McMaster University
DigitalCommons@McMaster

Open Access Dissertations and Theses | Open Dissertations and Theses

10-1-2012

ALTERING A LEGACY: REWRITING DEFOE IN J.M. COETZEE'S FOE

Leigha K. Bailey Ms.
McMaster University, baileylk@mcmaster.ca

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/opendissertations

Part of the Other English Language and Literature Commons

Recommended Citation
Bailey, Leigha K. Ms., "ALTERING A LEGACY: REWRITING DEFOE IN J.M. COETZEE'S FOE" (2012). *Open Access Dissertations and Theses.* Paper 7464.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Open Dissertations and Theses at DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

What kind of being is she, so

serenely blind to the evidence

of her senses?

— J.M. Coetzee
Foe

Drowning Susan Barton: The Quagmire of Representation in *Roxana* and *Foe*

The critical discourse surrounding J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*, much like Defoe's *Roxana* before, seeks to layer representation over Susan Barton/Roxana. She is symbolic of her sex, a prostitute, a contagion, the fall of civilization, a feminist and the female colonizer. The representation of diverse individuals within the single body of a white middle/lower class French/Englishwoman dangerously and counterproductively creates a homogeneity of 'woman'. In this chapter I refute these categorizations as I see they are working against what Coetzee truly accomplishes with Barton. He productively blurs the boundaries of categories like 'woman', 'mother' and 'colonizer'. He empowers Barton with agency—not simply oppositional consciousness—and destabilizes the stringent gender roles available to Englishwomen in the eighteenth century by divorcing wife/mother vs. prostitute from virtue vs. vice.

Although in the conclusion of *Foe*, Coetzee undermines the distinct individual woman he has created and pluralizes Barton, these women are conscious of their insubstantiality and reveal their waning individuality as a process created by the writer not a state of nature. Coetzee intentionally reproduces Defoe's homogenization, causing 'real' women to 'disappear' (Loomba 185) into representation. All of the female characters become empty repeating faces, versions of one another and ultimately of Foe. Barton's body becomes bloated and saturated in *Foe*'s conclusion, not with water, but with "whatever story is stuffed" (Coetzee 123) into her. Although Coetzee warns the insubstantiality of Barton is manufactured in (De)Foe's rendering of her,

critical discourse repeats this process, stuffing Barton until she is no longer recognizable as herself.

Out of Place: Critical Discourse's Anxiety to Classify Barton

J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* extracts characters from several works by Daniel Defoe and spins them—like individual threads—together to create an entirely new work. Friday and Cruso of *Robinson Crusoe*; Susan, her daughter and Amy of *Roxana*; an unnamed reference to Moll of *Moll Flanders;* Jack as a boy from *Captain Singleton*; an obscure reference to Captain Smith, an alias of Captain Gow in Defoe's novella *Adventures of Captain John Gow* (Hardin 10); and references to *Journal of the Plague Year* and *Apparition of Mrs. Veal* all appear, and yet critics frequently classify *Foe* as a Robinsonade. The *OED* defines a Robinsonade as a "novel with a subject similar to that of *Robinson Crusoe*; a story about being marooned on a desert island," a story in which Barton is an interloper. The term Robinsonade is problematic, then, for it includes only Crusoe and his island, both of which perish before the conclusion of the first section of Coetzee's text. Perhaps the complicating factor is the introduction of Foe, Coetzee's version of Defoe, as a character. Foe's appearance recalls a similarity between Coetzee's work and Charles Gildon's 1719 pamphlet entitled *The Life and Adventures of Mr. D—— De F—,* in which the author, De F—, appears under the scrutiny of his own characters. Gildon's text, published within a month of *Robinson Crusoe*'s sequel, thus assigns (De)Foe to *Robinson Crusoe*, making it seem as though *Robinson Crusoe* contributes the greatest portion of characters to *Foe*. In actuality, the characters in *Foe* from *Roxana*—Barton, her daughter Susan, and Amy—outnumber Crusoe and his man Friday. To center *Robinson Crusoe* as the primary text[1] of *Foe* is to limit the character of

[1] Gayatri Spivak in "Theory in the Margin" questions the identity of the "female narrator of *Robinson Crusoe*" (161) while Derek Attridge in "Silence of the Canon" takes as given that "the novel of which *Foe* is a rewriting [is] *Robinson Crusoe"* (70). Critics like Trisha Turk offer a more productive description of *Roxana* as a secondary

Barton. Although Barton is herself writing a Robinsonade, or seeks to have Foe write it for her, the story of the island quickly breaks down and questions of her substantiality fill the remaining pages of Coetzee's text. A.S. Byatt reflects in *On Histories and Stories* that a "text is all the words that are in it, and not only those words, but other words that precede it, haunt it, and are echoed in it" (Byatt 46). Barton haunts the text. She invades every page while, as the lesser known character, her identity remains "obscure" (Turk 299). Her text *Roxana* echoes through her even as it threatens to overwrite her.

Barton is out of place within a Robinsonade and lesser known to the literary canon through *Roxana.* Coetzee claims that "the process of reading is a process of constructing a whole for oneself out of the datum of the printed text, of constructing one's own version… In a clear sense, all reading is translation, just as all translation is criticism" (Wagner 1). Just as often to "explicate" is to "reduce" (Wagner 1). Roxana, because of her scandalous actions, long publishing history, and the discourse surrounding her, has indeed been explicated and reduced to the category of 'known'. Barton's character vigorously defies explication and yet there remains an anxiety in *Foe*'s critical discourse to classify, name and define her, to 'know' her, as critical discourse 'knows' Roxana.

Perhaps this classificatory anxiety also stems from her association in the margins with Friday. Sue Kossew argues that "imperial discourse and patriarchal signifying systems tend to place white women and indigenous people in the same category of abject otherness" (168); however, Barton's identification with the margin does not rely merely on her skin colour and gender. Her open sexuality, which equates her with fallen women, if not prostitutes, and her

---

intertext within *Foe* because her reference is rather "obscure" and her interpretation relies on "whether we recognize" (299) her.

working-class status brings her closer to the savage.[2] Although she occupies a space abject to society she is not the absolute other as is Friday. Friday's silence and Coetzee's meticulous writing style never reveal what Friday is, only what he is not. As Barton refuses to speak for him, Friday literally becomes the hole in the story, a "void" (80), but not in the sense of empty like the island, waiting for the infusion of language, reason and culture (McClintock 30). Instead, he voids himself, "day after day" (80) perpetually clearing his person of any meaning which attempts to adhere to him. As Coetzee removes any ability to 'know' *Foe*'s Friday, and Cruso's early death eliminates him as the central character, he transforms a story that is 'known' into obscurity. There is pressure to capture Barton and force her into recognizable roles, to return equilibrium to the classic tale of *Robinson Crusoe*, to do anything but admit that Coetzee is not rewriting a classic member of the literary canon, but dismantling it altogether.

Questioning a Quick Categorization: 'Representative of Her Sex'

Patrick Corcoran's chapter in *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphosis* responds to *Foe* under the assumption that *Robinson Crusoe* is the primary inspirational text. He intentionally sets aside any interest in *Foe* as a metafiction and so his examination of Barton comes without significant reference to her novel *Roxana*. He frames her as "not simply a female-castaway," an alternate version of Crusoe, but "a representative of her sex" (Corcoran 256). Women inhabit the edges of *Robinson Crusoe,* from Crusoe's mother, to the widow who guards his fortune, to his wife who promptly dies within sentences of marrying him. Each woman accomplishes little during her brief whisper in the text. For Corcoran, Barton is to stand in for what Ian A. Bell calls "the curious incident of the dog in the night-time," a reference to the Sherlock Holmes short story "Silver Blaze" in which the dog does nothing in the night-time,

[2] See Felicity Nussbaum's *Torrid Zones* 26, Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather* 23 and 56, and Ania Loomba's *Colonialism / Postcolonialism* 135.

which is in itself rather curious. She is an insertion of the feminine into *Robinson Crusoe* after its long absence.

Corcoran's quick categorization of Barton begs the question—how is she to represent the entirety of woman? She is a white, lower class Englishwoman. If her attributes in *Roxana* adjoin this list, she becomes a profitable prostitute, a capable capitalist, and a middle-class Frenchwoman. It is clear that she is a "bogus universal… incapable of distinguishing between the varied histories and imbalances in power among women" (McClintock 11). She certainly cannot stand in for the conspicuously nonexistent female colonized subject who is often "conceptualized out of existence" (Loomba 138) in colonialist ideology. Female subjects are traditionally represented as white whereas African or colonized subjects are represented as male. Coetzee does not write a female colonized who is indistinguishable from the male colonized from a distance like Defoe. Instead he purposefully includes a single colonized subject in the form of Friday to era(c)e the female colonized completely from the text, as she was within colonial ideology. Coetzee seeks not to reinforce but to dismantle this trope. The female colonized becomes a hole in the text, present through her absence. Barton is not capable of representing her, as Barton's status as a white woman is responsible for obscuring her.[3]

[3] Most interestingly, Coetzee's *Summertime*, a novel masquerading as Coetzee's post-humous biography written by an English biographer, devotes a section to the woman on whom Susan Barton was supposedly based. What is more, Coetzee reveals that although "*in the final version [Barton] is an Englishwoman,… in the first draft [Coetzee] made her a* Brasileira" (Coetzee *Summertime* 200; italics in original). This shift between drafts effectively moves Barton from the role of colonized to colonizer. In the published script, Barton's sexual aggression is attributable to *Roxana*'s capitalist endeavor, but as a member of the colonized she would signaling the "European lore" of the female colonized as residing in the "libidinously eroticized" (McClintock 22) colony. "Prostitution was a *national* disgrace" in England but "it was a naturally occurring phenomenon in the torrid zone" (Nussbaum 96). Here, "women consorted with apes," (McClintock 22), conveniently the only animal the castle Cruso builds defends against. Barton's attitudes towards the sexual relations she has with Cruso would also represent a writing over of the violent acquisition the bodies of the female colonized with the colonial trope of the "indigenous woman [who] extends an inviting hand, insinuating sex and submission" (McClintock 26).
Coetzee's *Summertime* is in novel form, and so the 'facts' within are already slippery without Coetzee's assertion that the preface to *Dusklands* is "all made up" (Coetzee *Summertime* 56); however, this piece of information allows Barton to have been, in different versions, both colonized and colonizer. The result of the publishing of *Foe* is the solidification of the English Barton over the Brasileira Barton, usurping her place not only on the island but

Chimera, Amazon or Feminist: Barton's Roots in *Roxana*

Barton is often categorized as feminist in critical discourse surrounding *Foe,* with strong roots reaching for Roxana's famous marriage speech for support. In an era in which the term feminism and its modern implications are anachronistic and Defoe, although sympathetic to women's trials within marriage, is by no means a feminist, it is difficult to attribute the actions of Roxana, and Barton in association with her, as genuinely proto-feminist. Jane Poyner argues that Roxana's text and actions are feminist by modern standards and John Zhang explicitly investigates the "female power" in *Roxana* as "a force that disrupts the male monopoly and threatens patriarchy" (Zhang 272), but a disruption in patriarchal power is not necessarily indicative of feminism. Gayatri Spivak, avoiding the label of feminism, characterizes Roxana's drive as a "passion for woman's freedom" (Spivak 163). I would argue this is a mischaracterization of her as it implies an altruistic alignment for the betterment of all women that Roxana does not possess. Her interests frequently center on no one but herself and the design for her immediate and future comfort. Within this section I argue that although Roxana aggressively acquires vast sums of wealth as an entrepreneurial "She-Merchant" (131), and displaces the position of the male as breadwinner, to describe Roxana as feminist does not account for the passivity she exhibits in relation to the men who court her, nor the ideal state in which she begins the novel. *Roxana* is not a handbook for early feminism. Her retrospective commentary calls for prudence, that the reader understand Roxana's errors and not follow in her footsteps. For Defoe, Roxana is not an example but a warning.

What Defoe creates in effect is a Chimera. Mythically, the Chimera is a monster possessing a serpent's tail, a goat's body and head protruding from its back and a lion's head

---

repeating the colonial ideology that obscures the female colonized. Interestingly, in an eerie parallel between the novels, Defoe's Roxana also writes over the Other as she appropriates the guise of a Turkish dancer, in form only not in spirit, thus her "colonizing novelty supersedes the other woman's barbarous nativism" (Nussbaum 36).

often with a mane. Despite the additional hair around its neck, the beast is female, indicated by the presence of ears in statues and paintings which would not be visible on that of a male lion. The Chimera also breathes fire from her mouth (Rédei 200). Although this definition did not exist in Defoe's time, biologically a chimera is a combination within a single entity of two or more genetically heterogeneous tissues (Rédei 200). A recent discovery of a very rare genetic chimera was announced in *The American Quarter Horse Journal.* A 1996 brindle stallion named Dunbar's Gold had his registration papers rejected when the accompanying blood sample came back as female. It was later discovered he had both a male and female cell line (Rédei 200)—two separate strains of DNA—in the same body. One of these strains presents as male, the other as female, reminiscent of Roxana's status as Man-woman. As to breathing fire, Roxana's fire is "the Flame of Desire" (40). Her Turkish dress, which "seems to have a mystical power of its own to attract men and woman alike" (Brown 123), is again the chimerical coming together of two separate identities, that of east and west, to form a new entity. Not to imply that the Chimera is hyper-sexualized, for indeed it is not. Its fire breath is pure aggression, not passion; however the double implication of fire as danger whether for sex or combat, is intriguing. In invoking Roxana's resemblance to the Chimera I do not imply she is a mythic beast, nor that Defoe ever compares her as such, but that the epic monstrosity Defoe creates in Roxana exceeds Amazonian limits.

Defoe christens Roxana as Amazon, a more appropriate eighteenth-century term than 'feminist' or 'chimera'. The Amazons, derived from the Greek ά-μαζώυ which means 'to have no breasts', are a group of women who live just beyond the edges of the map under the rule of a queen. They keep men only as servants and are known to mate with passing men and keep only the resulting baby girls. Often they cut off one of their breasts to allow greater accuracy with

their bow (Grimal 37). To label Roxana as an Amazon, which Defoe does only in passing, asserting the language she speaks is Amazonian in nature, is to activate an eighteenth-century cultural anxiety about female independence (Maurer 364) and its subsequent repercussions. Intriguingly, there is a natural mythic connection between the Amazons and the Chimera as Bellerophon, a significant though somewhat tragic classical hero (Grant 98), battles and defeats both.

Roxana is not born an Amazon or a Chimera, but later grows into these roles through a series of patriarchal and societal failures which force her to actively care for herself rather than passively allow herself to be cared for. In the novel's opening she is the ideal woman, wife and mother: natural, adequately passive and adept at all the frivolities that accompany femininity. Her French roots are a credit to her ability to dance "naturally, [and] lov[e] it extremely" (6). She sings "well" (6) and wants "neither Wit, Beauty, or Money" (7). Her name, Mademoiselle Beleau, although it appears only on the title page, comes from a juxtaposition of two French words, "bel" meaning beautiful or good and "eau" meaning water. Her name equates her beauty with nature. Defoe's choice of water imagery also recalls purity, redemption and rebirth as in the Christian baptism. Her opinions of marriage in the opening directly oppose those of her famous speech later in the novel. Even amid her passionate warning to the reader never to marry a fool at the price of becoming an old maid, she labels the unmarried condition "the worst of Nature's Curses" (8) and upholds marriage as woman's paramount ambition. As her father "marrie[s her]" (7) to the Fool/Brewer she is contently a passive chattel in a transaction between the two gentlemen. Defoe's phrasing serves to absolve Roxana of any substantial decision making.

Shortly after her marriage to the Brewer, Roxana's father perishes and leaves 5000 livres to her. Due to her husband's inability to handle money, her father leaves it in the hands of her

brother, who loses it "running on too rashly" (9). Two years after this, the Brewer's father "who manag'd the Business carefully" (7) leaves the family business to his son upon his death, but as the Brewer has "no Genius to Business" (9) and refuses to allow his wife to "join [her] Part to it" (11), ruin comes apace to the unhappy family. Shawn Lisa Maurer notes a "more rash and less proficient" generation acquires the spoils of a "competent elder generation" (Maurer 370) frustrating what would otherwise be a linear transference of stock and skills from fathers to their male descendents. As the household assets dwindle to seventy pounds, Roxana's husband abandons her. The protective barrier of familial men—husband, father and brother—all fail to provide for her subsistence, leaving her to apply to the next line of security: her husband's family. It is here Roxana attempts to provide for her family, though of a station "not bred to Work" (15), revealing a class system that ill prepares a woman of quality with the skills necessary to adequately care for her family without the presence of a male benefactor. Roxana's recourse is to sell her possessions until her house is as gaunt and empty as the bodies of herself and her family.

Roxana was also not always an abject mother. She insists she is of the same mind as "any one that is a Mother of Children" (16), as any mother would understand her fears to see her little ones perish from starvation. Her children sit with her "like *Job's* three Comforters" (17) as she rifles through her rags and linens in the parlor searching for anything to sell. In the story of Job, the Devil asks that God remove the "hedge [of protection] about him" (Job 1.10) as an experiment to see if Job loves God because he is God or because God protects him. The comparison between Job and Roxana suggests her innocence in her conundrum, as it is Job's devotion to God that provokes Satan's wrath. Also, it implies that she begins the novel "perfect and upright" (Job 1.1). She too loses her shelter from ruin, not only financially but personally.

Her hedge is in the form of a functional patriarchy. The parallel between God's protection and a man's protection legitimizes patriarchy as naturally occurring—a construct of God—so it thus follows that the generation of men who fail to uphold it are nothing short of blasphemous.

Although Maurer believes Roxana's anomalous and even Amazonian behaviour "emerges neither from her role as mistress nor from her position as 'She-Merchant'" but "out of her refusal to marry" (Maurer 365), it is clear the seed takes root instead with the expulsion of her children. The ideal woman that is Mademoiselle Beleau breaks, for she must "harden… [her] heart against [her] own Flesh and Blood" (19) and inevitably reject motherhood for the first, though not the last, time. Defoe elaborately constructs a situation which exhausts all lifelines possible for a woman of quality should patriarchy lose its functionality and men fail to care for their female dependents. Here is the definitive birth of the Chimera that Roxana will become. She must take on the male role of provider for herself, fusing the public and private spheres within a single monstrous body.

Shirlene Mason, an authority on Defoe's often paradoxical opinions of women—he frequently investigates several opposing opinions with equal dexterity—observes that Defoe repeatedly blames husbands of disconsolate wives for their unhappy state.[4] She also notes his distaste for a woman who refuses to rely on a "just" (Mason 48) husband. Indeed he is "not for a man's setting his wife at the head of his business," not even so much as to allow her to speak in his stead. She should be no more than "assisting and helpful" so that she might run the business should something happen to her husband. These skills Roxana never acquires. In short, that a wife should "not govern… [her husband]" (CET 294) remains Defoe's main point.

[4] Defoe's opinions of matrimony appear sparingly in the *Review,* a bi-weekly publication he wrote independently from 1704 to 1713. Defoe writes of ideal and immoral conduct within marriage in two substantive texts, each containing four to five hundred pages: *The Complete English Tradesman* (citation as CET) and more specifically in *Conjugal Lewdness* (citation as CL*)*. He also addresses the solution to the problem of street walkers within his short series of two letters bearing the title "Some Considerations Upon Street-Walkers" (citation as SW).

As assertive as Defoe is as to the wife's duties, surprisingly he is sympathetic to the prostitute who is the "most beautiful of our Species… reduc'd to this Condition," (SW 5). Defoe abstains from marking their plight as of their own making; instead he logically and poetically deduces

> the Cause of a Mischief must always precede the Cure of it; and to inquire into this, I don't find that upon strict Calculation the Number of the Female Sex so far exceeds that of ours, as to set the Surplus a wandring in this manner, as has been suggested. I believe the Numbers of both Sexes are very well equelled by the Hand of Providence, considering the Accidents common to both; and that the main Cause is that Neglect of Matrimony which the Morals of the present Age inspire Men with (SW 6).[5]

Defoe's critique of the male sex becomes more distinct in his individual characterization of various states of debauchery in his the *Review* and *Conjugal Lewdness.* Here he outlines male prototypes including the Fool husband, who is incompetent in business and in speech; the extravagant husband, who lacks aptitude with money; the debauched husband who murders his own wife through his promiscuity and venereal disease; and the man who commits matrimonial whoredom, who defiles his marriage bed by fornicating with a woman before marrying her. All of these character types appear in *Roxana.*[6]

Maurer attributes Roxana's plight to "defects within the institution of marriage, particularly in its middle-class instantiation of gender ideologies" (Maurer 368), yet it is not marriage which fails Roxana. Her properly functional marriage to the Dutch Merchant is adequate and her false marriage to the Jeweller is profitable to say the least. Both men, although somewhat morally questionable, fulfill to an extent the role of the patriarch-as-provider. Defoe's

[5] Street Walkers (1726) 6; Defoe's change in opinion from his assertions in *Moll Flanders* (1722) that women had lost their ability to say no, and that "men had such choice everywhere" (MF 68) among women for matrimony or the making of a mistress because there were far more women than men, shows an alteration in his thinking.
[6] Defoe also outlines the drunken husband (who appears briefly in *Moll Flanders* in the form of her first husband, who is cuckolded through drunkenness and does not notice his blushing bride is not a virgin) and the fighting husband in his other outlets, neither of which appear in *Roxana.*

opinions of morally weak men such as the Dutch Merchant and the Jeweller certainly do not frame them as ideal husbands, yet these men prove that the institution of marriage is not faulty. It is the failure of individual men to become men, like their fathers before them, to become adequate breadwinners and to support their families, which causes the breakdown of a functional patriarchy and leaves women to fend for themselves. A man's moral status will certainly affect his wife's happiness, but will not take food from her children's mouths or clothes from their backs. It is for this reason that Defoe's matrimonial opinions and suspicions appearing in the *Review* generally take aim at men (Peterson 186).

