interests, plans, mental or emotional states not only by focusing on that person's behaviour, language or gestures, but also by analysing his/ her external appearance. In fact, it is the exploitation of the 'man is a building' theory, according to which humans could be architecturally invested with (or, better said, analyzed from an architectural point of view) features and concepts generally associated to natural or artificial spaces (like gardens, rooms, buildings, cities, etc.) Studying the 18th century literature we observed that henry fielding characterised his characters as spaces, using language referring to architectural elements. Additionally, by emphasizing the external aspects of the characters, the author subtly points to their inner characteristics.

1. Characters as space

Since Fielding is constantly interested in weaving a complex, well-knit plot, he obviously proves to be a masterful designer of the narrative structure, too. We can observe his skill from the very beginning of the novel when he establishes a close relationship with the readers and presents the novel spatially, as a restaurant (a 'public ordinary', p. 23). This close relation is maintained all through the novel[1], in the introductory chapters to each of the 18 Books or in the commentaries while accompanying the characters on their journeys in the countryside or in urban areas.

The book is, in turn, a feast (p. 23), a history (p. 119), a 'heroic, historical prosaic poem' (p. 120), a great 'design' (p. 425) or a journey (p. 427). However, on the whole, the literary work is an intricate 'design' made up of parts forming a whole with distinguishable internal and external features; therefore, the novel itself resembles a spatial entity. This space should manifest a harmonious relationship between the interior and the exterior so

---

[1] We will also argue – in a future paper – that the reader turns into a cultural type, one that is not only characteristic to the 18th century, but a universal one.

as to fulfill its original function and not to acquire a different, atypical function. S. Varey focuses on two major elements as part of the architectural idiom, elements that can be identified in Fielding's treatment of space in his novels: *design* and *convenience*[2], where the convenience principle implies the existence of harmony or the lack of it between the external and the internal features of a space.

The book contains references to real or imaginary spaces but it also turns into a space inhabited by characters and places. This microcosm is the expression of a space which, in order to fully convey the proportions of a well-designed space, must exhibit equilibrium between all its components. Thus, the narrator warns the readers and the professional critics

> 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. (p. 425)

The book is definitely seen as a spatial unit, as a building in which the narrator had 'crammed' his 'variety of matter' (p. 763) just as people fill up their houses with objects, so that, in the end, the narrative observations will leave room only to events. But then, the novel uses space not only to express narrative organization (the work as a complex design), but also to provide the portraits of the characters inhabiting the fictitious world. We will analyse instances where the characters are metaphorically identified with buildings, cities, or they are characterized by means of language generally used to refer to buildings. Human beings are therefore analogous to houses where external features can be consistent with internal furnishings or not[3]. Consequently, we will analyse the relationship between interior and exterior features or between psychological and physical ones as seen in character portrayal as an instance of Fielding's use of architectural language. Characters are spatially conceived in terms of outer appearance and inner space and the readers are helped to distinguish between real motives and disguised intentions, truth and falseness, hypocrisy and good will, and so on.

2. Characters and typologies

As we mentioned, the author himself repeatedly acknowledged in the novel that, whatever the person, one must seek behind a veil to see if the appearance matches the inner world. This exercise is useful to see if the convenience principle is realized and this leads to a grouping of the characters in some major categories, like: false heroes or villains (Blifil) vs. heroes (Tom), according to Vladimir Propp's classification (see Cmeciu 2003: 24), princesses (Sophia Western) vs. their fathers (Squire Western) or victims (Sophia, Tom) vs. victimizers (Blifil, Mr. Western, Thwackum, Square)[4].

In other words, from a moral point of view, the characters can be divided into good (Squire Allworthy, Sophia, Tom, Mrs. Miller) and bad characters (Blifil, Lady Bellaston, or even Squire Western to some extent). But the opposition seems arbitrary (Cmeciu 2003: 96) since human beings are not totally good or totally bad. Then, if we remember that the narrator professed to be writing truthfully (p. 119), to 'keep within the bounds of possibility' (p. 323) and 'within the bounds of probability' (p. 325), this means that, in his 'heroic,

---

[2] Varey, Simon. 1990. Fielding and the Convenience of Design. In *Space and the Eighteenth-Century Novel*, 156–181. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

[3] Varey, *op. cit.*, p. 172 argues that the principles of architecture like design and convenience can be applied to individuals, too since 'the geometrical proportions of architecture were derived from the proportions of the human body'.

[4] Though the scheme may seem too simplifying, Cmeciu, Doina. 2003. *The Literary Character. Between Limits and Possibilities*. Bacău: Egal, p. 24, underlines the fact that one character may play different roles or, vice-versa, a role may be performed by several characters. It is this multiplicity of roles that will provide characters with psychological depth.

historical, prosaic poem' (p. 120), the author will try to avoid representing stereotypical figures and to come closer to real, verisimilar human beings.

