

“What the Hill does Tom know?”

By E. Aracely Maravilla



A Senior Essay submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts.

Felicia Martinez, Advisor

Saint Mary's College of California

March 17, 2016

Human nature is, in its simplest form and definition, the nature that comes naturally to humans, the thing that is attributed to only themselves without the influence of others or society. Henry Fielding opens up his novel, *The History of Tom Jones, A Foundling*, by explaining that he would like to explore the topic of human nature through his characters. In Chapter I of Book One, Fielding states that “in Human Nature, tho’ here collected under one general Name, is such prodigious Variety, that a cook will have sooner gone through all the several Species of animal and vegetable Food in the World, than an Author will be able to exhaust so extensive a subject” (36). Fielding understands that human nature is such a wide term that it cannot be explained easily. Although Fielding uses a range of characters to help the reader understand human nature, I shall focus on two characters: Tom Jones and the character that is his opposite, a man that helps to highlight the great characteristics that Tom possesses, the Man of the Hill. Tom, the protagonist, goes through a series of life changing events that test his patience, morality, and most importantly, his faith in humanity. During his journey, Tom encounters a character that sparks a gradual change in his own disposition, the Man of the Hill. Out of all the fascinating people Tom has encountered on his journey, the Man of the Hill is the only one that has gone through similar life experiences as Tom, including betrayal, societal disadvantages, and relationship problems, to name a few. Although they both seem to share the same history, they have ended up on very different paths of life. The Man of the Hill has isolated himself from humanity, while Tom continues to embrace life and all it has to offer. Looking at Tom Jones throughout the novel, how does he change from the boy that was not ready to commit to anything or anyone to the man he becomes in the end? In examining the Man of the Hill, I am reminded of Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s savage from his *Discourse on Inequality*. The Man of the Hill can be

easily compared to the savage that Rousseau describes in his work. Why does the Man of the Hill feel the need to return to the state of nature Rousseau describes? Analyzing both these characters, why does Tom Jones not end up with the same outlook on life as the Man of the Hill?

Ultimately, I will be concerned with human nature and the role it plays in the paths we take in life.

The reader, and our hero, Tom Jones, is not introduced to the Man of the Hill until the middle of the novel. Tom meets the Man of the Hill like he meets many of the other characters; he jumps in the middle of a fight and saves the unfortunate man or woman. The Man of the Hill lives a very solitary life and claims to have removed himself from society. In Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *A Discourse on Inequality*, Rousseau makes a claim that the savage was the happiest because he lived without the constraints of society. The savage was able to roam freely before the pressures of civilization. Rousseau asserts "that the state of nature, being the state where man's care for his own preservation is least prejudicial to that of others, is the one most conducive to peace and the most suited to mankind" (Rousseau 98). Rousseau believes that peace was attainable in the state of nature because everyone only worried about themselves, their own needs and their own business. The savages did not look to others in order to survive but only think of themselves. This is the state that did least harm to others because the savages did not look at others for what they needed or as a comparison. Once mankind stopped worrying about himself alone, and began worrying about what others' possessed, things began to move away from the state of nature. This phenomenon, according to Rousseau, was the beginning of society. The savages began to gather together and "to look at the others and to want to be looked at himself; and public esteem came to be prized. He who sang or danced the best; he who was the

most handsome, the strongest, the most adroit or the most eloquent became the most highly regarded, and this was the first step towards inequality and at the same time vice” (Rousseau 114). What Rousseau describes can be best characterized as competition. With competition comes pride and ranking. Now people are looking to be the best in all aspects of life. They are no longer worried about only themselves, but also about those around them. Once pride and rankings became part of the state of nature, the state of nature was forever changed. With this change the state of nature began to disappear and society began to form.

In his work, Rousseau describes man in the state of nature, the savage. According to Rousseau, man, contrary to the belief of many people and philosophers, lived a peaceful life in the state of nature. It is only when the inequalities and vices were introduced that man started to get violent, cruel and bloodthirsty. Rousseau states that “it is for lack of having sufficiently distinguished between different ideas and seen how far those peoples already are from the first state of nature that so many authors have hastened to conclude that man is naturally cruel and needs civil institutions to make him peaceable” (115). The savage was a solitary man who depended on no but himself. That is why the state of nature was one of peace because man only worried about himself, and did not care about others. Even the act of intercourse was viewed as an inconvenience. They “quietly [await] the impulse of nature, [respond] to it involuntarily with more pleasure, than frenzy; and once the need is satisfied, all desire is extinguished” (103). They participated in the act of intercourse not because they wanted to but because nature compelled them. The act was like anything else in this natural state, something that was necessary to continue on with everyday life. No one worried about those around them, no matter their relationship. Once man started to stray from this simple way of life and want more, that is when

the state of nature was no longer pure. The path that led away from the state of nature and to the beginnings of society is what people remember about the state of nature. They only remember the vicious road that finally got them to their current state, society.