A version Roxana's first husband, the Brewer, appears in the October 4th 1707 edition of the *Review* under the Miscellanea, a section in which the popular question-answer appears,[7] bearing the title "Brides Beware!" Here Defoe discusses four "bad husbands of the age, with which many a poor lady is intolerably plagued" (*Review* 230), many of which Roxana encounters. This article reveals the reason for the descriptive rather than Christian names of men in the novel: save Sir Robert Clayton, the husbands are all archetypal figures. The Brewer, Roxana's first husband, bears the title of Fool[8] and aligns with Defoe's description of the Fool

[7] References to the content of the *Review* are from Defoe, Daniel. *The Best of Defoe's Review: An Anthology*. Ed. William L. Payne. New York: Columbia University Press: 1951. Print. and will be cited as *Review* with the corresponding page numbers from this edition.

[8] Defoe's use of husband-types occurs also in *Moll Flanders*. Although their appearances in *Roxana* fit Defoe's descriptions in the *Review* almost exactly, the husbands in *Moll Flanders* are often hybrid forms and frequently span two categories at a time. Moll's first lover, the Older Brother, commits matrimonial whoredom, the younger brother Robin, her first husband, is the drunken husband for their wedding night. The gentleman-tradesman (the linen-draper) that is her second husband is a combination of the fool and extravagant husband, like Roxana's Brewer husband. Moll's third husband is a good man, and no fool, although he is her brother and so unintentionally commits matrimonial whoredom. The fourth husband who later repents is a combination of the debauched husband and commits matrimonial whoredom. The fifth husband, Jemmy, is the result of a trick on both sides that serves to bite them both, much like the Dutch Merchant intends "a Bite upon [her]" that becomes "a Bite upon himself" (Defoe *Roxana* 144) by impregnating Roxana to force her to marry him. Jemmy is also an extravagant husband before he marries Moll, but remains so after he leaves her as he goes to join the army. The final husband, the Banker, divorces his wife who is acting the whore, which results in her suicide. This is a version of the debauched husband, although he does not commit adultery before he marries Moll. The final man I will review is the drunken man she sleeps with frequently and from whom she steals and then later receives subsistence. This man is the quintessence of the drunken husband (although his wife is another lady and not Moll), and the debauched husband, who fears he will bring venereal disease home to his wife.

husband in so far as he is "obstinate" (*Review* 231; *Roxana* 9) with a head "empty" (*Review* 231; *Roxana* 8) of sense. Indeed his character, however, finds a better fit within the category of the extravagant husband who squanders his fortune in "roaring, gaming, and drinking" while his "unhappy wife wants bread at home for his children" (*Review* 230-1). In his work he is impotent and if he has a business it "runs at random" (*Review* 231), as does the Brewer's until he sells it. Most interestingly, the final addition to this sort of husband is that he abandons his wife only to join the military (*Review* 231) as, when Roxana catches up with her husband later in the text, he is feigning the attempt to do. The Brewer cons others into lending him a portion to purchase a Lieutenant's Commission although "no such Offer" (92) exists. It seems Defoe's frustration with the character of the Fool reaches a new level here. Defoe allows him to successfully join the gensd'arms, but not so that he may simply "die a rake" as in the *Review*, instead he must stoop to a new level of infamy: to entangle himself in a scandal in the process.

The figure of the Landlord in *Roxana* is an intersection of the vices and requisite virtues of each of the Brewer, the Prince, and the Dutch Merchant. Many of Defoe's writings on husbands contain pieces of him, but never does he fit as perfectly into a category as the others. The opposite of the Fool, the Landlord restocks Roxana's house with the items, while concealing it is he who removes them in the first place (Hummel 124). He also leaves Roxana with exorbitant sums of money upon his departure—in this instance his death—a duty the Fool fails to perform. This is his only redeeming quality. Although their marriage is a façade, the Landlord, like the Dutch Merchant, commits matrimonial whoredom. He "make[s] a Whore of the very Woman who he intends… to make his Wife" by sleeping with her before legally marrying her and in doing so "acts such a wicked and scandalous Part" (CL 66). Like the Prince he is also a version of the debauched husband, a man who "slights and abandons" his wife to take up with a

"strumpet" (*Review* 230); however, the Landlord's actions are an inversion of the debauched husband as his wife "jilt[s] and abandon[s]" (38) him, not the other way around, and he does not merely take up with a whore but creates one. The Landlord then is deviation of the debauched husband, but still firmly within this category. Although imperfect, the Landlord does serve to prove the functionality of a mutually affectionate marriage, as Defoe insists is of the utmost importance (CL 97). The lewd acts of the Landlord fade with his change of name, which first appears following Roxana's proclamation as his widow. His death solidifies the marriage and absolves him of his actions as his estate and possessions fall to his "pretty Widow" (57), Roxana. His new name, the Jeweller, implies bounty and removes the hierarchy of landlord over tenant, allowing husband and wife to be on equal terms. The Jeweller's name change is essential then to divide the morally deficient man from the providing and benevolent husband.

The Prince is the paradigm of the debauched husband of the *Review* to the letter. His Princess, the "sober, young, pleasant and beautiful wife" he leaves for Roxana, who at this point is fully a "strumpet" (*Review* 230), takes suddenly ill. What *Roxana* obscures but the *Review* makes clear is the illness of the debauched husband's wife is venereal in nature and passes from her husband "coming home laden with vice and rottenness" (*Review* 230). This illness, though, is her saving grace as it takes her "out of his reach, and out of torment altogether" (*Review* 230). Unfortunately the Prince repents too late and his Princess dies the following day.

The intentional matrimonial whoredom of the Landlord appears again in the Dutch Merchant who attempts to force Roxana to marry him. The resulting pregnancy proves a "bite upon" them both (Flynn 83). The Merchant's concern then becomes for the "Bastardy" he "spreads… in his own Race" (CL 65). Roxana's voice echoes Defoe as she weaves into her advice for ladies the responsibility of a man to obtain a "the fix'd State of Life, which God…

appoint[s] for Man's Felicity" as "there cou'd be no legal Claim of Estates by Inheritance, but by Children born in Wedlock" (151). A man is not only to leave an inheritance in his wake, but legitimate heirs to take up the family name. The blame here lies not with Roxana, whose opinions of marriage remain the same before and after their sexual relations, but with the Merchant who "could not with-hold himself from her… till the Performance of a lawful Marriage might make it sensible" (CL 65).

Defoe gives an "exhortation to men to be properly manly" (Maurer 381). Although the maltreatment of women moves Defoe, he does not claim that men are in any way inferior to women nor is the woman's place anywhere but within marriage (Mason 103-4). To Defoe, Roxana's actions are not encouragingly subversive or 'feminist' but monstrous. Roxana is not a Woman-Man, an effeminate man, a man in a petticoat, but a Man-Woman, a woman taking on the actions and burdens of a sex not her own. Roxana as Chimera implies the requisite of male leadership and domination (Maurer 366), to take from her hands the necessity of becoming a man. Roxana as Amazon implies the degradation of society as tales of these independent women often return to civilization from ships sailing out beyond the edges of the map (Brown 131). The Amazon is the symbol of the savage world beyond the pale, a place which precludes the assistance of men; her presence in society is an expression of its regression. It is evident then that the intention of Defoe's Amazon was not to validate the competence and sovereignty of women, but to reveal the deterioration of a once-functional patriarchy. Although Defoe equates English civilization with patriarchy, he does not conceive of it as a systemic hegemony over women, but composed of individual men upholding English values and thus it can be dismantled by individuals: incompetent men.

The appearance of a single Amazon, although discomforting, serves only to indicate the

beginnings of this phenomena of degradation. When Roxana puts her maid Amy to bed with her counterfeit husband, a scene which baffles critics, it serves a new purpose: as contagion. Defoe connects the betterment of the maid and the debasement of the wife as equally problematic, co-constituting issues (Peterson 175), and thus the notion "*like* Mistress *like* Maid" (83) becomes rather thematic as the status of one class affects, or infects, the actions of another. Eventually, Roxana elevates Amy, who she "dress'[es] like a Gentlewoman," and further "ma[kes Amy her] companion" (165). With this, Amy becomes no longer simply Roxana's appendage but her partner and equal, which explains why her daughter Susan can so easily substitute one for the other.

The necessity of her daughter Susan's death also baffles critics, as it seems an overreaction on the part of either woman considering it is only her husband Roxana wishes to keep her past from. The plot does not readily knit Amy's reaction as consistent and convincing. Alternatively, Susan's murder is the logical conclusion to something more astounding and cynical. Before giving her children away, as the supplies are dwindling, Roxana likens herself to "one of the pitiful Women of *Jerusalem*, [who] should eat up [her] very Children" (18). By the conclusion, Roxana metaphorically consumes her own child in that her existence is sacrificed for the betterment of another body. Lamentations 2, to which this alludes, is fall of Jerusalem to Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon and the destruction of the God's Temple. God prevents the siege of Jerusalem for three years to give his children time to repent of their sins and return to God, after which he "abandon[s]" the temple "that the enemy might enter and destroy it" (Ginzberg 138). Historically Nebuchadnezzar's attack is retaliatory, but in the Bible it is divine punishment. For three years the supplies in Jerusalem deplete until the women consider that they might eat their own children. The consumption of one's offspring then points to the abandonment of God.

Indeed this may reflect Roxana's sins as a whore, however the image of Jerusalem's impenetrable walls caging the hungry women, as Roxana undeniably is, fits more concretely with women's inability to have absolute control over their own destiny and virtue. The women do not eat their children after society collapses, but while it is in the process of falling. Roxana's final motion, even as Amy brings it into being, is a warning of great proportion and severity. Roxana is not causing the instability in patriarchal authority; she is a symptom of it.

Defoe's reference to the reader as male on four separate occasions is not incidental. Although many novels of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with female protagonists have the female reader in mind as the primary audience, Defoe's text is not one of them. It casts men's responsibility within society as upholding patriarchal order, to become men, to be adept in business, to follow the footsteps of their fathers, to create legitimate heirs to which to pass their bounty and to provide for the women in their lives—their wives, daughters and sisters. The failure of men to uphold a proper patriarchy "set[s] the Surplus" women "a wandring" (SW 6) as prostitutes. Defoe's Roxana must become the man she lacks, the breadwinner, the man-woman and indeed the Amazon. More than this, she becomes a Chimerical beast, the symbol of patriarchy's demise at the hands of incompetent men, and with it English civilization.

Appropriating Friday: Barton as Female Colonizer

Although Coetzee phrases her words softly, as a "plea" (39) for Friday's safety, in the minds of critics Barton frequently becomes the female colonizer.[9] This hasty label fails to acknowledge that Coetzee uses Barton not as a female-Cruso, but to highlight the intimate link between familial and colonial hierarchies and to destabilize terms like 'colonizer' and 'father'. As Coetzee buries meaning under layers of possibility—the crew is armed with orders to "by no

[9] See J.M. Coetzee, Wilson Harris and Toni Morrison's *J.M. Coetzee's Inconsolable Works of Mourning* 33, Dominic Head's "The Maze of Doubting Foe" 117, Sue Kossew's "Women's Words: A Reading of J.M. Coetzee's Woman Narrators" 172, and Jane Poyner's "Bodying Forth the Other" 94.

means harm Friday," but is "to effect what [is] needed" (39) to bring him to the ship—it is unclear whether Friday's journey from the island is a "violent appropriation" (Coetzee and Morrison 33) aboard a slave ship or the concern of a woman for a "poor simpleton" (39). In either instance, she is responsible for Friday's literal removal from the island and later subsumes Cruso's place as his "owner" (Coetzee and Morrison 33), but Coetzee's ambiguous phrasing further complicates her relationship with her new charge. When she is on the island with Cruso, or before men on the road or in a tavern, she refers to Friday as slave. At the same time, she reiterates repeatedly she is "no slave-owner" (250) and Friday is "not [her] slave but Cruso's" (76). Barton, in a sense, inherits Friday. Aboard the ship Barton becomes "Mrs Cruso" (42) for safety's sake, and later his widow even "if there are two" (99), in a scene that parallels Roxana's false marriage to the Landlord, her becoming his legitimate widow despite the existence of another wife and her acquiring his casket of diamonds and nearly ten thousand pounds sterling. Whereas Roxana leaves behind a child so that she may travel with the Jeweller, Barton gains a child in the form of Friday. She does indeed take Cruso's place but not simply as a colonizer.

Defoe's Friday calls Crusoe not only "Master" but carries for him affections like "those of a Child to a Father" (Defoe 209). Colonial and familial hierarchies are co-constructing. The structure of the family in which women are inferior to men and children are inferior to adults is an ontological certainty in the eighteenth century and so framing colonial structures in terms of familial structures solidifies colonial hierarchies as an immutable fact and therefore unchangeable (McClintok 45). Defoe's Crusoe, often termed the mythical embodiment of the colonial encounter and an upstanding adventurous Englishman in critical discourse, naturally displays these conflating hierarchies. It is plausible that Barton symbolizes the intersection of the familial and colonial systems that allow the subjugation of not only herself but Friday. While this

thinking is useful, it is essential not to reduce Barton once more to a symbol of her sex or her body to a site for debate.[10] She is more than a sum of her female parts.

Barton resists easy classification. Her class and occupation misalign with the attributes of an English colonizer so she cannot, and at the same time refuses to, command the center from the margins. Jane Poyner argues Barton's story "reproduces colonialist doxa" as she "inadvertently chooses the myth of the colonial encounter as the framing of her story" (94), but engaging with the myth does not necessarily mean she acquiesces with its doctrines. Friday remains in England because he is "unborn," a child that "cannot be born" (122) for women are "incomplete birthers" (McClintock 29). Women birth only bodies, while the male birthing ritual, the "imperial fixation on naming, on acts of 'discovery'" (McClintock 29), much like baptism, births the colonized a second time. Barton must carry Friday with her to Foe. She must "beget…not [as] the mother" (126) but as the father, Friday's story so that Foe may birth him through "the imperial act of discovery… a surrogate birthing ritual" (McClintock 29). Barton hurries Foe's writing "so that Friday can speedily be returned to Africa" and she released from her bond as his carrier. Friday aptly resembles the "silent…Orient" (Said 94) and becomes the hole in Barton's story because he refuses to or cannot communicate. Although she attempts to understand him, unlike Europe who is "never directly responsible to… native inhabitants" (Said 94), she refuses to speak for him and so he doggedly remains the hole in her story.

Susan attempts to teach Friday to speak and write, mimicking the relationship between Miranda and Caliban in *The Tempest*, but Miranda's affections for Caliban, which are anything but that of a mother for a child, divorces the maternal from the female colonizer. Barton's desperate search for her own daughter reveals she has the capacity for maternal affections. Her

[10] Loomba discusses Spivak's "Can the Subaltern Speak" in which discourse surrounding immolation is devoid of female voice, allowing their bodies to lose their physicality and become sites for debate.

claim that she "does not love [Friday]" invokes Roxana's maternal deficiencies, and yet Barton is still ready to "defend [him] with her life" (111), a capability neither Roxana nor Miranda have. Unlike Defoe's Crusoe who is father and colonist together, Barton resists labels. She does not reproduce categories like 'colonizer,' but undermines them. She blurs the impossibly pure distinctions between 'mother' and 'father' while at the same time destabilizing even the most natural of associations: the familial and colonial hierarchies, 'father' and 'master,' 'mother' and 'ideal woman,' 'woman' and 'reproduction,' and even 'father' and 'male.'

Destabilizing Structure: Barton's Resistance to Eighteenth-Century Systems of Value

Barton's resistance to easy categorization does not discourage the critical use of "sanctioned binaries" like wife-whore, mother-monster, self-other, dominance-resistance, which McClintock states are not "adequate to the task of accounting for let alone strategically opposing" (15) hegemonic structures of power. Coetzee critics such as David Attwell evaluate *Foe* as "a powerful ally of feminism" as Barton "resist[s] preexisting and more dominant modes of address" (Attwell 215), and yet the notion of female 'agency' as merely "oppositional consciousness" (Loomba 196) is inadequate. At the same time Sue Kossew notes that feminist critics believe Coetzee's representation of Barton is "patriarchal, appropriative and repressive," leaving *Foe* as no more than "an elaborate dead end" (Kossew 167-8). Indeed there are many uncomfortable instances in which Barton willingly succumbs to sexual dominance with complacency, which hides the often violent appropriation of women's bodies. But Barton's agency lies not in her resistance to dominance. Neither role allows Barton the ability to exist as herself, but always in relation to a larger social structure populated with innumerable binaries that threaten to subsume her. Barton's power lies in her failure to internalize the eighteenth-century valuations that position the wife as superior to the whore; mother as superior to monster;

rationality as superior to desire and with it the man as superior to the woman.

Barton washes up on shore in her petticoat after she slips out of a lifeboat carrying only herself and the moldering corpse of the Portuguese captain. The description, coming together in small pieces over several pages, implies that Barton and the Captain are engaging in sexual relations, although it is unclear if it is prostitution or merely extramarital sex. The very name of Barton's captain is reminiscent of Roxana's partners, whose names refer only to their occupation and not their individual person. Yet, the focus of the information Coetzee gives the reader refers to the death of the captain, his pleading and the disposal of his body. Regretful reflections in the form of admonitions to the reader do not plague Barton as they do Roxana. The story of Barton's promiscuity fades behind the death of the captain as unworthy of mention. Although the Portuguese think her a whore, she claims it is only because she "goes abroad freely" (115). She does not relate the title in any way to her open sexuality. She is "a bold adventuress" (45), "a castaway" (77). There remains room in Mr Foe's house for "whores to join [the] menagerie" (77), as they are not already present. Even as she receives money from Foe, it is for her services as Muse, as inspiration, not for sex. She not only never places a negative valuation on her sexuality but also refuses to acknowledge it as a defining piece of her. Sex is something she does, it is not who she is.

Although Barton is frequently sexually active, by her initiation or others, she is not a passive revolving door that allows all who knock to enter. On her journey to Bristol Barton travels figuratively "alone" (100). Friday cannot protect her from the dangers of men on the road, leaving Barton a "hare" among "hounds" (100), fearing not consumption but violation. As a result she takes on the dress of a man,[11] comparable to Hannah Snell in *The Female Soldier; or*

[11] Coetzee's reference to Barton donning men's clothes reminisces more to *Moll Flanders*, in which Moll "was to dress… up in men's clothes, and so to put [her] in a new kind of practice" (213): thievery. Roxana, although called a

the Life and Adventures of Hannah Snell (1750). Hannah Snell is the victim of abandonment by her husband, like Roxana. The loss of their male benefactors requires both Snell and Roxana to compensate by taking on male qualities. Whereas Roxana's abandonment leaves her anxious to never again depend upon a man for subsistence and causes her to become a capitalist man-woman, the failure of Hannah's husband allows her noble traits and romanticized beginnings. She is a virtuous woman beneath a man's dress. Snell goes in quest of her husband, much like Barton quests for Foe, in the dress and guise of a man, but the design of Snell's habit is to maintain her virtue. Barton's alteration in appearance is to protect her body from rape. It is also for her personal security, comfort, and autonomy. She does not change for the sake of virtue. She does not uphold the eighteenth-century notion that sexual integrity is an asset a woman could not do without. Barton does not acknowledge her actions as virtuous or as licentious and yet, as she embodies both, her character blurs the distinction between them and frustrates the valuation of one over the other.

