

**THE "TAME BEAR:" IMAGES OF THE SOLDIER IN THE EARLY ENGLISH
NOVEL**

by


JUSTIN CLIFFORD GAGE

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the Degree of
Master of Arts

ENGLISH

Raleigh

1997



APPROVED BY:

19970616 039

[Handwritten signature]

Chair of Advisory Committee

ABSTRACT

GAGE, JUSTIN CLIFFORD. The "Tame Bear:" Images of the Soldier in the Early English Novel. (Under the direction of John Morillo.)

This essay studies the representation of soldiers in eighteenth-century English novels. The emergence of the standing army (formally begun in 1670) and the creation of a new military profession in British society challenged older concepts of masculine identity and power. The challenges that the professionalization of the soldier posed were the source of anxiety and concern in the novelists of the early- to mid eighteenth century, and these anxieties were in turn manifested in the representation of the soldier and the army in general in the novel. These challenges to traditional masculine identity and power take the form of a series of dialectics within which soldiers are placed--dialectics of class, politics, sexuality, and military spectacle. The essay includes analysis of six novels of the period: Colonel Jack (1722) by Daniel Defoe; Gulliver's Travels (1726) by Jonathan Swift; Joseph Andrews (1742) and Tom Jones (1749) by Henry Fielding; Tristram Shandy (1760) by Laurence Sterne; and Humphry Clinker (1771) by Tobias Smollett. Each author varies somewhat in his handling of the soldier within these dialectics, but the dominant characteristic of the representation of the standing army in these novels is that of ambivalence, or "double discourse;" like a bear at a bear-baiting, the professional soldier is a source of conflicting emotions: admiration and fear, sympathy and scorn. The essay concludes with thoughts about possible shifts in the characterization of the profession of arms in the novels of Fanny Burney and Jane Austen.

BIOGRAPHY

Captain Justin C. Gage is an active-duty U.S. Army infantry officer with a B.A. in History from Central Washington University. After enlisting in the Army in 1986, Captain Gage served in a variety of infantry units in the United States and Germany. His professional training includes the U.S. Army Officer Candidate School, the Infantry Officer Basic- and Advanced Courses, and the Army's Airborne-, Jumpmaster- and Ranger Schools. He is currently assigned as an instructor to the English Department of the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION: Masculine Identity, Power, and the Dialectics of the Soldier.....	1
2. CHAPTER ONE: The Absent Soldier in Defoe's <u>Colonel Jack</u>	14
3. CHAPTER TWO: Beyond the Anti-War Argument in Swift's <u>Gulliver's Travels</u>	30
4. CHAPTER THREE: Containing the Soldier in Fielding's <u>Joseph Andrews</u> and <u>Tom Jones</u>	48
5. CHAPTER FOUR: Military Pedantry in Sterne's <u>Tristram Shandy</u>	61
6. CHAPTER FIVE: The Colonial Soldier in Smollett's <u>Humphry Clinker</u>	71
7. CONCLUSION: Assimilation of the Soldier in Austen and Beyond.....	84
8. WORKS CITED.....	88

Introduction: Masculine Identity, Power, and the Dialectics of the Soldier

In Tobias Smollett's 1771 novel Humphry Clinker, Jerry Melford describes Lieutenant Lismahago turning the tables on the practical joker, Sir Thomas Bullford. He sums up the episode by writing, "I have seen a tame bear, very diverting when properly managed, become a very dangerous wild beast when teized for the entertainment of the spectators" (281). Jerry--writing to one knight (Sir Watkin Phillips) about the cruelty of another knight (Bullford) and the subsequent humbling of that knight at the hands of a vengeful old soldier--is commenting on the relatively new problem of incorporating the full-time army into British society--of dealing with the benefits and the dangers of living with a "tame bear."

In his book, Factual Fictions, Lennard Davis has commented on "ambivalent reaction" as a characteristic of reading the novels of the early eighteenth century. (24) Davis goes on to explore what he terms the "double discourse" of the early novel--tensions between fact and fiction, repression and protest. (131) While Davis uses the prominent figure of the criminal to illustrate these tensions, the figure of the professional soldier in the British novel is also notable for the ambivalence in his portrayal, an ambivalence which indicates the deep debate over the very existence of the standing army and the attitudes of eighteenth-century British culture toward the new institution.

The ambivalent quality of the soldier's representation in the novel derives in part from his relationship to masculine identity. Specifically, I am focusing on masculine identity in mimetic terms--how individual men define themselves through their ability to compete with other men for what they desire: material wealth, power, women. In many hunter-gatherer societies, for example, martial prowess translates directly into a man's ability to provide for his family and community, through the close similarities of both hunting and warfare--which in turn translates into a man's ability to secure the best mates. A man's identity in such societies is bound up with his capabilities to effectively function

in combat. This identification of a man's material wealth, sexual potency, and social status with his physical prowess in war carries over into feudal society, where the most powerful and desirable men--the masculine ideal--are the nobles whose claim to dominance over other members of society is based in part in their unique military capabilities; Lancelot in Malory's Morte d'Arthur is a literary ideal of this type. Some of the romantic conventions associated with criminality--particularly as represented in the figure of the highwayman--stem from the association of masculinity with violence, and partly accounts for the ambivalence that Davis notes in the depiction of the criminal in the early novel. Not until the advent of soldiering as a separate profession does the man's capability to provide for a mate and his capabilities as a warrior begin to separate. Even officers, who largely came from the ranks of the aristocracy, were often the younger sons, who did not stand to inherit the family titles or estate--they were less desirable from the standpoint of being able to provide, despite any martial virtues they might possess. Britain's transformation into a capitalist, commercial society meant that a man's ability to compete with other men--to secure wealth, power, and women--was increasingly divorced from his ability to fight. This schism can be seen in the person of the king himself, ostensibly the most powerful man in Britain, who successively withdraws from the royal function of battlefield command, ending with King George II's presence at the battle of Dettingen in 1743, the last time an English king would appear in person on the field of battle. This conflict between older, more primal concepts of masculine identity and the values of an increasingly specialized commercial society is the source for much of the soldier's ambivalent treatment in the novel, particularly within dialectics of sexuality and class.

In addition to masculinity, the professional soldier's role in the differentiation of the sources of power in eighteenth-century British society also creates the approval and anxieties that lead to his ambivalent depiction in the novel. Before the creation of a

standing army and a body of professional soldiers, power in Britain fluctuated within a dyad--religion and the nobility. While it may be overly reductive to simplify the often overwhelmingly complex interaction between these two elements of British society, the key concept for understanding the professional soldier's influence on concepts of power lies in the differentiation of the warrior function from that of wealth. In feudal society, wealth was tied to the land, which was governed by nobles with specialized military skills and knowledge. By the eighteenth century, the sources of power begin to fragment due to the influences of capitalism and the specialization of soldiering into a separate profession. Now the concept of wealth begins to diversify away from being tied strictly to the land and toward being associated with capital. In addition, martial capability and wealth is no longer located within a single individual, but is instead formally separated, fragmenting the sources of power in British society from a dyad (religion, landed wealth/martial function) to a more diversified triad (religion, capital wealth, martial function). In the sphere of printed discourse, Davis has noted that "specialization, by breaking down community, hierarchy, and so on, might be said to have shifted the social gathering place from the daily world to the printed page," and the specialization of roles represented by the soldier also displaces other conventions. (145) By the time of the novel, this displacement creates uncertainty, which leads to tensions between different cultural values--New Testament values of community, charity, and non-violence; capitalist values of wealth and rule of law; martial values of personal honor, subordination, and acceptance of individual risk, for example. These cultural tensions, partly occasioned by the creation of a standing professional army, creates ambivalence in the figure of the soldier in the novel.

This ambivalence manifests itself through a series of dialectics wherein the soldier operates. For example, the soldier functions within the novel as both an affirmation and a protest of class--serving to reinforce class divisions while questioning

their rigidity. This protest is always conservative and centers around the problem posed by the man of merit; when a meritorious individual is identified among the lower classes, what should be done about him? The soldier is a figure of *conservative* protest in part because upper-class patronage plays the major role in solving the problem of the lower-class man of merit; the authors are unanimous in limiting and containing the ability of the soldier to transcend divisions of class. In some cases, the soldier serves as a means of criticizing the leadership of the landed classes, who now have invested a separate class with the military duties which had previously helped justify their position of dominance within English society. Just as "the novel embodies the contradictory qualities of rebellion and conformity," the soldier's simultaneous status as the thesis and antithesis of stability in the English class system embodies ambivalence. (Davis 222)

Just as the emergence of soldiering as a specialized profession provokes ambivalence over the new profession's implications for social order, the soldier also provokes fear and approval of his potential for enforcing or threatening the political order. Certainly their potential for causing disturbance was well-known to eighteenth-century novelists; "Soldiers and sailors together made a great affray in Plymouth in 1757; soldiers caused a riot in Sudbury in 1761; men of the Coldstream Guards caused a riot in a dissenting meeting house in Swallow Street in London. The examples could be multiplied" (Hayter 21-22). Swift's direct concern with the possibility of the professional soldier being the cause for tyranny, rather than Britain's defense against it, is ameliorated in Defoe, Fielding, and Sterne. Smollett attempts to contain the political threat that the Scottish soldier in particular represents to the English, but has to directly express the fear that the army may be a threat to liberty rather than its chief guarantor, while being very careful to effectively dismiss that threat. Perhaps the prospect of another civil war was so horrible, even a century after the end of Cromwell, that few authors were willing to directly contemplate this potential of the soldier.

One way in which this fear of the soldier is indirectly displayed in the novel is in the intermittent concern with government policies toward the maintenance of the army: how soldiers were compensated and sustained. As early as the end of Charles II's reign, "public attention was attracted to the distressed condition of soldiers, discharged because of age, wounds, or infirmity, begging or starving in towns and villages, especially in Ireland" (Williams 106). The old soldier's hospital at Chelsea opened in 1692, and concern for veterans and their dependents would continue throughout the next century. (Williams 108) Fielding and Smollett in particular evince concerns with such issues, as well as the purchase system of commissioning, quartering, half-pay and other sources of discontent within the army and society. This mild criticism of the government's policies toward keeping society's soldiers and veterans contented is one of the characteristics of the depiction of the professional soldier in eighteenth-century fiction which Smollett captures in Jerry's metaphor of bear-baiting--the bear is a source of both fear and delight. While some of the disorder that soldiers caused was undoubtedly due to the fears of the general population toward the new profession, "on the other hand there is no doubt that the army often behaved extremely badly in its off-duty dealings with the public: the frequent mention of soldiers in the criminal records is only one proof of this. Equally it is clear that soldier-baiting was a common form of sport" (Hayter 21). The soldier is a creature that must be controlled; the authors of eighteenth-century novels attempted to tame the new professionalized warrior.

Ambivalence also characterizes the soldier's function in what I categorize as military spectacle. Military spectacle in all its forms--from Blenheim Palace to the accounts of the daily newspapers--is, like a bear-baiting, a source of both horror and delight. The army was often appropriated by the public, in much the same way as executions, for purposes of diversion. During the Monmouth rebellion of 1685, James II instituted a summer camp outside London "for training and exercising his army," which

included ostentatious reviews that attracted large crowds from the city and became a commonplace feature of the army in Britain. (Williams 192) A contemporary observer of the camp on Hounslow Heath noted that, "In truth, the place was merely a gay suburb of the capital" (Williams 193). Spectacle is often criticized by the early novelists as serving to desensitize society from the horrors of war, putting even well-meaning citizens in the position of Fielding's blustering hunting gentleman, or Sterne's Uncle Toby, arguing for the continuance of war and thus for the continuance of the vicarious participation that military spectacle allows. Military spectacle is also linked to the development of science and its direct linkage to the increasingly systematized profession of warfare. Sterne and Swift, for all their differences, have both seized on the soldier as a symbol for their fears of the unwise harnessing of reason and science into the activity of killing one's fellow beings; one wonders if they would have felt sadly justified with the advent of atomic weapons in our own century.

While they present vignettes of either proper or unwise patronage of individuals, the authors all use various strategies to contain the threat that soldiers pose within the dialectic of sexuality. To counter the soldier as a figure of desire, the novelists often attempt to minimize his potency in the competition for desirable women. The soldier is uniformly matched with women whom society feels inclined to dismiss as "damaged goods"--Fielding's Betty and Lady Booby; Colonel Jack and his wives; Toby's and Trim's campaign to woo the widow Wadman and Bridget; Lismahago and Tabby--any attempts by soldiers in the narrative to acquire virtuous or chaste women--the half-pay captain's kidnapping of Fanny; the military suitors for Lydia's hand--are foiled or preempted. Thus the soldier operates as a figure of both sexual desire and loathing within the early novel.

My readings of selected novels will explore how these cultural attitudes toward the standing army became manifest in the cultural artifact of the novel. As the century

progresses the army becomes larger and more prominent within society due to events such as the Jacobite rebellions and the various wars of the first half of the century:

Under Walpole the army was small, seldom more than 18,000 in peace, at a time when the French peacetime establishment was 133,000, but increasing during the Austrian Succession War to 74,000. After the 1748 reduction the army at home totaled under 19,000 men. It increased gradually during the Seven Years War, reaching a total of over 67,000, with 27,000 militia. It was felt that Dutch, Hanoverian or Hessian paid levies could always be employed to supply the want of British forces, but the use of these against British mobs could not of course be considered.

(Hayter 22)

As the army haltingly grows, the soldier becomes more important to the narrative--the novelists begin to devote more of their narratives to the soldiers--until by the time of Smollett and Sterne the canon of British fiction includes such important characters as Lieutenant Lismahago, Corporal Trim, and Uncle Toby. The novels I have chosen to survey are quite diverse. They include narrative styles as divergent as those found in Colonel Jack and Tristram Shandy; satire as stinging as Jonathan Swift's and as forgiving of human nature as Fielding and Sterne; and characters so apparently different in personality as Uncle Toby and Lismahago. The soldier becomes a progressively more important literary figure as the eighteenth century continues, but continues to be portrayed with a great deal of ambivalence, reflecting the difficulties in reconciling the conflicts within masculine identity and power that I have outlined.

I have selected a work by Daniel Defoe--Colonel Jack (1722)--to begin my survey. I will then go on to analyze pertinent military episodes in Swift's classic Gulliver's Travels (1726). My selections for starting points to illustrate my argument deserve some amplification. Both writers and their works figure prominently in the

existing critical discourse about the early novel and its nature. Additionally, Defoe and Swift are a strong presence in the political discourse of the day--political pamphleteers on opposing sides of many government/opposition issues, particularly the controversy surrounding the standing army. Therefore, a brief examination of the opposing rhetorical positions of the standing army debate will provide insights into the opposing schools of thought from which these two novelists write.

In 1698 Defoe wrote "An Argument Shewing, that a Standing Army, with Consent of Parliament, is not Inconsistent with a Free Government." This pamphlet was one of a number of reactions to "An Argument, Shewing That a Standing Army Is Inconsistent with a Free Government, and Absolutely Destructive to the Constitution of the English Monarchy," which had been printed the year before by John Trenchard and Walter Moyle. James Boulton characterizes it as "one of Defoe's finest pieces of political rhetoric, admirably designed to appeal to the freeholders to whom it was primarily addressed" (35). Defoe's argument is that England's security in time of peace lies in a proactive defense based on the ability to quickly project military power onto the Continent in order to forestall foreign invasion, rather than attempting to prevent it altogether through reliance on the navy. Citing a "constant Maxim of the present State of the War," Defoe states that security rests in "*carry[ing] the War into your Enemies Country, and always keep[ing] it out of your own*" (Boulton 39). Defoe's maxim implicitly carries colonial concerns--the concept that rapid developments in lands far away from the mother country can adversely affect the well-being of British investors at home. The combination of the internal threat to the crown from Jacobitism and the increasing demands of a growing colonial empire are often cited as important reasons for the institution of the standing army by Charles II (Williams 24), and they are often associated with the figure of the soldier in the novel. Power projection also necessarily precludes reliance on the militia for defense, an important part of the argument of the

opposition. For Defoe, the militia is constrained to the role of assisting the standing army by taking on--in part--the role of internal defense against political dissent (particularly the Jacobites, since there is "a Pretender to the Crown in Being") (Boulton 37). Defoe argues that military alliances are the only way to keep France at bay: "Here is one neighbor grown too great for all the rest," he writes, "therefore to mate [match] him, several must joyn for mutual Assistance" (Boulton 39). In order to form these necessary alliances, argues Defoe, England must have an existing ground combat force to show its readiness to quickly come to the assistance of its allies against the depredations of the huge armies of France; other options, including hiring mercenary troops or levying units as needed, take too long to equip, train, and deploy to be of use. "If we have no Forces to assist a Confederate," he asks, "who will value our Friendship, or assist us if we wanted it?" (Boulton 39)

Having established the necessity for the projection of combat power into the interior of Europe (particularly into Flanders), Defoe cannily refuses to disallow the fears of the anti-army faction, stating that "no Army, and a great Army, are Extrems equally dangerous, the one to our Liberty at Home, and the other to our Reputation Abroad, and the Safety of our Confederates; it remains to Inquire what *Medium* is to be found out" (Boulton 41). Defoe believes that parliamentary control of the purse-strings is the method for finding that medium. Defoe "maintains that the entire nation has changed to a modern, money economy and that under such conditions, the House of Commons must always have control of the purse" (Novak 405-406). For Defoe, it is Parliament's control of revenues that is the chief device which will ensure the subordination of the standing army to the public will. "I am therefore to affirm," he declares, "*that the Power of the Purse is an Equivalent to the Power of the Sword*" (46). He argues that as long as the standing army continues to exist at the sufferance of the elective legislature, the power of the executive in the form of the king and his army will always be held in check. This

check historically took the form of the annual Mutiny Acts, which periodically "reaffirmed that a standing army in peacetime without the consent of Parliament was illegal" (Schwoerer 152). In his essay, Defoe clearly recognizes a standing army as a *potential* threat to the social and political *status quo*, but he carefully contains that potential--containment and limitation being prominent facets of the soldier's depiction in the early novel.

