Mary Nyquist, "Friday as Fit Help," *Milton in the Long Restoration*, ed. Blair Hoxby and Ann Baynes Coiro (Oxford, forthcoming).

Friday as Fit Help

Milton and Defoe have long been assigned literary-historical quarters that are decorously distant and unequally furnished. It goes without saying that as the creator of England's prodigiously learned epic, equal if not superior to the epics of Homer and Vergil, Milton should not share space with the scandalously improvident Defoe or his slapdash, promiscuous publications. Defoe (1660-1731) is roughly two generations younger than Milton (1608-1674). The years separating them, however, have been multiplied by the periods of English history to which they have been relegated – Milton the late Renaissance, Defoe the Restoration – with the result that Defoe usually hobnobs with his own homegrown, roguish adventurers, or, for more literary companionship, with Richardson and Fielding. Defoe's references to Milton are occasionally acknowledged.[1] Little has been made, though, of Defoe's extensive engagement with *Paradise Lost* in *Jure Divino* and *The Political History of the Devil*, both of which frequently refer to or cite Milton's epic.[2] That both Milton and Defoe are non-conformists, write in support of political revolution (respectively, the mid-seventeenth century revolution and the Glorious Revolution of 1688), advocate the right of political resistance, and produce their major works during England's rise to eminence as a Euro-colonial power — eminence they actively promote — has apparently not been considered significant.

One might think that Maximillian Novack's influential treatment of Defoe as a writer deeply interested in and knowledgeable about political theory would preclude such neglect.[3] Yet, interestingly, Novack does not name Milton among the political theorists whose ideas matter to Defoe -- Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Sidney, Pufendorf -- presumably because academic protocols place Milton among literary artists not political philosophers. More than a little problematical, this tacit preservation of social distinction, historical periodization, and disciplinary division is not the focus of this essay, however. My primary aim is to establish the terms in which Defoe rewrites the defenses of chattel slavery formulated by Grotius, Hobbes, Milton, and Locke, who despite important differences all follow Roman jurisprudence in assuming chattel slavery's coercive, non-consensual origins.

Commentators have often ignored or minimized the import of Defoe's investment in transatlantic slavery. As an apologist for the Royal African Company and author of several occasional and fictional texts that intervene in controversies about trafficking in and disciplining of African women, men, and children, Defoe has an interest in New World plantation slavery that has no precedent in Milton, who is therefore not consistently relevant to my exploration of Defoe's revisionism. Beginning with late 17th and early 18th centuries calls for the amelioration of English slaving practices, this essay

goes on to examine features of the antityrannicism shared by Defoe and Milton, to explore cannibalism's centrality to *Robinson Crusoe* (hereafter *Crusoe*), and then to analyze its engagement with a central tenet of Locke's *Second Treatise*. This engagement, which, I argue, has not been understood, will be contextualized by a brief, comparative study of Milton, Locke, and Defoe on the topic of penal violence.

Literary interrelations between Milton and Defoe are taken up in the penultimate section, where *Paradise Lost* brings into focus key features of *Crusoe's* revisioning of war slavery doctrine. More specifically, I suggest that Defoe's intimately psychological, temporally extended narrative of Friday's manifestation as the companion and slave (or servant, an important ambiguity) for whom Crusoe has longed may be indebted to Milton's similarly elaborated development of Eve's appearance as Adam's 'fit help'. Like Milton in book 8 of *Paradise Lost*, in the corresponding section of *Crusoe* Defoe creates a complexly ordered narrative that preserves the European male protagonist's representative, public status while foregrounding the private, familial basis of his providentially fulfilled desire (by Eve in *Paradise Lost*, Friday in *Crusoe*). The narrative strategies by means of which *Crusoe* articulates this desire manage some of its infamous contradictions: between spirituality and material acquisitiveness, civility and self-interested instrumentality, the state of 'meer' nature and racialized Euro-colonial hierarchies. If we take as evidence the welcome reception that centuries of readers, illustrators, and students have given Crusoe's rescue and education of Friday—*Crusoe* being, historically, the most widely circulated, re-edited, and adapted Euro-colonialist fictional narrative — Defoe's narrative discourse has been wildly successful. By fostering readers' approving, affective response to the climactic scene in which Crusoe enslaves Friday by saving him from his cannibalistic pursuers, Defoe both masks the violence that sustains transatlantic slavery and furthers his project of making slavery integral to Euro-colonialism's civilizing project.

Reformation of Enslaving and Saving

To understand what Defoe achieves when appropriating Milton's scene of the solitary Adam's desire, we need to analyze Defoe's use of what I call war slavery doctrine. Features of this doctrine, which legitimate a formal connection between military defeat and chattel slavery, appear in Greek and Roman literature before its influential formulation in Roman jurisprudence, where institutional slavery as a practice of the law of nations (*jus gentium*) is said to originate in the military victor's decision to spare rather than to take the lives of the vanquished. In the *Institutes* the significance of this formulation is conveyed by an etymological figure deriving *servire* (to serve) from *servare* (to spare or save): 'Slaves (*servi)* are so called because commanders order captives to be sold and so spare (*servare*) rather than kill them: they are also called *mancipia* because they are taken physically (*manu capi*) from the enemy.'[4] From Bodin through Locke, early modern political theorists are familiar with this passage, which informs countless literary and visual representations of warfare and bondage besides

entering into numerous debates on both figurative, political slavery and actual, chattel slavery.[5]

Novack's observation, frequently cited, that Defoe gives Crusoe the 'right to kill Friday' points to an essential feature of war slavery doctrine. Novack, though, derives this right from 'the right of conquest,' which is not the justificatory tradition to which Defoe appeals.[6] Commonly known as the power of life and death (*potestas necisque vitae*), the power to take life is essentially a life-threatening disciplinary power, which Defoe tends to downplay while making much of Crusoe's determination to save Friday's life. Like many of his contemporaries, Defoe was familiar with the jurisprudential formulation relating *to save* and *to enslave* (*servire*'s descent from *servare* in English) along with its conventional legitimation of the enslaver's disciplinary power of life and death. Generally speaking, Defoe seeks to revise this formulation so as to provide an affective, ethical foundation for the obligation the enslaved owes the life-saver (or life-sparer) and to connect saving with both Euro-colonialism and Christianity. For none of early modernism's major theorists or imaginative artists is war slavery doctrine merely an inconsequentially abstract issue. Each finds an innovative means of integrating a defence of slavery based on war slavery doctrine with systematic reflection on diverse modes of subjection or punishment and on individual or collective rights.

So important is war slavery doctrine to rationalizations of slavery that, on their part, critics of Euro-colonial plantation slavery often question or revise specific aspects of it. Thomas Tryon, for example, has the enslaved African spokesperson of *The Negro's Complaint* call the 'right' to 'murder, enslave and oppress the weaker' nothing more than the 'Power to do so.' Worse, this 'right' is a fiction invented by a destructive 'Centre of Wraith and Fierceness' active equally in heathens and Christians when waging war against members of their own kind.[7] Yet even while presenting war slavery doctrine with such a powerful challenge, Tryon perpetuates it by having it observed by both Europeans and Africans, thus universalizing its practice, and also by implying that the military victor ever has only two opposing choices: to kill or to enslave (that is, to save). This ideologically restrictive either/or occurs when Tryon's speaker recounts how in his native Africa the strongest warring parties kill the vanquished, 'and as for those that they *save alive*, 'tis not out of pity or kindness, but to gratifie their own Covetousness, by making Merchandize of them, and exposing them to Slavery, far worse than Death'(my emphasis, 81). That slavery is worse than death is not, in this formulation, the *topos* it may appear to be. Instead of endorsing the codes of honour that make enslavement a signifier of shameful defeat, Tryon uses it to bring shame on the European Christians and Africans heathens who use war slavery doctrine to rationalize patently commercial ends.

War slavery doctrine is central to the passage in *Reformation of Manners, a Satyr* (1702), a tract-in-verse, where Defoe satirizes England's enthusiastic embrace of transatlantic slavery. Defoe's engagement with war slavery is as complex as Tryon's, though it does not join the latter's outraged assault on plantation slavery's everyday

brutalities and injustices. At this point in *Reformation of Manners*, Defoe's theme is the absence of virtuous behaviour in an age where 'the Tricks and Cheats of Trade' prevail:

> Others seek out to *Africk's* Torrid Zone,
> And search the burning Shores of *Serralone*;
> There in unsufferable Heats *they fry*,
> And run vast Risques to see the Gold, *and die*:
> The harmless Natives basely they trepan,
> And barter Baubles for the *Souls of Men*:
> The Wretches they to Christian Climes bring o'er,
> To serve worse Heathens than they did before.
> The Cruelties they suffer there are such,
> *Amboyna's* nothing, they've out-done the *Dutch*.
> *Cortez, Pizarro, Guzman, Penaloe*,
> Who drank the Blood and Gold of *Mexico*,
> Who thirteen Millions of Souls destroy'd,
> And left one third of God's Creation void;
> Death cou'd *their* cruellest Designs fulfil,
> Blood quench't *their* Thirst, and it suffic'd to kill:
> But these the tender *Coup de Grace* deny
> And make Men beg in vain for leave to die;
> To more than *Spanish* Cruelty inclin'd,
> Torment the Body and debauch the Mind:
> The ling'ring Life of Slavery preserve,
> And vilely teach them both to sin and serve.
> In vain they talk to them of Shades below,
> They fear no Hell, *but where such Christians go*.[8]

This passage is important not least because it has been cited as evidence that Defoe is troubled by Euro-colonial slavery, the inhumanity of which he exposes by sympathetic identification with the enslaved.[9] Certainly, readers acquainted with the so-called 'Black Legend' -- which Anglo-colonial propaganda had exploited for well over a century by this time -- would be struck by Defoe's satiric inversion of the conventional contrast between Spanish barbarity and English civility. Instead of setting the unrestrained violence of Spain's treatment of New World Amerindigenes against England's exemplary high-mindedness, as anti-Spain propaganda ordinarily does, Defoe presents English enslavers of Africans as nastier than even the Dutch at Amboyna, and 'To more than *Spanish* Cruelty inclin'd.'