She also refuses to pit emotional motherhood against ambitious female individualism as mutually exclusive, "a fancy… only a man could entertain" (75), as Defoe does in *Roxana*. Defoe's tale of Roxana has historical roots in a very real social problem. Felicity Nussbaum, through her investigation of petitions to the Foundling Hospital in the years following 1720, reveals that prostitution and the proliferation of illegitimate children stemmed directly from colonial expansion, which called men away to colonies, but provided no social structure for the remaining women. The women left behind, in Roxana's state of destitution, without subsistence or a male provider, often could not raise their children and work simultaneously. These children were often placed with family members, in the parish or in the Foundling Hospital, if they were

---

Man-woman, it is a valuation of her unwomanly manner of thinking and not her outer appearance. Roxana does not take on the guise of a man.

fortunate. Many women claimed they gave up their children in the interests of avoiding prostitution. These mothers, she describes, were not "devoid of maternal feelings" (Nussbaum 29), but had no other options to care for their family. Defoe takes a social issue, a chink in the armor of imperial ideology, a problem with the social system, and transforms it into a "father-born" (91) mother versus monster dichotomy. For Defoe, men are not in short supply because they are fulfilling their duties overseas but because of personal failings. Without the men, mothers become beasts who consume their own children. On the contrary, Barton assures Foe that women do not "drop children and forget them as snakes lay eggs" (75). Barton has a motherly interest in her own biological daughter, Foe's wayward apparition and Friday, yet at the same time she is the inspiration for Roxana. As Barton possesses aspects of both mother and Roxana-as-monster, she dismantles this binary by forcing both extremes to exist within a single body.

The construction of Barton's story recreates the dichotomy between body as female and mind as male, in which by eighteenth-century standards would deem Barton inferior to Foe. Kathrin Wagner suggests the passion in the opening paragraph of *Foe* is indicative of "the extent to which Barton's career is determined by desire rather than by rationality," and yet she complies with the hierarchical binary and suggests that "surrender to Desire… set[s] us all adrift on the sea of life" (Wagner 6). Barton's open sexuality, even as it seeps into the words of the text, does not depreciate her value in relation to Foe's reason. Coetzee problematizes the "certain faith in the power of reason" in *The Lives of Animals* through an interesting reading of the Houyhnhnms and Yahoos in Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. Houyhnhnm-land is the epitome of rationality, and yet Coetzee's narrator Elizabeth Costello questions if "even a horse" would care to live in a society such as this. She poses the thought: "if Gulliver and an armed expedition were to land, shoot a

few Yahoos… and then shoot and eat a horse for food… what would that do to Swift's somewhat too neat… fable?" (57). For Coetzee, rationality becomes a dangerously exalted trait and more often a tool to justify violence. If Coetzee is indeed pairing rationality in the form of Foe against the desire that is Barton, the latter is clearly not hierarchically inferior.

Barton further undermines inherent male superiority simply through her existence in the text. Crusoe's journal in Defoe's text serves as an authenticating document, a witness to the reality of his life on the island, and yet takes up no more than a fifth of the text. Barton's letters make up over half of Coetzee's novel. Barton supplants Robinson Crusoe as narrator of the story, Poyner notes, with the exception of the final section, but Barton ousts more than merely Cruso. The first two sections are the entirety of Barton's letters. The quotation marks surrounding her letters are not merely "a representation *in* writing *of* writing" (Attridge 73; italics in original), for her letters serve the same purpose as Crusoe's journal, which is free of infringing quotations. Although she definitively narrates the third section of the text, these quotations imply a secondary narrator, much like the layers of narration in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, to which there is more than one inconspicuous reference in Coetzee's text. These letters are of her creation and presumably unaltered, yet instead of falling under a heading 'Letters' much like Crusoe's "The Journal," they are mediated by an unknown outside force, perhaps a foreshadowing of Coetzee's later assertion that Barton is insubstantial because she as "our hero… is no one but ourselves in disguise" (135). Tisha Turk remains unconvinced that Coetzee's Barton is Defoe's Roxana. She emphasizes that although the child, who I will call Susan, is seeking a woman who resembles Roxana, Barton does not fit the description, nor does she bear any resemblance to the girl.[12] It is illogical that Barton "would deny the daughter she

[12] Coetzee writes a section of *Summertime* supposedly about the woman on whom Susan Barton is based. Perhaps this could explain why Barton does not quite fit into the role of Roxana—because she is a real person, substantial

claims to be seeking" (Turk 302). Roxana fears her daughter will recognize her Turkish dress, a piece of clothing missing completely from Coetzee's text, and reveal her as a whore to her husband. Barton's complete disregard for her reputation and lack of an unassuming husband makes it unlikely that Barton is intentionally misleading the reader with her story. Foe becomes an "old whore" (151) in the end for he sells himself in the form of his characters over and over for money, but there is a possibility that Barton is not a creation of Foe, like Roxana. She appropriates his "pen," a phallic symbol for the masculine authority she lacks to write her letters. It "grow[s]… out of [her] hand" (67) as if naturally a piece of her, opening up the possibility that her power over him is not an indication that Barton is Foe, but that she subsumes him. He must contain her voice behind the bars of quotation marks to prevent her from rending from him not only the words on the page, the "ink" (66), but the very authority he has over his text.

Simply because Barton might not be Foe's creation does not mean they are not versions of the same character, comparable to Defoe's Roxana and Amy. Terry Castle explains the partnership between Amy and Roxana to be the "metaphorics of motherhood and childhood" (Castle 50); however, the maternal-child affinity elsewhere within *Roxana* is the weakest, easily broken and substitutable relation—not at all characteristic of this inseparable pair. Barton may or may not be "father-born" and in a perverse sense carrying on an incestuous relation with her father. The vertical parent-child relationship is an inadequate or at least incomplete description for either pair of characters. Freud's observation of the dynamic between Macbeth and Lady Macbeth as a single character "split… into two personages" (Freud 307), like Roxana and her "a 'me'" (Castle 46), is more comparable, where one's actions and reactions become nonsensical and erratic without juxtaposition with the other. Freud notes that although the echo through the house at the time of Duncan's murder proclaims that it is Macbeth who "shall sleep no more"

---

until she is rendered into text, and cannot be categorized.

(II.ii.39), Shakespeare leaves this as an empty threat as the audience shall hear no more as to Macbeth's sleeping patterns, and instead watch as Lady Macbeth rises night after night to the sink to wash. Macbeth murders Duncan and yet the king's blood saturates Lady Macbeth's hands. While his anxieties lead up to the murder, they manifest in her trembling and revulsion (Freud 308). Thus the couple becomes a union, two "disunited parts of a single psychical individuality" (Freud 308). The analogy of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth has an added benefit in that they are married, much like Foe is Barton's "intended" (Coetzee 126). [13] Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are also of opposite sexes, which is of the utmost importance as much of Roxana's half of the action is, if not distinctly male, in the very least unfeminine. Amy is the "Right-hand" (Defoe 318) to Roxana's brain. Although this means Amy actualizes some major plot shifts, it is Roxana herself who devises them. She is often unfemininely mentally active, making executive decisions in response to no more than suggestions, however persuasive, from Amy. Eighteenth-century women are of the body and men are of the mind, so physically Roxana and Amy become two parts requisite for a complete being, body and brain; however, they also complement each other as possessing the traditional attributes of male and female. They come together as desire and rationality to create a balanced whole,[14] much like Foe and Barton.

Barton's later encounter with Coetzee's Susan has the intimacy of a "lover" (Coetzee 131). Although this parallels Roxana's first interaction with her own daughter, when Barton opens her eyes Susan has become interchangeable with Amy. Roxana and her daughter, like Barton and Susan, share the same name and so have become versions of one another. Defoe's Amy is once mistaken for a "Man-Bedfellow" (Defoe 186) by Roxana's Lord, as Roxana and

[13] Word choice perhaps reflects Kurtz's fiancé in the conclusion of *Heart of Darkness*.
[14] The single character that Roxana and Amy create together, invokes the monstrous chimera, the coming together of pieces which do not normally coincide together: male and female, mistress and maid, reason and desire, active and passive. It is most intriguing that Coetzee repeats this doubling.

Amy often share a bed, just as do Barton and Foe. Coetzee, by explicitly linking Barton and Susan romantically refers back to the implications of an incestuous possibility between Foe and Barton, assuming he is her creator. The connections between each of these four characters and their parallels between *Roxana* and *Foe* serve to amalgamate them into versions of a single character. They can so easily interchange sexes and roles as mother and father of the story because together they form a single hermaphroditic entity. Their union within the text, although the resulting publications *Roxana* and *Robinson Crusoe* serve to efface Barton, dismantles the male female dichotomy as it forces male and female to exist within a single body.

Deflating the Myth: Stillborn Barton

Barton's presence on the island offers a revisionary critical gaze which reduces the original island myth of triumphant colonial progress, the unconquerable Englishman and his faithful noble savage to a sterile land, empty but for a senile old man and his mute companion. She strips both Cruso and Friday of their symbolic characteristics and leaves behind only individual, mortal men who will be a "disappointment to the world" (34). Simultaneously Barton, the inspiration for the chimerical man-woman becomes a woman who refuses to internalize the eighteenth-century gender roles and thus becomes "not-writable" (Turk 306). Edward Said warns that a "text can *create*… the very reality [it] appear[s] to describe" (Said 94), but Barton is not conducive to the eighteenth-century discourse of woman. She does not fit within any acceptable category: the ideal woman, mother, whore or fallen women. Whereas Friday is unborn and no 'real' part of him exists for its own sake outside of the approximation to another substantial being: the white male, Barton on the other hand is "stillborn," like the child she finds on the road. She is unacceptably "perfectly formed" (105), whole, substantial. She does not require Foe to 'create' her, to eliminate pieces of her, magnify others and confine her into a

writable subject. She scoffs at the notion of becoming a "hollow…house of words… a mere receptacle ready to accommodate whatever story is stuffed in[to her]" (131) and so he miscarries her "over and over, in version after version" (151). Her individuality dissipates as she becomes interchangeable with the woman who might be her daughter. She procreates a version of herself, not her individuality but a mirror image which only captures her most basic trait—that she is a woman. She becomes "doubt" (133) itself and he must abort her. She floats dead in the water of the shipwreck, reminiscent of the amniotic fluid of the womb, "the same water as yesterday, as last year, as three hundred years ago" (157), a static transhistorical trope. Those who would reform her to stand as a representative of her sex, an ideal woman, a mother, a prostitute, an Amazon, a Chimera, the fall of civilization, a contagion, a feminist, or the female colonizer, further drown her under layers of symbolism that she problematizes rather than upholds. Discourse surrounding Barton in *Foe* fails to locate her in any 'real' sense, and so Defoe is not the only one to write over her in published form.

History is nothing but a certain

kind of story that people agree

to tell each other.

— J.M. Coetzee
"The Novel Today"
Upstream 6.1

Creating Cruso(e): A Legacy of Blame

In 1719, the year of *Robinson Crusoe's* publishing, race by modern definition does not yet exist. As scientific discoveries of the anatomical body begin to replace the humoral body, ideologies are in a state of flux. The scientific body does not simply overwrite previous thinking, rather for the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth centuries anatomy and humours coexist. At this time English colonial endeavors did not operate on a racial hierarchy. From an English standpoint, the divisionary binary was not white and non-white but Christian and non-Christian.[15]

This chapter will investigate *Robinson Crusoe* not as the "'Colonization 101' handbook" (Akman 84) that it becomes in critical discourse, but as a celebration of England, both its people and practices. Crusoe, as an Englishman existing prior to the joining of Scotland to England in 1707, an amalgamation that Defoe disdained, reveals Defoe's believe in the inherent superiority of English blood. The benevolence of English colonization in comparison to the violent inquisition the Spanish used in America reveals superior English moral. Defoe organizes Crusoe's cultural relations by portraying each male in the text as a more or less successful

[15] See Introduction to Roxann Wheeler's *The Complexion of Race*, where she outlines that claims about race in the eighteenth century are largely based on biological racism from the nineteenth century forward and are thus anachronistic.

version of English masculinity—even those cultures without masculinity.[16] He naturalizes himself at the top as a father figure and often legitimizes this position through metaphorical connections with Old Testament patriarchs.[17] Defoe augments the Christian / heathen binary relation as parallel to father / child, not an aggressive drawing of lines, but a guiding assimilation. Thus he creates a natural hierarchy of masculinity outside Christianity, but certainly supported by it. Defoe writes Crusoe's colonial success into his very being. Defoe legitimizes Crusoe's right to rule over the colonized with individual attributes such as bravery, individual resourcefulness, patriarchal kindness and patience, and leadership skills. Defoe does not write Crusoe as an extension of systemic colonial / patriarchal power, unearned by the individual and merely passed to him because he is an English male. Defoe's text was astronomically popular in part because it reflected back to the culture an ideal vision of England and its people in their glory.

I also intend to show that Defoe as an author function serves to hold together all of the canonical texts present in J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*, but that *Robinson Crusoe* has a second author function. The Crusoe-author function creates Defoe's author function, for without Crusoe's mass popularity, Defoe most likely would not have become canonical. The Crusoe-author function also allows *Robinson Crusoe* to lift free of its writer, and with it its time period, so that its legacy, specifically within the past twenty five years, becomes entwined with nineteenth-century biological racism and violent colonial movements not tied merely to England, so Crusoe's ramblings are no longer of a bold English adventurer but a marginalizing white colonist.

---

[16] R.W. Connell describes masculinity as a "social practice that constantly refers to the body and what bodies do" (Connell 71). Gender, for Connell, "exists precisely to the extent that biology does *not* determine the social" (Connell 71; emphasis in original), thus, while "all societies have cultural accounts of gender,… not all have the concept 'masculinity'" (Connell 67).

[17] Although Old-Testament patriarchs appear in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, Defoe refers to these men in a Christian context.

I also intend to problematize the ramifications of Coetzee naming Defoe's 1986 counterpart 'Foe,' which is simultaneously a common noun: an enemy. Singling out Defoe as the enemy implicates the ideology of *Robinson Crusoe* as a personal failure rather than indicative of the discourse of his era. It solidifies Foe as a single person, rather than a metaphor for all those who colonize lives with writing, speaking for and re-presenting the other. Reading Foe as the villain of this text also repeats the colonial trope of pluralizing the other to create the individuality of the self—often a single character is asked to stand in for a mass of people, like Susan is 'representative of her sex,' a feminist, or the female colonizer (see Chapter 1), or Coetzee's Friday is asked to stand as the "guardian at the margin" (Spivak 172) (see Chapter 3)—whereas the white characters are themselves and are not required to stand for masses of others. As I have argued in the previous chapter, Susan must stand for herself, but I believe Foe must not be reduced to Defoe.

I intend to read J.M. Coetzee's *Foe,* not as a rewriting of *Robinson Crusoe* but as a voice to add to the critical discourse surrounding it. His commentary is not simply on Defoe's text but on its legacy. Coetzee engages Defoe's use of masculinity in a double plotline, one of paternal benevolence and the other of colonial violence, to reveal the power of the pen to overwrite distasteful actions as justifiable. He does not divorce masculinity from colonial violence, although they operate on separate and co-existing plotlines, he merely removes them from the individual by emasculating both Foe and Cruso, revealing their power not to be based on inherent qualities, but conferred systematically through phallic symbols: the knife and the pen. I also intend to prove that although Coetzee cannot explicitly state that it was Cruso who cut out Friday's tongue as it would destroy the effect of the competing plotlines, Coetzee allows enough

clues to bleed through that it is possible to piece together a narrative that identifies Cruso's guilt under the guise of paternal guidance.

The Race Anachronism

The eighteenth-century marks a transition in theories of skin colour from previous Greek and Roman perceptions of humoral causes to what will become the anatomically determinant biological racism of the nineteenth century. As Roxann Wheeler shows in *The Complexion of Race,* anatomical science, which declares that a person's interior brain functions are associated with and can be measured by their outer appearance,[18] does not replace outright theories of skin colour caused by the humours. In the late seventeenth and early to mid-eighteenth centuries these theories co-exist as an "interactive amalgam of dominant, residual and emergent ideologies" (Wheeler 42). Climate theory, which assumed that all bodies had the same potential but were effected by the surrounding environment—the weather, access to shelter, and clothing, culture and education—and humoral theory together acted as a secular explanation for differences between people (Wheeler 23). Race at this time refers to "family lineage,... 'the race of man' (as distinct from animals),...[or] to a subgroup of people such as the Irish race" (Wheeler 31). The meeting of humoral and anatomical theory allowed for speculation that skin colour was volatile, frustrating a connection between the eighteenth-century and the concept of race-as-nation of origin or as a visible indicator of a person's nation of origin.

Characteristic of this transition between theories, John Mitchell M.D. published "An Essay upon the Causes of the different Colours of People in different Climates" in 1744. He moves away from the time of Malpighi (1628-1694), in which "the Cause of the Colour of Negroes is a Juice or Fluid of a black Colour" (Mitchell 114) to determining that both black and

[18] This link between brain function and outer appearance later develops into the biological racism of the nineteenth century (Wheeler 45).

white[19] skin "differ... in nothing, but in Degree of Thickness and Density, and in Colour" (Mitchell 124). Mitchell transposes Newton's theory of light reflection onto the human body to show that it is the thickness of skin in whites that causes a "reflection or transmission of the ray," while "blackness is brought on by an Extinction or Suffocation of those same mixed rays" (Mitchell 130). This distinct association with light as the transmitter of colour leads Mitchell to deduce that the sun causes alterations in skin colour. Due to the different colourings of some populations dwelling in the same area of the earth, Mitchell complicates his theory of light with secondary factors such as the presence of mountains, water, soil, sand or wind which magnify the sun or diffuse its rays (Mitchell 136). The sun's access to the body is mediated by the wearing of clothes or having access some form of shelter. He specifies that a house would offer better protection than mere foliage to explain that the "*Canada Indians*, especially their going stark-naked all over, seem to have no Tendency to soften their skins" (Mitchell 140). He then clarifies that "as the *Canadian Indians* are the most northern,... they are the palest of all *Indians*" (Mitchell 140; italics in original). This explanation of skin colour dangerously crosses darker skin colours with geographic location, nakedness, and a lack of conventional English housing, a "barbarous and rude manner" of being, "little better than wild beasts" (Mitchell 138), but is characteristic of the transitioning theories .

Wheeler asserts that the "elastic" nature of skin colour often interacts with Christianity. Christian semiotics establish black is sinful and white is immaculate "mean[s] that a black man could, in some contexts, be a white man" (Wheeler 4). In the eighteenth-century the Christian /

[19] Mitchell uses the word white to describe the juices below the layer of skin, which are clear, offering an uninhibited passing of light through skin, so "as to transmit the Colour from anything below" so the skin "appear[s] red, or of the Colour of the Red Blood under" (Mitchell 104.) See Wheeler (75), which explains that the term 'white' first occurred in the colonies and not until the end of the seventeenth-century, referring to Europeans who were temporarily, rather than lifelong, servants. By the conclusion of the eighteenth-century 'white' is still not in common use, referring only to Europeans in the colonies. It does not describe the English at home. Wheeler warns literary critics of the tendency to "conflate whiteness and Englishness, and one result is that neither term is fully explored for its historical pertinence" (Wheeler 10).

heathen binary was definitively more important than skin colour. Mitchell ultimately has no concrete evidence of differentiations in skin thickness between races. The value of his essay lies in its indications of the changing ideologies of skin colour. Although there are times in his essay where it seems as though all bodies begin white and gain thickness in relation to their environment, the conclusion of Mitchell's paper asserts that Noah's curse on the descendents of his errant son Ham did not result in heathens of dark complexion.[20] Instead, he writes that "*Noah* and his Sons were of a Complexion suitable to the Climate where they resided... which is a dark swarthy, a Medium betwixt Black and White" (Mitchell 146). His link between Christianity and skin colour means he does "not affirm, that either Blacks or Whites were originally descended from one another, but that both were descended from People of an intermediate tawny Colour; whose Posterity became more and more tawny, *i.e.* black, in the southern Regions, and less so, or white, in the northern Climes" (Mitchell 147). He disassociates heathenism from skin colour as it is possible bodies of all colours "descended from the same Stock" (Mitchell 131).

Despite the importance of Christianity and the feeling of superiority that it gave to the English, differences in religion "were often suppressed to pursue common economic goals" (Wheeler 65) within the colonies and for trade between sovereign nations. Accusations of cannibalism allowed colonists to justify aggression and hostile enslavement of heathens as they were no longer a passive and compliant economic partners, but a threat (Wheeler 68). There is speculation that cannibalism did not actually occur in the Caribbean, but was instead a "nomenclature signaling a dynamic political protest" (Wheeler 68).

As an intermediary period, the eighteenth-century was not participatory an "anxiety about cultural and racial purity" (Wheeler 45) as we understand it today. Defoe scoffs at the

[20] Ania Loomba reveals that Ham's curse was originally associated with European peasants long before it was connected to blackness. (113)

miscegenation of the Scottish and English races after the joining of their counties and writes of Scotland as a detriment to the purity of English blood. In *The True Born Englishman* (1700) Defoe writes that an Englishman is a "Het'rogeneous thing" created "Betwixed a Painted *Britain* and a Scot" to create a "Mongrel half-Bred Race" (1280-1285). Defoe displays Britain as a painted[21] whore and the Scot as her john in his commentary on the creation of Britain. As reproduction in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century dictated men were active procreators while women were merely vessels, Defoe's fears that Scotland will subsume England are clear; however in the conclusion of *Robinson Crusoe,* Defoe sends wives from the Brazils for the men he leaves on the island with a promise to send English women in the future for those who were not personally comfortable taking foreign wives. For Defoe's generation miscegenation and racial purity depended not on colour but on country. Also largely absent from this era are ideologies of "pervasive white supremacism, the white man's burden of civilizing native populations,[22] and an interventionary political rule" (Wheeler 45) which appear in the middle of the nineteenth century with biological racism.