The vice that Rousseau speaks of—the vice (vanity, envy, shame, and scorn) that was introduced at the same time as the inequalities—is seen throughout the history of the Man of the Hill. In the retelling of his history, the reader can see the differences between Tom and the Man of the Hill. Tom Jones looks at the positives of every misfortune, while the Man of the Hill has grown bitter and has retreated from society because of his misfortunes. These misfortunes can all be tied back to his days at Oxford, where he encountered vice. While studying at Oxford, the Man of the Hill met another student, Sir George, that “had a great Delight in destroying and ruining the Youth of inferior Fortune, by drawing them into Expenses which they could not afford as well as himself; and the better, and worthier, and soberer, any young Man was, the greater Pleasure and Triumph had he in his Destruction” (Fielding 398). Sir George, a man who enjoyed seeing others suffer, was able to cause such suffering because of the inequalities society has created. The Man of the Hill had the misfortune to fall into the clutches of Sir George, and was taken in by his ploy of friendship and riches. Although the Man of the Hill enjoyed studying he also enjoyed doing other things that would bring him great joy and pleasure. The Man of the Hill does not specify the things, but his point is nevertheless made. The Man of the Hill was an easy target for Sir George because he “was high-mettled, had a violent Flow of animal Spirits, was a little ambitious, and extremely amorous” (Fielding 398). In other words, the Man of the Hill was a very passionate man and would let his passions get the best of him, just like his current companion, Tom. The Man of the Hill’s good friend, Sir George, had the fortune to

support his lavish lifestyle, while he had to take out credit in order to enjoy the same things Sir George was able to afford so easily. The inequalities between the Man of the Hill and Sir George can be seen easily when the Man of the Hill is accused and almost expelled for exploiting his colleagues. If these inequalities did not exist and were never introduced to Rousseau's state of nature, the Man of the Hill would never have encountered a man of such wealth. But once man started gathering together and pride became part of the equation, the inequalities began.

Sir George was not even thought of or investigated in connection to the exploitation of the students. The administration only went after the Man of the Hill. Sir George's station and wealth prevented the Vice-Chancellor from either suspecting his involvement or wanting to go against him. The Man of the Hill was the only one that could be blamed for what was going on with the students because he did not hold that same social standing as Sir George and he had become the face of the destruction his friend had caused. The inequalities between Sir George and the Man of the Hill are what make the Man of the Hill an easy scapegoat for Sir George. Although the inequalities are to blame for the situation, these inequalities have been a part of societal life for a very long time and have become a regular part of everyday life. The inequalities might be the source of the problem, but the Man of the Hill has no one to blame but himself for what had happened to him. He knew what Sir George was capable of, but continued to associate with him, and allowed it to get so far that his "Name generally stood first in the Roll of Delinquents" (Fielding 398). This made it easy for the administration to believe his colleague when he accused the Man of the Hill of stealing.

The Man on the Hill had to escape Oxford after he stole money from a fellow comrade. He was able to leave before any serious repercussions could be handed to him, but he did not run

away alone. He left Oxford with a female companion and “the first movements of the heart were the effect of this new situation” (Rousseau 112). The Man on the Hill and his woman headed to London, and he soon grew very fond of his woman, but the funds he had stolen had diminished. And as Rousseau says, the “women became more sedentary and accustomed themselves to looking after the hut and the children while the men went out to seek their common subsistence” (112). Rousseau explains that once men and women began to depend on each other, the body and the mind began to weaken. The problem was that only the Man of the Hill was dependent. He had fallen in love with this woman, and his mind was weakened because of this love. He could not see that the woman he had fallen in love with was only with him for his money he currently possessed, and when that money was gone, she looked for other ways to make up the missing capital—not to help the Man of the Hill, who was desperately trying to find a way to make his love happy—but for her gain only. Unlike the Man of the Hill, the woman’s mind was still strong because she was not emotionally attached to the Man of the Hill and she knew what she needed to do to survive. While the Man on the Hill was seeking out their subsistence, the woman began to grow impatient. Instead of waiting to see how the man that loved her would support the life of luxury she wanted to live, she contacted an old lover from Oxford and turned in the Man of the Hill. The Man on the Hill had become so dependent on this woman because of his love for her, that he was blinded to her true intentions. He wanted to marry her and start a family. He did not expect her to betray him.