With this passage Defoe enters contemporaneous debates regarding the trafficking, enslaving, and disciplining practiced by English traders and planters. Used with reference to enslaved Africans, variants of 'Cruelty' testify to Christendom's awareness of the less-then-civil practices sanctioned by the institution of chattel slavery. But what exactly makes English cruelty greater than Spanish? For its point as well as its wit, Defoe's riff on *topoi* relating to the Black Legend relies on war slavery doctrine, the terms of which are also inverted. Where traditionally death is a cruel and enslavement a merciful fate for the vanquished held in the victor's power, Defoe gives the Spanish

massacre of millions the value of a moderate because limited 'cruelty': 'Death cou'd *their* cruellest Designs fulfil, / Blood quench't *their* Thirst, and it suffic'd to kill.' The English, by contrast, sadistically withhold the '*Coup de Grace* that would terminate life and suffering; they thereby '[t]he ling'ring Life of Slavery preserve, /And vilely teach them both to sin and serve.' Although to an extent it may be governed by irony (to rank such cruelties is to expose the absurdity of the ranking), this contrast primarily crystallizes a single, conventional focus: the 'worse' than heathenish treatment of heathens by Christians, whether Spanish or English, whose behaviour instils dread of any afterlife Christians themselves might enter (a trope that goes back at least to Las Casas.)

Like Tryon, then, Defoe uses war slavery doctrine to portray the practice of sparing life for purely profit-driven ends to be no more expressive of humane values than is killing. Under the conditions of plantation slavery, to preserve life is mercilessly to deny 'the tender *Coup de Grace*' with the result that enslaved Africans are left begging not for life but 'in vain for leave to die.' Defoe's emphasis on the disciplinary regime legitimated by war slavery doctrine is not original. While emphases differ, Grotius, Hobbes, and Locke understand the victor's denial of the 'tender *Coup de Grace*' as Defoe does: to enslave is to save but in order to discipline by means of the ongoing threat of death entailed by the victor's power of life and death over the vanquished. Just as significantly, however, Defoe does not follow Tryon in denigrating this 'right' as the self-serving creation of a wrath-driven human imagination. So far as I can tell, Defoe does not query this power's legitimacy, either in the passage just cited or in any of his other writings.

As critique, this passage targets the cruelty involved not in a claim to *possess* the power of life and death but in its uncivilized *exercise*. This not a pedantic or trivial distinction. Presupposing the acceptability of Euro-colonialist war-related activities, it provides a durable basis for the ever-seductive belief that social justice can be achieved by improving conditions for those enslaved. Not the institution of Atlantic slavery but its crass practitioners are the problem. Defoe's language in this passage is accordingly more ideologically inflected than may at first appear. For example, he strategically avoids cognates of 'murder', since early modern theorists generally agree that what is deemed murder occurs only within civil society, where it is a crime. Essentially extra-civil, the power of life and death, on the other hand, is properly conveyed by cognates of 'to kill' or 'to destroy' (the latter Locke's preference), terms that designate lawful modes of taking life, whether the life of non-human animals or of humans outside civil society such as military combatants. Throughout his writings, Defoe tends to respect the juridical distinction between murder and killing. By contrast, Tryon, aware of this distinction, refuses to respect it; in *Negro's Complaint*, he lumps murder together with slaying, killing and destroying when it comes to the vanquished and calls killing of slaves 'murder'. Defoe's avoidance of 'to save' in this passage takes a significantly different turn. Though 'preserve,' the word he chooses, is not uncommon (it's the term Hobbes favours), Defoe suggests its insufficiency by rhyming 'preserve' with 'sin and serve'. With the latter phrase, Defoe charges irreligious English planters with forging a perverse connection between *servare* and *servire.* They 'vilely teach' the enslaved to 'sin and

serve' because without a commitment to civilizing and Christianizing, their extraction of unfree labour in 'Christian climes' provides a model and motive for 'sin'.

Defoe's message in this passage of *Reformation of Manners* is much the same as Morgan Godwyn's 'Trade preferr'd before Religion'. Godwyn adopts a denunciatory, prophetic voice to awaken complacent auditors to the sinfulness of English planters' failure to Christianize Amerindigenes and Africans. Frequently compared unfavourably with Muslims and Romanists, Mammon-worshipping Protestants are adjudged to 'have exceeded the worst of Infidels, by our first *enslaving*, and then *murthering* of Mens *Souls*'.[10] In neglecting heathen souls, England threatens to '*defeat* that his blessed *purpose*, for which, as must be piously supposed, he was pleased to *discover* unto us, and *possess* us of those many rich and fruitful Countries' (23). As the plural pronoun's 'possess us' indicates, Godwyn has no problem with England's success as a colonial power, nor with its investments in plantation slavery. Indeed, Godwyn is eager to remove misapprehensions planters may have about conversion, such as that it might give those who are enslaved big ideas about equality with their masters. Citing an act of Virginia's Assembly for the 'Security of this Interest' together with other legal authorities, Godwyn assures auditors that converted slaves will retain their status (5,6). His aim throughout is to leave English planters without excuse for refusing to 'save' heathen souls.

Defoe is even more keen that England improve its manners so as to merit its destined greatness. But England's greatness requires the unfree labour of Africans. By the late seventeenth century, racialized slavery was so well established in England's colonies that even a severe critic like Tryon simply assumes its continuation. Compelling as appeals to a common, divinely created humanity may have been or may still seem, a call for Christianization is a call for slavery's amelioration and perpetuation. Furthermore, as Godwyn s tracts indicate if it goes beyond conversion effected by preaching, , Christianization brings up the fear that baptism might serve as a gateway to manumission. *Afer Baptizatus*, a sermon by Anthony Hill published the same year as *Reformation of Manners*, is devoted to allaying this fear even while advocating the baptism of enslaved Africans ('Afer' supposedly denoting Africans' progenitor). To persuade resistant planters that baptism, an essential Christian rite, is compatible with slavery, Hill pulls together miscellaneous evidence from Scripture, Councils held by the primitive Church, and English law concerning villeinage. On its basis, Hill authoritatively declares that 'Freedom, oppos'd to Slavery, is no common Right of Christianity.'[11] The conclusion is, again, that Christian baptism will not alter the legal status of the enslaved.

An anonymous participant in this debate, whose revisioning of war slavery doctrine has affinities with Defoe's, applauds Hill's careful circumscription of the 'right' of freedom while affirming the victor's 'right' over the enslaved. In 'The Planter's Charity', the speaker ventriloquizes a 'hardened' planter's opinion (the author's own prior to reading Hill) that if his slaves were to become Christians he would suffer 'the loss of Right and of Estate', that is, they would cease to be his property. The speaker goes on to dismiss this notion, 'vulgarly / Receiv'd, That Slaves when once Baptiz'd are free.' Thanks to the learned Hill, the speaker can now confidently inform planters

> that whilst you strive to save
> A human Soul, you shall not lose your Slave.
> That Christianity won't rob you from
> A Victor's Right, nor injure Christendom.[12]

Historians of natural right discourse may not think these lines worthy of citation. Yet the very ill-fittingness of verse and content ('Victor's Right' is the right to absolute rule over the enslaved) underlines the intelligibility – indeed, respectability – of war slavery doctrine to contemporaneous readers. Note that 'save' here applies to 'Soul', as it does for Godwyn and frequently for Defoe. Aimed specifically at the fate of enslaved Africans' souls, Christianized saving is made compatible with 'A Victor's Right', a form of saving which, authorized by war slavery doctrine, grants a victor propriety over his 'Estate'.

