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ABSTRACT

The alternative Marxist approach to literary criticism in the present study consists of three "vocal" modes of interpretation: the public voice, the private voice, and the homeless voice of the self. The public voice represents authorial visions of the ideological real projected by dominant ideology that covers up the "objective" real, while the private voice corresponds to the authorial conscious or unconscious insertion into radical ideology that turns the "objective" real into the ideological real. However, the homeless voice of the self obliterates any ties with history and authorial ideology. A personification of the Marxist "particular interest" of the self, the homeless voice echoes in the open space of the text and reaches for the distant real shaped by the reader's interpretive paradigms inside or outside the constraints of the institutional discourse. Incorporating both traditional and poststructuralist Marxist insights, the current Marxist framework departs from the traditional conviction of a neutral reality and from the postmodern concept of the totalizing ideology. It acknowledges the role of the dialectical real that is simultaneously "objective" (edited out by dominant ideology) and "subjective" (picked up by radical ideology to be molded as the ideological real). The alternative Marxist approach also attaches relative importance to authorial intention, the text, and reader response in an interpretive activity and values both historical studies and theoretical elucidations because the
interplay between the two apparently contradictory modes of criticism may reinforce and supplement each other in their shared territory of the study of the private voice of the self in the text, although the public voice is more oriented towards history and the homeless voice towards theory. The different voices of the self are exemplified in a study of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe, Captain Singleton, Moll Flanders, and Roxana*, which profits from both modern critical theory (determinitorialization, Schlegelian irony, and feminist theory) and historical insights into Defoe's fiction.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There has been a tomato/tomahto thing going in the field of eighteenth-century studies: a debate over tradition versus theory or literature versus "metaliterature." The defense of the mainstream tradition rose to its climax at the April 1987 conference at Georgetown, the addresses of which were published in a book entitled Theory and Tradition in Eighteenth-Century Studies in 1990. The authors in this conference collection, led by Donald Greene, have launched attacks on modern critical theory, the "French clerks," and especially Joel Weinsheimer and other critics for their remarks on the tendency of being "relatively unresponsive to new critical systems and literary theories" and on barely having "something new to say" in eighteenth-century studies. While one side of the argument encourages new theoretical developments and deplores traditional historical studies, the other side turns its back on the workings of theory in the critical enterprise and values the tapestry of historical weavings that contributes to our understanding of the author's artistry in a literary work. At one extreme, literary criticism may be understood as "tomato" because the tradition of historical studies is, as Greene puts it, what we grew up with. At the other extreme, "tomahto" may be the right term because Weinsheimer, as the founding editor of The
**Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation**, is a leader of the radical new generation who has close ties with the thoughts of the French and other European chefs and is determined to question the value of the main recipe in the kitchen. They both represent what they stand for, and they are both involved in the political power struggle for a mainstream representation up front in the critical arena: one tries to push theory forward to the cutting edge while the other hangs on to tradition and preserves it in the front range. Basking in the wisdom and insight of both sides, students of literature are easily puzzled by the contradictory nature of the debate. But they are faced with a Foucauldian choice that they have to make between "filiation" with the "natural" critical tradition and "affiliation" with the institutional practices that have gained grounds in some other fields. Are we bound to make such a choice? It does not have to be this way.

The present study aims to harmonize the conflict between history and theory and incorporates both historical and theoretical insights into a reading of Daniel Defoe's fiction. Based on an alternative Marxist approach, this project absorbs elements of both traditional (classical and cultural) Marxism and postmodern or poststructuralist Marxism. It proposes a framework of a split self that possesses three kinds of voices: the public voice, the private voice, and the homeless voice; within this framework, both history and theory occupy a place, although their contradictory nature is not effaced. The public voice of the self, which is related to the author's public image defined by
dominant ideology, can be the sole interpretive domain in which historical studies play a leading role in making a connection between the author's aims in the text and history as reflected by dominant ideology or the conventional ideas of a certain historical period. History and theory may reinforce or supplement each other when it comes to a study of the private voice of the self, which promotes and advances radical ideology in struggle with dominant ideology. A repudiation of the established historical principles, the private voice of the self makes it possible for the critic to approach the literary text from both a historical and a theoretical point of view or to rely on one to make sense of the other (which is what I attempt for the most part in the last three chapters on Defoe's fiction). However, the "homeless" voice of the self, a term borrowed from Georg Lukacs, can make sense only by applying theory to the text, for it is characterized as a dissonance from both history and ideology. In short, both history and theory ought to be valued in literary criticism because a work of art may unfold the split self with those three voices.

That the present study proposes an alternative Marxist approach is obvious in the origin of the three voices. Both the public and private voices are derived from the Marxist notions of ideology, the traditional Marxist notion about ideology that represents the dominant class's interest as the common interest to cover up the real or the postmodern Marxist concept that rejects such a real and constitutes the real as ideological. But the homeless
voice departs from history and ideology and therefore goes beyond both traditional and poststructuralist Marxism. Although the term "homeless" is borrowed from Lukács's notion of the "transcendental homelessness of the novel," the homeless voice differs from such a Lukácsian notion. For Lukács, the home or origin of ancient artistic forms is "the transcendental structure of the form-giving subject," a cosmic organic world that finds harmony and unity in the created art forms. The modern novel, then, is "an expression of this transcendental homelessness," where the organic equilibrium between the form-giving subject and the artistic forms is destroyed or "is never again concentrated in the forms themselves." That is, the fragmented modern world has replaced the ancient organic harmonious cosmic world, and this modern fragmentedness reflected in the novel has destroyed the "home" in the art form. Here, the novel's "homelessness" is historically determined by the fragmented modern world. The "homeless" voice of the self in the alternative Marxist approach, however, is freed from such a traditional Marxist argument and from the postmodern Marxist control of the institutional discourse as well, for the homeless voice, which represents a distant real, is cut off from ideology and history and moves outside social relations into a "horizon of future aesthetic experience" (to use Hans Robert Jauss's term) with the reader's interpretive modes that may or may not be influenced by the postmodern Marxist "interpretive community."
What really threatens the dominant place of historical studies in literary criticism are anti-historical propositions in the new theoretical developments. According to postmodern theories, the literary text has its own force and does not imitate or reflect external realities. History for the poststructuralists is not a neutral objective reality independent of the text. As Hayden White points out,

the difficulty with the notion of a truth of past experience is that it can no longer be experienced, and this throws a specifically historical knowledge open to the charge that it is a construction as much of imagination as of thought...[which] puts historical discourse on the same level as any rhetorical performance and consigns it to the status of a textualization neither more or less authoritative than ‘literature’ itself can lay claim to.”

Here, White has turned history as a neutral truth of the past experience into just another form of discourse on the same level as the literary text; the fictive and the real are all the imaginative workings of the human mind, and there is no such thing as an authoritative reality that dictates what is real and what is fictive. History in the present study, however, is not a textual construction; nor is it defined as an objective and independent real against which literature is measured and studied. Rather, the historical real is always a hybrid of the traditional Marxist objective real, the postmodern Marxist ideological real, and the alternative Marxist dialectical real. The ideological real is most often what we conceive in the established accounts of historical events, shaped by dominant ideology and tradition; the literary text can be an expression of this external condition that is projected as the real.
Digging deep down into the historical phenomena that are the projected real and beneath the established descriptions of them, we disclose the objective real that is covered up by dominant ideology or ignored by tradition-oriented scholars. But according to the alternative Marxist approach, the status of this objective real is unstable, for although it is blocked out by the interference of dominant ideology and remains outside the boundaries of the illusive real that dominant ideology aims to project, this objective real will be picked up by another ideology and become a projected real as well. Therefore, the objective real is always dialectical in the sense that it bears within itself a tendency of being subjectified and advanced as an ideological real by radical ideology. So besides the acknowledgement of the postmodern Marxist real shaped by ideology, the alternative Marxist approach also sympathizes with the traditional Marxist objective real and fuses the two into a dialectical real that is both objective and ideological, objective in contrast to the illusive real molded by dominant ideology but ideological in relation to an emergent ideology. My argument does not amount to saying that everything is ideological, which is the same conviction as the postmodern Marxists. What it boils down to, in terms of the difference of the alternative Marxist approach from both the traditional and the postmodern, is that the alternative approach treats the ideological blocked-out or filtered-out seriously. The traditional Marxists regard the ideological filtered-out as the objective real that somehow threatens the social formation of the dominant class and is
determined by the material existence of the subjugated class, while the postmodern Marxists reject such an ideological cast-off. For them, ideology has a totalizing power and does not cast off any part of the real outside its grips; ideology constitutes the real. But for the alternative Marxist approach, ideology is always selective, and this alternative framework acknowledges ideological cast-offs, as in the distant real in its component of the homeless voice, which are neither historically determined nor ideologically constituted. These various forms of the distant real are cast off in various historical stages, first by dominant ideology and then by emergent ideology to shape its own real after picking it up as the objective real filtered out by dominant ideology, and these forms of the distant real will be in contact with only the future reader's interpretive paradigms influenced by or freed from the constraints of the institutional discourse.

The self has long been considered split from itself. For Jacques Lacan, the human being with its genetic label of gender is split first at the moment of birth from a primordial androgynous being. Lacan calls it the first "lack." The self is further divided from itself (the second "lack") as the child experiences the "mirror stage" or the Imaginary, where for the first time it identifies with an other (the mother or nurse), and passes into the symbolic realm of language acquisition (the Symbolic). By acquiring the symbolic system of language, the child is permanently split from the other half of itself and performs its roles in accord with cultural codes as dictated by the
linguistic sign. More important are Wayne C. Booth's and Georges Poulet's notions of the split self as the author and the reader respectively. Unlike Lacan's psychoanalytical model, Booth's and Poulet's models have direct bearing on discussions about the author/reader relationship. Booth's notion of the split author deals with the actual author and the authorial "second self" in the text. In this model of the authorial split self, the author has authority over the text and over the created reader's interpretation of the text in terms of reconstructing the author's aim or intention in it. In the case of the split self in Poulet's reader-oriented model, however, the author is dropped from the domain of interpretation, for the "thinking I" or the "thinking subject" that is divided from the reader asserts to be the subject and authority of the ideas and all the other "mental entities" in the text.5 Within these two models, there exists an impassable gulf between the author and the reader in an interpretive activity. Although Wolfgang Iser's model bridges the gap between the author and the reader, Jauss's is the closest to the alternative Marxist approach to literary criticism in the present study. Iser stresses the interaction between the text and the reader through the author's artistic guidelines that stimulate the reader's imagination and immediate participation in the text. Jauss also reads the literary text as the joint work of the author and the reader in "continuing productivity." But more importantly, Jauss's insight into the aesthetic distance between a work of art and its reception and into the work's "horizon of future aesthetic experience"
characterized by a belated critical reception approximates the distant real in the alternative Marxist critical approach. The alternative approach, however, does not exactly follow Jauss but deals with the "horizon of future aesthetic experience" on the basis of Marx's notion of "the particular interest" of the individual, which matches up with the future reader's interpretive paradigms influenced by or freed from the control of the postmodern Marxist "interpretive community." The alternative approach also incorporates Jauss's traditional Marxist views of historical determinism into the public voice of the authorial self and differentiates it from the homeless voice that dismantles relations with history and authorial ideology. While assigning value to both authorial intention in the public voice of the self and the reader's interpretive strategies in the homeless voice, the alternative Marxist approach also emphasizes the interplay between the author and the reader in the private voice of the self, where authorial ideology is not necessarily intentional but a joint production by the author and the reader. Thus, the split self in the present study has three forms. The self that articulates a public voice is the authorial public image defined by dominant ideology, and the self that pronounces a private voice is the author's intentional or unintentional insertion into radical ideology. But the homeless voice of the self is created by the reader as a textual self that is alien to the author. Such a study of the three kinds of voices of the split self departs from Booth's and Poulet's notions of the split self and Jauss's aesthetics of reception after incorporating
them into the alternative Marxist framework, and it recognizes the relative importance of the role of the author, of the reader, and the interaction between the two.

The model of the split self with the public, private, and homeless voices is established in Chapter 2, which offers a critique of both traditional and poststructuralist Marxism and advances an alternative Marxist approach to literary criticism that consists of an analysis of those three voices. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 exemplify this model in Defoe's fiction with an emphasis on the private and homeless voices of the self, and the public voice is undertaken only in contrast. Chapter 3 examines the private voice as shown in Deleuzian lines of flight or deterritorialization. In contrast to Robinson Crusoe's reterritorialization to authority (the public voice of the self) after deterritorializing the religious boundaries, both Captain Singleton and Roxana deterritorialize without coming to terms with authority. The private voice in either of the novels echoes through to the end. In Chapter 4, Defoe's private voice is illustrated by Schlegelian irony in Moll's chaotic world of becoming that disrupts the sense of a universal order and the certainty of authorial intention. Chapter 5 indicates a reversal of Lacan's model of the self that progresses from the primordial androgynous state through the Imaginary to the Symbolic. The Symbolic system serves to perpetuate the human subject's position in society, which corresponds to Defoe's public voice about Roxana's gender roles as perceived through the "male gaze." Roxana then
reverses her role as a dependent woman in the male-dominated society in the second stage of the Imaginary and becomes a whore who articulates a private voice and poses a threat to the male dominance. Finally, with a homeless voice, Defoe thrusts Roxana back to the primordial androgynous state and deconstructs her distinctive cultural gender roles towards the end of the novel.
CHAPTER 2

VOICES OF THE SPLIT SELF: AN ALTERNATIVE MARXIST APPROACH TO LITERARY CRITICISM

The self in the present study is defined as a split self, a self that articulates different voices, a self that borders on the domains of the author, the text, and the reader, and the present approach propels a dynamic motion of these relationships in literary criticism. Such a study of the author/text/reader dynamism builds on a notion of the split self derived from various models already developed by Wayne C. Booth, Georges Poulet, and Hans Robert Jauss. Inherent gaps between the author and the reader are somehow bridged through the space of the literary text in each of those models, but those critics stress either authorial intention, the authority of the reader, or historical determinism. The present study intends to resolve the author/text/reader/dilemma and harmonize the confrontation between theory and history. By incorporating authorial dominant ideology into the sphere of the public voice of the self portrayed in the text and by studying the text's departure from dominant ideology as the private voice and the textual open space void of authorial ideology and history as the "homeless" voice of the self, the following pages aim to lay a theoretical foundation for the next three chapters dealing with Defoe's different voices in his fictional narratives.
The author, for Booth, is a split self who creates an "official scribe" or "second self." The created "official versions" of the author play a different role or establish "a different air" depending on the needs of different works. Through such roles of "the implied author," the reader can trace intentions and value systems back to the biographical author. The created authorial second selves in Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*, *Tom Jones*, and *Amelia*, for instance, Booth tells us, all "value benevolence and generosity; all of them deplore self-seeking brutality." And through Shakespeare's plays, the reader knows what Shakespeare loved and hated, for "it is hard to see how he could have written his plays at all if he had refused to take a strong line on at least one or two of the seven deadly sins." The "second self" helps convey the text's meaning to another "second self," the created reader. Booth argues that "the most successful reading is one in which the created selves, author and reader, can find complete agreement." In Booth's framework, biographical authors play a key role in the reading process: they create the implied author and the implied reader; their artistic merit lies in their ability to bring the two in unison and in sharing the authorial values and intentions. The author communes with the reader but from one "second self" to another. The "second self" of a reader such as Booth is totally passive as it is created by the author and divided from the real historical Booth in a particular reading context. In other words, there is a strong bond between the author and the text, and the reader vanishes from the picture.
As the other extreme goes, the biographical author disappears from the text, and what matters, Poulet argues, is the "thinking subject" or "thinking I" of the reader. Here, the duality of the reader remains valid, for there is still a distinction between the "thinking subject" Poulet and the historical theorist Poulet. "Whenever I read," Poulet writes, "I mentally pronounce an I, and yet the I which I pronounce is not myself." It is not the author who creates and separates the "second self" from the reader; it is language that surrounds the reader with "unreality" and spurs the reader to split a "thinking I" that is drawn into the God-like fictional world. It is a game the "thinking I" and language play on the author, who is isolated from the text. Although the text embodies the author's ideas, the "thinking I" or the second self of the reader breaks the ties of the ideas from their source or from the author's authority. The "thinking I" celebrates the lost authorship of the text because as long as the "thinking I" entertains the "mental entities" such as language or the ideas in the text, Poulet writes, it asserts itself as the subject of those ideas. Therefore, the text "is there within me, not to send me back, outside itself, to its author, nor to his other writings." The author, the created authorial second selves in one text or the other texts, and the biography of the author are all at the mercy of the "thinking I" of the reader in a reading process. The text exists in the reader, and the "thinking I" enjoys full supremacy.8
The celebration of the author authority or the reader authority handicaps the author/text/reader relationships in literary criticism. Such maimed relationships are remedied in Jauss's "aesthetics of reception," where Jauss emphasizes the first historical reader's response to the literary text in an interacted production of the author's artistic greatness. "History of literature," Jauss argues, "is a process of aesthetic reception and production that takes place in the realization of literary texts on the part of the receptive reader, the reflective critic, and the author in his continuing productivity." Both the author and the reader play an important role in determining the aesthetic value of a literary text, measured by the reader's "horizons of expectations," the distance, or "the disparity between the given horizon of expectations and the appearance of a new work." The greater the distance is, the more aesthetic the work may be. The greatest distance of all involves "a 'change of horizons' through negation of familiar experiences or through raising newly articulated experiences to the level of consciousness." So on a scale from "culinary" or entertainment art to the art of "horizonal change," a literary work "satisfies, surpasses, disappoints, or refutes the expectations of its first audience." This "aesthetic distance" is connected to reception and "objectified historically along the spectrum of the audience's reactions and criticism's judgment."

However, Jauss's theory turns the author/text/reader relationship into a stagnant, historically determined mode and reveals a limited view of
traditional Marxist aesthetics. His model is restricted to historical determinism and to conceiving the formal "horizontal change" as a product of history. First, Jauss's emphasis of the continuing author/reader joint production of the literary text is mainly frozen at the historical moment when the work first makes its appearance. If a literary work destroys the familiar and conventional "horizon of expectations," it is only determined by history and works on the domain of "raising newly articulated experiences to the level of consciousness." The "newly articulated" or radical experiences bear conflicting interests with the established or familiar "expectations" and are bound to find their expression or representation in a work of art. When this happens, according to Jauss, the first reader and critic alike will be so stunned by the radical elements in a work promising "horizontal change" that it achieves "gradual or belated understanding" in its reception. Literary criticism of later generations ought to trace the reactions by the first reader to assess literary value. The assumption is this: a literary work is a product of history, a product of its social, ideological conditions. A great work of art transcends established or dominant ideologies and interacts with radical ones that have been "newly articulated" prior to the historical moment of the work's appearance. Second, Jauss's historical determinism also finds expression in its implicit cause/effect relationship between historical conditions and artistic form. His ideal example of "horizontal change" is Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (1605). In it, the reader's familiar "horizon of
expectations" is evoked, the "horizon" formed by a "convention of genre, style, or form." As Cervantes arouses the reader's "horizon of expectations" in the form of the familiar medieval tales of chivalry, the adventure of his knight destroys such a "horizon" and becomes a parody of the conventional form. In other words, the medieval artistic form of chivalry no longer keeps pace with the early modern life, and the changed social reality demands a parody and negation of the out-of-rhythm form.

Among the three terms in the author/text/reader relationship, Booth isolates the reader and Poulet isolates the author from the other two terms. Jauss's model includes one layer of the public voice of the self in relation to the familiar "horizons of expectations" and the other layer of the private voice of the self in breaking with the familiar and embodies a "horizontal change" which is historically determined. My framework of the split self incorporates all of these models but goes beyond Jauss's paradigm of historical determinism and deals with the homeless voice of the self that is not historically determined or ideologically constituted. The self in the present study, in its vocal division among the public voice, the private voice, and the homeless voice of the self, provokes an interplay among the author, the text, and the reader and proposes an alternative Marxist approach to literary criticism. First, the public voice of the self pertains to the author's insertion into the dominant ideology or adherence to the conventional "horizons of expectations." Second, the private voice of the self promotes radical ideology
that is submerged by dominant ideology and needs to be raised to the level of consciousness and shape an ideological real out of it. Under these circumstances, the reader's role to dig out historical facts and make connections between history and fiction serves to make sense of the literary text. The homeless voice of the self, however, transcends authorial ideology and intention and initiates a whispered conversation with the future interpretive paradigms. Such a distance between the author's ideology and the reader's interpretations occupies a space in the literary text, and the connection between the two is made possible with the application of critical theory. Within such a framework of the self, history and theory, in the first place, have distinct functions. Historical studies, on the one hand, make sense of the text in terms of the author's ideology and the socio-historical milieu that produces ideology, e.g. the public voice of the self. Theory, on the other hand, abandons history and historical determinism and tries to make sense of the text solely in theoretical terms, e.g. the homeless voice of the self that transcends the author's ideology and anticipates the reader's interpretive strategies. In the second place, despite their contradictions, history and theory also occupy an overlapping area that covers part of both history and theory, e.g. the private voice that departs from the familiar "horizons of expectations" but taps into the radical "horizons" of change--both history and theory can, in such cases, arrive at the same conclusions about the text, as in the following chapters on deterritorialization, the chaotic world of
becoming, and the reversal of gender roles in Defoe's fiction. So the framework of the split self among the public, the private, and the homeless can be reduced to a simple model that involves history and theory and the author and the reader in relation to the text: the public voice (authorial dominant ideology and history), the private voice (authorial radical ideology and shared territory of history and theory), and the homeless voice (flight out of authorial ideology and history into the reader's interpretive paradigms). Critical theory reinforces historical studies just as historical studies reinforce critical theory in that shared territory of literary criticism. Literary criticism, it can be argued within the present model, ought to recognize and value all of the three "vocal" spheres of interpretation, for a great work of art can reveal a split self on all the three levels of its voices.

The following pages will be divided into two sections: (1) a critique of traditional and poststructuralist Marxism and (2) the voices of the self: the public voice, the private voice, and the homeless voice. The first section deals with the limited view of Marxism, in which both traditional Marxism (classical and cultural) in its historical determinism and poststructuralist Marxism in its ideological and institutional approaches are examined and revised. The second section first evaluates the public voice in relation to the notions of history and the ruling class ideology in traditional Marxism and in relation to the concept of the ideology-centered human subject in poststructuralist Marxist theories. Then, the private voice coincides with
radical or emergent ideologies. The homeless voice of the self is derived from Marx's theory of "particular interest" in contrast to "communal interest." This component of the homeless voice promises an alternative Marxist approach and enhances an expanded view of Marxism that moves beyond its traditional and poststructuralist variations. It revises both in its departure from traditional Marxist historical determinism and in its awareness of the dissonance between authorial ideology and the reader's interpretive paradigms, controlled by or freed from the "interpretive community," so that a literary text may obliterate its ties with both ideology and history, creating an open space for the reader. In this sense, the author, with the public voice, the private voice, and/or the homeless voice of the self in the text, may or may not be manipulated by ideology; the same applies to the reader and the critic, whose interpretations of the text may or may not adhere to their ideology influenced by the institutional discourse and may leave an open space, too, for the future interpretive paradigms.