The Masculine Christian Englishman and the Heathen

Robinson Crusoe was not written as a guidebook for imperialism as, after a lengthy publishing history, it comes to appear. The text presents English colonization as superior to the Spanish who, through the inquisition, murdered heathens in droves, while Englishmen like Crusoe took the time to show these heathens the light. Englishmen reserved force only for threatening cannibals. As the Christian / heathen binary does not allow for degrees of difference

[21] Defoe's opinions of paint / make-up are also quite strong. He reveals often in *Roxana* that although she is a whore her beauty is natural and not in need of paint. Defoe use of paint for his Britain elevates her whoredom to, not merely a private taste for money or sex, but as a public spectacle.

[22] This sentiment appears in J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* as Foe's prerogative because Coetzee's text is not a commentary on *Robinson Crusoe* alone, but the critical discourse that accompanies and builds upon it over time, which projects onto Crusoe anachronistic thoughts in order to utilize *Robinson Crusoe* as a guide to imperialism.

between groups of non-Christians, Defoe mediates relations between cultures by overlaying a version of English masculinity. In doing so, Defoe reveals his valuation of cultures, forming them into a Christian hierarchy mediated through masculinity. Defoe also reduces systemic colonial / patriarchal power and focuses it into individual hands, as if Crusoe becomes leader not because he is the armed muscular Christian Englishman but because the individual courage and ingenuity, manifested through masculinity, are his alone. Crusoe reigns from the top of the hierarchy through metaphors of the family and monarchy in which he is always the father or king. Reading *Robinson Crusoe* as a colonization manual leaves unconsidered the discursive context in which the novel was written, which controls what Defoe and the era in which he was writing are able to know and to write. As Derek Attridge notes, "the text, like any text, is manufactured from the resources of a particular culture in order to gain acceptance within that culture"(Attridge 73). As Theophilus Cibber writes in 1753, the text was "written in so natural a manner, and with so many probable incidents, that, for some time after its publication, it was judged by most people to be a true story" (Cibber 282). Defoe's text was received with such applause because it reflected back to its readers an ideal vision of themselves.

Critical discourse about *Robinson Crusoe* from the date of its publication was largely unconcerned with his colonial endeavours. The first English translation of Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Émile* in 1762, which it is speculated lead to a proliferation of Robinsonades (Free 107), chooses of all texts for the education of Émile, *Robinson Crusoe,* simply because it "affords a complete treatise on natural education" (Rousseau 283). Rousseau defines Crusoe as a man "cast ashore on a desolate island, destitute of human assistance, and of mechanical implements, providing, nevertheless, for his subsistence, for self-preservation, and even procuring for himself a kind of competency" (Rousseau 283). John Ballantyne in 1810 suggests

that Crusoe's tale sprouts from a "wearied heart turn[ing] with disgust from society and its institutions, and [finding] solace in picturing the happiness of a state, such as [Defoe] has assigned to his hero" (Ballantyne 287). It is a story that does not "at an advanced age, diminish our early impressions" but instead "the situation is such as every man may make his own" (Ballantyne 287). In the early nineteenth century, Crusoe has ceased to be English and instead is now "a Representative of Humanity," whose readers "become [men]" as they read (Coleridge 288). Even today, the definition of a Robinsonade in the OED is of a "novel with a subject similar to that of *Robinson Crusoe*; a story about being marooned on a desert island or some similarly inhospitable place." There is no mention of the colonized, or even of the colony.

Defoe's contemporary critics often attack his inconsistent writing style, but of his treatment of other cultures often say nothing—with the exception of Friday. Gildon states that Defoe has made a "blockhead, incapable of learning to speak [English] better... to make [Defoe's] Lie go down the more glibly with the Vulgar Reader" but he says also that Defoe uses Friday "no worse than [he does] the *Bible* itself" (Gildon 280). Gildon's slanderous pamphlet *The Life and Adventures of Mr. D—— De F—* writes less in defence of Friday and more against Defoe's unrealistic use of both his servant and his religion. More than a century later, Charles Dickens writes of the "utter want of tenderness and sentiment" (Dickens 295) in the death of Friday, but only because Friday has been Crusoe's man for many years. Dickens proceeds to condemn the sequel, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, but not for Crusoe's bold imperial ramblings. Instead, Dickens complains that Defoe's character "who was 30 years on that desert island" has "no visible effect on his character by that experience" (Dickens 295).

It is not until much later that *Robinson Crusoe* ceases to be a story of inspirational individual perseverance and becomes a story of colonization. James Joyce in 1912 finds the "true

symbol of the British conquest is in Robinson Crusoe... the manly independence and the unconscious cruelty... the calculating taciturnity" (Hulme 216). Even if Defoe's contemporaries were disinterested in it, Defoe did consider his relations with those in his colony and within the different sovereign areas he passes through during his travels. Specifically Defoe compares his actions to the Spaniards in America. As he considers what he will do if he is ever confronted with the cannibals, Crusoe compares killing them to "the Conduct of the *Spaniards* in all their Barbarities practis'd in *America*, and where they destroy'd Millions of these People" (171). 'These people' are heathens, what Crusoe calls "Idolaters" (171), but although they may have had different and violent customs, they had not attacked the Spanish. Thus Crusoe dubs the actions taken by the Inquisition as a mass murder of non-Christians, "meer Butchery, a bloody and unnatural Piece of Cruelty, unjustifiable either to God or Man" (171-2), which Crusoe determines not to participate in. Crusoe's justifies his murder of the cannibals pursuing Friday, and those on the beach about to consume the Spaniard and Friday's father, as defense and as a heroic rescue mission. Although Peter Hulme attests that Defoe's Spaniards are "discursively produced as a buffer zone between Crusoe (that is to say the English) and the cannibals" (Hulme 200), this is not so. The Spaniards are an example of a violent misuse of the Christian versus non-Christian binary, actualized through colonial power. Though he broods a lot about killing the cannibals, it is not until Crusoe sees the cannibals about to eat another man, that he sees the line between passive pagan and active threat dissolving before his eyes, that he takes action. Crusoe's Christian versus heathen considerations foreshadow an early nineteenth-century trope in the frame of race that Daniel Coleman identifies in *White Civility* as a "code of honour" that "serves to ennoble the story of original violence by portraying it as the Loyalist's defence of common justice, as demonstrated by their aligning themselves with vulnerable non-whites"

(Coleman 47).

Interestingly, Friday cannot serve as the "vulnerable non-white," but neither can Crusoe serve as 'white'. Due to the volatility of skin colour, both Friday and Crusoe are of the same colour.[23] Wheeler compares Crusoe's skin, which is "not so moletta[24]-like," to Friday's "very tawny" skin. Although in the seventeenth and eighteenth-century tawny and mulatto were "often associated" she reminds us that "complexion bears no relation to subjectivity and provides no key to character" (Wheeler 80). This is also consistent with the length of time Friday and Crusoe have spent in the same geographic location: Crusoe admits he has not heard another voice for "above Twenty Five Years" (204) and no more than a page later confirms Friday's precise age as twenty six. Mitchell writes that in "*Virginia*, an *Englishman*, by living only three Years among the *Indians*, became 'so like an *Indian*, in Habit and Complexion, that he knew him not but by his Tongue'" (Mitchell 149). In other portions of America, Mitchell claims that it may take a "Succession of many Generations" to become "as dark in Complexion" (Mitchell 150). Crusoe, though not in America but the Caribbean, falls within this timeline.

Though Defoe has interest in skin colour, Friday's relationship with Crusoe is one of Christian and heathen not of white and non-white; however, the binary of Christian and non-Christian does not allow for differences between Friday, the cannibals, the Africans, the Turks or Xury. Defoe's construction of each culture and character in terms of English masculinity, allows for a hierarchy through Christianity so as to differentiate between societies of non-Christians. As "all societies have cultural accounts of gender, but not all have the concept of 'masculinity'"

[23] Wheeler 73-80; It should be noted that Coetzee is aware of Crusoe's skin change and although he does not specifically compare it to Friday's, his Nobel Prize lecture describes "the skin of [Crusoe's] face" as having "been almost blackened by the tropic sun," an interesting choice of words since *Foe*'s Friday is not Caribbean but African.
[24] Moletta: an eighteenth-century form of the word 'mulatto' meaning a person of mixed race having most frequently "one white and one black parent" (OED), often interchangeable with the word tawny. Mulatto was devised in the sixteenth-century meaning "young mule" (OED). Science, at this time, was unsure if people of colour were of the same species as whites and considered that interbreeding might cause infertility, like with a horse and a donkey. Although in the eighteenth century this was a descriptive term, it is now considered offensive.

(Connell 67), that the language Crusoe uses to describe each culture is threaded through both Christianity and is described in terms of English masculinity reveals Crusoe's hierarchy to be anything but natural and instead a reflection of the value Crusoe places on each culture or character.

Friday is the non-European character whose masculinity most closely aligns with Crusoe, most likely because he becomes Christian so readily. His face is "very manly" and yet has "all the sweetness and Softness of an *European"* (205). This detail is interesting, since Crusoe makes the Turkish Moors he meets earlier in his journey more masculine than himself. It is as if he must mediate Friday's masculinity so as not to equate him with his former slave owner. Friday can handle a gun and is a better shot than Crusoe, and yet the guns Crusoe entrusts to Friday are always smaller. Friday holds a fowling piece when Crusoe carries muskets. If their weapons are equal then Friday carries fewer in number as if he is Crusoe in miniature. Hulme characterizes it this way:

> Crusoe's initiation of Friday into the use of firearms [is] a lesson that repays its investment when Crusoe and Friday stand shoulder to shoulder shooting and killing the cannibal hordes. This initiation, though, is a final step that, historically, was never taken, the reason being—and this completes the unravelling of the mimetic reading of the episode—that slavery was never founded on the gratitude of the slave (Hulme 205).

Yet Friday's carrying a gun portrays Crusoe's patriarchal muscular Christian English leadership as so natural that it does not require the withholding of weaponry. Connell argues that "patriarchal definitions of femininity... amount to a cultural disarmament that may be quite as effective as the physical kind" (Connell 83), as if the difference in power between masculinity and femininity is equivalent to the possession or non-possession of arms. Friday's deliberate armament symbolizes a legitimate masculinity.

Crusoe in relation must become hypermasculine as Friday's masculinity so closely

resembles his own. Defoe finds it necessary not only to lay Friday's "Head upon the Ground, and taking [Crusoe] by the foot, set [Crusoe's] Foot upon his Head; this it seems was in token of swearing to be [Crusoe's] slave for ever" (203-4) but to further place Crusoe in the position of father by looping their relationship through the story of Abraham and Isaac. "Two or three days" (210), after rescuing Friday and taking him home, Crusoe decides to turn Friday from his macabre eating habits and takes him out to shoot a kid. Abraham, ordered by God to kill his only son Isaac, after three days takes him to Moriah, to a mountain to sacrifice him. Isaac is unaware of Abraham's intentions and asks his father where the lamb they are to sacrifice is. In the end God asks Abraham to sacrifice a Ram in the place of his son. Crusoe, in what appears to be a showcase of the might of English technology, shoots a kid as Friday watches. Friday, assuming Crusoe is "resolv'd to kill him" begs and "pray[s]" (211) that Crusoe spare him. Although the sex of the kid is androgynous in comparison to Abraham's masculine ram, this is characteristic of Crusoe who throughout his stay on the island never consumes a male animal. All consumable animals on the island, goats and turtles alike, are either female or genderless, as though the assimilation of a male animal into the self were a form of cannibalism. Although the intentions of the characters are different, Crusoe's story seems to imperfectly point to Abraham and Isaac, but in such a way as to conflate the roles of both God and Abraham within Crusoe. Crusoe is not figured simply as Friday's metaphorical father, adored by Friday as a "Child to a Father" (209), as his biological father arrives only pages later, but as biblical patriarch with the power of the ultimate father: God. Wheeler describes "the paradigm of colonial relations associated with Crusoe and Friday," that Crusoe is indeed the benevolent father but also that Friday is a worthy son, willing to take on English responsibility and religion, "characterize eighteenth-century British conceptions of themselves" (Wheeler 47).

At the other end of the heathen spectrum are the genderless Cannibals against whom Crusoe builds his castle. Although Wheeler characterizes the depiction of cannibals after 1492 to be "hideous [in] appearance" (Wheeler 68), she also notes that Defoe "does not provide a single physical description of the cannibals" (Wheeler 80), only of their morose remains; however this is untrue. Defoe's only description of the cannibals is that they are "stark naked" and "whether they were Men or Women... [Crusoe] could not distinguish" (183). To defend himself, Crusoe erects more than a physical building. Crusoe's castle represents the self (Easthope 36), Crusoe's own corporeal body, as symbol of impenetrable masculinity. Crusoe creates a wall, not through the insertion of vertical posts at intervals and between them horizontal boards, but by "driving" stakes "into the ground" (59). He pricks the earth over and over, until every opening closes. He then builds a ladder he can pull up inside the enclosure to prevent penetration. Only when his wall is complete and his protection assured, he burrows a hole Hulme calls a "womb" (193) into the earth. The "land is virgin,... passively awaiting the thrusting, male insemination" which he expands, fortifies and fills with the remains of England he has rescued from the ship—"history, language and reason" (McClintock 3).

This womb births him as patriarch of the island but Defoe once again loops his legitimacy through the bible. As he fells a tree in the building of the canoe, Crusoe ponders "if Solomon ever had such a One for the Building of the Temple at *Jerusalem* (126; italics in original). Crusoe's canoe building skills are lacking, resulting in an unsuccessful escape attempt, but Crusoe's comparison is not of his boat to the temple. Crusoe and Solomon both use cedar for their constructs (1 Kings 6). Crusoe's comparison is of himself to Solomon. Crusoe's later description of the cannibalism he finds on shore reflects the language used in Lamentations 2 at

the fall of the same temple at Jerusalem.[25] In the biblical recount God "abandon[s]" the temple for the sins of his children; however history tells us the three year siege of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon reduces the food stores to the point where mothers consider eating their own children. God then allows the enemy to "enter and destroy it" (Ginzberg 138). It seems then, cannibalism and the desertion of God go hand in hand; however it is interesting that Crusoe writes himself and the cannibals at different points in the same biblical narrative. What is more interesting is that the cannibals are not before Crusoe, but after him. This invokes the ideology of the four-stages theory, which outlines four types of societies, two savage and two civilized, to explain England and other nation's progress from barbarity to civilization (Wheeler 35). Although this theory seems to lead linearly to perfection, progress is instead "perceived as part of a cycle in which eminence characteristically preceded decline" (Wheeler 35). Defoe's belief in the possible degeneracy of English society based on the actions of their male inhabitants arises often in his other works including *Roxana* (see Chapter 1) and *The True Born Englishman*. Crusoe's anxiety to become hypermasculine in order to repel the genderless cannibals may perhaps stem from a realization, not that he is ahead of them, more advanced, but due to the cyclical notion of the four-stages theory, that they may be his future.

That said, mere obscurity of gender is not enough to demonize an entire civilization. The Africans Crusoe encounters become allies. Carrying nothing more than a "long slender stick" (29), which encourages Crusoe to keep his distance from shore, the Africans offer Crusoe food and fill for him jars of water. Crusoe saves them from a wildcat as payment for their kindness and they split the carcass, taking the cat for food, thus they are not cannibals, and leaving for Crusoe the skin. Crusoe's "friendly *Negroes"* (31; italics in original) have become non-threatening trading partners who have only the misfortune not to be Christian, yet Crusoe can

[25] For more information see Chapter 1.

overlook this for mutual economic benefit.

Unlike the Friday, the cannibals and the Africans, the Moors and Turks to which Crusoe becomes a slave for a time, are more masculine than he. The Moors, Wheeler claims are "represented as frightening rather than inferior or savage" which "derive[s] from centuries of maritime and financial power" (Wheeler 56). Turks are often not simply Other to the English but their "foil" (Knowles 112). In addition, the word Turk "does not usually suggest anything positive about the culture" (Akman 77), yet Defoe's Turks are different. Beyazit Akman notes that Defoe's Turks, including the one in his *A Continuation of Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy*, "almost singlehandedly def[y] all of the stereotypes about the Orient… to such an extent that the Turkish Empire seems to be the model for the Enlightenment not only for Britain but for the rest of Europe" (Akman 80). Akman even suggests that the roots of *Robinson Crusoe* lie not in the true life story of Alexander Selkirk, a Scottish castaway, but *Hayy Bin Yaqzan* (*Alive, Son of Awake*) a story by Turkish philosopher Ibn Tufail. Ibn Tufail sought to answer the question "Can God be found by the individual without recourse to scripture, the law, and society" (Akman 81)? Akman further shows that Ibn Tufail's text was translated into English most recently in 1708 and that although the text is not present within Defoe's library, he was familiar with the translator's work and "was well acquainted with the Quakers, who, for several decades, used *Hayy Bin Yaqzan* as a sort of guidebook among themselves" (Akman 81). Akman also notes that the claim that *Robinson Crusoe* is "the product of an Islamic culture, may seem somewhat frightening," but that this might explain "why many recent critical editions of the text still ignore this relationship" (Akman 84). It is "an indication of how deeply rooted the Canon is to the idea of European civilization as an isolated enterprise" (Akman 84). Defoe's relation with the Turkish culture is one of respect, not of disdain.

Although he does write the Turkish Moors in *Robinson Crusoe* as a foil to the English, he chooses to express this foil in terms of gender. The ship which captures Crusoe is male. Defoe describes the Turkish Rover of Sallee as "he" (18), the diametric opposite of the customary term 'she'. Only the ships built by the Turks are male. Captured by the same master is another Englishman, a boat builder. The ships he creates are all female. Minaz Jooma notes that upon his escape, Crusoe "robs his Turkish master of his pinnace… with its curious phonemic proximity to that other vessel of pleasure, the penis" (Jooma 71). Without besting the Turkish Moor's masculinity, it would be impossible for Crusoe to escape, and yet he later cuts his facial hair into "*Mahometan* Whiskers, such as [he] had seen worn by some *Turks*, who he [saw] at *Sallee*" (150; italics in original). He describes them as "monstrous" and "frightful" and yet wears them purposefully as if to appropriate the Turk's masculine appearance. Homi Bhabha describes mimicry as producing a "partial vision of the colonizer's presence" (Bhabha 321), as though even after Crusoe escapes he is still subject to those who once conquered him.

Xury, the young Moor Crusoe takes with him in his escape, is Islamic not Christian, but interestingly is also European. Xury's very existence causes a strange imbalance in the Christian / heathen dynamic. Here Crusoe steps outside of masculine metaphors and resorts to making a contract with the boy. Although Islam is normally depicted as a pagan religion, Akman says of Defoe that he is "quick to note that Muslims also believe in Jesus as a prophet and that Islam conceives of Jesus in relation to the Judeo-Christian culture" (Akman 79). As Defoe does not demonize Islam as is the custom in the eighteenth century, when Xury and Crusoe are captured by the Turkish Moors they have their European origins in common (Wheeler 59). As with the Africans, once again religion can be overlooked in the interest of common economic gain. Once they have escaped and are in the possession of the captain who rescues Crusoe, all characters

present are of European origin and Islam as the pagan religion becomes Xury's identifying characteristic. Xury is sold for a period of ten years, his freedom set at becoming Christian. Wheeler reveals that slavery in *Robinson Crusoe* is always an "individual and even temporary phenomenon and not… systemic oppression necessary to a successful colonial empire" (Wheeler 89).

This making of contracts, as Crusoe does with Xury, is characteristic of Crusoe's relations with other Europeans, although most often at the cost of placing Crusoe in the position of patriarch. His capture of the mutinous crew relies on surrender to a fictitious army of men and Crusoe's intimidating titles, which grow from "Governor" to "Commander of the island." Crusoe-as-father or as-monarch frequently occurs within contract. The captain who rescues Crusoe from the water after he escapes the Turks with Xury becomes his "universal Heir" (40). Although Crusoe is younger than this captain, he is as a father for the purpose of bequeathing. The English captain of the mutinied ship mistakes Crusoe for the ultimate father: God. The Spaniard and all of his men on Friday's home island must swear allegiance to Crusoe on paper before he agrees to help them. Even with the Spaniard's assurance of Crusoe's supremacy he anxiously describes the Spaniard with a diminished masculinity. The Spaniard is older, what Crusoe describes as "white" (233), which in this era refers not to his skin colour (as all races in *Robinson Crusoe* appear in italics and are organized by nation i.e. *Indian, Negro, Spanish, English*), but to his hair colour. He is also "very weak" (238) from his time with the cannibals. The Spaniards remaining on Friday's home island are so incompetent that they have "neither Vessel, nor Tools to build one, or Provisions of any kind" (233). With the arrival of the Spaniard and Friday's father, Crusoe states his "Island [is] now peopled" (241) in an asexual form of reproduction that places him as father, and thus naturally king, over his new subjects.