If we think of Forster's classification, it seems that Fielding's characters are generally flat since they revolve around one main idea or feature and they can be easily recognized and remembered. Thus, they are 'two-dimensional and predictable' beings. (Cmeciu 2003: 97 – 98)

From a sociological point of view the character is either a type or an individual, that is a character associated with a single trait vs. a being with unique, diverse traits (*id.*)[5]. Moreover, Fielding is the first writer 'to have created historically marked social types' (Cmeciu 2003: 100) in *Tom Jones*, such as: the wealthy country squire (Allworthy, Western), the Justice of Peace (Allworthy, Western), the innkeeper (a numerous group mainly exhibiting the same traits), the scoundrel (Blifil, Black George), the country gentlewoman (late Mrs. Western), the worldly gentlewoman (Aunt Western, Lady Bellaston), the frivolous decaying aristocrats (town rakes, Mr. Nightingale, or Lord Fellamar).

But these types are also significant from a cultural viewpoint since they shape and reflect the 18th century English socio-cultural realities and values[6], like: country gentlemen, justices of peace, scheming servants, doctors, painters, philosophers, pedagogues, fortune hunters, orphans, corrupt politicians and clergymen, emancipated women, etc.

In the *Dictionary of Literary Genetics* characters are seen as archetypes if they display primitive, general or universal traits which can be traced in any representative of the group. (Pârvu 2005: 15). From among these archetypal characters listed in the book (the hero, the orphan, the traveler, the warrior, the magician, the buffoon, the maid/ virgin, etc.), in Fielding's novel we find a great number of travelers (most of the characters), the orphan (Tom, Blifil), the generous old man (Allworthy), or the virgin (Sophia). However, as the narrator underlines, Tom is not the typical hero, he is an anti-hero or a mock-heroic protagonist[7], one who does not function as a reproduction of moral or intellectual excellence. Fielding criticizes the other writers who create false images of reality at the expense of truthfulness and launch 'models of perfection' (p. 426). He rejects 'inserting characters of such angelic perfection or such diabolical depravity' (*id.*).

The main flaw of the characters seems to be a sense of 'indiscretion' (p. 5 in the *Dedication*) understood as imprudence, and the moral he wants to teach is that there certainly exist people driven either by good impulses or by mischievous ones but 'it is much easier to make good men wise, than to make bad men good' (*id.*). Recognizing the double nature of man, the comic mode also seems to be the solution to advocate 'innocence and virtue' through 'laughing mankind out of their favourite follies and vices' (*id.*). The narrator invites us in a world where good humour, harmony and plausibility are the dominant rules, the narrator utterly detesting 'scurrility' (p. 764) while journeying together with the reader in a 'stage-coach' (p. 763).

On a social level, Fielding proves that moral flaws or qualities are indiscriminately found in any man, no matter their social status (Macsiniuc 2003: 206). Allworthy persons (the very name of the naïve old squire Allworthy) can become cruel, philosophers can be hypocrites (Square), and the parson preaches malice. All the more, the very protagonist has, as we said, nothing of a haloed good man; his flaws are revealed and he comes to learn from his own mistakes. As a young man, he was

---

[5] As we will analyse, Fielding's technique is to state a general idea about humankind only to introduce, immediately after, specific, particular instances and examples working against the initial all-knowing verdict.
[6] Doina Cmeciu, *op. cit.*, p. 40, highlights that humans can become cultural types since they are encapsulators of an age's mentality and system of values.
[7] Macsiniuc, Cornelia. 2003. *The English Eighteenth Century. The Novel in its Beginnings*. Suceava: The University of Suceava, p. 198, coins this new type of character as the 'unheroic hero'.

indeed a thoughtless, giddy youth, with little sobriety in his manners, and less in his countenance; and would often very impudently and indecently laugh at his companion for his serious behaviour. (p. 105)

In the introductory chapter to the last book (Ch. 1, Book 18) the narrator distances himself from the narrative world after handling the events and the characters, aware of the fact that these very characters and events will be those that 'will most probably outlive their own infirm author, and the weakly productions of his abusive contemporaries' (p. 764). From this perspective, the characters can also be defined as the creative productions of an artist, and his works, contrary to the fate of the human being, are eternal.

3. A spatial approach to characters

As 'mediators between the reader and the text' (Cmeciu 2003: 6), as ingredients of the narrative world, the characters are directly or indirectly portrayed, that is through descriptive language or through the characters' speech, action or behaviour during the course of events.

Description is the main narrative modality that realizes character portrayal (Colipcă 2005: 103), which implies a focus on different parts of a being according to the narrator's interest: details about the head, the body, specific marks, way of dressing, attitude, moral features, personal history, idiosyncrasies, curiosities, etc.

Fielding makes brief, straightforward portraits of people[8] belonging to various social classes so as to create a comprehensive map of the contemporary society. The character portrayal is always added new elements so as not to waste too much time on static scenes at the expense of action; on the other hand, the narrator also conveys a sense of suspense and mystery. Thus, in building the picaresque narrative, the narratorial eye must focus on the accumulation of events which will subsequently mirror individual psychology. At the same time, 18th century authors were interested mostly in 'conveying a moral, didactic message which required stress on mobility and action'. (Colipcă 2005: 104)

As examples of living human beings, the characters are invariably portrayed as entities with internal and external attributes; if coming back to the starting assumption that characters are spatially pictured in terms of *in* vs. *out*, then our main concern will be to analyse excerpts where such instances are clear. We will see if the characters in the novel under study are harmonious or non-harmonious spaces/ buildings[9].