2.1. A Critique of Traditional and Postmodern Marxism

For Marx, the economic structure of society or the material productive forces constitute an economic base that gives rise to a legal, political, and spiritual superstructure and to forms of social consciousness. Marx writes, "it is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the
contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness." This is what Marx deems as the deterministic relationship between the economic base or infrastructure and the ideological superstructure. In *The German Ideology* (1846), Marx and Engels regard "the material activity and the material intercourse of men" as "the language of real life" and consider the production of ideas as conditioned by the productive forces. While the base contains all the material existence in society, the superstructure consists of the State, the legal system, and all the ideological components such as religion, ethics, politics, art and literature, etc. The function of the superstructure, in Louis Althusser's terms, is to reproduce labor power's "submission to the rules of the established order" or reproduce all the social relations required to maintain the economic base. As the base determines the whole edifice of all social consciousness or ideology, and as a certain class dominates the productive forces in society and therefore dominates that economic base, the dominant class always produces a dominant ideology that becomes social consciousness. "During the time that the aristocracy was dominant," Marx and Engels tell us, "the concepts honour, loyalty, etc. were dominant, during the dominance of the bourgeoisie the concepts freedom, equality, etc." This idea of material existence or social reality as the determiner of ideological concepts is especially clear in Marx's explanation of the English Revolution of 1688, where Marx regards material factors concerning conflicting classes as the real cause for the overthrow of the English Restoration monarchy. In
Marx's view, the driving force for the Revolution is a class struggle for material benefits. First, it was "the fear on the part of the great new landowners," who had to return their property (seven-tenths of England's land) they had acquired by robbing the church before the 1660 Restoration. Second, it was the bourgeoisie who fought for freedom in commerce and industry. In the Revolution, the new landowner class joined forces with the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, which was averse to Charles I's interference with free competition and to the control of Catholicism over England's industry and commerce. Behind apparent ideological demands for political privileges and religious freedom lies the material existence that determines the ideology of the oppositional classes in the Revolution. Marx and Engels even warn people of the misconception that ideology revolutionizes society. They argue that ideas may revolutionize society but the ideas are a product of historical conditions, for "within the old society, the elements of a new one have been created," and "the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence." That is, the revolutionary or "emergent" ideology springs from the elements of a new society within the old one. And the "residual" ideology will dissolve if the soil that begets its existence and fertilizes its growth is replaced by a new base or new conditions of existence. That is why, for Marx and Engels, as "feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie," Christianity, which had overcome the ancient world, succumbed
to the eighteenth-century emergent bourgeois rationalist ideas and had to remain to be "residual" ideology.¹¹

Classical Marxist historical determinism also cuts into art and literature as ideological forms and renders cultural Marxist readings of the text. Writers' social consciousness cannot escape from their social existence. Marx regards "petty-bourgeois writers" as "shopkeepers" of the class they represent. The "shopkeepers" and the petty-bourgeois class cannot go beyond the limits of their "material interest and social position" and are driven "to the same tasks and solution." Art and literature, for Marx, are part of the social process and have social roots in history. Revolutionary developments in literary form, in Terry Eagleton's words, "result from significant changes in ideology. They embody new ways of perceiving social reality." Jauss's view of Don Quixote, as discussed above, is such an example of the changed social reality and ideology as determiners of the artistic form. Eagleton's evidence is derived from Ian Watt's formal realism in The Rise of the Novel, as Eagleton argues that the novel "reveals in its very form a changed set of ideological interests.... It shares certain formal structures with other such works: a shifting of interest from the romantic and supernatural to individual psychology and 'routine' experience." Themes of the romantic and the supernatural tend to give way to those of the individual and common life, as the social conditions have changed in favor of the modern artistic form, a form to better express the changed ideology. In Georg Lukacs's cultural
Marxist views, literary form also reflects a "metaphysical dissonance," which is determined by culture or, in Marshall Berman's words, stems from "the inner contradictions of its historical and social milieu." For Lukacs, "every art form is defined by the metaphysical dissonance of life which it accepts and organises as the basis of a totality complete in itself." "Metaphysical dissonance" because the totality that the art form embodies renders a completeness in itself, but completeness, Lukacs maintains, is "utopian." Both the epic and the novel think in terms of totality, and the basis of such a totality or "the metaphysical dissonance" corresponds to the respective outside realities of the epic and of the novel. In the epic, Lukacs argues, the basis of the totality is derived from the form-giving philosophy characteristic of the ancient world that deems life and essence as identical concepts. Thus, the epic world and the outside world knit a "perfect rhythmic system" where all characters in the created artistic forms are at the same distance from the essence. The organic ancient world, however, is disrupted by the fragmented modern world. The basis of the totality of the novel originates in this changed modern world, where "the immanence of meaning in life has become a problem." Then, the art form personifies a totality that captures "the life of the problematic individual" rather than "the immanence of meaning" or "the all-sustaining essence." As the modern world has changed and has left no trace of the cosmic essence that marks the ancient world, the modern literary form likewise keeps pace with that change.
Historical determinism is perhaps best illustrated by Fredric Jameson in his three political or ideological horizons of what he calls a "Marxist method of literary and cultural interpretation," which realizes the force of culture on poetics or the political interest behind art. Within Jameson's first (narrow) horizon, the text or "the object of study" (the individual literary work) functions as "a symbolic act," where social contradictions "find a purely formal resolution in the aesthetic realm." Political and ideological just as the first, the second (expanded) horizon refers to the text, which, construed as class discourses, "has widened to include the social order" and serves as "the ideologeme" that reflects "the essentially antagonistic collective discourses of social classes." The text in this horizon, in other words, may be used as a tool to maintain the reign of the dominant social class and to repress or resolve social opposition and ideological antagonism. Jameson's third and last political and ideological horizon encompasses "human history as a whole" in the form of cultural revolution. All of the three horizons are determined by modes of production. While the individual text (the first horizon) and the collective ideologemes (the second horizon) are "sign systems which are themselves traces or anticipations of modes of production," the ultimate broad horizon of cultural revolution enhances and perpetuates the dominant place of the new social formation or the new modes of production--as a product of cultural revolution--and the new ideology that is meant to justify them. Having established the three horizons of interpretation, Jameson calls for "a
whole new framework for the humanities, in which the study of culture in the widest sense would be placed on a materialist basis."13 Art and literature in Jameson's model are symbolic forms of ideology that enact social conditions or reflect class interests. These symbolic "traces" of the economic base or of the modes of production are all worked up towards cultural revolution, where the old modes of production give way to the new on which a new ideology or social consciousness is based.

Traditional Marxism is often accused of claiming a dichotomy between a neutral reality and ideology as false consciousness. In The German Ideology, Marx and Engels discuss ideology's function of legitimation or universalization. "Each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it," according to Marx and Engels, "is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, that is, expressed in ideal form: it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones." To prevent the subjugated classes from knowing their true interest in society, ideology here is stamped with a ruling class trademark in order to perpetuate the power structure and is conceived as an illusion alien to the objective external world. However, art and literature, when activating radical ideologies, can pierce through the dominant ideology or the false consciousness of the ruling class. Marx speaks highly of the nineteenth-century English realists such as Dickens, Thackeray, Bronte, and
Gaskell for exposing the middle class and issuing to the world "more political and social truths than have been uttered by all the professional politicians, publicists and moralists put together." In his 1888 letter to Margaret Harkness, Engels, too, believes in the penetrating capacity of literature. He praises Balzac's *Comedie Humaine* (1816-48) for being freed from the ruling class's restrictive ideology and plunging into the objective reality of his era, for Balzac goes against "his own class sympathies and political prejudices" and admires "representatives of the popular masses." Literary form, in the hands of Balzac, transcends ideology or false consciousness into truth or an independent external world. Here, we actually confront a dilemma in this dichotomy between an objective world and ideology as false beliefs. On the one hand, ideology functions to impose the dominant class's will on all classes in society as a universal ideal that blocks the dominated classes from a true knowledge of reality. On the other hand, in helping us get a glimpse into truth, the literary work, ideological in nature, challenges and dispels the false beliefs that ideology strives to project.14

In order to resolve this dilemma and repudiate the traditional Marxist conviction of a neutral reality, the poststructuralist or postmodern Marxists launch a different operation that centers on ideology (residual, dominant, and emergent) as the real itself. First, the postmodern Marxist pioneer Louis Althusser starts off by obscuring the traditional Marxist distinction between the material and the conceptual, between the primary independent world and
secondary illusive ideology, and by asserting the influence of the institutional "Ideological State Apparatuses" to constitute individuals as subjects. Emphasizing the relative autonomy of the superstructure, Althusser refuses to categorize ideology as dependent on the material and claims that "ideology has a material existence" in itself. Rather than being external to ideology, material existence is embodied in ideology, and the two are yoked into individuals' material practice of whatever they believe in. For Althusser, "ideology interpellates individuals as subjects," who are always subjected to one ideology or another and free to act in accord with their ideology, and "the 'ideas' of a human subject exist in his actions." First, the interpellation of ideology starts even before the human being is born. Family ideology turns the unborn into a subject, for there is an "ideological ritual that surrounds the expectation of a 'birth', that 'happy event.'" The unborn child also carries with it an ideological impress in social and gender terms the moment when it is expected to be born: it is going to bear its father's name and is going to be conceived along the lines of the male/female dichotomy in relation to its gender roles in society. Also, ideology does not remain intact in the cognitive sphere. If you believe in God, for example, you do not just harbor that notion in your mind and keep faith in it without doing anything; that ideological notion in you will materialize itself in your actions and your practice of the material rituals of religion. As Althusser says, if a human subject believes in God, "he goes to Church to attend Mass, kneels, prays, confesses, does
penance." In this materialist concept, ideology no longer represents false consciousness, something to be penetrated through in order to reach for the real. Ideology, in this poststructuralist Marxist view, opens on to the outside world and is, as Jonathan Dollimore puts it, "the very terms in which we perceive the world."15

While the material and the conceptual are mixed and blurred in Althusser's theory, Terry Eagleton even rejects the objective real and takes it as non-existent. Just as Eagleton feels there is no exteriority or the signified outside language, there is not any "direct, spontaneous relation between text and history." The text does not render referential ties to the real. Any reading of Balzac by-passing ideology into history "belongs to a naive empiricism which is to be discarded." Balzac's insights, for Eagleton, are the effect of "authorial insertion into ideology." The text does not pierce holes in ideology as false beliefs and disclose the real but produces an ideology that is the real itself. Drawing on Engels's distinction between the musical score and the tunes played by the band and his distinction between "dead" drama in script form and drama on stage performed "from the thymele and orchestra [the orchestra and the chorus] through the living mouths of the actors," Eagleton introduces the idea of the text as production. The literary text is "a certain production of ideology" not the "expression" of it, "nor is ideology the 'expression' of social class," just as a play on stage "produces" the script on which it is based rather than expresses or reflects it. Thus, history
and the real are erased from the traditional Marxist deterministic history-ideology-text formulation. What remains is authorial insertion into ideology in the text.

Besides the author's production of ideology in the text instead of reaching for the objective real, the reader, too, is manipulated by what Stanley Fish calls the "interpretive community" or the educational institutions as an Althusserian "Ideological State Apparatus" to constitute the human subject. Within the poststructuralist Marxist framework, this institutional approach repudiates the autonomy of the reader and emphasizes the determining force exerted by the institutional discourse that reproduces ideology in setting up interpretive norms to regulate reading strategies and orchestrate patterns of thinking. This institutional control produces both textual meaning and authorial intention. Any interaction between the critic and the text, Fish argues, will never occur without reference to "a public and stable norm," for "meanings come already calculated, not because of norms embedded in the language but because language is always perceived, from the very first, within a structure of norms" established by the "interpretive communities." Following Fish's argument, Edward Said studies critical consciousness as a product of institutional influence by distinguishing between "filiation" and "affiliation." Filiation, for Said, pertains to a natural instinct to include certain aspects of culture (involved with "birth, nationality, and profession") as "us" and exclude others as "them," while affiliation is
related to institutional influence of the critic by "social and political conviction, economic and historical circumstances." Filiation in preserving culture gives rise to affiliation in educating the young, but the latter, with its relative autonomy, "sometimes reproduces filiation, sometimes makes its own forms." Said contends that "the narrow circle of what is natural, appropriate, and valid for 'us'" is influenced by filiation, which canonizes Western culture within the "narrow circle" and represses and "excludes the non-literary, the non-European, and above all the political dimension in which all literature, all texts, can be found." The filiative order limits literary value within boundaries and marks them as humanities that are to be studied in the classroom and to be handed down to the next generation, while leaving out what is social and political, what is non-literary, and what is opposite to Western culture. That is, natural filiation with culture demarcates between an "us" as the self to be valued and passed on and a "them" as the other to be repressed and discredited. However, filiation does not exist without affiliation, the affiliative institutional influence of those in the classroom to inherit the cultural legacy, "who in turn become members, by affiliation and formation, of the company of educated individuals"--affiliation reproduces filiation. Affiliation also "makes its own forms" by adding another interpretive parameter that reads the non-European, social and political, and the so called "non-literary" text as aspects of culture, aspects that filiation excludes, and by relating them to the critic's "actual social world." In this sense,
institutional discourse in the form of poetics produces an effect on culture. Faced with filiation and affiliation, the critic cannot escape being institutionalized. As Said points out, "the contemporary critical consciousness stands between the temptations" represented by these two institution-reinforced powers. The critic is free to choose between the two but is constituted by either choice and free from neither one.\(^{17}\)

While traditional Marxism claims an objective real that is obtained through radical ideology to demystify dominant ideology as false consciousness representing the illusive real, poststructuralist Marxism in both its author/ideology and reader/institutions approaches deems ideology, both dominant and radical, as the real itself (see Figure 1 below):

(Figure 1 Notions of the real in traditional and poststructuralist Marxism)

A critique of traditional and poststructuralist Marxism, within the scope of the present study, will focus on the dialectic of the real and ideology.\(^{18}\) More specifically, it will focus on the dialectic of a spectrum of the two-layer reality and the exposing and productive ideology, a dialectic that both traditional and poststructuralist Marxists ignore. First, there is an element of truth in the traditional Marxist belief in the real or what we call "history," but the real
ought to be distinguished from the real constituted by dominant ideology. Literature, in a sense, tries to catch up with reality or historical developments in society. That is why critics can locate connections between history and fiction, and Lenin's critical method about a time lapse between the real and the reproductive fiction applies here--the art form usually lags behind historical events it aims to portray. In Lenin's view, the relation of a literary work to historical reality, as Macherey writes, "cannot be reduced to the 'spontaneous' or the 'simultaneous,'" and "the writer is behind the times, if only because he invariably speaks after the event." Following Lawrence Stone's historical insight, for example, Dollimore, in his New Historicist reading, sees Shakespeare's Measure for Measure (1606) as reaching for the historical real and George Whetstone's A Mirror for Magistrates (1584) as conforming to the ruling class ideology--both are behind the times. By the early seventeenth century, the authoritarian family and the authoritarian state had become responsible, according to Stone, for maintaining social order as part of "solutions to an intolerable sense of anxiety" on the part of the ruling class. Sexuality was heavily under this family social surveillance, Dollimore argues, as a result of the upper classes' "insecurity in the face of change." Suppression of sexual licence "was an attempt to regulate not the vice, nor, apparently, even the spread of venereal disease, but the criminal underworld" that threatened social order and the power structure of the upper classes. Threat from the underworld, the anxiety, and insecurity were
the historical real to the ruling class, but this real was ideologinated by the dominant class as a concern about low-life immorality. This ideological regulation was in effect what Dollimore calls a "displacement" of blame from the ruling class to the ruled. While Whetstone reinforced the dominant ideology by blaming the low, Shakespeare lashed across and thrust through ideology and presented the real cause for disorder—misrule, unjust law, and corruption from above—and the blame was truthfully re-placed from the ruled to the rulers.20

We can define the real or historical conditions as whatever the dominant ideology attempts to hide, as the ruling class will (and has the power to) "naturalize" their class interest as the "common interest." In Dollimore's reading, there could be two layers of the real that the literary work is related to. One is Whetstone's work that corresponds to the real (sexual licence and immorality) constituted by the dominant ideology, the real that the ruling class wants to make the ruled believe; the other kind of the real is the real constituted by another kind of ideology, the ideology of the ruled, although the ruled have not realized it yet. Paradoxically, social existence determines the ruling class's ideology, but non-dominant ideology does not originate as the discourse of the subjugated classes. When you focus on the first part of the sentence, historical determinism holds true (dominant ideology is determined by the social existence of the ruling class to maintain social formation), but the second part contradicts the same claim. Consider
this: if a writer brings the illusion of the ruled to light, the illusion of their believing in the "real" that is constructed by dominant ideology, and reveals or constitutes the real and even arouses them to fight for it, then (radical or emergent) ideology makes things happen or even triggers revolution and transformation of the infrastructure. In this latter case, radical ideology determines history and revolutionizes society. Although Marx is right in asserting that radical ideology or elements of a new society emerge from the old (from the contradictions of social classes), that new ideology is not necessarily determined by the social existence of the ruled, for they are not aware of the ideology until external figures from outside their social class, like Marx and Engels, even Shakespeare, Balzac, or Tolstoy, despite their class interests, start to produce and portray that emergent ideology, an ideology that opens on to reality or cuts through the dominant ideology into the historical real. The conflict between the upper classes and the low-life underworld, the real in the sense of the early seventeenth-century English ruling class's alarm for anxiety and insecurity, did exist. But it would be blind faith to amplify, like the critical method of traditional Marxism, the deterministic power of the infrastructure without realizing the reciprocal nature of infrastructure and superstructure, and it would be blind faith to reject the fact that one ideology penetrates another in the process of reaching for the real, in the way the historical real is conceived by radical ideology in Dollimore's reading of Shakespeare.
In fact, Marx and Engels on many occasions point out the reciprocal nature of base and superstructure and deny any mechanical and passive correspondence between the two. The English free-thinking philosophy developed by Locke, for Marx, influenced and activated the French Revolution of 1789. The reciprocal nature of base and superstructure is also reflected in Marx and Engels's belief that "circumstances make men just as much as men make circumstances" and in the priority Marx gives to education in schools, which has to be taken over from the "intervention of society" and the "influence of the ruling class." This is because "on the one hand a change of circumstances," according to Marx, "was required to establish a proper system of education, on the other hand a proper system of education was required to bring about a change of social circumstances." The Marxist theory of base and superstructure, for Engels, too, is a two-way traffic system. He corrects the misconception of passivity in it, as he writes "political, juridical, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic, etc., development is based on economic development. But all these react upon one another and also upon the economic base." 21

To emphasize the role of ideology based on the reciprocal nature of infrastructure and superstructure is to study the magic of radical or emergent ideology to shape the real in spite of the deterministic power of the real. Marx and Engels as Michel Foucault's "initiators of discursive practices," for example, awaken the working class from their illusions and dispel the myth
of the ruling class ideology, in an attempt to shape the real. And this real is not a neutral objective reality. In this sense, poststructuralist Marxism certainly has a point here. Marx and Engels, in their first joint work *The Holy Family* (1844), emphasize the "self-abolishing" side of the dialectic nature of property. Within the Hegelian antithesis of property, Marx and Engels write, the proletarian is the destructive side while the property-owner the conservative side; one is to annihilate it and the other to preserve it. In their theory, wage-labor produces "wealth for others and poverty for itself," and then, no doubt, the social existence of the working class, their poverty, determines their will to annihilate property, thus the "self-abolishing" side of the property dialectic. However, this self-destructive side will never materialize without a link between the social conditions and the awareness of them. This is where the role of an ideology comes in. The working class is not conscious of the "self-abolishing" nature of property to begin with; that consciousness does not surface in "clarity" due to the cover-up of the dominant ideology. As ideology, in Marx's views, functions to maintain the infrastructure, it smooths things over or "naturalizes" the property/poverty antithesis in order to regulate, justify, and reproduce the social relations around it. Not until the "initiatives" have developed their revolutionary ideology, can the working class realize their "spiritual and physical poverty" and "dehumanisation." As Marx and Engels have initiated a radical ideology that attacks the dominant ideology, "a large part of the English and French
proletariat is already conscious of its historic task and is constantly working to develop that consciousness into complete clarity." Social consciousness plays a vitally important role here in Marx and Engels's "historic task" that is meant to lead to a new historical epoch. The relationship between infrastructure and superstructure here is far from a "Hegelian expressive causality" one (to use Jameson's term).\textsuperscript{23} Infrastructural change will never guarantee an automatic transformation of the superstructure. Such a change will not even have too much effect on the working class's consciousness of their dehumanization, not until "initiators" of ideology shed light on that social reality and activate the superstructure to change the infrastructure.

It is safe to say that the revolutionary or emergent ideology in the superstructure reacts and influences the infrastructure and helps to shape the real, but the real out of the mold of radical ideology is not a neutral reality or an objective world. While the real, in the traditional Marxist sense of the term, does not align with the dominant ideology that attempts to conceal it (and vice versa), the "real" here is tinted with the radical ideology (like Marx's revolutionary ideology) that shapes it and later functions to promote it. Engels's comments on realism as "the truthful reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances" serve as a good example of how ideology functions to shape and promote the real. In his review of Harkness's \textit{City Girl} (1888), Engels argues that the essence of "typical characters under typical circumstances" should not be the depiction of the
working class as "a passive mass, incapable of helping itself or even trying to help itself." The working class appears passive in the *City Girl*, because "all attempts to raise it out of its wretched poverty come from the outside, from above." Rather, for "the fighting proletariat," Engels suggests, emancipation should be "the cause of the working class itself." In other words, the novelist, in Engels's argument, should in the first place depict historical reality where the working class is already conscious of its "dehumanisation" and is already fighting for its place in society, and the real here that the literary work unfolds is the working class's "typical," embodied in its ideology (the cause of emancipation within the class itself). In the second place, the novelist should promote and reinforce the working class ideology that has shaped the real and is "typical" to its class (leaving out the untypical). Marxist radical ideology has shaped the real, and the novelist should function to consolidate, promote, and advance that real.

It is important to note that Marx and Engels's definition of ideology in *The German Ideology* means to represent class interest as the universal interest of all members of society and to project an illusion as the real. Ideology, for Marx and Engels, has an across-the-board meaning that applies to all dominant classes in all historical periods. Even when the working class is in power, in their view, it will also "naturalize" its class interest as "the general interest" of all members of society. "Every class which is struggling for mastery," Marx and Engels write, "even when its domination, as is the
case with the proletariat, postulates the abolition of the old form of society in its entirety and of domination itself, must first conquer for itself political power in order to represent its interest in turn as the general interest." Here Marx and Engels emphasize the necessity of the working class's overthrowing the dominant political power to ensure its own "mastery" in society, but the new society with the new masters in dominance, in its total sum of material existence and social relations, lives in the shadow of another ideology, the working class ideology that represents its class interest "in turn as the general interest." The objective real that is rescued from a dominant ideology bears in itself a tendency of covering up another spectrum of the real and projecting an illusion in its place. That is, when the working class is still subjugated by the bourgeoisie, it has to rely on a radical ideology to lift the "veil" from the real that is submerged by the dominant ideology. When the radical ideology finally becomes dominant, it will, like every dominant ideology, perpetuate the social place of the new dominant class, promote the "real," and justify the new modes of production by imposing the dominant class's interest as the general universal interest. Then, outside this very "real" that the new dominant ideology functions to represent, there will exist another new historical real that is filtered out by the network of the new dominant ideology, an ideology that in turn, in Marx and Engels's logic, will be false consciousness or illusive representation of the real.
In any given historical era, there must be two kinds of the real going hand in hand. One is the "surface" real manipulated by the dominant ideology and the other, the filtered-out "underlying" real that is an antithesis to the real remaining on "surface." And this "underlying" objective real itself is tinted with ideology and will become another level of the subjective "surface" real in its projection of class interest as universal interest, a "real" intertwined with both objective and subjective elements. The side-by-side coexistence of the "illusive" real and the "historical" real only proves the dialectic or the relative stability of either real. Traditional Marxism amplifies the Marxist conviction of historical determinism in literary criticism, and poststructuralist Marxism, in denying the deterministic passivity in traditional Marxism, emphasizes the power of the institutions and questions the validity of an independent objective world. They both represent a limited view of Marxism in that the first proposes the text's penetration through ideology into history (text--ideology--history) and the second obliterates the text's ties with history and establishes an ideology that is the "real" itself (text=ideology="history") because the text is produced by and perceived through ideology. Both are a limited view of Marxism because both isolate one part from the dialectical on-going cycle of reality production and representation. Traditional Marxism believes in the real that is underneath the ideologination of the dominant class and rejects the dominant ideology as false consciousness. Poststructuralist Marxism ignores the real filtered
through the massive legitimation of dominant ideology and regards ideology
in general as the "real." A dialectical relationship between ideology and the
real is that dominant ideology produces the "surface" subjective real and
radical or emergent ideology picks up the "underlying" objective real and
shapes and promotes it so that it becomes "surface" and subjective itself. So
the respective traditional and poststructuralist Marxist claims about the
objective historical real and about the subjective ideological "real" verge on
radical ideology that generates the distinction between the above two kinds
of the real. Traditional Marxism targets the real that only radical ideology
exposes in spite of the workings of dominant ideology, and poststructuralist
Marxism (besides its conviction about the real shaped by dominant ideology
as ideological), by contrast, hits on the same real that only radical ideology
shapes and promotes, a real that boarders on the objective and the subjective.
In their dialectical relation to radical ideology as a mediation between the two
variations of Marxism, the traditional Marxist objective real that radical
ideology reveals is what I would call "the preceding real" and the
poststructuralist Marxist ideological real "the consequential real" as a
consequence of the promoting radical ideology, just for the purpose of clearing
up the objective/subjective confusion. A broad view of Marxist criticism would
fuse the two aspects of the limited view as the public voice that indicates the
ideological real and the private voice that captures the preceding-
consequential real or the dialectical real, and would suggest an expanded
view in terms of the homeless voice of the self in the text. On this last level of the voices, the echoes from history and from ideology or from the ideological and the dialectical real, in the case of Defoe, for example, no longer resound between the pages and are no longer there for the critic to tape-record and to play out again but are lost into the abyss of the text. What lingers in the open space of the text is a distant real connecting the text and the reader's interpretive paradigms (not necessarily influenced by the "interpretive community"), whatever theories and historical insights the reader may adhere to or stand up against. The model of such a split self is an alternative Marxist approach to literary criticism, for it departs from both traditional and poststructuralist Marxism as well as generates its energy from it. The alternative Marxist approach carries on with the poststructuralist notion of ideology representing the ideological real and sympathizes with its suspicion about the objective real. The current approach also distinguishes between the traditional Marxist illusive real and the poststructuralist ideological real and fuses the latter with the traditional objective real and transforms the two into the dialectical real. Apart from a partial over-lapping with the institutional Marxism in that the reader's interpretive strategies are governed by the "interpretive community," the present study also suggests a reader with a "homeless" voice resounding outside the institutionalized modes of expression and obliterating any contact with history and ideology.
2.2. Voices of the Self

The model of the voices of the self in the present alternative Marxist approach is first derived from traditional and poststructuralist Marxist views of ideology for the public and private voices. The traditional Marxist notion of dominant ideology constitutes the dominant class discourse. Here, the real represented by dominant ideology is the illusive real. Radical ideology fights a battle against repression and subjugation by exposing the objective real that is sifted out by dominant ideology. The representation of this radical ideology surfaces to stand up against the illusive real and to project and shape a poststructuralist Marxist ideological real once it gains dominance. As radical ideology turns the objective real into the ideological real, the real becomes an objective/ideological duality (the dialectical real) in the alternative Marxist approach. In this alternative approach, the public voice represents dominant ideology that projects the ideological real. The private voice promotes radical ideology that shapes a dialectical real. Finally, while the public voice and the private voice are guided by the authorial ideology, the "homeless" voice of the self originates from the Marxist "particular interest" of the self that is defined neither by the postmodern Marxist ideological real nor by the traditional Marxist objective real; instead, the homeless voice constitutes a distant real that is materialized not by authorial ideology but
by the reader's interpretive paradigms within or outside the institutional discourse (see Figure 2 below).