Robinson Crusoe writes relations between cultures, as Christian / heathen. Although Crusoe's evaluation of other cultures is Eurocentric, it is not written as a colonial hierarchy. Slavery functions on an individual basis and heathen populations are not obsessively converted but sometimes overlooked in favor of economic gain. Defoe uses heathenism to reveal the Englishman's benevolence upon first meeting other cultures. As he writes of England in *A Continuation of Letters Writ by a Turkish Spy* "whenever they have to do with any Sect or Opinion of People, differing from their own, the first thing they go about is, to represent them as monstrous and unnatural" (62). Defoe does not represent differing cultures as Other but as versions of Englishness, versions of masculinity, as worthy children to Father England. Only those who offer violence to Crusoe are met with violence, portraying a colonial interaction far superior to that of the Spaniards. What will later become systemic power of the white muscular Christian is for now no more than the natural earnings of a single innovative and adventurous Englishman.

The Dual Author Function

The alteration in *Robinson Crusoe*'s reception since its publication is connected to its author function. An author function, as Foucault asserts, is a division between the author's name and the human writer who holds it. An author's name, not necessarily the physical wo/man attached to that name, connects various works under a collective heading. Foucault explains it as such:

> If I discover that Shakespeare was not born in the house that we visit today this is a modification which, obviously, will not alter the functioning of the author's name. But if we proved that Shakespeare did not write those sonnets which ass for his, that would constitute a significant change and affect the manner in which the author's name functions (Foucault 284).

The author's name also "indicates that there has been established among [texts] a relationship of homogeneity, filiation, authentication of some texts by the use of others, reciprocal explication, or concomitant utilization" (Foucault 284). It is a "mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society" (Foucault 284). The author's name is not a referent to the wo/man, so much as it is "the equivalent of a description" (Foucault 283).

Defoe works as an author function in Coetzee's *Foe*, connecting together all of the canonical texts present; however, *Robinson Crusoe* has a secondary author function: the Crusoe-author function. The Crusoe-author function creates the Defoe-author function. The Crusoe-author function subsumes the Defoe-author function. This allows the temporal element of the author function, that "passages quoting statements that were made or mentioning events that occurred after the author's death must be regarded as interpolated texts (the author is here seen as a historical figure...)" (Foucault 286), to become void. No longer attached to its historical time period, *Robinson Crusoe*'s legacy becomes entwined with nineteenth-century biological racism and violent colonial movements not tied merely to England. Critical discourse, over time, reinterprets Crusoe's actions not as those of a bold English adventurer, but the shoddy cloaking of colonial violence as colonial aide.

As it is the Crusoe-author function and not the Defoe-author function that acquires historical events beyond Defoe's death, I also intend to problematize the ramifications of naming Defoe's 1986 counterpart 'Foe,' a common noun meaning enemy. By naming Defoe the antagonist of *Foe*, a man who could not have known what his text would become, that the text, due to its instant popularity, would "escape the control" (Hopes 314) of its author, we point a finger not at nearly three hundred years of discourse but to a single figure who had only the knowledge of his time. The Defoe-author function, as Coetzee utilizes it in *Foe,* serves a

classificatory role, in that several characters from Defoe's novels are only present because they are connected to his name. Coetzee extrapolates this connection and definitively attaches Foe to Defoe the person. Foucault claims it would be "just as wrong to equate the author with the real writer as it would be to equate him with the fictitious speaker" in what he calls the plurality of self. Interestingly, more often than not Crusoe and his author are interchangeable in critical discourse. Even Barton, as she is in Foe's embrace, "might have thought [herself] in Cruso's arms again, for they were men of the same time of life" (139). Coetzee, in his Nobel Prize Lecture reveals is awareness of the Crusoe-author function, although he does not call it by this name. He writes of Crusoe's man, he refers to Defoe, not to Friday, who writes other stories but not Crusoe's. Crusoe writes his own story, thus Coetzee confuses Defoe and Crusoe. Are they the same person, or versions of each other, "our hero (who is no one but ourselves in disguise)" (*Foe* 135)? Coetzee describes the relationship between Crusoe and Defoe in ship metaphors, intriguing considering Defoe's use of ship metaphors is always in reference to marriage. As "the author's name" is "more than an indication, a gesture, a finger pointed at someone, it is the equivalent of a description" (Foucault 183), the writer behind the name becomes "a closed circuit in which allegory functions as a stable and constant current, and, depending on how the switch is flipped, alternately charges the poles 'Robinson Crusoe' and 'Daniel Defoe', so that one lights up and then the other" (Sanders 43).

Despite this confusion, what Coetzee does make clear is that Crusoe creates Defoe, for "who or what would Defoe be to us without Robinson Crusoe" (Sanders 42)? Although *Roxana* is now a canonical text, "it was critically invisible for the first fifty years of its life" (Mullan viii). It was the immediate success of *Robinson Crusoe* that made Defoe a canonical author and his

other texts with him. The Crusoe-author function is able to create the Defoe-author function because Crusoe's text and many of its rewritings were "Written by Himself" (np).

Melissa Free gives a very thorough outline of *Robinson Crusoe's* intricate publishing history, but I will narrow its effects down in the interest of space as this is not my primary objective. Students began reading of Crusoe's travels in the classroom in 1783, but the *Robinson Crusoe* of the nineteenth century was paired with its sequel, published four months after the first: *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe.* Betteredge of Wilkie Collins' *The Moonstone* (1868) uses *Robinson Crusoe* as "some people have drawn upon the Bible" (Parker 18), which is appropriate since it has been "re-issued more often than any book except the Bible" (Crowley vii). During the nineteenth century "when the British were often (though not always) winning the day, *Robinson Crusoe* was increasingly thought of as a book for boys" (Free 113). Often Robinsonades, and other "numerous bastardized versions for children" (Free 96), focussed on the story of the island but contained events from *The Farther Adventures*. Pictures of Friday in illustrated copies of the text "emphasize his affiliation with Negroes" (Wheeler 81) despite Crusoe's description of his similarity to Crusoe. Biological racism of the nineteenth century turned "'savagery' and 'civilization' into fixed and permanent conditions" (Loomba 101) and with them slavery. The temporary status of slavery in *Robinson Crusoe* is overlooked. James Joyce in 1912 notes "the unconscious cruelty" and "calculating taciturnity" (Hulme 216) of Crusoe. After the Boer war (1899-1902) the popularity of *The Farther Adventures* waned and *Robinson Crusoe* was published alone, often called the "castration of *Crusoe*" (Free 114). At the bi-centennial anniversary of *Robinson Crusoe*'s release, Virginia Woolf wrote that the text "resembles one of the anonymous productions of the race rather than the efforts of a single mind" (Woolf 121). Crusoe passes through time, unattached to a temporal author, gathering

discourses and continuing to stand for 'every man' for hundreds of years after its publication.

Coetzee's decision to write Defoe's alter ego as 'Foe,' the name Defoe held until 1695, but also a common noun meaning enemy, can become misleading if it is read by critical discourse as a critique not of every man who holds a pen with the intent to cover atrocities, or of Crusoe's tale in combination with its legacy of interpretation, but of a single man in 1719 who stands accused of writing "foul... papers" and knowing the nature of their filth. Although *Foe* does present "narrative as its own form of colonization," to classify Foe as a "writer-colonizer" (Hardin 9) is to disregard that the lives Foe most often 'colonizes' in Coetzee's text are fellow English. He pulls stories from the people around them and packages them to "please [their] readers" (63), much as Defoe did. It has been said of Defoe that "originals will ultimately be found for all of Defoe's longer narratives"[26] whether from previous works or people he meets. Foe's reworking of a "narrative from an African and a woman and giving it to a dead white male" (Hardin 9), demonizes him, and with him Defoe, although Coetzee's tale of the roots of *Robinson Crusoe* is a complete fiction. The history of Defoe's story points most popularly to a Scottish mariner Alexander Shelkirk, who "found an 'almost drowned Indian' on the shore of an island upon which he had been shipwrecked" (Wheeler 51) and less often to *Hayy Bin Yaqzan* (*Alive, Son of Awake*) by Ibn Tufail, but never to an English woman seeking the heart of the story of an African Friday. Critical discourse directly associates Foe with Defoe the writer and person, rather than Defoe-as-author-function or Crusoe-as-author-function (which often contaminates Defoe-the-author-function as Crusoe through history has many different authors). Critical discourse then concludes "Defoe's complacency" in the "ethnocentric attitudes that underlay colonial conquest" (Parker 28). Defoe is naturally a product of the discourse of his time, but it is unreasonable to ask that Defoe think beyond 1719 when writing his text. The sentiments

[26] J. Paul Hunter as cited in Akman 82

expressed in *Robinson Crusoe* are not a personal failing, but the ideology of an age. Associating Foe with Defoe directly also allows critical discourse to finger a culprit and draw a line between the present and the past, where we can congratulate ourselves for moving beyond such individual racism. Even now, it is not individual racist attitudes that result in systemic oppression but discourses, of which *Robinson Crusoe* is indeed a part, but so too are several hundred years of voices, history and change Defoe cannot be responsible for.

Foe must be read as a metaphor for all those who colonize lives through writing, speaking for and re-presenting the Other. To equate Foe to Defoe exclusively is "to pluralize the other…to produce one's own singularity" (Chambers 144). As I have explained in chapter one, asking Susan Barton to become the sole female interloper into *Robinson Crusoe*, to represent not only the entirety of femininity, but also feminism and the female colonizer, eliminates her individuality. So does asking Friday to stand in as the "guardian at the margin" (Spivak 172), which I will discuss in chapter three. To pluralize the marginal characters only to reduce Foe to Defoe, not only grants him individuality, but a solidified, historic and substantial existence. Critical discourse must consider the pluralization of Foe. He must represent all who knowingly colonize lives, as Foe knows he is doing for he admits his "papers are foul enough" and Friday "can make them no worse" (151). Foe must be reduced not to the proper noun 'Defoe', but to no more than a common noun, 'foe'. The connection between them must end there.

The Phallus, the Knife and the Pen

Coetzee's *Foe*, rather than rewriting *Robinson Crusoe*, enters into a critique of its legacy, and the history of colonial violence, not merely the original text. Coetzee engages Defoe's use of masculinity through a double plotline: one of familial, paternal benevolence and, bleeding through it, the loss of Friday's tongue. Coetzee does not divorce masculinity from colonial

violence, although they operate on separate plotlines, he merely separates them from the individual. Both Cruso and Foe are emasculated and impotent within *Foe* and yet they wield phallic tools. Cruso uses his knife to cut out Friday's tongue and Foe uses his pen to 'make Friday speak', to eliminate Susan and to give their story to a white English male. This doubling plot reveals the pen to be as potent a weapon as the knife. Masculinity in *Robinson Crusoe,* represented often as fatherhood, makes Crusoe's mastery of other continents and peoples seem natural; however, Foe's pen, writing drafts of a bloody history as justifiable defense or benevolent assistance, reveals colonial violence and presence as a *process*. Coetzee shows the difference between earned strength, as it appears in *Robinson Crusoe*, and unearned power conferred systematically.

The superiority of man over woman and adult over child were "natural facts" (McClintock 45), used as a metaphor in the nineteenth-century family of man to create a racial "*hierarchy within unity*" (McClintock 45; italics in original). Crusoe's benevolent father-child relation with Friday becomes an overwriting of "murderously violent change legitimized as progressive unfolding of natural decree" (McClintock 25) only later in critical discourse. The superiority of white to non-white thus "could be portrayed as natural and inevitable" through the image of the family, "rather than as historically constructed and therefore subject to change" (McClintock 45). Coetzee investigates this dynamic competition of voices resulting in the final silencing of the marginal in favour of the fought for, written and published master narrative that will be *Robinson Crusoe*.[27] Cruso's emasculation and yet superiority lies in his ability to appropriate a symbol of hegemonic masculinity: his knife. Connell in a section of his chapter entitled "Relations among Masculinities: Hegemony, Subordination, Complicity,

[27]Although *Foe* is written as a prequel outlining the events leading up to the publishing of *Robinson Crusoe* in 1719, we must recall that the colonial race issues Coetzee is addressing, are anachronistic in the early eighteenth-century.

Marginalization" states that "the number of men rigorously practising the hegemonic pattern in its entirety may be quite small" yet "the majority of men gain from its hegemony, since they benefit from the patriarchal dividend" (Connell 79). Crusoe need not be a muscular Christian patriarch, merely hold its metonymy to allow him access to the 'patriarchal dividend', the unearned power he may appropriate no matter what his individual aptitude as leader.

Coetzee goes to great lengths to eliminate Crusoe's masculinity and every extended metaphor of his prowess. Cruso does not carry several muskets and fowling pieces with him but only "a short stick and a knife" (8). His terrace is no longer a series of poles endlessly penetrating the earth and then springing to life to grow into an impassable, the only entrance is by ladder. Cruso creates a "hut of poles and reeds... artfully thatched together... in the shape of a triangle" (9). He does not penetrate any earth within his enclosure except to prepare his terraces for planting with a shovel, although it is a "narrow wooden thing with a crooked handle" (15). Sheila Roberts speculates that the loss of the final 'e' in Coetzee's Crusoe is a "de-Englishing" (Roberts 88), but Cruso justifies the few words he teaches to Friday, as opposed to full sentences, by saying it is a result of their not residing in England. Cruso's lost 'e' could be from Ian Watt's speculation that Crusoe is *homo economicus*. Cruso is no longer the builder of an economy, which Coetzee expresses through metaphors of impotence. Crusoe has "nothing to plant" for "planting is reserved for those who come... and have the foresight to bring seed" (33). In Defoe's novel Crusoe's journal allows him to track the seasons and plant so as to acquire the greatest harvest for his labour and yet *Foe*'s Cruso keeps none. He has neither ink nor paper and does not cut notches into a staff to count the years as they pass. Cruso could not harvest even if he had seed for he cannot know when to sow. The only successful crop Cruso plants is the seed of fear in Barton's mind of Friday's cannibalism, despite her later assertions that she believes there are

no cannibals for they have "left no footprint" (54). He impregnates her mind, but fails to beget a child on her.

Thus, Cruso is stripped of his father status both literally and figuratively. During Barton's duration on the island, Cruso and Friday's relation is no longer natural and familial but one of master and "pet" (Aravamudan 75). Only once is Cruso a father: in Barton's representation of Cruso cutting out Friday's tongue she realises her page could also appear to be a "beneficent father putting a lump of fish into the mouth of child Friday" (68). Although Coetzee cannot confirm definitively that it is Crusoe who cuts out Friday's tongue and not the slavers without favoring one narrative over the other, thus defeating the discomfort the reader is to feel without a master narrative, there is enough evidence to extract from the entwining storylines one possible history. In this possible plotline, the benevolent father is no more than an impatient, intolerant, impotent colonizer who, unable to teach Friday to speak, cuts out his tongue.

Coetzee presents two possible introductions to Friday's stay on the island. He is first a slave who washes on shore at the same time as Cruso when his ship goes down, but at the time is a "mere child" (12). When Cruso is in a fever, however, he tells of a cannibal whom he had rescued from being consumed by a hoard of fellow cannibals. Barton suspects that the tale told in the fever is the truth, but at the same time notes it odd that "a man so fearful of cannibals should have neglected to arm himself" as he "did not save a single musket from the wreck" (53). Indeed, there are "no strange fruits, no serpents, no lions" (43) and the cannibals never do come to the island, and even if they had, how is Cruso to save Friday from cannibals with no more than a stick and a knife? This leaves the narrative of Friday as slave-boy washed ashore with Cruso. Although he claims Friday "lost his tongue before he became mine" (37), implying the slavers drew it from his mouth when he was a mere child, he alternately claims Friday "has known no

other master" (37) than himself. Although this would appear to support the cannibal storyline, it also equates the two stories if Cruso is the slaver. Crusoe leaves his plantation in *Robinson Crusoe* to acquire slaves for himself and his neighbours. In his feverish sleep once again, Cruso bellows out the words "*Masa* or *Massa*, a word with no meaning" (29). Perhaps it has no meaning to Barton who has never heard Friday speak, but to Cruso it is the haunting of 'master' in Pidgin English. Only pages before Cruso presents Barton with a series of reasons the slavers may have removed Friday's tongue.

> 'Perhaps the slavers, who are Moors, hold the tongue to be a delicacy,' he said, 'Or perhaps they grew weary of listening to Friday's wails of grief, that went on day and night. Perhaps they wanted to prevent him from ever telling his story: who he was, where his home lay, how it came about that he was taken. Perhaps they cut out the tongue of every cannibal they took as punishment. How will we ever know the truth?' (23)

It is the additional detail, not simply that Friday has "wails of grief" but that they "went on day and night" (23) as from an inconsolable child. From this evidence we can piece together Cruso's washing ashore from the wreck of a slave ship with the only rescued slave: Friday and, like his interaction with Xury in the original *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe makes Friday his subordinate.[28] Just like in Gildon's *The Life and Adventures of Mr D—— de F—* Friday learns to speak "broken *English*... incapable of learning to speak it better" (Gildon 280), as indicated by his Pidgin callings to Cruso that haunt him in his sickness. Friday is not the fetching, eager and compliant servant that he is in *Robinson Crusoe* but a scared and wailing child. Cruso teaches Friday, not English or Christianity, not gun shooting, canoe building or bowl shaping, but "eternal obedience, at least the outward form of obedience, as gelding takes the fire out of a stallion" (98). Barton's equation of the phallus and the tongue is intriguing since Connell states that "most

[28] The confusion of Xury and Friday into a single character or to versions of the same character is common in Robinsonades and rewritings of *Robinson Crusoe*.

episodes of major violence... are transactions among men. Terror is used as a means of drawing boundaries and making exclusions" but also "violence can become a way of claiming or asserting masculinity" (Connell 83). Cruso's cutting out of Friday's tongue is not merely to silence him but to dominate him. Crusoe's superior masculinity, which makes him father, patriarch and leader over all cultures but the Turks in *Robinson Crusoe*, is now finalized, not as adult to child but as male to non-male for Friday's lost tongue is also his castration.

J.A. Parker in his article "*Crusoe*'s Foe, *Foe*'s Cruso, and the Origins and Future of the Novel" asks "how it is possible to... (re)write the barbarity of slavery as benevolent paternalism" (Parker 33). Coetzee's response in *Foe* is simple: with a pen. On the heels of Cruso's death is the introduction of Foe. Paola Splendore writes in 1988, only two years after *Foe* is published, that "clearly [Cruso] is not the hero of this novel, but perhaps Foe is" (Splendore 56), betraying an underlying assumption that it must be a white male who is the central character of a *Robinson Crusoe*-like text. Although authoring is a form of fathering (McClintock 235), Foe is as impotent as Cruso. Barton takes Foe's pen and ink and writes the second section of Coetzee's text as a series of letters. She appropriates his masculine authority and insists upon maintaining it. She is "intended not to be the mother of [her] story, but to beget it. It is not [she] who [is] the intended but [Foe]" (126). The intended is acknowledged in critical discourse as a reference to the conclusion of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, to the female intended who knows nothing of the true story of Kurtz, the dehumanization of the Africans, the violence, the slavery, the emaciation, the death, the horror, and yet she is told that Kurtz's last words are her name. The intended learns the story of her fiancé only as a writing over of violence for a delicate audience, indicative of what Cruso does with the story of Friday's tongue upon presentation of the story to Barton. This intimate looping of Barton, Cruso and Foe as substitutes for one another, their

gender status never crystallized but fluid, indicates the unimportance of individual identity, merely access to systemic power through the pen and a desire to use it as such.

Indeed, as "God continually writes the world, the world and all that is in it" (143), the writer has the ability to create, destroy and remake any story in their own image. Barton brings to Foe what he calls his "first breakfast" (49), the opposite of the last supper, implying many things simultaneously. Foe has the power of the Son, consuming the first breakfast implies a beginning to his eternal reign and yet, as the first breakfast is the polar opposite of the last supper perhaps he is the anti-Christ of revelations marking the end of the world, or perhaps merely the marginal narrative. Foe's story of *Moll Flanders,* which appears unnamed, is mistaken by Barton for a parable. Despite this immense influence Foe's pen possesses, it is not true power. As Barton "dr[aws] the curtain on [Friday]" before she goes to bed with Foe, she warns him to "pay no attention" (137) to the pair of them, a reference to *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* in which the wizard, who appears to be all powerful, is no more than a man behind a sheet. Without the "command of words" there is "no defence against being re-shaped" (121) for the pen is as mighty as the sword. It is not necessary, as Defoe makes it appear in *Robinson Crusoe* for the individual to earn his supremacy as a benevolent English muscular Christian patriarch, indeed he may simply appropriate it for as Barton notes "the moral" of the *Moll Flanders*-parable "is that he has the last word who disposes over the greatest force" (124): the gun, the knife, the pen.