At the same time, if we take into consideration Bacon's assertion that man was a 'microcosmus' (Cuddon 1998: 126) or the little world, then the fictional characters are examples of microcosms within the larger macrocosm represented by the novel encasing them.

Squire Allworthy, a rich country gentleman and a JP, is apparently the embodiment of all worthiness although what the narrator wants to suggest is that perfection with humans does not exist. As a proof, Allworthy dispossesses and mistreats Tom while favouring the villain Blifil all through the novel. In his description we can find an ironic use of language suggesting the clash between appearance and true nature:

Nature may *seem* to some to have come off victorious, as she bestowed on him many gifts. (p. 25)

---

[8] S. Varey, *op. cit.*, p. 164, considers that the main characters in *Tom Jones* and *Joseph Andrews* are only 'hierogryphical representations' of people. From this perspective the critic sees the characters as examples of a human type, but not as too complex people. But though they serve as examples or replicas of typologies, Fielding continuously states his attempt to offer a slice of reality, examples of individuals, of individualities (and we can start from the very example of the title).

[9] As men display both an external form and internal consistency, then they can be compared to the structure of buildings, too. The body represents the outer frame and the morals and the feelings represent the 'inhabitants' of that particular frame, or the 'objects' filling that space.

However, we may embark on our analysis starting from the protagonist's remark which is applicable to most characters in the novel, with few exceptions:

> 'Appearances', cried Jones, 'are often deceitful; men sometimes look like what they are not'. (p. 363)

Dr. Blifil and Bridget Allworthy are characterized by means of the same stylistic strategy: the narrator asserts something positive about the characters which they put on show outwardly, but then the narrative voice quickly shows the opposite which stands as the truth. Thus, some characters take pride in possessing wide knowledge, like Dr. Blifil. As he loathed his profession, books on medicine 'were almost the only ones with which he was unacquainted'. (p. 47).

At the same time, he displayed 'a great appearance of religion' (*id.*) and engaged in religious disputes with Bridget who assumed a 'grave and solemn look' which was totally contrary to her true nature if we consider her secretly giving birth to a bastard, Tom. She has good knowledge of religious theories but she does not put them into practice:

> To say the truth, she had read much English divinity, and had puzzled more than one of the neighbouring curates. Indeed her conversation was so pure, her looks so sage, and her whole deportment so grave and solemn, that she seemed to deserve the name of saint[10] equally with her namesake. (p. 47)

Furthermore, the reader is warned that women are generally putting on a mask to conceal their real motives, as in Lady Bellaston's case who 'was a strict observer of all rules of decorum' (p. 52). At the same level, the courtship between captain Blifil and Miss Bridget turns into a battle and he treats her as if she were a space to be conquered starting from the outside so as to capture the inside. And yet, everything, the whole relation is just a matter of form:

> The captain made his advances in form, the citadel was defended in form, and at length, in proper form, surrendered at discretion. (*id.*)

The main difference between Tom and Blifil while living on Allworthy's estate seems to be that between joyfulness (as a sign of a light heart) and somberness (as a sign of a cold heart). Tom is a kind and civil man but he disregards manners and whatever is related to outward display, while Blifil slyly flatters and praises both their pedagogues. In Tom's case, there's an accord between what he feels inside and its external manifestation, whereas in Blifil's case his hypocrisy is hidden under the disguise of good will:

> (1) Tom Jones (…) was not only deficient in outward tokens of respect, often forgetting to pull off his hat, or to bow at his master's approach; but was altogether as unmindful both of his master's precepts and example. (p. 105)
>
> (2) Master Blifil, on the contrary, had address enough at sixteen to recommend himself at one and the same time to both these opposites (i.e. Thwackum and Square). With one he was all religion, with the other he was all virtue. And when both were present, he was profoundly silent, which both interpreted in his favour and their own. (*id.*)

As similar temperaments easily get together, Sophia preferred Tom to Blifil who, though seemed of a more serious character, looked too stern as if always brooding something against the others. Ironically, the space of Blifil's mind remains unknown even for the narrator – obviously, only to show the permanent, unexpressive dissimulation on Blifil's face – who often underlines the clash between Tom's openness and Blifil's moroseness:

> As he did not, however, outwardly express any such disgust, it would be an ill office in us to pay a visit to the inmost recesses of his mind, as some

---

[10] Notably, the name (Bridget or Brigid) sends back to the Irish abbess who was venerated in Ireland as a virgin saint and praised in miracle stories for her compassion. *New Oxford Dictionary of English*, Oxford University Press: electronic edition.

scandalous people search into the most secret affairs of their friends and often pry into their closets and cupboards (…). (p. 125)

Metaphorically speaking about the 'great theatre of nature' (p. 265) or the 'theatre of time' (p. 264), the narrator highlights the clash between the internal and the external features in men. He associates hypocrisy with performing as 'actors', acting turning men away from any trace of sincerity so that they have come to be only some masks ('personas'). Falseness and concealing become the key-traits:

> Some have considered the larger part of mankind in the light of actors, as personating characters no more their own, and to which, in fact, they have no better title, than the player hath to be in earnest thought the king or emperor whom he represents. (p. 264)