(Figure 2 Alternative Marxism in relation to traditional Marxism, postmodern Marxism, the real, and ideology)

The public voice of the self is closely connected to what Williams calls "the political economy of writing" or ideological "alignment." Writing, according to Williams, is a commodity ideologically specified because the author has to survive "the pressures and limits of the social relationships on which, as a producer, he depends"; otherwise he will find it difficult to get his "commodity" supported or sold. About the "pressures" of dominant ideology on individuals, Engels offers a vivid description. In his essay "The Condition of England" (1843), Engels writes: "If you should go amongst educated Englishmen and say that you are Chartists or democrats—the balance of your mind will be doubted and your company fled. Or declare you do not believe
in the divinity of Christ, and you are done for; if moreover you confess that you are atheists, the next day people will pretend not to know you. Writers in this sense, due to the ideological "pressures," are indeed the "shopkeepers" or the representatives of their social class. The writing of Whetstone in Dollimore's reading, for example, belongs to this ideological "commodity." He is a "shopkeeper" of the dominant ideology that finds fault with the lower classes for social immorality and disorder. Booth's notion of the "official scribe" in Fielding and in Shakespeare about their value systems, too, falls into the category of the public voice of the self. There is also a resounding public voice in Ian Watt's reading of Samuel Richardson in his resorting to Puritan values to resolve the class differences between Mr. B. and Pamela. My man in the present study is also not immune to the influence of dominant ideology and has his share of the public voice. In fact, Defoe is often conceived to be ready to maintain the status quo, emphasize social order, and consolidate the dominant power structure. For instance, Paula R. Backscheider, following J. Paul Hunter's argument of the prodigal son, detects "a longing for social stability and order" in the endings of eighteenth-century novels, including Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, and Colonel Jack. Jim S. Borck enhances the reader's understanding of Moll Flanders's self-image in her desire for Hobbesian "societal bonding" through unions with men. For Paul J. deGategno, too, Defoe in his criminal biographies promotes the "preservation of society and the value of the
culture" and the equilibrium between God and man. Finally, John Richetti focuses on the public voice in Defoe's works in terms of the "totalizing" impact of social institutions to regulate and ideologinate individuals like Moll and Jack.27

While dominant ideologies serve the ruling class to efface the possibility of opposition and antagonism and to unify differing ideologies, oppositional force is situated within the ideological dominance, rejecting absorption and repression, and will find avenues to emerge from subjugation. In forms of nonhegemonic ideologies, the oppositional dissonance will challenge the dominant ideologies and raise itself from latencies to the level of consciousness.28 These dissonant emergent ideologies, in their battle against false representation and legitimation, surface in the text as the private voice of the self. The private voice personifies what Engels calls "the independent Englishman" who "begins to think and shakes off the fetters of prejudice he has absorbed with his mother's milk." In doing so, Engels continues, "he feigns an opinion before society that is at least tolerated, and is quite content if occasionally he can discuss his views with some like-minded person in private." To pronounce a private voice is to water down the ideological "milk" or to dilute the strength of "prejudice" and tradition. It is private action because the "independent" person has to bear with the "pressures" of dominant ideology and because once it goes to public it will be drowned by public opinion that is saturated with "milk" fat and full of "milk"
bubbles. That may be one of the reasons why an eighteenth-century writer like James Boswell in his biography of Dr. Johnson, as Felicity A. Nussbaum points out, may hold his ideologically conflicting notions of character within the "private domain," but they may "disappear when brought to the public sphere," due to the impact of the "milk." But in general, the "private domain" as well as the "public sphere" will find their places in fiction. In fact, the fictional world may be perfect fairgrounds where you can peddle for all kinds of "dairy products" (good for the ideological body) such as yogurt, cream, butter, and cheese. In the back streets and bizarre corners, "independent" unsavory characters hang around "black-markets" where they circulate "anesthetic" that may numb the ideological spinal nerve-system, "poison" that may paralyze the "milk cows," "germs" that may spoil the "dairy products," or just nice plain "water" that may dilute the "milk" itself.

The private voice does not appear in a vacuum; it is usually embodied in radical ideology in literary form. Good examples are Cervantes's negation of the familiar "horizons of expectations" in Don Quixote, Shakespeare's reaction to the dominant ideology in Measure for Measure, and Balzac's insertion into the working class ideology in Comedie Humaine discussed earlier. Self-writing in spiritual autobiographies and scandalous memories by eighteenth-century women writers, Nussbaum tells us, also moves "outside authorized and institutionalized modes of expression" and represents a new consciousness, in resisting male dominance and the public constructs of
women's "character." For David Marshall, Defoe's fiction exemplifies the influence of the radical anti-Puritan tradition of the theater on the writer. Defoe's authorial disguises and masks and concealment of identity of his characters all suggest the roles actors and actresses play—creating and changing identities—in competing with God, who creates and inscribes fixed identity to man. Also, critics like Leo Braudy and Maximillian E. Novak have noted Defoe's two inconsistent voices between his fiction and conduct books, the public voice in nonfiction and "private impersonation" by his first-person fictional characters. Although Defoe's "private impersonation" usually draws from the form of criminal biography, it departs from the conventional by neutralizing the plot and awarding his fictional sinners like Singleton, Moll, and Jack. Sometimes, the private voice of the self is dissonant to the degree that Defoe even uses the power of legal discourse itself to disrupt the English contemporary penal code, as Moll picks up the discourse of natural law, the foundation, according to the radical ideology of John Locke, on which any legal discourse is based, to disrupt the eighteenth-century English common law and justify her crimes. The private voice is here to deliver the self from the manipulation of dominant ideology that functions to regulate the self.

In their relations to dominant ideology that functions to cover up the objective real and to radical ideology that picks up that left-out real as a projected ideological real, both the public voice and the private voice center on the ideological real and the dialectical real. The public voice taps into the
dominant modes of expression while the private voice is embodied in emergent ideology that shapes and promotes the radical dialectical real. There exists yet another voice, hovering in the open space between the text and the reader, alien to the historical conditions and the ideologies of the author. Unlike Jauss's "horizon of future aesthetic experience," this open space may echo a "homeless" voice that none of the historical and ideological determiners can account for. It is a voice without "home" and without origin. The voice does not lag "behind the times" and does not speak "after the event" but reaches beyond the limits of historical space and time for the distant real. It abandons the author and communes with the reader whose interpretive paradigms replace the author's ideology and drop the author from the historical and ideological boundaries. Not only does the authorial insertion into a radical ideology turn historical events into the ideological real (as in Eagleton's insight about Balzac), but there is also a textual (not authorial) insertion that reaches forward into the reader's ideology out of which the reader constructs an ideological real that is free of the historical author and the authorial ideology. As the reader, in the institutional Marxists' views, is institutionalized by the "interpretive community," in this sense, the reader's ideology to replace the author's may be over-lapped with the institutional discourse or may be influenced by the contemporary theoretical developments. Apart from this partial over-lapping with the institutional Marxist approach, the homeless voice that the reader detects in the text may be completely cut
off from any over-lapping, for the reader's insight may also be "homeless" and freed from the constraints of the institutionalized discourse. Just like fiction writers, readers, as authors of their interpretations of the text, too, may develop their own "homeless" voice or "particular interest" in the reading process.

The "particular interest" of an individual, in Marxist theories, is "homeless" and is contrary to the "communal interest" of all individuals. In *The German Ideology*, Marx and Engels offer us a full account of this homeless "particular interest": "the division of labour implies the contradiction between the interest of the separate individual or the individual family and the communal interest of all individuals who have intercourse with one another." The "cleavage" between the particular and communal interest here is not related to radical ideology representing the opposing class's consciousness versus dominant ideology projecting the ruling class interest as universal interest. Marx and Engels here break social classes down into small units as particular individuals. As long as there is labor division, all individuals have to orient themselves toward that structure of social relations constructed around that division. When an individual "is a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd, or a critical critic" or is in any other profession, Marx and Engels write, "he must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood." As restricted by the particular material existence, individuals cannot develop their "particular interest" or full
potentiality as to change careers as they wish. This, according to Marx and Engels, is only possible in communist society, a classless society, "where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes," and "society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic." This "particular interest" is homeless and free of class interest because no members of society can afford to switch to other walks of life as they wish. That Marx and Engels think the "particular interest" is only possible in a classless society also proves its affiliation with no social class nor ideology at all. Because of its status of non-affiliation and de-ideologination, the "particular interest" or the homeless voice cannot be evaluated with reference to the biographical author, for it is about the distant real in the "horizon of future aesthetic experience." So the authorial self must turn into a textual self or consciousness that possesses the homeless voice, in the way that the voice, free of the authorial ideology, leaves its trace only in the text, a trace only the reader can identify in the interpretive activity. In alignment with Poulet's model, the homeless voice of the self thus denotes not the author's presence in the text, nor the Jaussian joint production by the author and the reader, but the reader's creation of a textual self free of the authorial self.
The text may be an emblem of conflicting class society; it may become a platform for dominant ideology to air the public voice of the self. It may also be a battleground for radical ideology, which seeks its representation as the private voice of the self, disguised or openly, in its rebel against dominance. The text may also characterize a "classless society" or a "no-land" for ideology, where the homeless voice of the self or the "private interest" of the individual, which is impossible to realize in the individual's society, may slip into the text and percolate in parts of the fictional world. The model of the three "vocal" interpretations of the self incorporates both the thinking of tradition and that of postmodernism. Just as the Freudian psychoanalytical framework renders "dreams and slips of the tongue readable rather than dismissing them as mere nonsense or error," and just as the Derridaen deconstructive approach treats the "gaps, margins, figures, echoes, digressions, discontinuities, contradictions, and ambiguities" as signifying force in a text, Barbara Johnson is able to argue that "when one writes, one writes more than (or less than, or other than) one thinks" without realizing the fact that those "nonsense" signifiers within the text may just as well imbue textual meaning as difference in the process of signification. Here, "one writes more than one thinks" suggests a traditional claim of authorial intention as well as a poststructuralist proposition of signification that suspends the traditional interest in history and the authority of the author. In close resemblance to this pattern of thinking, the three voices of the self in the alternative Marxist
approach acknowledge both of these claims in the public voice and in the homeless voice respectively. The notion of the totalizing ideology, in the sense of the Lukacsian all-sustaining form-giving subject of the text, in poststructuralist Marxism tends to encompass the totality of textual meaning—every textual sign is marked within the ideological or institutional boundaries. Ideology in the present study, nevertheless, has its limits in that totalizing power or is designed to discredit or even edit out things according to "binary oppositions" of its own. The edited-out or the filtered-out in the process of producing the dialectical real in postmodern Marxism becomes a distant real that emerges in the sphere where one writes "other than one thinks," while the public voice represents what one thinks.

Pronouncing all the three kinds of voices, the self in the present study signifies two meanings. The self with its public and private voices represents authorial visions of dominant and radical ideologies in the text. Out of the already divided self between the public and the private, a textual self out of contact with authorial ideology is created by the reader. However, it is important that authorial ideology ought to be distinguished from authorial intention. In his critique of the New Critical thesis of "the intentional fallacy," E. D. Hirsch, Jr. argues that there is "no magic land of meaning outside human consciousness." Emphasizing authorial intention, Hirsch directs critical attention to textual meaning that is constructed by searching for the author's consciousness. Authorial intention is always in the author's
consciousness, but authorial ideology in the present study may not be. It consists of the author's safeguarding of dominant ideology and authorial insertion into and production of emergent ideology. The public voice of the self, which taps into dominant ideology or the established ideas, may constitute authorial intention. In the private voice of the self, however, there may be two possibilities. When authorial insertion into an ideology that has been articulated on the level of consciousness, the private voice representing that ideology may be part of authorial intention. But before the ideology emerges from latencies to consciousness, the author's production of the ideology or raising it to the level of consciousness may not involve authorial intention, but the text is still part of authorial ideology. Engels's interpretation of realism or the authorial insertion into the working class ideology in Balzac is a perfect example of this unconscious private voice. Authors may conceal their artistic interface with radical ideology in the text, Engels writes, but "the realism I allude to may creep out even in spite of the author's views." The first is authorial intention to engage in an assault on dominant ideology, in concealment; the second is authorial ideology without intention.

In terms of the author/text/reader relationship, the model of the self with the three different voices values its dynamism and its interrelationship with one another. The public and private voices come out of the authorial ideological bugles and retain the role of the author within the sphere of
criticism. The public voice of the self in Defoe's fiction, for example, always relates to Defoe's conduct books and his other nonfiction writings. In reading this public voice, authorial intention plays a key role. Defoe's "second selves" or "official scribes" in his fiction and nonfiction focus the critic's attention back on the author himself, his public value systems being represented by his public voice in the text. Besides the validity of Booth's author-oriented study, Poulet's model of the reader without the role of the author is also incorporated in the framework of the split self with different voices. The homeless voice of the self, as it is separated from the author, situates between the text and the reader, leaving the author's intention and ideology out of the enterprise of interpretation. Authorial meaning here may be constituted on the one hand by the reader's ideology as influenced by institutional discourse and on the other hand by the reader's interpretive paradigms free of institutional control as in those of the Foucaultian "initiator of discursive practices." The conflict between the author-oriented and the reader-oriented approaches is also patched up together within the unconscious private voice of the self that involves a production of the literary text by the joint work of the author and the reader in that the author's unconscious private voice in negation of the familiar "horizons of expectations" is raised to the level of consciousness in the text by the reader (e.g. Defoe's anticipation of Schlegelian irony in Moll Flanders that reinforces radical ideology in Chapter 4). Merging the models developed by Booth, Poulet, and Jauss into
cohabitation under the roof of the framework of the split self, instead of including one to the exclusion of another, this alternative Marxist approach also departs from those models by assigning relative significance to authorial intention, historical determinism in the public voice of the self, the play of the private voice, the institutional control of the reader, and also the homeless voices of the author and the reader alien to ideology and the institutional discourse.

In applying the model of different voices of the self to Defoe's novels such as Robinson Crusoe, Captain Singleton, Moll Flanders, and Roxana, the emphasis of the following three chapters is laid upon the private and homeless voices of the self and upon theoretical interpretation. Although the homeless voice of the self, as the alternative Marxist approach theorizes, obliterates its ties with ideology and history toward the end of Roxana, one can witness in the next three chapters an interaction between theoretical explications and historical studies in the mode of the private voice. In this shared territory of theory and history, the one cannot go without the other. In Chapter 3 on lines of flight or deterritorialization, theory and history go hand in hand in the shared territory of interpretation of the private voice. The discussion of deterritorialization is impossible without a historical background in the seventeenth-century theories on the relationship between theology and medicine, Defoe's notions about dreams as communications with the supernatural, and his views on the laws of matrimony. Without a
historical background, it is hard to describe how Robinson Crusoe reterritorializes into his public voice after entertaining a deterritorializing private voice; without a historical background, it is also hard to know how Captain Singleton and Roxana articulate their private voices in rebelling against the laws of God and man without coming to terms with authority in the end. The private voice in Moll Flanders in Chapter 4 is Defoe's ideology of radical thought about disorder and chaos in the universe, a sense of the contemporary skepticism about the already disrupted order of the divine creation. Incorporating both theoretical and historical insights about the chaotic world of becoming indicates a level of the private voice in the novel. Historical studies certainly are valuable here to provide the reader with insight into the ideologies about universal disorder. The theme of disorder and chaos is implemented in a theoretical application of Schlegelian irony to the text, which centers on uncertainty and ironic ambiguities. Critics' historical studies of natural law, the living standards of the contemporary working class, and the theories of sympathy developed by Burke and Smith all help to determine Moll the character's growth and process of becoming and Moll the narrator's ambiguous double role in terms of Schlegelian irony. Finally, the feminist study of Roxana in Chapter 5 (except for her homeless voice, which is in contact with the distant real and with recent theoretical systems) draws on both recent critical discoveries and historical concepts about the distinctions of gender roles, including Defoe's ideas about an ideal
woman. The Lacanian critical model is measured against historical insights in light of Roxana's public voice as a woman visualized in the ideology of the "male gaze" and her private voice as a "She-Devil" who poses a threat to patriarchy.
CHAPTER 3

DETERITORIALIZING CULTURAL BOUNDARIES

Georg Lukacs in *The Theory of the Novel* distinguishes between the epic and the novel in terms of a spatial/temporal relation in both of their inner and outer forms. Externally, the epic soul "goes out to seek adventure; it lives through adventures." The novel, however, comprises in the totality of its "biographical form" a temporal order in the limit within the beginning and the end of the fictional world, which "tends to unfold its full epic totality only within that span of life which is essential to it." The spatial/temporal distinction, for Lukacs, also applies to the inner form of the epic and of the novel. "For the epic," writes Lukacs, "the world at any given moment is an ultimate principle." Any temporal historical moment is conceived in spatial relations to essence or the entire cosmos, which is life itself. Both history and the philosophy of history as "a form of life" and as "the form-giving subject" of the epic mark "the formative prime reality of every individual phenomenon." They supply the content and determine the form of artistic creation that ends up as a totality where "every action is only a well-fitting garment for the world." The metaphysical space between fictional characters, then, is "at the same distance from the all-sustaining essence..., for all are striving in the same way towards the same centre, and all move at the same
level of an existence which is essentially the same." In the novel, by contrast, "the extensive totality of life is no longer directly given." Now that the all-determining transcendental "home" or the harmonic parallelism between the organic structure (essence and life) as "the form-giving subject" and "the world of created forms" has been destroyed, the novel supplies its own content and seeks its own form in the process of becoming.\(^3_6\) Following Lukacs's argument, Fredric Jameson revives the distinction between the earlier novel and its modern form along the lines of such spatial relations and temporal order, a Lukacsian distinction between two types of narration: "the novel of abstract idealism" and "the novel of romantic disillusionment." While the external world of the earlier world-oriented novel is primarily spatial, where the hero wanders through geographical space and experiences adventures, the novel of romantic disillusionment is dominated by an external reality that is time itself. The hero in the modern novel as the renewed epic can act and express a kind of epic unity of meaning and life, but the modern hero acts not across geographical space but in time. "It is a unity thrust into the past, a unity remembered only. For in the present the world always defeats the hero." Internally, Jameson maintains, "each novel is a process in which the very possibility of narration must begin in a void, without any acquired momentum: its privileged subject matter will therefore be the search, in a world in which neither goals nor paths are established beforehand."\(^3_6\)
The spatial/temporal criterion of the modern novel championed by Lukacs and Jameson confronts a re-evaluation in the Deleuzian lines of flight or "deterritorialization." While Lukacs and Jameson devalue geographical space in favor of temporal order, Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet reverse the two terms and value geographical flight for its "deterritorialization." In their elucidation, the temporal order in terms of both the past and the future in literature fixes man to territorialization or under the supremacy of traditional culture. Flight across geographical space per se is not belittled; only that which does not launch a departure from tradition is. Deleuze and Parnet argue that while the French are "too historical, too concerned with the future and the past" and always begin "the search for a primary certainty as a point of origin," Anglo-American writers create characters who engage in "a line of flight" or "deterritorialization." First, the temporal order is no major concern for Deleuze and Parnet. Unlike the Lukacsian and Jamesonian hero who lives in the memory of the past because "in the present the world always defeats the hero," the Deleuzian flight crew enjoy the here and now and concern neither the traditional past nor the future. Second, adventurous journeys across geographical space are not discredited. "American literature operates according to geographical lines: the flight towards the West, the discovery that the true East is in the West, the sense of the frontiers as something to cross, to push back, to go beyond." Besides being geographical, a line of flight for Deleuze and Parnet can also "happen on the spot, in motionless travel."
Although characters in French literature may go on a voyage, "there is always a way of reterritorializing" themselves on the voyage; they always return, always fall back to an old track and back into something they are fleeing from, or they escape from this world and exit to the next. But Anglo-American literature is preoccupied with ruptures, with characters who know how to become and how to "create a new Earth." Then, fleeing across boundaries is developing a private voice against tradition. Deleuze and Parnet discuss the opposition between boundaries and flight in terms of the demarcations between trees and grass, gods and demons, tricksters and traitors. The terms on the one side of the demarcations serve the functions of cultural fixation: in the imagery of trees, the roots hold the soil in place within territorializing boundaries and keep it from eroding; gods have "fixed powers which try to hold us back"; and "the trickster claims to take possession of fixed properties, or to conquer a territory." On the other hand, "grass has its line of flight, and does not take root"; demons jump across intervals; and traitors betray "the world of dominant significations" and the established order. Flight across geographical lines helps us get loose from the coils of the tree roots, the fixation of the gods, and the control of the tricksters, which hold us back from departures and territorialize us within boundaries and walls. To take a Deleuzian flight is to jump over, plane down, or crash through the territorializing walls and is to pick up a cultural code like the laws of God and of man and deterritorialize it. A line of flight is thus
not striving towards a center of essence but is "a sort of delirium" or a tendency "to go off the rails." It is a movement of departure away from the traditional, the fixed, and the stable. A line of flight is a betrayal of "the established powers of the earth," a betrayal characterized, for example, by a "double turning-away": "Man turns his face away from God, who also turns his face away from man. It is in this double turning-away...that the line of flight--that is, the deterritorialization of man--is traced."37

Although critics have rightly argued about the departures of Defoe's fiction from the Spanish picaresque novel based on Defoe's seriousness about morality and religion, the present study of deterritorialization does not align Defoe's novels back to the picaresque tradition, for they show some vital differences from their predecessors in their lines of flight. The picaro or the picaresque hero, in Lazarillo, Guzman, or El Buscon, for instance, seeks adventure in his quest for freedom, but the adventure usually ends up in harmony with the imperfect world the picaro lives in. The picaro (Lazarillo) may secure a position and an identity in society and reterritorialize himself from flight across geographical space and occasional mockery of authority (e.g. his prayer to God to let more neighbors die so that he can commit his "sin" of eating at more funerals). Or the rogue (Guzman) may experience a religious conversion and compromise with authority. Or the delinquent (Pablos) may go out to sea and come back to Spain without changing his original "nature" and without taking any lines of flight. The self and the other
may be in conflict, but it is only rogues cheating and robbing rogues; their energy is barely oriented towards deterritorialization or jumping over boundaries but is exhausted in adapting to situations and begging the mercy of society.\textsuperscript{38} Thus, a line of flight can serve as a criterion to distinguish between those novels that break from the earlier tradition and those that strike a close resemblance to it.

Defoe's five major fictional characters, Crusoe, Singleton, Moll, Jack, and Roxana, all engage in some sort of getaways. Geographically, they all get away from England some time in their lives, but not all of them take a Deleuzian line of flight. Both Moll and Jack spend some time in the New World, one a transported thief and the other a deceived robber and sold as a slave. Both return to England as corrected and rewarded middle class personages who can fit into the old society and live happily ever after. Crusoe longs to go to sea and to flee from England, where he does not find satisfaction in his station. After his isolation on the island, he comes back a converted Christian and finally accepts Providence into his heart. Although they have taken some lines of flight earlier in their lives in committing crime against the social and divine order, these three characters--Crusoe, Moll, and Jack--finally reterritorialize themselves and come to terms with the authority they rebel against. Only Singleton and Roxana have taken truly Deleuzian lines of flight in their lives, although in a different way. Singleton engages in a line of flight in motionless travel after he breaks the laws of God and man,
for he finally, though reluctantly, comes back to London, and refuses to identify with the society he flees away from in the first place. Roxana, too, deterritorializes the social and divine order in breaking the laws of matrimony and leaves England for good. The present chapter will focus on all the three kinds of flight involved with three of Defoe's novels: reterritorialization or an illusory line of flight in Robinson Crusoe, a line of flight in motionless travel in Captain Singleton, and a line of flight across geographical space in Roxana. Although Crusoe develops a kind of private voice in disrupting the religious tradition earlier in the novel, he comes back to England in the end with a public voice and reterritorializes himself to authority. By contrast, both Singleton and Roxana, in deterritorializing the laws of God and man, pose a threat to authority and tradition with the private voice of the self throughout their lives.

3.1. Crusoe and Reterritorialization

Robinson Crusoe (1719) is Defoe's dramatization of the confrontation between two opposing attitudes toward human experience: the secular and the religious, where the latter triumphs through to the end of the novel, the triumph even extending to its sequel The Farther Adventures (1719) in Crusoe's religious dissemination that prepares for his final celestial "longer journey" into the next world. With his island solitude for Puritan
internalization, Crusoe is converted to a Christian, but only after he revisits his island in the sequel is his religious longing finally realized, in the successful reformation of his island. The secular is fighting a losing battle in the novel, but this component of the combat is not without its moments, especially earlier in the novel, which constitutes a line of flight across geographical space. Going out to sea for Crusoe against his father's authority is falling into sin and crossing cultural boundaries. But Crusoe reterritorializes himself at the end of the novel by returning to what he is fleeing away from in the first place and by compromising with authority, the heavenly Father, thus ending in an illusory line of flight and delusion of deterritorialization.