The savage was not dependent on anyone but himself, but once the savage entered into society, he had to conform to societal standards. With those societal standards came falling in love with a woman and continuing his blood line. This relationship was supposed to be

reciprocal. The savage and his woman were to be dependent on each other to survive. The Man of the Hill was ready to fulfill his societal duties in regards to a woman, but unlike the savage, the Man of the Hill was not so lucky. The Man of the Hill was emotionally dependent on the woman, while the woman was only fiscally dependent. Though he felt great affection for his woman, she did not feel the same way. It was very easy for her to find other means to support herself. It is not made clear whether she went back to her old lover because he had the funds to support her, or if she only contacted him because there was a bounty on the head of the Man of the Hill that she wanted to acquire. Either way, she did not make herself dependent on the Man of the Hill, and was able to find another way to live the life she was accustomed to when he no longer had money. In this way she was very similar to the Man of the Hill; while at Oxford he also did what he had to in order to live a life he could not afford, and so did she.

The Man of the Hill had “regained [his] Liberty...but [he] had lost [his] Reputation; for there is a wide Difference between the Case of a Man who is barely acquitted of a Crime in a Court of Justice, and of him who is acquitted in his own Heart, and in the Opinion of the People” (Fielding 404). Though he gained his freedom in the sense that he was not behind bars, he would never truly be free. In civil society, reputation is so intertwined with identity that his stealing accusation will forever follow him. His reputation was in tatters because of his greed. He wanted to live the luxurious life that Sir George was able to live even though he knew those dreams were lofty. Although he was able to escape being punished by the law, he was being punished by society. All of this could have been avoided if he had just learned to rein in his pride and greed. He wanted to show that he could afford the same luxurious lifestyle that others of higher standing could easily afford, but, like Tom, the Man of the Hill was born into a life of societal

disadvantages and would never be able to afford the lifestyle he dreamed of because of those disadvantages. Instead of proving he was as worthy as his peers of the upper class, he just ended up ruining his life and being turned in by someone he trusted. Albeit this might seem like a horrible betrayal, a betrayal caused by a woman he loved, this is not the only deception he will face in his life.

A few years later, after parting ways with his brother after their father's death, the Man of the Hill meets an old friend, Watson. Watson was an old colleague from Oxford that left school a year before the scandal occurred. He was also the man that got the Man of the Hill into gambling after being accused of stealing, one of the lowest points of the Man of the Hill's life. The Man of the Hill encounters Watson at Watson's lowest point. He saves Watson from a suicide attempt and helps his dear old friend by giving him the 100 pounds he needed to settle his affairs. One would think that a man who has already been betrayed once because of money would be more careful of who he trusts, but the Man of the Hill, at this point in his life, is still optimistic and wants to see the good in others. When Watson gambles away half of what the Man of the Hill gave him, the Man of the Hill decides to still give him the benefit of the doubt and gives Watson the other half of the money he promised him. The Man of the Hill is still willing to give Watson the rest of the money even though there is no guarantee that Watson will use it to finally settle his affairs. The trust he still has in the people around him shows that the Man of the Hill still has faith in the good of humanity. He could have easily not given Watson the money, but he chose to help an old friend that was in a bad place. Watson and the Man of the Hill decide to stick together and join the army in order to fight against King James' forces, but in the battle at Sedgemore, the Man of the Hill received an injury and they both ran. Running from King James'

soldiers, both men made it to a little hut where the Man of the Hill was treated by a woman. It was here that Watson left the Man of the Hill and betrayed him to the very soldiers they were hiding from. This is the violation that turns the Man of the Hill into the man Tom encounters.

Rousseau explains that

“a devouring ambition, the burning passion to enlarge one’s relative fortune, not so much from real need as to put oneself ahead of others, inspires in all men a dark propensity to injure one another, assumes the mask of benevolence in order to do its deeds in greater safety; in a word, there is competition and rivalry on the one hand, conflicts of interests on the other, and always the hidden desire to gain an advantage at the expense of other people” (Rousseau 119).

According to Rousseau, man has always felt a need for self-preservation. This has always been their first concern, but with the introduction of society there was also the introduction of rivalry. Watson, wanting to protect himself and gain favor with King James’ soldiers betrays the Man of the Hill. Watson turned himself over to the soldiers and exposed the Man of the Hill so that he would not be punished as severely as he would have if the soldiers had found them both on their own. He, like the woman the Man on the Hill loved, were only looking after themselves and only thought of what they would gain by turning in the Man of the Hill. In the society the savages have created for themselves, it is every man or woman for themselves. In order to move up in the world, one must be willing to do what it takes in order to accomplish their goal. It is very possible that Watson was jealous of the success the Man of the Hill found after he left London with his father. This could be another reason that Watson felt the need to betray a man that had been nothing but kind to him. Whatever Watson’s reasoning, this betrayal is what changes the Man of the Hill irrevocably. This final betrayal is what pushes the Man of the Hill over the cliff, unlike Tom Jones, he no longer sees the good in others. He has learned that “being and