While the climax of the standing army debate occurred between the fall of 1697 and the spring of 1699, even as late as 1722--the year Defoe published Moll Flanders and Captain Jack--public debate over the army continued. (Schwoerer 15) The annual Mutiny Act debates in Parliament were an excellent venue for the Tories and other opposition factions to voice their objections over the existence of a new professional warrior class--rhetoric to which Dean Swift contributed in his "Letter to Mr. Pope" (1721) and other essays. (Lock 128-130) John Trenchard was still writing in opposition to the standing army, this time collaborating with Thomas Gordon on "Cato's Letters" and other polemical tracts. Both the Defovian pro-army argument and the anti-standing army argument that Swift articulates in Gulliver's Travels remained essentially unchanged from the turn of the century.

Trenchard argues that a standing army, no matter what controls are placed upon it, inevitably results in military tyranny. "It is certain," he writes, "that all parts of Europe which are enslaved, have been enslaved by armies; and it is absolutely impossible, that any nation which keeps them amongst themselves can long preserve their liberties" (Trenchard 682). All of the early novelists who include significant military characters or episodes in their narratives engage with this fear in some manner. Most attempt to contain it, as I pointed out earlier; but Swift positively expands upon it, viciously depicting the worst kinds of military tyranny, particularly during Gulliver's time in the despotic Kingdom of Lilliput.

Trenchard, Swift and other anti-standing army pundits also rely on the history of European military dictatorship--figures such as Caesar and Alexander are particularly prominent--to amplify the political threat that soldiers represent. Socially, this historical perspective of the anti-standing army position often verges on the nostalgic, looking back to a halcyon period where the civil- and military executive functions of government were embodied together in the feudal nobleman. Trenchard and Gordon point to this specialization with alarm, maintaining that the members of government who make the decision to go to war (the King and the Parliament) and the middle-class property-holders who pay the taxes to support the war are protected from the physical consequences of their decisions in a manner that the feudal nobleman was not. Trenchard argues that by setting up a separate profession which specializes in warfare, the government is engaging in a dangerous form of "mock heroism," which he describes as "a violent appetite for war, and victory, and conquest, without engaging personally in the danger, or coming near it; but being very valorous by proxy, and fond of fighting without drawing a sword" (Trenchard 663). "The upper class," reports J. R. Western, "no longer regarded war as its profession, and was not eager to sacrifice time and money to military pursuits" (440). Thus the existence of the specialized warrior profession creates all manner of social and economic ills: "depletion of the labor market, cost of quartering and maintaining troops, unfortunate social composition and moral implications, and threat to the sanctity of property" (Schwoerer 183). Soldiers themselves are debased by this specialization, since--compared to their medieval predecessors--they have no grounded interest in the land they defend; according to the anti-army faction, they are little more than "mercenaries," or "cut-throats," guided only by their own carnal desires, much as Swift's Yahoos exemplify men in their basest state. While Swift in particular will adopt a nostalgic position regarding proper social relationships--between soldiers and leaders,

civil- and military executives--this concern about society "being very valorous by proxy" is characteristic of most depictions of the soldier in the early novels.

The military alternative that Trenchard and the other opposition figures advocate is a reliance on a strong navy and a vigorous militia under the control of the landed aristocracy. "Contemporary opinion preferred the navy and the militia: the former was the traditional guardian of the shores, the latter the 'constitutional force'" (Hayter 3). Responding to Defoe's concept of the proactive use of ground forces on the Continent, the opposition writers "were not willing, beyond engaging the fleet, to use England's strength to contain the power of France," and they felt that the navy, by its very nature unable to extend the crown's power on land beyond the littoral, was inherently less dangerous politically. (Schwoerer 181) If defense of England's interior became necessary, the anti-army position was to rely on the notoriously inept militia, a position derived partly from a nostalgic, mythologized ideal of English popular resistance to foreign invasion and internal tyranny. Militia advocates "admired the old feudal nobility and the old yeomanry--independent of the crown and able to maintain that independence because they were armed. This was the state of things that they hoped to restore by militia legislation" (Western 437). Inherent in the opinions of Swift and Trenchard is the belief that "there was a reservoir of natural force in the state which, if properly appealed to, would be sufficient to quell any disturbance" (Hayter 20). At its extreme, the anti-army position preferred the threat of internal political dissent represented by the Jacobites to the inevitable tyranny represented by the professional soldier: "If we [are] to be governed by armies, it is all one to us, whether they be Protestant or popish armies" (Trenchard 672). Jonathan Swift wrote Gulliver's Travels from this Tory/radical Whig perspective on the professional army, a perspective which manifests itself in the images of the soldier in his novel.

Thus these polar opposites of the standing army debate serve as starting points for investigating the double discourse of the professional soldier in the early novel. The political positions of Swift and Defoe can be seen as opposite reactions to the differentiation of power in British society--tensions between the professional soldier's role in contemporary society and the social and political ideals embodied in England's feudal past. The creation of a standing army formally marks challenges to older concepts of masculine identity and sources of power within English society--challenges which are the sources of admiration and anxiety, and which in turn manifest themselves in dialectics of political power, social class, spectacle, and sexuality. Defoe and Swift illustrate how the early novelists place and shift the soldier within these dialectics, baiting and/or mollifying this new, permanent, and dangerous element of British society. Subsequent authors continue to be influenced by the poles of standing army discourse exemplified by Defoe and Swift.

Chapter 1: The Absent Soldier in Defoe's Colonel Jack

Defoe's Colonel Jack exemplifies the ambivalence represented by the debate carried on in the prose essays of the day. Jack is both an affirmation and a conservative protest of class divisions. Through his service in the armies of Louis XIV and his involvement in the '15, he serves to illustrate the political threats that Defoe uses to argue for the standing army. The commentary on military spectacle characteristic of later novels is muted, but generally uncritical of the effects of the representation of war in society. And like all that follow, Defoe carefully contains the implicit sexual threat that soldiers represent to non-soldiers through the characters of his numerous wives. One strategy of social and political containment that Defoe resorts to is the lack of a sustained army career for Jack; the first issue of the soldier in Colonel Jack one must deal with is his absence.

Despite the obvious military connotation of the title, Jack's military experiences only fill a few pages. Defoe was a consistent public advocate of the position of the Williamite and Hanoverian courts on the issue of the standing army. So the question is, what purpose did Defoe have in mind in entitling his work (and naming his hero) in such a way as to give the impression that the work would contain a substantial amount of military action? One of the reasons is Defoe's purpose for the novel as a tool of moral instruction. Written in the same year as the similarly structured Moll Flanders, Defoe designed Colonel Jack with a similarly didactic purpose in mind. In his preface, Defoe writes, "Every wicked reader will here be encouraged to a change, and it will appear that the best and only good end of a wicked misspent life is repentance" (2). Instead of Jack's military career, Defoe gives the vast majority of the narrative to describing other aspects of his repentant sinner's checkered life: his youth as a thief on the streets of London, his marital career (he marries five times, twice to the same woman), and his ultimate success as a planter and trader after being transported to America. Defoe, an "enthusiastic and

faithful advocate" of William III's attempt to establish an army free of parliamentary control, could not depict his sinner, Jack, as a full-fledged member of the professional army for which he had argued--thus seeming to validate the arguments of the anti-army writers. (Schwoerer 178) Thus despite the title, Defoe carefully writes only a brief military career for his hero which is largely outside of the British army, a career which poses the kinds of threats (France and Jacobitism) that Defoe and other standing army advocates listed as justification for the maintenance of a peacetime military. While Jack's military career is a small interlude in the narrative as a whole, the issues that surround the figure of Jack as a soldier--in particular, as an officer--are those which characterize subsequent use of the soldier in the fictional narratives of the eighteenth century.

The first dialectic at work in the figure of the soldier in Colonel Jack is the dialectic of class; the professional army both marks soldiers as members of particular classes and creates limited opportunities for social mobility. Some critics have noted that "Jack's irrepressible desire to appear the gentleman remains the centre of the novel," and his progress from child-thief to repentant gentleman-capitalist controls the narrative. (Blewett 99) The problem of the lower-class individual of merit is indeed important to understanding Colonel Jack. As we shall see, the authors of eighteenth-century novels vary in how liberally or conservatively they approach this concept represented by the soldier; Defoe is very conservative.

In reading Colonel Jack, Macaree characterizes Defoe "almost as a social scientist exploring the effect of genetic influence on a being deprived from infancy of normal family ties and forced to struggle from earliest childhood for survival in a hostile environment" (113). Defoe's use of military titles is tightly bound up in his social analysis. Defoe uses army ranks partly to affirm the leadership of the English upper class. First, Jack is the bastard son of a gentleman, left by his parents in the care of a

nurse while still an infant. The two children with genteel backgrounds (Colonel Jack and Major Jack--who are more resourceful and more humane than the boy of plebeian birth) are marked by appropriate military titles: "a hierarchical structure based on officers' titles is introduced" (Hartveit 128). Furthermore, Jack tells us that his father instructed the nurse to inform and remind the boy that he "was a gentleman," in order to "inspire me with thoughts suitable to my birth, and that I would certainly act like a gentleman if I believed myself to be so" (3). The nurse bestows Jack with his rank by virtue of his birth: ". . . every tarpaulin, if he gets but to be lieutenant of a press-smack, is called captain, but colonels are soldiers, and none but gentlemen are ever made colonels; besides . . . I have known colonels come to be lords and generals, though they were b-----s at first, and therefore you shall be called Colonel" (5). The nurse's speech indicates the affirmative relationship that Defoe draws between the concept of gentility and leadership in the army; Colonel Jack's genteel blood is reflected by his rank--the vast majority of the army's proprietary colonels indeed being members of the gentry. (Houlding 104) The rank in this context functions as a designator of class--captains and other company-grade officers could be from a wide variety of social backgrounds, including even lower-class non-commissioned officers promoted to the officer ranks. As one examines the class of officers in the army by rank, however, the lower class man of merit becomes increasingly more rare with increased rank. (Houlding 104-105) Thus the gradations in rank among the boys delineate the gradations of their heritage: Captain Jack's lower rank reflects his lower social background at birth as well as his diminished prospects in becoming a gentleman. Major Jack is so named because his father is reputed to be "a Major of the Guards" (thus conferring partly gentle birth on Major Jack--the Guards being an elite unit composed almost entirely of gentlemen). (6) While the character of Major Jack's mother is unknown, Colonel Jack is careful to point out that his own "mother was a gentlewoman" and his "father was a man of quality" (3). Still, Major Jack "had

something of the gentleman in him" even as a child, compared to the "sly, sullen, reserved, malicious, revengeful" Captain Jack. (5-6) Defoe's reference to bastards being elevated through their military careers may also have been "meant to draw attention, as he had done more than twenty years earlier in *The True-Born Englishman*, to the 'lascivious' reign of Charles II, and the dukedoms conferred on six of his bastard sons at the country's expense" (Armstrong 102). Thus one of the characteristics of the ambivalent discourse that Defoe represents through the use of the military titles is to affirm social convention.

Another characteristic of that double discourse, however, is social protest, and Defoe also represents the idea that the lowest social classes can attain some kind of legitimacy in the context of military service. The nurse cares for two other children, also named Jack, whom Defoe uses as alternate models of human development; he contrasts their ultimate failure to rise from their humble circumstances and find a productive niche in English society with Jack's ultimate success. Defoe establishes an inverted hierarchy by using military titles to distinguish between the three Jacks, in this case a pyramid of corruption with the oldest boy, Captain Jack, becoming more corrupt than Major Jack, and with Colonel Jack being the only one of the three to eventually overcome the naturalistic constraints which determine the others' fates. Captain Jack, the nurse's natural son by a seaman, is doubly damned by nature and environment--his humble origins and the indigent circumstances of his childhood doom him to his ultimate fate at the end of a rope. Rather than the social status of their parents, however, Defoe indicates that the key distinction between Captain Jack and the other boys is that he was "ignorant and unteachable from a child"--emphasizing the importance of education in the creation of a productive citizen (6). Major Jack shares the advantages of gentle birth with Colonel Jack, but lacks other elements that allow the Colonel to succeed where the Major falls short. The Major's education is truncated; unlike the more advanced education

which the Colonel undertakes in America, the Major has no opportunities for schooling beyond the death of their nurse, when the Colonel was "almost ten years old" and the Major eight. (8) In his preface, Defoe as "editor" of Jack's story informs us that it contains "just and copious observations on the advantages of a sober and well-governed education, and the ruin of so many thousands of youths for want of it" (1).

In addition to education, another discriminator between the two Jacks is patronage--the Major never seeks out or receives the patronage of the upper class. Lars Hartveit argues that "the main emphasis in *Colonel Jack* is on the patronage formula" (131). One can partly ascribe Jack's ultimate success to the examples of the upper class--the gentleman who reproves the owner of the glass-house for swearing, the man in the custom-house who holds his money for him, and his master in America--all operate as models and mentors for him. The Major, like the Captain, slides from petty thievery to a career as a highwayman--a figure that has connections to the soldier through the relationship of violence and masculinity. However, the Major "was a man of more gallantry and generosity" than the Captain, a more "dexterous" criminal who escapes from Newgate to become a Robin Hood-like bandit in France named Anthony, relying on "the English way of robbing generously, as they called it, without murdering or wounding or ill-using those they robbed" (207). So while the Major and the Colonel share characteristics of resourcefulness and polite behavior that Defoe associates with their origins, the author asserts that "without help from somebody within society he can have no hope of acquiring the respect he yearns for" (Hartveit 125). Major Jack's ultimate fate (the Colonel tells us "he had the honour to be broken upon the wheel at the Grève in Paris" [207]) falls somewhere in between that of the Captain's ignominious "exit at the gallows" and the Colonel's attainment of legitimacy, and indicates Defoe's position on the role of education and patronage in social mobility. Even with the advantages of gentle birth, Major Jack fails through a lack of education and upper-class patronage--a notion

that will continue to be worked out through the figure of the soldier in later novels. The nurse's speech in this light "may be compared with the approval of meritocratic social advancement expressed in *The Complete English Tradesman* (1726). Defoe does not object to sudden elevation if it is deserving" (Armstrong 145). In noting how bastards could "come to be lords and generals" through military service, the nurse is voicing the concept of the army as an outlet of social mobility for lower-class men of merit--the social protest element of the novel's double discourse noted by Davis.

Defoe, however, does not expand greatly on this theme of social mobility in the context of military service in the rest of the narrative, because it would have been counter to the didactic purpose of his story mentioned earlier. The hero of this tale has to be repentant and his career has to be such as to act as a warning to Defoe's readers. Davis writes of the "double function" of the criminal biographies and novels of the early eighteenth century, with the repentant criminal serving "as both example to be avoided and example to be imitated" (126). Defoe's depiction of Jack's military career is in keeping with this double function. After leaving London for Scotland with Captain Jack, the two brothers split up. Subsequently finding himself jobless in Leith, Colonel Jack encounters his older brother, who had been traveling and thieving his way through Scotland and Ulster, "being after all his adventures and successes advanced to the dignity of a foot soldier in a body of recruits raised in the north for the regiment of Douglas" (116). Defoe's usage here is ironic; the brutal Captain Jack is hardly dignified, and Colonel Jack's enlistment in the same regiment is an act of opportunism: "I found no better shift before me, at least for the present, than to enter myself a soldier too" (116). The two brothers subsequently desert when they learn that the regiment is being sent to fight in Flanders. Defoe could have continued Jack's career in the army from that point in the narrative, except that it would have prevented him from involving Jack in at least three themes that become increasingly important as his story unfolds: marriage, the

economic prospects of England's colonies in the New World, and Jacobitism. Since private soldiers had been prohibited from getting married without official permission since 1670 (a policy that would remain in place until the next century), Defoe couldn't achieve an exploration of marriage within the context of legitimate service to the crown. (Williams 54) Likewise, the benefits of the transportation of criminals and the economic prosperity that Jack achieves in America would have been difficult to script into an army career. Depiction of Jack as a soldier in the army would also preclude his involvement in Jacobitism, since to depict the disloyalty of the army would be to reiterate one of the strongest arguments against the existence of the standing force. In addition, Defoe wished to show his readers that "as the great rise by degrees of greatness to the pitch of glory in which they shine, so the miserable sink to the depth of their misery by a continued series of disasters" (4). Jack's career is a succession of bad decisions and mistakes from which greater misery springs, only to be relieved by Providence and the helping hands of the upper class. One should consider his desertion from the army as an "example to be avoided"--part of Jack's catalog of sins to be repented. It makes sense for Defoe to have his anti-hero desert legitimate army service, leading eventually to his service in the armies of England's enemies.

Serving as a "dis-example" that reinforces the rules of society (Davis 130), Jack's brief brush with service in the British army also locates the prospect of an outlet for social aspirations and gainful employment in the service of the crown. While Defoe centers his conservative social protest outside the army and into an argument for commerce and upper-class patronage as the primary means to employ the individual of merit, he briefly shows the army as a kind of social safety net for those who possess the morals that his hero yet lacks. Jack finds peacetime soldiering to be certainly no worse, in a material sense, than the life of a criminal: "I confess that thing did not sit so ill upon me as I thought at first it would have done. For though I fared hard and lodged ill--for

the last especially is the fate of poor soldiers in that part of the world--yet to me, that had been used to lodge on the cinders of the glass-house, this was no great matter" (117). A standing army, Defoe argues, offers employment that, while no easier than life on the streets, at least has the virtue of being honest.

While his desertion and some of his subsequent adventures belie his pretensions to gentility at this point in the narrative, Jack expresses the moral superiority of soldiering over his alternative, i.e., crime: ". . . it was an inexpressible ease to my mind that I was now in a certain way of living which was honest, and which I could say was not unbecoming a gentleman" (117). Jack's explanation for his desertion touches upon another theme of the soldier which recurs in later narratives: a concern for how soldiers are compensated or treated by the government. A government propagandist himself, Defoe's criticism is very mild; he merely points out the disparity between the risks of the common soldier versus his compensation. Jack tells us, "I began to be very uneasy, and very unwilling in my thoughts to go over, a poor musketeer, into Flanders, to be knocked on the head at the tune of three-and-sixpence a week" (118). For Defoe, soldiering is a bad investment for those who can afford a start in other fields, particularly the commercial ventures through which Jack later makes his wealth. Unlike most of his fellow recruits, Jack has capital, in the form of a receipt for a hundred pounds being held by the gentleman from the custom-house. Jack's cowardice really seems to stem from his suspicion that serving as a foot soldier--as opposed to an officer--is a poor investment of one's life and limb, particularly if one is not indigent. He poses the hypothetical: ". . . if it should have been asked all the soldiers in the regiment, which of them would go to Flanders a private sentinel if they had £100 in their pockets, I believed none of them would answer in the affirmative, £100 being at that time sufficient to buy a colours in any new regiment . . ." (118). Defoe implicitly portrays the purchase system of commissioning (whereby officer status and advancement in rank is contingent on

seniority and wealth--a system notorious for its abuses) as a form of investment, which was a widely-held perspective in the eighteenth century. Unfortunately for Jack (but fortuitously for Defoe's thematic agenda), Douglas's regiment is an "old establishment"--Jack's money is insufficient to buy an ensigncy. He agrees to desert with his brother, intending to return to London--a journey that is interrupted by his transportation to America. Summing up his experiences in the army, Jack tells the reader, "This whetted my ambition, and I dreamt of nothing but being a gentleman officer, as well as a gentleman soldier" (118). Jack's brief interlude with the army serves both to reinforce class as well as to conservatively question its rigidity, offering a model for limited social mobility. Defoe's depiction of the army and Jack's prospects of service within it are part of a dialectic of "both the act of repression and the reaction of social protest" (Davis 130-131). The latter is particularly muted in Defoe, but becomes more prominent in later writers.