Is it a version of utopianism…

when we will hear (or heard)

music as sound on silence,

not silence between sounds?

— J.M. Coetzee
White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa

Sounding Silence and Silencing Sound:

The Postcolonial Use of Friday in J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*

Coetzee suggests a reading or understanding of the other that does not reduce him to the colonizer's terms. The colonizer must learn to listen differently, to the silence of the other as if it is its own language. I intend to argue that Coetzee means bodies to be their own signs.[29] That is not to say in terms of the colonial gaze, that the colonizer might objectify the colonized, to gather information about him so as to further conquer him, but as a different form of communication and also as a witness to colonial violence. The rope scar around Friday's neck, his missing tongue and penis reduce him to the perfect victim, a cipher, a hole, a shadow, existing only as absence. Yet, Friday's "failed" writing lesson may not be writing in English but communicating in symbolism, his phallus stripped in the colonial sense of appropriated power, but latently present, the sound that issues from his mouth in the conclusion of his story silencing the unknown narrator and eliminating the colonial gaze, and the petals he strews over the water a mourning for his life before he became Friday.

Much like Susan does not internalize the eighteenth-century gender role and titles imposed upon her as I discussed in chapter one, neither does Friday internalize his role as the

[29] Gayatri Spivak suggests that bodies are not their own signs. Her concern is that the margin becomes "caught in the empire of signs" (Spivak 174) as an object of gaze.

colonized. He is not in direct opposition with colonial authority, as subversion to it, but instead is indifferent to it. His actions during Cruso's illness, his dancing and his music playing are all indifferent to the will of the colonizer. He is what he is. That is not to say that "Friday is Friday," because the term 'Friday' refers not to the man himself as a substantial being, but to the man the colonial encounter creates and controls. Susan claims that failing to make Friday speak is much like selling a book with the pages silently empty, yet the pages of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* are conspicuously full. Although Friday's silence may prevent Foe from acquiring source material—the man behind Friday—for his character, he merely inserts a new tongue which wags with the imposed voice of the colonizer, turning Defoe's Friday into what Homi Bhabha would call a proto-mimic man.

I also intend to argue that Coetzee's alternative communication in the form of reading bodies is in danger of being misinterpreted, of which he is fully aware, as Susan often applies her own desires and meanings to Friday's actions, using metaphors which betray sentiments that are opposite her intentions. Critical discourse repeats her error, and defines Friday's motions and body in terms of the colonizer. In its obsession with master narratives, such criticism frequently cuts out Friday's tongue, despite the fact that his tongue may or may not be missing. He becomes a page in a novel, his writing indicating everything from Greek letters to Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* to Jean-Jacques Rousseau[30]—canonical terms and ideas Friday can know nothing about.

Despite the benefit of learning to read the colonized, not as a version of the colonizer but as its own separate entity, like Spivak's woman at the end of "Can the Subaltern Speak," it is possible to reduce Friday to 'the colonized,' and read him not as an individual, as substantial, but as Cruso's black African slave. I will interrogate Spivak's assertion that Friday is the "curious

[30] David Marshall's article "Friday's Writing Lesson: Reading Foe" reads much of the text surrounding Friday in *Foe* as referential to canonical texts. Attributing the A's and the O's to the Alpha and Omega of the Greek alphabet is a popular interpretation within critical discourse of *Foe* (see Wagner 10, Marshall 235 and MacLeod 13).

guardian at the margin" (Spivak 172),[31] for although oppositional thinking seems to undermine the colonizer, what it accomplishes is a homogenization of all margins, all colonized, into a single entity—the glue holding each piece to the next in this singular margin: the colonizer.

A Different Kind of Hearing

Perfectionism: a "graduality in treatment… not based, for example, on random choice or on particular relations, but rather on the level of the presence of some favored elements." (Cavalieri 3). Coetzee, in response to Paola Cavalieri's *The Death of the Animal* in which her fictional characters interact in a philosophical debate on the lives of animals in a Mediterranean resort locale, challenges Cavalieri's choice in setting. He claims the location of the text and the privileges she allots her characters are in themselves "an affirmation of and advertisement for the life of reason" (Coetzee 86). His argument is ultimately that perfectionism is unavailable to animals, but this sentiment can extend to any society that does not value rationality over desire, progress as paramount to tradition, and sound as superior to silence.

As I discuss in the first chapter, Coetzee questions the opposition of rationality and desire in *Foe*, manifesting each concept in the form of a character: Cruso / Foe and Susan respectively. Coetzee's Elizabeth Costello in *The Lives of Animals* reveals reason as "suspiciously like the being of human thought" (Coetzee 23). Thus reason is not inherently better than desire but artificially elevated. Coetzee in *Foe,* through the character of Susan, successfully destabilizes this hierarchy of reason over desire. The opposition of Cruso / Foe and Friday is that of sound and silence, but Coetzee once again seeks to unseat the notion that one surpasses the other in value. Truly, "the voice remains our central metaphor for political agency and power" (Parry 6).

[31] Barton claims to withhold her story, but it is Friday who truly reveals nothing for Foe to use as grist for his mill when writing his novel. Spivak labels Friday as the "guardian" (172) because he does not speak-for the margin, but instead frustrates all attempts to render him an "object of knowledge" (Said 32). Friday is not a passive defense mechanism, like a wall or barrier, but an active "agent" (172).

The old sailor who speaks to Friday loudly "as we do to deaf people" (Coetzee 108) does not understand Friday's silence any better than Susan who frequently misinterprets him, or critical discourse which often reduces Friday to "an unreadable silence (Parry 6). To say Friday's silence is unreadable sparks the question: to whom? Surely Friday does not find his own silence unreadable. Only those who seek to discredit Friday's silence as a legitimate language, an alternate form of communication, would label it incomprehensible. Of the old sailor, Susan questions if "he too is deaf," (Foe 108), but listening to "each other's silences" may require from critical discourse, from the colonizer, from western society "a different kind of hearing" (Attridge 90).

The Home of Friday: Interpreting Bodies as a Witness to Colonial Brutality

The unknown narrator in the final section of *Foe*, having fallen into Susan's letters to the author, asks "what is this ship?" (157). "Each syllable, as it comes out, is caught and filled with water and diffused," a place where words have no power. This is "a place where bodies are their own signs. This is the home of Friday" (157). This is also the scene of colonial devastation, a sunken slave ship, a place where all who dwell are not silent by choice but silenced by their surroundings. I disagree with Spivak, that "Friday's body is not its own sign" (Spivak 174). Friday's body and the bodies of those around him, must stand as evidence of colonial brutality, where silence is what cannot be spoken, but what must be witnessed.

First, I intend to refute Jane Poyner's assertion that "Barton's attempt to know Friday through looking upon his body… objectifie[s him] so that the master/slave dialectic that Barton thinks she is dismantling is simply reproduced in the colonizing effect of the gaze" (Poyner 104), for Susan's gaze is not colonial. She is not attempting to gather information so as to reduce him to a "fact" for "to have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over

it" (Said 32). At no time does Barton have absolute authority over Friday; indeed, most of her readings of Friday's body and actions are an attempt to communicate with him. As Spivak notes "if we want to start something, we must ignore that our starting point is shaky. If we want to get something done, we must ignore that the end will be inconclusive" (Spivak 158). Critical discourse must understand Friday's body, not with an objectifying colonial gaze, but as an alternate, separate and distinct form of communication not directly comparable to writing or speech. Benita Parry believes that "bodies are to be read as encoding a protowriting" (Parry 9), but this becomes problematic as it reduces Friday's body to a version of the colonizer's writing, which it is not. Often "colonialism inscribes meaning upon the body of the other and reads this body within its own ideological parameters" (Poyner 105). To understand Friday's body as such is to do as the unknown narrator in the final section of *Foe*, to "ignore the beating of [his/her] own heart" (154).

Friday's body, as a vision of colonial aggression, carries many scars, including one of a "necklace, left by a rope or chain" about his neck, visible only in the final pages of the novel. Although Friday's body is underwater at this time, the rope of which the narrator speaks is not one literally lashing him to the ship, dissolving over time in the current, but one of a more delicate nature—necklace thin—like the "cord" (99) holding his papers of manumission. Barton writes his deed to freedom in Crusoe's name and hangs it in a small bag around Friday's throat, but benevolent or heinous though her actions are, deciding to bring Friday to England so that he may acquire Barton's perception of freedom is submitting Friday to her own terms. These papers "cannot prove that Friday is not a slave" (Marshall 231), as David Marshall shows; Friday's situation resembles post-Civil War America in which the North has set the Blacks free but "everywhere" they are "in chains" (Marshall 232). How then to "set a people free if they are

already free, if no one believes the words that set them free" (Marshall 232). The promise of Barton's conception of freedom, of something better, which causes Barton to remove Friday from the only home he has known for fifteen years, becomes a chain about his neck, tying him to Barton, revoking the very independence she hopes to bestow. Friday carries more than one load about his neck. The scar could also be from the bag holding the petals of grief he carries to sprinkle over the wreck of his ship and fellow slaves. Whichever necklace hangs from Friday's throat, it matters not, for each carries the weight of colonial damage inflicted upon his life.

Friday's missing tongue, although Coetzee through his multiplicity of possible plot lines does not verify that his tongue is literally absent, becomes "to the world what [Barton] make[s] of [it]" (122). She declares his silence "a helpless silence" and in doing so invokes the colonial trope Said identifies as "a European in command" not of Friday himself, but "of Oriental history… because nothing in the Orient seems to resist one's powers" (Said 86). Rendered voiceless by Barton's narrative, Friday becomes "a cipher, a perfect victim" (Morrison 24). "Such an Orient was… unable to resist the projects, images, or mere descriptions devised for it" (Said 94), much like Friday who "becomes a cannibal" or "becomes a laundryman" at Barton's word because he "has no command of words and therefore no defense against being reshaped day by day" (121).

The "exteriority of representation is always governed by some version of the truism that if the Orient could represent itself, it would" (Said 21), yet since Friday cannot or chooses not to use his tongue to represent himself, or in the colonizer's terms, a pen, Friday in an English sense is metaphorically emasculated, which translates in *Foe* to the possibility of literal castration. Unlike the Friday in *Robinson Crusoe*, the Friday of *Foe* carries neither a musket nor knife. His only weapon is a spear, an interesting choice for Coetzee considering a spear is the only weapon

carried by the Africans Crusoe meets on the coast after his escape from the Turks.

Friday becomes defined by absence. He is without English masculinity, a pen, a language, a tongue, a weapon, or potency, to the extent that Barton believes he has "grown to be [her] shadow" (115). Yet Barton's use of shadow imagery describes Friday's proximity to her person, that he is "never parted" (115) from her. She asserts that he "is no more in subjection than [her] shadow is for following [her] around. He is not free, but he is not in subjection" (150). She infers that Friday "is his own master" (150), because she assumes that a shadow is a substantial being in itself. In doing so she invokes Franz Fanon's notion that "the black man… must be black in relation to the white man" (Fanon 110), not that Barton is to stand in for the 'white man,' but the mimesis of black to white body, as one creating the other, for indeed the shadow is made in the direct image of the form that casts it. What Barton misses entirely is that a shadow is not a presence of shade but an absence of light. The Friday of *Foe* is not a creation of Coetzee but of Defoe. As Defoe describes *Robinson Crusoe*'s Friday he does it through negation. His hair is "not curl'd like Wool… The Colour of his Skin was not quite black…His Face was round, and plump; his nose… not flat like the Negroes" with "thin lips" (205-6). He is also "stark naked" (206). The Friday of *Foe* is another shadow cast, in this instance not from Barton or the generic white man, but by Defoe's re-presentation of the other. Although Coetzee writes Friday as the reality behind Defoe's Friday—he is "black… with a head of fuzzy wool" wearing "a pair of rough drawers" with a "flat face,… broad nose,… [and] thick lips" (5-6)—the Friday of *Foe* is the direct inverse of the 'original'. The Friday of *Foe* is indeed a colonial "void" (80), present only through absence.

Friday's Writing Lesson: Understanding Bodies as an Alternate Form of Communication

Barton considers Friday's writing lesson as largely unsuccessful despite Foe's assurances that she has "planted a seed" (147) of literacy in her charge. This implantation of a seed may in truth be a misinterpretation of Barton's achievements with Friday. Barton-as-narrator confines the reader to her words, eyes, thoughts and conclusions, the only blocks with which to build an understanding of Friday. Poyner suggests this sowing of literacy is an intent to "impose… the language of the colonizer on Friday" (Poyner 100), which indeed, malicious or benevolent, Barton is doing; however Poyner also asserts that Friday "refuses to be tutored" (100). Oppositional thinking, even while attempting to undermine the authority of the ideology it opposes, by "refusing to mean within the oppressor's symbolic system" (Poyner 106), constantly refers back to the colonizer as the primary thought. Does Friday refuse at all, or is he communicating in another form that Barton is failing to interpret because she aims to read Friday, to reduce him to terms she is familiar with and can comprehend?

Friday draws "as it seem[s], leaves and flowers. But when [Barton comes] closer [she sees] the leaves [are] eyes, open eyes, each set upon a human foot: row upon row of eyes upon feet: walking eyes" (147). These "rows upon rows of the letter *o*" (152) in the form of petals and eyes could signal the empty sockets looking up at him from the sunken wreck, mingling with petals as he drops them from the surface of the water. Empty eyes mounted on feet as they would appear from above—a mass grave. The eyes on feet could literally mean Friday's eyes looking down at his feet signifying a lack of reciprocal colonial gaze. The walking feet show displacement from his original home, before the slave ship steals him, or from Cruso's island before Barton takes him to England. David Marshall suggests his inscriptions are literally petals and leaves, so that Friday is not writing in English but recording his ritual (Marshall 243). Multiple interpretations are implied simultaneously. Much like Coetzee's competing storylines,

no single meaning is paramount. All are possible.

When Barton reaches out to Friday, to take the slate from him, "instead of obeying" her, Friday puts "three fingers into his mouth and wet[s] them with spittle and rub[s] the slate clean" (147). Friday's movements may seem defiant, but if so, why did he use only three fingers? Perhaps Friday's hand is so large that he requires only a portion to erase a "child's slate" (145), but then why not use the flat of his palm? If Friday is refusing to write, why then does he write at all? Spivak's close reading of *Robinson Crusoe* recalls that "'saying O' is Friday's pidgin translation of his native word for prayer" (Spivak 171). It is shortly after the Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* tells his master of his god Benamuckee that Crusoe educates him in Christianity—as Defoe phrases it, Crusoe "open'[s] his Eyes" (Defoe 216). The Friday of *Foe* places three fingers, symbolizing the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit of Christianity, which do not simply overwrite Friday's native religion, do not add to it, nor act as palimpsest, where aspects of Friday's beliefs bleed through his reprogramming, but wipe it clean from the slate as if it never existed. The Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* also shouts 'O master!' when he seeks Crusoe's attention or approval so Friday's erasing of the O's in *Foe* could be a form of asserting his freedom from Cruso. The O's also imitate the stream of breath that issues from Friday's mouth in the final section of *Foe*. Perhaps Friday is writing his silence. Barton worries that Friday cannot write because "there are no words within him, in his heart, for writing to reflect" (143), and yet Foe is convinced that writing is not a reflection of speech. If Friday is writing his silence, whether he is silent by choice or by force, he is communicating from his heart, despite not using his tongue. Friday does not 'refuse' to write at all, for he does write, in the sense of pressing chalk to slate, before and after he wipes it clean, but as Barton links writing with speaking, his language of silence is incomprehensible to her.

Despite this evidence, Barton and critical discourse with her seem confident that Friday rejects the pen and possesses no tongue. Coetzee himself will not admit "whether Friday is potent or not", but he does emphasize that it "is more important [that Barton] doesn't know" (Morphet 463). At times when Friday dances he wears "nothing but [Foe's] robes and wig" so that as he spins in place "the robes would stand out stiffly about him, so much so that one might have supposed the purpose of his dancing was to show forth the nakedness underneath" (118). Barton describes what she sees as "a slave unmanned" and she stares "without shame at what had hitherto been veiled" (119). Barton does not at any time confirm what she sees, for that would not raise the question what does it mean for Friday to have or to not have a penis, but solidify a master narrative of Friday-as-castrated. Barton "saw; or, [she] should say, [her] eyes were open to what was present to them" (119). To see invokes the power of colonial gaze. Barton's eyes are merely open, inactive, a passive witness to a possible colonial violence or a trick of the light and the dark robes. Barton's metaphor of the robe-as-veil is intriguing, since the veil is "out of fashion in England in the eighteenth-century" but "associated with the sexualized Other and the romantic past" (Nussbaum 71). The veil is the "sign of exotic otherness" used to "obscure women's naked desires from the scrutiny of either sex" (Nussbaum 122), to cover her "'manliness' (associated with the prostitute and exotic woman)" (Nussbaum 133). Foe's robe-as-veil implies Friday's masculinity is inferior to Foe's, yet the veil sexualizes him in a way that draws attention, not to his phallus, but to his otherness and renders him effeminate.

Friday's 'refusal' of the pen and his veiled member, each an instance of missing or inferior masculinity, are forms of English masculinity: symbols of power. Friday, as he prepares to strew petals over the sunken ship, carries a beam to the shore, "launche[s] his log upon the water… and straddle[s] it" (31), in a way that Toni Morrison believes is phallic symbolism

(Morrison 34). Barton also notes "how long Friday's fingers" are as he holds "the shaft of the spade" (70), an item Cruso uses to penetrate the earth over and over but never to plant seed. Barton's observation threatens to recall stereotypes of the hypersexual Other, yet it occurs only once and in so latent a manner that it seems rather to portray Friday's proximity to English masculinity. His hands may fold around it, but can never use it in the same way that Foe and Cruso do, as unearned power conferred systematically.

Friday and Cruso also trade father / child positions within *Foe*, but once again, not in the sense of Friday holding power over Cruso. Friday, when Cruso grows ill, makes "no effort to help" Barton, but instead "shun[s] the hut as if [Barton and Cruso have] the plague" (27). Barton's harsh judgment of Friday's actions are inaccurate at best. "At daybreak he would set off with his fishing-spear; returning, he would put his catch down beside the stove, gutted and scaled, and then retire to the far corner of the garden" (27). This short scene is in reference to a portion of Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year*.[32] In *Journal of the Plague Year*, Robert, who is father to a plague infected family, keeps away from his home, fetching provisions up and down the river and leaved them on shore for his wife who, having the plague herself, looks after her children, one of whom has already perished. As Barton, who cares for Cruso, easily fits the position of wife, a role she later takes on literally as she becomes Cruso's widow, this makes Cruso the child for whom Friday is providing. The reversal of the father / child dynamic does not function as simply an inversion of the previous system, as Friday asserting colonial and familial authority over child Cruso, but as a sense of duty and of care, possibly explaining why Friday does not "beat… in his master's head with a stone while he slept" (36) as Barton wonders that he should. Friday may feel for Cruso, not the colonial father / child relation of naturalized domination, but of a guardian for his charge. Friday's restraint is not helplessness but

[32] This portion of *Journal of the Plague Year* appears again in Coetzee's Nobel Prize Lecture.

benevolence. The reversal of the father / child dynamic also undermines the colonial need to both "'civilise' its 'others' and to fix them into perpetual 'otherness'" (Loomba 145) in which the Other is to become the English, "almost the same but not quite" (Bhabha 318). The father / child relation implies that the noble Other will eventually grow into the English father, and yet the Other becomes crystallized as the child and can never become the father. Friday-as-father frustrates this trope.

In the final section, Friday's teeth are prised apart to reveal whether or not he possesses a tongue, and with it the means to tell his own story, but just as Friday does not require a phallus as proof of his masculinity, neither does he need a tongue to speak his history.

> From inside him comes a slow stream, without breath, without interruption. It flows up through his body and out upon [the narrator]; it passes through the cabin, through the wreck; washing the cliffs and shores of the island, it runs northward and southward to the ends of the earth. Soft and cold, dark and unending, it beats against my eyelids, against the skin of my face (157).

These are the final words of the novel as when Friday's silence begins, the author must cease. "[M]usic," Coetzee explains, is "sound upon silence, not silence between sounds" (Marshall 225). Both silence and sound exist together in the formation of any story. Like the slave in Barton's drawing whose "hands were tied" behind his back "but that could not be seen" (68), there are portions of pictures and of histories that remain unseen or unheard, but they are still present; however, when what is visible and what is invisible trade positions, when all one can see in the picture is what was formerly obscured from view, or hear what was formerly silenced under sound, it can present as pages "quietly left empty" (67). It is not a passive silence indeed, as it beats "against [the narrator's] eyelids" (157), a voice with such determination its effects are physical. Friday's spoken silence truly triumphs over the colonial master narrative. The O's that issue from Friday's mouth fall over the island, like his petals over the ship, as a "gestural

recuperation of colonial territory" (Poyner 103). As the unknown narrator descends into the wreck "petals float… around [him / her] like a rain of snowflakes" (156), the same petals Barton assumes Friday scatters "in memory of some person who perished in the wreck" of which she gives for example "a father or a mother or a sister or a brother" (87), all of which might be true. Yet, for the narrator to swim amongst flakes of flowers is to imply that Friday is simultaneously above and below him / her, casting tokens in memory of his own life, the self that died aboard the slave ship only to be born onto the island as a broken, colonized slave.

