"These Men against Arbitrary Power Are the Most Absolute in Their Families":
Patriarchal Challenge to Daniel Defoe

Masaaki Takeda

December 1706 saw the death of James Foe, a London tallow Chandler. According to his will, the legacy was distributed among his grandchildren, apparently leaving nothing to his son Daniel, who was already in his late forties. James Sutherland, in his biography of Daniel Defoe, comments on this will: “[James Foe] seems at any rate to have realized by the year . . . when he drew up his will, that to leave [Daniel] any money would be only throwing it away . . . James Foe had lived long enough to see his son twice a bankrupt” (Defoe 163). However, this will does not necessarily show opposition between the father and the son. “In fact,” as a later biographer, Paula Backscheider puts it, “the terms of the will protected James’s legacy from the creditors to whom Daniel owed £2,000.” (Daniel Defoe 200). There must have been a mutual agreement about the distribution of the legacy.

Whatever their relation was, it is undeniable that the son Daniel had troubled his father till he left the world. The father may have once told the son to live moderately as a city merchant rather than to involve himself in risky projects and surreptitious businesses. James Foe was not a man who thought only of candles and family welfare. As an established tradesman, he participated in the politics of the City of London. From his standpoint, however, his son’s life must have looked too adventurous and neglectful of his proper station. The father of another frustrating son seems to speak for James’s feeling: “[It is] for Men of desperate Fortunes on one Hand, or of aspiring, superior Fortune on the other, who [go] upon Adventures, to rise by Enterprize, and make themselves famous in Undertakings of a Nature out of the common Road” (Robinson Crusoe, I, 2).

1 When we quote from Robinson Crusoe, Roman numbers show the volume numbers of the three-volume set of Robinson Crusoe and The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe (Shakespeare Head edition).
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As Robinson Crusoe goes abroad, ignoring the father’s warning quoted above, so Daniel Defoe never settled himself as a city merchant like his father. The year 1706 was actually a memorable one for his literary career, for it was this year that he at last published the long- awaited (and duly long) poem called *Jure Divino*. Financial hardship may have stimulated his literary activities. While publishing his journal *The Review* thrice weekly, he could find time to complete that verse monster on the origin of government comprising twelve parts.\(^2\) This work marked one of Defoe’s highest points as a political writer. As the title suggests, his criticism was directed at the divine right (or “*Jure Divino*”) theory of government. And the writers who supported that theory often authorised the divine right of the monarch through the patriarchal title of Adam, the first man and the father of the whole human race. That is why this poem is important for us to examine Defoe’s attitude towards patriarchalism.

Though he had enemies everywhere, the battle with High Churchmen was probably the most notable of Defoe’s political struggles. The High Church faction embodied everything contrary to Defoe’s ideals. They opposed William III in favour of the Pretender; they warned against the threat of the Dissenters to the Church of England; they did not support the Anglo-Scottish Union ratified in 1707, which Defoe vigorously promoted as a secret agent in Scotland. This essay focuses on Charles Leslie as an eminent High Churchman, for Leslie’s writings are most helpful if we are to understand patriarchalism at that time.

Leslie was a Nonjuror, that is, a priest who refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary after the 1688 Revolution. He once became an advisor to “James III” in Bar-le-Duc, but he is remembered mainly as a prolific writer of pamphlets and articles against the social contract theory of government. He popularised Robert Filmer’s divine right theory. Like Filmer, Leslie traced the origin of government to the creation of Adam and Eve. Adam’s domination over Eve was the origin of government, according to Leslie, and his government grew as the number of his children increased. To prove the supreme authority of the father, he quoted the Fifth Commandment, “Honour thy father and thy mother”. The kernel of Leslie’s political scheme lay in the fact that Adam was treated as the first monarch of the world. All the kings governing

\(^2\) Though published in one volume, *Jure Divino* is separated into twelve “Books”. A modern reprint (published by Pickering & Chatto) is composed of about 330 pages.
their countries were thus represented as the true descendants of King Adam, and Leslie regarded the disobedience of the children or the subjects as a religious sin.

Though this scheme does not sound convincing today, Leslie’s pamphlets and his journal called *The Rehearsal* were favourably accepted by many contemporary readers. Why? This is no doubt because of the necessity for a theory of government with which to counter Whig principles. Leslie’s argument appealed temptingly to those who opposed the Whigs and the Low Church. For example, Jonathan Swift, though well aware of Leslie’s deceptiveness, still approved of his criticism of the Low Church and the Dissenters: “Without doubt, Mr. Lesley is most unhappily misled in his Politicks; but ... [he] hath written many useful Discourses upon several Subjects, and so well deserved of the Christian Religion, and the Church of *England* in particular” (*A Preface to the Bishop of Sarum’s Introduction* 79).³

As was pointed out before, Leslie and the High Churchmen embodied everything hostile to Daniel Defoe. It would be wrong to assume, however, that Defoe’s political ideas exactly matched what Leslie criticised. His works are in fact not to be categorised as typically Whiggish. Compared with radical Whig pamphleteers like Benjamin Hoadly, Defoe did not assume a position safely on the Whig-Revolution side. We shall see the ambiguity of Defoe’s political ideas in his works, mainly *Jure Divino, The Family Instructor*, and *Robinson Crusoe*.