Just as Jery Melford uses bear-baiting as a metaphor for Lismahago's treatment at the hands of Bullford, there is a close association of the standing army with entertainment and spectacle in eighteenth-century English fiction. Defoe gives us a small glimpse of this early in the narrative, while Jack is still a boy. Growing up in the period of the Anglo-Dutch Wars, Jack informs us that "I was always upon the inquiry, asking questions of things done in public as well as in private; particularly I loved to talk with seamen and soldiers about the war" (11). He becomes so adept at reiterating these battle narratives that Jack declares, "I was a kind of an historian" (11). These unspecified framed narratives point to two issues. First, the use of the battle narrative or military history for entertainment--or more generally, any use of the soldier as a tool for public diversion or entertainment, such as reviews, ceremonies, camps, or public training. Second, these narratives of the Anglo-Dutch wars are characteristic of the "undifferentiated matrix" of narrative from which the novel emerged in the early

eighteenth century--what Davis refers to as the "news/novel" discourse. (48-49) Jack's historical/journalistic concern with "what had been done and of what was then a-doing in the world" is dominated by military minutiae--even down to "the names of every ship in the Navy, and who commanded them, too" (11-12). This episode recognizes a public fascination with the standing military establishment and its actions, a recognition that changes to outright concern by the time Laurence Sterne creates the whimsical Uncle Toby and Corporal Trim.

Jack takes what he believes is passage aboard a ship back to London, only to discover that he is actually being transported to Maryland to be sold as an indentured servant. Here Defoe argues his point about the efficacy of transporting criminals and the poor to the colonies, and the glittering economic prospects that await the unfortunate who are willing to work: ". . . every Newgate wretch, every desperate forlorn creature, the most despicable ruined man in the world, has here a fair opportunity put into his hands to begin the world again" (172). Defoe emphasizes this opportunity and reiterates the profession of soldiering as an act of last resort, at least for those unable to afford a commission. When his master questions Jack if he would return to England, Jack replies, "No indeed, sir, if I can but get my bread honestly here, I have no mind to go to England, for I know not how to get my bread there; if I had, I had not listed for a soldier" (140). Defoe reinforces the idea that "only those rendered desperate by failures in civilian life enlisted in such a force" as the army. (Hayter 22) During this episode, Defoe also argues that the patronage of the upper classes is essential to identifying and raising the lower-class man of merit. The planter to whom Defoe finds himself indentured successively sponsors Jack, first to overseer of one of his plantations, then to ownership of his own plantation.

Jack leaves Maryland for England, only to have his ship seized by a French privateer. After bilking the French privateer of his ransom, Jack briefly stops in Ghent,

where his bland observations of the War of the Grand Alliance prepare the ground for his involvement with France and the Jacobites later. Jack says, "As to the merit of the cause on either side, I knew nothing of it, nor had I suffered any of the disputes about it to enter into my thoughts" (206). Defoe will argue that Jack's ignorance and noncommittal attitude toward the Prince of Orange--his political naiveté--make him vulnerable to the fantasy of Jacobite succession.

Jack then finally returns to London, posing as a Frenchman--"Colonel Jacques"--and begins his marital career by marrying a coquette who proves unfaithful. Jack leaves her, but a scene between Jack and a gentleman sent by his estranged wife to collect on a bill for thirty pounds--a bill which Jack refuses to honor--contains issues pertinent to the class of the professional soldier. Defoe includes this confrontation between Jack and the gentleman as an argument against the current fashions of the gentry, particularly the over-blown sense of honor and aggression that encourages dueling--concepts that, as we shall see, become increasingly associated with the soldier. Jack's gentleman opponent swears frequently, a sign throughout *Colonel Jack* of the ungentleel. "I omit," sniffs Jack, "intermingling the oaths he laced his speech with, as too foul for my paper" (224). The boorish gentleman threatens Jack by laying his hand on the hilt of his sword. This act exposes Jack's pretensions of gentility. Jack tells us, "I must own that though I had learned a great many good things in France to make me look like a gentleman, I had forgotten the main article of learning how to use a sword . . ." (225). When the frightened Jack tells the gentleman to "take your satisfaction another way"--meaning to undertake a civil suit, the gentleman misunderstands, believing that Jack has just challenged him to a duel. Defoe has constructed an intersection of two separate codes of masculine behavior: the gentleman is speaking in the discourse of "gentlemen"--where it is an individual responsibility to redress grievances and enforce justice, through violence if need be; Jack is speaking the discourse of the commercial middle class, where the

law--enforced by representatives of the community--serves this function. Violence is exercised by proxy. In this episode, the author privileges the rule of law through the arrival of a constable who enforces peace, but there is ambivalence within the law-honor dialectic evident even in this strongly anti-dueling vignette. Jack comes across as a coward in this confrontation, admitting "I took courage when the constable was there" (228). He head-butts the gentleman, throwing him to the floor, and is prevented from stamping him to death only by the constable. Afterward, the gentleman exposes himself as a coward as well by using hired thugs to brutally attack Colonel Jack. Implicit in Defoe's description of this overtly anti-dueling confrontation is a scorn of confrontation by proxy and a distrust of the possibilities of unscrupulous individuals using the law as a shield for dishonorable behavior. In later novels, the officer gentleman will become the repository for these tensions between individual and community justice, between the martial values of the new warrior class and the commercial values of the old warrior class.

Jack divorces his wife, goes to Dunkirk, and purchases a company in an Irish regiment in service to Louis XIV. Patronage plays an important role in elevating Jack, albeit in the context of England's enemy. He describes the process thus: ". . . by the help of Lieutenant-General ----, an Irishman, and some money, I obtained a company in his regiment, and so went into the army directly" (232). Defoe also raises questions of the loyalties of the peripheral peoples of the crown--the ranks of the French and the Jacobites are filled with Irish and Scots. Jack's time in the service of France again links gentility and soldiering in a suspect way: "While Jack does indeed acquire gentlemanly attributes--such as wealth, education, polite manners--his social position continues to be based on pretence. His colonecy is granted by the Pretender" (Blewett 109).. After fighting against England's ally Austria in northern Italy during the War of the Spanish Succession, Jack once again breathlessly proclaims, "I used to say to myself I was come to what I was

born to, and that I had never till now lived the life of a gentleman" (232). Jack's combat experience has another effect as well:

I now had the satisfaction of knowing, and that for the first time too, that I was not that cowardly, low-spirited wretch that I was when the fellow bullied me in my lodgings about the bill of £30. Had he attacked me now, though in the very same condition, I should, naked and unarmed as I was, have flown in the face of him and trampled him under my feet; but men never know themselves until they are tried, and courage is acquired by time and experience of things.
(233)

Hereafter Jack handles his grievances on an individual basis--he duels with and wounds a French marquis whom he accuses of having an affair with his second wife. He confronts and canes a captain of a man-o-war for taking advantage of wife number three, an alcoholic. Both events are described in the same mildly vexed manner of Jack's confrontation with the bill collector; while dueling and personal violence are criticized, a modicum of personal bravery and honor are desirable. At the same time, the women over whom these confrontations ostensibly take place are carefully characterized by Defoe: a coquette, an adulteress, a widow turned alcoholic, and an unchaste peasant girl. Defoe limits Jack's sexual conquests to women whose virtue is as suspect as his own. These episodes establish an early link between masculine identity and the figure of the soldier.

Jack's career in Italy and his subsequent involvement in the Jacobite cause represent the threats which Defoe has used to justify the standing army, and it is through Jack that Defoe characterizes the Englishmen that have thrown their lot in with the

Stuarts. Jack's motives are alternately self-serving and naive. While he rises by dint of his meritorious service to the rank of lieutenant-colonel, he confesses that "I was in several skirmishes and petty encounters before this, by which I gained the reputation of a good officer, but I happened to be in some particular posts too which I got somewhat that I liked much better, and that was a good deal of money" (234). After being wounded, captured, and exchanged by the forces of Eugene of Savoy, Jack determines to find a way to leave his regiment: "I had now a secret design to quit the war, for I really had enough of fighting" (249). The offer of a brevet to colonel in the abortive 1708 Jacobite expedition to Scotland provides Jack with the reason to sell his company, but he reflects in terms reminiscent of his observations of the War of the Grand Alliance that he was "insensibly drawn in" to the Old Pretender's service, despite having "no particular attachment to his person or his cause, nor indeed did I much consider the cause of one side or the other; if I had I should hardly have risked not my life only, but effects too" (250). Jack's later involvement in the 1715 rebellion reinforces Defoe's picture of the Jacobite threat. Secretly joining Lord Derwentwater's force at Preston during the '15, Jack urges the Jacobites to "defend the pass between Preston and the river and bridge" (297). When the Jacobites foolishly ignore Colonel Jack's sound military advice, he declares, "from that moment I gave them all up as lost" (297-298). "This excursion allows Defoe to focus on the incompetence of the [Jacobite] leadership as represented by its failure to devise adequate battle plans and it is this that becomes Jack's reason for slipping away before the onset, yet another indication of his lack of total commitment" (Macaree 114). Jack barely escapes before "the action at Preston happened, and the miserable people surrendered to the King's troops. Some were executed for examples, as in such cases is usual" (299). The army captures or kills the entire Jacobite force. Defoe thus characterizes the Jacobite threat as dangerous but incompetent, and the Jacobites themselves as opportunists and fools, rather than dedicated followers of the Pretender.

Defoe also argues throughout Colonel Jack for a policy of limited government coercion, perhaps aware of the charge that the standing army fosters absolutism and reacting as well to public criticism of the severe sentences handed out to several of the leaders of the '15. He does this by showing that brutal repression fosters only resentment and the prospect of greater disorder. The authorities sentence Captain Jack to a brutal whipping for the crime of kidnapping when he is only thirteen. Despite the severity of his punishment, it only temporarily discourages the boys--they soon resume their lives of crime. In Maryland, Colonel Jack becomes overseer of slaves on one of his master's farms. When a slave, drunk on stolen rum, assaults a white servant, Jack sentences him to twice-daily whippings for three days--tantamount to a sentence of death. When the planter rebukes Jack for being overly severe, Jack responds: "This fellow, with your leave, I intended to release to-morrow without any whipping at all, after talking to him in my way about his offence, and raising in his mind a sense of the value of pardon" (151). Defoe constructs a long dialog between Jack and the planter in which Jack explains his "principles of gratitude": raise expectations in the offender of severe punishment; ensure that pardon is ostentatiously bestowed by the ruler--in this case the master of the plantation; resulting relief and gratitude in the offender reinforces his loyalty to the existing order. "The servant's response of gratitude to his master for having raised him from the dust is the sign of health as well as a guarantee of progress in this society" (Hartveit 131). The planter exclaims, "'Tis against the received notion of the whole country." Colonel Jack responds, "There are, it may be, public and national mistakes and errors in conduct, and this is one" (151). Defoe transports this concept for the use of coercion and pardon from slavery in the colonies to political dissent in England through Colonel Jack's story after his involvement in the '15. He leaves England after the death of his fourth wife and returns to his plantation in America, only to encounter convicted Jacobites among the indentured servants who have been transported to the colony. Jack's

fears of being uncovered and punished as a Jacobite and rebel are eventually relieved when the king issues a general pardon. Jack's principles of gratitude (a close corollary to patronage) operate on himself just as they did on the slaves: "it made a generous convert of me, and I became sincerely given in to the interest of King George; and this from a principle of gratitude, and a sense of obligation to His Majesty for my life" (310).

Defoe's concept of "survival in a world governed by harsh economic laws is inextricably bound up with the idea of 'Deliverance'--achieved through the help of people in power, or through Providential intercession" (Hartveit 127). The whip operates as a sign of government coercion--and particularly of the army in this era before the establishment of a police force. Mindful of the arguments of Trenchard and others, Defoe argues that government should not resort to the army to enforce order under all circumstances. Instead he argues that the threat of violence combined with the example of pardon will prevent rebellion and disorder in the long term and rehabilitate those (like the Jacobites) that transgress, bringing them gratefully back into their subordinate position in society, rather than turning them into outcasts or life-long enemies of the state by sheer necessity. Jack's obsession with becoming a gentleman provoked one critic to write: "Coming into the world remains Jack's chief concern, whether in terms of the transformation from criminal to law-abiding citizen, in the literal voyage from colonial to Londoner, or in the readmission of the rebel into the dominant political order. His 'Memoirs' constitute an additional gesture towards integration, marking the various stages (and reversals) of his rehabilitation and asserting his social and political importance" (Armstrong 91). If the rebels prove (like Captain Jack) to be incorrigible, then the state still has the power of death as the last resort. Defoe argues that the king can rule without using the whip, but the whip and the force it represents must be present in order for him to rule.

Chapter 2: Beyond the Anti-War Argument in Swift's Gulliver's Travels

I wish to turn now from Defoe to examine Gulliver's Travels--a narrative written by Defoe's political opponent on many issues, particularly in the matter of the standing army. Swift's fanciful depiction of soldiers prompted Michael Foot to note that Gulliver "is still the most powerful of pacifist pamphlets," but the episodes that feature soldiers and military action in some way don't argue against war under any circumstances; instead, Foot's observation that Swift's Brobdingnag is "the nearest effort he ever made to describe his own notion of an ideal State" hints at a more supportable argument for characterizing Swift's position on the relationship between war and society. (Swift 8, 25) Gulliver's Travels argues to support Swift's position against the existence of a standing army. Rather than arguing against the use of military force altogether, Swift uses Gulliver's visit to Brobdingnag to push for a reliance by the state on a military force that is tied to traditional class relationships, rather than a separate, specialized profession. Swift argues for the re-integration of civil executive powers and military command into one responsible, property-owning class, thereby reducing the potential for both tyranny and internal disorder. Gulliver's voyages to the other lands serve to reinforce various perspectives on the ideal expressed through Brobdingnag. Swift's apparently anti-war stance is actually an attack on what he sees as the corrupt process of modern warfare; he criticizes war profiteering, the motives of modern princes in waging war, and the harnessing of science and system to warfare. Swift leaves the possibility of a just war open--in his view, a strictly defensive war--while criticizing the modern motives and professional means of warfare.

Gulliver's voyage to Lilliput allows Swift to satirize his government's defense policies in the context of its rivalry with France (here played by Blefuscu). While "everything Lilliputian seems somehow ludicrous simply because of its inconsequentiality in relation to Gulliver," the first interaction that Gulliver observes

between the Lilliputian people and their army is significant. (McNeil 66) Gulliver reports that "I was left with a strong guard, to prevent the impertinence, and probably the malice of the rabble" (66). Nevertheless, the crowd begins to become unruly, forcing the commander of the guard to reestablish order. Significantly, "the colonel ordered six of the ringleaders to be seized" rather than some more general or indiscriminate action against the crowd. Gulliver's actions when the commander offers up the leaders of the crowd to him are right out of Colonel Jack's "principles of gratitude." Gulliver takes them one-by-one out of his pocket. "I made a countenance as if I would eat him alive," he tells us of each case, before releasing them. Gulliver's lenity establishes a certain amount of authority: "both the soldiers and the people were highly obliged at this mark of clemency" (66). He not only establishes a kind of local rule through his use of pardon, but his actions also make "so favourable an impression in the breast of his Majesty" that he is accepted temporarily into Lilliputian society (67). Gulliver could be speaking the wish of Defoe's Jack when he reports that "ingratitude among them is a capital crime . . . whoever makes ill returns to his benefactor, must needs be a common enemy to the rest of mankind" (96). This episode shows that Swift understands that force may have to be used to maintain order, and like Defoe he believes that coercion is best achieved through the threat of overwhelming violence, the use of pardon and charity to co-opt dissent, and the use of measured force as a last resort. The two depart on the instrument of that force, however.

Swift expands on this principle by describing the use of state violence by the despotic Emperor of Lilliput. During the deliberations over Gulliver's "treason" to Lilliput, "his Majesty gave many marks of his great *lenity*," and while the chiefs of both the navy and the army argued for a death sentence, the emperor reportedly leaned toward "mercy, the most commendable virtue in a prince" (106). But the emperor's idea of mercy is deliberately distorted by Swift. Gulliver reports on the practice of the current

emperor in dealing with political dissension, alluding to the Hanoverian response to the '15--an attack on the court which Defoe had tried somewhat to forestall and ameliorate in Colonel Jack. Gulliver tells us:

after the Court had decreed any cruel execution . . . the Emperor always made a speech to his whole Council, expressing his *great lenity and tenderness, as qualities known and confessed by all the world*. This speech was immediately published through the kingdom; nor did anything terrify the people so much as those encomiums on his Majesty's mercy; because it was so observed, that the more these praises were enlarged and insisted on, the more *inhuman* was the punishment, and the *sufferer more innocent*. (109)

The emperor's ironic mercy toward Gulliver is "to spare your life, and only give order to put out your eyes" (106). Swift contrasts Gulliver's enlightened approach to justice with the tyranny of the Emperor of Lilliput--a tyranny backed by a standing army. Swift attacks those (like Defoe) who support the status quo when the emperor ironically observes that "blindness is an addition to courage, by concealing dangers from us"--like the dangers Swift sees in having a peacetime army in English society (107).