appearance [become] to entirely different things, and from this distinction arose insolent ostentation, deceitful cunning and all the vices that follow in their train” (Rousseau 119). In civil society, people judge each other by appearance only and the way a person really is does not necessarily matter. Public outings become an opportunity to show off and to put on a persona different than the one shown to close friends and family. The world outside the home becomes a stage and not everyone is what they seem. People might even have malicious motives but one cannot find out if they’re a friend or enemy until it is too late and the damage is done. This was a hard lesson for the Man of the Hill to learn, because this lesson came with consequences that could have potentially ruined his whole life, some with the potential to even kill him, instead it just ruined his outlook. Because the Man of the Hill had very good fortune, although he might not see it that way, every time he was captured, and about to be imprisoned or put to death, some divine force intervened and he escaped untouched.

The Man of the Hill had once again escaped a brutal betrayal relatively uninjured, but unlike the last times, he did not come out of this completely unscathed. He no longer trusted anyone and after escaping the soldiers, made it a point to avoid roads and towns, not because he was hiding from King James’ men, but because he believed that anyone he encountered would betray him. He wandered until he came to the hill that Tom Jones and Partridge find him on, “where the Solitude and Wildness of the Country invited [him] to fix [his] Abode” (Fielding 421). Tom Jones and Partridge encounter the Man of the Hill many years after the unfortunate betrayal, and not only has his attitude changed, but also his appearance. The Man of the Hill really looked the part of the savage Rousseau describes. He “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” (Fielding 394). Not only does he now avoid others, but his appearance also helps repel unwanted attention. He had, essentially, become one with nature. The Man of the Hill learned to provide for himself without depending on others. He removed himself from society, and avoids people at all costs. Rousseau explains that

“For however it may seem a Paradox, or even a Contradiction, certain it is that great Philanthropy chiefly inclines us to avoid and detest Mankind; not on Account so much of their private and selfish Vices, but for those of a relative Kind; such as Envy, Malice, Treachery, Cruelty, with every other species of Malevolence. These are the Vices which true Philanthropy abhors, and which rather than see and converse with, she avoids Society itself” (Rousseau 395).

Rousseau makes a distinction between private vices and relative vices. Although one can argue that those private vices could lead to the relative ones, not everyone suffers from the same private vices while many people do seem to have the relative vices within them. These relative vices are the ones that affect other people. They reach outside the home and hurt those around them. These vices are what drive both Philanthropy and the Man of the Hill away from the people who perpetuate them. The Man of the Hill, just like Rousseau’s Philanthropy, decides to hide away from society. He walks at night just to make sure he does not encounter anyone. And just like Philanthropy hates society.

The things that Rousseau describes as creating society, the inequality and vice, are what drove the Man of the Hill away from society. The inequalities and vices that are present in society were too much for the the Man of the Hill to take. Once he realized what society truly brought to the world he could no longer live among the people who continued to perpetuate it. Although the Man of the Hill expressed his hatred for society and mankind, he was not as

removed from them as he would like to believe. This solitary man, among other things, has a maid that cleans and cooks for him. The Man of the Hill says he hates society, but he likes the conveniences that society has made available to him. The savage Rousseau describes relied on no one but himself, and “so long as they applied themselves only to work that one person could accomplish alone and to arts that did not require the collaboration of several hands, they lived as free, healthy, good and happy men so far as they could be according to their nature and they continued to enjoy among themselves the sweetness of independent intercourse” (Rousseau 116). Man, in the state of nature described by Rousseau, is completely free because he relies on no one but himself. He does not need the help of anyone in order to survive in the world. As much as the Man of the Hill would like to believe he is free from societal constraints, he is not. Not only does he have a maid, he also likes to travel and visit different countries in Europe. These countries, with their monuments and statues, were created by the collaboration of many hands. The few things that bring him joy were created by society.

Though he might believe otherwise, the Man of the Hill will forever be part of society and the inequalities that come with it. He will never truly know what it feels like to be free because of the hold society has over him. And man will always live “outside himself; he knows how to live only in the opinion of others, it is so to speak, from their judgement alone that he derives the sense of his own existence,” unlike the savage who “lives within himself” (Rousseau 136). It is because of the opinion of others that the Man of the Hill made the decisions that led him on this path. He did not know how to live life within himself, and only now that he has isolated himself from the rest of the world does he seem to have learned to live within himself, like the savage. Although he has learned to live within himself and no longer care about what

others think, he does this by not interacting with anyone and he still goes into the world to enjoy the things society has created. The Man of the Hill proves that man can never fully go back to being the savage Rousseau describes.