In spite of fatherly advice to "stay and settle at Home," the young Crusoe sets out to sea to seek wealth and adventures. Defoe prepares the protagonist in the first three journeys for the subsequent island shipwreck, and during the three trials Crusoe demystifies the traditional symbol of the tempest by dislocating the meaning of it and reinforces his "Original Sin" by acquiring the necessary survival skills on the coast of Africa and in the Brazils. On his first journey to sea, his father's "truly Prophetick" warning that he will be "the miserablest Wretch" seems to come true for Crusoe, for he, being "a fresh Water Sailor," gets sea-sick. He reflects that "how justly I was overtaken by the Judgment of Heaven for my wicked leaving my Father's House, and abandoning my Duty." This religious rude awakening, however,
is due to the individual's physical and psychological response to the sea, which may differ from person to person, for it is a "terrible Storm" to Crusoe what is to his sailor friend "a Cap full of Wind" that gives the sailors "a good Ship and Sea Room" (9). The religious confession of guilt is stimulated by the symbol of the tempest, but the symbol itself is problematic and inaccessible to meaning. The "storm" as Crusoe understands it does not constitute a symbol to the rest of the world but a dislocated symbol that means something only to its bad reader. Witty and piquant, Crusoe and his "Companion" do not pierce through the membrane of irony that hides a mockery of the religious overtone of the symbolic storm. Although they do not share the same notion of the "terrible storm," they do go the same "old way of all Sailors" and share the punch and make Crusoe drunk with it, so that, in Crusoe's words, "in that one Night's Wickedness I drowned all my Repentance" (9). The sailors' mutual comprehension of the "storm" disarms Crusoe's unnecessary repentance more than the punch "drowns" it in the sailors' old-fashion way.

Not only does Crusoe dislocate the symbol of the tempest, but he also refuses to read any significance into it on this first journey, an attempt to (over)correct his bad symbol reading. When a real storm hits the ship, anchored at Yarmouth Roads, the narrator changes from the mode of reflecting to that of describing and focuses more on the crew's physical activity to save the ship from "foundering" and later to escape for life from the sinking ship. The realistic details, cutting away the foremast and the
mainmast, pumping up water out of the flooded hold, and Crusoe's being scared to a swoon by the shot of the SOS signal, all draw the reader's attention more to the physical situations of the event than its religious signification. The narrator is caught up in the victims' desperate efforts to fight the storm and the other ship's difficult but successful rescue operation while forgetting, together with everyone of the crew, all about the traditional warning on Crusoe's sin. It crosses no one's mind to pray to God for deliverance; it occurs to no one that the storm may be a visible sign of divine wrath. Only after knowing it is Crusoe's trial journey against his father's will does the captain of the ship warn Crusoe that "perhaps this is all befallen us on your Account, like Jonah in the Ship of Tarshish" and swear that "I would not set my Foot in the same Ship with thee again for a Thousand Pounds."

In response to it, Crusoe lightheartedly comments in a comical tone, "This indeed was, as I said, an Excursion of his Spirits which were yet agitated by the Sense of his Loss [of the ship]" (15). Crusoe has taken a failed symbol seriously and treated a possible divine sign lightly on this first journey, not because he is either ignorant of religious hermeneutics or blind to divine visible signs. It is because Crusoe has taken a flight across the interpretive boundaries and blurred the hermeneutic territories of the tempest symbol. The symbol first means something for Crusoe but nothing to everyone else, and he later overcorrects his bad reading by ignoring any monitory implications of the storm. This hypercorrection seems to work for Crusoe,
because no one at the moment of distress reads anything into the symbol. Then, it is no wonder he does not take the captain's aftermath comments seriously.

Contrary to fatherly warning, the next two journeys consolidate Crusoe's restlessness to go to sea, for they answer the purpose of acquiring survival skills Crusoe will later find in handy at seafaring. Far from being punished for harboring a disobedient wandering soul, Crusoe comes back from a successful second trip abroad, to the coast of Africa. Besides the 300 pounds he has made from the voyage, Crusoe has also acquired, among other things, "a competent Knowledge of the Mathematicks and the Rules of navigation, learned how to keep an Account of the Ship's Course, and take an Observation" (17). The next journey proves less fortunate because Crusoe is captured by the Moorish pirates at Sallee. But there is also a bright side to it: physical endurance during the two years of captivity, intrigue involved in his escape from the Moors, and most importantly his short career as a planter in the Brazils. Crusoe does not elaborate on the survival essentials he has learned from these experiences in this short preparation section of the novel, but he does give credit to them later when he is stranded on the island. For example, two important tools essential for survival on the island, responsible for shelter and food respectively, are made with the skills and knowledge Crusoe has learned from the Brazils: "the Iron Tree" with which he makes a shovel for digging his cave (73) and the technique to make the grinder
hollowed out from a big log of wood for pounding "Corn into Meal to make my Bread" (122). Besides the tools for subsistence, Crusoe has also learned from the Brazilians to use tobacco to cure his illness on the island (93). Having thus allowed Crusoe to demystify the symbol of the tempest and procure the essential survival skills in the beginning pages of the novel, Defoe is ready to put Crusoe to test in the battle between the secular and the religious on his island.

The confrontation between the secular and the religious is best shown in the first few months before Crusoe settles down on the island. After Crusoe's breathless struggle out of the foaming waves of the sea and landing on the island, the first thought that crosses his mind is "I had a dreadful Deliverance" (47) instead of reading the shipwreck as a sign of divine punishment. There is no room in Crusoe's perspectives for religious hermeneutics for a proper reading of the sign of the tempest. At this moment, he is occupied with the task of survival rather than spiritual meditation, for he is worried about clothes, hunger, shelter, and the danger of being devoured by wild beasts. Sleeping in a bushy and thorny tree to hide from wild creatures, tying up logs of wood to make a raft in order to unload the wrecked ship, balancing the weight of the load on the raft, and seeking an ideal place for his habitat, every physical activity is described to the minute detail. When he thinks about God, it is His deliverance that he feels thankful for but not the divine punishment of him that is supposed to be just to his "Original Sin"
to leave his father's house. So far for Crusoe, God seems to have mercy on him for his disobedience while he, like a true Christian, should have heeded God's visible signs as punishment. Crusoe does not even realize the meaning of the sign when he dreams about nine months later of a man saying "Seeing all these Things have not brought thee to Repentance, now thou shalt die," which should have made him think of the shipwreck as "a just Punishment of my Sin" (87-8). The misreading of God's Providence before this realization in the first nine months surely constitutes a line of flight in that Crusoe has deconstructed the traditional symbol of the tempest. Not only has he rebelled against authority but has also chosen to ignore the signification of the shipwreck.

Crusoe's misreading of Providence also resides in his reading of signs in the barley and the tobacco episodes, where (mis)reading of the signs of the divine providence is only the difference of his (feigned) faith. As soon as Crusoe spots some barley stalks growing by the side of his cave, "in a Climate which I know was not proper for Corn," he, understandably, praises Providence for the miracle: "God had miraculously caus'd this Grain to grow without any Help of Seed sown" (78). Miraculous as it seems, the barley grows on the scorching island in the summer without a seed! Crusoe has no choice but to believe it is the wonder work of Providence. However, Crusoe the sign reader disrupts the miracle and turns it into something natural and common, piece by piece. As he later finds out that the barley has grown from
the remainder of the grain in a bag, Crusoe is aware he has made a mistake and admits that "the Wonder began to cease" and "my religious Thankfulness to God's Providence began to abate too upon the Discovering that all this was nothing but what was common" (78). Part of the miracle has been explained away; the barley does not grow without seeds. The next part of the myth about its growing condition is also demystified, for Crusoe has thrown the grain "in the Shade of a high Rock" so that it has not been "burnt up and destroy'd" (79). It is ironic then that faced with the failed sign of Providence, Crusoe still justifies his mistake by reinforcing his misreading: "it was really the Work of Providence as to me [italics added], that should order or appoint, that 10 or 12 Grains of Corn should remain unspoil'd" (79). As he says ten pages later, "the growing up of the Corn...began to affect me with Seriousness, as long as I thought it had something miraculous in it" (89). Crusoe can praise God for the things to which His power is not attributed, as long as he lets his faith hang in there and not fall with the miracle, although the praise-worthy miracle itself has already collapsed.

This blind faith in the divine providence is illustrated in the tobacco episode as well. When Crusoe is ill, he says "Conscience that had slept so long, begun to awake, and I began to reproach my self with my past Life" (90). He then thinks about his "Original Sin" and about his father's advice and cries out "Lord be my Help, for I am in great Distress" (91). The next morning Crusoe feels "the Fit being entirely off," but he does not owe it to his
prayers for divine deliverance but to being "refresh'd with the Sleep" and expects the return of the illness the next day. There is no connection between yesterday's prayers and today's slight recovery. He does not wait for Providence but prepares a mixture of water and rum and puts it along with a piece of boiled meat on his table "in Reach of my Bed." Repentance and prayers do not help much until Crusoe uses tobacco that he remembers the Brazilians used to cure all kinds of illnesses. In the tobacco chest, Crusoe also finds the Holy Bible, which he thinks is "a Cure, both for Soul and Body" (93). Crusoe tries several experiments on the tobacco for five days and cures "the Fit for good and all" (95). He then attributes the cure solely to the Bible and thanks God for delivering him from the illness.

It is clear that this traditional separation of theology and medicine runs counter to the practice of the Paracelsian new medicine that posed a threat to mainstream Puritanism in the seventeenth century. Crusoe's final attribution of the cure to the realm of the supernatural rather than the tobacco indicates this Puritan orthodoxy. Defoe in his Review, it is true, notes the glory and omnipotence of God in nature, as he says, "Heaven having plac'd Medicinal healing Vertue, in the Plants, Drugs, and other Produce of the Earth, is a full and authentick Testimony of his Will." The supernatural may permeate the natural life, but the practice of medicine, Defoe continues, is mainly of a human endeavor, for "the Skill of rightly applying proper Medicines to every Evil, and of rightly judging of the Disease, is obtain'd by
Study, Application and Experience." In *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722), where Defoe displays both the traditional and contemporary views on the Plague as a divine visitation and as a natural calamity, H. F., the narrator, even ambivalently endorses human efforts in preventing the spreading of the infection in spite of the divine power. On the one hand, while he explains the Plague as "a Distemper arising from natural Causes" and as a result of "the Conduct of human Causes and Effects," H. F. categorizes both under the traditional theory that "the divine Power has form'd the whole Scheme of Nature" (194). Since it is "the Hand of God" that is behind the epidemic, "there was nothing to be hoped for, but an universal Desolation" (171). On the other hand, flight across geographical space away from London deterritorializes the universal divine boundaries. The observant H. F. prescribes "the best Physick against the Plague is to run away." For those who believe "God is able to keep us in the midst of Danger, and able to overtake us when we think our selves out of Danger," they end up in "the great Pits" with the other carcasses, "who, if they had fled from the Danger, had, I believe, been safe from the Disaster" (197-8). Apart from fleeing from the divine vengeance, H. F. also suggests saving people from the infection by opposing "shutting Houses up" (159). H. F. himself is immune to the contagion not because of God's mercy but because of the anti-pestilential drugs called "Venice Treacle" (240) he takes under the recommendation of his doctor. The human empirical part of medicine, for Defoe, sometimes is even
more important than the divine "healing Vertue" and even more important than Providence itself. In the sequel of Robinson Crusoe, The Farther Adventures, Crusoe rescues a hurricane wrecked ship bound home to Bristol from Barbados. All people on board are starving to death, and the doctor's role here is vital to saving them. First, Crusoe's ship being present as divine deliverance to the victims is not enough, for if the starved eat at once as much as they want to, they will all perish. Second, Crusoe's surgeon does not use any medicine of "healing Vertue" to cure the patients but judges on the nature of the illness and prescribes moderation "to give every man but a very little at a time; and by this caution he preserved the men, who would otherwise have killed themselves with that very food that was given them on purpose to save their lives." 46

The tobacco having the healing power in itself may be a sign of glory in divine creation. However, there is a private voice or an anti-orthodox deep layer that underlies the episode. Found in the same container with the Bible, the tobacco is not excluded from the marked boundaries of the power of healing while its role in the healing process apparently is ruled out. Crusoe only says, in his feigned faith, that he has been relieved from the illness by Providence, but the details about how he experiments with the medicine suggest the real cure results from a natural cause, the tobacco, and Crusoe's human ingenuity. To use the tobacco correctly to cure a particular disease is a question of human knowledge and may be more important than the
"healing Vertue" of the medicine itself. Defoe's obsession with the details about Crusoe's experiments with the tobacco implies Crusoe's role in curing his own illness, where his empirical studies, of a natural science nature, with the tobacco overshadow his pure faith in Providence: drinking the tobacco steeped in rum, chewing tobacco leaves, and holding his head over the tobacco smoke. Crusoe has cured the illness only after he experiments with the tobacco all the three ways within five days and tries them all at one time and doubles the amount of the tobacco rum that he has taken the day before. Therefore, it is ironic that Crusoe, after all the descriptions of the experiments, discredits the realm of the material and attributes his recovery to that of the supernatural.

As a matter of fact, Crusoe shows some ambivalence toward Providence or the invisible world in the novel. Although he does not fail to acknowledge Providence when it comes to deliverance from crises, he does not hesitate to give credit to human wisdom or ingenuity. After seeing the footprint on the shore, for example, Crusoe imagines all sorts of dangers waiting for him and admits that "God, who was not only Righteous but Omnipotent...; 'twas my unquestion'd Duty to resign my self absolutely and entirely to his Will" (157). God's will it may be to punish him by giving the sign of the footprint, but Crusoe does not adopt a sit-and-wait attitude toward what may be the hand of Providence but takes "all the Measures humane Prudence could suggest for my own Preservation" (162). One of the things he does to protect himself is
to plant a thick layer of bushes to conceal the wall in front of his cave. Due
to his protective precautions, no one has ever discovered Crusoe's retreat on
the island, except when he, to show off his talents, deliberately introduces the
place to his island subjects. Even the English captain Crusoe has saved on
the island from the mutineers later gives high marks to Crusoe's ingenuity:
"the Captain admir'd my Fortification, and how perfectly I had conceal'd my
Retreat with a Grove of Trees" because the wall of the bushes is so thick that
"it was unpassable in any Part of it, but at that one Side, where I had
reserv'd my little winding Passage into it" (258). Moreover, the human mind
can even alter the contents of a supernatural prophecy. Crusoe's dream about
taking a savage as his slave reminds him of man-labor to assist him in his
escape from the island, and thus he says, "I made this Conclusion, that my
only Way to go about an Attempt for an Escape, was, if possible, to get a
Savage into my Possession" (199). Note that Crusoe no longer expects any
ships to come to shore as a sign of divine deliverance but begins to scheme
up a plan to escape with the help of a savage. His high hopes of Providence
for deliverance are transformed down to those of the sub-human. What is
more important is that Crusoe deliberately changes the plot of the dream
story in the process of the real-life hunt for Friday, the savage Crusoe has
rescued and taken as his servant. Having asked Friday to bury the two dead
savages, Crusoe leads him to his cave "on the farther Part of the Island; so
I did not let my Dream come to pass in that Part, viz. That he came into my
Grove for shelter" (205). The reader familiar with Defoe's notion about dreams as a form of communication with the supernatural⁴⁷ can easily see that Crusoe has altered the direction of the prophecy in that part of the dream he feels might be a potential threat to his "Castle" while allowing the rest to come true in the process.

Crusoe in *The Farther Adventures* shows more of this ambivalence and even complains about Providence. Early in the book, Crusoe's ship rescues a French merchant ship on fire and picks up "two boats full of people." The rescued people start to give thanks to God for their deliverance, but Crusoe is having a problem. "To carry this whole company to the East Indies," Crusoe thinks, "would be ruining our whole voyage by devouring all our provisions." Being part of the deliverance that may jeopardize his mission, Crusoe seems to think God is to hold responsible for this "unforeseen accident" because he has no choice but to save the miserable people according to his religious principles. About this inconvenience, "no one could say we were to blame: for the laws of God and Nature would have forbid that we should refuse to take up two boats full of people in such a distressed condition" (23). Crusoe is unhappy that Providence has put him in this deliverance operation that gets him, the rescuer, into trouble. This frame of mind runs a sharp contrast to "the variety of postures which these poor delivered people ran into to express the joy of their souls at so unexpected a deliverance" (17), about which he is not too excited to see because he has to
worry about his own mission. What Crusoe is getting at is that the rescued have all the reasons to express their joy and gratitude by owing their deliverance to Providence, but they are only doing that at the expense of the rescuer--Crusoe, it seems, would not have rescued the ship had it not been "the laws of God and Nature" and had he foreseen the trouble. This different point of view, from the perspective of the rescuer, certainly indicates Crusoe's ambivalent instinct about Providence.

Crusoe has taken lines of flight by crossing hermeneutic boundaries and misreading the signs of the tempest, by ironically pricking the phantom of Providence and dismantling the traditional dichotomy between religion and medicine, and by showing his ambivalence toward divine deliverance and giving credit to human ingenuity. All these lines of flight are embedded in his flight across geographical space that characterizes his private voice or "Original Sin" against fatherly and divine authority. Also, the confrontation between the power of the spiritual world and the power of the human world in the tobacco and the dream of the savages episodes deterritorializes the boundaries of the first (divine) causes and the second (human) causes. The realm of the human forces occupies its place in what should be traditionally assigned to that of the supernatural, for human knowledge and ingenuity in the medical experiments have actually cured Crusoe's illness, and the human will actually intervenes with the supernatural prophecy of Crusoe's dream. Fleeing across geographical space, thus, merges with crossing cultural
boundaries or deterritorialization in Crusoe's restlessness to go to sea. Seeking adventures at sea is nothing like driving toward a center of established principles as in the ancient Greek genres but is fleeing away from the center, creating a slippage, and leaving behind nothing but deterritorialized boundaries.

However, Crusoe reterritorializes himself in his religious conversion on the island and goes back to where he was when he started the flight. So his journey back home to England is a trip back to the center with reterritorialized boundaries, a trip characterized by his return from his "fortunate fall." Being a converted Christian, Crusoe returns to England after thirty-five years. The success of his plantation in the Brazils, which has made him 5000 pounds and an estate of above 1000 pounds a year, lands Crusoe in "the middle station," the very state with which his father used to advise him to be content. Crusoe also reterritorializes himself and compromises with a higher authority. Determined to stay at home, Crusoe sells his Brazil plantation for "33000 Pieces of Eight" and enjoys his riches in England. The only reason for his pick for England, instead of the Brazils, as his home is his newly found authority--Protestant Christianity. "As I had entertain'd some Doubts about the Roman Religion, even while I was abroad, especially in my State of Solitude; so I knew there was no going to the Brasils for me...; so I resolv'd to stay at Home" (303). Even his mission to revisit his island in The Farther Adventures is to "establish them there," to disseminate
the Word of God and to imbue his island subjects with the laws of God and
man in his arrangements of the marriages of the converted prisoners and the
savages. Bringing all the material necessities to the island on his revisit is
not sufficient; only after the religious conversion of his subjects has Crusoe
"brought the affair of the island to a narrow compass" (161), and only after
the dissemination of the Word of God has Crusoe colonized a new world and
invented, or duplicated, the human civilization all over again on his island.
His father already dead after he comes back, Crusoe, at his best, becomes a
seventeenth-century "masterless man," who finds a new master in God.60 The
world Crusoe has created on his island, after all, is a representation of the
ultimate principle of divine glory, and now a true Christian, he has
territorialized his subjects and subjugated them, following his own example,
to the laws of God and of man. Finally, the life-long journeys of adventures
and the adaptation to the religious principles have qualified him as a
candidate for the after-life in heaven, his last words of the book being: "I am
preparing for a longer journey than all these, having lived seventy-two years
a life of infinite variety, and learnt sufficiently to know the value of
retirement, and the blessing of ending our days in peace" (319).

3.2. Captain Singleton's Flight in "Motionless Travel"
Captain Singleton (1720) consists of two flights its hero takes during his life-time and is divided into two halves of equal length devoted to both flights. Singleton starts out as an orphan, and his first flight takes off on board the Portuguese ship, which is a symbol of social authority. Singleton's private voice originates on that ship. Unruly and rebellious, the young Singleton cannot stand his master's cruelty from the outset and cooks up a plan, without execution, to kill the master and escape from the ship or to flee across the social boundaries. Added to his resistance to authority is the motivation of a mutiny worked up among the crew, when the ship comes to an anchor on the coast of Madagascar: "They threaten'd the Captain to set him on Shore.... I wish'd they would, with all my Heart, for I was full of Mischief in my Head, and ready enough to do any." As Singleton "embarked in it so openly" that he and the others "were seized, and put into Irons."61 A slave's conspiracy of a mutiny is rebelling against the hierarchical system maintained on the ship, with both civil and religious authorities represented by the Captain and the Chaplain of the ship. The structural and social hierarchy in the upper/lower consciousness runs through the social order on board the ship. Singleton's master refers to the Captain as "in the Office above" (7). The upper/lower social structure also reflects the relationship between Singleton and his master. Before being set on shore because of his involvement in the mutiny, Singleton requests if he can talk with his master, and "they told me I might, if my Master would come down to me, but I could
be not allowed to come up to him" (12). The act of "coming down" is the master's gesture of benevolence or patronizing, but the slave cannot be granted the right to go up to his master or to cross social boundaries in that hierarchy and place conscious territory. Then, it is not surprising that the Captain, the supreme authority of the ship, thinks "Mutiny on board a Ship was the same thing as Treason in the King's Palace" (16). Singleton and the other criminals are then set on shore to fight for their own survival. Rather than a form of punishment, it is assistance to Singleton's escape from authority he has planned so long. Twenty-three of the crew members even volunteer and beg the Captain to allow them to join the flight in the name of protecting the criminals (17). The group establish a democratic society of their own, trade with the natives, pirate on the seas, find a gold mine on the way, fight their way out of Africa against lions and savages in the jungle, and finally Singleton comes back to England with over three pounds of gold in his pocket. But this flight against authority reterritorializes itself, for the whole flight is characterized by Singleton's desire to come home, to come back to where the center is, and it takes Singleton exactly at the middle point of the novel back to the things he has been fleeing away from. He is broke in two years' time. The lesson he has learned is he should not have tried to fit in a society that does not belong to him, and "it was Time to think of farther Adventures" (138), which will make him change his notions about "home."
Singleton's second line of flight means much more to him. Captain of his pirate ship in his flight across geographical space, Singleton breaks the laws of God and man and never becomes a converted Christian like Crusoe. He goes through a process of identifying with William the Quaker, a God-figure and an external ideological influence on Singleton, acquiring his own identity as the real commander of his ship, and dragging the almighty God-figure down to his own human level. Although he finally comes back to London at the end of the novel, he throws away his newly acquired identity and refuses to be part of the society that offers him no place at all from the outset. He does not reterritorialize cultural boundaries but completes a Deleuzian line of flight in motionless travel and reveals the private voice of the self. First, Singleton's line of flight consists in his mockery of the divine providence. In the "Blast of Lightning" episode, for example, Singleton's ship is "Thunder-struck." Conscious of the conventional tempest symbol, Singleton thinks that he is "doom'd by Heaven to sink that Moment into eternal Destruction" and is "afflicted at the Punishment, but not at the Crime." The persona of the narrative suggests Singleton should have felt "the moving, softening Tokens of a sincere Penitent" in face of the sign (195). It is interesting that the narrator does not finalize on this one interpretation of the storm but soon points out another one: "But perhaps many that read this will be sensible of the Thunder and Lightning, that may think nothing of the rest, or rather may make a Jest of it all" (195). The narrator here is aware
of the natural cause/divine providence debate that caught the attention of Defoe's contemporaries. The narrative draws the reader's attention to the irony that no divine punishment actually falls on Singleton, neither at this moment nor any time in his life-time; nor does Singleton regard the storm as a warning on his piracy. As a matter of fact, Singleton and his crew, the narrator says, are just like the ship, whose "Part of the Head was gone, but not so as to endanger the Boltsprit; so we hoisted our Topsails again, haul'd aft the Fore-sheet, brac'd the Yards, and went our Course as before" (196). Singleton and his crew do make a jest of the storm incident, although the serious reader may not.

Although Singleton does not interpret signs so readily as Crusoe, who in the Serious Reflections thinks "it is easy to know when that hand of Providence opens the door for, or shuts it against, our measures" (188), the tendency in the young Crusoe to resort to the second causes or human knowledge of natural phenomena, rather than supernatural signification, also applies to Singleton. For example, the knowledge of the monsoons affecting the coast of Madagascar earlier in the novel helps Singleton ignore what Crusoe would call "the hand of Providence" and explain the course and the difficulty of that voyage in terms of natural causes instead of any symbolic divine meaning. First, "as the Monsoones, or Trade-Winds, generally affect that Country, blowing in most Parts of this Island one six Months of a Year one Way, and the other six Months another Way, we concluded we might be
able to bear the Sea well enough" (28). Crusoe or any optimistic Christian would think "the hand of providence opens the door" for Singleton and would jump at the opportunity of sailing with the monsoons and thank the benevolent signs of Providence. The thought about its supernatural meaning never occurs to Singleton. He has to quit the idea of sailing with the monsoons to the Cape of Good Hope because they lack fresh water. They have to go the opposite direction for the mainland of Africa and sail along the coast toward the Red Sea, and "venture we did, madly enough," for the winds "blew right in our Teeth" (36). In this case, Singleton does not resort to the idea of Providence shutting the door against him, either. He reads neither of these situations as assistance to their voyage when they could have sailed with the monsoons, or divine warning on their piracy when they choose the opposite way and sail against the winds, because all is explained as natural causes with Singleton's knowledge of the monsoons.