A few months after the publication of *Jure Divino*, there appeared an issue of *The Review* answering the challenge Leslie laid down in *The Rehearsal* about the divine nature of the origin of government. Contrary to our expectation, Defoe made a concession to Leslie:

> I agree with [Leslie], the Scripture is to be regarded in this Dispute above all other Testimonies, and to burlesque or attempt to ridicule the Scripture, or the sacred Institutions of Heaven declar’d in it, is, what wise Men avoid, and Christians abhor — And hope, I need not defend my self as to any such Practice ... I know, what Mr. *Lock, Sidney* and others have said on this Head, and I must confess, I never thought their Systems fully answer’d ...  
>  
> (Vol. III, No. 108)

In the same article, he went so far as to admit that “government is of

---

a divine origin”. Leslie had already sensed something similar to his ideas when he read *Jure Divino*. Quoting the poem’s Dedication to “The Most Serene, Most Invincible, and Most Illustrious Lady, REASON. First Monarch of the World . . . Hereditary Director of Mankind”, he made a character called “Country-man” exclaim, “Hey-Day! Hey-Day! . . . This is *Tory Tory Tartivy! High-Flying indeed*!” (*The Rehearsal*, Vol. I, No. 125). It is certain that Defoe picked up some terms that Leslie and his party favoured, but this does not mean that he was in their party. In that *Review* article, he declared, “I am arguing by my own Light, not other Mens”. Now we should ask: what was his own system?

Leslie often pointed out that we could not find any historical proof of the social contract that founded a government. Benjamin Hoadly replied to this criticism in his *Original and Institution of Civil Government* (1710): “There is no necessity at all that such a *Time* should be nam’d . . . Because there might be such a *Time*, and yet not mark’d precisely in those short accounts of the first Ages, which are transmitted down to us by *Ancient Historians*, whether *Sacred* or *Profane*” (145). Leslie made a sharp retort against this passage in his work called *The Finishing Stroke* (1711): “This is a Matchless *Proof* indeed! . . . Sir, by your good Leave, these two *Schemes* [i.e. the divine right and the social contract schemes] do not stand upon a *Level*. For the *One* is expressly Mentioned in the *Sacred History*, and of the *Other* there is not one *Tittle*” (16–17). Defoe shared with Leslie a dislike of Hoadly. When Defoe denied lineage from Locke and Sidney (though, in *Jure Divino*, we can find many passages influenced by their thought), it seems, he attempted to separate himself from this tendency of the Whig orthodoxy and to address the questions which he thought they and their disciples left unanswered. Describing the sacred origin of

---

4 *The Rehearsal* is written as dialogue between “Country-man” and his master, “Mr. Rehearsal”. As Leslie’s mouthpiece, “Mr. Rehearsal” teaches “Country-man” his patriarchal scheme of government.

5 See, for example, *A Declaration of Truth to Benjamin Hoadly* (1717) and *A Friendly Rebuke to One Parson Benjamin* (1719). In these pamphlets, Defoe was satirical about Hoadly’s secularism rather than seriously criticizing it.

6 Algernon Sidney especially is praised against Robert Filmer in Book IV. Defoe even wrote: “When therefore they found *Algernon Sidney’s Argument unanswerable by Words, the only way left them was to lay aside debating with the Book, and fall upon the Man — So they cut off his Head, meely because they could not answer his Book*” (note (d), 169).
government, *Jure Divino* never mentions any explicit contract between the monarch and the people. Disowning Locke and Sidney, Defoe answered Leslie’s patriarchal challenge “by his own Light”. His own scheme in *Jure Divino* was to provide an account of the origin of government strictly according to Holy Scripture that would nonetheless uphold the rights of the people.

A typical example of Defoe’s argument can be found in Book II, where he interpretes the Bible’s account of the rise of Saul to the Jewish crown. When the Israelites asked God to give them a king, in answer to their plea, claims Defoe, God “fix’d the Choice [of the king] / In Providence, and not the People’s Voice” and thus “Made Isreal’s Kings be Kings by Right Divine” (Book II, 120, ll. 605–8). Here Defoe digresses from Whig orthodoxy, whose faith was “*Vox Populi, Vox Dei*” or the voice of the people is the voice of God. As we follow the lines of the poem, however, we will find that God’s neglect of the people’s voice soon faces a problem. The people do not admit Saul’s title: “[W]hen they saw a Youth mean and despicable in his Original, of the youngest Tribe of Israel, a Benjamite, and every Circumstance concurring to Disappoint them; they go away dejected, and refuse him, notwithstanding all Samuel’s Anointing or God’s Singling him out by Lot” (Book II, 123, note (a)). Defoe emphasises that the people rejected divine ordinance. Defoe’s God does not show any anger at this disobedience. On the contrary, God compromises: “*Tis just,*” says He, “*the People should be shown,* / *The Man that wears it, can deserve the Crown.* / *Merit will make my Choice appear so just,* / *They’ll own him fit for the intended Trust; * / *Confirm by Reason my Exalted Choice,* / *And make him King by all the Peoples Voice*” (Book II, 124, ll. 702–7). Thus showing a good understanding of democracy, God makes Saul beat the enemy, the Ammonites. From ancient times, it seems, victory in the war was the common way for political leaders to gain a right. We cannot help thinking however that Defoe’s explanation of Saul’s coronation rather undermines God’s authority. Defoe seems to say that when the people do not agree, God has to make a concession to them. If God is truly almighty, such a concession is absurd or unnecessary from the first.