Inner feelings must sometimes be suppressed when they are irrelevant, as in Mrs. Western's opinion while trying to force Sophia to formally 'contract an alliance' with Blifil (p. 269). A woman of the world, Mrs. Western equates her experience with the true values of marriage, focusing only on external marks. Therefore, for the 'politic aunt' (p. 270) the 'frame' is all that matters:

> I think, to have seen the world, in which I have not an acquaintance who would not rather be thought to dislike her husband, than to like him. The contrary is such out-of-fashion nonsense, that the very imagination of it is shocking. (p. 270)

On the other hand, Sophia, though taught in the spirit of 'prudence and discretion' (p. 261), stubbornly rejects Blifil as she simply 'hates' him (p. 269). It is a rejection of being with someone whom she feels no attraction to, but the father and the aunt insist on pushing her in the business-like idea they have formed about marriage.

Blifil's lack of a concordant blending of internal and external features is emphasized all through the novel, as he never revealed his true intentions, but he rather made use of 'great art' (p. 279) in covering them. In fact, he does not know how to court a woman and Sophia does not want to express her feelings, though this is due to an apparent social ritual as in:

> (1) Her behaviour to him (…) was entirely forced, and indeed such as is generally prescribed to virgins upon the second formal visit from one who is appointed for their husband. (p. 279)
> (2) Blifil having conveyed the utmost satisfaction into his *countenance* (…) (*id.*)
> (3) (…) by endeavouring to hurry on so blessed an event, faster than a strict compliance with all the *rules of decency and decorum* will permit. But she might be induced to dispense with any formalities. (*id.*)

Sophia symbolizes Mr. Western's estate and this is the main reason for Blifil's metaphorically transforming Sophia into a piece of delicious, rare food to be engulfed, i.e. totally subsumed to his own being, to his only control. He had a 'distinguishing taste' (p. 280) which

> taught him to consider Sophia as a most delicious morsel, indeed to regard her with the same desires which an ortolan inspires into the soul of an epicure. (*id.*)

Additionally, Blifil artfully controls his feelings and is some sort of a dull, monotonous being, or, more probably, he controls the outward manifestation of what he feels inside:

> (…) his appetites were, by nature, so moderate, that he was easily able, by philosophy or by study, or by some other method, to subdue them; and as to that passion which we have treated of in the first chapter of this book (i.e. love), he had no tincture of it in his whole composition. (p. 229)

The food metaphor above refers to a space connotatively taken over by another: Blifil's estate 'eating up' Western's estate, or the game between Blifil and Sophia of constantly rejecting the idea of violating the other's private space. The metaphor of the clothes employed by the Man of the Hill opens the way to new interpretations. It suggests the striking clash between falseness, hypocrisy and evil vs. true nature in humans. Verbs like 'to display', 'to be equipped', 'to be dressed' (p. 390) enhance this gap which greatly dishonours the 'omnipotent Author', God:

> (…) going to a carnival at Venice, for there they will see at once all which they can discover in the several courts of Europe. The same hypocrisy, the same fraud; in short, the same follies and vices, dressed in different habits. But human nature is everywhere the same, everywhere the object of detestation and avoidance. (*id.*)

As we underlined, the narrator does not waste too much time on detailed direct character portrayal, but rather advances the events and the actions so as to reveal the essential character-traits. Consequently, in Book 9, Chapter 5 the narrator suddenly decides to make up for saying 'very little' about Jones' 'accomplishments' (p. 413). In contrast with other characters (except for Sophia) where outer countenance does not match the inside, what is particularly underlined in Tom's case is a perfect equivalence between the two. In spatial language, he fulfills the 'convenience' principle at the roots of our analysis:

> (…) so strongly was this good-nature painted in his look, that it was remarked by almost everyone who saw him. (p. 413)

The Man of the Hill detests humankind because of the deceptions and deceits he had met with in his life among men, and yet he senses that, considering his looks, Tom must be a good quality person, an opinion consistent with the narrator's belief that Tom's inner qualities are manifest on his outer aspect.

> I have read that a good countenance is a letter of recommendation; if so, none ever can be more strongly recommended than yourself. (p. 363)

In fact, in the character of the Man of the Hill's we can identify a blending between inner aspects and outer ones: he doesn't care about outer conventions or regulations and puts on a wild appearance. He looks and feels like an untamed recluse because the world that he recreates for himself is a more primeval, pure one. To justify this hatred of humans even more, the narrator also brings forth the episode when the hermit is attacked by some villains even in this remote, solitary place, being rescued by Tom (p. 361). He is a Robinson Crusoe out of his own will, and yet not on a deserted island but among his fellow beings:

> (…) it was an appearance which might have affected a more constant mind than that of Mr. Partridge. This person was of the tallest size, with a long beard as white as snow. His body was cloathed with the skin of an ass, made something into the form of a coat. He wore likewise boots on his legs, and a cap on his head, both composed of the skin of some other animals. (p. 362)

The Man of the Hill rejects some spaces preferring others generally avoided by the civilized community, and he turns the temporal dimensions upside down, too. Thus, out of the same desire to keep away from human company and what is specific to it, he twisted the common living in and through time: he spends the days sleeping and the nights walking and meditating (pp. 392 – 393).