Human knowledge makes the difference. What if Singleton had no knowledge whatsoever about the monsoons? The consequence is obvious. Singleton further illustrates his point on his second flight to sea in the Ceylon episode, where Singleton and his crew would fall into evil hands, which may be the result of divine punishment, if it was not for William's knowledge of the Knox tale. Here in this episode, human efforts, as in the case of Crusoe, play an important role in deterritorializing signs of Providence or even combatting divine punishment. Having being attacked by "a violent Storm of
Wind" that "blew in a most desperate and furious Manner," Singleton's ship is driven ashore and lands in the sand by the Island of Ceylon, where Mr. Knox used to be decoyed on shore and kept in captivity for over nineteen years. The barbarians entice Singleton and his crew to come to shore, but William the Quaker talks Singleton out of it and proposes caution that prevents the Knox tragedy from falling on Singleton and the whole crew. So Singleton acknowledges that William is "here again the Saving of all our Lives" (222). While the Knox family, a friend later tells Singleton, "thankfully ador'd God's wonderful providence" for their escape from the captivity on the island (249), Singleton shows his gratitude to William, the second causes, for his deliverance, and rightly so. Singleton's digression into the Knox tale serves to show "what it was I avoided" (238), but the juxtaposition of the two incidents is tinted with irony and strikes the reader as a mockery of faith in Providence. The "violent Storm" that maims Singleton's ship, the "mighty Storm" that disables Knox's vessel, and the Knox family's thankfulness to Providence for their deliverance, the reader is familiar with all these religious conventions. It seems the reader ought to congratulate Singleton for being delivered by Providence from setting his foot on that same island. But Singleton does not think it is any business of Providence that saves him and his crew. It is William, or may be any other person who has heard of the Knox tale before (like Singleton's friend who later tells him the story), who delivers the whole crew from possible captivity with his little knowledge of
the history of Ceylon. (Had Mr. Knox known something about the barbarians of the island, even he would not have been taken in and his father would not have died in captivity; then his family would not have been grateful to Providence for deliverance from a non-existent captivity). If Providence does impinge on man in this incident, it may be the storm that drives Singleton’s ship ashore as a sign of punishment for his piracy, just like the thunder storm that sets fire on Singleton’s ship earlier or any of Crusoe’s storms as punishment for his "Original Sin." A sign of divine punishment it may be, but William’s precautions have turned it around. Providence has been placed in man’s own hand after all.

Besides mockeries of the divine providence, Singleton’s line of flight is also involved with a journey from identifying with an all-powerful God-figure to bringing the heavenly idol down to earth. All of Defoe’s reterritorializing characters depend heavily on an external cause for internal transformation of the self. Crusoe needs the Bible for his Puritan internalization on his island in order to become a converted Christian; even The Farther Adventures relies on the French priest to remind Crusoe of reforming his island in accord with the laws of God and man. Only after going through ideologination by the social institutions like Newgate and by the prison priest, has Moll Flanders started to become penitent. And Jack will not be transformed into a Christian without his mentor on the Virginia plantation. They all need a form of external ideological influence, usually social
institutions or a God-figure, for their character development. The self needs to be vitalized with the energy provided by the other, and this interaction between the self and the other accounts for the issue of morality in Defoe's fiction. That is why Crusoe, Moll, and Jack all reterritorialize themselves, guided by dominant ideology. Singleton, and later Roxana, however, will take a line of flight across the boundaries in such ideologination, push back this interaction between the self and the other, and deterritorialize or jump over the cultural territory of a pilgrimage from earth to heaven—in becoming a Christian who will be accepted by the Holy Ghost. Singleton desires only to be a man, even without any identity or place in society or in that future blissful paradise.

First, Singleton starts out on his second voyage overseas, like most other Defoenian characters, to identify with a religious person in his search for identity. This identity figure of Singleton's is his "never-failing Friend" and "Ghostly Father," William the Quaker. Captain Bob always lives in William's shadow ever since the Quaker gets on board. Whatever the captain does in the earlier part of his pirate voyages, he feels the need to consult with William. The Quaker is the captain of the ship in disguise because he is always right when it comes to pirate strategies and trading, the two most important aspects on board the ship. That leaves Singleton the captain of the ship only in name. For instance, one time when Singleton becomes captain of a Portuguese man of war they have taken on the sea, William advises
Singleton not to fight against the other man of war, the Portuguese ship's partner, for he reasons "thou wouldst have had twice the Booty in a Merchant Ship, with not one Quarter of the Fighting" (154). Another time when Singleton, being captain of his pirate ship and having enemies all over the place, has no idea where and how to sell a ship full of black slaves they have taken as prisoners, "our old never-failing Friend William help'd us out again, as he had often done, at a Dead-lift." In this hopeless situation, William proposes he lead a group of twenty men and "attempt to trade privately upon the Coast of Brasil, with the Planters, not at the principal Ports" (164). William is even more than a qualified captain. To Singleton, he is also a prophet. He foresees trouble on the Island of Ceylon and therefore saves Singleton's life (222); the supernatural also communicates with him in his dreams, for his dream prophecizes a fortune on the Island of Madagascar (177). As a surgeon, William also excels in medicine. In spite of the other surgeons' opinions, "William went to Work his own Way," saving a black slave's mortified leg (159). And initially when William is on his way to Barbados "to get a Birth" (143), Singleton fatefuly takes him as a prisoner, who is supposed to give him a spiritual birth in the end. In short, William is Singleton's perfect God-figure to identify with to lead Singleton out of his pirate life.

However, towards the end of the book, the God-figure's perfection begins to fade. Singleton now begins to slip out of William's shadow, and his
identity as the captain-in-name-only gradually wears off, and replaced in it is his own identity, the real commander of the ship. This identity switching process starts with the failed military operation, with the "never-failing" Quaker in charge, to seize a tree-cave the savages use as their defense system on an island in the Indian Ocean. Singleton tells the reader, "Never was a Fortification so well defended, or Assailants so many ways defeated" (212). William, the religious man who serves as Singleton's spiritual guide in the novel, may be powerful in mind, but he is only a man. Ever since that defeat by the savages, William finds himself in a position where Singleton can argue with him. The first time Captain Bob ever disagrees with William is in the Ceylon episode. As William advises him not to set foot on the island, Singleton says, "I opposed him a great while, and told him, I thought he used to be always right, but that now I thought he was not" (222). This time proves William right again, but it is the first rebellious sign against the God-figure. Later, when Singleton and William decide whether to sell their goods to the English merchants nearby in Surat or they should risk going all the way to the Persian Gulf themselves where they can make as much money as the English merchants do, Singleton wins the debate and proposes play-it-safe in Surat (253). Now, Singleton is on his way to overruling William and becoming the real captain of the ship. The identity switching process is not complete until a final trading trip to Surat. "My Apprehensions prevailed with William, whether my Reasons did or no, and he submitted; and we resolved to try
another Ship's Loading to the same Merchants" (253). Singleton sends his men to Surat with the sloop and the crew in disguise: while the sloop is "a perfect Cheat, disguised in every Thing that a Stranger could be supposed to take any Notice of," William acts as one of "the Super-Cargoes, by a formal Procuration from one Captain Singleton" (254). Captain Singleton's real identity emerges from a play of disguise, where everything else is a fake, except William and the other crew are truly acting "by a formal Procuration" from the real Captain Singleton. To obtain an identity of a "Captain Singleton" is to get even with William, who has been actually in charge all along. Unlike any of the reterritorializing characters in Defoe's other novels, Captain Singleton has surpassed his God-figure and his external ideological influence. He has become a personification of the private voice of the self that resists dominant ideologination.

The play of disguise goes on to the end of the novel; only this time Singleton throws away his acquired identity and even abandons his identity of an Englishman in his native country where he has been "cheated and imposed upon, and used so ill" (257). If acquiring an identity as the real commander of the ship is Singleton's cry for staying out of William's shadow and influence, abandoning his true identity as an Englishman is his will against convention and further ideologination. William, the God-figure, encourages Singleton to wipe the slate clean and tries to convert him into a penitent Christian who will repent and will as well think about the after-life
at the end of his pirate career, but Singleton replies "to think of Death, is to dye; and to be always thinking of it, is to be all one's Life-long a dying" (257-8). Repentance is the farthest thing on Singleton's mind, but he does not like to disappoint the Quaker and says "Say any Thing to me, William, said I. I will take it kindly" (258). How kindly will he take it? He pays lip service to William's spiritual advice. First, after he wakes up from his dream of the devil, Singleton seems to repent a little the next morning and confesses to William he has talked aloud in the dream that "I am a Thief, a Rogue, by my Calling; I am a Pirate, and a Murderer, and ought to be hanged" (269). He then says to William he hates himself and everything he has earned, and points a pistol to his head. Not to be so fast to believe Singleton is going to pull the trigger; neither does he think William will do the shooting for him as he says he will—Singleton has put on a fraudulent show. He does not really want to put an end to his life yet, and he tells the reader "if any Body had been near me to understand English, I had been undone, and the Thought of shooting my self forsook me from that Time" (269). It is a relief to Singleton no by-standers, who may have heard him, speak English, and therefore no one is going to turn him in to the gallows.

Second, Singleton knows "Repentance could not be sincere without Restitution" (267), but since he can hardly find the victims, restitution is impossible. So he thinks his money "was due to the Community, and I ought to distribute it for the general Good" (276). Ironically, Singleton never turns
out to be a community person as he claims he wants to be; money distribution is only within the family: Singleton, William, and his sister who finally gets married to Singleton. He even refuses to accept the society he lives in. Only when William agrees to his terms to wear foreign vests, not to "shave off our Mustaches or Beards" in order to pass for Grecians, and not to speak English in public, will Singleton come home to England with him. Thus, Singleton comes back home not to repent or to reterritorialize but to become a Deleuzian traitor to society; he is going to lose his identity, "to disappear, to become unknown." Singleton and William's disguise and social apartness have more meaning than a simple matter of escaping punishment, for the Quaker does not have to agree to the terms since he is a respectful Christian and has nothing to be afraid of. Even though he may be accused of accomplice to piracy on Singleton's ship, he can easily shake off that accusation: when he was first brought onto the ship, he made Singleton sign a peculiar but a life-saving statement that proved William was robbed and forced on board the ship. Whatever the reasons, William, the God-figure and external ideological influence in the novel, has compromised with the insincerely penitent Singleton, not the other way around, to refuse to accept society and be part of its system. Although Singleton refers to William as the "Ghostly Father," he does not take him as his spiritual inspiration to raise himself up to a religious altitude. If William's role in the novel is to be an identity figure and a spiritual guide to Singleton, he is at the end of the novel brought down to
Singleton's own level. Singleton is not ideologinated, converted, or endowed with a public voice but remains a traitor with a private voice who engages in a line of flight, that is, in motionless travel at the end of the novel.

3.3. Deterritorialization in Roxana

Defoe's major fictional characters from Crusoe to Roxana commit crime against the laws of God and man. But their crime differs slightly from person to person. Crusoe commits his "Original Sin" against fatherly and divine authority. Singleton, Moll, and Jack all have brushes mainly with the English common law in piracy and robbery. Besides robbery, Moll is also engaged in whoring, but her goal in life is family oriented, because she believes in matrimony and longs to find a husband and to settle down. Roxana, however, first treads on the laws of God and man by blaspheming matrimony and worshiping whoredom. Second, unlike the other characters, who reterritorialize themselves by coming to terms with social order and authority in the end, Roxana, along with Singleton, flees across boundaries without reterritorialization. Roxana's flight is even more dynamic and more complete than Singleton's, for her final line of flight cuts both ways, both geographical space and motionless travel in deterritorializing cultural codes. Her later romantic affairs with foreign personalities and her passions for royal titles do not reterritorialize her along the lines of social order or reconciliation. They
simply conceal her hostility toward the men's world in what she deems as her native country, toward the English "FOOLS" who tailor the laws of matrimony ordained by God to their own social and financial interests, a tragedy to a woman as Roxana has experienced with the Brewer, her first husband.

Roxana's private voice starts with her first brush with the laws of matrimony in her affair with the Jeweller, her landlord. Roxana lives under necessity in the beginning of the novel after her "Fool" husband the Brewer goes bankruptcy and abandons her. Activated by her maid, Amy, for self-preservation, Roxana encourages the Jeweller's advances and "marries" the suitor: "We were to call one another Man and Wife, who, in the Sense of the Laws, both of God and our Country, were no more than two Adulterers, in short, a Whore and a Rogue," for both of them separate but are not divorced from their spouses. The sham marriage certainly goes beyond self-preservation on Roxana's side of the story. She does it for the enjoyment of adultery. In order to show she is nothing but a whore, Roxana insists on Amy sleeping with the "bridegroom." After initial modesty and resistance, "at last, when she see I was in earnest," Roxana says, "she let me do what I wou'd; so I fairly stript her, and then I threw open the Bed, and thrust her in" (46). Roxana's intention is obvious here as she looks on and comments, "Had I look'd upon my myself as a Wife, you cannot suppose I would have been willing to have let my Husband lye with my Maid, much less, before my Face,
for I stood-by all the while" (47). In fact, Roxana never once calls the Jeweller "husband," not even after he is murdered in Paris and leaves her a wealthy "widow." On the other hand, the patriarchal ideology may secure a less-picky attitude toward the Jeweller's part in the adultery. The Jeweller is just like Roxana in his marital status, but his earlier advances to her may be in the eyes of a woman all his own goodness and a sign from heaven. Roxana tells the reader, "I shou'd have look'd upon all the Good this Man had done for me, to have been the particular Work of the Goodness of Heaven; and that Goodness shou'd have mov'd me to a Return of Duty and humble Obedience" (38). But Roxana does not return to her former duty and obedience, and this remark turns out to be an ironical mockery of "the Goodness of Heaven" and those who may not think less of the Jeweller for his adultery, for as soon as Roxana thrusts the naked Amy into his arms, the Jeweller "held her fast," and has more of this farce several times after that.

The laws of matrimony, for Roxana, certainly side with man rather than woman because they are invented by man. When Roxana refuses to marry the Dutch Merchant after sleeping with him, she condemns the laws of matrimony and reasons to him that "the very Nature of the Marriage-Contract was, in short, nothing but giving up Liberty, Estate, Authority, and every-thing, to the Man" (148) and that "the Laws of Matrimony puts the Power into your Hands" (151). The deterritorializing aspect of Roxana's arguments against matrimony lies in its radical departure from "what the
receiv'd Custom had given us of it" in that she regards a woman as "a free Agent, as well as a Man" (147). What she wants to do is to take a line of flight and carve up the customary territory of power and freedom that belongs to men by staking her claim in it and by maintaining her status as a whore to ensure it. Under the traditional laws of matrimony, argues Roxana, while "a Wife is look'd upon as but an Upper-Servant, a Mistress is a Sovereign" (132). Her preoccupation with her liberty is so strong that she cannot sacrifice her personal desire for moral principles. She even says she cannot "reconcile my Judgment to Marriage" after the Merchant appeals to the authority of God and asserts that "Marriage was decreed by Heaven; that it was the fix'd State of Life, which God had appointed for Man's Felicity" (151).57

Even though she finally ties the knot with the Merchant, after she is over fifty and past her prime time as a whore, Roxana does not reterritorialize herself in reconciliation with the laws of matrimony she has fought against so vehemently. Instead, she uses her feigned obedience to manipulate her husband and secure her liberty as well as her estate, which could have been given up to the man decreed by matrimony. First, as the Merchant has promised in his agreement with Roxana, he gives up his right to control her estate and yields "the Management wholly your own." To Roxana, of course, this is nothing unexpected, and as he "gave back all my Writings into my own Hands again," Roxana secures the right to her own estate and says "seeing you will have it kept apart, it shall be so" (259).
Getting to manage her own estate is a vital aspect of a married woman's freedom, but Roxana will not forget to put up her image as a virtuous wife to be envisioned by her husband, for her "Duty and Obedience" will never leave her lips. As they are getting married, Roxana tries to sweet-talk the Merchant with a tongue-in-cheek flattery and says, "I hop'd he shou'd see I knew how to act the Servant's Part, and do every-thing to oblige my Master; that if I did not resolve to go with him wherever he desir'd to go, he might depend I wou'd never have him" (233). "To oblige my Master"? "To go with him wherever he desir'd to go"? Never. There is no way Roxana wants to oblige the Merchant. Manipulation is her true colors, and she has to call all the shots when the couple decides to do anything. Their first decision soon after their wedding week, for example, is to give the Quaker, their hostess and friend, a present to show their appreciation of all the help she has offered for the wedding. The Merchant proposes "to settle a thousand Pounds upon her, for her Life, that is to say, sixty Pounds a Year." But Roxana thinks that is too much and wants to be in charge. She is for "a Purse with a Hundred Guineas as a Present first, and then made her a Compliment of 40 £. per Annum for her Life" (250). Another time when she does not want the Merchant to meet the Captain and her daughter Susan again, Roxana is determined to make the Merchant go out of town with her for a few days. She first "fix'd upon North-Hall," and "he, who did every-thing upon the Foundation of obliging me, readily came into it." Then, the very next morning
before they set out, she changes her mind at the last minute and wants to go to Tunbridge instead; and again "he, being entirely passive in the thing, agreed to it with the greatest willingness" (209-301). Even their final decision to settle down in Holland is in Roxana's hands: "My Spouse, who was perfectly easie, whether in going or staying, left it all entirely to me" (318).

Not only has Roxana taken a line of flight in deterritorializing the laws of matrimony in conventional marriages and safeguarding her independence and estate, she has also launched a flight across geographical space to leave England at the end of the novel, unlike Crusoe, Moll, or Jack, who will come back in the end to make peace with authority. There is no reterritorializing for Roxana. Although born in France and fluent in French, Roxana grows up in England and regards it as her native country. England is the center of the novel, and action springs from and withdraws back to that center. When her first romantic affair ends in Paris after the death of the Jeweller, Roxana finds herself in "a strange Country" (54) and no longer thinks of French as her own nationality. After the French Prince leaves her, "the first thing that I resolv'd to do, was to go directly to England" and to be "among my Countryfolks," for she says "I esteem'd myself an English-Woman" (111). Then, her move to Holland in the end is a line of flight across geographical space away from home, away from the center, and she never comes back. Roxana may have some reterritorializing motives for the flight, as she herself admits--to avoid the shame if exposed by Susan and by her old acquaintances
and to repent for her past by escaping from the place of her "old Station," etc. However, those apparent motives are only disguises, for Roxana's narrative does not provide solid foundations for her fears of exposure and repentance. And even when she moves to Holland only for the title of a countess, she can always move back to England again afterwards, but she does not. Her real motive for staying in a foreign country is her desire to flee from the English "FOOLS" under the laws of matrimony and live with her foreign husband, "the best Husband in the World" who can guarantee her absolute independence. She is insistently against a woman marrying a fool, for if so, she will be stuck in "the Ditch" and starve and die in it (96). Roxana has also developed an aversion to the Englishmen she is related to. Her first husband, the English brewer, proves to be a fool, and a crook later in France; she has an affair with her English jeweller only for his money and for the sake of evil; she is sick and tired of the old English lord she meets at court; even the king may be an object for her to conquer. Also, what cannot be offered by her own country, she gets it and protects it from matrimony through her own individual efforts in a foreign land, the title of "the Countess de __" besides her liberty and estate. Roxana is a book about ingenuous disguises: Roxana is disguised under many circumstances, such as at court and in the Quaker's house; her motives for her final flight are disguises; her repentance is a fake; the murder of Susan is a deception; so is Roxana's punishment by God at the end of the novel. Her final title of "the Countess
then, is a double disguise without a name, a disguise under another disguise that she is punished by divine wrath in Holland while she continues to succeed in spite of Providence. Yet to her English "Countryfolks," Roxana has no identity. She is simply a Deleuzian traitor to the laws of matrimony and, out of the grips of them, disappears into the sunset, leaving behind the private voice of the self echoing over a decentered territory.

First, her reason for escaping from England for fear of exposure is just a disguise. It is true Roxana cannot sleep well when her daughter, Susan, fumbles into her life. As Susan wants to recognize her and claim her as her mother even if she has to "ramble in Search" for her over the whole country, Roxana knows she is "safe no-where, no, not in Holland itself" (310). She does not feel safe if Susan does not quit looking for her, not in England, not even in Holland. Even if it was the fear of the daughter's search for her that makes the mother long for a hide-out in a foreign country, Roxana would not have to leave England any more after she says Amy has taken care of the haunting wench. Susan is not the cause for her flight to Holland; neither are Roxana's old acquaintances who might expose her, if they have a chance. Roxana is an expert in disguises. When she indulges herself at court with the English royalties, she passes for a French lady. Although the guests wear masks at spectacular balls, leaving Roxana, the hostess, without anything to conceal her identity, Roxana handles this masquerade with skill too, for she is in a different way disguised, just like her masked royal guests, in her
"French Behaviour under the Mahometan Dress" (99). Her French behavior and Turkish apparel make it impossible for anyone to realize she is an English woman, so she can say "I appear'd, leaving the World to guess who or what I was, without offering to put myself forward" (165). Even the insistent Susan, once a maid-servant at Roxana’s house for two years, can hardly recognize her. "I never saw my Mistress in my Life," says Susan, "except it was that publick Night when she danc’d in the fine Turkish Habit, and then she was so disguis’d, that I knew nothing of her afterwards" (206). Her disguise as a Quaker is even more impeccable. "I had not only learn’d to dress like a QUAKER, but so us’d myself to THEE and THOU, that I talk’d like a QUAKER too, as readily and naturally as if I had been born among them" (213). Apart from her disguises, the difference in Roxana’s looks after her stay in the Quaker’s house may further protect her from being recognized by her old acquaintances. While Roxana is active at court, she says, "any-one who look’d in my Face, might see I was above twenty Years old, and yet, without flattering my self, I carried my Age, which was above Fifty, very well too" (187). In about two years, Roxana still does not look like her age, but the Quaker compliments her that she cannot be "above Forty" (245), a twenty-year difference. Her false identity and her age difference can surely discourage any attempts to expose her by her old relations in London.

Fleeing to Holland does not mean Roxana has developed a sense of repentence for her rebellion against the laws of matrimony, either. She is
incapable of penitence. For instance, having escaped from the danger of the Jew's blackmail with help from the Dutch Merchant in Paris and protected all her money, Roxana does not regard her deliverance as due to Providence. She says, "had I any Religion, or any Sense of a Supreme Power managing, directing, and governing in both Causes and Events in the World, such a Case as this wou'd have given any-body room to have been very thankful to the Power who had not only put such a Treasure into my Hand, but given me such an Escape from the Ruin that threaten'd me" (121). She is not religious and will not read anything into her deliverance accordingly. Even if Roxana was religious, she would consider it, she says, as the power of Providence that puts the vast amount of money into her hand after her evil enterprise. It would have been repentance in the wrong way. All the money Roxana has made in Paris is through her affairs with the Jeweller and with the Prince, the pay-off of her whoredom. God should punish her for her gain but at least not put "such a Treasure" into her hand. Paying gratitude to Providence for what is good to oneself in spite of the nature of the thing itself is contrary to Defoe's idea of the function of Providence that "opens the door, or shuts it against, our measures." Such an act of self-interested thankfulness for Providence, in Roxana's logic, is destroying the power of Providence, for what deems to be divine power is turned into something she plays at her own discretion, regardless of God's will to approve or disapprove. Second, about her lucky deliverance, Roxana also says "I had indeed, a grateful Sense upon
my Mind of the generous Friendship of my Deliverer, the Dutch Merchant; by whom I was so faithfully serv'd, and by whom, as far as relates to second Causes, I was preserv'd from Destruction" (121). In taking the Merchant as her deliverer, Roxana equates the efforts of a human being to the "Supreme Power." She is even more radical than the young Crusoe, who initiates the blurring of the difference between the first and second causes, and more radical than Singleton, who, like the young Crusoe, gives proper credit to human prudence. Roxana simply ignores "the Hand of Providence" and worships a human being as the Deity, for whose service she repays by giving him her own body.

Roxana may also seem to fear divine punishment for hiding from the Merchant her secret relation with Susan when she suspects he must have known the truth from the Captain. While repeating the Captain's miscomprehended story to Roxana, the Merchant is interrupted by the candles Roxana deliberately throws off the table to cover her uneasiness. At this juncture, she seems to realize how powerful the divine providence is and says "what a glorious Testimony it is to the Justice of Providence..., that the most secret Crimes are, by the most unforeseen Accidents, brought to light, and discover'd" (297). The irony is that after hearing the Captain's half-told story about Roxana getting a daughter more than she expects, the Merchant does not see the truth of it but thinks it is about Roxana's pregnancy that he knows is not true. The big secret is not discovered after all. Why repent if
Providence does not govern the affairs of the world the way Roxana says it does? Also, whenever Roxana claims she is repenting, her repentance is only a fake on all occasions, when she is a whore, when she is married, or when she is in Holland at the end of the novel. After Roxana finally goes to Holland with her husband, she seems to have been penitent for her past wicked life, including having Susan killed. The pleasures of material riches and the honor of royal titles do not have any more attraction for her. "Not all the Affluence of a plentiful Fortune," Roxana says, "not a hundred Thousand Pounds Estate; (for between us we had little less) not Honour and Titles, Attendants and Equipages; in a word, not all the things we call Pleasure, cou'd give me any relish, or sweeten the Taste of things to me" (264). Here, she seems to have renounced what she has been striving for all her life. Repentance is the key note here in Holland. However, Roxana also tells the reader that her repentance is "rather mov'd by my Fears of Vengeance." Just as a sense of repentance moved by the fears of punishment and vengeance flashes through Singleton's mind when his ship is thunder struck, Roxana is experiencing the same kind of repentance, which will vanish as the fears wear off. What is different is Roxana's realization of its being a "lower kind of Repentance" than "a Sense of being spar'd from being punish'd, and landed safe after a Storm" (261).