This logical confusion shows how difficult it was for Defoe to make up a democratic myth based on the *First Book of Samuel*. The main challenge was that the Bible does not show any explicit contract that justifies the people’s right over the monarch. Defoe then tried to harmonise the
people’s consent (not a legal contract) with God’s ordinance. In so doing, he elevated the people to a position superior to God in terms of political right. While pushing the social contract into the background, Defoe implicitly introduced another contract (not a commandment) existing between God and the people. God is indeed like a contractual king in Jure Divino, and if he is contractual, God can no longer be an agent of authorisation or divine ordination. It would be illogical if God awarded a particular person the title to govern the people, when the title of God is given by the people. The last issues of The Rehearsal criticised this point:

[Defoe says that] if God pretends to any Power over us but what he Derives from the People, He is a Tyrant! And [that] all who pretend to Divine Right are Tyrants under Him! . . . [If] Men Derive not their Right from God, it is Easie to know whence they Derive it . . . So that our Dispute is brought to a short Issue, that is, for God, or Belial the God of Liberty. (Vol. 4, No. 47)
[Defoe] wou’d Dethrone God, and Set up Belial. (ibid., No. 48)

When Hoadly was subjected to a similar criticism, he simply refuted Leslie, relying on the idea of Vox Populi Vox Dei in his Original and Institution of Civil Government. From a Whig viewpoint, Defoe’s account of the Bible in Jure Divino was apparently awkward, for it presupposed the case of a contradiction between Vox Populi and Vox Dei. It can be read however as a much more serious response to Leslie’s criticism. Leslie was in fact not persuaded by Hoadly’s refutation, and repeated the same criticism in The Finishing Stroke, which was ignored by Hoadly and in consequence their debate finished fruitlessly. Defoe took the problem of divine ordination more seriously than Hoadly.

Defoe’s estimation of divine ordination probably derived from his admiration for William III. He believed that there was something divine in a monarch like William, all the more because most monarchs were, according to him, tyrants. While the personal ability of William III is passionately praised in Jure Divino, Defoe rarely refers to the English people’s sense of judgement in choosing such a good monarch. As a matter of fact, not all people who supported the Glorious Revolution liked King William. Some political writers like John Tutchin and Andrew Fletcher criticised William III as well as the Stuarts. These people often called themselves “Old Whigs”, and formed a minor sect of the Whig Party. It is well known that Defoe’s popularity as a writer was established with his poem, The True-Born Englishman (1701), which refuted Tutchin.
Defoe sided with neither the major ("Modern") Whigs like Hoadly nor the minor ("Old") Whigs like Tutchin, to say nothing of the Tories and the High Church Party. Defoe’s political position was quite unique. This partially explains why he was thought of as a mercenary hack taking sides with anybody provided he was paid. As he did not belong to any party, he could embrace any political ideas when he thought fit.

Despite the author’s disownment, it is not difficult to find Lockian ideas in Jure Divino. Paula Backscheider has traced its literary and political sources. As to literary sources, her discoveries are helpful, but, in regard to political ideas, her suggestions are perhaps less helpful, because she applies typically Whig principles to the poem: “Defoe saw absolute, hereditary monarchy as a mortal threat to human happiness, the Protestant religion, property, and civil rights” ("The Verse Essay, John Locke, and Defoe’s Jure Divino" 109). “None of the ideas in Jure Divino is new”, declares Backscheider. Among the Whig political writings, she continues, “It is John Locke’s Two Treatises of Government … that Defoe’s poem most closely resembles in thought” (115). Other scholars find Backscheider too Lockian in her reading of Defoe’s works, and Manuel Schonhorn, for example, shows her partiality by picking up the image of the warrior king in Jure Divino. Introducing Defoe’s interpretation of Saul as the warrior king, Schonhorn points out, “The divine sanction of Defoe’s narration strengthens the concept of Saul’s appointment by God’s will, rather than popular acclamation” (Defoe’s Politics 127). Obviously opposing Backscheider, he asserts, “Never, in Jure Divino or elsewhere, does Defoe indicate that crowns are given by the people” (ibid. 139). Their interpretational opposition cannot be resolved, because Jure Divino is nothing but an attempt to consolidate opposing political positions. As we have seen, that attempt was not very successful. However, Jure Divino makes us see the real challenge of patriarchalism that Defoe and his contemporaries must have felt. Defoe was probably not a good political philosopher, but he definitely had a sense to show the root of the problem. He was a realist rather than a theorist.