Superficial or selfish persons cannot perceive or are not interested in this complementary relation body – soul; moreover, Mrs. Waters is only an instinctually driven person and her passion for Tom's body is rendered by means of the food metaphor:

> The beauty of Jones highly charmed her eye; but, as she could not see his heart, she gave herself no concern about it. She could feast heartily at the

> table of love, without reflecting that some other had been (…) feasted wit the same repast. (p. 420)

Distinguishing people by their profession is not necessarily suggestive of their true nature. Additionally, the naming practice is not a clear evidence of what the person really is and the narrator uses suggestive names to challenge the readers' judgment. These symbolic names hint at human types epitomizing a major inner trait, like, for instance, one's obsession with money and garments:

> (…) every person can distinguish between Sir Epicure Mammon, and Sir Fopling Flutter; but to note the difference between Sir Fopling Flutter[11] and Sir Courtly Nice suggests a more exquisite judgment. (p. 426)

Mr. Fitzpatrick is ironically characterized in terms of his 'handsome' appearance (p. 451) and his 'handsome fortune' (p. 433). The narrator emphasizes the contrast between what he shows and what he really feels, between how he was in the past and what he became. The narrator finds excuses for him, softening his wife's complaint by revealing that, on the whole, he has a good nature:

> (…) for he was really born a gentleman, though not worth a groat; and, tho', perhaps, he had some few blemishes in his heart as well as in his head, yet being a sneaking or niggardly fellow, was not one of them. In reality, he was so generous a man, that whereas he had received a very handsome fortune with his wife, he had now spent every penny of it (…) (p. 433)

Mrs. Fitzpatrick portrays him to Sophia by referring to the prominent change he had undergone, going from gallantry to wildness. Thus, Mrs. Fitzpatrick focuses on external features, on his manners which, together with his excessive jealousy, totally dismissed the kindness of his soul:

> He was handsome, degage, extremely gallant, and in his dress exceeded most others. In short, my dear, if you was unlucky to see him now, I could describe him no better than by telling you he was the very reverse of everything which he is: for he hath rusticated himself so long, that he is become an absolute wild Irish man. (p. 476)

Innate wildness in temperament is related to women, too. For example, Molly Seagrim's inner traits are mirrored truthfully on her appearance, thus creating a harmonious blending. She is rather portrayed in terms of manly appearance as her beauty 'had indeed very little of feminine in it' (p. 137). Comically, she is more of a man taking up manly actions, and the frame generally matches the interior:

> Nor was her mind more effeminate than her person. As this was tall and robust, so was that bold and forward. So little had she of modesty, that Jones had more regard for her virtue than she herself. (id.)

The narrator frequently calls attention to some of the major concepts of the 18th century like decorum, property, propriety, prudence, folly or frivolity. In Chapter 1, Book 14, the narrator characterizes the 'higher order of mortals' (p. 610), namely the aristocratic circles, particularly the women belonging to the group. They are reduced to outward traits of affectation, dullness, dissimulation and emotional shallowness. In fact, the narrator directly states their abasement and their functioning as mere forms, the whole personality being reduced to outer display. The contrast between 'form' and 'character' enhances the fact that, with such persons, the quality of being unique or the implications of strength, freshness and originality have faded away:

---

[11] According to the *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, 2002, Oxford: Macmillan, the term 'mammon' sends to the idea of money considered as the most important thing to have (p. 867). The *New Oxford Dictionary of English* explains that it refers to wealth regarded as an evil influence or false object of worship and devotion. The *Macmillan Dictionary* quoted also defines the term 'fopling' deriving from the word 'fop', an old fashioned word referring to a man who thinks too much of clothes and appearance (p. 550). In fact, all these metaphorical names refer to the cultural type of *the fop*.

> What Mr. Pope says of women is very applicable to most in this station, who are indeed so entirely made up of form and affectation, that they have no character at all, at least, none which appears. I will venture to say the highest life is much the dullest, and affords very little humour or entertainment. (p. 611)

On the other hand, the lower classes seem to be defined through diversity, vivid existence and open manifestation of anger or joy as

> the various callings in lower spheres produce the great variety of humorous characters. (*id.*)

In the case of the men of the 'higher species' contrasts coexist again, apparent honesty being destabilized by the practice of 'deceits' and 'treachery'[12] (p. 623). For most gentlemen, loving and playing tricks on women, or keeping mistresses is a business. Moreover, Nightingale's name may be suggestive of his outward charms and abilities to enchant women with his nightly singing. The harmony in – out is only partial since his honesty is not complete, being impaired by a great weakness, his lust for women:

> This Nightingale (…) was in the ordinary transactions of life a man of strict honour (…); yet, in affairs of love he was somewhat looser in his manners; not that he was even here as void of principle as gentlemen sometimes are, and oftener affect to be; but it is certain he had been guilty of some indefensible treachery to women (…). (pp. 623 – 624)