Even a realization of a higher kind of repentance is ironic. Roxana does show a sense of being saved from a storm as she goes on a voyage with Amy
from Paris to Holland to settle her bills earlier in the novel. But that supposedly higher kind of repentance turns out to be just a derision of Providence and "Heaven's Goodness." During the terrible storm, Roxana cries out "Lord have Mercy upon me" and vows to "live a single and a virtuous Life" if God can spare her life this one time (126-7). As the ship is finally driven to the coast of Suffolk in England, to their "great Joy," both Roxana and Amy feel the mercy of God, and Amy even "fell flat upon the Ground, and kiss'd it, and gave God thanks for her Deliverance from the Sea" (128). This scene can be an illustration of what Roxana calls a more sincere sense of repentance, but it is not necessarily so. "For the Danger being over," Roxana tells the reader, "the Fears of Death vanish'd with it; ay, and our Fear of what was beyond Death also; ...and with our return to Life, our wicked Taste of Life return'd, and we were both the same as before, if not worse"; thus, Roxana says "Death-bed Repentance, or Storm-Repentance, which is much the same, is seldom true" (128). As Roxana later implies, she even should not have repented at all, putting aside the insincerity of repentance. The religious symbol of the tempest is problematic again just like it is with the young Crusoe. Later, the Dutch Merchant makes Roxana's "womanish Fears" of the storm a laughing stock, for he tells Roxana, "it was nothing but what was very ordinary in those Seas; but that they had Harbours on every Coast, so near, that they were seldom in Danger of being lost indeed" (136). "Womanish Fears" may be one cause for false alarm, and the Crusoe-like "fresh Water"
sailor experience may be another. Back in the storm scene, Roxana stares out of her cabin into the steerage room and sees "two Seamen on their Knees, at Prayers," who obviously behave like the "fresh Water" Crusoe numbed by the first big-waves he confronts on the sea. The more experienced sailor may also look to the frightened Roxana like doing his part in praying, which is definitely something else, for Roxana also sees "only one Man who steer'd, and he made a groaning Noise too, which I took to be saying his Prayers, but it seems it was answering to those above, when they call'd to him, to tell him which Way to steer" (125). The praying act exists only in the eyes of the beholder. Roxana takes it to be divine punishment what it is to the experienced sailors to be something ordinary. She has learned from her own experience that she has prayed to God for nothing. Even that more sincere repentance is a bitter mockery; how can the "lower kind of Repentance" at the end of the novel be sincere?

The murder of Susan as the interpolated ending of the novel is also a disguise. The controversial ending has been problematic for many critics. In Paula R. Backscheider's view, on the one hand, lack of conclusions and of poetic justice "reduced Roxana's chance for popularity and imitation." Maximillian E. Novak also argues that "what prevents Roxana from being Defoe's masterpiece is the truncated ending." On the other hand, Robert D. Hume posits that "Roxana may well have been left as Defoe conceived and wanted it" without the actual exposure of Roxana's ruin. For Everett
Zimmerman, "the book's ending is consistent with its heroine's development and with the development of Defoe's fiction." Zimmerman contends that "sin and repentance, the conceptions that he used to order his works, gradually diverged from their traditional religious meanings." First, Zimmerman and Hume are right about Defoe's intention to end the novel the way it is. About this point, textual evidence in this first edition is clear. Before Roxana starts to give a flash-back on the episode about Susan, it is meant to be the last one in the book. She says "I must now go back to another Scene, and join it to this End of my Story" (265). Second, Zimmerman's reading is most convincing in its argument about the novel's deviation from traditional religious meanings. Divine wrath apparently works in the end, for Roxana tells us, "the Blast of Heaven seem'd to follow the Injury done the poor Girl, by us both" (330). But it is not what is really going on. For one thing, the reader is never sure whether Susan is murdered. Roxana speculates the murder from the kind Quaker, who reports that "she suppos'd Amy had manag'd it so well, as to put an End to it" (323). Murder is never on the Quaker's mind, and neither Roxana nor the reader has the satisfaction of confirming the news as Roxana chooses to see it. At the end of the novel, Roxana tells the Quaker that Amy cannot join her in Holland unless the suspected murderer "gave full Satisfaction to my Friend the QUAKER, that she had not murther'd my Child." But what happens later is that Amy "came over afterwards, without
giving my Friend any of that Satisfaction or any Account that she intended to come over" (329).

Roxana never tells the reader in explicit terms what Amy has "put an End to it" means perhaps because Susan is never murdered. There might be two possibilities. First, Roxana may have mistaken Amy's half-told story for a different story (or we as readers have done the same if we take the Quaker's report of Amy's story the way Roxana does), just as the Merchant has mistaken the ladies' half-told story for something about Roxana's pregnancy a little earlier in this same episode. The reader can see a perfect symmetry and parallel between these two incidents. In the earlier incident, after meeting with Susan, Roxana decides to make excuses to the Captain for cancelling the plan to go to Holland with his family. She says vaguely to the Quaker that she is "very much out of Order" and sends her to "insinuate to them, that she was afraid I shou'd not be able to get ready to go the Voyage" (280). The Captain hears the half-told story from his wife and Susan. He tells the Merchant he hears the ladies say that "your Lady has got a Daughter more than she expected" (296). The reader knows whom the ladies may be referring to after the Susan scene. But the Captain not knowingly twists this half-told story into a completely different one and tells the Merchant that he knows "a Daughter" here refers to Roxana's pregnancy. So Roxana later says, "My Husband told me what the Captain had said; but very happily took it, that the Captain had brought a Tale by-halves, and having heard it one way,
had told it another; and that neither cou'd he understand the Captain, neither did the Captain understand himself" (297). The beauty of this parallel of misinterpretation is that the Quaker plays a crucial role in both of the incidents. In the first, she delivers Roxana's message that has caused misinterpretation. In the second, she delivers Amy's message that may just as well have caused misinterpretation on Roxana's part. Actually, Defoe has reminded the reader of other interpretations concerning Susan's disappearance. The "innocent well-meaning" Quaker "thought nothing of any Evil herself, so she suspected none in any-body else." To her, it is "good News" that "the Impertinent Visitor" stops bothering Roxana again because "she thought Amy had found some Way to perswade her to be quiet and easie" (323). The disappearance of Susan is quite another story for Roxana's relatives in Spittle-Fields, for "they believ'd Amy had carry'd her to pay her a Sum of Money, and that somebody had watch'd her after her having receiv'd it, and had Robb'd and Murther'd her" (325). Everyone chooses to believe what he or she is willing to believe, just like the Merchant wishes Roxana is with child in that "Tale by-halves" incident, "which he wish'd might be true" (299), and the choice of what to believe is based on the believer's personal traits. The Quaker does not suspect anyone because she is kind and benevolent and will not think of anything rotten like murder. Roxana's relatives project on Susan's disappearance what is ordinary the case on the street, robbery and murder. In the same manner, Roxana herself interprets
the story according to what she (or the reader) has suspected Amy would do
to Susan. The only assurance Roxana (together with the reader) can get about
it is "Amy had made her away; and I believ'd it the more, because Amy came
no more near me, but confirm'd her Guilt by her Absence" (325). Actually the
reader is not sure about Susan's death or the cause of it if she is dead;
neither is Roxana. If she is, it is only her illusory projection. Amy may have
persuaded the girl into giving up following Roxana, as the Quaker figures;
Susan may also have been robbed and murdered by highwaymen, as Roxana's
relatives think so; of course she may also have been murdered by Amy, as
Roxana sees it. Whatever happens to Susan, Roxana will not know exactly
until the end of the novel when Amy comes over to join her in Holland.

The second possibility may be even more surprising—Roxana has
known everything all along. She has pretended to take the Quaker's half-told
story the way the reader may take it. If the reader believes Amy has
murdered Susan, it is only the reader's projection. Then the reader may have
been completely fooled by Roxana's (or Defoe's) art of concealment, through
the mysterious web of fabrication she has weaved into her narrative, about
what has exactly happened to the trouble-maker Susan. Thus, the murder
of Susan is only projection in the first case and fabrication in the second.
Then in both cases, "the Blast of Heaven" as punishment for the murder is
only fiction. The reader would not expect the wrath of the divine power to fall
on Roxana for something she has not made happen much less has done by
herself in person. "The Fortunate Mistress" may finally maintain her status under disguise in Holland without any Divine Justice troubling her conscience, since the retribution, as Roxana states in the last sentence of the novel, is for the alleged murder only, not for her past whoring career she lets the reader believe she is worried about all the time towards the end of the novel.
Discussions of the use of irony in Defoe's *Moll Flanders* (1722) have often been focused on authorial intentions. For example, Moll moralizes her necklace theft about its instructive implication, just as Defoe himself points out in the preface, as a lesson to teach the reader for the sake of social good. If the reader takes this intention seriously, no artistry of irony can be identified. What one may infer from this incident is Defoe's blindness to the immoral nature of his heroine's crime. On the other hand, if one takes neither Defoe's remarks in the preface nor Moll's preaching at face value, one can locate Defoe's intention for irony to indicate the heroine's moral confusion, thus exonerating the author from blame. Perhaps Robert Alan Donovan's is the most provocative study of Defoe's use of irony in *Moll Flanders* in terms of the "double function" of Moll, who serves as both "subject and object" or "the Moll who perceives and narrates" and "the Moll who acts and suffers." The irony of the book, for Donovan, lies in the disparity between Moll's two voices, one pertaining to the erring character and the other to the moralizing narrator. Donovan aims to identify Defoe's "potentially fruitful organizing principle" in the novel that "seems to say one thing and actually says
another.\textsuperscript{62} One obvious weakness of these suggestions of authorial intention, no matter for irony or for moral preaching, is that they all assume a traditional bond of certainty between the author and the reader, who knows what the author means and knows how to interpret what the character or the narrator says in the text, while such relationships in the novel sometimes render Schlegelian ironic ambiguities, which depart from the traditional claim about the certainty of authorial intention.

Rather than asserting a faith in a universal hierarchical order, the private voice in \textit{Moll Flanders} about chaotic becoming indicates Defoe's insertion into radical historical outlooks of the disrupted universal order. The present study will indicate this private voice about a broken link of certainty and account for ironic ambiguities, a practical model that anticipates Schlegelian irony. It will focus on the chaotic world of becoming that perplexes Moll the character's finite perceptions and involves them in growth and dialectic tensions. It will also examine Moll the narrator's ambiguous role that draws the reader into the chaotic textuality of the novel. The ambiguous relationships under discussion have something to do with a paradoxical bifocal vision, with multi-level roles of the character, the narrator, and the reader intermingled in the reading process.Caught up in this terrain of uncertainty or even chaotic confusion, the reader is experiencing Schlegel's aesthetics of romantic irony instead of having a clear picture of authorial intentions. Schlegelian irony also challenges the Iserian shared autonomy of
the author and the reader in his theory of reader response. Paradoxically, the Schlegelian fictional world in an ideal work of art that the finite artist creates is infinite and chaotic. The reader's participation in the literary text must likewise fluctuate between the waves of the chaotic textuality of the fictional world. While Iser bases his notions of reader response on the grounds that are slanted for the interaction between the author's artistic "guidelines" or "controls" in the text and the reader's imagination, Schlegel's theory of romantic irony tilts toward the chaotic textuality of a work of art, which defies the certainty of authorial intention. The uncertainty of authorial intention cuts both ways. First, the ironic ambiguities in Moll Flanders indicate an unconscious anticipation of Schlegel's romantic irony and Defoe's insertion into radical ideology about disorder and chaos. This reading of romantic irony is then made possible with the joint production by authorial ideology as the unconscious private voice and the reader who makes the connections in the text between romantic irony and that radical ideology. Second, authorial intention about the narrator's role to moralize her actions is jeopardized by Moll's double role as the character and the narrator and by the reader's dual perspectives as a result of the narrator's ironic ambiguities.

4.1. Schlegelian Irony
Friedrich Schlegel's notions of irony developed in his literary fragments (1797-80) mark a striking departure from the traditional mode. In classical irony, ironists, assured with the security of knowledge in saying the opposite of what they mean, know what they mean and hope the reader will know what they want to attain. For Schlegel, the difference between traditional irony and his philosophical irony lies in the demarcation between sophist polemics and poetry. He states that there is "a rhetorical species of irony which, sparingly used, has an excellent effect, especially in polemics." But it is nowhere to be compared to "the sublime urbanity of the Socratic muse." Hans Eichner holds that in Schlegel's view "when Socrates asserted that he knew nothing, he not only knew more than his interlocutor, but knew enough to know that he did not really know anything properly." Socratic irony, Schlegel writes, "contains and arouses a feeling of indissoluble antagonism between the absolute and the relative, between the impossibility and the necessity of complete communication." This form of irony in the romantic mode Lilian R. Furst calls "an irony of uncertainty, bent primarily on the perplexities of searching."63

Schlegel's poetic world corresponds to his ontological view of the universe, which he deems as "infinite and inexhaustible." Schlegel contends that poetry "alone can become, like the epic, a mirror of the whole circumambient world, an image of the age," but it can also be "free of all real and ideal self-interest, on the wings of poetic reflection, and can raise that
reflection again and again to a higher power, can multiply it in an endless succession of mirrors." In other words, infinity is captured in romantic poetry which, Schlegel writes, "is still in the state of becoming."64 The universe is chaotic and infinite, but the human being's conceptions, in contrast, are finite. While the task of the artist is "to transform the finite into the infinite," yet Schlegel also states that "never will the mind that knows the orgies of the true Muse journey on this road to the very end, nor will he presume to have reached it." Artists are sandwiched between the immediate finite and the potential infinite and encounter the Schlegelian paradox of "the impossibility and the necessity of complete communication" with the infinite in their work.65 Out of this system of the infinite, Schlegel defines irony as "the clear consciousness of eternal agility, of an infinitely teeming chaos" and as "continuously fluctuating between self-creation and self-destruction." Such an execution of creation and de-creation, for Schlegel, resides in artists' paradoxical mission of both attachment to and detachment from the work of art they create. As Schlegel asserts, "in order to write well about something, one shouldn't be interested in it any longer."66 That is, in romantic irony, one is perfectly aware of one's own limitations in the infinite chaos and at the same time is exposed to ever-new experiences in the reality of becoming and growth, experiences in which one overcomes one's limitations and transcends oneself and produces "an endless succession of mirrors." In so doing, the ironist is able to create what Schlegel calls "transcendental buffoonery." By
"transcendental," Anne K. Mellor points out, "Schlegel refers to a poetry that hovers between the real and ideal, between the chaos of becoming and the order of being," while the Italian buffo in Schlegel is "a dramatic character who both controls the plot and mocks the play" without impeding the plot from moving forward. Thus, "transcendental buffoonery" is an ironic twist generated by a dramatic character who "is simultaneously affirming and mocking its own creation" or is creating and de-creating the play. In short, ironists possess a paradoxical dual perspective of attachment to and detachment from their creations.67

Moreover, the continuous oscillation between self-creation and self-destruction is a paradox that can be specified as a dialectic fusion of opposites. Even Hegel owes his indebtedness to Schlegel's dialectic thought.68 The alternation between creation (the thesis) and de-creation (the antithesis) is a dialectic fusion that consists of simultaneous attachment and detachment (the Hegelian synthesis that incorporates both the thesis and the antithesis). Then the dialectic process moves on to the third stage, re-creation of a new conception of the self, as Schlegel maintains that "confusion is chaotic only when it can give rise to a new world."69 As the present chapter will later show, Moll the character is immersed in a chaotic world of becoming, where her finite conceptions are ironically involved in growth through a dialectic process of creation, de-creation, and re-creation. Moll the character may transcend the dialectic tensions between creation and de-creation and
triumph through to re-creation, but due to Moll the narrator's paradoxical attachment to and detachment from parts of her narrative, the character-narrator-reader relationships are thrown into ironic bifocal ambiguities that resist any clear and stabilized categorization.

One may find the juxtaposition of romantic irony and *Moll Flanders* chronologically problematic. Critics have identified "a glaring area of ambiguity with regard to establishing reliable chronological parameters" in romantic irony. In his survey of this ambiguous time frame, John Francis Fetzer holds that Schlegelian irony, for some critics, is exemplified after the advent of German romanticism starting from the 1790's onwards, and for others, it reaches back as early as Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (1605). In fact, chronology of the theories of romantic irony would never have been a problem with Schlegel, for he intended to universalize them. In Schlegel's view, romantic irony can be present, to use Eichner's words, "in any product of the human mind that displayed adequate awareness of the paradoxical position of mankind itself." For instance, Schlegel points out in the *Lyceum* (the *Critical Fragments*) (1797) that "there are ancient and modern poems that are pervaded by the divine breath of irony throughout and informed by a truly transcendental buffoonery." In the *Athenaeum Fragments* (1798), Schlegel also finds in the epic of Homer full of the ironic combination of "intention and instinct," a tendency of "continuously fluctuating between self-creation and self-destruction." Furthermore, Furst regards Schlegelian irony
as being derived from "the practical models he acknowledged in Socrates, Petrarch, Dante, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Sterne and Diderot." Schlegel's achievement, Furst argues, "lies in his insights into the significance of their irony and his ability to crystallize those insights into a palpable, albeit complex theory."\(^7\)

Besides the universal and trans-historical crystallization of Schlegel's theory to justify Defoe's practice, not necessarily conscious practice, of romantic irony in *Moll Flanders*, socio-historical considerations about a radical ideology against the established order may also render parallel conditions that may make Defoe's private voice possible in the novel. As Schlegel states in the *Athenaeum Fragments*, "the French Revolution, Fichte's philosophy, and Goethe's *Meister* are the greatest tendencies of the age." Critics have established this trio as three sources of potential influence on Schlegel. Fetzer contends that the French Revolution "undermined the sanctity of an established order"; Fichte's *Theory of Knowledge* modified Kant's "analysis of man's fervent but futile attempt to attain absolute truth" by challenging the very existence of the "thing-in-itself" and postulating that "the ego, and not some mysterious transcendent force, is responsible for our perceptions of the empirical world"; and Goethe's novel *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* proved the "discrepancy between conception and execution," for "man's highest aims were forever to be frustrated by his innate shortcomings."\(^7\) One can also find similar background conditions in Defoe's
time. Mellor argues that "romantic irony is a way of thinking about the world that embraces change and process for their own sake" and that several background factors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries contributed to the formulation of romantic irony. Chief among them were socio-political revolutions, loss of faith in the hierarchical order in the universe, and John Locke's denial of any necessary connection between objects in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). These factors approximate the Schlegelian famous trio mentioned in the *Athenaeum Fragments*.

Kevin L. Cope's recent insightful study of the English Enlightenment sheds more light on the seventeenth-century paradoxical outlook on the infinite chaotic world. Cope argues that Halifax, for example, is preoccupied with a zest for a moral certainty that "is itself a stabilizing psychological response to instabilities in evidence." Stability and instability are a paradoxical formation in Halifax. Rules may capture and encompass the undercurrent of the unstable and the uncertain, but when one focuses on "the variable, unstable character of evidence," instability and incoherence loom so large that they reject any dictates of totalizing rules. Although Halifax is ardent about his use of the maxim to account for instabilities, the Halifaxian explanatory system, Cope argues, "stabilizes the boat not in order to sail toward a single truth, but in order to provide a platform for the free-floating clash of many drifting interests." Hence, Halifax's notion about a nation as "a Mass of Dough" to be molded into one systematic form is only, writes Cope,
"the nourishing bread of a but not the stable state." Halifax's thinking of the flexible and unfixed state and of the paradoxical nature of stability and instability anticipates the Kantian denial of absolute truth and the Schlegelian notion about one's view of poetry as only one true but limited view of the infinite nature of poetry. Finally, critics have also examined and evaluated Defoe's view of man as a short-sighted creature, his visions of the uncertain human lot and disorder of life, and the context of Defoe's age in terms of its doubt about the existence and nature of Providence in the universe. The chaotic world of change, process, and becoming in the Schlegelian sense of the word may likewise be reflected in Moll Flanders, as the private voice that strikes a dissonant tone about the mainstream belief in a universal order.

4.2. Chaotic Becoming and Uncertainty of Authorial Intention

That Moll as a finite human being drifts along toward growth in the chaotic world of becoming is not surprising to the reader. At the end of her marriage career, Moll expresses a sense of limitation in the infinite chaotic world, but she also indicates an enthusiasm for discovering her power to transcend herself and overcome her limitations in the process of becoming and growth. First, Moll knows her own inadequacies and is not certain about what exactly she can do to face the dilemma of a forty-eight-year-old widow,
who has lost her allure to recommend for any marriage proposals. Her descriptions about the dreadful state prior to her career as a thief indicate her self-awareness. "I sat and cried and tormented my self Night and Day; wringing my Hands, and sometimes raving like a distracted Woman; ... my Understanding was sometimes quite lost in Fancies and Imaginations." Reduced to a state of distress, Moll has no capacity to do anything but to cry and to bury herself in her own fancies as if she has lost contact with reality. Perhaps Moll is so much in her own finite subjective world that she does not know she has to do something about her predicament or to design a way-out. It is no wonder she "LIV'D Two Years in this dismal Condition" (190). Then, as soon as Moll reveals her self-consciousness, she moves beyond it by conquering her stasis and getting into action. "For a little Relief I had put off my House and took Lodgings, and I was reducing my Living so I sold off most of my Goods, which put a little Money in my Pocket" (190), an ironic touch about Moll's self-awareness of her limitations and her power to transcend them. Such a tendency sets the tempo for another cycle of the process. After she realizes the present crisis, Moll has to face another reality, still unable to have the slightest idea about what to do. Again acknowledging her limitations, she tells the reader, "I am very sure I had no manner of Design in my Head, when I went out, I neither knew or considered where to go, or on what Business" (191). In this fashion, Moll is depicting herself as wandering in the chaotic world where she knows nothing about how to
respond to the ever-changing reality. Having accepted her inadequacies once again, Moll sets out on the move to search for open possibilities, and the act of stealing in the chaotic outside world is ironically a means of overcoming the inadequacies in the process of becoming.

Such a process of becoming also takes form in a dialectic of creation, de-creation, and re-creation, which bears a resemblance to Hegel's dialectic method. John J. Richetti, in his stimulating book *Defoe's Narratives*, has studied the Hegelian dialectic in *Moll Flanders*. For instance, Richetti considers the Colchester elder brother's seduction as one such process. The young, naive, and spontaneous Moll is regarded as the thesis or the self, the elder brother as the antithesis or the other, while the narrating Moll is the third term or the synthesis "that results from the collision of self and other, the calculating self able to operate within the other, seeing the old spontaneous part of itself as merely obeying the determination of the other."

This dialectic process perfectly supports Richetti's thesis about the movement of Defoe's novels "towards the depiction of a dialectic between self and other which has as its end a covert but triumphant assertion of the self," a strong argument against the self's dependence on the other or the external world for definition. However, it is precisely this external negating other that differentiates from de-creation in the dialectic process of romantic irony. The negating other or de-creation in romantic irony takes place in the world within not without, for residence of the other in external circumstances will
not be part of the artist's self-destruction, thus short of the paradox of the ironist's simultaneous attachment and detachment.

Marriage to the Virginia planter is an emblem of Moll's attachment to and detachment from her own creation of the self that is involved in a dialectic process. First, the marriage is one of the fruits of Moll's creation of a masterful artist. Moll is equally at home in cheating and putting up a moral image of the self and tricks a man into marriage without, paradoxically, losing her integrity in the eyes of the victim. From the outset, Moll is fully aware of the disadvantage a woman has to face, that is, the small number of men available "for a woman to venture upon." They have been occupied with overseas businesses and carried away by war, so that "there is no Proportion between the Numbers of the Sexes; and therefore the Women have the Disadvantage" (74). But Moll, having a small fortune of about 500 pounds, passes for a lady with an estate of over 1500 to attract potential admirers, with the help of the Captain's Wife, who comes up with the plan and helps spread the word around. Moll does indeed succeed in singling out her man among a swarm of suitors. Moll's artistry in cheating without losing integrity lies in her preparing the groom-to-be for unpleasant surprises. With her man's diamond ring, Moll writes on the window pane in her chamber that "I'm Poor: Let's see how kind you'll prove." Anticipating the possibility of her testing him, the Virginia planter engraves a promise on the glass, "Be mine, with all your Poverty" (79). This is the promise Moll has expected of him, just
in case he is disappointed in discovering the truth later about Moll's fraudulence, and he will find it hard to eat his own words. Having thus not been pretentious herself or lying to him about the figure of her estate from her own mouth, Moll marries her desirable Virginia husband, who has a steady income of 1200 pounds a year from his plantations. The dowry he gains is Moll's 500 pounds, much more than Moll has prepared him for but much less than what the rumor has made him expect. The beauty of this marriage is that the groom has to admit to the bride, "I may perhaps tell the Captain he has cheated me, but I can never say you have cheated me" (83).