Defoe’s early masterpiece, Jure Divino, attempted to overturn the patriarchal scheme, whereas in his later work, The Family Instructor (two parts: 1715, 18), he attempted something totally the reverse — to set up the patriarchal authority in a family through religion. As The Family Instructor is a conduct book, there was nothing unusual (from the standard of the age) in insisting that wives and children should respect their husbands
and fathers. This work has hardly been discussed from a political viewpoint.\footnote{As far as we know, Minoru Oda’s essay, “On the Theme of Disobedience in Defoe’s Writings” is exceptional in pointing out that The Family Instructor can be read as a political allegory. See Part I, 61 and Part II, 53. Oda connected the ideal father with Defoe’s ideal king, William III. Though Oda did not develop his point, it can be said that he read The Family Instructor in the same way as Manuel Schonhorn would read Jure Divino twenty years later.} The Family Instructor does not refer to Leslie, nor does it make any account of the origin of government. Nevertheless, The Family Instructor has its own political meaning. Since the time of Aristotle, ethics and politics have often been considered as seamlessly connected, and Defoe was not an exception to this tradition. In Jure Divino, for example, he traces the origin of tyranny to moral degeneration with which human nature has been imbued since the Original Sin and the Fall of Man. Moral reformation constituted, therefore, an essential part of Defoe’s politics. Two years before the publication of The Family Instructor, Defoe finished writing The Review, which he had continued for nine years. In the final issue of the journal (June 11, 1713, Vol. IX, No. 106), Defoe harshly criticised the degeneration of political journalism, satirising The Examiner, The Spectator, The Guardian, and The Review itself. It can be pointed out that the frustration with political journalism led Defoe to consider moral reform and compose The Family Instructor.

Reading from this viewpoint, we can find a number of political allusions in The Family Instructor. This work is composed of several dialogues, and in the most significant one of volume I, the father is represented as a strict governor who supervises the moral reformation of his family. While his wife and younger children obey his command, the eldest son and daughter both find the father’s sudden decision arbitrary and absurd. The father’s “Reformation” aims at banning everything irreligious, such as to wear luxurious clothes, to go out on the Sabbath day, to go to theatres, to drink, and, last but not least, to read corrupting romances and novels. The children’s disobedience starts when their parents burn all their playbooks and novels. This striking sternness of the father reminds us of a passage in Leslie’s New Association Part II: “These Men whose chief Topick is the Liberty of the People, and against Arbitrary Power, are the most Absolute of any other in their Families” (Supplement, 6).

Seeing his sister crying with despair and his own books also burnt, the eldest son tries to persuade his fanatic father to think again about such a
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quixotic project. As a champion of liberty, he says: "Liberty is a Native Right, the Brutes seek it; not a Bird will be in a Cage, if it can be free". While the son defends liberty based on nature, the father rejects this as a false idea of liberty: "Liberty to do Evil is an abdon’d Slavery, the worst of Bondage; and Confinement from doing Evil, is the only true Liberty" (135). The son’s idea of liberty was in fact introduced in Jure Divino, to criticise the High Church theory of passive obedience to rulers: "How much more blest are Brutes than Passive Men! / For these when they're oppress’d may turn again; / Not Man himself reproaches their Design, / 'Tis fair they shou'd resist and countermine" (Book III, 135, ll. 265–8). Defoe comments on this passage in the footnote: "The Government of a Man over the Creation is by an undeniable Right, and of Divine Original, and yet the Creatures may resist" (ibid.).

The father’s criticism of false liberty in The Family Instructor could have been penned by Leslie. Just consider The Rehearsal criticising Defoe’s idea of liberty: “A Devilish Liberty, which is perfect Slavery! As the Service of God is perfect Freedom. But he that will not serve God, must serve the Devil” (The Rehearsal, Vol. 4, No. 47). We do not have to think that Defoe followed and imitated Leslie because such kinds of criticism of liberty can be found in many religious writings. It is nevertheless notable that Defoe unwittingly approached the divine right theory when he attempted to promote moral education. The father's attitude towards his son is just like an arbitrary monarch authorised by divine sanction. After criticising his son’s liberty, he continues: “But to cut this Discourse short, I can give Liberty no longer to any under my Roof to break God’s Commands, or prophane [sic] his Sabbath . . . [I]f you will not submit to my Government, you must quit my Dominions” (135). The son is thus deprived of the right to complain, and the father justifies himself by threat of expulsion (note the words, “my Government” and “my Dominions”) rather than by persuasion. It is clear from this that unlike God in Jure Divino, the father as king does not listen to the subject’s voice, or Vox Populi, pretending to be God's vicegerent.