As Defoe elaborates the Christianization of war slavery in *Crusoe*, *Farther Adventures* (hereafter *Adventures*), and *Colonel Jack*, the non-Europeans whose physical lives are saved are also saved civilly and spiritually. In *Adventures*, the priest who urges the negligent Crusoe to provide captive Amerindigenes with religious instruction reminds him that 'no man is sav'd but by Christ and the merits of his passion'.[13] Variants of the verb 'to save' inevitably bring up associations with Christian redemption even where context specifies bodily mortality. Of course, British colonizers do not always achieve the lofty goal of converting heathens to Christianity. But this may not matter all that much, since, as we shall see, for Defoe Christianization is a good means of inculcating European mores. 'I have often observ'd', Crusoe says in *Adventures*, 'that the Christian religion always civilizes the people, and reforms their manners, where it is receiv'd, whether it works *saving* effects upon them or no' (248, my emphasis).

Antityrannicism and Racialized Penalty in Milton and Defoe

Despite numerous differences -- Defoe's celebration of constitutional monarchy being the most prominent – Miton and Defoe unequivocally defend the right of resistance, that is, the right to resist political tyranny. Their polemical works draw on a common repertoire of antityranny tenets, texts, tropes, and rhetorical strategies to vilify the tyrant's refusal to respect the citizenry's lawful privileges or, alternatively, to excoriate the depravity of a population that surrenders them. Antityranny discourse generally applies to collectivities, whether the nation as a whole or those who represent its servile proclivities as opposed to its free-born rights. Tenets relating to popular sovereignty similarly apply to 'the people' as a political community (actual membership of course restricted to propertied male citizens). Like other resistance theorists, Milton and Defoe write eloquently of the people's superiority to the government they institute. Regarding the issues explored here, the people's priority over the ruler is of special importance. It is conceptualized as fundamental, even ontological: the people are the 'original' of political power in the sense of being its sole, constitutive source. Ontological priority may also have a temporal dimension. Throughout the divorce tracts, Milton safeguards the people's analogical priority to government by stressing the chronological

priority of the representative first man's desire to the institution of marriage: just as woman is created *for* man, so the ruler is created *for* the people. [14]In *Iure Divino* Defoe similarly argues that the 'Funds of Power' drawn on by Parliament are supplied by the people who in this sense are '*Immortal*, and as old as Time, / Their Right, as *their Original*, sublime'.[15]

For Milton, Defoe and other religiously-minded supporters of popular sovereignty, the ideological contrary of the people's originary power is the idolatrous servility encouraged by a tyrannous ruler. In a passage from *Iure Divino* castigating England's devotion to Charles II, Defoe depicts the English sacrificing 'Law, Parliament, and Liberty' to the 'Idol Crown'. This idol Defoe christens Molock, the heathen god of child-sacrifice in whose honour brain-washed subjects 'damn to Bonds their *free-born Progeny*.'[16] If England's recent crown-worshipers were ready to sacrifice future generations' rightful freedom, what accounts for the absence of freedom in non-English or non-European nations? Not surprisingly, the answer is usually found in the idolatrous practices that Euro-colonial discourse attributes to members of non-Christian communities, nations, or gigantic land-masses (for example, 'America' and 'Africa'). Even when clearly a feature of non-Christian religious—rather than specifically political—ritual, acts considered idolatrous are associated with collective political servility, as happens, for example, when Milton protests against contemporaneous laws that invest marriage 'with such an awfull sanctity, and give it such adamantine chains to bind with, as if it were to be worshipt like some *Indian* deity.'[17] In such formulations idolatry represents the very superstitious *ethos* from which enlightened European Christendom wishes to distinguish itself.

In many Euro-colonial contexts, idolatry and other heathenish practices are represented as a non-Christian society's defining feature, with the result that its practitioners appear to be statically and thus naturally servile. Mindful of Augustinian theology's emphasis on the penal character of human sinfulness, Milton and Defoe give divine justice official credit for such large-scale, seemingly natural inter-generational irreligiousness. As early as 1641, Milton, for example, associates enslaved Africans with the divinely condemned apologists of episcopacy whom he imagines in the '*darkest* and *deepest Gulfe* of HELL', lying forever subject to demonic inmates who 'exercise a *Raving* and *Bestiall Tyranny* over them as their *Slaves* and *Negro's*'.[18] In Book 12 of *Paradise Lost*, an excursus on postlapsarian human servitude distinguishes individual psycho-ethical servitude and collective political servitude, both remediable, from the ongoing, outward servitude that befalls 'nations' unworthy of freedom. Explicitly tracing such servitude to the 'heavy curse' that falls on Ham's 'vicious Race,' Milton attributes this more irrevocable loss of liberty to 'Justice, and some fatal curse annext'.[19]

For Defoe, too, the burden of Original Sin, theologically a degrading congenital condition imposed equally on everyone, tends to fall more conspicuously on darker-skinned nations. Ponderous claims about the divinely imposed penal privation that afflicts selected non-Christian nations recur throughout *Crusoe*. They serve Crusoe in his

struggle to understand the scandalous behaviour of the Amerindigenous people he encounters on the island, who, he reasons,

> had been suffer'd by providence in his wise Disposition of the World, to have no other Guide than that of their own abominable and vitiated Passions; and consequjently were left, and perhaps had been so for some Ages, to act such horrid Things, and receive such dreadful Customs, as nothing but Nature entirely abandon'd of Heaven, and acted by some hellish Degeneracy, could have run them into.[20]

Though language such as 'abominable and vitiated Passions' is often used of Original Sin, the effect of this passage, which twice mentions God's penal withdrawal, is to suggest that the abandoned 'savages', as Crusoe repeatedly calls them, are peculiarly susceptible to further vitiation, as is ambiguously confirmed when their actions are attributed to nature 'acted by some hellish Degeneracy.'

Cannibalism, Killing, and Saving in 'Robinson Crusoe'

Crusoe's many diatribes against the customs of people abandoned by God are sparked by 'cannibalism', the racialized term Euro-colonialism invents for the anthropophagy ostensibly practised in the New World and Africa. Although ritual human sacrifice performed for 'idols' is mentioned, idolatry is not at issue in the island section of *Crusoe* (as it is in *Adventures* and *History of the Devil*). Why this heavy-handed emphasis on cannibalism? The most obvious answer is that Crusoe's visceral, ever-present fear of being devoured involves readers intensely in his individual fate. As countless later adventure narratives, travel literature, newscasts, and films attest, life-threatening behaviour on the part of non-European subalterns is a sure-fire device for strengthening affective bonds with European protagonist(s).

There are other explanatory contexts, as well, though. First, on the level of charged associations, verbal forms of 'devour' are a conventional feature of antityranny discourse, which depicts the tyrant as a voracious consumer of his subjects' goods or, worse, of their lives. Against ideal forms of political rule, which nurture the citizenry's material, civic, or spiritual wealth for the good of all, the tyrant typically either claims ownership of this wealth on the model of the slave-master *vis a vis* his slaves or greedily devours it as a predatory beast would its prey. In his antiprelatical tracts Milton associates tyrannous devouring with the corrupt clergy, who have morphed from watchful shepherds into hungry wolves stalking their unprotected Christian sheep, while in *Lycidas* they appear, unforgettably, as 'Blind mouths'! (l.119). On its title-page, the 1713 edition of Locke's *Two Treatises* cites Livy on the tyrant's insatiable appetite for his people's blood and flesh, while in the *First Treatise* Locke attacks patriarchal-royalism using what purports to be ethnographic evidence that Peruvians have children "on purpose to Fatten and Eat them".[21]Devouring tyranny is one of Defoe's favourite anti-tyranny tropes, used liberally whenever avariciousness or indifference to the citizenry's distinctive privileges are vituperated. In this context, *Crusoe*'s unusual stress on his protagonist's fear of being

devoured represents a colonialist adaptation, possibly inspired by Locke, of a popular polemical trope. Cannibalism, a staple of Euro-colonialist discourse, is made congruent with antityrannicism, central to resistance theory: he or they who 'devour' stand in hostile, life-threatening antagonism to those who are vulnerable to being devoured. In consequence, the political community or individual European threatened with being devoured possesses a natural right to self-preservation.

We will consider this right further in the next section. At present, it is worth noting that Defoe does not make use of a countervailing trope employed by other early critics of Atlantic slavery: enslavers as greedy devourers of the wealth produced by their slaves. Godwyn, for example, accuses profit-hungry planters of being unashamed 'to debase *Men*, made in the *Image of God* (no less than themselves,) and *whose Flesh is as their own*' to the level of lowly non-human creatures, and then immediately charges them with self-animalization. In boasting that they travel to the colonies to get 'Money and Estates', the planters, Godwyn claims, show they have no higher aim than 'the Beasts of the Field, only *to devour*' (17). Metaphorical cannibalism is hinted at here in the reference to 'Flesh' and, of course, in 'devour'. It is elaborated by Tryon when his African spokesperson satirizes masters 'who sport your selves in all manner of superfluity and wantonness, and grow fat with our Blood and Sweat, gormandizing with the fruits procured by our Slavery and sore Labour' (96). Tryon is fond of this figure, which appears again when his speaker addresses the Christian God: 'O thou great Preserver of men! They enslave and oppress thy poor unworthy Servants, and are drunk with our Blood and Sweat' (122).