However, the artist's creation of a moral self in the handsome marriage bears the seed of de-creation in itself, as Moll's husband turns out to be her own brother. The Hegelian assertive thesis (the moral self) is confronted with the negating antithesis (the incestuous self) at the very moment of creating the image of a masterful artist in the marriage arrangement. Moll the artist is simultaneously attached to and detached from her own creation. The assertive self has artfully gained a husband suitable to her without losing integrity in his eyes, but at the same time the idea of incest means to de-create the bright side of the marriage, to mock Moll's moral self, and to negate self-creation, thus becoming a fusion of opposites or the Hegelian synthesis. The moral self has been proved to her brother/husband, but the negating incestuous self must not be exposed to him. So the dialectic fusion of creation and de-creation within the domain of marriage does not stagnate
here but moves further into her plan to cover up the incest, where both the thesis and the antithesis are also paradoxically incorporated. As "a good Husband" is "the most necessary Thing in the World" to Moll (76), she decides to save her marriage, in spite of the incest. After hearing her mother(-in-law)'s name and story, Moll cannot recognize her right away due to mixed motives, partly because "it might be difficult to convince her of the Particulars" and partly because she thinks the suggestion of incest "would have immediately separated me from my Husband" (89). Moll is so desperate to protect the marriage, a part of her artful creation, that she wishes she had not known the sibling relationship with her husband, for she says, "O had the Story never been told me, all had been well" (88). Knowing while hoping for not knowing her true identity itself is an ambiguous fusion of opposites-bound within the incestuous shame but wishing to remain outside with conscience. Then, knowing but refusing to confirm, Moll "liv'd with the greatest Pressure imaginable for three Year more, but had no more Children" (89). "The greatest Pressure" and "no more Children" in the three-year cover-up suggest her ambiguous dispositions and indicate a paradoxical mixture of moral confusion and a troubled conscience. Thus, the continuation of incest, a synthesis of both the thesis and the antithesis, is another indication of Moll's ironic instinct of simultaneous attachment to and detachment from her own creation of a moral self.
Finally, the dialectic tension between creation and de-creation dissolves in re-creation, a higher level of creation and a new conception of the self. This stage of re-creation is different from the first stage of creation, where Moll creates her moral self in the eyes of the man on whom she has played a trick. In re-creation, she not only convinces her brother-husband and her mother(-in-law) of her moral self but also shows to the reader the finite human being's moral awakening and growth. Tormented by her conscience, Moll says, "I loathed the Thoughts of Bedding with him, and used a thousand Pretences of Illness and Humour to prevent his touching me" (90). She also proposes to go back to England, knowing he would not go with her, because "it would be ruinous to his Affairs, would Unhinge his whole Family, and be next to an Undoing him in the World" (91), thus hoping to end "the worst sort of Whoredom" and "Misery and Destruction." Since Moll has eventually "refus'd to Bed with him," the husband thinks she is insane and threatens to confine her to a mad-house, which, Moll says, "would at once have destroy'd all the possibility of breaking the Truth out, whatever the occasion might be; for that then, no one would have given Credit to a word of it" (92). All these details suggest to the reader that Moll has gained some moral conscience after three years of hesitation to reveal the truth because of her mixed motives—initial uncertainty about her convincing power and her love for her brother-husband. She wants to put an end to the incestuous marriage before it is too late. Having convinced her mother of all "the Particulars," she alleviates her
brother-husband's terrible shock by preparing him for the news of incest, which demonstrates her concern and love for him as a brother. After all, Moll says, "I might love him well enough for a Brother, tho' I could not for a Husband" (99). Any "Mystery yet unfolded" about Moll that is in the brother-husband's suspicion, it goes without saying, is demystified in the end, for the real cause for her recent aversion to sleeping with him and her desire to return to England is not lack of passion nor evil craving; it is but the tragedy of incest. This re-creation of the self or the awakening of moral conscience in this last stage of the ironic process corresponds to what Richetti calls Moll's "dialectical transformation of disastrous social circumstances into personal affirmation and freedom" and her "new consciousness and a refined skill in the art of survival."76

Moll also acts as an ironic artist who creates, de-creates, and re-creates her image as a moralist in the necklace robbery, her second theft. In such an ironic procedure of Moll's maturation, one can employ John Locke's natural law to measure the stages of growth. Three of the Lockean principles of natural law must be considered: (1) man's right to self-preservation, (2) leaving enough for the preservation of others, and (3) not appropriating more than needed. Natural law for Locke governs not only the state of nature, an imaginary pre-historical state, but also society and political governments, because it is used to indicate "what is and what is not" and because "without natural law there would be neither virtue nor vice, neither the reward of
goodness nor the punishment of evil." Political power for Locke is justified
only in so far as it preserves man's natural rights, and Locke indeed insists,
"the binding force of civil law is dependent on natural law."79

The ironic process of growth to re-creation through creation and self-
destruction is clearly in Moll's reflections on this second theft. First, Moll is
performing a self-creation task when she remarks, "my own Necessities made
me regardless of any thing: The last Affair left no great Concern upon me, for
as I did the poor Child no harm" (194). Moll is here creating a self-image of
a widow who, with a moral conscience, steals only when driven by necessity.
Any reader who is familiar with natural law can see morality in Moll's act
and will accept her justification. Yet, the key words here are "I did the poor
Child no harm." On the one hand, they serve to reinforce Moll's denial of the
immorality of the theft, for she has done no harm to the child physically. On
the other hand, such a statement requires a rational clarification, which Moll
is going to offer to the reader, a clarification that embraces the danger of self-
destruction. If her justification for her crime on the basis of necessity is to
create a morally acceptable image of the self, Moll's follow-up reflections only
de-create this very image, and this self-destruction is embodied within her
attempt to moralize and to create the self image. The artist is simultaneously
bound to and distanced from her own creation: "I only said to my self, I had
given the Parents a just Reproof for their Negligence in leaving the poor little
Lamb to come home by it self, and it would teach them to take more Care of
it another time" (194). However witty and rational, this self-creating commentary no doubt contradicts Moll’s moral self, as though she is mocking her moral conscience or de-creating the self. It is clear that the reader will not judge, at least not in light of natural law, Moll’s robbery of the child as morally acceptable under the pretext of acting for the good of the victim or in Moll’s excuse that her stealing will prevent future crimes of the kind. That is why critics insist upon her ironic confusion with a moral vision. It is worth noting that when critics regard Moll’s preaching as ironic in the traditional sense, they are taking it as a product of Moll’s (or Defoe’s) intentions and are isolating this self-destruction stage from the whole ironic dialectic process, functioning to undermine Moll’s creation of a moral self. For Schlegelian irony, self-destruction stems from the ironist’s finite perceptions in the chaotic world of becoming, and irony grows out of this disparity between the finite and the chaotic rather than the intentions of the finite. Finally, the fusion of self-creation and self-destruction gives way to a new conception of the self. Moll then makes an endeavor to re-establish her image as a thief with a moral conscience. By focusing on the needs of the victim, Moll is implying an argument for the acceptability of her robbery since she, having been thrown back to the state of nature under necessity, has taken only what is more than the child needs, leaving enough for her preservation. About the necklace she has robbed, Moll says it "might have been formerly the Mother’s, for it was too big for the Child’s wear" (195). Moll is justifying
the theft by appealing to her natural rights since she steals for self-preservation, takes what is more than the child needs, and leaves enough to the preservation of the victim.81

The character's finite perceptions can hardly capture the fictional world of becoming in Moll Flanders, but so far the reader is watching the heroine suffer and is certain about her shortcomings as a finite being. Apart from this, the novel may also draw the reader into the fictional chaotic world of uncertainty, where the reader is whirled into it to join the character and the narrator on a ride through the "perplexities of searching" in the text. That is, the ironic ambiguities in the novel not only repudiate the certainty of authorial intention but also challenge Wolfgang Iser's phenomenological theory of reader response. Iser's theory of art "lays full stress on the idea that, in considering a literary work, one must take into account not only the actual text but also, and in equal measure, the actions involved in responding to that text." Iser stresses an "author-reader dialogue," which is an interplay between the authorial "pre-intentions" or "schematised views" in the text and the reader's imagination or participation. In other words, neither the author nor the reader has total autonomy. Within the scheme of the dialogue, the author invents certain controls to prevent the reader's subjectivity from "playing too dominant a part" and "gives him guidelines as to how he is to view the proceedings." Here, the author's guidelines, "pre-intentions," or "expectations" are intended for the implied reader, the reader who is
constituted by the text. Such a reader, having the authorial guidelines at his disposal, enjoys some degree of autonomy and makes his own choice, and "then he will fill in the picture accordingly" to the extent that he never has "the feeling that the author wants to lead him by the nose." In this light, Iser argues that in Fielding's *Joseph Andrews*, for example, the author's guidelines about the differences between his novel and the repertoire of the established genres disappear as the novel moves along, "so that the reader is left to discover the differences for himself." The Iserian reader shares autonomy with the author, and "the distance between the story and the reader must at times be made to disappear, so that the privileged spectator can be made into an actor."  

However, Schlegelian irony disrupts such Iserian shared autonomy of the author and the reader in *Moll Flanders*, and the narrator, who performs part of the author's artistic guidelines, distances the reader from herself. In fact, the narrator's role is undermined by her Schlegelian ambiguous dual perspective, and the reader is thrown into the chaotic textuality of the narrative. First, it is important to note Defoe the editor's intention behind the narrator's voices in the novel, intention that never falls into clear boundaries. One can find various degrees of moral preaching of the first-person narrators in Defoe’s major novels, but *Moll Flanders* is specially designed for this purpose. Unlike the prefaces to Defoe's other novels in which Defoe intends to let "a just History of Fact" speak for itself, the preface to *Moll Flanders*
states in explicit terms that the famous lady "is made to tell her own Tale in
modester Words than she told it at first" and that "the Copy which came first
to Hand, having been written in Language, more like one still in Newgate,
than one grown Penitent and Humble, as she afterwards pretends to be" (1).
So behind the narrator's persona, there masked the editor's (Defoe's)
intention. To reflect the "Penitent and Humble" side of Moll, Defoe makes her
pose as a narrator in the book and, approaching seventy years of age,
moralize her actions while delineating the history of her bumpy earlier years.
Critics have noted Defoe's narrative method involves two techniques that are
derived from the major writing techniques of the seventeen-century Royal
Society scientists Robert Boyle and Robert Hooke: precise description of
details with brief emotional response. The function of emotional responses or
reflections or preaching is to show the narrator's sincerity in repentance or
her endeavors for the effect of sympathy.84

The ambiguous double role of the narrator in Schlegelian irony can be
discerned in the bundle episode, where Moll, driven by necessity, commits her
first theft. Reality for Moll at this juncture of her career is no longer a
prewritten text with a fixed pattern but an infinite flux of uncertainties. One
way of identifying romantic irony in this episode is through the narrator's
reflections on the theft. As a finite human being, her perceptions can never
completely capture the chaotic world. Moll, as an ironic memoir narrator,
shows such a disparity in her narrative and performs an ambiguous double
role of the character and the narrator with both her involvement in and disengagement from the story she is telling. With fear and remorse in the wake of the incident, Moll remarks, "Perhaps, said I, it may be some poor Widow like me, that had pack'd up these Goods to go and sell them for a little Bread for herself and a poor Child, and are now starving and breaking their Hearts" (193). Here Moll the character tells herself that she may have robbed a poor widow who is in desperate need for food.

Nevertheless, the reader cannot take Moll's words too seriously. In the beginning of the theft scene, Moll describes that beyond the bundle "stood a Maid Servant with her Back to it" (191), implying the maid is sent by the "poor Widow" to sell the goods. The widow then cannot possibly be starving at the time, for she still has the financial capacity to hire a maid. If the maid is the "poor Widow" herself, Moll finds more than eighteen shillings together with the silverware and linen in the parcel, which suggests that the "poor Widow" would be foolish to have packed those goods in the bundle for sale with the hard-earned money in it. Also, when the widow has that much money on hand, she would not sell the bundle only to alleviate her family's starvation in the first place. The reader has been told in the midwife's first charging table that ten shillings can cover Moll's meals and lodging for a week in the midwife's house (164). It is also interesting that even just before her reflections on this theft, Moll reminds the reader that a loaf of bread costs six pence (190). According to the calculations of Gregory King, an
economist of Defoe's time, the average yearly income and expenses of servants and common laboring people in England in the year of 1688 (two years after Moll's 1686 dated memoir) were about fifteen pounds in a family of four.\(^8^5\) That comes down to roughly 6 shillings a week. Eighteen shillings and six pence in a family of two, then, could last six weeks to support both the widow and her child in the standard of living of the working-class family. Although Moll feels that she has robbed a starving poor widow just like her, her discovery of the money in the bundle proves her perceptions false.

Such a discrepancy indicates Moll's ambiguous double role as both a character and a narrator in the novel, who is engaged in a paradox of simultaneous attachment to and detachment from her narrative. The character's voice and the narrator's reflections often have distinctive boundaries in narrative point of view. One example will suffice. After Moll gives her Virginia husband her estate that amounts to less than half of his expectations, "he accepted it very thankfully." Moll then says, "And thus I got over the Fraud of passing for a Fortune without Money, and cheating a Man into Marrying me on pretence of a Fortune; which, by the way, I take to be one of the most dangerous Steps a Woman can take" (84). Here, the first "I" is Moll the character's persona, and the second the preaching narrator's. But the boundaries are not always so clear-cut. The narrator's voice may even be implicit in the character's actions. For instance, in the fire robbery episode, Moll pretends to rescue the lady of the house but comes with a mind to her
valuables. At the very moment of securing the booty, Moll meets with another woman who offers help to Moll and who, Moll says, "was one of the same Business with me, and wanted nothing but the Bundle" (205). No one doubts that Moll is breaking the ethical code here robbing the desperate lady, but the narrative cunningly suggests that had Moll not taken advantage of the fire and committed crime, people like the other woman would have done the same any way--she is only seconds behind Moll. This is not a justification for crime but is a plausible excuse to alleviate Moll's guilt. So when Moll whispers "go Child" into the new-comer's ear, the reader can sense the narrator's voice hovering over the scene, a forgiving voice hidden in the narrative of the robbery itself, although the narrator has never said a word about that excuse.

In similar fashion, Moll the narrator carries over her role in representing the story and thrusts through the mode of narration and participates in the plot of actions herself in this bundle episode. Moll the character, having discovered what is wrapped up inside the bundle, is "under such dreadful Impressions of Fear" when she says, "What am I now? A Thief!" (192). After a long night with a troubled conscience, Moll is "impatient to hear some News of the Loss; and would fain know how it was, whether they were a Poor Bodies Goods, or a Rich" (193). She then thinks she may have robbed a poor widow like her, who was going to sell the bundle. The "I" in "perhaps, said I, it may be some poor Widow like me" is clearly meant to be the
character's voice. But one can hardly attribute the voice of "some poor Widow like me, that had pack'd up these Goods to go and sell them" to the same Moll. Speculating on the polarity between "a Poor Bodies Goods" and "a Rich," the suffering Moll surely has a motive to imagine a robbery of "a Rich" in order to bleed some of her guilt and to soothe her troubled conscience. As she has already discovered the money in the package, the logical progression of her expectations in this context ought to be developed in the direction that Moll the character, with that motive in mind, rules out the possibility of having robbed a poor widow with a starving child. So Moll's remarks about the "poor Widow" do not fall into the character's reflecting space but into a space preserved for the narrator, the artist, who has stepped in and speculates the opposite, in spite of the character's worries. The narrator does not do this for nothing. On the one hand, she is showing her moral awareness in accord with her "Penitent and Humble" nature. On the other hand, by having Moll the character identify herself with her victim, the narrator is able to imagine a figure to simulate the very predicament the heroine is reduced to, so that the narrator can gain the reader's sympathy for the character and for herself as if she were this imaginary poor widow whose "bundle" or social security has been robbed.86

Only a narrator with an ambiguous double role can attempt this sympathizing accomplishment. Sympathy, one of the passions for Edmund Burke that can be a source of the sublime, is "a sort of substitution, by which
we are put into the place of another man, and affected in many respects as
he is affected." Following this Burkean idea of the "imaginary change of
situation," Adam Smith develops his theory of what he calls "moral
sentiments." For Smith, when one is suffering, "there may be some
correspondence of sentiments between the spectator and the person
principally concerned." Burke's idea is still valid here, in the sense that for
Smith the spectator must endeavor "to put himself in the situation of the
other, and to bring home to himself every little circumstance of distress which
can possibly occur to the sufferer." But Smith doubts a complete consolation
from spectators because of "the thought that they themselves are not really
the sufferers." The sufferer is aware of this possibility and "passionately
desires a more complete sympathy." Moll the narrator picks up a similar
scheme. After describing the character's melancholy frame of mind on the
brink of starving to death and pleading for the reader's sympathy on the
grounds of necessity, the narrator knows she needs to win more of the
reader's compassion for the character. She sympathizes with Moll the
character and places her in a position to sympathize with the "poor Widow"
and to obtain a correspondence of sentiments between what she calls "the
prospect of my own Starving" and that of the poor widow's. The role of the
spectator or the sympathizer, on the narrator's part, then turns into that of
the sympathizee who desires a more complete consolation from the reader,
the ultimate spectator. In other words, by pitying the victim for her desperate
circumstances in which the character is lodged, the narrator's voice, under
the persona of the character, is permeating into the emotions of the victim,
as an imaginary insertion into the sufferer's situation, in order to secure
sympathy for the character's desperate action and ultimately for the narrator
herself. So far, the narrator's design may be clear to the reader. However, the
artist's involvement in her own creation at this stage is balanced
simultaneously by detachment from it. With the narrator's reflections, under
the disguise of the character, on the possibility of having robbed a desperate
poor widow, she also disrupts her task of sympathizing and de-creates the
character, for the narrator can hardly justify harming someone in an
outrageous situation like the alleged poor widow.88

Furthermore, believing in the alleged identity of the poor widow and
later discovering her fictitious status, the reader, too, is imposed upon himself
an ironic two-fold role of the fictive reader (attached to the narrator) and the
actual reader (detached from the narrator), as a result of the ambiguous
ironies of the narrator's double vision. From the outset, the narrator expects
the fictive reader, the contrived reader her narrative intends to guide and
influence, to be attached to her tale. She actually reaches out to such a reader
before she presents the bundle episode: "O let none read this part without
seriously reflecting on the Circumstances of a desolate State...; it will
certainly make them think not of sparing what they have only, but of looking
up to Heaven for support, and of the wise Man's Prayer, Give me not Poverty
least I Steal" (191). The fictive reader may sympathize with the heroine, considering her desperate circumstances, and may also show further compassion for the starving thief when she is identified with a poor heartbroken widow with a devastated child crying for food at home. But when the actual reader, whose response is not always what the narrator expects, recognizes the injustice of one desperate widow robbing another, the reader is then detached from the narrator's mission of sympathizing and may argue against her immorality. Another layer of ironic ambiguity also resides in the fact that this detached reader then turns attached again and becomes a victim of the ironic ambiguity when taking the widow's identity as authentic. From this attached reader, by the time the reader discovers the fabricated identity of the alleged "poor Widow," then emerges a reader who is once again detached from the sentimentality of the narrator, a narrator who herself is disoriented by the chaotic world of the literary text. The narrator distances and drives the reader away from herself, and the only thing that draws the reader's attention is the chaotic textuality of the narrative. Such free-floating and indefinite movements of involvement and disengagement defy any conviction of certainty on the reader's part about authorial intention masked behind the narrator's persona: to show Moll's repentance or to disorient the reader?
CHAPTER 5

DEFOE'S "MAN-WOMAN" ROXANA:
A STUDY OF GENDER, REVERSAL, AND ANDROGYNY

A feminist reading of eighteenth-century fiction can take one (or a combination) of the following popular approaches: exposing the male ideology in its oppression of women, transcending ideology and delineating female true experiences, engaging a power struggle and moving inside the male dominance, or resisting patriarchy and moving outside the male order. Critics have provided us with insight by demonstrating these methods in eighteenth-century studies, but the emphasis characterizes a disruption of the male order by highlighting female power. This tendency marks a pattern of the distinctive either/or thinking in gender studies; it is what K. K. Ruthven calls an attempt, in saving the Kristevan system in feminist criticism, to take the maternal Semiotic as an alternative to the paternal Symbolic instead of concentrating on the Kristevan interplay between the two. For instance, such an emphasis can be seen in Laurie Langbauer's reading of romance as a move to the maternal chora and of the female body as discourse in the subject's struggle for power, and in Patricia Meyer Spacks' discussion about the female usurp of the male oppressors' power from the supreme power. Drawing on the Lacanian and Kristevan insights of feminist theory, the present chapter
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takes a somewhat different direction and departs from the popular approaches to feminist criticism after incorporating them. It will examine Defoe's *Roxana* (1724) in terms of female power, which may be a force that disrupts the male monopoly and threatens patriarchy when perceived as the Kristevan maternal chora. This feminist force, however, is not totally destructive as to perpetuate the dominance of the maternal. Instead, not conceiving feminism as oppositional practice for its ultimate goal as shown in the other approaches, this study will indicate Defoe's "Man-Woman" Roxana as the epitome of the reversal of the Lacanian Androgyny-Imaginary-Symbolic triad. This is a feminist mission that moves beyond the Imaginary or the Semiotic maternal chora into the primordial and degenderizing androgyny before the human being ever experiences the Lacanian sexual split or "lack." Defoe's novel marks a departure from male ideologies and stirs a ripple of dissonance from his traditional ideas in nonfiction, but it never perpetuates the dominance of female power. Roxana is, towards the end of the novel, a paradoxical figure with a homeless voice who rejects the distinctive either/or thinking in gender and is both subjected to man's laws of matrimony and at the same time capable of draining his power that is mandated by those laws.

*Roxana* invites different readings for feminist studies and provides the reader with an example of the Lacanian three-component model in reverse. To focus on only one part of Roxana's three-stage maturing process will not
do justice to the import of the whole novel. First, the ideologies of the male self can be exposed in their function to hold Roxana, the female other, in place as an ideal woman and a caring mother in the beginning of the novel; so can the brutal reality of her experiences as a whore be delineated by focusing on her material existence as a dependent commodity reified by men with their financial and social superiority in the patriarchal system. The reader can then locate a feminist maternal chora where Roxana reverses her traditional feminine role and engages in a power struggle against the male monopoly. More importantly, if the Lacanian model involves the progression of a triad from the primordial sexual Androgyny to the (maternal) Imaginary and then to the (paternal) Symbolic, Roxana launches a reversal of such a progression. What makes the present study different from other approaches is that Roxana's dynamic maternal force after the interplay between the Symbolic and the Imaginary does not remain inside the maternal chora nor moves back into the paternal order from which she is fleeing in the first place. It instead progresses into the primordial sexual androgyny, towards the end of the novel, where the degenderization of the human being and the deconstruction of cultural gender codes are achieved.

The three kinds of the voices of the self in the public, private, and homeless components correspond to the Lacanian triad in reverse and to the three parts of the novel with Roxana's relationship with the Dutch Merchant in the middle. Before her liaison with the Merchant in the first part of the
novel, Roxana is fixed in the traditional feminine role prescribed by culture in its paternal Symbolic (her youth, her first marriage to the Brewer, and her early career as a courtesan to the Jeweller and to the Prince), which constitutes Roxana's public voice about the female other dependent on the male ideology for definition. Following this is the second phase, the Imaginary, in which the self envisions a terrifying but blurring other in the "mirror" as symbolized in the moment when the Jew fixes his horrible gaze upon Roxana's face, which renders the other as an opaque reflection of the self. Here Roxana has her private voice by establishing a period of the maternal chora and reversing the cultural gender codes in her affair with the Merchant. Finally, the "Man-Woman" Roxana in her marriage to the Merchant pushes back into the sexual unity with the missing part of the primordial whole and degenderizes the human being in sexual androgyny, where she defies and deterritorializes a distinctive cultural gender orientation and orchestration. As Roxana disappears from the fictional world in the end, she disappears from both her "public domain" and "private sphere" and remains alien to the distinctive dichotomy between male ideology and feminist politics. The "Man-Woman" Roxana does not epitomize Defoe's notion of an ideal woman but a homeless androgynous figure who vanishes from the ideological arena.

5.1. Lacanian "Symbolic" and Roxana's Cultural Gender Roles
According to Jacques Lacan, the human being experiences two "lacks" in the process of becoming a subject. The first is conceived to be at the moment of birth in the mother’s womb, which is "situated at the advent of the living being, that is to say, at sexed reproduction." This is the moment, Kaja Silverman explains, "of sexual differentiation within the womb, but it is not realized until the separation of the child from the mother at birth." Silverman also maintains, "the subject is defined as lacking because it is believed to be a fragment of something larger and more primordial," a sexual androgyny or the original whole from which the human subject is derived. The subject's existence is "dominated by the desire to recover its missing complement." The second lack "suffered by the Lacanian subject," Silverman continues, "occurs after birth, but prior to the acquisition of language." This is a loss "inflicted by what might be called the 'pre-Oedipal territorialization' of the subject's body," the "orchestration" or cultivation (by the mother or nurse) of the infant's regulated "drives around sexual difference" in culture's genital economy. This second "lack" takes place between what Lacan calls the "mirror stage" or the "imaginary state" and the language-acquisition "symbolic order" in the process of human subject's psychological development. It takes place, according to Lacan, before the subject is "objectified in the dialectic of identification with the other, and before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject." "The child," according to Lacan, "at an age
when he is for a time, however short, outdone by the chimpanzee in instrumental intelligence, can nevertheless already recognize as such his own image in a mirror." In this pre-Oedipal or the Imaginary "mirror stage," the self, for the first time, perceives the other and thus forms the blurring notion of "the specular I," which is part of the other (usually the mother). For Lacan, the Symbolic is the "moment in which the mirror-stage comes to an end" and which inaugurates "the deflection of the specular I into the social I" with a distinctive sense of the self and the other. "It is this moment," writes Lacan, "that decisively tips the whole of human knowledge into mediatization through the desire of the other." The second "lack" or the Imaginary also corresponds to Julia Kristeva's feminist notion of the semiotic chora or the maternal rhythm of "uncertain and indeterminate articulation," where the infant's sexual "drives involve pre-Oedipal semiotic functions and energy discharges that connect and orient the body to the mother." It is the opposite of Symbolic meaning, a period where the bond between the child and the mother is experienced through infantile babbling and jabbering and non-sense baby talk before the regulation of the paternal Symbolic through the child's acquisition of language. Kristeva associates her "semiotic" to Lacan's Imaginary, the stage prior to the Symbolic. For Kristeva, the Lacanian "phallus," the supreme signifier in the Symbolic, "totalizes the effects of signifieds" and dominates human society in language. But the Semiotic, for Kristeva, precedes the Symbolic, and the mother's body, associated with the
Semiotic or the Imaginary, is "what mediates the symbolic law organizing social relations and becomes the ordering principle of the semiotic chora."  