Naturally, this king cannot get his children’s consent, either explicit or tacit. The eldest daughter at last conforms, however, not because she admits her father’s patriarchy but because, providentially or not, she falls in love with a young gentleman who is as pious as his father. She marries this handsome man and now readily accepts the Reformation. Her poor brother, left alone, and not lucky enough to find a pious, pretty girl, has
to stick to liberty and disobedience. He at last leaves the house as a soldier, gets severely injured in Flanders, and comes back home with one hand amputated. Only his sister comes to see him, and, considering his feelings, suggests that he should reconcile himself with the father. The son at first objects to the proposal, but the sister patiently tries to persuade him to quit the disobedient life in favour of familial love. The brother, who has already become sick of his defiance, succumbs to the sister’s kind words, saying, "I am easily overcome by Kindness, never by Violence" (412).

Now the reader expects that the brother, being a penitent not by force but by love, will give up his opposition and be reconciled with the father. However, the author betrays this expectation, revealing that the sister "could never bring him to any Sense of Duty to God, or his Father", and that "he grew melancholy, and disturbed, and offered two or three Times to destroy himself" (413). It is as if the son were doomed to dissension and perdition. He cannot control himself and even attempts suicide in despair. Whether God has heard his voice or not, he becomes fatally ill in no time and here follows his final scene: "[H]aving never seen his Father, nor so much as desiring it, till on his Death-bed, being delirious, he cried out for his Father! his Father: That he had abused his Father! and begged to see his Father! That he might ask him Forgiveness! But he died before his Father, who happened to be in the Country, could be sent for" (414). Why didn’t Defoe write a happy ending with reconciliation? If he had done so, The Family Instructor would have been more instructive, if less impressive. We can answer that Defoe was realistic rather than didactic, as was usually the case with him. In addition to this, probably, he avoided telling a story of the defiant son at last obeying his divine right father, out of the subversive instinct of a champion of revolutionary principles.

Isn’t there any way, however, to save the poor son? Or, how can the children doomed to defiance find their way to justify themselves both politically and morally? To solve this problem, Defoe had to synthesize his political and moral tendencies: that is, he had to make peace between a stubborn father and a defiant son in himself. This reflection seems to have led him to his next work, The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. One of the tasks he tackled there was nothing other than to establish the political theology of a defiant son.

As if to remind the reader of that eldest son in his previous work,
Defoe starts the narration of *Robinson Crusoe*, talking about Crusoe's eldest brother, who went to Flanders as a soldier and was killed in the war: “I [i.e. Crusoe] had two elder Brothers, one of which was Lieutenant Collonel to an English Regiment of Foot in Flanders ... and was killed at the Battle near Dunkirk against the Spaniards” (I, 1). Robinson, a younger brother and another defiant son, also suffers from the power of fate that drives him into disobedience. Though his first voyage was disastrous, Crusoe cannot contain his desire: “[M]y ill Fate push’d me on now with an Obstinacy that nothing could resist; and tho’ I had several times loud Calls from my Reason and my more composed Judgement to go home, yet I had no Power to do it” (I, 14).

As a result, the defiant son is banished — not to a battlefield but to a desert island. His struggle for survival begins, and, as we know, he invents one way after another to solve the problems. One day, however, he catches a severe cold, which lingers on for ten days. In a delirious condition, he remembers his father's warning against the adventurous life, and repents his disobedience, saying “I rejected the Voice of Providence, which had mercifully put me in a Posture or Station of Life, wherein I might have been happy and easy” (I, 104). He regards his hardship as God's punishment, and thinks that he is destined for a miserable death.

It is the next day, however, that he finds a good medicine for his disease: “[I]t occur’d to my Thought, that the Brasilians take no Physick but their Tobacco, for almost all Distempers” (I, 107). He opens a chest, where he discovers “a Cure, both for Soul and Body” — namely, a roll of tobacco and a copy of the Bible, as if “directed by Heaven”. In only a day, the heavenly message has changed from curse to grace. He starts to read the Bible and acquires mental stability, feeling the protection of Providence. John J. Richetti, in his *Defoe's Narratives*, makes a systematic analysis of this part, depending upon a sort of Hegelian logic. According to Richetti, Crusoe used to be in a state of pure action when he contrived one way after another for survival in the relentless environment of the desert island. This state ends with his falling ill, which puts him into a state of pure passivity. Only after going through both pure activity and pure passivity can Crusoe resolve all the contradictions on the island, or, to put it in a Hegelian way, make a synthesis from the duality of the situation. As he “discovers that the island has wet and dry seasons, he builds a ‘villa’ for pleasure to balance his secure fortress for survival” (*Defoe's Narratives* 47). Crusoe's conversion “enables Crusoe to leave his
paranoid seclusion and to convert his island from a prison into a garden” (46).