There is nothing figurative about the flesh and blood devoured by Defoe's 'Savages'. As a practice, the eating of human flesh offers Defoe's protagonist opportunities to entertain cultural relativism, as earlier it did Montaigne.[22] Unlike Montaigne, however, Crusoe pursues various lines of reasoning in the urgent, high-pressured expectation of deciding if or how he is to act. While his first, powerful impulse is to kill cannibalism's practitioners, when Crusoe asks himself whether he has the 'Authority, or Call' to execute justice on them as 'Criminals', he reasons that they don't believe what they do to be wrong: 'They think it no more a Crime to kill a Captive taken in War, than we do to kill an Ox; nor to eat humane Flesh, than we do to eat Mutton' (190). Comparing the normatively high value Euro-Christians give human life, to Amerindigenes' shockingly low—equivalent to the value European Christians ('we') place on ox or sheep—Crusoe's charitable reflection places relativism in the service of racialized denigration. Yet it resolves Crusoe's initial ethical dilemma by removing cannibalism from a judicial framework that positions him as an executioner of justice.

In the passage immediately following, Crusoe acknowledges that Christians, too, can be ruthless; they often kill war captives and even those who have voluntarily submitted: 'these People were not Murtherers…any more than those Christians were Murtherers, who often put to Death the Prisoners taken in Battle; or more frequently, upon many Occasions, put whole Troops of Men to the Sword, without giving Quarter, though they threw down their Arms and submitted'(191). Here, at the bar of *ius gentium*, Christians and non-Christians are both exonorated: in relation to the militarily

vanquished, killing is not murder. Yet despite its reassuringly dispassionate tone, enslaving as saving—the practice preferred by Europeans— appears less brutal, indeed, commendably civilized, when set against the killing, or in the case of the 'savages', killing and eating, of war captives. Defoe frequently identifies the victims of ritual cannibalism as war captives, thereby inviting contrast between its practitioners, victorious in their own inconsequential, internecine manner, and Europeans, whose proven military superiority has produced plantations the prosperity of which owes everything to enslaved Africans.

A related advantage of cannibalism's prominence is that it gives Defoe an opportunity to engage issues initially raised by Spanish depredations in the New World. Arguments for and against the legitimacy of waging a just war against people who commit acts construed as violations of natural law are recapitulated by Crusoe at the level of individual conscience. As his indignation loses some of its edge, Crusoe's schemes to 'destroy some of these Monsters in their cruel bloody Entertainment' (188) give way to reflective probing. Defoe shows his ethically sensitive English protagonist coming to the realization that he has no justification for taking up arms against people whose customs, however barbarous, do not concern him because they pose no threat to his life. This conclusion, Crusue recognizes, sets him apart from the Spanish, in relation to whom Amerindigenes were equally 'innocent'. As he steps back from what he now considers 'wilful Murther', readers are presented with familiar anti-Spanish sentiments:

> [T]his would justify the Conduct of the *Spaniards* in all their Barbarities practis'd in *America*, and where they destroy'd Millions of these People, who however they were Idolaters and Barbarians, and had several bloody and barbarous Rites in their Customs, such as sacrificing human Bodies to their Idols, were yet, as to the *Spaniards*, very innocent People; and that the rooting them out of the Country, is spoken of with the utmost Abhorrence and Detestation, by even the *Spaniards* themselves, at this Time; and by all other Christian Nations of *Europe*, as a meer Butchery, a bloody and unnatural Piece of Cruelty, unjustifiable either to God or Man (191).

More seems to be at stake here, though, than the intra-European-state rivalry the Black Legend usually sanctions. If Spaniards themselves now condemn their conquistadorial, imperial violence — a reformed stance Defoe underscores in both *Crusoe* and *Adventures* by emphasizing the Spanish Governour's extraordinary civility and humanity —a new era of kindly, paternalistic Euro-colonialism may be taking shape.

Milton, Locke, and Defoe on Executing Justice and on Slavery

It has not been recognized that in this and related passages, Defoe definitively rejects Locke's tenet in the *Second Treatise* that individuals naturally possess the right to punish offences against the law of nature. In 'State of Nature', Locke categorically asserts that '*every Man hath a Right to punish the Offender, and be Executioner of the*

Law of Nature' (II.2.8). Defoe grasps what modern commentators wish to avoid: characterizing certain actions as declarations of 'War against all Mankind' and legitimating military punishment of the 'Offender', Locke appropriates Spanish defences of armed violence against criminally transgressive Amerindigenes, at the same time preserving a natural juridical right to punish the criminalized tyrant).[23] In explicitly rejecting this rationalization of armed violence as a 'Right', Crusoe dismisses the notion that neighbouring 'Cannibals' knowingly commit an 'Offence' or are guilty of a 'Crime': what they do 'is not against their own Consciences reproving, or their Light reproaching them'(190). Besides decriminalizing cannibalism, Defoe has Crusoe refuse the offices of 'Judge and Executioner' on those whom 'Heaven had thought fit for so many Ages to suffer unpunish'd, to go on, and to be as it were, the Executioners of his Judgments one upon another' (190).

As this indicates, where Locke places the right of juridical violence in the hands of 'every Man', Defoe has Crusoe yield the right of judgement and prosecution of justice to 'Heaven'. Humanity's inability to encompass the ways of divine justice — on whose offices it ought not infringe — is a basic Protestant principle that receives scant attention in the *Second Treatise* but infuses Defoe's providentialism. In its eschewal of juridical violence as an individual natural right, Defoe's state of nature is much closer to Milton's than to Locke's, since Defoe's 'Heaven', like Milton's, is notoriously oriented towards judgement, punishment, and rewards. From a more conventionally Protestant standpoint, Locke's claim that judgement and execution of justice are a natural, human right does indeed seem 'strange,' as he allows (II.2.9).

Despite this major difference, Milton, Defoe, and Locke all refer to 'Nations' when discussing slavery. Milton, we saw, aligns divine justice with the outward servitude of unspecified 'Nations' by assigning slavery's origins to the justice of the Hamitic 'curse'. Locke uses 'Nations' when contrasting 'Jews, as well as other Nations' who practice voluntary servitude with those under the sway of 'perfect slavery', which involves degrading subjection to an 'Absolute, Arbitrary, Despotical Power'(II.4.24). Defoe has no qualms about using 'curse of Ham' as invective, but in his more considered reflections attributes a nation's eligibility for slavery either to the Deity's penal withdrawal or to Satan.[24] Crusoe, for example, explains that cannibalism is to be tried by 'the Governour of Nations' who 'knows how by National Punishments to make a just Retribution for National Offences' (191). In *History of the Devil*, Defoe conjectures that Satan may be responsible for conveying the first inhabitants to America (likely, Defoe thinks, from Africa) as well as for ensuring their isolation for above 3,000 years. When they were discovered by Europeans, Satan was 'in a full and quiet Possession of them, ruling them with an arbitrary Government, particular to himself.'[25]

In safeguarding divine justice, neither Milton, Defoe, nor Locke actually uses the phrase 'power of life and death' or its Latin original, at least so far as I am aware. Locke, however, makes it clear that the Euro-colonial subject who enslaves someone has the right 'to take away his Life, when he pleases,' a right Locke grounds in war slavery doctrine. Exploitation of labour is similarly justified by the notion that the enslaver to whom the enslaved has criminally forfeited his life 'may (when he has him in his Power)

delay to take it, and make use of him to his own Service' (II.4.23). As we have seen, Defoe likewise assumes that the enslaver has this right and, like Locke, tacitly binds it to war slavery doctrine. *Paradise Lost*'s presentation of the Hamitic curse serves as a compact defence of slavery, whether national or personal. Unlike Defoe or Locke, however, Milton does not imaginatively reconstruct slavery's actual operations except in *Paradise Lost,* where the punishment imposed on the rebel angels for the war they instigate and lose turns them into everlasting slaves. Milton's epic revises war slavery doctrine so as to make the fallen angels suffer *both* spiritual death and servitude.[26] In the moment their formal penalty is imposed, they are referred to as 'th' accurst" (VI.850).

Given this involved set of options and his rejection of a natural juridical right, how does Defoe rationalize slavery? In a baffling about-face, Defoe's protagonist in *Crusoe* decides that he *does* have the right to kill 'Cannibals' despite his relegation of juridical right to divine justice. In fact, Crusoe eventually kills the two men (in the case of the second, he oversees Friday's killing) who run after the fleeing Friday. Is this a shamelessly open contradiction, not too worrisome since, having staged Crusoe's conversion as well as his internal reflections, Defoe has persuasivly established his protagonist's ethico-spiritual credentials? To an extent it is. But Defoe maintains the distinction between wrongful juridical killing and self-defence. Later, Crusoe pointedly repeats his critique of juridically based killing just before he and Friday shoot twenty-one 'Wretches' gathered to dispose of a white Christian, rescue of whom is so obviously just that rationalization is not required (242, 43).