Along with tyranny, Swift's vision of the professional soldier also includes a critical position on the role of the soldier in public spectacle--a facet of the soldier as literary figure which I noted as latent in Defoe and upon which Swift expands considerably. The Lilliputian army spends a great deal of time exercising "to divert the Emperor" (75). Swift links military spectacle to regal self-indulgence. Gulliver builds a cloth parade ground and encourages the emperor to order "a troop of his best horse, twenty-four in number, come and exercise upon this plain" (76). The tiny army "performed mock skirmishes, discharged blunt arrows, drew their swords, fled and

pursued, attacked and retired, and in short discovered the best military discipline I ever beheld" (76). McNeil and others have noted how Lilliputian actions are freighted with a kind of pettiness or inconsequence, and this episode brings out the characteristics of theatricality or play rather than the journalistic quality one finds in Defoe. The on-lookers describe it as "entertainment" or "performance" (76). The emperor also "took a fancy of diverting himself in a very singular manner" by having his army march between the feet of the colossus-like Gulliver--the ultimate in megalomaniacal, puerile, and distasteful display. (77) Whereas Defoe accepts public engagement with the army as an object of display, "Swift clearly means to comment on the popularity of such events as public spectacles"--raising questions as to their ultimate value for society (McNeil 81).

While Swift clearly links the Lilliputian army to tyranny--the emperor's subjects "are bound to attend him in his wars at their own expense"--the author does not pose Lilliput as a one-dimensional warning against absolutism and the threat of a military state. (67-68) Gulliver himself represents a tremendous threat to Lilliputian security by virtue of his sheer size; while he is not apparently a soldier, Gulliver in the kingdom of Lilliput represents to the Lilliputians many of the dangers that Swift associates with a standing army. Lilliput's attempts to control Gulliver--their attempts to keep the bear tame--indicate additional issues surrounding the existence of a separate class of armed men in society. In particular, the "articles and conditions" to which Gulliver must agree to in return for his liberty represent fears which are used to argue against a standing army "which I here offer to the public" (78-80). The first article reads, "The Man-Mountain shall not depart from our dominions, without our licence"--a fear that an army that exists without being raised (Swift associates raising a force with public consensus) can involve the nation in foreign adventures without public assent, perhaps with the service of Charles II's English regiments in the armies of Louis XIV in mind. The second article indicates the idea of being able to dominate an entire city--such as London--with a single

body of men: "He shall not presume to come into our metropolis without our express order; at which time the inhabitants shall have two hours warning to keep within their doors" This article also presumes a certain amount of danger to the inhabitants of the city even under authorized circumstances--part of the ambivalence of the standing army as an instrument for establishing or maintaining order and property which is also feared for its potential to threaten order and property. The third and fourth articles reinforce these fears: "The said Man-Mountain shall confine his walks to our principal high roads and not offer to walk or lie down in a meadow or field of corn . . . nor take any of our said subjects into his hands, without their own consent." Articles six, seven, and eight are not indicative of fears so much as they are Swift's satirical statements of justifications for a standing army: external defense and civic projects. Significantly, the threat of Blefuscu invasion is never confirmed; Gulliver has only the Lilliputian government's statements to substantiate the intent of Blefuscu. The emperor's ambitious reaction to Gulliver's subsequent seizure of the Blefuscu navy ("he seemed to think of nothing less than reducing the whole Empire of Blefuscu into a province") indicates that the Blefuscu threat to Lilliput's security is, at least, over-blown. (89) The other projects are--like the army's parades and exercises--principally to feed the emperor's ego: raising stones to cover the royal buildings and determining the size of his "dominions" (80). The final article establishes Gulliver's reward for his services: "a daily allowance of meat and drink sufficient for the support of 1728 of our subjects, with free access to our Royal Person, and other marks of our favour." This characterizes Gulliver as a drain on resources (in addition to the extraordinary efforts made earlier to clothe and sustain him) and marks his privileged status in Lilliputian society. In this context, Gulliver represents the fears of English society toward the destructive potential of the army, as well as the potential for such a powerful organ of government to act independently of the civil executive.

The Lilliputian Principal Secretary of Private Affairs, Reldresal, tells Gulliver that "we labour under two mighty evils; a violent faction at home and the danger of an invasion from abroad," thus reiterating the principal justifications of the standing army (83). By resorting to the farces of the High-Heel/Low-Heel and Big-Endian/Little-Endian controversies, Swift seeks to minimize--without eliminating--the importance and danger of external and internal threats to order. Through the episode of the riot examined earlier, Swift recognizes that force plays a role in maintaining internal order. While Gulliver's military expedition to Blefuscu may express "Swift's endorsement of the Tory view in the War of Spanish Succession that advocated a shift away from the struggle on the continent to a naval strike against the Spanish and French overseas trade" (McNeil 66), I would argue that Swift is more concerned with general concepts than specific policies for a war that concluded twelve years before the publication of Gulliver. Swift is characterizing a proper military force and its use in defense from external threats, arguing for "anti-army values of volunteerism, amateurism, and improvisation" (Gordon 200). Gulliver approaches the emperor with his plan to seize the enemy fleet--"he is a gallant volunteer in civilian clothes--a military amateur acting solely for the benefit of his hosts and for no professional or mercenary reasons" (Gordon 200). Gulliver's use of the pack-thread and iron needles, as well as his inspiration to use a pair of convenient spectacles to protect his eyes from Blefusudian arrows, provide the proper quality of improvisation. "His is a great and humane triumph accomplished, not with the systems and techniques of the new political and military order, but with mother-wit employing common utensils"--encapsulating the anti-army argument for reliance on militia and naval forces (Gordon 200).

While the Emperor of Lilliput's "arbitrary despotism was supported by a standing army," the King of Brobdingnag's "only forces are a citizen militia, but he is secure in the love and respect of his people" (Lock 171). Thus Lilliput serves as a satire of the

relationship between the military and the monarchy, while Gulliver's voyage to Brobdingnag provides Swift with an instructional template for "the ideal State" noted by Foot, as well as a tool for criticizing the current government-military relationship. Swift undertakes the latter task first through Gulliver's exposition on European affairs. The king's questions about the treasury and the financial policies of the British king quickly turn to the army: "He wondered to hear me talk of such chargeable and extensive wars; that certainly we must be a quarrelsome people, or live among very bad neighbours, and that our generals must needs be richer than our kings" (171). Swift constantly reminds his readers of the economic costs as well as the other harmful effects of a standing army. His attacks on Marlborough and Blenheim Palace are well documented, and need explanation here only to point out the nostalgic character of Swift's position--Swift associates the worst practices of the army with its modernity, as though warfare in England's past had not been as corrupt as current practices. Robert Gordon notes that

Swift's hostility derives from his association of modern warfare with "big business." The practice of war profiteering had been and was being exemplified in the apparent entrepreneurship of a Montluc, a Wallenstein, or a Marlborough. Swift considered such activity dangerous to morality in that it made avarice seem heroic and to liberty in that it enlarged the army at the expense of a proper balance in the state. Generals richer than kings, particularly in a new age worshipping money, had a powerful support should their ambitions match those of a Caesar. (191, n. 9)

Swift finds that the corrupting influence of an increasingly commercial and industrial culture combines with the nobility's age-old impulses toward tyranny to produce the standing army as a tool to repress democratic impulses. In a letter to his friend Charles Ford, Swift identifies causes of corruption in society, among them, "the bad influence of

army officers during the reign of Queen Anne. Only a thorough reform of the education of the nobility could end the need for these continual recruits from the lower ranks of the gentry (or from even lower down the social scale) and enable the nobility to once again take the part in public life that their rank required of them" (Lock 176). The king of Brobdingnag goes on to clearly articulate Swift's Tory/anti-army/pro-militia position:

Above all, he was amazed to hear me talk of a mercenary standing army in the midst of peace, and among a free people. He said, if we were governed by our own consent in the persons of our representatives, he could not imagine of whom we were afraid, or against whom we were to fight, and would hear my opinion, whether a private man's house might not better be defended by himself, his children, and family, than by half-a-dozen rascals picked up at a venture in the streets, for small wages, who might get an hundred times more by cutting their throats. (171)

Swift echoes the Jacobite position on this issue. Writing in "The Shift Shifted" in June 1716, Jacobite George Flint wrote: "I am amaz'd, astonish'd, stupified, how it is possible for a Man that has a Life, Liberty and Property to lose, a Wife, Sister or Daughter to be ravish'd, can be pleased to see a standing Army" (Higgins 181). Contrary to Defoe's fairly bland depiction of the common foot-soldier in Colonel Jack, Swift enunciates and encourages the widespread fear of the standing army as an alienated collection of anti-social reprobates--that the army served only as a place to shelter and perhaps legitimize the criminal element. "Swift would certainly have objected to any kind of a Mandeville argument that the military actually provided employment for the lower classes" (McNeil 68). Swift's connection of money, corruption, and the specialization of professions informs the king's observation that "It doth not appear from all you have said, how any one perfection is required towards the procurement of any one station among you, much

less that men are ennobled on account of their virtue, that priests are advanced for their piety or learning, soldiers for their conduct or valour, judges for their integrity, senators for the love of their country, or counsellors for their wisdom" (172). By including the soldier in his catalog of professions in which advancement is not tied to professional merit, Swift is implicitly attacking the widely criticized purchase system. The King of Brobdingnag is Swift's device to safely displace the harshest criticism of the forces of the crown.

Gulliver in Brobdingnag also serves as a foil for Swift's sharp criticism of the harnessing of science to modern warfare--a concern that also appears in *Sterne*. Swift's argument against modern warfare "reflects a preference for an increasingly out-of-date world of simple combat for simple and visible goals," as well as a fear of the increasingly arcane and specialized profession of arms. (Gordon 194) Gulliver extols the virtues of the modern cannon not, significantly, to defend Brobdingnag against foreign aggressors, but as a device for state repression--to "batter down the walls of the strongest town in his dominions in a few hours, or destroy the whole metropolis, if ever it should pretend to dispute his absolute commands" (175). There is something of the paradoxical *save-the-village-by-destroying-it* mentality in Gulliver's logic. His description degenerates into a graphic (and hyperbolic) portrayal of the gruesome effects of smoothbore cannon on personnel. Again, Gulliver as a representative of the conventions of Europe appears badly, while the king argues sensibly for the ideal. "The King was struck with horror at the description I had given of those terrible engines, and the proposal I had made," he reports. (175) While "there is a long tradition of satiric or grotesque denunciations of war engines that preceded Vauban" (McNeil 69), the king's exclamations ("such inhuman ideas") reflect the belief that these innovations are different from the evolutionary changes of bygone centuries--that indeed the age of complex military technologies and tactics exemplified by Vauban's geometrical defenses are a new and

worrisome development. "This dehumanizing treatment is appropriate," notes Gordon, "for Swift is describing the instantaneous killing of masses of men under the guidance of 'science'" (198). The king excoriates Gulliver for being "wholly unmoved at all the scenes of blood and desolation, which I had painted as the common effects of those destructive machines, whereof he said, some evil genius, enemy to mankind, must have been the first contriver" (175). The king declares in admirable (if somewhat unbelievable) terms that "although few things delighted him so much as new discoveries in art or in nature, yet he would rather lose half his kingdom than be privy to such a secret" (175). Plainly science itself is not Swift's target, but rather its appropriation for the new, specialized, and encoded knowledge of the professional soldier. As Robert Gordon has noted, Gulliver ties the newly-emerging professions of war with the Walpole government when he pins the Brobdingnagian revulsion against modern warfare to "not having hitherto reduced *politics* into a *science*, as the more acute wits of Europe have done" (176). Through this passage, Swift is "emphasizing the connection in his mind and Gulliver's between the destructive technology of the new warfare and what he regards as the Caesaristic techniques of the new ministerial methods of government" (Gordon 195). The differentiation of power from nobility to ministers and soldiers drives Swift's anxieties over the military use of new technology.

The second function of Gulliver's descriptions of Brobdingnag is as an exemplar of a harmonious relationship between governed and prince--a relationship that abjures a standing army. While Lilliputian military spectacle is derided, the Brobdingnagian army is rendered differently. Note the modest scale and solemnity of the king's escort when Gulliver observes that "when he goes abroad on solemn days, he is attended for state by a militia guard of five hundred horse, which indeed I thought was the most splendid sight that could ever beheld" (154). Rather than seeming ridiculous, spectacle in this case is

depicted as a by-product of the stature of the Brobdingnagians; it is European Gulliver who seems ludicrous:

they boast that the King's army consists of an hundred and seventy-six thousand foot, and thirty-two thousand horse: if that may be called an army which is made up of tradesmen in the several cities, and farmers in the country, whose commanders are only the nobility and gentry without pay or reward. They are indeed perfect enough in their exercises, and under very good discipline, wherein I saw no great merit; for how should it be otherwise, where every farmer is under the command of his own landlord, and every citizen under that of the principal men in his own city, chosen after the manner of Venice by ballot? (178-179)

Thus Swift crafts Gulliver as an ironic reflection of the attitudes of Defovian proponents of the standing army. Contrasted to the Lilliputian standing army, the drills of the Brobdingnagian militia make for an awesome display. Describing their sword drills, Gulliver admiringly says, "Imagination can figure nothing so grand, so surprising and so astonishing. It looked as if ten thousand flashes of lightning were darting at the same time from every quarter of the sky" (179). Swift goes beyond arguing that a militia is as effective as a standing army to the position that a volunteer amateur force is superior to a separate profession. Brobdingnagian history is as filled with internal strife and civil wars as England's; however, Gulliver tells us that the last such conflict was "put an end to by this Prince's grandfather in a general composition; and the militia then settled with common consent hath been ever since kept in the strictest duty" (179). One of the charges of the proponents of the standing army was that the Jacobites and their Tory sympathizers argued against such a force precisely because it prevented a violent overthrow of the Protestant succession. Part II of Gulliver's Travels has prompted one

critic to observe that "The King's rhetoric on standing armies closely resembles Jacobite formulations on the issue" (Higgins 180). Certainly, Swift's view of the proper role of the army is a nostalgic yearning for an idyllic era when military service was an organic function of class--the nobility filled the role of the officer corps, and the yeomen and peasantry followed them in wartime just as they did in peace. Swift is fearful of the effects of separating the civil executive and military command functions within society. He is fearful as well of the consolidation of those powers into two separate professions: the politician (as exemplified by Walpole), and the professional soldier (as exemplified by Marlborough). He fears that whatever the nationality of the new professional warrior class, they will become internal mercenaries, with no meaningful connection to the society they ostensibly protect other than six pence a day. Swift's Brobdingnagian "military ideals belong to an older and better world, with its armed and militant gentry and yeoman made simultaneously belligerent and responsible because of the very property they defended" (Gordon 194).

Critics have noted that the flying island of Laputa operates as a metaphor of English colonial domination of Ireland, but the island also operates against Balnibarbi in the same manner as a standing army operates against society: "the King hath two methods of reducing them to obedience. The first and the mildest course is by keeping the island hovering over" a rebellious town. (214) Laputa hovers over a town in a manner reminiscent of the practice of quartering troops in troublesome areas. The mere existence of the force is a tool of repression. "The last remedy," which destroys the town, is to let "the island drop directly upon their heads" (214). One of the Tory arguments was that reliance on the navy for external defense meant a reduced risk of tyranny at home due to the impossibility of projecting naval power beyond the nation's coast. The flying island is able "to assert the punitive power of Laputa at any point within Balnibarbi that it selects, exhibiting a mobility within the borders of the realm obviously denied to

fleets" (Gordon 199). The Laputan loadstone is the ultimate combination of the standing army and the new impersonal military technology, "the central symbol of all the imperial technology on display in *Gulliver's Travels*. It is methodical, destructive, and, of course, successful--so flawlessly precise, in fact, that intention and deed, idea and fulfillment, are inseparable" (Gordon 198). Gulliver's visit to the Academy of Projectors expands this criticism of science within a general argument about the state of learning in contemporary Britain. The projects which are harnessed to the domination of the state are depicted in as ludicrous a light as the exercises of the Lilliputian army. The professor "at work to calcine ice into gunpowder," and another working on "a large paper of instructions for discovering plots and conspiracies against the government" are undertaking projects as ineffectual to real defense as the Lilliputian emperor's parade between the feet of Gulliver. (235) Swift also minimizes Defovian threats to order as a fanciful creation of pseudo-science: "they can decipher a close-stool to signify a Privy Council, . . . a lame dog an invader, . . . the plague a standing army, . . . a broom a revolution, . . . an empty tun a general, a running sore the administration" (236-237). Swift also lampoons the use of acrostics and anagrams by deciphering his hypothetical letter from "Our brother Tom has got the piles" into "Resist; a plot is brought home, the tour" (237). This is not only humorous, but also sinister; anyone's innocuous communication can be torturously reworked into a seditious act. Swift argues through Laputa and the Academy of Projectors that the marriage of the Enlightenment to the military and the organs of state repression in general is not only a waste of human resources, but harmful as well.

Gulliver's voyage to Glubbubrib elaborates on the theme of military spectacle, particularly on the process of creating military heroes and history. With all of history at his command, Gulliver tells us that since "my first inclination was to be entertained with scenes of pomp and magnificence, I desired to see Alexander the Great, at the head of his

army just after the battle of Arbela" (240) He conjures forth Hannibal, Caesar, and Pompey, all with their respective armies. Gulliver then launches into a panegyric to Brutus, the slayer of Caesar, Swift's paradigmatic military dictator. Comparing the senate which rid Rome of Caesar (who himself agrees that his assassination was glorious) with a "modern representative" (presumably Parliament), Gulliver says, "The first seemed an assembly of heroes and demigods; the other a knot of pedlars, pickpockets, highwaymen and bullies" (241). Swift's inference is that Rome's senate killed the dictatorship which Parliament continues to support through the annual Mutiny Act. The key thing to note is how this episode comments on the historical canon of military figures. Gulliver spends his time "beholding the destroyers of tyrants and usurpers, and the restorers of liberty to oppressed and injured nations;" a figure so admired for military exploits as Caesar is denigrated for his dictatorial government (241). Reviewing the exploits of more recent historical figures, Gulliver finds less and less to admire, in keeping with Swift's generally nostalgic politics: "I was chiefly disgusted with modern history" (244). He relates that "a general confessed in my presence, that he got a victory purely by force of cowardice and ill conduct: and an admiral, that for want of proper intelligence, he beat the enemy to whom he intended to betray the fleet" (245). Swift criticizes the "lowest level of historiography"--unanalytical battle narratives--that privileges the soldier without examining the ends of the military means. (McNeil 162) He attacks the kind of war stories that the young Colonel Jack listened to so attentively. Highlighting the arbitrary reworking of historical facts to create military spectacle and heroes in order to fulfill a public desire to share vicariously in the exhilarating risks of combat and glorious battlefield success, "Swift effectively asks how much of military honor is legitimate and why is it that the human imagination needs to fabricate military heroism in the first place" (McNeil 81). Swift's answer is that these fabrications of

heroism are self-serving to the interests of the new profession of soldiers; Marlborough's heroism and perceived aggrandizement would figure prominently in his argument.