If for Mr. Nightingale a woman is a mere possession to be won on a war field, for Jones she is a delicate counterpart who must not be injured in any way. Thus, Mr. Nightingale speaks of women using war language, they are spaces to be conquered, while Jones refers to them using love language. Nightingale

> was so far from being ashamed of his iniquities of this kind, that he gloried in them, and would often boast of his skill in gaining of women, and his triumphs over their hearts, for which he had before this time received some rebukes form Jones, who always expressed great bitterness against any misbehaviour to the fair part of the species (…) to be considered, in the light of the dearest friends, were to be cultivated, honoured, and caressed with the utmost love and tenderness; but if regarded as enemies, were a conquest of which a man ought rather to be ashamed than to value himself upon it. (*id.*)

As with most male characters, female ones are also portrayed in terms of contrasting features. Again, the narrator does not want to offer a model of perfection in the person of the main female protagonist, but, by focusing on elements which convey the ideas of harmony and balance, he puts forward an example of virtue. This requires proper respect from the narrator himself who, in a poetic stance, carefully prepares the ground for Sophia's appearance in front of the readers. Sophia is therefore introduced with 'utmost solemnity' and 'elevation of style' (p. 121), because the description must necessarily express the many qualities of this 'paragon' (p. 122). On the other hand, the narrator exercises his own stylistic skills so as to offer a model of what he 'can do in the Sublime' (p. 121). The solemn atmosphere is created by invoking the balmy winds and the auspicious seasons to attend Sophia's entrance (pp. 121 – 122). The narrator uses spatial language to describe her as if she were some architectural mold, referring to all her physical traits using terms generally associated with buildings: 'adorned', 'bedecked', 'shape', 'proportion', 'symmetry', 'arched', 'regular' (pp. 122 – 123). Since with most of the

---

[12] Anyway, it seems that the entire aristocratic class presented, whether males or females, distinguish themselves by an acute sense of frivolity and disrespect for true feelings, often using the others as the object of their erotic passions – like Lady Bellaston or Lord Fellamar.

characters there is no matching of external features with the internal ones, the narrator explicitly underlines that her soul was in total agreement with her aspect:

> Such was the outside of Sophia; nor was this beautiful frame disgraced by an inhabitant unworthy of it. Her mind was every way equal to her person[13]. (p. 123)

It is obvious here that Sophia is spatially made up of a beautiful 'frame' that is 'inhabited' by remarkable feelings. Tom's body is architecturally seen as a frame, too, or as a city. In these two characters' depiction, this technique frequently heightens their honesty and sincerity, and focuses on the rejection of hypocrisy as demonstrated by the balance between outward and inward features:

> (1) If he touched her, his hand, nay his whole *frame* trembled. (p. 189)
>
> (2) The *citadel* of Jones was now taken by surprise. (p. 180)

Aunt Western is a woman of the world who has learnt of 'philosophy and politics' which taught her to be 'artful' (p. 273), meaning deceptive, guileful, duplicitous. On the other hand, Sophia is characterized through the employment of a concept specific for the 18th century England, that is *sensibility* understood as prudence and wisdom. Additionally, what she lacks is exactly that 'art' fully recognizable in her aunt's case. Sophia is wise, prudent, decent and honest, since her interior world is outwardly revealed so as to show a perfect harmony:

> (…) for she was indeed a most sensible girl, and her understanding was of the first rate; but she wanted all that useful *art* which females convert to so many good purposes in life, and which, as it rather arises from the heart, than from the head, is often the property of the silliest of women. (*id.*)

With shrewd, passionate women like Lady Bellaston there is a constant fight between inner impulses and the rules of decorum related to what should be exhibited in public. The narrator includes the lady in a whole class of well-bred women who symbolize the idea of 'intrepidity'. She manifests utter defiance of everyone else and an explosive temper. Yet, her courageous, daring nature is due to her financial power:

> Some there are however of this rank, upon whom passion exercises its tyranny, and hurries them far beyond the bounds which decorum prescribes: of these, the ladies are as much distinguished by their noble intrepidity (…) Lady Bellaston was of this intrepid character. (p. 611)

But when it comes to rivals in love, she privately works out for measures to destroy the enemy and shows nothing of her rage. The narrator proceeds from generalities to specific examples so as to avoid presenting too strict and unreal typologies:

> When the effects of female jealousy do not appear openly in their proper colours of rage and fury, we may suspect that mischievous passion to be at work privately (…). This was exemplified in the conduct of Lady Bellaston, who, under all the smiles which she wore[14] in her countenance, concealed much indignation against Sophia. (p. 648)

The verb 'to wear' is very much used with the spatial meaning of having something on the body so as to protect oneself from what is outside, or as a means to conceal what is underneath. Lady Bellaston encourages Lord Fellamar to take more drastic action against Sophia's shyness:

> Do you think any woman in England would not laugh at you in her heart, whatever prudery she *might wear in her countenance*? (p. 656)

---

[13] Moreover, she is compared with various famous statues and paintings, the narrator insisting on the resemblance between all the ladies in the 'gallery of beauties' (p. 122), women like Venus de Medicis, the daughters of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough or Lady Ranelagh.

[14] The choice of the verbal phrase exemplifies again the narrator's use of architectural language as it refers to a purely external shape which functions here as a mask for the character to put on, to present, or to assume a false image.