Rousseau ends the introduction of his *Discourse on Inequality* stating that

“Discontented with your present condition for reasons which presage for your unfortunate posterity even greater discontent, you will wish perhaps you could go backwards in time--and this feeling must utter the eulogy of your first ancestors, the indictment of your contemporaries, and the terror of those who have the misfortune to live after you” (79).

When looking into the future, people sometimes believe that something better is coming, but in retrospect, the past is sometimes much better than what the future will ever hold. Everyone looks to the future with hope, but sometimes the future holds nothing but disaster. No one sees the truth until it is much too late and turning back is no longer an option. The Man on the Hill wishes to go back to a time where society does not exist, but because he has already been touched by the societal customs of his time, he will never be as free as the savage and never as happy. He will always live in an inbetween state knowing that true happiness exists, but not being able to let go of his societal ties in order to reach it.

Although the Man of the Hill makes a valid argument for wanting to return to the state of nature that Rousseau describes, Tom Jones does not agree with him. Tom states at the conclusion of the Man of the Hill’s speech that

I believe, as well as hope, that the Abhorrence which you express for Mankind, in the Conclusion, is much too general. Indeed you here fall into Error, which, in my little Experience, I have observed to be a very common one, by taking the Character of Mankind from the worst and basest among them; whereas indeed, as an excellent Writer observes, nothing should be esteemed as characterized of a

Species, but what is to be found among the best and most perfect Individuals of that Species. This Error, I believe, is generally committed by those who, from Want of proper Caution in the Choice of their Friends and Acquaintance, have suffered Injuries from bad and worthless Man; two or three Instances of which are very unjustly charged on all Human Nature (425).

The explanation that Tom gives the Man of the Hill tells not only the Man of the Hill, but also the reader that the nature of humans vary from person to person. The Man of the Hill and Tom Jones are perfect examples of the difference in people's natures. Tom Jones, like the narrator at the beginning of the novel, understands that human nature cannot be classified by just a few people. There are many different kinds of people in the world and just a few atrocious beings cannot be what the world is measured by. If the Man of the Hill's opinions of mankind were true then the world would be a very miserable place. The differences in opinion regarding the nature of man is what sets these two seemingly similar men apart. What in Tom Jones' history has allowed him to continue to have such an optimistic view of man?

From the very beginning, Fielding sets Tom Jones apart from the other characters in the novel. Tom Jones is no ordinary boy. The story of his coming to live and grow up as the ward of Mr. Allworthy is filled with gossip and rumors. Nothing about his parentage is sure. The only thing that seems certain is that his mother is Jenny Jones because she admitted as much to Allworthy, but even this is proven false later on in the novel. Despite the murkiness of his history, Allworthy believes that children are born innocent and should not be condemned for the sins of their parents and decides to raise Tom. Tom was very fortunate to have landed in the hands of such a kind and generous benefactor. Being raised by such a caring man has many benefits, but that still does not negate the fact that Tom is a foundling, a boy that was abandoned

by his parents, and a bastard because Jenny Jones was not married at the time of his birth. This stigma still follows him around, and he is constantly under scrutiny because of who is raising him, and although people expect him to be on his best behavior, they also expect the worst because he is a bastard. This is one of the downsides of society that was explained earlier. Like Rousseau stated being and appearance have become to different things in society. People do not know who Tom Jones really is, but they punish him for something that he had no control over. Society has told them that bastards are to be shunned so they do just that. Though, Tom is fortunate in that people do treat him a little better because his benefactor is such an influential man. Because of Allworthy, Tom was given many opportunities, and he has been able to meet many people, including Sophia Western.

Sophia Western, a girl the narrator introduces as the heroine of the novel, has grown up with Tom Jones and Blifil, Allworthy's nephew. She has been able to see both these characters develop throughout their childhood and "when very young, discerned that *Tom*, tho' an idle, thoughtless, rattling Rascal, was no-body's Enemy but his own; and that Master *Blifil*, tho' a prudent, discreet, sober, young Gentleman, was, at the same Time, strongly attached to the Interest only of one single Person" (Fielding 149). Sophia had insight on both boys that not everyone had. She was able to see how they interacted with each other and with her. Although Sophia may not know this, the reader does know that Blifil is a master at manipulating people into believing he has good intentions. Blifil only worries about himself, while Tom worries about everyone but himself. Not only does Tom worry about the well being of others, but Sophia was right in calling him 'thoughtless.' Tom Jones does not think, and he reacts instinctively. Most of the trouble he gets into along his journey is because he does not think before he acts. This