Lest I give the impression that Gulliver's Travels is without any element of what I noted in Defoe as an impulse to reform the treatment of soldiers, I would point to the story of the Roman admiral who bravely acquits himself in the service of his country. Despite his service, "without any regard to his pretensions," the government gave the vacant command of a larger ship "to a boy who had never seen the sea, the son of a *libertina*, who waited on one of the Emperor's mistresses. Returning back to his own vessel, he was charged with neglect of duty, and the ship given to a favourite page of Publicola the Vice-Admiral" (246) The critical tenor that Swift uses to describe the triumph of influence over merit is actually meant to affirm patronage; "Swift himself used his influence to secure Lieutenant Bernage, Esther Johnson's friend, a promotion to captain-lieutenant with a clear path to the captaincy as soon as it became available" (McNeil 81). The moral of the story, if you will, is that patronage without consideration of merit is harmful--a theme that others will pick up on. This is plainly an attack on the corruption of the purchase system--where money forms the basis for advancement, and one's connections to the elite ensures success. Of course, Swift carefully uses a nautical example to prevent conflict with his anti-army agenda.

Finally, Gulliver's voyage to the land of the reason-loving Houyhnhnms gives Swift the chance to argue that it is the application of reason without intuition or considerations of humanity and community that causes such phenomena as professional soldiers--and the political repression and inhumanity of modern warfare that they foster. Gulliver gives the Houyhnhnms a devastatingly long list of petty and maleficent impulses that "were the usual causes or motives that made one country go to war with another" (292). As before, Swift trades on the narrator's lack of credibility and the audience's

sensible observations (including those of Gulliver's Houyhnhnm master), Swift criticizes modern conventions of warfare rather than constructing a blanket condemnation of war.

The Houyhnhnms are shocked at the news that in English society "the trade of a *soldier* is held the most honourable of all others: because a *soldier* is a Yahoo hired to kill in cold blood as many of his own species, who have never offended him, as possibly he can" (293). This *ad hominem* attack is characteristic of Swift's Tory politics: "it was precisely the establishment of the art of war as a distinct vocation with its own professional codes, institutional forms, and separate political and financial interests that disturbed Bolingbroke and his followers" (Gordon 190). Gulliver then alludes to the Hanovers, referring to "beggarly princes in Europe, not able to make war by themselves, who hire out their troops to richer nations . . . such are those in Germany and other northern parts of Europe" (293). This is not only a topical reference to the use of foreign mercenary troops (the famous Hessian levies of the American Revolution for example), but also a condemnation of the Defovian position on of assisting an ally with troops--a practice only the standing army could fulfill because the militia was restricted by law to defense of the kingdom. Gulliver's expulsion from Houyhnhnmland is due mostly to the Houyhnhnms' perception of Gulliver as a practitioner of the military science with which they are unfamiliar. Gulliver explains that "it was to be feared, I might be able to seduce them [the Yahoos] into the woody and mountainous parts of the country, and bring them in troops by night to destroy the Houyhnhnms' cattle, as being naturally of the ravenous kind, and averse from labour"--a description of Swift's concept of the effects of a standing army. (328) The reaction of Gulliver's Houyhnhnm master to his description of the motives of princes in waging war represents Swift's thesis about modern professional warfare being a product of unalloyed reason: "What you have told me . . . upon the subject of war, doth admirably discover most admirably the effects of that Reason you pretend to" (293). Although the Houyhnhnm master is disgusted at the motives for

modern warfare, he is relieved that humans seem so unequipped by nature for deadly combat. Gulliver then disillusiones him by engaging in a satirical description of the use of science for military purpose which is similar to his discourse with the King of Brobdingnag.

Cannon are once again the symbol of the marriage of science to the new profession of arms. Gulliver's exposition degenerates from a list of the tools of warfare through brutal descriptions of battle to the ghastly aftermath. He caps his grotesque catalog with an observation that once again links the activities of soldiers with spectacle, in the most gruesome manner: "I had seen them blow up a hundred enemies at once . . . and beheld the dead bodies drop down in pieces from the clouds, to the great diversion of all the spectators" (294). One critic notes, "The whole sequence is designed to suggest a causal connection between inhumane, systemized professionalism and human misery" (Gordon 197). Gulliver voices Swift's indictment of this use of science by observing that the Houyhnhnms "seldom were able to kill one another, for want of such convenient instruments of death as we had invented" (307). Swift attacks the idea of warfare as a science wherein there has been "progress"--indeed, he values antique military technology over modern weapons. Swift attacks such technology for its capability to separate and desensitize the warrior from the consequences of his violence--to impersonalize the very personal event of combat between fellow humans, and to encourage man to greater brutality. Again, the soldier for Swift is an agent of corruption--in this case the new profession corrupts the Enlightenment project from inquiry and invention for the betterment of mankind into a search for weapons of greater and greater destructive capacity. The Houyhnhnm master notes that "the corruption of that faculty might be worse than the brutality itself" (295).

Throughout Gulliver's voyages, Jonathan Swift argues forcefully for the elimination of the standing army. By using his fanciful isolated societies as laboratories--

similar to Defoe's behavioral experiments with the three Jacks--Swift is able to accomplish his ideological objective. The concern for the deleterious effects of the army as an object of entertainment is one of the important innovations of Swift's analysis of the soldier's role in society. In another departure from Defoe, Swift writes extensively about the trend of developing warfare as science. He is critical of the specialization and professionalization of the soldier, pointing out the harmful possibilities of investing a separate profession with the means of political repression. While Defoe's Colonel Jack operates against the background of the relationship between the state and its armed force as a given, Gulliver's Travels directly confronts the military state, arguing for a nostalgic alternative.

Chapter 3: Containing the Soldier in Fielding's Joseph Andrews and Tom Jones

The figure of the soldier continues to be a shadowy one as the middle years of the eighteenth century unfold, skirting around the edges of narrative. While the soldier "is kept on the periphery" of Fielding's novels, "the military characters, incidents, and references in the novels do add up to a substantial commentary" (McNeil 113). Fielding's strategies for alleviating the tensions within masculine identity and power that the soldier represents include assimilating the military profession--conflating the army with other established institutions such as the church and the law. Fielding uses Horatian satire to illustrate the problems that soldiers pose to masculinity and power within English society, and to disarm those threats through laughter. Fielding's satire is based less on the notion that the very profession itself is corrupt than on the idea that the profession's practitioners--like those of every other profession in Fielding's novels--suffer from sins of pride and hypocrisy like everyone else. Fielding deconstructs the society-soldier binary by taking a third position critical of the universal human tendencies of both. While he remains peripheral to the main action of the novel, in Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews (1742) the figure of the professional soldier assumes his place alongside other professions within British society to take his licks from Fielding's satirical pen.

Fielding's satirical gambit in terms of soldiers and their interaction with the rest of society is the depiction of the practice of quartering and its effects. "The vicious system of billeting troops upon the country, with its resulting endless bickering with innkeepers, magistrates and inhabitants generally," was a focal point for many of the tensions between society and the soldier, particularly between the emerging middle class and the relatively new professional warrior class (Hayter 52). Fielding refuses to negate or affirm either side of the proprietor/soldier conflict; instead, he shows his readers that neither is truly virtuous. Confronted with the naked Joseph and the stagecoach party, Mrs. Tow-wouse exclaims in an exasperated tone to her husband that "the Law makes us

provide for too many already. We shall have thirty or forty poor Wretches in red Coats shortly" (50). Tow-ouse's lack of charitable Christian virtue exposes the objections of the proprietor to be essentially venal and self-interested in nature. On the other hand, Fielding also shows his readers how common and frequent quartering is, and soldiers--particularly in the more extensive quartering scene in Tom Jones--come across as government-sanctioned freeloaders. However, Fielding's satirical strategy is even more clearly evident in his humorous description of Betty.

In his "history" of Betty the chambermaid, Fielding depicts the soldier as a kind of persistent sexual pest, seeking out women of questionable virtue. Rather than describing contacts between England's young women and soldiers in the urgent, nearly hysterical tones of Swift, Fielding narrates "the ticklish Situation of a Chamber-maid at an Inn, who is daily liable to the Solicitations of Lovers of all Complexions, to the dangerous Addresses of fine Gentlemen of the Army, who sometimes are obliged to reside with them a whole Year together" (75). Fielding's descriptions of soldier's peccadilloes are designed to ameliorate or minimize the threat soldiers pose to masculine identity as sexual competitors--contrast this to Swift's uniformed Yahoos, out to rape everyone's wives and daughters. "An Ensign of Foot," the narrator notes, "was the first Person who made any Impression on her Heart" (75). Soldiers are not the only competitors for Betty's attentions: "Officers of the Army, young Gentlemen traveling the Western Circuit, inoffensive Squires, and some of graver character"--all compete for the willing women that Fielding plants in England's roadside inns. (75) "Fielding suggests that, despite superficial social differences, sexual passion operates uniformly across not only gender but class lines as well" (Schneider 378). Rather than taking sides in the competition between soldiers and the general English male population, Fielding humorously conflates all male suitors, military and civilian alike.

However, Fielding--like Defoe--also contains the threat of the soldier as a sexual competitor by limiting their conquests to women of the lowest order of male desire. Generally speaking, Fielding's soldiers in Joseph Andrews are not serious competitors for women of quality--they tend to be matched up with women who are either socially suspect in some way because their chastity is obviously compromised, or because their appearance or personality makes them unmarriageable--bawds, spinsters, and widows, for example. When the peddler tells his tale toward the end of the novel, he relates that while recruiting, his party "overtook on the Road a Woman who seemed to be about thirty Years old, or thereabouts, not very handsome; but well enough for a Soldier" (292). For Fielding, soldiers may be randy, but there are plenty of women like Betty and Slipslop willing to go for a soldier--he softens the image of the soldier as an outright sexual predator. The peddler tells his audience "every Man of the Party, namely, a Serjeant, two private Men, and a Drum, were provided with their Woman, except myself" (292). Fielding gets rid of Lady Booby at the end of the narrative by matching her off with a soldier: "As for the *Lady Booby*, she returned to *London* in a few days, where a young Captain of Dragoons, together with eternal Parties at Cards, soon obliterated the Memory of *Joseph*" (311). This aspect of the soldier repeats in later novels and one can see it in its nascent form in Colonel Jack's turbulent marital career: he marries a female rake (though she is a gentlewoman at first), an Italian adulteress, a widow (who becomes an alcoholic), and a country girl (who gave birth to an illegitimate child in her past), before remarrying his repentant first wife. Each author represents their concerns and attitudes toward the soldier as sexual competitor in a different manner--Defoe in a reportorial style, Swift with Juvenalian savagery, and Fielding with Horatian whimsy.

In the "History of Leonora," or "the Unfortunate Jilt," the narrator pontificates that "many a grave and plain Man, will, on a just Provocation, betake himself to that mischievous Metal, cold Iron; while Men of a fiercer Brow, and sometimes with that

Emblem of Courage, a Cockade, will more prudently decline it" (101-102). The lawyer Horatio undertakes his own personal justice and skewers the lothario Bellarmine, which gives Fielding an opportunity to lampoon physicians and their dire prognoses of the dandy's wound. Within the overall construct of his comic-epic experiment, the author satirizes the impulse to aggression in eighteenth-century society represented by the professional soldier. Joseph Andrews is populated with lawless lawyers, warlike parsons, and cowardly soldiers. Parson Adams meets up with a country gentleman out hunting. While they walk, the gentleman complains about the lack of game:

"Perhaps then the Game is not very plenty hereabouts," cries *Adams*. "No, Sir," said the Gentleman, "the Soldiers, who are quartered in the Neighbourhood, have killed it all." "It is very probable," cries *Adams*, "for Shooting is their Profession." "Ay, shooting the Game," answered the other, "but I don't see they are so forward to shoot our Enemies. I don't like that Affair of *Carthage*; if I had been there, I believe I should have done other-guess things, d----n me; what's a Man's Life when his Country demands it; a Man who won't sacrifice his Life for his Country deserves to be hanged, d----n me." Which words he spoke with so violent a Gesture, so loud a Voice, so strong an Accent, and so fierce a Countenance, that he might have frightned a Captain of Trained-Bands at the Head of his Company. (117)

Fielding packs a lot of attitudes about the military in a few lines. First, one can recognize the soldier as sexual competitor in the metaphor of shooting game. The second issue is Fielding's criticism of the upper class's role in sending the army to war. The gentleman's bluster about the failed Cartagena expedition of 1741 is manifest--Fielding is drawing an unflattering picture of the monied classes who are eager to undertake dangerous military

ventures because they undertake no risk to their person. The reference to the "Trained-Bands" is an attack on the Tory position on the use of the militia and trained bands--the captain is as ironically depicted as the gentleman himself. "I have disinherited a Nephew who is in the Army," he tells Adams, "because he would not exchange his Commission, and go to the *West-Indies*" (121). This exposes his motives as entirely self-serving; he'd rather his son serve in one of the colonial company units, because there is more money to be made there. The welfare or defense of the state never enters into the gentleman's head. Of course the gentleman's bravery is all bluster and affectation. When they hear Fanny's cries for help, "the Man of Courage made as much Expedition towards his Home . . . where we will leave him, to contemplate his own Bravery, and to censure the want of it in others" (122). It is Parson Adams who leaps into action to save Fanny. Fielding's transposition of values--aggressive parsons and meek soldiers--derives from the soldier's impact on the sources of power in British society.

Another example of this displacement of martial values takes place during the events surrounding the roasting squire, who numbers among "the Gentlemen of Curlike Disposition" which he keeps around him for entertainment, "an old Half-pay Officer" (218). The "Quack Doctor" and the captain are the only two who represent professions that are not ostensibly concerned with entertainment. The captain's presence indicates Fielding's acknowledgment of soldiers and their exploits as public spectacle. When the captain bristles at Parson Adams's defensive remarks over his ill-treatment, he growls that "he had as much *Imanity* as another, and if any Man said he had not, he would convince him of his Mistake by cutting his Throat" (221). The captain is as hypocritical as the hunting gentleman had been. The violent act he chooses to describe is not characteristic of either conventional combat or of dueling between gentlemen--both of which involve a voluntary exposure to the weapons of one's enemies; he instead associates himself with the sneaking criminality of the cutthroat, where the assumption of

minimal risk is the convention. Once again Fielding inverts professional stereotypes, describing "this warlike Disposition in *Adams*" in his reaction to the captain's thinly veiled threat. (221) Like the hunting gentleman, the captain is a hypocrite who rationalizes his cowardice: "the Captain made no other Answer than, 'It is very well you are a Parson'" (221). Later, when the captain arrives at the inn to abduct Fanny, he balks at the prospect of serious resistance until it is safe: "The Captain was no sooner well satisfied that there were no Fire-Arms, than bidding Defiance to Gunpowder, and swearing he loved the Smell of it, he ordered the Servants to follow him" (229).

The presence and use of the servants are notable. I observed that fighting by proxy in Colonel Jack is characteristic of middle class commercial values of minimal personal risk through legal or group action, while personal confrontation and dueling are associated with gentility, though not always in a validating manner. In the ensuing battle, the captain "ordered the Servants to fall on," while he attempted to stay aloof from the actual fighting and abduct Fanny. The combative Adams strikes him and "the Captain, who was not accustomed to this kind of play," draws a sword to use against the unarmed parson, only to be laid out by a stone chamberpot. (229) The servants are the ones who actually win the fight to abduct Fanny. After Fanny's rescue, Joseph challenges the professional fighting-man to individual combat, "but the Captain refused, saying he did not understand Boxing" (241). Fielding, for all his wit at the half-pay captain's expense, uses him to point out the disparity between the real values of the upper class (minimal risk by acting through proxies--in this case the captain acting through the servants--but also the roasting squire acting through his followers) and the ideal values of gentility--acceptance of personal risk and adherence to articulated codes of honor. During another battle at an inn, Parson Adams finds himself bathed in hog's blood. When Adams mentions his order, he elicits a response from one of the gentlemen present, as well as telling commentary from the narrator: "At the word Order, the Gentleman stared, (for he

was too bloody to be of any modern Order of Knights)" (108-109). Fielding ironically portrays the relationship between the upper classes and the soldier because of the incongruity he perceives between the antiquated role of the upper classes as military leaders in the feudal state (their former willingness to share in the dangers of war) and their present practice of fighting by proxy through the professional army. By highlighting this incongruity between the old and new warrior classes, Fielding argues that part of the original basis for the political dominance of the landed classes--their specialized military capabilities--no longer exists.

Fielding, like Defoe, also implies that the army is an engine for social mobility or legitimacy. Lady Booby suggests to her brother that "by a Commission in the Army, or some other genteel Employment, he might soon put young Mr. *Andrews* on the foot of a Gentleman; and that being once done, his Accomplishments might quickly gain him an Alliance" (270). This indicates that English society still associates the idea of meritocratic advance with the professional army. While the tensions between the antiquated martial role of the ancient upper classes and those of their commercially-oriented eighteenth-century incarnations remain very much below the narrative surface in Joseph Andrews, Fielding's comments add up throughout the narrative.

The tension between the rule of law and personal justice in Joseph Andrews can be summed up in two separate incidents. After Adams is acquitted of being Fanny's assailant, the bird-beaters who apprehended them begin to fight among themselves--a drunken riot. The manner in which Fielding restores order indicates Fielding's affinity for the law and his future as a magistrate: "The Justice himself sallied out, and with the Dignity of his Presence, soon put an end to the Fray" (134). The justice is among the primary enforcers of order in Britain; army troops can only be used to quell civil disturbance upon application of the local justice for their assistance. The government's "reliance was placed on an uneasy partnership between the magistrate and the army" to

keep internal order. (Hayter 1) Fielding's justice acts as an example of how the crown's legal representatives can enforce order without recourse to violence.