Though it is doubtful whether Crusoe experiences “pure action” before falling ill, Crusoe’s view of the island surely changes after the recovery. He gets interested in the parts of the island he has not yet visited, and during the adventure he finds pleasant meadows where not only tobacco but also lots of fruits are growing: “I found Mellons upon the Ground in great Abundance, and Grapes upon the Trees; the Vines had spread indeed over the Trees, and the Clusters of Grapes were just now in their Prime, very ripe and rich” (I, 113–4). From our viewpoint, this passage is important because we can confirm that Crusoe regards the island as his property only after the recognition of Providence. The Bible has authorised Crusoe as the governor of the island. He is no longer a survivor banished from home, for the island has become his estate. Though he has not given up hope of one day going home, his desire to return to human society troubles him much less.

This peaceful state does not last long, however. One day, walking along the coast, Crusoe finds “the Print of a Man’s naked Foot . . . very plain to be seen in the Sand” (I, 117). It is natural that he should find the trace of others only after settling down on the island. Now that he is conscious of the right of possession over the island, he has to watch out for the existence of others. He thus sees the world according to the opposition between his territory and that of others, rather than to the opposition between human society and the desert island. The natives he finds later are represented as enemies not only because they are cannibals but also because they challenge Crusoe’s title of property. If they ate the captives somewhere else, he would not complain about their custom.

Anxiety about losing the property makes Crusoe’s life on the island hard again. By and by, his desire to return to England re-emerges, until at last he becomes obsessed with the thought of getting to the mainland in a canoe. Exhausted with this thought, he falls sound asleep to see a dream in which he finds “upon the Shore, two Canoes, and eleven Savages coming to Land”. They bring one (in Crusoe’s term) savage, “who they [are] going to kill, in Order to eat him”. However, that captive savage suddenly “[jumps] away, and [runs] for his Life”. Crusoe gives refuge to the man, who becomes his servant. Then Crusoe says to himself in the dream, “now I may certainly venture to the main Land; for this Fellow will serve me as a Pilot” (I, 230).
Needless to say, this dream leads him to capture his Man Friday, who happened to be taken to his island as a captive along with other tribesmen. It should be pointed out that the process of his acquiring subjects is always described as the work of Providence. In the case of subjecting a Spaniard, Crusoe happens to find him held captive among the natives on his island. After saving him and driving the natives away from the island, Crusoe finds another captive on a boat, who is none other than Friday's father. Everybody is put under Crusoe's power by some accident. Crusoe does not rule his subjects from the desire of domination. All the subjects more or less admit that Crusoe is their saviour, which authorises Crusoe as a providential governor.

Providence is not the sole basis of Crusoe's title. Crusoe's military power is indispensable to maintain his title. That is why he is always cautious about keeping the gunpowder under his control. As Manuel Schonhorn points out, the image of the warrior king is essential in *Robinson Crusoe* as well as in *Jure Divino*: "For Defoe it is not the mild law of nature but the violent law of arms that is the foundation of kingship and rule... The society in Crusoe's island affirms that truth... It is the warrior-king and not the community who is the soul animating the body politic" (*Defoe's Politics* 154). Schonhorn puts too much emphasis on violence, however, when he regards it as the foundation of the body politic. Violence is essential, but it does not initiate Crusoe's community. The true origin of government lies in the accidents interpreted as the work of Providence. It is this accidental function of Providence that enables Crusoe to be a monarch without any hereditary title. While his title is not hereditary, he is not a usurper, for there is no kingship before him on the island. There are native tribes, all of which have their kings, but, from Crusoe's viewpoint, they cannot be regarded as his equals, because they do not believe in (what he thinks of as) Providence, or the grace of the Christian God. This is how a defiant son can be a king *de jure*. This idea of the monarch was developed from that in *Jure Divino*. In that poem, there was a problem in harmonising *Vox Populi* with Providence, but in *Robinson Crusoe*, Defoe seems to have elevated the authority of God. God no longer has to worry about public opinion, for the subjects admit King Robinson's military power from the first, which is different from the case of Saul.

As Crusoe is not a king with any hereditary right, he does not find the need to force some traditional value as authentic. Crusoe himself has to
be a Christian if he is to justify his rule, but his subjects can preserve their own identities, provided they obey Crusoe's orders. King Robinson boasts of his liberal policy: "It was remarkable...we had but three Subjects, and they were of three different Religions. My Man Friday was a Protestant, his Father was a Pagan and a Cannibal, and the Spaniard was a Papist: However, I allow'd Liberty of Conscience throughout my Dominions" (II, 30–31). There is a problem, however, in Friday's conversion to Protestantism if Crusoe thoroughly sticks to his liberalism. Soon after the capture of Friday, as a matter of fact, Crusoe "began to instruct him in the Knowledge of the true God" (II, 1). He deliberately converted Friday, even if uncoercively. Friday's conversion is necessary, because he is not only a subject but also Crusoe's personal servant in his house. As the ruler of his kingdom, Crusoe does not enforce any religion, but as the master of the house, he, like the father in *The Family Instructor*, is willing to reform his protégé. This is not necessarily a concession to patriarchalism. Crusoe is rather opposing the patriarchal scheme of government by distinguishing his household from his government. It does not mean, however, that Crusoe can maintain this distinction without facing a problem.