'Friday is Friday': Failing to Internalize Slavery

Yet, Friday does not arrive on shore as a slave, but is "a child unborn, a child waiting to be born that cannot be born" (122). He does not internalize his role as the colonized and is largely indifferent to whatever face Cruso and Barton impose on him. Although Cruso's orders to him are limited to short commands such as "[f]irewood" (21), which appears to be a complex version of 'fetch', as if Cruso speaks to a dog, it is clear from Friday's actions when Cruso is sick, when Friday takes on the role of father, that he has not internalized his position on the island as inferior to Cruso. His dancing ritual places him "beyond human reach" (92). Barton "call[s] his name and [is] ignored" (92). She "put[s] out a hand and [is] brushed aside" (92). Barton plays her flute to Friday's dancing and thinks she has "made a consort" and yet he is "insensible of [her]" (98). When Friday and Barton play their flutes at the same time, for indeed to say they play together is inaccurate, she believes she is communicating with him, that she will "need no language" as long as she has "music in common with Friday" (97). Daniel Defoe thought "mathematics and musical notation represented universal languages" (Novak 116), so Barton's attempting discourse with Friday through the notes of a flute seems plausible; however, Barton cannot resist from "varying the tune" (97). She "first make[s] one note into two half-

notes, then chang[es] two of the notes entirely, turning it into a new tune and a pretty one too, so fresh to my ear that [she is] sure Friday would follow [her]" (97). Friday "persist[s] in the old tune" (97) despite the discord between their instruments. Barton's alteration in the song could represent England's obsession with progress, but Friday's refusal to acquiesce with her change reveals he has not internalized the colonizer's need for linear perfectionism. Barton, though she thinks she is extending a hand to Friday, she also believes that "music and dancing… are to speech as cries and shouts are to words" (142), that if she cannot understand him, his communication translates into incomprehensible noise. Instead of modifying her method of listening she changes the tune. Just as she is insensible to him, so is he to her in turn. Friday is what he is.

That is not to say that "Friday is Friday" (122), for 'Friday' is the name given to the nameless African man beneath the subjugation of the colonizer. 'Friday' is an idea of the colonized, a face or mask as Fanon would suggest, "a white man's artifact" (Fanon 14). In *Foe* neither Cruso nor Friday have a past, they exist only in colonial relation. Friday's past life is erased with his name. Coetzee writes nothing of the man Friday is before the colonizer's re-conceptualization of him. 'Friday', like the other terms—"laundryman" and "cannibal" (121)—that Foe and Barton re-shape Friday with, is a "mere name" (121) that does "not touch his essence" (122). Coetzee's text dangerously threatens to essentialize Friday as 'Friday,' and yet if Coetzee were to write Friday as he was before he was cast ashore with Cruso, he would most certainly presume "to speak for an / the other" (Parker 37) and replicate in himself the author-as-colonizer he writes into his character Foe.

Simply because Barton does not internalize the discourse of eighteenth-century gender roles does not mean she exists outside that discourse; this too is true for Friday. Even if Friday

holds his silence purposefully, and becomes the intentional "guardian at the margin" (Spivak 172), he is recreated in his own name, through the text that Foe will write of him, as something he is not. Foe represents him as he pleases. Friday's silence defends nothing from misrepresentation, not his culture, his family, fellow slaves or himself. He is "re-shaped day by day" (121) through Foe, year by year through Robinsonades, until his legacy in critical discourse becomes more substantial than his own flesh and blood body. The singular character of the Friday of *Foe*, with his two possible histories, draws together two characters in Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*: Xury and Friday. Foe "splits Friday at the root…the point of origin…just as Friday's tongue might have been split in *Foe*" (Turk 302), revealing that representation does not even guarantee that Friday remain a single person—"*a* laundryman" or "*a* cannibal" (121; emphasis mine)—he could be several: a pluralization beyond recognition.

The Mimic-Man: Coetzee's Implied Re-reading of *Robinson Crusoe*

Barton believes that to write a story and "be silent on Friday's tongue is no better than offering a book for sale with the pages in it quietly left empty" (67). Although Lewis MacLeod asserts that *Foe*'s Friday "thinks he *can* afford to ignore [Barton] and Foe (as representatives of more secure discursive communities) and as a result he does not inform on himself" (MacLeod 7; italics original), Said reminds us that "the Orient is much too important to be left" even "to the Orientalists" (Said 106). What chance does Friday as a mere native, as "the subject of exploitation" who "cannot know and speak the text of… exploitation even if the absurdity of the nonrepresenting intellectual making space for [him] to speak is achieved" (Spivak 84), have filling those 'empty' pages, even if he were to choose to speak? The pages of *Robinson Crusoe* are, however, conspicuously full.

The readings of *Robinson Crusoe* in the previous two chapters come with underlying

assumptions: what Defoe can and cannot have known when he wrote his novel. Coetzee replaces Defoe with a fictional character, Foe. Foe is not a product of 1719, like Defoe, but of Coetzee's mind. Although he is set in the same time period, Foe is ideologically armed with nearly three hundred years of hindsight. This change prompts a very different reading of *Robinson Crusoe* if it is Foe and not Defoe writing the text. Foe is a man who is well aware that his "papers are foul" (151), that he is intentionally overwriting colonial violence as benevolence, and fully conscious that the Friday he will write into *Robinson Crusoe* bears no resemblance to its source. The Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe is a native islander with remarkable resemblance to Crusoe, right down to the colour of their skin. Defoe explains that Friday differs from Crusoe in far fewer ways than one might think for an alien race on an unknown island. The "fruit" (152) Foe bears from Barton's island tales actualizes the cutting out of the Friday of *Foe*'s tongue. It is an extended metaphor, for there is no essence of truth behind the Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* if it is Foe, rather than Defoe, holding the pen. As Said asserts, "Europe… articulates the Orient," not in a way that reminisces of a "puppet master, but of a genuine creator" (Said 57). The Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* as written not by Daniel Defoe, but by Daniel Foe, has no semblance to the implied original in Coetzee's text. Foe creates in the character of Friday what Homi Bhabha would call a mimic man.

Mimicry, in the colonial sense, is "one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" (Bhabha 318). It is a "desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as *a subject of difference that is almost the same*" as the colonizer *"but not quite"* (Bhabha 318; emphasis original). Bhabha utilizes a sentiment from Jacques Lacan, that mimicry is "not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled" (317). It is not a "colonization-thingification" (Bhabha 321), or as Fanon would call it,

a mask to be worn and discarded at will to reveal beneath a true native. It is an "authorized version… of otherness" (Bhabha 321), the only way to become substantial in the eyes of the colonizer. If the colonized are able to fully assume the position of colonizer then the system effectively eliminates itself, thus "mimicry must produce its slippage… its difference" (Bhabha 318) so as to reject the Other as a member of the colonizing population. Indeed to be "Anglicized is *emphatically* not to be English" (Bhabha 318; emphasis original). Mimicry becomes "the metonymy of presence" (Bhabha 323) and "fixes the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence" (Bhabha 319). Coetzee's *Foe* reads the Friday of *Robinson Crusoe*, as a continuation / writing over of an original Friday.[33] Hereafter the Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* written by Daniel Foe will be referred to as 'Foe's Friday' because Foe creates him. Coetzee's alternate reading of *Robinson Crusoe* reveals Friday to be a mimic man. A man who is an "interpreter… between [the colonizer] and the millions whom [they] govern," native "in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect" (Bhabha 320).

Robinson Crusoe's Friday materializes two years, but only two pages, after Crusoe's dream of a man who will "serve [him] as a Pilot,… will tell [him] what to do, and whether to go for Provisions; and whether not to go or fear of being devoured, what Places to venture into, and what to escape" (199). Crusoe's desire for a guide, if not an intermediary, between himself and the cannibals who frequent the island, replaces the worker in *Foe*, cast ashore when his slave ship sinks. For Defoe to write this passage is to give his castaway hope of escape and his readers a progressive plot that moves away from pages and pages of detailed lists and repetitive journals. For Foe to write this passage is to gloss over the violence of slave appropriation as a prophetic dream. Friday later becomes Crusoe's "Interpreter, especially to his Father, and indeed to the

[33] Although the Friday in Coetzee's text is still as much a representation of the colonized other as Defoe's Friday, Coetzee's text implies that the Friday of *Foe* is the 'original' of *Robinson Crusoe*'s Friday, which allows an alternate reading of Defoe's text.

Spaniard too" (242). As Crusoe's right hand man, his "Lieutenant-General" (267), the Friday of Defoe is nearly equal to Crusoe and is certainly above the mutinied captain and his men. The Friday of Coetzee is often fearful of others and would not serve as a mediating force between other island Africans (if there had been any on Coetzee's island) and Cruso. 'Foe's Friday' is a successful mimic man, who "so well manag'd [his] Business" (265) that he is sent to intermediate not only between the savages on shore in the sequel *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, but also with the English crew on shore after the mutiny.

The Friday of *Robinson Crusoe*'s resemblance to an Englishman is characteristic of the era, where "the Influence of the Sun upon the Body" increased or decreased its thickness "upon which its Blackness depends" (Mitchell 138). 'Foe's Friday' rewrites an African as "*[a]lmost the same but not white*" (Bhabha 322). The Friday in *Robinson Crusoe* is "pleas'd to see himself almost as well cloath'd as his Master" (208), much like Amy of *Roxana.* The alteration in clothes indicates a rise in station. Friday's clothes in *Foe* comprise only a "pair of rough drawers" (6), for he feels uncomfortable in more and often goes barefoot. Coetzee's emphasis on Friday's discomfort wearing clothing shifts the emphasis of Defoe's statement from a rise in station to a pleasure for English dress. Indeed, Friday is "almost" as well dressed as Crusoe, implying he has a working knowledge of English clothing and its corresponding rank. 'Foe's Friday' is, as Bhabha would say, "English in tastes" (Bhabha 320).

Indeed the Friday of *Robinson Crusoe* is the "prototype of the successful colonial subject. He learns his master's speech, does his master's work, happily swears loyalty, believes the culture of the master is better, and kills his other self to enter the shady plains of northwestern Europe" (Spivak 169) but 'Foe's Friday' does more than merely 'kill his other self'. 'Foe's Friday' overtakes the Friday of *Foe*. 'Foe's Friday' is the re-presence of the Friday of *Foe*, the

mask Foe constructs in *Robinson Crusoe*, a mask that hides behind it no authentic native but serves to erase him, to silence him. "Me die, when you bid die" (231) has a secondary meaning, not of sacrifice for Crusoe in battle, but death at the hands of the author, Foe, who bids Friday die to make way for an effigy of Friday: an acceptable Other.

If I Can Ignore the Beating of My Own Heart: Misreading Friday

Coetzee's use of bodies as an alternative mode of communication to the colonizer's words becomes problematic in that critical discourse can and often does misread him. The interpretation of Friday depends on "the truth of [Barton's] witnessing" (Morrison 35). For the most part, the accuracy of Barton's story is indiscernible; however, Coetzee writes into Barton's narration many instances which belie a lack of concern with maintaining truth, though she openly obsesses about the necessity of truth in her tale. When she is not sure of something, Barton names it, details it, and understands it in her own way, but not in such a way that survives with the essence of truth in relaying the information to a third party. Often she loses the original meaning. She calls the little birds "sparrows for want of a better name" (51) and the apes on the island are "between a cat and a fox, grey, with black faces and black paws" (21). What is in a name? It is neither "hand, nor foot, nor arm, nor face, nor any other part belonging to" (Shakespeare II.i.82-4) an object. To call a "rose by any other word" (Shakespeare II.i.85-6) indeed does not change the rose, but to call a rose a daisy, apart from its physical self, is to distort its representation. It is clear that the apes of the island are not apes, nor do they in any way resemble apes.

Barton often mislabels Friday in this way. She finds his bag of petals beneath his bed and "*conclude[s]* he had been making an offering to the god of the waves to cause the fish to run plentifully" (31; emphasis mine). Her interpretation of the bag is hasty and relies on tropes and

stereotypes of island natives as "performing… superstitious observance[s]" (31) of foreign gods. She later discovers he is casting petals within the bag over the wreck of the ship that cast him on shore. She notes that "he stands always in corners, never in the open" and so deduces that he must "mistrust… space" (77). The Friday of *Foe* dwells on Cruso's island for fifteen years, often disappearing to the other side of the island for days at a time, as if he desires space, yet Barton does not revise her statement once she spends more time with Friday. Perhaps it is not the open space he 'distrusts'. Perhaps he is simply drawn away from Barton. The reader remains forever dark to his true intentions. She later "discover[s]" (103) why Friday dances in England when she, in a bed of straw, wet and cold, dances herself after his fashion. She "dance[s] until the very straw seem[s] to warm under [her] feet" (103). Only the paragraph before Barton notes that Friday, "born in the tropic forest," should be more sensitive to the change in temperature, and yet he "walk[s] barefoot in the dead of winter and [does] not complain" (103). The straw beneath her feet, a natural insulator, reflects her own body heat back at her. She knows what it is like for her to dance Friday's dance, thus she assumes she knows what it is for Friday to dance Friday's dance.

Barton describes Friday's silence in metaphors which, much like her conclusions, reveal her ignorance of Friday. "To live in silence is to live like the whales, great castles of flesh floating apart one from another" (59), but whales communicate over great distances through singing, an interesting metaphorical choice considering Friday's ability to play the flute. The "root" of his tongue is "closed behind… heavy lips like a toad in eternal winter" (57). A hibernating toad is merely sleeping, awaiting a spring to which he might awake. That the winter is eternal might mean that he never wakes, but he has not perished. His tongue as a 'root' does not emphasize the portion the slavers sever, but, in a novel where seed imagery appears

frequently, the potential for new growth. "Like smoke" his silence wells up the stairway, until her "lungs, [her] heart, [and her] head [are] full of black smoke" (118). Black smoke points towards the discomfort the colour of his skin coupled with his silence gives Barton. Black smoke also comes from very hot and substantial fires. Friday is not the smoke that invades her mind, the smoke is his silence. Friday is the fire.

Yet, despite these evidences that silence is substantial in itself, Barton describes Friday's portion of the story in terms of absence. He is "properly not a story but a puzzle or hole in the narrative" which she "picture[s] as a buttonhole, carefully cross-stitched around, but empty, waiting for the button" (121). Barton envisions the creation of the buttonhole as if the button just appears once its place is complete. A buttons are made for buttonholes, and buttonholes for buttons. Friday's story is made to fit the hole later. Trisha Turk claims that Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, "disguises the blankness of Friday's page" (302). But is the Friday of *Foe*'s page blank? Or is it merely indecipherable because Barton, and critical discourse with her, searches for the page of a novel, an English invention,[34] for what is customarily found there: written words, letters and language. To *read* Friday as one would a book is to reduce him to English terms.

Indeed, just as the unknown narrator in the final section of *Foe* states, critical discourse must "ignore the beating of [its] own heart" (154). Yet, this is easier said than done as the anonymous narrator hears issuing from Friday's mouth as "the roar of waves in a seashell" (154). At first, that the sounds of the island would pour from Friday's mouth, as the first sound he has made since Cruso's demonstration of his missing tongue in the beginning, seems cliché. Can it be true that all that Friday contains within him to release to the world is the colonizing setting? The sound one hears from a seashell is simply an amplification of the ambience around the shell; however a common misinterpretation of this sound is that it is the pulsation of the listener's

[34] Ironically, the invention of the English novel is often attributed to Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*.

blood which reflects back to her / him through the shell. The narrator, although aware that s/he must listen to the silence behind the sound of their own heart, is unable to transcend it. Much as Poll's speech in *Robinson Crusoe* is an echo, "severed from the utterer's consciousness and rooted instead in that of the listener" (Spaas 101), the sounds the narrator hears from Friday's mouth are "traces of a myth in which the self has obliterated the other and in which the self is reduced to hearing the otherness of his own voice" (Spaas 103).

MacLeod reveals that, like Barton, critical discourse is "afraid to look into Friday's mouth because [it] is reluctant to face the complications that might reside there" (MacLeod 11). MacLeod notes that a failure to recognize Friday's 'missing' tongue as merely one of the many possible stories, is to succumb to the "seductive power of grand narrative" and to cut Friday's tongue out anew. By the conclusion, "Foe and [Barton] know for certain that Friday has no tongue, and so a discursive signal that began as an unverified assertion from an unreliable source (Cruso) eventually comes to direct the foundational assumptions" (MacLeod 8) of not only Foe, but critical discourse. That is not to say that all critics of the Friday of *Foe* maintain his mutilation as absolute truth, but many do.

It is also tempting to cut out Friday's tongue by forcing another in its place. By reading into his writing lesson and the sounds escaping from his mouth in the conclusion, critical discourse often forces abstract relations between Friday and canonical texts that he, as an African slave since childhood, illiterate in English and Latin, could not know about and therefore cannot communicate. David Marshall, in one of the most extensive close readings of the Friday of *Foe,* makes a convincing case for a relation between the girl's writing lesson in Rousseau's *Émile*, who writes many O's, sees her unladylike portrait in a mirror and casts her pen aside (Rousseau 368-9). Rousseau's girl is in itself a reenactment of the story recounted in Ovid's *Fasti* of

Minerva who plays a flute until she sees her cheeks puff in a mirror and casts it aside (Ovid 373 as cited in Marshall 238). Indeed, Marshall's observations are precise and Coetzee may have imbedded these canonical references purposefully, especially considering Rousseau's *Émile* is largely responsible for "relegate[ing *Robinson Crusoe*] to juvenile literature" (Free 107). Melissa Free in her in-depth study of the publishing history of *Robinson Crusoe* notes that "almost all of the adaptations and abridgements of [the novel] that have been made since [*Émile*'s publishing] have been with the idea in mind of its being read chiefly by children" (Free 107). Each of these canonical references shows Coetzee's vast canonical knowledge, a luxury Friday surely does not have, so is it possible to understand Friday through metaphors that reduce him to a version of the colonizer? Marshall later compares the O's pouring onto the slate from Friday's hands as mouths and wounds, like "Caesar's wounds" are "poor dumb mouths" (Marshall 241). Yet if Friday is unaware of Shakespeare, is it possible for him to symbolize *Julius Caesar,* or for Caesar to represent him? Critical discourse frequently labels these O's, coupled with Foe's assertion that Barton will teach Friday "*a*" (152) the following day, as Alpha and Omega. Not only does this deduction solidify an isochronous timeline (although inverted, as the end arrives before the beginning, which is yet to come in the closing lines of the text), but it assumes that Friday is communicating with Barton, or attempting to do so, by using letters from the Greek alphabet, of which Friday would have no knowledge, or by invoking symbols of the Christian God, in which he does not believe.

"A case of delirium rather than sanity": The Effects of Using Friday

It is evident that Coetzee uses the portion of his text to rewrite *Robinson Crusoe* as a potent critique of colonialism, but as Spivak reminds us, "we understand more easily when folks of the other *gender* inscription wish to join *our* struggle. For example, I confess to a certain

unease reading a man's text about a woman. Yet, when we want to intervene in the heritage of colonialism or the practice of neocolonialism," both of which Coetzee attempts, "we take our own goodwill for guarantee" (Spivak 159; emphasis original). This is not to undermine the value of Coetzee's critique, nor critical discourse's evaluation of his text, but to reveal that in many instances that reading Friday against colonialism inadvertently reinscribes the terms of colonialism. Often critical discourse still uses Friday, perhaps with more benevolent aims, but then Crusoe thought he was using Friday to that end, did he not? As I discuss in chapter two, Crusoe thought himself superior to the Spaniards who still dwelt in the dark ages of mistreating their colonized. Indeed, "if we want to start something, we must ignore that our starting point is shaky. If we want to get something done, we must ignore that the end will be inconclusive" (Spivak 158). To ignore is not to forget.