As an example that illustrates the values of gentility and depicts the soldier as an informal enforcer of social justice, I point to Mr. Wilson's story. During his rake's progress narrative, Wilson describes an incident: "As I was one day at *St. James's* Coffee-house, making very free with the Character of a young Lady of Quality, an Officer of the Guards who was present, thought proper to give me the lye" (182). The confrontation with the officer is seemingly the cue to cast Wilson out of fashionable society--he becomes a pariah. Wilson (like Colonel Jack initially) refuses a third party's encouragement to recover his social standing by engaging in a duel, and he is forced to move to another neighborhood and a new circle of acquaintances. The officer acts as an informal and immediate social corrective in a situation where the law is too unwieldy to modify behavior. The idea that soldiers in particular are capable of enforcing proper codes of behavior which are difficult to enforce by law--such as libel--will continue in eighteenth-century fiction. These two incidents illustrate the contemporary tensions of English society between the commercial value placed on order through law and the martial value of order through personal intervention--an ambivalence that finds its way into the novel.

While he illustrates the concept of the soldier as an extra-legal enforcer of social convention, Fielding is also very leery of the power of the standing army to destroy the existing order, and he is anxious lest the government provoke the soldiery--if one teases the bear too much, the object of entertainment can become a source of terror. In this vein Fielding condemns the defense policies of the government and ponders their effects not only on the soldiers, but on the rest of society as well. The half-pay officer in the roasting squire episode is an example--one can partly attribute his sycophancy toward the squire to the notoriously low compensation of half-pay. The captain trades his

entertainment value to the squire for his room and board--a perverse form of patronage. The peddler who charitably assists Adams, and who returns at the end of the narrative with part of the story of Joseph's origin, "had been formerly a Drummer in an *Irish* Regiment, and now travelled the Country as a Pedlar" (153). Fielding contrasts the charity and generosity of the peddler with the parsimonious practice of the government--enlisting thousands of soldiers for a war or foreign adventure, only to discharge them with no useful skills or means of subsistence when the emergency is over. The peddler's circumstances are similar to those of the innkeeper who tells the tale about the falsely-charitable squire. The squire makes a promise of patronage to the innkeeper for his valiant naval service--as I have indicated, a recurring theme in the treatment of the soldier. He says, "The Squire told me, he was so pleased with the Defence I had made against the Enemy, that he did not fear getting me promoted to a Lieutenancy of a Man of War" (162). The squire reneges on his promise of patronage just as he leaves Adams and his party without a place to stay. In the story of the rake Wilson, the woman whom he corrupts starts out in humble circumstances attributable to military service: "the Daughter of a Gentleman, who after having been forty Years in the Army, and in all the Campaigns under the Duke of *Marlborough*, died a Lieutenant on Half-Pay; and had left a Widow with this only Child, in very distrest Circumstances: they had only a small Pension from the Government" (184). Fielding juxtaposes the wealth of Marlborough with the reward of an ungrateful government. As the army increases in size, growing numbers of veterans engenders concern on the part of the novelist with their lot in- and their influence on British society. In the unfinished "History of two Friends," Fielding again calls attention to the disparity between the wealth of the commercial classes and the poverty of those who defend their riches. While "Lennard" seeks his fortune in the East Indies, Paul "served his King and Country in the Army" (283). By the time the two are mature men, "*Lennard* was now married and retired with a Fortune of thirty thousand

Pound; and *Paul* was arrived to the Degree of a Lieutenant of Foot; and was not worth a single Shilling" (283). Fielding's commentary on the need for reform in the matter of military pay and benefits--particularly for survivors--is laced into the overall social commentary. The hard lot of the soldier is a fundamental though subtle element of the plot of Joseph Andrews--Fielding relies on the circumstances of army service to provide the opportunity for the swap of the infants Joseph and Fanny--dirt-poor Gaffar Andrews is also a veteran. His wife tells him "when you went a Serjeant to *Gibraltar* you left me big with Child, you staid abroad you know upwards of three Years" (304). Gaffar's absence during Fanny's birth and abduction makes the rest of the plot possible. That Fielding chose to attribute Gaffar's absence to government defense policy is linked not only to concerns of plausibility, but also to his commentary on the soldier and how society treats or mistreats him. The plot of Joseph Andrews is sprinkled with indigent veterans, marking a growing social concern.

An extensive close reading of Fielding's classic Tom Jones (1749) would serve only to reinforce the themes associated with the soldier in Joseph Andrews, and would be largely redundant; a few general examples should suffice. Fielding continues to disarm the soldier as a legitimate sexual rival by his characterizations of the treasure-hunting Captain Blifil--who marries Squire Allworthy's old-maid sister Bridget--and the coarse Ensign Northerton. The author illustrates tensions between the new and old warrior classes within several episodes: Lord Fellamar's use of the naval press-gang and the confrontation between Lord Fellamar's proxy Captain Egglane and Squire Western are examples. Fielding again criticizes government policies such as the quartering, pay, and survivor benefits of soldiers. In Chapter Five, Book Fourteen, "A Short Account of the History of Mrs. Miller," the widow Miller, who was "born and bred a gentlewoman," found herself in dire circumstances. "My father," she tells Jones, "was an officer of the army, and died in a considerable rank: but he lived up to his pay; and as that expired

with him, his family, at his death, became beggars" (624). Tom Jones highlights many of the problems of the army in society in much the same manner as Joseph Andrews. What is more interesting than the similarities, however, are the differences between the two novels in terms of their treatment of the soldier.

First of all, soldiers are much more prominent in Tom Jones than they were in Joseph Andrews. I attribute this to two factors. First, Tom Jones is a longer, more comprehensive survey of eighteenth-century British society; Fielding's narrative is more broadly focused and examines each profession in great detail. Since he is not in this case writing in direct response to Richardson's Pamela (whose agenda is "the climax of a long-standing movement in Christian and middle-class apologetics against the glamour of the pagan and warrior virtues" [Watt 244]), Fielding can include the profession of arms on his satirical agenda. Second, the soldier occupies a more prominent place in the later novel because the soldier was more prominently at work in domestic current events. During the wars of 1739-48, twenty-three battalions were added to the standing army, plus thirteen additional battalions raised specifically to suppress the '45. (Houlding 10) The Jacobite rebellion of 1745 provided Fielding with the historical milieu appropriate to satirize both Jacobitism and the current state of the army in British society--the '45 was an example of the army visibly defending the government, not fighting on the continent or in defense of some remote colonial possession, but countering violent political dissent at home.

Because he examines the army in greater detail, Fielding is able to expand his social commentary about the army as an engine for meritocratic social advancement. Fielding's argument in Tom Jones is more sharply critical about the military's failure to provide a means to advance the fortunes of men of merit and more concerned with the potential for disturbing social miscegenation that he sees at work--an idea that Smollett examines in greater detail. The lieutenant of the company that Jones encounters at the

inn represents the man of merit--the exemplar of Davis's double discourse. Among the soldiers we encounter in Tom Jones, the lieutenant is the most unambiguously virtuous. Despite his fitness, "he had seen vast numbers preferred over his head, and had now the mortification to be commanded by boys, whose father were at nurse when he had first entered into the service" (302). The lieutenant's story highlights the corruption of the purchase system in much the same way as Swift's Roman admiral and Smollett's Lismahago. The lieutenant's wife "would not purchase his preferment at the expense of certain favours which the colonel required of her" (302). While he argues through the lieutenant that the army fails to advance men of merit, Fielding argues through others--principally Ensign Northerton--that the army also raises the unworthy to a dangerous degree. Northerton is one of "two ensigns, both very young fellows; one of whom had been bred under an attorney, and the other was son to the wife of a nobleman's butler" (303). Fielding depicts Northerton's baseness through language and by characterizing his scorn for education--he swears repeatedly, damning Homer because a copy of his writings were used to discipline him in school. This is reminiscent of Defoe's characterization of Captain Jack as ignorant and unteachable, only Fielding has elevated the reprobate to a position of legitimate authority rather than keeping him suppressed as a social outsider. Combined with the French lieutenant (who, ironically, "tho' he could neither, read, write, nor speak any language, was, however, a good officer" [311]), the two ensigns represent the dangerous propensity of the officer corps to socially elevate the unsuitable or undeserving. Fielding hints at the arbitrary nature of the system of advancement when Northerton mentions that "There's Thomas of our regiment, always carries a *Homo* in his pocket" (303). The lieutenant and Thomas represent the unrealized potential that the purchase system ignores: the poor soldier of merit.

The last difference between Tom Jones and Joseph Andrews is the existence of an argument against modern warfare and science that on the surface is quite reminiscent of

Swift's position in Gulliver's Travels. After a violent scuffle among Jones, young Blifil, and Thwackum, the narrator engages in a reflection upon weapons and warfare. Like Swift's Houyhnhnms, the narrator says,

Here we cannot suppress a pious wish, that all quarrels were to be decided by those weapons only, which nature . . . hath supplied us; and that cold iron was to be used in digging no bowels but those of the earth. Then would war, the pastime of monarchs, be almost inoffensive, and battles between great armies might be fought at the particular desire of several ladies of quality; who together with the kings themselves, might be actual spectators of the conflict. (214)

Like Swift, Fielding expresses a nostalgic desire for a more organic, less technical approach to warfare. He asks, "Might not a battle be as well decided by the greater number of broken heads, bloody noses and black eyes, as by the greater heaps of mangled and murdered human bodies?" (214) But Fielding's purpose in this narrative digression is partly ironic--recognizing the desirability of such a world while implicitly criticizing Swift's argument as utopian fantasy. After arguing in a more obviously ironic fashion that England's French enemies would willingly give up their advantages in military engineering to place themselves "upon a par with their adversary" in a gentlemanly manner, Fielding concludes that "such reformations are rather to be wished than hoped for" (214). One can infer Fielding's position on the modern science of warfare to be pragmatically opposed to the utopian ideals of Swift.

Chapter 4: Military Pedantry in Sterne's Tristram Shandy

Fielding's wish that "cold iron was to be used in digging no bowels but those of the earth" coincidentally presages Laurence Sterne's Uncle Toby and Corporal Trim and their whimsical fortifications on the bowling green. The period from Tom Jones in 1749 and Tristram Shandy in 1760 was one of increased military presence and activity, both at home and in Britain's burgeoning colonial possessions. After 1763, the peacetime army peaked at some 45,000 soldiers; before that date, an average of one-quarter of the foot regiments served outside the British Isles; after 1763 more than one-third did so.

(Houlding 11-13) Cultural expression--in this case, the novel--reflects this increased cultural prominence. Sterne's soldiers function within the same dialectics--class, political order, and especially spectacle and sexuality--as the preceding examples. The author uses the concept of pedantry, of the profession of warfare as a "hobbyhorse," to illustrate the tensions of masculinity and power located in the soldier.

In a preface to Tristram Shandy, Howard Anderson observes that "Sterne probes the abstractions which pedants put in place of life, dilating on the humorous potential of such a process, but also revealing the appalling self-interest from which it originates" (vii). In a 1759 letter to Robert Dodsley offering the first two volumes of Tristram Shandy for publication, Sterne describes the broad scope of his satirical agenda: "The Plan, as you perceive, is a most extensive one,---taking in, not only, the Weak part of the Sciences, in w^{ch} the true point of Ridicule lies---but every Thing else, which I find Laughable in my way---" (461). One of the sciences that Sterne targets is the modern profession of arms and its role in British society, a concern magnified by the then-on-going Seven Years War. In a 1760 letter to *Lloyd's Evening Post* about Sterne's novel, one reader observes:

'tis a smart satirical piece on the vices of the age, particularly of that part of the Creation, which were designed for the pleasure and happiness of man. But this is not an age for wit and humour: arms and military achievements engross the attention of one part of the public; pleasure and luxury occupy the minds of the other: So that neither Gentlemen nor Ladies have leisure to inspect their own conduct. (Sterne 479)

This reader's letter captures some of the anxieties of observers of the mid-eighteenth-century social scene, including the preoccupation of male Britons with the professional military. For example, "in 1760 the Marquess of Tavistock, appointed by his father the Duke of Bedford to raise and command the Bedfordshire militia, confessed that he was 'militia mad' . . . In 1762 he could still say that 'my old hobby horse has entirely distanced all the new ones'" (Western 310). In the highly militarized context of the mid-eighteenth century and the global conflict of the Seven Years War, Sterne's cultural exploration naturally focuses on the popular yet arcane science of warfare. Through Captain Shandy, Corporal Trim, and their exploits on the bowling green, Laurence Sterne seeks to expose the role of the soldier as a profession in English society. In particular, he highlights how military spectacle desensitizes society from the real effects of the wars that the army wages.

Tristram tells us, "I will draw my uncle *Toby's* character from his HOBBY-HORSE," and since his hobbyhorse is a representation of battle, Sterne establishes early the guideline that Toby cannot be judged in isolation from his status as a soldier (55). Toby's hobbyhorse is one of the most articulated examinations of the role of military spectacle in the English novel since Swift. Sterne's narrator characterizes the seductive nature of the increasingly technical and technological field of warfare when he describes Toby's pedantry as a kind of addiction: "The more my uncle *Toby* drank of this sweet

fountain of science, the greater was the heat and impatience of his thirst" (63). Toby's reenactments--including the war stories told by him and Corporal Trim--are a form of military spectacle, much the same as the stories of Colonel Jack's youth. Sterne seeks to make the reader question his or her own role in promoting war while deconstructing war as a manifestation of individual aggression--Toby's meekness refutes the construction of soldiers as innately aggressive. This double discourse that Toby operates in is especially apparent when the War of Spanish Succession ends and he argues that the war ended too soon. "Sterne puts the reader in the awkward position of feeling sorry for uncle Toby because the Peace of Utrecht ends the War of Spanish Succession, and the end of the war means the end of uncle Toby's miniature reenactments on the bowling green" (McNeil 149). This "awkward position" is designed to spur contemplation on the part of perceptive readers about their own role in war and its promotion. We sympathize and support Toby--Sterne draws us in--until he goes too far; the bowling green wars are revealed as a metaphor designed to allow Trim and Toby to vicariously participate in war stripped of the inglorious. Toby's white sentry-box, designed to allow him to play in the rain without getting wet--"which enabled my uncle *Toby* to take the field with great splendour"--, contrasts with Trim's memories of the miseries of the rain-drenched trenches outside Limerick. (314) Tristram at one point defines the hobby-horse: "'Tis the sporting little filly-folly which carries you out for the present hour----a maggot, a butterfly, a picture, a fiddle-stick----an uncle *Toby's* siege----or an *any thing*, which a man makes a shift to get a stride on, to canter it away from the cares and solitudes of life" (413). Thus the sieges are apparently harmless diversions--a quality enhanced by their miniature size. "The significance of the miniature as a reproduction is its abstract nature, which it shares with military history and tableaux"--thus serving to nullify or ameliorate the horrors that they represent (McNeil 155). But the miniaturization of Toby's sieges, like the Lilliputian army, also serves to imbue the activities with a quality of the

grotesque, "a self-conscious mode in that the artist or writer, in an intentional and playful way, reminds us that the representation is not real" (McNeil 42). Thus Swift and Sterne use the soldier to argue from similar premises that military spectacle and history glorify what is inherently inglorious--misery, destruction, and homicide on a seemingly ever-larger scale. Tristram's account of one of his father's many orations signifies the paradox of military adornment:

The act of killing and destroying a man, continued my father raising his voice----and turning to my uncle *Toby*----you see, is glorious----and the weapons by which we do it are honourable----We march with them upon our shoulders----We strut with them by our sides----We gild them----We carve them----We in-lay them----We enrich them----Nay, if it be but a *scoundril* cannon, we cast an ornament upon the breech of it. (456)

The two instruments of war responsible for the wounds of the two veterans are glorified, turned into works of art. The aesthetic appeal of the musket and cannon mentioned above is juxtaposed with the musket ball that crippled Trim's leg and the cannon ball that indirectly caused Captain Shandy's mutilation. Like the Lilliputian exercises, the bowling green wars are inherently self-indulgent entertainment that generates few benefits other than diversion. Sterne evokes the incongruity of the apparent harmlessness of Toby's playful activities on the bowling green versus the horrible realities they reflect when Tristram casually mentions the maggot--emblem of death and decay--in his list of possible hobby-horses. Walter seemingly defends Toby's spectacles in a conversation with Yorick: "if any mortal in the whole universe had done such a thing, except his brother *Toby*, it would have been looked upon by the world as one of the most refined satyrs upon the parade and prancing manner, in which *Lewis XIV*, from the beginning of the war, but particularly that very year, had taken the field" (314). Walter's protestations

make it more, rather than less likely that Toby and his sieges are "a satyr upon the parade and prancing manner" of eighteenth century warfare. Captain Shandy and Corporal Trim--both painfully maimed in action--also operate as visible reminders of the horrible nature of war which belies the playful aspect of their spectacles.

Toby's and Trim's hobbyhorse includes oral tales of their military adventures--histories like those imparted to the young Colonel Jack. Trim and Toby serve to represent the influence of all kinds of military history and journalism. Tristram refers to not only the magnitude of the number of Toby's bowling green sieges, but also refers ironically to their importance when he says, "The campaigns themselves will take up as many books [as TS]; and therefore I apprehend it would be hanging too great a weight of one kind of matter in so flimsy a performance as this, to rhapsodize them, as I once intended, into the body of the work----surely they had better be printed apart" (313). Since Sterne argues elsewhere that "the happiness of the Cervantic humor arises from this very thing--of describing silly and trifling Events, with the Circumstantial Pomp of great Ones" (462), Tristram's reference to a kind of historiography is a comment on the sheer literary volume accorded to the battle narrative--like the veteran's stories it is a form often devoid of any profound introspection into the nature of war. Sterne clearly indicates here that nothing is lost to society if detailed accounts of Toby's sieges never see print. Sterne criticizes the lack of analysis in military history through Toby's speech to Trim on the usefulness of what he calls "chronology:"

As for *Chronology*, I own . . . that of all others, it seems a science which the soldier might best spare, was it not for the lights which that science must one day give him, in determining the invention of powder; the furious execution of which, renversing every thing like thunder before it, has become a new æra to us of military improvements, changing so totally

the nature of attacks and defences both by sea and land, and awakening so much art and skill in doing it that the world cannot be too exact in ascertaining the precise time of its discovery (398-399).

One can recognize here a kind of latent Swiftian argument: the precise moment of the discovery of gunpowder is more important to the blithe Captain Shandy than analyzing the effects that gunpowder weapons have had, ignoring the obvious effects to Trim's knee and his own masculinity. Sterne uses Toby as a device to criticize military history's role in distancing society from war's real consequences.