thoughtlessness that Tom possesses rarely hurts anyone but himself. Sophia was accurate in her description of both the boys, especially when she calls Tom his own enemy. His ill-considered actions and decisions are what lead him down the path he takes that lead him to the Man of the Hill. Whether or not he is aware of the fact is not made clear right away, but what is made clear is that when he believes his impulsiveness has hurt someone or has ruined someone, he takes full responsibility. The reader sees time and time again how Tom Jones protects those he considers friends and lovers. He protects Black George, his friend and Allworthy's game keeper, when they were caught hunting on a neighbor's property. Tom was caught but Black George managed to escape and when asked about his partner, Tom insists that he was alone. His protective nature does not stop at small things like this, but when he finds out he had impregnated Black George's daughter, Molly, he vows to take care of her and protect her. Coincidentally this is at the same time that Tom realizes his feelings for Sophia, but he pushes his feelings aside to do what is right. These are just a few of the occasions where the reader witnesses Tom's responsible nature. Albeit his responsible nature after the fact, but responsible none the less.

Although Tom is responsible, he is still immature and naive in many respects. He trusts almost everyone he meets on his journey. The narrator states that "every Profession of Friendship easily gains Credit with the Miserable; it is no wonder, therefore, if *Jones*, who, besides his being miserable, was extremely open-hearted, very readily believed all the Professions of *Benjamin*, and received him into his Bosom" (369). Tom, having been exiled of his home, has no friends around or anyone to talk to. He is vulnerable to anyone who is kind to him because he is starving for companionship. Benjamin — aka Partridge, the man accused of

impregnating Jenny Jones and being Tom's father — had ulterior motives for befriending Tom. Partridge knew who Tom was from the very beginning. He heard Tom's name and immediately knew Tom's connection to him. Partridge knew that the accusation that ruined his life was false so he concluded that Allworthy must be Tom father. Wanting to win good favor with Allworthy, Partridge decides to return his son. Tom does not know about Partridge's plans for him, instead he readily accepts the man's offer of friendship. In this sense Tom and the Man of the Hill are similar. Until the final betrayal, the Man of the Hill was a very trusting person. He gave everyone the benefit of the doubt, until the last betrayal almost got him killed. The betrayals Tom Jones faces are never life threatening, although they are life-changing.

Sometime during his journey, Tom became aware of Blifil's true character. When he encountered Dowling, a lawyer, a second time, Dowling decided to make a toast to both Allworthy and Blifil. This toast angers Tom and prompts him to say, "I thought he wanted that Generosity of Spirit, which is the sure Foundation of all that is great and noble in Human Nature. I saw a Selfishness in him long ago which I despised; but it is lately, very lately, that I have found him capable of the basest and blackest Designs" (578). Tom believes that everyone wants to strive to do good and be generous just like he has lived his life, just like the man raised him lived his life. He knows that the greatness of man lies in his ability to be generous and to help others. He wants everyone to strive towards this good, and for a time he believed that Blifil was also striving towards this goal. He is now aware that Blifil is only generous to himself and no one else. Tom is not yet aware of the extent of Blifil's betrayal and lies, but he knows enough to be able to discern his character. Tom puts a lot of weight behind charity and generosity. Tom has learned to give without a thought to his wants or needs. Some could argue that this is the work of

Allworthy raising him, but Blifil also grew up in the same household as Tom with the same teachings and, like Tom states in the above quotation, Blifil lacks the “Generosity of Spirit”.

This spirit that Tom possesses can be seen throughout the novel, and his outlook on charity is best expressed in Book XII Chapter IV when he and Partridge encounter a beggar:

Jones then fell a laughing, and asked Partridge, if he was not ashamed, with so much Charity in his Mouth, to have no Charity in Heart. ‘Your Religion,’ says he, ‘serves you only for an Excuse for your faults, but is no Incentive to your virtue. Can any Man who is really Christian abstain from relieving one of his Brethren in such a miserable Condition?’ (555-556)

Tom does not understand how anyone, especially someone who talks about religion and uses it for an excuse, can walk right by someone in need. Tom will not walk away from someone in need if he has the means to help them. This is how Tom feels about charity, but he is not the only one who feels strongly on this subject. If the reader interprets the narrator as speaking for the author, than the reader also gets Fielding’s thoughts and feelings on the subject. He states in his introductory chapter of Book VI

...that there is in some (I believe in many) human Breasts, a kind and benevolent Disposition, which is gratified by contributing to the Happiness of others. That in this Gratification alone, as in Friendship, in parental and filial Affection, as indeed in general Philanthropy, there is a great and exquisite Delight. That if we will not call such Disposition Love, we have no Name for it (241-242).