So what happens to sanction killing in self-defence? Regarding interactions between Crusoe and the human 'Creatures' who visit the island, the answer is, nothing at all. Crusoe's major internal debate, which rejects juridical killing, takes place in his 15th year on the island, after he discovers the charred remains of ritually consumed human flesh. His embrace of self-preservative killing takes place in his 24th year, nearly two years after he witnesses from afar the ritual performance of war-cannibalism and during the time of his preoccupation with getting possession of a captive. At no time in these twenty-four years are visitors made aware of his presence. Yet at this point in the narrative, Crusoe reminds readers of his earlier arguments against juridical killing, then says, 'I had other Reasons to offer now (*viz*.) that those Men were Enemies to my Life, and would devour me, if they could; that it was Self-preservation in the highest Degree, to deliver my self from this Death of a Life, and was acting in my own Defence, as much as if they were actually assaulting me, and the like' (214,15) Both before and after this passage Crusoe expresses his aversion to shedding human blood, thereby distracting readers from the question: how have people who know absolutely nothing of his existence become 'Enemies' to his life?

To pre-empt this question, Defoe has recourse to narrative sleights-of-hand. The first appears in the phrase, 'this Death of a Life,' which emotively conveys the recurrent, debilitating anxieties Crusoe has suffered about being eaten. The second, more critical, is the craftily introduced suggestion that sojourners to the island consume human flesh not only ritually, in celebration of military victory, but as an ordinary part of their diet. This is not a minor reconceptualization. It removes cannibalism from practices associated with

warfare — significant, if not central, to the relativism earlier reflections opened up — and re-inserts it into the category of the incomprehensively sub-human. Though Crusoe has always regarded it as a degenerate custom, the more closely his narrative approaches the encounter with Friday the more insistently is cannibalism linked to imminent endangerment. Shortly before claiming a right to self-preseervation, Crusoe thinks with astonishment of how close he has been for years to 'the worst kind of Destruction, *viz.* That of falling into the Hands of Cannibals, and Savages, who would have seiz'd on me with the same View, as I did of a Goat, or a Turtle; and have thought it no more a Crime to kill and devour me, than I did of a Pidgeon, or a Curlieu'(212).[27] By contrast with the relativizing passage cited earlier, Defoe here elides cannibalism's ritual character. Stripped of ties to warfare, the devouring of human flesh degrades both eaters and eaten. Its practitioners inexplicably choose to seize and eat human beings the way Crusoe would goats or turtles. Note that in this comparison Crusoe draws on game ('a Pidgeon, or a Curlieu') enjoyed by contemporaneous English, for whom goats and turtles might be too exotic. Variants of 'falling into the Hands of Cannibals, and Savages' become short-hand for the anarchic death, dismemberment, and consumption of which Crusoe lives in terror.

Defoe's third sleight-of-hand has the greatest effect narratologically and jurisprudentially: Crusoe covertly endows lawful self-defence with an elasticity capable of expressing 'self'-identification with a victim of savagery, on the basis of which armed intervention is justified. Gradual development of this arbitrarily extended defence of 'self' prepares for and ultimately structures Crusoe's encounter with Friday. Even before entering into agonized consideration of juridical versus self-preservative killing, Crusoe discloses an unusual motive for military action: accompanying his impulse to 'destroy' the perpetrators he feels an urge to 'save the Victim they should bring hither to destroy' (188). Crusoe's need to 'save' the victim suggests a momentary capacity for cross-racial identification that conflicts with the novel's uniformly racialized dehumanization of its Amerindigenous hordes (not, I believe, to be honoured as 'Caribs'.)[28] Yet in lieu of multiple victims whose remains he has discovered, Crusoe here fantasizes saving a *single* designated victim. Emphasis on a lone victim continues unobtrusively throughout the lengthy section that begins with these words (or perhaps the single footprint?), reaches its climax with the twin acts of saving Friday and destroying his adversaries, and concludes with Crusoe's induction of Friday into Christianity and civility.

The narrative momentum acquired by Crusoe's impulse to 'save' a victim (explored in the next section) obscures the dubious legitimacy of his self-preservative aggression. If we recall Crusoe's physical revulsion on first seeing the remains of war-cannibalism (revulsion discharged in vomiting), the victim-to-be-saved's isolation seems to associate Crusoe's need to save with the threat ritual cannibalism poses to his own psycho-physical integrity.[29] Projecting his struggle for whole-bodily survival onto the victim-to-be-saved, Crusoe's identificatory bond makes the victim's 'enemies' his, which, in turn, makes the fatal violence he directs against them simultaneously an act of self-defence and an iconic act of humanitarian intervension. In this psychologically oriented, protagonist-centred fashion, *Crusoe* fictionally adapts the tenet, affirmed by Locke, that violators of natural law are enemies of humankind so as to fuse it with a

scene in which 'self'- preservative force gets directed against an enemy hot in pursuit of a victim elected by that self.

Just as significantly, in setting both protagonist and potential victim against deadly enemies, Defoe's novel recreates the conditions necessary for war slavery, conditions in which saving and enslaving become kin. Crusoe does not, of course, either vanquish Friday or purchase him as a war captive whose life victors have spared; strictly speaking, he should have no power of life and death over him. Crusoe instead saves Friday in the sense of rescuing him *from* enemies who have vanquished his people and taken him captive. Yet this distinction is fudged. From the frightened Friday's perspective, mediated glimpses of which readers are shown, Crusoe—who continues to hold the firearm that killed one of his pursuers nd knocked out the other—may indeed regard him, too, as an enemy (217,18). While Crusoe treats the 'Savages' who pursue Friday as his enemies as well as Friday's, Friday, could just as easily be in hot pursuit of those vanquished by his people. From Crusoe's viewpoint, as practioners of war-cannibalism the 'Savages' are all potentially enemies and thus available for saving and enslaving. On the one occasion he imagines saving a number of captives, Crusoe assumes they would all become slaves (a state *Adventures* calls 'absolute slavery' and Locke 'perfect slavery'): 'I fancied my self able to manage One, nay, Two or Three Savages, if I had them so as to make them entirely Slaves to me, to do whatever I should direct them, and to prevent their being able at any time to do me any Hurt' (215). Anyone with a passing knowledge of Atlantic slavery would have known that unregulated disciplinary power is needed to achieve these goals.

Desiring and Receiving a Fit Help

Between books 4 through 10 of *Paradise Lost* and the island section of *Crusoe* there are many intertextual relations, among which are the paradisal land's remarkable fertility and superfluous productivity; the 'natural' pleasures enjoyed by characters who represent European civility and industry; the equally 'natural' institution of pre-political, patriarchal-monarchical rule; the presence of unthreatening, non-human animals; the protagonists' reliance on the divine Word, uttered for Eve and Adam, scriptural for Crusoe; the fostering of readers' identification with white protagonists' vulnerability to hostile, death-dealing invasion; what Adam calls the 'strange/ Desire of wand'ring' Eve follows in the separation scene and Crusoe's 'foolish inclination of wandring' (which recurs in *Adventures*); the foreboding of disaster counterposed by signs of providential guidance; the ongoing communication between mediated divinity and fallen humanity (in Crusoe's case, post-conversion); and the initial state of loneliness experienced by the male protagonists. Although all these interrelations need to be explored, especially as features of Euro-colonialism, only the last will be taken up here.

In both *Paradise Lost* and *Crusoe*, a shared intertext gives loneliness structure and significance. In the second, Yahwist account of creation the Creator declares, 'It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him' (Genesis 2:

18).[30] This Scriptural text is key to Milton's exegetical pyrotechnics in the divorce tracts, where he castigates contemporaneous law-makers and exegetes for failing to grasp its import. Because, according to God's own words, Milton tirelessly argues, woman and therefore marriage itself were created for the purpose of solacing lonely Adam, a marriage failing to provide such solace is not actually marriage. In *Paradise Lost*, Milton has the Deity's 'It is not good' words conclude a lengthy dialogue with Adam; their purpose is to reveal that the animals offered as potential mates (in Genesis a scene that follows Jahweh's words) were merely a 'trial' of Adam's ability to judge what is 'fit and meet'. For Milton, the narrative priority that Adam's desire has over its rational articulation, divine sanction, and .fulfilment in the creation of Eve has enormous ideological implications. On the basis of the analogical argumentation commonly used to correlate the private household and the state, this priority shows both marriage and political rule to be social formations that are instituted (or co-instituted with the Creator) to meet the need(s) of those who initially conceive them. In polemical contexts, the originary status of Adam's need for a companion is the analogue of the priority (male) citizens have over their ruler(s) or political representatives, who remain in office only insofar as they reasonably fulfill the purpose for which they were instituted.