Sterne also exposes the role that journalism plays in society's self-delusion over the true nature of war. Newspapers feed Toby's obsession in a manner meant to reflect on the combat correspondence of the day. For the first time in the eighteenth century, English readers could follow the operations of armies on the continent on a daily or weekly basis, as the campaign unfolded in newspaper accounts. The bowling green reenactments are in fact heavily dependent on the newspaper, for the miniature sieges are carried out "by the accounts my uncle *Toby* received from the daily newspapers;" Toby and Trim execute their meaningless exercises "the one with the *Gazette* in his hand,---- the other with a spade on his shoulder to execute the contents" (313). Newspapers foster Toby's obsession, increasing his desire for greater vicarious participation, which translates into increased investments of resources to further the entertainment. Tristram tells us that the Shandy family was relieved that Uncle Toby's artillery pieces could not actually fire during his recreation of the siege of Lille, because "so full were the papers, from beginning to the end of the siege, of the incessant firings of the besiegers,----and so heated was my uncle *Toby's* imagination with the accounts of them, that he had infallibly shot away all his estate" (316). This desire for greater spectacle leads Trim to devise smoking siege mortars from the boots Roger Shandy wore at Marston Moor. Not only do

newspaper accounts drive the bowling green simulation, but they also drive innovation and "science" to squander resources in an unproductive manner. While we are amused at the antics of the two veterans, we are also reminded that their spectacles consume wealth.

During his "apologetical oration" in defense of his desire for the War of Spanish Succession to continue after the peace, Toby challenges Walter Shandy to describe why he thinks Toby takes such a position based on "unworthy views"--"upon what one deed of mine do you ground it?" he asks. "*The devil a deed do I know of,*" replies Walter, "*but one for a hundred pounds, which I lent thee to carry on these cursed sieges*" (324). Earlier, Walter warns Toby about the costs of his hobbyhorse sieges bringing him to financial ruin: "What signifies it if they do, brother, replied my uncle *Toby*, so long as we know 'tis for the good of the nation" (150). One can argue, as Toby does, that the purpose of entertainment alone suffices. He justifies "that infinite delight, in particular, which has attended my sieges in my bowling green, has arose within me, and I hope in the corporal too, from the consciousness we both had, that in carrying them on, we were answering the great ends of our creation" (325). Toby's "good of the nation" and "great ends of our creation" are Sterne's wry commentary on the justification of often pointless and puerile representations of war in English society: in history, art, journalism--even the army itself as an object of entertainment. Like Toby's hobbyhorse, they consume resources and entertain society, but the human cost signified by Toby's wound indicates that it is a diversion bought with human blood.

In terms of the dialectic of class and social convention that I have identified as an integral part of the figure of the soldier in the early novel, Sterne's military characters serve largely to confirm the existing social order. Toby comments on the struggle for power between the mid-wife and Dr. Slop: "I like subordination, quoth my uncle *Toby*,---and but for it, after the reduction of *Lisle*, I know not what might have become of the garrison of *Ghent*, in the mutiny for bread, in the year Ten" (134). Patronage continues

to play the dominant role in the problem posed by the meritorious man. When Walter pontificates over the role of inheritance, Toby pipes up: "I was born to nothing, quoth my uncle *Toby*, interrupting my father---but my commission" (201). Sterne reminds us that Toby's options as the younger son are limited, but the army and the patronage of an uncle for 120 pounds a year provide an outlet for Toby's energies--which transforms into the bowling green sieges after he returns from Flanders. Walter, who as the oldest son has inherited the Shandy estate, acts as a patron for Toby, financing his miniature sieges. Toby, in his turn, acts as a patron to Corporal Trim and the son of the unfortunate Lieutenant LeFevre. Thus the element of social protest over the man of merit is submerged in Sterne. Rather than arguing for reform of the army, Sterne is criticizing the values of British culture which allow society to blithely glorify war.

Sterne bases his cultural critique in the character of Uncle Toby. Sterne's description of Toby and his behavior evokes what David McNeil refers to as the "fearful-ludicrous duality" of the grotesque. (McNeil 158) The author compels the reader to sympathize with Toby through his gentle behavior while at the same time associating Toby indirectly with the ultimate ends of the professional soldier's calling--death and destruction: "understanding the paradox between the honourable ends of war, a love of country and God, and its horrific means, mass slaughter, is central to understanding Sterne's uncle Toby" (McNeil 39). Toby is yet another example of ambivalence at work in the figure of the soldier--we are both amused and horrified by him.

Toby also acts as an argument that war is culturally influenced, rather than a strictly natural behavior. During his "apologetical oration," Toby rhetorically asks, "Did I plant the propensity there?---did I sound the alarm within, or Nature?" (324) But Toby's idea of natural influences refers to human artifacts--works of military fiction and history. Sterne argues through Toby that England's fascination with war and the growing numbers of warriors is a socialized behavior learned while individuals are children, and it is

history that serves as the ideological agent. Toby says, "When *Guy, Earl of Warwick*, and *Parismus* and *Parismenus*, and *Valentine* and *Orson*, and the *Seven Champions of England* were handed around the school . . . was I not as much concerned for the destruction of the *Greeks* and *Trojans* as any boy of the whole school?" (324) Toby goes on to declare that "'Tis one thing, from a public spirit and a thirst for glory, to enter the breach the first man, . . . and 'tis another thing to reflect on the miseries of war." He argues that man engages in war not by "nature," but by "necessity." "What is war?" he asks, "what is it, but the getting together of quiet and harmless people, with their swords in their hands, to keep the ambitious and turbulent within bounds?" (325) Sterne means for his readers to be horrified at Toby's naive rhetoric. Toby's seeming disregard of the various possibilities for self-serving motives for war sparks the reader's incredulity at his naiveté. Sterne invites his reader to conclude that the soldier more often fights in wars for "the turbulent and the ambitious," and to recognize that Toby's credibility in this subject is compromised; the reader infers nearly the opposite of Toby's characterization of war--he or she reads Toby ironically.

Sterne's treatment of Trim and Toby and their relationships to women is in keeping with the general trends noted in earlier examples of the professional soldier as literary figure in the early novel, in that Sterne takes measures to contain the soldier as a competitor for women of quality. Toby's emasculating wound and his ignorance of the social codes of courtship are Sterne's key strategies. He is also careful to pair up Toby with the widow Wadman and Trim with her servant Bridget, a technique of containment favored by Defoe, Fielding, and, as I shall show, Smollett.

While Uncle Toby is one of the remarkable characters in the early novel, the soldier in Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* generally addresses the same thematic concerns that I have identified in earlier works. Sterne's main point in concentrating on a soldier's hobbyhorse seems to be Walter's statement that "SCIENCES MAY BE LEARNED BY

ROTE, BUT WISDOM NOT" (276). Toby's bowling green reenactments challenge the reader to be conscious of the underlying realities from which military representations--parades, newspaper accounts, histories--serve to distance the audience. Sterne's contemporary and rival, Tobias Smollett, also created some memorable military characters, chief among them another wounded veteran, the irascible Lieutenant Lismahago.

Chapter 5: The Colonial Soldier in Smollett's Humphry Clinker

At one point in Humphry Clinker (1771) Matt Bramble compares Lismahago to "a crab-apple in a hedge, which I have been tempted to eat for its flavour, even while I was disgusted by its austerity" (189). This ambivalent attitude toward soldiers is symptomatic of both the admiration of soldierly virtues by eighteenth century English society, and the perception of the threats posed by the inclusion of soldiers in their midst--the ramifications of a separate profession of arms to previous concepts of masculine identity and power. The function of the soldier in the dialectics of class, politics, spectacle, and sexuality are heavily influenced by Smollett's Scottish heritage. He is especially keen to contain not only the threats of soldiers in general, but of Scottish soldiers in particular. "Smollett captures the disruptive effects of economic and social change in the conflict between emergent and traditional groups" (Zomchick 173). Smollett follows the earlier novelists, particularly Fielding, in contrasting the gentry and the burgeoning new professional class of officers, but his satire is much acerbic in nature.

In the characters of Bullford and Lieutenant Lismahago we see the clearest contrast between the old- and the new warrior. Bullford, who is addressed in Jerry's letter as "knight," is a valetudinarian, "disabled by gout from enjoying amusement abroad" (274). Lismahago, despite the obvious delight Smollett has in ridiculing him, is an active, vigorous (and Scottish) character untouched by diseases of rich indulgence--a character "with a certain austerity of aspect" (278). Bullford, indulging in his practical joke on Lismahago, exclaims in snatches of Italian and French--the languages of decadent foreigners. Although Lismahago is the object of Bullford's joke, Smollett seems to be criticizing the old warrior class in Tabitha's voice when she tells Bullford that "she did not see that Mr. Lismahago was a fitter subject for ridicule than the knight himself" (277-278).

Smollett highlights the tensions between the old martial class and the new profession of arms. He uses this theme of the ill-treatment of the military by the aristocracy during the incident of Lismahago's demand of satisfaction from Lord Oxmington on behalf of Bramble. The soldier serves as the driving force for social justice. "To respond with swift retributive violence to gratuitous rudeness and injustice is, in Bramble's eyes, a social, moral duty, and one from which a tired, sick old man would like to be excused" (Lewis 411). In the violent confrontation, Lismahago is surrounded by Oxmington's servants. Like Fielding's roasting squire in Joseph Andrews, Oxmington fights only by proxy--a "French valet de chambre"--but in both this incident and the affair of Bullford, there is a connection drawn between the aristocracy and the influences of England's arch-enemy, France (261). Both Bullford and Oxmington are impotent or unwilling warriors: Bullford has the gout and Oxmington cravenly backs down from a personal confrontation with Bramble. In both cases, "to endure ridicule by a moral inferior . . . is an act of cowardice" which the soldier acts upon "for the moral order of the community" (Lewis 413).

But Smollett's position is not entirely on the side of the soldier. He also sees the new profession as promulgating inappropriately aggressive responses to social transgression, as in Lismahago's role in forcing a violent confrontation with Oxmington. When Humphry Clinker is challenged to a duel by Dutton, he says, "It doth not become servants to use those weapons, or to claim the privilege of gentlemen to kill one another when they fall out" (195). But Lismahago encourages him to "hazard a thrust of cold iron with his antagonist" (196). Lismahago's reaction indicates an egalitarian attitude, wherein masculine identity is defined by martial prowess rather than social standing--a disregard for social convention that Smollett time and again criticizes in other characters.

Like previous writers, Smollett draws a clear distinction between the sacrifices of the professional warrior and the non-fighting, decadent nature of the former warrior class

in the characters of Matt Bramble's friends: Rear Admiral Balderick, Colonel Cockril, and Sir Reginald Bently. While Bramble's "description of some old friends . . . converts potential anxiety over death into grotesque figures," it also serves to describe veterans in terms of the concern for the "teizing" of the bear that Jerry describes. (Hopkins 173) Balderick has a wooden leg; Cockril "lost the use of his limbs in making an American campaign;" but Sir Reginald is bent in the shape of a telescope, a consequence of catching a bowel infection while engaging in the one of the pleasures of the titled--fox-hunting (51-52). Bramble feels sympathy for the troubles of the two soldiers, but writes of the "chagrin" of the knight as "the effect of his own misconduct" (54). This contrast between the "misconduct" of the titled aristocracy who formerly engaged in war as a duty of their social and political position, and the sacrifices of the professional soldier in the wars of empire, forms a basis for discontent, which would be dangerous in veterans who, like Lismahago, are able-bodied. Bramble tells us "they were all malcontents at bottom" (52).

Smollett also continues the criticism of government defense policy noted in the earlier novels. In particular the purchase system of commissioning officers is held up for examination. The foremost victim of the pernicious sale of military duty positions for officers is Lismahago. Bramble says, "Our pity was warmed with indignation, when we learned, that in the course of two sanguinary wars, he had been wounded, maimed, mutilated, taken, enslaved, without ever having attained a higher rank than that of lieutenant" (177). Bramble tells him "your case is a reproach to the service" (177). Despite Lismahago's contentious protestations of resignation to his fate within a system where others "bought their preferment with their money," the sense of his disappointment is clear (177). Like Fielding's Paul in "the History of two Friends," he entered the army "as other gentlemen do, with such hopes and sentiments as honourable ambition inspires" (178).

Lismahago is a character to be read in a paradoxical light; he rhetorically confirms what others (principally Bramble) argue by vociferously arguing against them-- what Bramble calls his "spirit of contradiction" (189). His "disputatiousness works technically as a rhetorical strategy, forcing English readers, along with the Welsh Bramble, into defense of the Scots" (Lewis 410). Lismahago's knowledge is gained "in order to qualify himself to refute established maxims, and thus raise trophies for the gratification of polemical pride" (189-190). Thus when Lismahago maintains that "the Scots did nothing more than their duty" in America, distinguishing themselves no more than their counterpart British units, his contradictions tend to confirm rather than deny what "all the world allows" (190). His arguments are suspect since they are the result of a stubborn "polemical pride" rather than reason. By having a "North Briton" argue what should be a "South Briton's" position, Smollett is also deconstructing the idea of the rebellious Scottish soldier. Lismahago, who should be the most bitter over his treatment in military service, speaks in terms of resignation, rather than rebellion; it is "South Briton" Bramble who is indignant at his treatment. Smollett displaces the critique of government policies regarding soldiers from Lismahago's mouth in order to ameliorate the threat that a standing army of malcontents--especially Scottish or Irish malcontents--may represent to English readers.

However, Lismahago is a veteran, a man who has spent thirty years of his life in the service of the king, and he gives the reader insights into the unfairness of the service, particularly as it effects the peripheral peoples of the crown. Lismahago participates in the social dialectic from his perspective as a Scotsman. He says: "I know of no Scotch officer, who has risen in the army above the rank of a subaltern, without purchasing every degree of preferment" (190-191). The ability of the (mostly English) aristocracy to advance in the military by virtue of their money, with no practical means to advance those officers who, like Lismahago, attempt to succeed based on personal merit, is a

cause of discontent--and a recurrent theme in the novel. Like Swift's Roman admiral and the lieutenant in Tom Jones, Colonel Cockril "was mortified to see himself over-topped by upstart generals, some of whom he had once commanded" (52).

Smollett also criticizes the compensation that veterans receive. Balderick and Cockril, "who have acted honourable and distinguished parts on the great theatre," are "reduced to lead a weary life in this stewpan of idleness and insignificance" due to the paltry half-pay of a rear-admiral and a colonel (52-54). The high human cost of England's wars during the eighteenth century is especially poignant when compared to the compensation given to the maimed survivors. This cost not only includes Balderick, Cockril, and Lismahago, all of whom are maimed through their service to the crown, but also the dead Murphy and Bramble's brother (who was a captain in the army) (93). Smollett criticizes the priorities and wisdom of how compensation for service is doled out by the government. Contrast the pecuniary fates of Lismahago, Cockril, and Balderick with that of Captain C____, "whom the government occasionally employed in secret services" (104). Despite the rumor that he is a double agent for the French--and worse, a Roman Catholic--as well as his reputed past in "fraudulent practices" as a merchant in France, Captain C____ has been given "a comfortable pension, which he now enjoys in his old age" (104). The unsavory con man Captain C____--who has a noble patron (the duke of Ormond)--is rewarded, whereas the honorable, maimed fighting men eke out a bare existence on half-pay.

We have seen in Defoe and Fielding how service in the colonial companies was regarded as being more profitable than a commission in the king's army. Smollett also points out that the prospects for economic success for a man of merit are greater in the semi-private service rather than in service directly to the crown. This idea is played out chiefly in the success of Captain Brown in the service of the government-sponsored East-India company. Brown is the "honest favorite of fortune" who rose from enlisted man to

captain, amassing a fortune in excess of twelve thousand pounds (245). But like Defoe, Smollett makes it clear that what is needed to make the system work properly is aristocratic patronage of meritorious men. Brown's advancement is due to "the notice and approbation of lord Clive" (245). Brown is Smollett's example of the result of proper aristocratic patronage; Captain C____ is his example of unwise patronage.

Smollett's ambivalence toward soldiers as a feature of eighteenth-century society is particularly evident in his placement of soldiers in the dialectic of sexual competition. Characters like Captain O'Donaghan, nephew of Sir Ulic Mackilligut, are regarded as potential romantic aggressors in the competition for marriageable young women. Lydia writes that the advances of Captain O'Donaghan are cut off by the protective intervention of Jerry (39). Bramble tells Doctor Lewis that he will "shift the scene, if I find the matter grow more serious" between Lydia and the captain (45). Matt is aware of the dangers of romantic liaison with military men. His own sister, Tabitha, is practically unmarriageable because of unwise associations with military types. Her reputation was "a little singed" by "flirting with a recruiting officer" (57). This early mention of the pairing of the spinster Tabitha with military types is more vexed than the similar treatments of soldiers and their women that one finds in Fielding and Sterne, for Tabitha's unmarriageable status appears to be partially derived from her contact with the recruiting officer. Officers on recruiting duty were popularly conceived as licentious rakes, leaving local women pregnant in their wake as they traveled on to new parishes in search of recruits. Here Smollett is capitalizing on a tradition that goes back at least as far as George Farquhar's dramatic comedy, "The Recruiting Officer" (1708), where in one scene Captain Plume exclaims to Sergeant Kite, "What! No bastards! and so many recruiting officers in town; I thought 'twas a maxim among them to leave as many recruits in the country as they carried out" (I.i.210-212). Sergeant Kite himself has difficulty reckoning all his "wives" and children. But like Bridget Allworthy in Tom

Jones (the old maid who marries Captain Blifil), Tabitha's personality tends to work against the idea of her as a virtuous woman of quality corrupted by soldiers. Tabitha's closest brush with marriage is with a naval lieutenant "who did not understand the refinements of the passion," but was killed in battle with a French frigate before the marriage could be concluded (57). Matt and Jerry shield Lydia from the threat of a similar fate.

Smollett links the dialectics of class and sexuality in Bramble's description of the scene at Bath. The army, a vital agent in colonization, is also an agent in the kind of social blending that Bramble comments on with such horror in the first half of the novel, an expression of the soldier's capability for contributing to social disorder. The two Negro French-horn players in the lodging house at Bath are the slaves of a Creole, Colonel Rigworm (29). Military characters take their place in "the general mixture of degrees" in the public rooms of Bath (45). We see the link between the romantic and social threat posed by soldiers in Colonel Tinsel, who "danced all the evening with the daughter of an eminent tinman from the borough of Southwark" (46). Like Lismahago urging Clinker to duel with Dutton, Tinsel displays a casual disregard for social convention that Bramble finds offensive. The inclusion of these lower-class military characters with the aristocracy in a public social setting is what Bramble "reprobates, as a monstrous jumble of heterogeneous principles" (45).