The narrator, when explaining the different kinds of love, makes a point of including this type of love. It is not a type of love people would normally think of, but, as the narrator says, if the name is not love then what should it be called? When people think of love they only think of loving a significant other or a parent, but the type of love the narrator describes is a love of mankind, A love that gives without expecting anything in return. This is the type of love that the narrator

seems to see as the best kind of love to possess, the love of making others happy. Tom Jones is one of the few people in the novel that the reader sees give to others without expecting a reward in return. Unlike the Man of the Hill and Rousseau, he does not abandon society once he encounters the ugliness that comes along with it. Instead, Tom continues to help others whenever he has the means to do so. The reason for this might be attributed to the fact that, because of the odd circumstances surrounding his birth, he has always been in close proximity to the hatred and malice society can dispense on a person that does not fit into the mold society has created. Tom, although protected by Allworthy's name, still feels the effects of his parentage. Tom knows that the world is filled with people that find pleasure in harming others, but he does not let that dissuade him from continuing to do good. He knows and understands that those that do good outweigh those that do harm. He understands that Blifil is a selfish man but he also knows that the world contains plenty of Allworthys to balance out the scales. He shows time and time again that he values generosity over anything and admires those who are also generous.

This Generosity of Spirit also reaches those who have done him wrong. One of the biggest difference between the Man of the Hill and Tom Jones is the ability to forgive. Forgiveness plays a huge role in Tom's life. At the end of the novel, he is able to forgive everyone that has done him wrong. Not only does he forgive them, but he also does not want them punished for their indiscretions, although Allworthy believes they should be punished. The two main characters that require his forgiveness are Blifil and Black George. They both betrayed Tom because of money. Blifil manipulated Allworthy into believing that Tom was joyful of his illness, which leads to Allworthy banishing Tom from his home. This betrayal leads to Tom's journey. Blifil's betrayal is the one that is most heart-wrenching because he is a boy Tom grew

up and considered a friend, although they had grown apart as they grew older. Blifil manipulated the events that led up to Tom's banishment to his advantage because he did not want to share his inheritance. What Blifil does not understand is Tom's indifference towards money.

Tom cares very little for money and when he is speaking with Dowling says, "I had rather enjoy my own Mind than the Fortune of another Man" (581). When Allworthy falls sick and lays out the terms of his will, Tom does not care that Allworthy has included him the will. Tom did not expect to be included at all and that is not what is important to him. What is important is that that Allworthy get well. That is all Tom cares about. The things that Tom finds important are not things at all, but people. Tom values people more than anything else in the world, that is why he is so generous towards others and gives without a thought to himself. Tom does not need money to find happiness because he finds happiness in those around him. He is one of the unique people in the novel that does not care about money. Others, the Man of the Hill, Blifil, Black George, etc. believe they need money to find happiness. But money does not always bring happiness, sometimes it generates misery. The Man of the Hill loses his reputation because he was trying to live a life that he could not afford. Blifil loses the love of his uncle because of his ambition to claim all of Allworthy's fortune. On the other hand, Tom Jones is aware of his social status. He does not try to reach beyond what he knows his societal limitations are.

When Tom falls in love with his childhood friend, he realizes that, though they grew up together, they were on different paths of life. Sophia's overprotective father wants his daughter to have a good life with a man who can provide for her. In spite of the fact that he is the ward of a very influential and wealthy man, Tom is a bastard, and bastards are looked down on no matter

who their guardian is. Knowing what's at stake, Tom struggles to decide what actions to take concerning his feelings. Nevertheless, "Honour at last, backed with Despair, with Gratitude to his Benefactor, and with real Love to his Mistress, got the better of burning Desire, and he resolved rather to quit *Sophia* than to pursue her to her Ruin" (279). The respect Tom holds for Allworthy is a factor in his decision because he does not want to go against the wishes of a man that raised him. A man that he greatly respects and admires. Allworthy plays a role in his decision, but Sophia is the defining factor. Tom's love for Sophia is more powerful than his desire to possess her. He wants her to find happiness and he knows that going against her father to be with him would be her ruination. Tom is a very honorable young man which is why he makes the decision to leave Sophia rather than ruin her. Though he is honorable, he is still ruled by his passions.