Judging from the severity with which in *History of the Devil* he criticizes the antitrinitarian implications of the chronology Milton creates for Satan's fall,[31] Defoe would have appreciated Milton's re-ordered elaboration of the Genesis narrative together with its significance as an aspect of popular sovereignty. More generally, the Genesis words negating aloneness were central to reflections in pre-modern Christendom on the sanctioned naturalness of sociability and the unnaturalness of solitude. Though their relevance to *Crusoe* has been neglected, in *Serious Reflections*, Defoe echoes them when he disparages the religious ascetic's search for isolation or permanent retreat: 'Man is a Creature so form'd for Society, that it may not only be said, that it is not good for him to be alone, but 'tis really impossible he should be alone.'[32] With respect to food, shelter, crockery, and other necessities, Defoe's protagonist nearly disproves this assertion. But *Crusoe* insists on its psychological truth. The impossibility of human aloneness at times appears as the fitting, divine punishment for Crusoe's rejection of social bonds, at times the unspeakable lack at the heart of his paradise. The latter is Derek Walcott's suggestion in 'Crusoe's Island':

> Upon this rock the bearded hermit built
> His Eden:
> Goats, corn crop, fort, parasol, garden,
> Bible for Sabbath, all the joys
> But one
> Which sent him howling for a human voice. [33]

Crusoe's anguish at his solitary state is captured perfectly in Walcott's enjambed, isolated 'But one.' The phrase also exactly repeats the language used at the prospect of human companionship that suddenly arises when Crusoe sees a ship go down off shore. After

over twenty years of solitude, the possibility that *but one* human being has survived floods Crusoe with desires:

> I cannot explain by any possible Energy of Words, what a strange longing or hankering of Desires I felt in my Soul upon this Sight; breaking out sometimes thus; O that there had been *but one* or two; nay, or *but one* Soul sav'd out of this Ship, to have escap'd to me, that I might *but have had one* Companion, one Fellow-Creature to have spoken to me, and to have convers'd with! (my emphasis)

Two paragraphs later, Crusoe again tries to express 'these earnest Wishings, That *but one* Man had been sav'd! O that it had been *but One!* I believe I repeated the Words, O that it had been *but One*! A thousand Times; and the Desires were so mov'd by it, that when I spoke the Words, my Hands would clinch together, and my Fingers press the Palms of my Hands' (158-9) (my emphasis). So intense is his longing that Crusoe seems almost dissociated from it, referring not to my desires but 'the desires'.

But no one survives. The purpose of this episode is to stir up the longing for a human companion later transferred to the victim Crusoe hopes to save. It is crucial, however, that the imagined object of Crusoe's awakened, tumultuous desire for 'but one' is a European Christian. A 'Savage' could not and does not directly occasion such longing. Milton's Adam experiences and expresses his desire for a female partner when trying to explain how unsuitable the non-human animals are for what he has in mind ('among unequals what society'/ Can sort' [9.383-4). Crusoe's desire for a male companion is likewise awakened and expressed only when he can imagine enjoying the society of someone who is equal in the sense of being a European Christian. Because Crusoe's desire is not immediately satisfied, it prepares for the subsequently elaborated desire for a 'Savage' slave or servant with which it becomes integrated. Initially, the scene of 'earnest Wishings' involves Crusoe's hope that 'but one Man had been sav'd', with 'sav'd' having the sense of having been naturally or providentially spared death by shipwreck. Yet as he is about to set off to explore the wreck, Crusoe excitedly imagines 'that there might be yet some living Creature on board, whose Life I might not only save, but might by saving that Life, comfort my own to the last Degree.' Here 'saving' has the sense of rescue that it has in Crusoe's fantasies of saving a victim of war-cannibalism from death. The life-giving 'comfort' he envisions is, though, closer to the psycho-spiritual solace provided by Milton's first marriage than anything Crusoe has so far associated with victim-saving.

Narratologically, then, this episode introduces subjective dynamism and complexity to Crusoe's interest in rescuing a non-European victim, which up to this point has been fairly impersonal. Once Crusoe has experienced the force of these wishings he feels a compelling need to go on board the wreck to see if he can find a survivor. This compulsion Crusoe calls an 'Impression', which, he says, 'was so strong upon my Mind, that it could not be resisted, that it must come from some invisible Direction, and that I should be wanting to my self if I did not go' (206). Not long before this episode, Crusoe reflects on the wisdom of following 'secret Hints', or 'pressings' of the mind, and

counsels others ‘not to slight such secret Intimations of Providence, let them come from what invisible Intelligence they will’ (194-95).Taking this hint, readers can interpret Crusoe’s emotionally charged response to the prospect of saving *but one* fellow Christian as a sign that his ‘earnest wishings’ are themselves divinely approved even if not at this moment satisfied. As in *Paradise Lost*, desire for a companion precedes its fulfilment, but in the interim (a year and a half for Crusoe) is providentially strengthened and blessed.

Crusoe’s ‘impression’ serves as a promise of sorts, equivalent, perhaps, to the promise Adam’s Creator makes before putting him into a trance, when Adam is told to expect ‘Thy likeness, thy fit help, thy other self, / Thy wish, exactly to thy heart’s desire’(8.450-52). We may also see the dreamlike state in which Adam joyfully perceives Eve formed from his rib (8. 470-77) as the biblical epic’s counterpart of Crusoe’s dream of a lone fugitive from war-cannibalism seeking refuge with him. (This dream comes after the scene of ‘earnest Wishings’.) Just as Adam plunges into a desperate state when he awakens to find the dream-woman gone (8.478-80), Crusoe falls into ‘a very great Dejection of Spirit’ when awakening to find that his victim-saving ‘was no more than a Dream’ (214). Waking to a reality that painfully shatters a wish-fulfilling dream-vision is a long-lived, cross-cultural literary trope. Yet neither Milton nor Defoe is content to sever dream from reality. When Eve returns to Adam led by her creator (a return to the Genesis narrative where Jahweh formally presents his creation), Adam, overjoyed, beholds her, ‘Such as I saw her in my dream’(8. 482). Likewise, Crusoe’s dream so closely foreshadows the later reality involving Friday that when a lone escapee begins running towards him he ‘expected that part of my Dream was coming to pass’ (216). Though he counsels himself not presumptuously to expect his dream to be translated into reality, it is not necessary: the whole adventure turns out exactly as he had dreamt, with only minor discrepancies. Shortly before Crusoe begins strategizing how to kill Friday’s pursuers, he insists once more on the scheme’s providential design. He feels ‘irresistibly, that now was my Time to get me a Servant, and perhaps a Companion, or Assistant; and that I was call’d plainly by Providence to save this poor Creature’s Life’(217). Here for the first time companionship joins Crusoe’s more strictly instrumental needs (the indigenous knowledge that will help deliver him having priority), thereby seamlessly tying the scene of saving with the earlier scene of wishings.

If, as has been remarked, Defoe feminizes Friday, this is in part because Friday’s compliant temperament is stereotypically both feminine and Amerindigenous but also because Europeanized descriptors contrast his physical appearance with that of Africans: Friday has ‘a very good Countenance, not a fierce and surly Aspect’; ‘His Hair was long and black, not curl’d like Wool’; ‘The Colour of his Skin was not quite black’; ‘his Nose small, not flat like the Negroes’ (219-20). Less overtly, however, it results from the strategic priority Defoe gives Crusoe’s desire *vis a vis* the providentially proferred object of its fulfilment. To the extent that readers register them, affinities between Crusoe’s productive desire and Adam’s in *Paradise Lost* underline Friday’s position as feminized object of inspired dream-vision and desire. Perhaps they also account for what in Walcott’s *Pantomime* the white English employer, Trewe, nervously dismisses as ‘such a corny interpretation of the Crusoe-Friday relationship’, when brainstorming with his

employee, the black Jamaican Jackson, about their performance of a cross-racial version of *Crusoe*.[34]

In Milton's epic, both the invisible 'Presence Divine' and Adam intervene to correct the wayward Eve, who turns away from Adam as soon as she sees him. In their retrospective narrations, Eve and Adam give different accounts of this initial encounter, discrepancies between which reveal the narrating character's particular frailty. In Eve's narration, Adam is shown resorting to a bit of force —his 'gentle hand/ Seiz'd mine' (4. 488-49)— to prevent a second disappearance. Defoe's representation of the initial encounter involves a fearful, not wayward, Friday, but Crusoe, like Adam, coaxes an initially resistant, childlike lesser being into interrelationship. *Crusoe* does not formally differentiate Crusoe's point of view from Friday's, however. Though Friday's perspective is occasionally conveyed, it is focalized through Crusoe, whose interpretation of Friday's nonverbal gestures authoritatively interpolates them into his first-person narration. As if conveying an impartial even-handedness, Crusoe also reports his own use of nonverbal, gestural language, the purpose of which is to encourage the timorous Friday to overcome his fear. Unlike Eve, Friday not only responds positively to Crusoe's encouragement but also immediately knows his place. This, at least, is how Crusoe masterfully interprets Friday's non-verbal kneeling 'in token of acknowledgement for my saving his Life', and the prostration that follows in which Friday places Crusoe's foot upon his head, 'in token of swearing to be my Slave for ever.'