Critical discourse relegates Friday into one of two categories on two simple assumptions: that Friday has a tongue or that he does not have a tongue. He becomes either the silenced victim, after slavers rend his tongue from his head, or "the curious guardian at the margin" (Spivak 172). Offering to Friday the ability to speak and the willpower to withhold, to keep from the colonizer "a secret that may not be a secret but cannot be unlocked" (Spivak 172), to deny the colonizer full access to all knowledge of the colonized is to negate the colonizer's power. For Said, to have "knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it" (Said 32), thus to prevent the acquisition of knowledge halts the totality of the colonizing mission. Cruso may have Friday's body, but he can never have his inner mind, his inner secret. Beneath his physical exterior remains a presence the colonizer cannot possess; however, to ask Friday to guard 'the margin' as if it were singular, re-creates the colonizer's homogenizing mission. Margins exist by negative definition. They are emphatically *not* the center, not the self, not a white, male, straight, rich,

possessing of a conferred power backed up by allegiance to the correct country with appropriate access to firepower. This is all they have in common, much like all Friday and Xury have in common is that they are not Crusoe. Roxann Wheeler reveals this "tendency detectable in British culture" which "encourages a sense of exchangeability between Indians and Africans" (Wheeler 88). Yet, if even now margins can become singular, perhaps confining this tendency to British culture of the eighteenth century is premature. Also problematic is defining Friday by his race. Shortly after *Robinson Crusoe*'s publication, illustrations of Friday within the text were not always of a Caribbean but as early as 1720, make Friday appear African (Blewett 41). To write Friday as African in *Foe*, Coetzee recalls *Robinson Crusoe*'s publishing history and the tendency to read all others as the same other. That one might interchange an Indian with an African implies that all Africans and Indians might interchange with each other, "*produce[ing]* homogeneity out of heterogeneous populations" (Thobani 24; emphasis original). As I have discussed in previous chapters, the colonized is "entitled only to drown in an anonymous collectivity" (Loomba 118) for, as Samuel Johnson expresses it, "One set of Savages is like another" (Nussbaum 2), while the colonizer basks in an individual identity and history. Said warns that "knowledge" of the colonized allows generalizations, so as "to dominate" (Said 26), but it is more. Distance is also necessary. Barton warns that "seen from too remote a vantage, life begins to lose its particularity. All shipwrecks become the same shipwreck," all slave ships become the same slave ship, "all castaways the same castaway," (18) all slaves the same slave. Not only is the Friday of *Foe* incapable of symbolizing the diverse populations of colonized peoples of Africa in the eighteenth century, who are not all uniformly silent; or as able to speak and withholding; or attempting to communicate in an alternative form; African or male. What of the female colonized, whom Barton obscures and *Foe* asks Friday to represent. It is she who is

truly present only in her absence. Yet, *Foe* through its near three hundred year retrospective investigation and critical discourse's rare disagreement, asks that Friday be a transcendent character who is to represent all the colonized throughout history: a crystallized colonized.

Indeed to "transcend the other's alterity is to efface that alterity" (Parker 21), but to reduce the Other to his alterity has similarly counterproductive and detrimental results. It is "unsurprising" that "*Foe* has invited a number of feminist as well as postcolonial readings" (Poyner 92), but to render readings of the Friday of *Foe* as postcolonial, simply because he is the sole African in a text dominated by English is no more helpful to solving the power imbalance between the colonizer and colonized than reducing Barton to a feminist, simply because she is the only woman in an entirely male text. Again, this is not to devalue the benefits of postcolonial readings but to remind critical discourse that the colonized exist outside of their relationship with the colonizer. The very label 'colonized' carries with it an implicit relation with the colonizer, and a series of preconceived notions. It allows for wildly inaccurate conclusions while 'reading' the body of the other, if critical discourse brings to the table a homogenizing 'knowledge' of the Other. In the conclusion of "Can the Subaltern Speak," Spivak addresses the "reading" (Spivak 104) of the body of a young woman, Bhuvaneswari Bhaduri, who committed suicide in her father's apartment in North Calcutta in 1926 (Spivak 103). Bhuvaneswari knew her actions would "be diagnosed as the outcome of illegitimate passion" (Spivak 104), so she waited to hang herself until she was menstruating. As a result her suicide was alternately observed as a protest against *sati* immolation, where women threw themselves upon the funeral pyre of their husbands. Spivak reveals that the word *sati* in itself means only "good wife" (Spivak 101), and yet its connotation couples it with self sacrifice, as if to be a good wife one must give up all of herself, even her last breath. *Sati* are not permitted to cast themselves into their husband's fire while they

are menstruating (Spivak 104). "In this *reading*, Bhuvaneswari Bhaduri's suicide is an unemphatic, ad hoc, subaltern rewriting of the social text of *sati*-suicide" (Spivak 104; emphasis mine). These 'readings' stem not from Bhuvaneswari's individual desires, thoughts and emotions but from assumptions closely related to her gender and nationality—no more. Ten years after Bhuvaneswari's suicide, when the need for secrecy to protect those involved dissolved, it was released that she was part of an Indian independence resistance who had been "entrusted with a political assassination" she felt unable to follow through with, yet "aware of the practical need for trust, she killed herself" (Spivak 103). The truth of Bhuvaneswari, her courage, independence and bravery, cannot be deduced through generalization. Indeed, digging into Friday's colonial situation is necessary, but so too is recognition that this is only one aspect of him, that he is substantial, that he is more than the sum of his parts.

Conclusion

To Coetzee, *Robinson Crusoe* is significant, but so is Daniel Defoe. This thesis covers extensively the relation between Defoe's Roxana, Crusoe and Friday and Coetzee's Susan Barton, Cruso and Friday; however, it only touches on the relationship of the character of Foe, not only to Defoe, but to Coetzee himself. Defoe has a consistent storyline that runs through many of his works, "the same story over and over, in version after version, stillborn every time" (*Foe* 151). Coetzee's Nobel Prize Speech implies that Defoe's most famous works, including *Robinson Crusoe*, *Roxana*, *Moll Flanders* and *Journal of the Plague Year*, are versions of "the flight, the pennilessness, the tatters, [and] the solitude" (NPL np) of Defoe's life. He flees his debtors and abandons all he loves. His life becomes "a figure of the shipwreck" (NPL np). Defoe is trapped on his own personal island.

Coetzee's texts carry a similar thread, but his repeating plotline is different than Defoe's stories of perpetual castaways and solitude. Within many of Coetzee's texts I have read to date, which include *Foe*, *Waiting for the Barbarians*, *Disgrace* and *Summertime*,[35] there is a dysfunctional and ultimately failed sexual relationship between an older man and a younger woman, usually with a significant power differential. Cruso has a small affair with Susan Barton, but his power over her is limited to the island. Due to his death in the beginning of *Foe,* Cruso's place as older sexual partner is replaced by Foe. He is, if not Barton's author, then the writer of her legacy. The Magistrate in *Waiting for the Barbarians* keeps a captured barbarian girl in his bed. David Lurie of *Disgrace* is a university professor having an affair with a student.

[35] I am familiar with *Boyhood* , *Youth* and *The Lives of Animals* as well, although the relationship I discuss does not appear explicitly in these texts.

Summertime recounts Coetzee's relationship with four women.[36] Each of these women remark on Coetzee's asexual aura, as though he has been doused in "a neutering spray" (25) and is now "a eunuch" (114). I do not encourage a psychoanalysis of Coetzee himself, but I do suggest that like Defoe, Coetzee feels as though he writes "the same story over and over, in version after version, stillborn every time" (*Foe* 151).

While critical discourse generally seeks to tie Foe to his logical counterpart Defoe, a reading that investigates Coetzee as Foe or as 'the foe' could lead to intriguing conclusions. Foe appropriates the story of a woman and an African man and misplacing it as the history of a white man. Foe recognizes his own writing as "foul" (*Foe* 151). Coetzee writes Foe's position as a parallel to his own as a white South African writer: "legal but illegitimate" (*Summertime* 209). Coetzee's *Summertime* makes a close connection between his own life as a white South African living on soil that "belong[s] not" to him "but, inalienably, to its original owners" (*Summertime* 210), and *Robinson Crusoe* taking up an 'abandoned' island as its governor. The addition of a fourth chapter might interrogate Foe as a character, not of Defoe but of Coetzee.

As a final note, although Coetzee is known for his postcolonial interest, Coetzee also writes within animal theory critical discourse. Indeed, Coetzee so often argues all sides of the animal theory debate while threading his opinions through fiction that he cannot be said to advocate for or protest against animal rights through his works. *Disgrace*, *The Lives of Animals*, which is published both separately and as a section of a larger work, *Elizabeth Costello*, as well as several articles he has written, including his most famous "Meat Country", instead encourage heated discussion in the academic community. Coetzee is also a vegetarian himself.

Although it becomes apparent when reading these texts how often Coetzee utilizes animal

[36] Although it is written as a post-humus biography of Coetzee it is ultimately fictional text so the correlation between Coetzee's own life and the words on the page may be quite different.

metaphors to describe his characters' feelings and situations, his use of animal metaphors is not confined to his animal texts. As Coetzee's knowledge of the critical discourse on *Robinson Crusoe* is extensive, Defoe's use of animal metaphors to describe Friday is most likely not unknown to Coetzee, yet his character Barton often chooses to describe Friday in these terms. Had there been more room, a short section on the significance of Coetzee's choice not to refrain from referring to Friday as animal, would be worth pursuing.

Works Cited

Akman, Beyazit H. "The Turk's Encounter with Defoe." *Digital Defoe*. 1 (2009): 76-85. Print.

Attwell, David. "Afterword." *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Eds Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996. Print.

Attridge, Derek. "The Silence of the Canon." *J.M. Coetzee and the Ethics of Reading*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004. 65-90. Print.

Aravamudan, Srinivas. "Piratical Accounts." *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency 1688-1804*. London: Duke University Press, 1999. 71-102. Print.

Backscheider, Paula R. *Daniel Defoe: His Life*. London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989. Print.

Ballantyne, John. "On Defoe." *Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 286-8. Print.

Baum, Frank L. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. United States: The Reilly & Lee Co., 1956. Print.

Bell, Ian A. "Crusoe's Women: Or, the Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-time." *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*. Ed. Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson. London: Macmillan Press, 1996. Print.

Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Men: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *The First Decade*. Eds. Michelson, Krayss, Crimp, and Copjec. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987. 317-325. Print.

Blewett, David. "Man and Nature; L'Homme et la Nature." *Proceedings of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 5 (1986): 29-49. Print.

Brown, Laura. "Amazons and Africans: Gender, Race, and Empire in Daniel Defoe." *Women, 'Race' & Writing in the Early Modern Period*. Eds. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. London: Routledge, 1994. 118-137. Print.

Byatt, A.S. *On Histories and Stories: Selected Essays.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001. Print.

Castle, Terry. "'Amy, Who Knew my Disease': A Psychosexual Pattern in Defoe's *Roxana*." *The Female Thermometer: 18th Century Culture and the Invention of the Uncanny*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. 44-55. Print.

Cavalieri, Paola. *The Death of the Animal*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. Print.

Cibber, Theophilus. "The Success of Robinson Crusoe."*Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 282. Print.

Chambers, Ross. "The Unexamined." *Minnesota Review* 47 (1996): 141-156. Print.

Coetzee, J.M. "Comments on Paola Cavalieri, 'A Dialogue on Perfectionism." *The Death of the Animal.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. 85-86. Print.

———. *Foe*. London: Penguin Books, 1993. Print.

———. *Nobel Prize in Literature Lecture*. 2003. Print.

———. *Summertime*. London: Vintage Books, 2010. Print.

———. *The Lives of Animals*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999. Print.

———. "The Novel Today." *Upstream* 6.1 (1988). Print.

———. *White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa*. Sandton: Century Hutchinson, 1988. Print.

Coetzee, J.M., Harris, Wilson and Toni Morrison. "Speechless Before Apartheid: J.M. Coetzee's Inconsolable Works of Mourning." *Postcolonial Narrative and the Work of Mourning*. Albany: University of New York, 2004. Print.

Coleman, Daniel. *White Civility: The Literary Project of English Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006. Print.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "Crusoe as a Representative of Humanity." *Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 288-289. Print.

Connell, R.W. "The Social Organization of Masculinity." *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995. 67-86. Print.

Conrad, Joseph. "Heart of Darkness." *The Norton Anthology: English Literature.* Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and M.H. Abrams. 8th ed. London: Norton, 2006. 2327-2386. Print.

Corcoran, Patrick. "*Foe*: Metafiction and the Discourse of Power." *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*. Eds Lieve Spaas and Brian Stimpson. London: MacMillan Press, 1996. 256-66. Print.

Crowley, J. Donald. "Introduction and Notes." *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. London: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. vi-xxii. Print.

Defoe, Daniel. *Conjugal Lewdness or, Matrimonial Whoredom*. London: T. Warner, 1727.

———. *Moll Flanders.* United States: Random House, 2008. Print.

——— . *Roxana: The Fortunate Mistress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Print.

——— . *Some Considerations Upon Street-Walkers. With a Proposal for Lessening the Present Number of Them.* London: A. Moore, 1726. Print.

——— . *The Best of Defoe's Review: An Anthology*. Ed. William L. Payne. New York: Columbia University Press: 1951. Print.

——— . *The Complete English Tradesman*, *in Familiar Letters: Directing him in all the Several Parts and Progressions of Trade*. 2nd Ed. London: Charles Rivington, 1727. Print.

———. *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe.* London: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. Print.

———. "The True-Born Englishman: A Satyr." *A True Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True Born English-man. Corrected by Himself.* 1703. Print.

Dickens, Charles. "The Want of Emotion in Defoe." *Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 295. Print.

Doyle, Sir Arthur Conan. "Silver Blaze." *The Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1981. Print.

Easthope, Antony. "The Castle of the Self." *What a Man's Gotta Do: The Masculine Myth in Popular Culture*. Massachusetts: Unwintlyman, 1990. 35-44. Print.

Fanon, Franz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967. Print.

Flint, Holly. "White Talk, White Writing: New Contexts for Examining Genre and Identity in J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 22.4 (2011): 336-353. Print

Flynn, Christopher. *Defoe's Review*. St Edward's University, 2006. Web. 10 December 2011.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" *The Book History Reader*. 2nd ed. Ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleary. London: Routledge, 2002. 281-291. Print.

Free, Melissa. "Un-Erasing Crusoe Farther Adventures in the Nineteenth Century." *Book History 9* (2006): 89-103. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. "Some Character Types Met with in Psychoanalytic Work." *Art and Literature* 14 (1985): 293-316. Print.

Gildon, Charles. *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Mr. D—— De F—*. London: J. Roberts, 1719. Print.

Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. Middlesex: Echo Library, 2007. Print.

Grant, Michael and John Hazel. "Bellerophon." *Who's Who in Classical Mythology*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973. 97-8. Print.

Grimal, Pierre. "Amazons." *A Conceise Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. Ed. Stephen Kershaw. Trans. A.R. Maxwell-Hyslop. Paris: Basil Blackwell, 1990. 37-38. Print.

Hamilton, Christine. "One in a Million." *The American Quarter Horse Journal* 28 July 2010. Web. 8 December 2011.

Hardin, Michael. "Colonizing the Characters of Daniel Defoe: J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*." *Notes on Contemporary Literature*. 2001. 9-10. Print.

Head, Dominic. "The Maze of Doubting: '*Foe*'." *J.M. Coetzee*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 112-128. Print.

———. "The Writer's Place: Coetzee and Postcolonial Literature." *J.M. Coetzee*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 1-27. Print.

Hopes, Jeffrey. "Real and Imaginary Stories: *Robinson Crusoe* and the *Serious Reflections*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 8.2 (1996): 1-16. Print.

Hulme, Peter. "Robinson Crusoe and Friday." *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean 1492-1797*. London: Methuen, 1986. 175-222. Print.

Hummel, William E. "'The Gift of my Father's Bounty': Patriarchal Patronization in *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana.*" *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literatures* 48.2 (1994): 119-141. Print.

Jooma, Minaz. "Robinson Crusoe Inc(corporate): Domestic Economy, Incest and the Trope of Cannibalism." *LIT* 8 (1997): 61-81. Print.

King James Bible. Literature Online. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1996. Web. 12 December 2011.

Knowles, James. "'The Faction of the Flesh': Orientalism and the Caroline Masque." *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*. Manchester: Manchester University, 2006. 111-137. Print.

Kossew, Sue. "'Women's Words': A Reading of J.M. Coetzee's Woman Narrators." *Critical Essays on J.M. Coetzee.* New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1998. 166-179. Print.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. Ed. John Drakakis. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

MacLeod, Lewis. "'Do We of Necessity Become Puppets in a Story?' or Narrating the World: On Speech, Silence, and Disclosure in J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 52.1 (2006): 1-18. Print.

Marshall, David. "Friday's Writing Lesson: Reading *Foe*." *Historical Boundaries, Narrative Forms: Essays on British Literature in the Long Eighteenth Century in Honor of Everett Zimmerman*. Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 2007. Print.

Mason, Shirlene. *Daniel Defoe and the Status of Women*. Vermont: Eden Press, 1978. Print.

Maurer, Shawn Lisa. "'I wou'd be a *Man-Woman*': *Roxana*'s Amazonian Threat to the Ideology of Marriage." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 46.3 (2004): 363-386. Print.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Mitchell, John. "An Essay Upon the Causes of the Difference Colours of People in different Climates." *Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775)* 43 (1744-1745): 102-150. Print.

Morphet, Tony. "Two Interviews with J.M. Coetzee, 1983 and 1987." *Triquarterly* 69 (1987): 454-464. Print.

Morrison, Toni. "Black Matters." *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992. Print.

Mullan, John. "Introduction and Notes." *Roxana: The Fortunate Mistress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. vi-xxxii. Print.

Novak, Maximilian. "Friday: Or, the Power of Naming." *Augustan Subjects: Essays in Honor of Martin C. Battetin*. Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 1997. 110-122. Print.

Nussbaum, Felicity A. *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary. 2011. Oxford University Press. Web. 25 February 2011.

Parker, Jo Alyzon. "*Cruso*'s Foe, *Foe*'s Crusoe, and the Origins and the Future of the Novel." *KronoScope* 11.1-2 (2011): 17-40. Print.

Parry, Benita. "Speech and Silence in the Fictions of J.M. Coetzee." *New Formations* 21 (1994): 1-20. Print.

Peterson, Spiro. "The Matrimonial Theme of Defoe's *Roxana.*" *PMLA*. 70.1 (1955): 166-191. Print.

Poyner, Jane. "Bodying Forth the Other: Friday and the 'Discursive Situation' in *Foe*." *J.M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authorship.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2009. 91-109. Print.

Rédei, George P. "Chimera." *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Genetics, Genomics and Proteomics*. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2003. Print.

Richetti, John. *The Life of Daniel Defoe*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.

Roberts, Sheila. "'Post-colonialism, or the House of Friday' –J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*." *World Literature Written in English* 31.1 (1991): 87-92. Print.

The Tragedy Rousseau, Jean Jacques. "A Treatise on Natural Education." *Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 282-284. Print.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979. Print.

Sanders, Mark. "The Writing Business: 'He and His Man', Coetzee and Defoe." 25.4 *JLS/TLW* (2009): 39-50. Print.

Shakespeare, William. "The Tragedy of Macbeth." *The Norton Anthology Shakespeare: Tragedies*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard and Katharine Eisaman Maus. London: Norton, 1997. 783-846. Print.

———. "The Most Excellent and Lamentable Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet." *The Norton Anthology Shakespeare: Tragedies*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard and Katharine Eisaman Maus. London: Norton, 1997. 143-219. Print.

———. "The Tempest." *The Norton Anthology Shakespeare: Romances and Poems*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard and Katharine Eisaman Maus. London: Norton, 1997. 329- 401. Print.

Spass, Lieve. "Narcissus and Friday: From Classical to Anthropological Myth." *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*. London: MacMillan Press, 1996. 98-109. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea*. Ed. Rosalind C. Morris. New York: Columbia University, 2010. Print.

———. "Theory in the Margin: Coetzee's *Foe* Reading Defoe's *Crusoe / Roxana*." *Consequences of Theory: Selected Papers from the English Institute, 1987-88*. Eds. Jonathan Arac and Barbarra Johnson. London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1991. 154-180. Print.

Splendore, Paola. "J.M. Coetzee's *Foe*: Intertextual and Metafictional Resonances." 11.1 (1988): 55-60. Print.

Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels.* London: Penguin, 2001. Print.

The Female Soldier; or, the Surprising Life and Adventures of Hannah Snell. London: R. Walker, 1750. Print.

Thobani, Sunera. *Exalted Subjects: Studies in the Making of Race and Nation in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011. Print.

Turk, Tisha. "Intertextuality and the Collaborative Construction of Narrative: J.M. Coetzee's Foe." *Narrative* 19.3 (2011) 295-310. Print.

Wagner, Kathrin M. "'Dichter' and 'Duchtung': Susan Barton and the 'Truth' of Autobiography." *English Studies in Africa* 32.1 (1989): 1-11. Print.

Watt, Ian. "Robinson Crusoe as a Myth." *Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 311-332. Print.

Wheeler, Roxann. *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth Century British Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. "Robinson Crusoe." *Robinson Crusoe: An Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Sources, Criticism.* Ed. Michael Shinagel. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975. 306-311. Print.

Zhang, John Z. "Defoe's 'Man-Woman' Roxana: Gender, Reversal, and Androyny" *Etudes Anglaises* 46.3 (1993): 272-288. Print.