As we saw in Swift, another part of the fear of "the bear" was the perception of soldiers as a political threat, either in rebellion against the crown, or as the agent of repression in service to the crown against the liberties of English society. The loyalties of the professional soldier were often in doubt, particularly among those soldiers recruited from England's subjugated neighbors. For example, Murphy the Irish lieutenant goes to his death singing the Jacobite *Drimmendoo* "in concert with Mr. Lismahago" (181). Smollett concedes the potential of the Scots as a particular military/political

threat. He refers to their important role in the military when the contradictory Lismahago "would not allow that the Scots abounded above their proportion in the army and navy of Great Britain" (190). As Bramble and his family travel through Scotland we are given some specific warnings of the potential of the Scots for destruction due to their martial virtues. Bramble writes: "If all the Highlanders, including the inhabitants of the Isles, were united, they could bring into the field an army of forty thousand fighting men, capable of undertaking the most dangerous enterprize" (235). In the past a mere four thousand was enough to "throw the whole kingdom of Great Britain into confusion," defeating "two armies of regular troops, accustomed to service" (235). Partly, these encomiums to Scottish military prowess and importance are due to Smollett's ethnic pride, but Smollett is also being careful to show his readers both ends of the dialectic, in this case the soldier's potential (particularly the Scottish soldier's potential) to dominate the remainder of society through force. By delineating the *potential* of the threat, Smollett avoids the risk of alienating his south Briton readers by overtly denying or avoiding a fact that they presume to be true.

Smollett, however, is not trying to frighten his readers with the specter of rampaging Scot soldiers; he is instead attempting to subvert it. Having posed the threat of Scots within the military, he is careful to ameliorate that threat. Jery takes on as his valet "an old soldier," Scotsman Archy MacAlpine, who Jery says, "has been recommended to me for his fidelity" (198). MacAlpine--who served his last master, a colonel, until the colonel's death--serves faithfully (if not soberly) throughout the book. Lismahago himself seems a very loyal servant to the crown, and Smollett often places South Briton arguments in his mouth. In one of his letters, Bramble tells Doctor Lewis of a "noble park" in Dunbar, scene of a battle between a Scottish force and an army headed by anti-royalist Oliver Cromwell (201). Through these images Smollett is building a case for Scottish military loyalty to the crown to balance the perspective of Englishmen

for whom the rebellion of 1745 must still loom large, and further the case that "the contempt for Scotland . . . is founded on prejudice and error" (258).

If Smollett has tried to tame the bear as a threat to the British crown, he also discusses the threat that the military servants to the crown can pose to the liberty of the people, balancing that with their power to maintain good order in society in the double discourse common to depictions of the soldier. Lismahago tells Bramble that "any king of England, . . . supported by a standing army," may "overthrow all the bulwarks of the constitution" (191). But in terms of the internal threat to the good order of society, the threat posed by the standing military is overshadowed by the threat of an uncontrolled free press, and here one sees the soldier again acting as informal enforcer of social order. Lismahago calls the press "a national evil," besmirching the reputations of the meritorious and assisting rebels in the destruction of "the good order of the community" (192). Smollett allows that a free press is important ("a valuable privilege"), but fears that there is no government mechanism to prevent its abuse: "At present there was no law in England sufficient to restrain it within proper bounds" (192).

But Matt Bramble poses a solution: "If, from the ignorance or partiality of juries, a gentleman can have no redress from the law, for being defamed in a pamphlet or newspaper, I know but one other method of proceeding against the publisher, which is attended with some risque, but has been practised successfully, more than once, in my remembrance" (97-98). Bramble goes on to tell how a newspaper printed an account of the repulse of the Royal Horse Guards at Dettingen, impugning the reputation of the regiment. "A captain of that regiment broke the publisher's bones, telling him, at the same time, if he went to the law, he should certainly have the like salutation from every officer of the corps" (98). But this example of the military acting as a beneficial control on the free press is problematized, for Bramble is recalling an incident related earlier in the book by the publisher himself. In the letters between the bookseller and the Reverend

Mister Dustwich, the bookseller remembers an incident when he inserted in the evening paper a paragraph "reflecting upon the behaviour of a certain regiment in battle" (3). However, the bookseller relates a different story than Bramble's: the officer threatens to cut off the publisher's ears, the bookseller has him "bound over" and prosecutes him (3). We cannot know whether Bramble has gotten the story wrong or whether the bookseller has altered events, anxious to allay Dustwich's fears of Lismahago's "minatory reproaches" in order to publish Humphry Clinker. "With contentiousness, however socially unacceptable (and however ironically intended by Smollett), Lismahago means to protect the rest of the cast from greed and exploitation" (Lewis 410). Smollett has given the reader a dialectic of the threat of repression by the standing army as well as a beneficial perspective on the army's ability to coerce good order.

At one point Matt Bramble laments over the fate of Martin the highwayman; like Defoe he asks, "'What shall we do (said he) to save a poor sinner from the gallows, and make him a useful member of the commonwealth?" (151) While Smollett poses the problems of dealing with the standing army and its cast-off veterans, he also shows us how the professional army as a social engine to make this new class of citizen "useful" members of the commonwealth.

Consider first how the pair of characters Lismahago and Martin interact. Bramble solves the problem of Martin by acting the role of Martin's patron and sending him to the East Indies, "for a commission in the company's service" (175). Just as in Colonel Jack, Britain's colonial project serves as a place to rehabilitate criminals and the indigent. Martin then disappears from the narrative, presumably to a successful career in the colonies, immediately followed by the appearance of the scarred Lismahago. The link between Martin and Lismahago is further strengthened when we are told that Lismahago is well suited for the character of Captain Gibbet the highwayman in the *Beaux Strategem* (305). Martin's future is bright because of the aristocratic patronage

charitably given by Bramble, patronage that the down-at-the-heels Lismahago has stubbornly refused to seek (177-178).

It is through the charity of the aristocracy that Smollett proposes to solve some of the problems posed by the new warrior class exemplified by Lieutenant Lismahago. This idea can be more strongly supported by looking at the exemplar of successful service, Captain Brown. Captain Brown redeems his family's fortunes, raising them from poverty to respectable economic independence. Contrasted with Cockril and Balderick, Brown will contribute to the British economy through "a manufacture which he intended to set up," and by reducing unemployment (he gets one brother out of prison to help with the factory and intends to purchase a commission for the other brother, an enlisted man) (245). Smollett depicts the idea of patronage in military service as being a self-regenerating act. Clive's patronage raises Brown to a level of economic success which allows him to act as a patron for his family, his youngest brother presumably continuing the chain.

But Smollett stops short of allowing lower class men of merit to rise too far in social standing. Despite his success in colonial service, Brown is laudably modest, according to Smollett. Jery writes that he was "pleased with the modesty" and "filial virtue" of Captain Brown (245). He doesn't go to the social mixing pot of Bath; he doesn't marry above his social station; he instead intends to marry "a person of low estate" (245). Brown doesn't aspire to rise higher in social degree; he is content to return to Dunbar (the site of the reassuring Scottish stand against Cromwell) and financially elevate his family through the fruits of Clive's patronage. "Torpor among the elites is dispelled by plebeian energy reduced to a safe level" (Zomchick 172). This is reminiscent of Defoe's "principles of gratitude," in which an act of charity or pardon on the part of the ruling class serves to improve the lot of deserving lower-class individuals while reinforcing the existing order. Brown wouldn't be so ungrateful as to challenge

Clive's position of dominance; he has instead become a useful member of the commonwealth.

But how does Smollett, through Matt Bramble, tame the remaining "bear," Lieutenant Lismahago? Lismahago returns from America to find his family reduced to "weaving manufacture" (252). As Brown's family has prospered (he was a journeyman weaver before joining the service), Lismahago's has been forced into commerce (245). This plus "the expence of living encreased to double what it had been" makes the maimed veteran determine that English society has no place for him--he decides to return to Indian society, where he had been a sachem on his own merit (252). Once again patronage is the safety net. Bramble says, "he thought it very hard, that a gentleman who had served his country with honour, should be driven by necessity to spend his old age, among the refuse of mankind, in such a remote part of the world" (247). Bramble encourages the match of Lismahago and Tabby, noting that both of the social cast-offs, the spinster and the old soldier, would have a "comfortable provision" (247). Bramble's stipulation that they would reside outside of Brambleton Hall so that Matt "should have no more of their company than he desired" indicates that patronage of the military class stops short of allowing free social mobility (247).

Smollett depicts the dangers of social pretension in the old soldier at the moment of Bramble's act of charity chiefly through Lismahago's dress at the wedding. Lismahago and Tabby, in their pride of dress, are contrasted with the true members of the upper class, George Dennison and Lydia, who "were distinguished by nothing extraordinary in their apparel" (317). Smollett introduces Lismahago to the reader wearing "a coat, the cloth of which had once been scarlet"--his old British service jacket (175). But now, like so many of the nobility (Oxmington and Bullford), Lismahago assumes a French affectation. In terms very much like those that Sterne uses to describe the courting Uncle Toby, Lismahago appears in his army best: "a tarnished white cloth faced with blue

velvet, embroidered with silver"--a French service jacket taken in war (317). His comical presentation in the marriage scene is a reminder of Lismahago's true place in society despite Bramble's charity.

Throughout Humphry Clinker Tobias Smollett presents the reader with some of the problems that faced the inclusion of members and former members of England's standing armed forces into society. Lismahago "bear[s] the charge of unresolved ambivalence characteristic of the grotesque" to the end of the narrative. (Lewis 414)

The most successful technique in the text for treating the political and social problems that are posed by the new warrior class is patronage on the part of the English upper class. Patronage counters the resentment that poor government handling of its veterans incites, smoothing over the disappointments of military service, ameliorating the threats to society that a standing army represents, and creating a chain of charitable acts which benefits the less fortunate and stimulates the economy. At the end, Bramble's patronage of Lismahago "represses the strident voice of an emergent culture . . . through solutions that transform social relations into more manageable personal or familial ones" (Zomchick 175). Through Bramble, Smollett posits that wise patronage on the part of the upper class can keep "the bear" of a standing army tame; one of Lismahago's gifts to Bramble on his wedding day is "a fine bear's skin" (318).

Conclusion: Assimilation of the Soldier in Austen and Beyond

Thus authors of early English novels through the time of Smollett depict soldiers in accordance with their own ambivalence toward the new profession. The differentiation of the martial function into a specialized body challenged traditional views of masculine identity and power, and the authors of these novels were keenly aware of the many problems that were posed by this new institution. But this study only serves as a baseline consideration of the role of the professional military in the English novel. While I have opted to focus on the army, and the impact of the process of creating a professional, standing ground combat force on fictional narrative, there are many other lines of inquiry associated with professional military institutions and the English novel.

One can extend my particular reading of military types in English fiction in a number of ways. First, while I have focused on men in early English novels, it is readily apparent that one can examine how female authors have dealt with issues that surround the professional military. The constraints of gender roles in the early eighteenth century have apparently prevented any significant appearance of military types in the works of female authors during the period that I have surveyed; women were not expected to concern themselves deeply with the kind of national issues that war and the professional military often represented. Thus, novels by Haywood, Edgeworth, Inchbald, and Lennox show a marked lack of military types, despite the increasingly militarized character of the society within which they lived, and this absence in itself marks a space for critical speculation. Secondly, one can also look at a military institution with perhaps a greater claim to social and military importance in the period than the army: the Royal Navy. An examination sailors in fiction in the context of the genesis of the Royal Navy as a separate professional institution may reveal modes of representation similar to- or different from their land-bound counterparts. With two female authors writing after

Smollett and into the next century, these two lines of inquiry intersect: Fanny Burney and Jane Austen.

Fanny Burney's abrasive Captain Mirvan, the vulgar source of so much conflict in her "History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World," Evelina (1778), marks one of the earliest extensive treatments of English professional military men by a woman author. In a sense, Mirvan's depiction seems to owe as much to the same tradition of military men as social misfits from which Swift writes; certainly her characterization of Mirvan is more Juvenalian than the more sympathetic treatments of Fielding or Sterne. She certainly stands out from earlier women authors in her willingness to characterize a military man in an unflattering manner, for which she was criticized by her readers; "A common complaint in her own day," writes editor Edward A. Bloom, "was that Captain Mirvan's grossness went beyond credibility" (xxx). Burney's Captain Mirvan seems to belong solidly in the tradition established by the earlier authors.

In the case of Jane Austen, one could argue that she is a kind of transition point for the military character. The works of her early period seem to work within the tradition of detachment or indifference to military types manifested in women authors before Burney, or they continue in the same tradition as Burney. In Northanger Abbey (published in 1803) and Sense and Sensibility (published 1811), the militarization of society is virtually absent, despite the naval careers of the Austen brothers and the omnipresence of war with revolutionary France. General Tilney, the hero's father in Northanger Abbey, and Captain Tilney, the hero's brother, are notable because of the unobtrusive nature of their military experiences: "life at Bath and the Tilney estate went on in the customary, eighteenth-century way, even though England was at war . . . there is no indication that either General or Captain Tilney fought in any of the campaigns against France, or that they or anyone else were aware of the war" (Roberts 95). Colonel Brandon's military career is similarly ignored in Sense and Sensibility, but it is significant

in light of the extraordinary measures taken by male authors to contain soldiers' romantic conquests that Austen marries Elinor and Brandon in the end. In Pride and Prejudice (published 1813) Austen deals with the soldier in terms somewhat more like that of Burney and the earlier male authors. The soldiers at Meryton are clearly a kind of romantic menace, albeit again Austen indicates that the soldier is an object of desire for women of quality--a step that most of the male authors shy away from--through Lydia's subterfuge to vacation at Brighton in order to be near the army encampment. Austen's early novels represent the beginnings of a transition to a new mode of characterizing professional military men in English fiction.

Austen's later works--particularly Mansfield Park (1814) and Persuasion (1817)--represent another site for expanding the critical inquiry into soldiers and their representation in English novels. The profession of arms is more prominent in the later works, possibly as the result of the increasingly massive scale of the Napoleonic Wars of the same period. The fathers of Fanny Price and Jane Fairfax of Mansfield Park, for example, are lieutenants of marines--Lieutenant Fairfax is killed in action, while Lieutenant Price is maimed. The hardships resulting from Fairfax's death and the disability of Price provide an important "background of gloom" to Mansfield Park, and it is another soldier--Colonel Campbell--who "provided for Jane's education and even provided her with a home while growing up" (Roberts 98). Naval officer William Price also figures prominently in the narrative with his tales of service in the Mediterranean and West Indies--another example of military spectacle being used by a novelist. Persuasion expands on the growing acceptance of professional military types in Austen's work. The novel is filled with naval combat veterans--Admiral Croft, Captains Harville and Benwick--and Captain Wentworth. These are thoroughly military characters, rather than characters--like Brandon or the Tilneys--who happen to have military backgrounds. Wentworth's marriage to Anne at the end of the narrative is a note of endorsement of

military professionals as viable members of the upper class--Anne's acceptance of the role wife to a military man indicates Austen's recognition and acceptance of the profession of arms in English society. So while the male authors that I have examined through their representation of soldiers serve as a base for exploration of women authors, women authors--especially Austen--may hold the key for widening the inquiry even further, into issues characteristic of Victorian discourse over the warriors in the midst of English society: the "tame bear."

Works Cited

- Armstrong, Katherine A. Defoe: Writer as Agent. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 1996.
- Blewett, David. Defoe's Art of Fiction. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Bloom, Edward A. Introduction. Evelina. By Fanny Burney. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Boulton, James T., ed. Daniel Defoe. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.
- Davis, Lennard. Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Defoe, Daniel. Colonel Jack. 1722. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1947.
- Farquhar, George. The Recruiting Officer and Other Plays. Ed. William Myers. Oxford Drama Library. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Fielding, Henry. Joseph Andrews and Shamela. Ed. Douglas Brooks-Davies. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- . The History of Tom Jones. 1749. Ed. R. P. C. Mutter. London: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Gordon, Robert C. "Jonathan Swift and the Modern Art of War." Bulletin of Research in the Humanities 83 (1980): 187-202.
- Hayter, Tom. The Army and the Crowd in Mid-Georgian England. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978.
- Higgins, Ian. Swift's Politics: A Study in Disaffection. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Hopkins, Robert. "The Function of the Grotesque in *Humphry Clinker*." Huntington Library Quarterly 32 (1968): 163-177.
- Houlding, J. A. Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

- Lewis, Joanne. "Death and the Comic Marriage: Lismahago in *Harlequin Skeleton*." Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture 18 (1988): 405-417.
- Lock, F. P. Swift's Tory Politics. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1983.
- Macaree, David. Daniel Defoe's Political Writings and Literary Devices. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991.
- McNeil, David. The Grotesque Depiction of War and the Military in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990.
- Novak, Maximillian E. "A Vindication of the Press and the Defoe Canon." SEL 27 (1987): 399-411.
- Roberts, Warren. Jane Austen and the French Revolution. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.
- Schneider, Aaron. "Hearts and Minds in *Joseph Andrews*: Parson Adams and a War of Ideas." Philological Quarterly 66 (1987): 367-389.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. "No Standing Armies!": The Antiarmy Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Smollett, Tobias. The Expedition of Humphry Clinker. 1771. Ed. James L. Thorson. Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1983.
- Sterne, Laurence. Tristram Shandy. Ed. Howard Anderson. Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1980.
- Swift, Jonathan. Gulliver's Travels. 1726. Ed. Peter Dixon and John Chalker. London: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Trenchard, John, and Thomas Gordon. Cato's Letters, or Essays on Liberty, Civil and Religious, and Other Important Subjects. Ed. Ronald Hamowy. Vol. 2. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1995.
- Watt, Ian. The Rise of the Novel. 1957. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1967.

Western, J. R. The English Militia in the Eighteenth Century: The Story of a Political Issue, 1660-1802. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Williams, Noel T. St. John. Redcoats and Courtesans: The Birth of the British Army (1660-1690). London: Brassey's (UK), 1994.

Zomchick, John P. "Social Class, Character, and Narrative Strategy in *Humphry Clinker*." Eighteenth-Century Life 10 (1986): 172-185.