This 'saving' is ambiguous. Readers have long been on intimate terms with Crusoe's desire to save a lone victim of war-cannibalism. Yet readers are encouraged to entertain Friday's alternative, strategically mediated, reading of the encounter: Crusoe has saved, that is, spared, Friday's life when he could have taken it. Already a war captive, Friday has just witnessed the peculiar-looking foreign paleface in the act of killing (or trying to kill, since Crusoe initially avoided shooting lest the noise give him away) his two captors. Not having had readers' privileged access to Crusoe's interiority, Friday has every reason to expect Crusoe to kill him, too. In any case, according to Crusoe's retrospective narration, Friday, not Crusoe, draws the connection dictated by war slavery doctrine by placing Crusoe's foot on his head: having been saved, he is now forever enslaved. Friday's understanding rests on what readers are presumably to take as war slavery's universally recognized codes and gestures, which are immediately intelligible to Crusoe, just as Friday apparently expects them to be. Put more plainly, what Crusoe complacently recognizes is Friday's belief that he is one of the enemies Crusoe has vanquished but is now prepared to save.

Crusoe not only declines to disabuse Friday of this belief but also joins saving with enslaving when he assumes the power of life and death over him. This power enables Crusoe to threaten to kill Friday should he ever again hanker after human flesh (reinscribing the ideologeme that it's a food-source). It is also evident in precautions Crusoe takes when arranging separate sleeping quarters, as well as in his decision to teach Friday how to operate a firearm only when confident that he no longer need threaten Friday with it and when Friday can be trusted not to use it against his master.

Once this degree of identification-with-the-master has been attained, in *Adventures* Crusoe can declare that his man Friday was 'as true to me as the very flesh upon my bones' (63). Though not exactly 'flesh of my flesh, bone of my bones,' this is a close approximation, with the advantage that the identification, now one-way, lacks the dangerous tendency to idealize that befalls Adam once woman is created from his side. Defoe's most memorable achievement, however, is the fantastical spectacle of *voluntarily* contracted enslavement, in perpetuity, to a private master.

Why Friday is (not) African and the Principle of Saving

What prompted Defoe to set *Crusoe* and *Adventures* in the mid-seventeenth century, decades before it was written, and to place his lonely protagonist amidst Amerindigenes not Africans?[35] In concluding, I would like to speculate on these questions and to propose that Defoe's trilogy lets him engage issues relating to Atlantic slavery without doing so directly. Even a casual survey of *Crusoe's* extraordinary influence reveals that Friday is often represented or discussed as a black African.[36] Because the history of Defoe's novel coincides with the rapid rise of transatlantic slavery and its multiple, ongoing aftershocks, this legacy would seem to leave us spinning forever within a hermeneutic circle. Yet the possibility that *Crusoe* offers an oblique defence of plantation slavery is greatly strengthened by an as yet unremarked signifier of Friday's African ancestry: 'Friday', the name Crusoe gives his fit help, is modelled on the West African, specifically Akan, practice of naming a newborn after the day on which s/he was born. With his knowledge of the ins and outs of England's investments in transatlantic slavery, Defoe would have been familiarity with this practice. Scholarship on day-names suggests that though initially used to retain continuity with ancestors and possibly to resist the names imposed by Europeans, they later became generic signifiers of enslaved status. Significantly, 'Cuffey', transliteration of the Akan word for 'Friday', was a widely used male name. [37] In 1719, the date of its publication, informed colonists, investors, traders, and planters would have recognized that Defoe adapts the African practice of birth-day-naming to Crusoe's day of 'saving'. Yet Crusoe bestows the name 'Friday' not only to commemorate this day but also ritually to create the new, enslaved identity that obliterates his unnamed, adult subject's former kinship bonds.

This does not, of course, mean that Defoe's Friday *is* Black but rather that he is unmistakably associated with enslaved Africans. Which takes us back to the question, why is *Crusoe* historical fiction? Firstly, by turning the clock back, Defoe avoids entanglement with conflicts between the Royal African Company and the independent (or 'separate') traders who, along with other constituencies, opposed the Company's monopoly on the slave trade.[38] Instead, he takes these conflicts up indirectly, and, I would argue, in ways that have the potential to please both sides. As an apologist for the Company, Defoe satisfies its supporters by suggesting that the failure of Crusoe's trafficking voyage to Africa and the solitude he suffers for twenty-four years after his shipwreck are the penal consequences of severing ties with not only his paternal but also his national home. Neglect of the latter, which commentators often overlook, is explicitly addressed in *Adventures*.[39] In effect, Crusoe is a separate trader *avant la lettre*, one whose

'meer wandring Inclination' is severely punished by a form of solitary confinement. Yet because Crusoe sets out well before Charles II gives the Royal African Company its monopoly over English trade with Africa, and is thus not actually a separate trader, *Crusoe* can also be read—the way it generally has—as an adventure narrative extolling its independent English protagonist's pluck, fortitude, and industriousness. However Crusoe's separateness is understood, his conventionally Protestant experience of penitence, conversion, and gratitude for the providential care that ensues apparently more than suffices to legitimate his divinely sanctioned enslavement of Friday and the immense profits awaiting him in England.

Defoe's decision to populate Crusoe's island with American rather than African 'Savages' suggests another nexus of motives for backdating. We've seen that Crusoe's ethical conflicts take up questions raised during Spanish colonialism about the (il)legitimacy of using force to Christianize Americas' inhabitants. By rehearsing debates from an earlier phase of Euro-colonialism centred on the expropriation of New World lands and resources, and by rejecting strictly juridical rationalizations of colonial violence, Defoe gets his protagonist to validate a novel argument in favour of humanitarian intervention. Grounded in Crusoe's terror of death-by-savage-devouring, this argument in theory applies equally to Africans, since *Crusoe* represents them, too, as inveterate human-flesh-eaters. But whereas the enslavement of Friday is deeply interconnected with Crusoe's claim to possess the land he cultivates and guards, in 1718 the enslavement of an African would inescapably be associated with monetary exchange and forcible transportation to the Americas. Defoe's fictions successfully avoid representing the trafficking in Africans who were separated from family and nation to endure the middle passage, to suffer loss and degradation, and to begin lives as unfree labourers in an unimaginably remote land.

Additionally, in making Friday American not African, Defoe showcases the positive benefits of Euro-colonialism's Christianizing-as-civilizing mission without troubling readers about its socio-political implications. Though *Crusoe* memorably represents Friday's introduction to European manners and his conversion to Christianity, Friday is not baptized (neither, in *Colonal Jack*, is the large population of enslaved Africans who seem not even to be Christianized). Only in *Adventures* is baptism of non-Europeans (Caribbean 'savages') addressed, and the context makes it unobjectionable. When Defoe does tackle transatlantic slavery, in *Colonel Jack*, he sets his protagonist on a well-established plantation where the violence of abduction and trafficking lie in a long-forgotten past. *Colonel Jack* concerns another form of economically productive violence, namely, the disciplinary violence institutionalized in plantation societies. In a long episode meant to reform the manners of planters and overseers whose behaviour is giving slavery a bad name, interactions between Jack, at this time an overseer, and Mouchat, an enslaved African, demonstrate mercy's superiority to punitive force as an instrument of social control. Everyone involved learns that by exercising forbearance, the planter class fosters the paternalistic cross-status bonds which Defoe has Mouchat and other slaves enthusiastically welcome.

A surprisingly revealing passage in *Adventures* makes Crusoe's induction of

Friday into servitude and civility a model of Euro-colonial governance. Crusoe contrasts the lax methods English ruffians in his company use to discipline recently enslaved war-captives with his own former practice *vis a vis* Friday. They fail, Crusoe says, 'to take their measures with them as I did by my man *Fryday*, *viz*. to begin with them upon the principle of having saved their lives, and then instruct them in the rational principles of life, much less of religion, civilizing and reducing them by kind usage and affectionate arguings' (62). Erected into a 'principle', the act of saving here clearly signifies war slavery doctrine's alternative to legitimate killing. Silently erased, however, is the power of life and death that underwrites this principle and the 'measures' that have such success. '[R]educing', often applied to those vanquished militarily, here relies on nothing more coercive than 'affectionate arguings.'

The principle of saving is essential to Defoe's revisioning of war slavery doctrine and his reformation of English slaving. A beneficial, redemptive act, saving inaugurates a process that is supposed to mitigate slavery's dehumanizing effects for both enslavers and enslaved. Defoe's commitment to binding voluntary servitude (or service) to the gratitude inspired by saving is more systematic than this suggests, however. Even when plantation slavery is not at issue, Defoe's exemplary Europeans either graciously refuse commercial rewards for saving another's life or, as beneficiaries of life-saving, remain gratefully loyal. Defoe refrains from declaring such gratitude obligatory, since that might cast doubt on its voluntariness, but tacitly gives it a contractual character.[40] Having rescued a Spaniard and Friday's father from war-cannibalism, Crusoe reflects that he now has three subjects who 'all owed their Lives to me, and were ready to lay down their Lives, *if there had been Occasion of it*, for me' (250). Unstated is the principle that saving of life requires, in return, sacrifice of life.