Lady Bellaston's tool in attempting to keep Tom and Sophia separated is the same Lord Fellamar whose title is hardly appropriate if we consider his public conduct. The narrator emphasizes this fact by humorously feeling puzzled himself at the contradiction between his inner characteristics and the external ones: '*Lord* Fellamar (for this was the title of this young nobleman)...' (p. 649). Significantly, the narrator's stylistic playfulness leads to a reversal between human and object features so as to represent the Lord's perception of Sophia as if she were a possession:

> he would not suffer so handsome an occasion of improving his acquaintance with the beloved *object* (...) (*id.*)

Mr. Western's hypocrisy comes to the surface when hearing that Jones is Allworthy's son. But his violent nature makes him look sincere as he directly expresses his feelings by using language referring to hunting activities; on the other hand, at the end of the novel, his obstinate interest in marrying Sophia with a rich man and his total change disclose a lack of harmony between his inside and outside features. Similarly, he focuses only on outside traits just as he asks for nothing more than material, palpable, external possessions, no matter who the provider is. The former bastard and rascal becomes a 'gentleman' and an 'old friend' (p. 806) only with the news of fortune. All of a sudden he fully accepts Tom:

> Men over-violent in their dispositions, are, for the most part, as changeable in them. No sooner then was Western informed of Mr. Allworthy's intention to make Jones his heir, than he joined heartily with the uncle in every commendation of the nephew, and became as eager for her marriage with Jones, as he had before been to couple her to Blifil. (p. 801)

Western had heartily sworn the two before, but the clash between his true nature and the pretense of happiness on his face is obvious here in his enthusiastic praise of the same people.

Tom's sincere forgiveness for all who had treated him dishonestly (like Blifil, George Seagrim, even Mr. Western and Mr. Allworthy) is characterized in terms of excess (p. 810 – 811), whereas Blifil secretly negotiates in his mind (a space of mysterious dealings again) whether to reveal or to hide the hatred he felt, finally coming to another type of confession: assaulting Tom's private territory in a servant-like manner. He slyly externalizes a fake inner regret:

> He then asked pardon of his brother in the most vehement manner, prostrating himself on the ground, and kissed his feet: in short, he was now as remarkably mean, as he had been before remarkably wicked. (p. 810)

Silence is sometimes taken as sadness; thus, a harmonious expression of what Sophia and Tom feel inside, their quietness in the happy ending of the book is a moment of great confusion for the others who value outward expression too much. Allworthy and Western cannot understand that the apparent discontent hides a 'great joy'. This happens because

> great joy, after a sudden change and revolution in circumstances, is apt to be silent, and dwells rather in the heart than on the tongue. (p. 819).

Ultimately, the silence of the two protagonists sends to the order brought in the course of events at the end of the book; it is a sense of order understood as peacefulness, absence of conflict, and harmony.

Conclusions

After analyzing Fielding's employment of words referring to characters as spaces (cities or buildings) we consider that the discrepancy between internal and external elements in the case of the 'bad' characters seems to be a strategy supporting the ironic or the comic mode. This is because, with these characters, true intentions are veiled behind a mask just as in ironic contexts the narrator uses language to 'dignify' the opposite of what

he says. This way, the narrator exploits as many techniques in order to create his narrative universe mainly as a 'prosai-comi-epic writing' (p. 167).

References

Chevalier, Jean and Alain Gheerbrant. 1994. *Dicţionar de simboluri.* Bucureşti: Artemis.
Cmeciu, Doina. 2003. *The Literary Character. Between Limits and Possibilities*. Bacău: Egal.
Colipcă, Gabriela Iuliana. 2005. Veiling and Unveiling: Description in the Eighteenth-Century Novel. In *Cultural Perspectives*, 10/ 2005, 101– 119. Bacău: The University of Bacău.
Cuddon, J. A. 1998. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin Books.
Culea, Mihaela. 2006. The exploitation of narrative possibilities in Laurence Sterne's *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. In *Semiotics beyond Limits. Proceedings of the 1st ROASS Conference*, 463 – 475. The Romanian Association of Semiotic Studies. Bacău: Alma Mater.
Fielding, Henry. 1985. *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*. London: Penguin Books.
Hazard, Paul. 1965. *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Lotman, I. M. 2004.*Cultură şi explozie*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.
Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners. 2002. Oxford: Macmillan.
Macsiniuc, Cornelia. 2003. *The English Eighteenth Century. The Novel in its Beginnings*. Suceava: The University of Suceava.
New Oxford Dictionary of English (*NODE*). Oxford University Press: electronic edition.
Pârvu, Bogdan S. 2005. *Dictionary of Literary Genetics*. Iaşi: Institutul European.
Richetti, John. 1999. *The English Novel in History 1700 – 1780*. London and New York: Routledge.
Saumarez Smith, Charles. 2000. *The Rise of Design. Design and Domestic Interior in Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Pimlico.
Varey, Simon. 1990. *Space and the Eighteenth-Century Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
Verdonk, Peter, (ed.) 1993. *Twentieth-Century Poetry. From Text to Context*. London and New York: Routledge.
Webster's New World Dictionary and Thesaurus (*WWDT*). electronic edition.