It is in the second part of the novel, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* that the problem of this double standard is seriously treated. At the end of the first part, Crusoe leaves the island without settling down the system of government during his absence. When he revisits the island in *The Farther Adventures*, he is told by a Spaniard that life on the island has been one of continuous struggles and hostilities among Crusoe's subjects as well as between them and the natives. The Spaniard formed a group with his countrymen brought from the mainland, while the other group was made out of the knavish Englishmen. Though their open battles later subside, the mutual distrust still remains between them. As the supervisor of all inhabitants, Crusoe organizes a reconciliation, in which each subject's right of property is clarified, and the problem is apparently solved. The root of the problem, however, is left untouched. It was Crusoe who sowed the seed of that confusion. When he left the

---

8 They came to the island to expel their captain and his men. Instead of taking over the ship, however, those knaves were beaten by Crusoe (who had saved the captain) and left on the island. The captain regained the ship, on which Crusoe went back to England.
island, he did not nominate anybody as his successor or vicegerent. Even in that meeting, he did not nominate the governor during his absence. He did not fix the royal line on his island, either. Though he had children in England, he did not bring them to the island. What is totally lacking in Crusoe’s idea of government is the problem of succession or continuation of government after his departure.

Let us now consider the relations between Crusoe’s government and patriarchalism. As we have seen, Crusoe disowns the idea of paternal succession. He does not become a king under any claim of paternity or nobility, nor does he resort to the right to decide his successor. If we seek to define his government, however, we have to call it patriarchal rather than democratic, because Crusoe is not elected by his subjects. Even if we think that there is a “tacit consent” of all his subjects, King Robinson, whose power is not legally limited, cannot be democratic. According to Crusoe’s own account of his reign, “I was a greater and more powerful Prince than ever the Czar of Muscovy was, tho’ my Dominions were not so large, or my People not so many... I had the absolute Disposal of the Lives and Fortunes of all my Subjects... [N]otwithstanding my absolute Power, I had not one Person disaffected to my Government, or to my Person, in all my Dominions” (III, 199–200). His relation to his subjects is paternal, if not rigorously patriarchal like the father in The Family Instructor. He is rather a liberal, modern father who does not interfere with his children provided they do not defy him. In short, Crusoe’s government is a paternal government without patriarchalism. We should not miss the point, however, that liberalism on the island is guaranteed solely by the authority of King Robinson. Once Crusoe leaves the island, as we have seen, nobody can prevent conflicts and dissensions. Together with the problem of succession, this is a serious defect for the community to overcome. This crisis is even more serious, because, during Crusoe’s absence, some Englishmen have brought native women from the mainland and had many children.

The solution comes from a clergyman who was shipwrecked and then saved by Crusoe on his way from England to the island. Seeing that some inhabitants made native women their wives, that clergyman asks

---

9 Crusoe calls one Spaniard (who occupies the cave he used to live in) “the Spanish governor”, but we cannot find any passage where Crusoe officially appoints him that title.
Crusoe to stop such an open “adultery” and have these couples marry in a Christian way, which naturally includes the conversion of the wives. Listening to the zealous request of the clergyman, Crusoe exclaims, “How far . . . have I been from understanding the most essential Part of a Christian! (viz.) to love the Interest of the Christian Church, and the good of other Mens Souls! I scarce have known what belongs to being a Christian” (III, 23). Thus they start the moral and religious reformation of the whole island. The work goes pretty well, with the aid of his English subjects. The effect of this reformation is dramatically described in the repentance of Will Atkins, an English villain, and in his successful attempt to convert his Caribbean wife. The family of a pagan wife and a non-religious husband symbolises the polymorphic society on the island before the reformation. That divergent society has now become a more consolidated community formed under oaths before the same God. In this way, the island has built up its own communal identity, overcoming the danger of the whole society.

However, isn’t it “Tory Rory” High Church? From a radical Whig viewpoint, this change in Crusoe’s county looks like nothing but a decline of religious toleration. That clergyman who suggests a moral reformation to Crusoe is, as a matter of fact, a French Catholic. The word “Papist” was a common label attached to the High Church in Defoe’s time, and Charles Leslie, though not supporting the papal supremacy, proposed the union between the Anglican Church and the French Gallican Church in The Case of Regale and Pontificat [sic] Stated. Nevertheless, Defoe’s narrative does not simply follow the High Church line, just as the Part I of Robinson Crusoe is by no means typically Whiggish. Soon after the success of the reformation, Crusoe leaves the island for good without naming any successor. The crown of the island is thus vacated, and the country becomes (in Crusoe’s word) a “commonwealth”. As there used to be a paternal rule without patriarchalism, so now there

10 “I am sure the English and the Gallican Churches are Nearer one another . . . than the Churches of France and Rome. And why then shou’d not we rather take Part with one another, against Rome, than, by our Differences, in other and Smaller Matters, to let [the Pope] Triumph over Us Both, in his Supremacy?” (292) As is shown in this passage, Leslie was not actually a “Papist”; he only felt sympathy with Gallicanism or French Catholicism. His criticism of the Roman Church is not surprising, for Robert Filmer, his theoretical master, argued against those liberal Catholics (like Francisco Suarez and Robert Bellarmine) who insisted on the limit of monarchical power.
emerges a republican government with patriarchal features, namely, a community integrated into one family.