In the passage cited above, where the principle of saving is enunciated, Crusoe stresses the value to enslavers of 'reducing' the enslaved so they will 'assist them and fight for them, as I had my man *Friday*' (63).Serving militarily is, of course, a conventionally acceptable means of risking the loss of or sacrificing life. In *Adventures*, Friday's readiness to lay down his life —'*he would die, when I bid die,*' Crusoe reports (242)—results in being fatally shot while fighting one of Crusoe's battles. Presented as a combination of infantile attachment and radical gratitude, Friday's selflessness is re-enacted by Mouchat in *Colonel Jack*, which strategically sets the same racialized dynamic in motion. Jack experimentally withholds the whipping with which Mouchat had earlier been threatened, and on the basis of Mouchat's willingness to lay down his life in gratitude, persuades the plantation master that 'kindness well manag'd' is even more effective than 'Cruelty'.[41] 'Negroes', he has demonstrated, are indeed capable of responding positively to disciplinary saving.

In *The Family Instructor*, Defoe has an unruly English wife complain to her husband that he treats her as nothing more than an upper servant (the rank all married women hold in Roxana's opinion). Though the emotional 'Violence' of her penitence and conversion nearly take her life, she does not voluntarily lay it down, nor is this expected of her. In Defoe's didactic tale, her devoted, long-suffering husband refrains from exercising even the 'Violence of Entreaties and Perswasions'.[42] In early modern Europe,

it is understood — by political philosophers, clergymen, and women entering marriage — that husbands do not hold the power of life and death over their wives. This is simply taken for granted in *Paradise Lost*, *Crusoe*, Locke's *Two Treatises*, and in *Reflections on Marriage*, where Astell satirizes theorists of political resistance by stating, famously, that 'how much soever Arbitrary Power may be dislik'd on a Throne, not *Milton* himself wou'd cry up Liberty to poor *Female Slaves*, or plead for the Lawfulness of Resisting a Private Tyranny'.[43] Astell uses the inflammatory rhetoric of female 'slavery' even while acknowledging, in her comments on Locke, 'a Husband can't deprive a Wife of Life without being responsible to the Law.'[44]

Ideally, Defoe's *Instructor* shows, husbands chivalrously respect their wives' status as free yet subordinate partners, while properly loving wives are grateful for such respect. Gratitude is more crucial to Defoe's reformation of plantation slavery. It is to be expressed by an identification with the 'master' so complete that it effects an introjection of his power of life and death. In *Crusoe,* Defoe conveys this lesson by getting self-sacrificial gratitude to serve the process of transforming 'slave' into a 'servant'. Slippages between 'slave' and 'servant' in this era often deliberately obscure the many forms of violence, including racialization, which make plantation slavery possible. At the same time they ensure that a large population of enslaved Africans on a single plantation remain part of a single master's private household. As 'servant', Friday is Crusoe's companion, friend, pupil, and child — roles that reinforce his familial position as wished-for fit help at the same time as they erase its origins in an ambiguous marriage of war slavery and voluntarily contracted perpetual slavery under the power of life and death.

---

[1] See, for example, Edward Fletcher, 'Defoe on Milton', MLN, vol. 50, 1 (1935), 31-2.
[2] Recent exceptions are Katherine Clark's *Daniel Defoe: The Whole Frame of Nature, Time and Providence* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007) and Andreas K. E. Mueller's *A Critical Study of Daniel Defoe's Verse* (Lewiston, N. Y.: Edwin Mellen, 2010).
[3] Maximillian E. Novack, *Defoe and the Nature of Man* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).
[4] *The Digest of Justinian,* ed. Theodor Mommsen and Paul Krueger, trans. Alan Watson, vol.1-4 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), vol.1, bk 1, ch. 5, par.4.
[5] Discussion of war slavery doctrine is indebted to Nyquist, *Arbitrary Rule: Slavery, Tyranny, and the Power of Life and Death* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2013), 193-226.
[6] Novack, *State of Man*, 51-2.
[7] Thomas Tryon, *The Negro's Complaint in Friendly Advice to the Gentlemen-Planters* (Andrew Sowle, 1684), 79,80. Further references appear parenthically.
[8] Daniel Defoe, *Reformation of Manners, A Satyr* (1702), 12.
[9] Of this passage, James G. Basker, editor of *Amazing Grace: An Anthology of Poems About Slavery, 1660-1810,* says, 'Defoe sympathizes with Africans and Native Americans who are so ruthlessly exploited and enslaved by Europeans'(New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 38. John McVeagh challenges J. R. Moore and Wylie Sypher for a similar reading, ''The Blasted Race of Old Cham': Daniel Defoe and the African', *Ibadan Studies in English* 1 (1969), 85-109.
[10] Morgan Godwyn, *'Trade preferr'd before Religion, and* Christ *made to give place to* Mammon' (London, 1685), 27. Further references are parenthetical.
[11] Anthony Hill, *Afer Baptizatus* (London, 1702), 39.

[12] Anon., *The Planter's Charity* (London, 1704), 7
[13] Defoe, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1925), 148. Parenthetical references are to this edition.
[14] For further discussion, see *Arbtirary Rule*, 162-192.
[15] Defoe, *Jure Divino: A Satyr* (London: 1706), Bk. 11, p.244
[16] *Jure Divino*, Bk.11, p. 255.
[17] Milton, *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (London: 1643), 21.
[18] Milton, *Of Reformation* (London: 1641), 90.
[19] *John Milton: Complete Poems*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes, (New York: Odyssey Press, 1957), Bk. 12. 78-104. Quotations from this edition appear parenthetically. For more detailed discussion, see *Arbitrary Rule*, 137-47.
[20] Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*, ed. Evan R. Davis (Peterborough: Broadview Editions), 190. Parenthetical references are to this edition.
[21] John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), I.6.57. Parenthetical references are to this edition.
[22] Michel Montaigne, 'Of the Caniballes', trans. John Florio, *Montaigne's Essayes*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1910) 240-256..
[23] For detailed discussion, see *Arbitrary Rule*, 326-361.
[24] The title of McVeagh's essay, above, is from Defoe's discussion of Africa in *Atlas Maritimus* (1728), which continues in a similarly vitriolic vein, 'Blasted Race,' 97-8.
[25] Defoe, *The History of the Devil*, 3rd edition (Dublin, 1728), Pt 1, 121
[26] On responses to this punishment by late eighteenth century radicals, see Nyquist, 'Equiano, Satanism, and Slavery,' *Milton Now: Alternative Approaches and Contexts*, eds. Catharine Gray and Erin Murphy (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 215-246
[27] See also *Adventures*, 62
[28] Greatly as scholarship in Euro-colonialism has benefitted from Hulme's brilliant *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the native Caribbean*, 1492-1797, the resulting practice of identifying Defoe's 'Savages' as 'Caribs' perpetuates Euro-racialist representations, given the 'realist' registers prevalent in classrooms and critical discussions,.
[29] See Hulme's discussion of this anxiety and its disavowal of 'all contradictory evidence', *Encounters*, 194-98.
[30] King James Bible.
[31] Defoe, *History of Devil*, 36-7, 37,73, 76-85.
[32] Defoe, *Serious Reflections* (London, 1720), 12.
[33] Derek Walcott, Collected Poems: 1948-1984 (New York: Farrar, Straus & Girous), 69.
[34] Walcott, *Remembrance & Pantomime* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1980), 103.
[35] Though our conclusions differ, I am much indebated to Roxann Wheeler's treatment of changes between narrative time and publication as they relate to Friday's Africanization in ''My Savage,' 'My Man': Racial Multiplicity in *Robinson Crusoe*', *ELH* 62 (1995), 848-49.
[36] See Wheeler's discussion of Toni Morrison's assumption of blackness, 'Racial Multiplicity,' 822-25. Wheeler, however, claims that Defoe's Friday, though uniquely individualized, 'is a Carib, an Amerindian attached to a group with specific customs, religious and social beliefs, and rules of governance', 823.

[37] For materials on day-names I am very grateful to Margaret Williamson. See K. Scott, 'The Slave Insurrection in New York in 1712,' *The New York Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 45 (1961), 43-72; David DeCamp, 'African Day-Names in Jamaica', *Language*, vol. 43, 1 (1967), 139-149; J.S. Handler and J. Jacoby, 'Slave Names and Naming in Barbados, 1650-1830', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 53, 4 (1996), 685-728; Williamson's unpublished 'Naming and Agency on Blue Mountain Plantation'.
[38] See William A. Pettigrew's *Freedom's Debt: The Royal African Company and the Politics of the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1672-1752* (Chapel Hill: University of N. Carolina Press, 2013.
[39] Anna Neill treats this in a discussion of international trade and 'cosmopolitan right,' 'Crusoe's Farther Adventures: Discovery, Trade, and the Law of Nations', *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 38, no. 3 (1997), 213-230.
[40] Novack shows how central gratitude is to Defoe in *Nature of Man*, 113-128.
[41] *Colonel Jack*, 3rd edition (London: 1724), 174, 180-82. George Boulukos examines *Colonel Jack*'s use of this dynamic in *The Grateful Slave: The Emergence of Race in Eighteenth-Century British and American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 75-94
[42] *The Family Instructor* (London: 1715), 392; 385
[43] Mary Astell, *Reflections upon Marriage* in *Political Writings*, ed. Patricia Springborg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 46-7.
[44] Astell, *Reflections*, 17-8.