(975. Tom Jones = The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling, Henry Fielding. The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling, often known simply as Tom Jones, is a comic novel by the English playwright and novelist Henry Fielding. The novel is both a Bildungsroman and a picaresque novel. First published on 28 February 1749 in London.Â characters: Tom Jones, Squire Allworthy, Sophia Western. Ø³Ø±Ú¯Ø°Ø´Øª ØªØ§Ù… Ø¬ÙˆÙ†Ø²: Ú©ÙˆØ¯Ú© Ø³Ø± Ø±Ø§Ù‡ÛŒ - Ù†ÙˆÙ†Ø±ÛŒ ÙÛŒÙ„Ø¯ÛŒÙ†Ú¯ (Ù†ÛŒÙ„ÙˆÙˆØ±) Ø§Ø¯Ø¨ÛŒØ§Øªâ€Œ Ø¨ªØ§Ø±ÛŒØ® Ù†ØªØ®Ø³ØªÛŒÙ† Ø®ÙˆØ§Ù†Ø´: Ø±ÙˆØ² Ø¨ÛŒØ³Øª Ù Ù‡Ø¨Ù… Ù…Ø§Ù‡ Ù ÙˆØ±ÛŒÙ‡ Ø³Ø§Ù„ 1984Ù…ÛŒÙ„Ø§Ø¯ÛŒ. Ø¹Ù†ÙˆØ§Ù†: Ø³â€Œ Ø±Ú¯â€Œ Ø°â€Œ Ø´Øª ØªØ§Ù…â€Œ Ø¬â€ÙˆÙ†â€Ø² Ú©â€ÙˆØ¯Ú©â€Œ Ø³â€Œ Ø±â€Ø±Ø§Ù‡â€ÛŒ Ø§Ø« Ø±: Ù†‡Ù†â€Ø±ÛŒâ€Œ Ùâ€ÛŒâ€Ù„â€Ø¯ÛŒÙ†â€Ú©â€ÛŒ, Ø¨â€Ø±Ú¯â€Ø±Ø¯Ø§Ù†: Ø§Ø«â€ÙÙ…â€Ø¯ Ú©â€ÛŒâ€Ù…â€Œâ€ÛŒâ€Œ Ø§â€Ú©â€Ø§Ú©Ú©â€ÛŒâ€Œ› Ù†Ø´Ø± Øªâ€Ù†â€Ø±Ø§Ù†â€ÛŒØ± Ù†â€ÛŒâ€Ù„â€ÙÙ†â€Ø±â€«Ø› 1361ØŒ Ø¯â€Ø± Ú†Ù†Ù‡â€Ù„â€Œ Ù‡ 809ØµØ› Ø´Ø§Ù…Ú© Ú‡Ø§Ù¾ Ø³Ù٠Ù… 9789644480782Ø› Ù†Ø´Ù¾ Ø¯Ù‡٠Ù‡ Ù¾Ø§ÛŒÛŒØ² 1368ØŒ Ù†Ø§Ù¾ Ø³Ù٠٠زÙ…Ø§ØªØ§Ù†. The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling, often known simply as Tom Jones, is a comic novel by English playwright and novelist Henry Fielding. It is a Bildungsroman and a picaresque novel. It was first published on 28 February 1749 in London and is among the earliest English works to be classified as a novel. It is the earliest novel mentioned by W. Somerset Maugham in his 1948 book Great Novelists and Their Novels among the ten best novels of the world. Henry Fielding's classic 1749 novel The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling can best be described as having employed a rather unconventional narrative style, injecting a highly-intrusive, omniscient, third-person narrator who not only relates the story of its protagonist, but comments regularly on the process of writing a story while also offering comments and asides that depart from what readers. ordinarily expect from a narrator. Fielding's narrator is apart from the action he describes; he is telling a story about an individual, but with a somewhat detached, ironic tone that provides much of the story's humor. An early indication that the reader is in... by Henry Fielding. The literary work. A novel set in England in 1745 during the Jacobite rebellion; published in 1749. SYNOPSIS.Â Next came The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and of His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams (1742). In 1748 Fielding was appointed magistrate for Westminster and Middle sex, in which capacity he established a reputation for justice in the suppression of crime.Â In Tom Jones, Fielding opposes his latitudinarian ethics to other doctrines then prevalent among religious controversialists, particularly the doctrine of total depravity found both in the ethics of self-interest espoused by Thomas Hobbes and the Calvinist theology then gaining renewed strength with the rise of Methodism in England. Both Hobbes and the Calvinists asserted. Jones spent most part of the day in the company of a new acquaintance. This was no other than the landlord of the house, or rather the husband of the landlady. He had but lately made his descent downstairs, after a long fit of the gout, in which distemper he was generally confined to his room during one half of the year; and during the rest, he walked about the house, smoked his pipe, and drank his bottle with his friends, without concerning himself in the least with any kind of business.Â We shall therefore transcribe no more of her speech, as it approached still nearer and nearer to a subject too indelicate to find any place in this history. Early in the morning Partridge appeared at the bedside of Jones, ready equipped for the journey, with his knapsack at his back.