Tom is a reactionary person. He does not always think before he acts, and sometimes that lands him in some trouble. Just like he gives without a thought, he also gives into his basest instincts without a thought. Sophia holds his heart, but Tom still continues to feel desire for other women. This is just part of his nature. Like the Man of the Hill, Tom likes to enjoy what the world has to offer and easily gives into his passions. These passions lead him to do things without thinking them through. Unlike the Man of the Hill, Tom's pleasures don't lean towards the monetary type, but rather that of the female variety. He is still a young man that still has a lot to learn about adulthood and love. In the second to the last chapter there is a conversation that occurs between Tom and Sophia where they discuss love. Sophia does not understand how Tom was able to have an affair with another woman when he had professed his love for her. Tom states that "the delicacy of your Sex cannot conceive the Grossness of ours, nor how little one

Sort of Amour has to do with the Heart” (866). According to Tom, women do not understand that the affairs of the heart are separate than the affairs of the body. Sophia will forever own Tom’s heart, but he believes that his body can be shared with other women. Even at the end of the novel, Tom is still every immature in many respects, including in his passions. He does not give going to bed with other women a second thought. He believes this type of behavior is acceptable because his heart belongs to Sophia and that is what is important. The heart is what matters, while the body holds little importance. Even by the end of the book, the reader can still see how much Tom Jones still has to grow in this respect, but they also get a glimpse of how much the journey has changed him for the better. He now thinks through his decisions, instead of acting impulsively. He no longer lets his first instinct be the deciding factor for his life choices. His response to Arabella Hunt’s marriage proposal is a great example of this. Tom is very tempted by the offer, and the old Tom would’ve said yes because he let his passions rule him, but the Tom the reader sees at the end of the novel is able to think through the marriage proposal, and although he needs the money and is most certain of not being able to be with his Sophia, he still refuses the marriage proposal. Although Tom is still a very passionate young man, he is about control he passionate nature and is no longer ruled by his impulses.

In the last book of the novel, Tom finally addresses Sophia’s assumption from the very beginning of the novel, that he is his own worst enemy. He states, “but why do I blame Fortune? I am myself the Cause of all my Misery. All the dreadful Mischiefs which have befallen me, are the Consequences only of my own Folly and Vice” (814). After his long journey, Tom is able to reflect on what has led him on this path. He is able to reflect on his choices, because, although he is still the same passionate man that he was in the beginning of the novel, he now thinks before

he acts. Although it takes Tom Jones the whole of the novel to realize this, he does understand that it is because of his choices in life that he ends up on the path that he did. This is one of the many differences between Tom and the Man of the Hill; while the Man of the Hill blames his misfortunes on those around him, Tom realizes the role he played in his own demise and eventual resurrection.

The Man of the Hill and Tom Jones are two men that have gone through similar experiences—both having been born with societal disadvantages and betrayed by those they trusted—but end up on two very different paths in life. Henry Fielding uses these two characters to demonstrate that although people can go through similar life incidents, the strength of a person's character can influence where the person ends up in life. The Man of the Hill's inability to forgive pushes him to live a life similar to Rousseau's state of nature, while Tom's ability to pardon leads him to embrace life and all it has to offer. Rousseau's state of nature works only because of the isolation the savage must partake in. Tom could never survive in this state of nature or in the world the Man of the Hill has created because he thrives on those around him. In introductory chapter of Book XV, the narrator outlines two sorts of virtues: the first that stays at home, and the second that ventures outside. The second type of virtue —

if by Virtue is meant (as I almost think it ought) a certain relative Quality, which is always busying itself without Doors, and seems as much interested in pursuing the Good of others as its own; I cannot so easily agree that this is the surest Way to human Happiness; because I am afraid we must then include Poverty and Contempt, with all the Mischiefs which Backbiting, Envy, and Ingratitude can bring on Mankind, in our Idea of Happiness; nay, sometimes perhaps we shall be obliged to wait upon the said Happiness to a Goal; since many by the above Virtue have brought themselves thither (689),

—seems to describe Tom perfectly. According to the narrator, a staying at home kind of virtue leads to happiness, while the going out kind of virtue instead allows people to encounter greed and poverty, among other things. All the things the Man of the Hill is trying to avoid. Tom does not settle for just his happiness, but also looks out for the happiness and wellbeing of others. He has a personality that cannot be confined indoors. He has to be outside helping others. It is an integral part of his character, and the main reason he would never end up as the Man of the Hill. The boy who was born on the outskirts of society cannot live without the people in society. The nature of these two men, although similar in their sharing of passionate natures, are also vastly different because Tom Jones possesses in his nature compassion for others, and this compassion leads him to venture out into the world and embrace all the good and all the bad it has to offer.

Works Cited

Fielding, Henry, Tom Keymer, and Alice Wakely. *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*.

London: Penguin, 2005. Print.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and Maurice Cranston. *A Discourse on Inequality*. Harmondsworth,

Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1984. Print.