Throughout the two parts of Robinson Crusoe, we can see how Defoe, as an independent political thinker, managed to keep a balance between the ideologies of his time. We do not have to regard the society in the second part as a development of or evolution from that in the first part. The second part rather seems to be a necessary supplement to the first part. Considering Defoe’s political writings, the country in the first part is probably closer to his ideal, but he could not help revealing the limitation of his own ideal by writing The Farther Adventures. Explaining Crusoe’s departure from the island, Maximillian E. Novak states that Defoe had to make his hero leave there because Crusoe “was an obstacle in the way of Defoe’s attempt to present his theories on the political evolution of society” (Defoe and the Nature of Man 62). According to Novak, Crusoe’s monarchical rule over the island is not consistent with Defoe’s political ideas, and the island should be kept in “a democratic state just barely removed from the state of nature” (60). Like Bâckscheider, Novak presupposes Defoe as democratic and excludes any possibility that he might promote a monarchical scheme. In this respect, Schonhorn effectively suggests an alternative vision of politics in Defoe’s writings including Robinson Crusoe. However, Schonhorn as well as Novak does not see the delicate balance between different ideologies throughout the novel, which is why neither of them can show a convincing explanation of the change of state in The Farther Adventures.

Defoe was such an intense realist that he did not hesitate to make his hero leave his island when neither a patriarch nor a defiant son is allowed to live there. This decision was boldly consistent, though it probably made the rest of the second part less attractive to most readers. To the end of his adventures, Crusoe is denied a reconciliation with his father and what the father symbolised. It can be said, on the one hand, that he has remained true to his identity as a defiant son, but on the other, he is doomed to that role beyond his own will.

At the very end of his life, Defoe had to leave home to hide himself.

---

11 Here is another example of a Whig interpretation of Robinson Crusoe: “[A]s a result of these earlier struggles . . . [Defoe] created the first ‘fiction based on a Whig myth of open opportunity,’ Robinson Crusoe” (Geoffrey Sill, Defoe and the Idea of Fiction 26). The expression, “fiction based on a Whig myth of open opportunity” is quoted from Novak’s essay, “Fiction and Society” (63).
from a creditor. Separated from all his friends and family, he sent a letter to his son-in-law, Henry Baker. Three years before, Defoe and Baker had started a long quarrel as to the dowry for Sophia, Defoe’s youngest and most beloved daughter. Sophia, who may have been instructed by her father’s *Family Instructor*, did not complain about his stinginess, until at last she, having waited for marriage for two years, suffered a breakdown. Then the stubborn father compromised with a suitor as stubborn as he. Soon after the reconciliation, Baker had to listen to Defoe’s criticism of another son, Daniel Defoe Jr., who must have looked after his father’s property while he was escaping from the creditor. Complaining that the son neglected to give financial support to Defoe’s wife and two unmarried daughters, he asked for Baker’s help. It seems that Defoe was not only a frustrating son but also a frustrated patriarch. This does not mean that Defoe did not love his family. There is an echo of King Lear deserted by his children in a passage from that letter lamenting over his solitude and missing Sophia, his Cordelia.

At present I am weak, having had some fits of Fever that have left me low... I have not seen Son or Daughter, Wife or Child, many Weeks, and kno’ not which Way to see them... It adds to my Grief that I must never see the pledge of your mutual Love, my little Grandson. Give him my Blessing, and may he be to you both your Joy in Youth, and Your Comfort in Age, and never add a Sigh to your Sorrow. But, alas! that is not to be expected. Kiss my dear Sophy once more for me; and if I must see her no more, tell her this is from a Father that loved her above all his Comforts, to his last Breath.

*(The Letters of Daniel Defoe 475–6)*

There was no definitive answer or *Finishing Stroke* from Defoe to the patriarchal challenge put by Charles Leslie. His effort to answer persisted at least until the publication of *Robinson Crusoe*. He continuously attempted to make his own myth of the origin of government that might fully answer Leslie’s challenge to revolutionary principles. Every time, however, his pursuit of perfection rather drove him to find out some inherent problem or contradiction. Was this a failure? Or should we praise his courage and thoroughness to reveal the incompleteness of any system, including his own? I would like to leave this question open. But for the moment, let us hope that Defoe could see Sophia and others of his family before it was too late.
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