As the human subject participates in language, the Symbolic apparatus disorients it from its flows of instinctual or libidinal drives and shoves them into repression. This way, the Symbolic functions to hold the "social I" or the subject in perpetuation, and the subject's alignment to appropriate gender roles is one of the aspects of subjection and fits right into traditional gender stereotypes. From now on, the child, through language acquisition, differentiates in its sexual roles and acquires a gender identity designed and imposed upon it by cultural codes. "A cultural code," Silverman states, "is a conceptual system which is organized around key oppositions and equations, in which each term is aligned with a cluster of symbolic attributes." For example, in the case of "men" and "women," those symbolic attributes are most likely to be dispersed around the dichotomy between "rational," "firm," "strong" and "emotional," "pliant," "weak." The eighteenth century sees an abundant manifestation of the public voice about such gender distinctions in its literature. Nussbaum notes John Hill's acknowledgement of the cultural gender codes in On the Management and Education of Children (1754): "Boys run, girls walk; boys swim in the pond, girls wash in their chamber. Much attention is directed toward the protection of girl's pale and delicate complexions, and natural and symmetrical shape." Nussbaum points out that eighteenth-century male ideologies also work to maintain the status quo, for
women "were encouraged to accept public perceptions as their 'character,'" and "discouraged from 'knowing' their own character or recognizing their intelligence" because to "know" one's character is to threaten "the possibility of maintaining the heterosexual gender system." Besides male writers, women novelists in the eighteenth century too, according to Spacks, "define a heroine by her weakness, showing how weakness and passivity become social resources," and she has identified the gender differentiation of the period along the lines of Edmund Burke's distinction between the beautiful and the sublime. The beautiful is associated with the fair sex ("smallness, delicacy, curving lines") while the sublime with the authority of a father and of God ("fortitude, justice, wisdom"). Not only is personality gendered but formal features such as fictional endings are supposed to be male/female distinctive. Following Nancy K. Miller's argument about gendered plots and stories in fiction, Schofield sorts out those two kinds of endings in eighteenth-century fiction. She contends that "male writers tend to favor 'happy,' whitewashed, patriarchally approved endings, whereas female writers subvert happy, satisfying closures and instead present unfulfilling, nagging, worrisome, tragic endings that underscore the sense of separateness in which women exist and write."99

Similarly, Roxana's role in the first part of the novel is gender distinctive, pertaining to the public voice of the self defined by male ideology. Before turning into an independent she-devil, Roxana is fixed in the grips of
the cultural gender codes as the (female) other of the (male) self: an ideal woman in her youth, a caring mother in her first marriage, and men's dependent commodity in her initial career as a whore. First, Roxana starts out to be what Defoe and his contemporaries would call an ideal woman. "Sharp as a Hawk in Matters of common Knowledge; quick and smart in Discourse..., BOLD, tho' perfectly Modest" in deportment, Roxana sings beautifully and dances "naturally" and "wanted neither Wit, Beauty, nor Money..., having all the Advantages that any Young Woman cou'd desire." This description of Roxana when she is fourteen covers almost everything Defoe said about an ideal woman nearly thirty years earlier in his 1697 proposal for "an Academy for Women." One must not mistake Defoe's idea of an ideal woman in that pamphlet, however, as feminist in nature. Although Defoe is an advocate for a women's college and believes that "the Capacities of Women are suppos'd to be greater, and their Senses quicker than those of the Men," he does perceive women from a "male gaze" and proposes that "the Ladies might have all the Freedom in the World within their own Walls and yet no Intriguing, no Indecencies, nor Scandalous Affairs happen; and in order to this, the following Customs and Laws shou'd be observ'd in the colleges...." We know what women's "Freedom" means within their own walls and under customs and laws. Besides, the purpose of educating women for Defoe in that proposal is "to breed them up to be suitable and serviceable," for he argues "not that I am for exalting the Female Government in the least:
But, in short, I wou'd have Men take Women for Companions, and educate them to be fit for it." Defoe even satirizes women for their inability to govern in a fictional female take-over of the government depicted in his Review.102

Roxana's gender distinctions also manifest in her role as a caring mother early in the novel. After the Brewer, her first husband, abandons her and her five children, Roxana, driven by necessity, has to give up the children to her relatives, but she shows a good image as a caring mother and says "if I had but one Child, or two Children, I would have done my Endeavour to have work'd for them with my Needle" (15). No luck with the relatives and when she is told to take her children into "the Parish keeping," her response further reinforces the caring mother figure. "A hundred terrible things came into Thoughts; viz. of Parish-Children being Starv'd at Nurse; of their being ruin'd, let grow crooked, lam'd, and the like, for want of being taken care of; and this sank my very Heart within me" (19). The last thing she would do at this moment, she makes us believe, is to part with her children. But she tells the reader that she is definitely in a difficult situation with them. "When I consider'd they must inevitably be Starv'd, and I too, if I continued to keep them about me, I began to be reconcil'd to parting with them all, any how and any where, that I might be freed from the dreadful Necessity of seeing them all perish, and perishing with them myself" (19). She is desperate and ready to grasp anything for a life-saver. But she makes it perfectly clear that she does not want to harm her own "Flesh and Blood."
Besides being an ideal woman and a caring mother from the outset, being held in place by male ideologies, Roxana is also a dependent commodity in men's possession in the early part of her career as a mistress. The notion of women as commodities is not a new one. For Marx and Engels, "the bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production." This is the fate not only for women; in fact, everyone in capitalist societies, for Marx, confronts this same dehumanizing dilemma. Georg Lukacs extends Marx's idea of objectifying the social character of men's labor into a concept of "reification" (or "thingification"), a process in which a person is transformed into a thing. For Lukacs, the capitalist society, through its ideologies, conceals the social relations of men with each other, which "appear as things and the relations of things with each other." Also interesting are Langbauer's comments on critical readings of the female body or prostitution as a metaphor for the conditions of women's reality. Langbauer maintains that sexuality in whoring, which is "relocated in terms of brute materialism and economics--the violence done to the body of the prostitute, the money paid her," becomes in some critics' readings "a crucial metaphor for the treatment of women in general."

The alignment of the materiality of the female body with her dehumanizing material conditions is relevant here for Roxana, who, through her self-commodification as a whore, participates in man's desire at the price of her own and "solidifies her bondage to the patriarchal system."
power to reify is first retained in the hands of a male in this part of the novel. Reification of woman’s body as a commodity by men finds its way into Roxana’s liaisons with the Jeweller and the Prince that all start out as financial transactions to the male’s advantage, unlike her later romance with the Merchant. Just as Moll Flanders, who gets five guineas from the elder brother of the Colchester family for his initial "assault" on her, Roxana receives somewhat the same treatment from the Jeweller, her landlord. "After kissing me twenty times, or thereabouts, [the Jeweller] put a Guinea into my Hand; which, he said, was for my present Supply, and told me, that he would see me again, before 'twas out" (31). Reification lies in Roxana’s body as a commodity that the Jeweller can purchase. He can win her over with money and later with the house (rent-free) and the furniture in it. Roxana’s body is reified in the form of a "product" and is just another thing that the Jeweller can buy with money. The money that he pays her is deceitfully meant to be a token of love or kindness while the relationship is not so sacred and pure at all, for Roxana throws Amy, her maid, into the Jeweller’s bed, which is a confession of whoredom that the Jeweller accepts by complying. The female body, money, love, and kindness are objects that all depend on the male dominated society for identification and realization. Roxana is certainly aware of herself as such a reified object having been made by a man, for she tells us: "he had made me what I was, and put me into a Way to be even more than I ever was, namely, to live happy and pleas’d, and on his Bounty I
depended" (35). Roxana, the person both in her present and in her perceivable future, and her gratitude for his love and kindness are all peripheral around the center of "his Bounty," around the center of reification of herself.

The French Prince's money also turns Roxana's body into an object of reification, consolidating the relationship between the male self and the female other, but this relationship deteriorates as Roxana draws close to her next phase, to the maternal chora. Her affair with the Prince begins with "a Black Box ty’d with a Scarlet Ribband, and seal’d with a noble Coat of Arms" delivered by the Prince's gentleman. "There was in it a Grant from his Highness...with a Warrant to his Banker to pay me two Thousand Livres a Year, during my Stay in Paris" (60). Of course, Roxana, as the inferior other should, receives the royal gift "with great Submission, and Expressions of being infinitely oblig’d to his Master, and of my showing myself on all Occasions, his Highness’s most obedient Servant" (60). Roxana at this stage as a reified object of the male is not as passive as when she is with the Jeweller. It turns out that she somehow has managed to turn the Prince's process of reifying her into an act of her own artful control. After she grants the Prince the ultimate favor, Roxana tells us, "he gave me Leave to use as much Freedom with him, another Way, and that was, to have every thing of him I thought fit to command" (66). Money, love, and sex are still changing hands in favor of the male as the agent who desires the female body. Although she cannot yet reverse the process of reification and thus disrupt
the gender codes by purchasing a man's labor, as she will later try to do to her Merchant, Roxana can now objectify herself as a commodity in the male gaze at her own artful command. She does not mature as a more skillful and more demanding whore aiming at greater material gain; she simply progresses onto the road of becoming a character of the maternal chora and later an epitome of the degenderization of man in the novel.

5.2. Lacanian "Imaginary" and the Reversal of Gender

The Lacanian Imaginary "mirror stage" or the Kristevan Semiotic maternal chora as a reversal of the paternal order in subverting the paternal Symbolic meaning characterizes Roxana's second phase in the novel--disruptions of the paternal cultural codes. Defoe's fictional characters suffer immensely from fear, real or imaginary, at some stage in their lives. The fear that Robinson Crusoe and Roxana suffer in his surprising discovery of the footprint and in her excruciating confrontation with the Jew has striking similarities in relation to the Lacanian Imaginary. Crusoe tells the reader about a "new Scene" of his island life: "I was exceedingly surpriz'd with the Print of a Man's naked Foot on the Shore, which was very plain to be seen in the Sand." While a rational human being would, in David Hume's view, logically conclude that the other print may have been "effaced by the rolling of the sands or inundation of the waters," the sight of this single footprint
takes Crusoe's reason away. "I stood like one Thunder-struck, or as if I had seen an Apparition." Homer O. Brown's reading of this scene illuminates the possibility of linking Crusoe's discovery to the Lacanian "mirror stage." About the possible causes of the mysterious footprint, Brown argues, Crusoe's "speculations—the chimera, his own foot, his own shadow, an evil conscience, the curious ability to see himself as another would see him—amount to a confusion between the self and the other." For Brown, fear of the other determines "the need for concealment" of the identity of Defoe's narrators in relation to their play of names. He also contends that "unable to accept the given definition of himself, the will and legacy of his father, the world of law, Robinson experiences himself as incomplete and searches mistakenly for completion in the world outside." However, Brown never explicitly connects the confusion of the self and the other to the Lacanian "mirror stage"; he never looks at the footprint as the Lacanian "mirror" image of the self as an incomplete subject after the sexual division. The other part (the other footprint) is permanently missing. First, Brown's idea of "allurement of the world offering some form of completion to the self" can never happen in Lacan's notion of the human subject after the "lack." The self remains incomplete since it cannot find completeness or unity with the missing component of the sexual androgyny or the original whole of the primordial being from which the gendered subject is derived. Even heterosexual union and procreation, which Silverman considers to be the "only resolution to the
loss suffered by the subject as the consequence of sexual division," are far from possible for Crusoe on his island because there is no sex whatsoever involved in his wandering life in the outside world, for women, Watt points out, have only the economic, not the sexual, role to play in the novel.108

Second, it can be argued that the footprint symbolizes the "mirror" image or Crusoe's own "Shadow" and thus reflects the self in the Imaginary. The obscure difference between the self and the other also applies. Crusoe can hardly distinguish the self and the other, which, as he speculates, can be the "Shadow" of himself or the other things that he thinks may be the work of his own imagination.

In similar fashion, Roxana and the Jew confront each other with the same sort of fear that highlights Crusoe's scene of mystery and horror. This confrontation in Roxana indicates the beginning of the heroine's private voice and her reversal of the Lacanian model from the Symbolic in the first part of the novel to the Imaginary in the second part. When the Merchant decides to help Roxana with the transferral of her estate to a London bank and asks the Jew to appraise her jewels, the scene goes as follows:

As soon as the Jew saw the Jewels, he falls a jabbering in Dutch, or Portuguese, to the Merchant, and I could presently perceive that they were in some great Surprize, both of them; the Jew held up his Hands, look'd at me with some Horror, then talk'd Dutch again, and put himself into a thousand Shapes, twisting his Body, and wringing up his Face this way, and that Way, in his Discourse; stamping with his Feet, and throwing abroad his Hands, as if he was not in a Rage only, but in a meer Fury; then he wou'd turn, and give a Look at me, like the Devil; I thought I never saw anything so frightful in my life. (112-3)
Note that the Jew's body gesture and jabbering in a language incomprehensible to Roxana approximate the semiotic rhythm between the infant and its mother in the maternal chora. Here the self confronts the other for the first time. The self and the other in this scene work both ways and reflect each other as the devil, just as Crusoe thinks that he has seen "an Apparition" in his other, the footprint. The self can first be the Jew, for he looks at Roxana "with some Horror" as though he envisioned the devil, while this devil may just be a "mirror" image (Roxana's face) or the other that reflects the self (the Jew) who is looking into the "mirror." The self can also be Roxana, who tells us that "I thought I never saw anything so frightful in my life." She may have just seen, in the Jew's face, in the "mirror" image, or in the other, a reflection of herself who is just as terrifying to the Jew as he is to her. This blurring and horrible self in the Semiotic or the Imaginary makes the reversal of the Lacanian model possible in the novel with one differentiation: Roxana fears and abhors the other and refuses to identify with it, while the other in the Lacanian "mirror" is always "a pleasing unity" that the narcissistic self finds and something with which the ego can identify. Lacan's self moves from the Imaginary to the Symbolic in the sense that the self is held as the gendered subject in language or the male symbolic order. Accordingly, Crusoe finally turns into the symbolic order "through the desire of the other" by recognizing the authority of the Father and accepting the divine power after his isolation and alienation on the
island. Roxana, however, establishes a reversal of the Lacanian model by inverting the gender codes and defying the (male) divine power, which can be characterized as the initiation of the maternal chora or the disruption of the meaning of the (male) Symbolic. Roxana, at this point, is like a true feminist with a private voice hailed by Helene Cixous, who calls for a return of the repressed of the paternal culture by "breaking the codes that negate her."  

The disruption of cultural codes begins with the reversed role that a diabolical mistress plays in the male-dominated society. In this maternal chora, the gender stereotypes have their opposite boundaries, and Roxana is no longer weak, dependent, and sentimental. In a word, she is not fixed in a space in which the male would like to visualize her. Rather than being a feminine prey to men in the paternal order, Roxana undergoes a metamorphosis and occupies a power zone that is generally reserved for men. She becomes an evil woman, a victimizer who is empowered with masculine qualities such as reason and the ability to govern and is able to pose a threat to patriarchy by what Backscheider would say "feminizing" and weakening the male and robbing him of his reason and will. First, Roxana is no longer depicted in this second phase as an affectionate mother when she is fixed in the Symbolic. For one thing, the Merchant rightly accuses her of having no "common Affection of a Mother" because she decides to "ruin" her baby she has from the Merchant and to bear it out of wedlock. Also, Roxana herself tells the reader, "I wou'd willingly have given ten Thousand Pounds of my
Money, to have been rid of the Burthen I had in my Belly" (163). One can see no trace of a caring mother figure left in her.

Second, in contrast to her early career, Roxana's position with a man in this maternal chora has been reversed. While the Jeweller and the Prince reify her body with the money they pay for her sexual services, Roxana is in a position to reify the Merchant's labor, when she makes a financial offer to the Merchant, for rescuing her out of the disaster with the Jew in Paris: "If he wanted Money, I would let him have any Sum for his Occasion, as far as five or six thousand Pistoles" (141). Of course the Merchant refuses the money because he has something else in mind. Thus, the focus is once again switched to the issue of sex. It turns out to be no less dehumanizing for the Merchant. The reversed roles of both sexes are clear here in this love affair. The Merchant succumbs to Roxana's charm and is feminized and weakened. Toppling from male power, he is actually begging her to throw him a bone and pleading "since you have been so kind as to take me to your Bed, why will you not make me your Own, and take me for good-and-all?" (145), whereas Roxana reasons to herself that "to resist a Man, is to act with Courage and Vigour" (152). Roxana has thwarted the Merchant's plan to marry her through sleeping with her first. Although Roxana used to be dehumanized by the Jeweller and the Prince, right now she turns the table around and is dehumanizing the Merchant and reifying his labor. Sex, though still a reifying act here, is no longer a game in which the male calls the shots,
no longer a game played to the male's advantage. Roxana designs the sexual encounter to "balance accounts," which is more than the money Roxana has proposed to repay the Merchant in reifying his labor. "The Favour of Lying with a Whore," says Roxana, is equal to "all the Debt I ow'd him for saving my Life, and all my Effects" (144). Dehumanization on the Merchant's part lies in Roxana's question: "Where is the Man that cares to marry a Whore, tho' of his own making?" (145) and in her upsetting his plan: "his Project of coming to-Bed to me, was a Bite upon himself, while he intended it for a Bite upon me" (144). For the Merchant, to plot such a scheme in order to consummate a marriage is dehumanizing enough, and to fail in the scheme is even more shameful.\footnote{112}

Moreover, apart from the fact that Roxana is endowed with such male strength as "subtle reasoning" and reasoning strongly on her argument about matrimony as the Merchant has more than once acknowledged, she is also an antithesis to the idea of women's inability to govern. The Dutch Merchant, in his public voice, is perhaps referring to that gender stereotype depicted in Defoe's \textit{Review}, for he warns Roxana that women are not capable of managing estates; "their Heads were not turn'd for it, and they had better choose a Person capable, and honest, that knew how to do them Justice...; then the Trouble was all taken off their Hands" (153). However, Roxana's private voice disapproves him immediately. "It was a dear Way of purchasing their Ease," says she, "for very often when the Trouble was taken off their
Hands, so was their Money too; and that I thought it was far safer for the Sex not to be afraid of the Trouble, but to be really afraid of their Money" (153), and she has proved her point. Roxana rebels against traditional female financial disabilities by "her shrewd investment and financial management as a 'she-merchant.'" Having left Paris, Roxana bids a farewell to her old days as "a Lady of Pleasure" and welcomes the advent of "a Woman of Business" (131). With her experience of having successfully handled bills and dealt with jewelers and bankers, Roxana is confident to say that "by managing my Business thus myself, and having large Sums to do with, I became as expert in it, as any She-Merchant of them all" (131). Besides her lengthy descriptions about how she has secured her transferred estate in Holland, Roxana's business with Sir Robert Clayton in London gives the reader a picture of a woman who is in control of her own estate while keeping her eyes open to advice. Sir Robert advises Roxana to stow away 1000 pounds as a long-term C.D. so that the amount will double in ten years (167). About this handsome financial proposal, Roxana first tells him that she has not been completely sold to the idea of long-term banking. She complains to him, "you are contriving how to make me a rich Old Woman, but that won't answer my End; I had rather have 20,000 l. now than 60,000 l. when I am fifty Year old" (168). She does not want to invest so much in banking, so when she accepts the offer, she shows her businessman-like restraint and caution by cutting down the lay-up to seven hundred pounds a year. Roxana
does show a little of her management in terms of accepting sound financial
determination and modifying expert opinion.

Roxana's banking business is only part of her means to make money. If this avenue involves the help of a man like Sir Robert, her career as a courtesan is solely done on her own. The later married Roxana for one time compares herself in her past life of crime to "a Passenger coming back from the Indies..., after many Years Fatigues and Hurry in Business," and this, interestingly enough, parallels to and equates the Merchant's "all the Fatigues of so many Years Hurry and Business" (243-4). Lois A. Chaber notes that Moll Flanders has escaped from "the feminine cycle of reproduction into the historical social cycle of production," and Carol Houlihan Flynn has studied the infamous body economy in Roxana as a struggle against materiality.114 Like Moll, Roxana devotes herself to a business that also involves a social cycle of production, a business of whoredom and of a body economy. While Chaber considers an unwed mother like Moll as the producer (of babies) and the governess as the capitalistic entrepreneur, both the producer (the female body) and the entrepreneur (the pimp) are incorporated in Roxana herself. The physical Roxana (her body) is the producer of sexual gratification, the "product" purchased by the consumer (the whoremaster), who is brought to the site of production by the marketing Roxana, the capitalistic entrepreneur. Moreover, like Flynn's Roxana who presents her body for a material gain, "to overcome a fundamental fear of bodily needs,"
both the producer and the businesswoman (here all in one) also profit financially from the body; in some cases, the producer (like John Cleland's Fanny Hill) also shares the pleasure and thus splits the "product" for which the consumer pays. However, Roxana here in the second phase is not at a stage, where, as Flynn contends, she has to "feign compliance and submission" in order to maintain independence. Flynn examines how Defoe "creates characters driven by desire and necessity to express themselves through bodies that eventually betray." The present study, by contrast, is more concerned about the way the body works for the feminist Roxana.

While Sir Robert helps Roxana with her bank investment, which eventually amounts to 2,000 pounds later on, her "Principal" (35,000 pounds) comes from the main industry which is kept back from Sir Robert without any of his assistance. "He applauded my Way of managing my Money, and told me, I shou'd soon be monstrous rich; but he neither knew, nor mistrusted, that with all this Wealth, I was yet a Whore, and was not averse to adding to my Estate at the farther Expense of my Virtue" (171). The reason why Roxana is "not averse to" continuing her reliance on whoring as her main stock is that it is the only way that answers her end without any help from or joint venture with a man like Sir Robert, for she is both the producer and the businesswoman. That is why she does not want to totally depend on Sir Robert; that is why she rejects even the trustworthy and shrewd Sir Robert's idea of marrying a well-to-do merchant he introduces to
her, hoping to increase her wealth, not to mention her earlier refusal of the Merchant's proposal for matrimony. The sole rationale behind all her marriage refusals, a point that she has so painstakingly tried to establish in the novel, is obviously to maintain her financial independence, for she asserts that "a Mistress makes the Saying true, that what a Man has, is hers, and what she has, is her own" (132). Or it is even more than that, to prove her argument that "a Woman was as fit to govern and enjoy her own Estate, without a Man, as a Man was, without a Woman" (149), and she really is such a woman.

Finally, Roxana's repudiation of cultural codes in the maternal chora resides in her denial of the (male) divine order. In contrast to Robinson Crusoe, who evolves from the Imaginary into the Symbolic "through the desire of the other" in his recognition of God's plan and his religious conversion, Roxana rejects that Symbolic and openly disobeys the power of God in her maternal chora. Defoe in his early years was surely educated in Calvinistic principles, and in many of his conduct books he adhered to those values. However, it is not surprising that Defoe, other than dealing with accepted ideas in his fiction, may develop a different voice in it. Such a voice tends to be dissonant from the public voice in his nonfiction. Many critics have identified Defoe's private voice about religion in his novels. Watt points out that impotence of religion or secularization and de-horrification of Calvinist notions of physical labor contribute a great deal to individualism in
Robinson Crusoe. In contrast to J. Paul Hunter's linking Crusoe's "original sin" to stories of Jonah and the prodigal son, (which "were frequently used as exemplar by the Puritan preachers to warn against restlessness, filial disobedience, and failure to follow one's calling"), Leopold Damrosch argues that "Defoe's story curiously fails to sustain the motif of the prodigal."115 In similar manner, Roxana rejects the divine power when it comes to the laws of matrimony.

Once again as the voice of reason and public opinion, the Merchant presents to Roxana the traditional views of matrimony after hearing her lengthy infamous argument about the difference between a wife and a whore. "He first hinted, that Marriage was decreed by Heaven; that it was the fix'd State of Life, which God had appointed for Man's Felicity" (151). The Merchant's remarks surely echo Defoe's idea of matrimony in his Conjugal Lewdness (1727), where Defoe defines matrimony as "GOD's holy Ordinance."116 But Defoe's private voice is different in fiction from his public voice in non-fiction. Declining to marry and determined to give birth to the baby out of wedlock, Roxana renounces the laws of matrimony and says "I cou'd not reconcile my Judgment to Marriage" because, as she argues with the Merchant, "the Laws of Matrimony puts the Power into your Hands; bids you do it; commands you to command; and binds me, forsooth, to obey" (151). Roxana's remarks here are a harsh criticism of the eighteenth century matrimonial law that has troubled her, which puts a woman in a financially
and social inferior position, for in the early century, once a woman "entered into marriage her husband had legal rights to any real or personal property that she owned." What is important here is that Roxana implies injustice in what the Merchant deems as the sacred laws of matrimony. Not only is it the male subject in a husband that Roxana wants to reject, but also the (male) divine power that she disobeys. That is why the Merchant warns her against blasphemy. "You restrain yourself from that Liberty, which God and Nature has directed you to take; and, to supply the Deficiency, propose a Vicious Liberty" is "neither honourable nor religious" (157). But Roxana insists on doing it in spite of his religion.

Furthermore, the divine power, according to Spacks, is the ultimate extension of the father's authority, power, and terror. The supreme power, which bestows the power of the paternal, belongs to His paternal nature. This paternal connection between God and man, Spacks finds it in Burke's notion of sublimity, which is "an essentially 'masculine' quality, associated with 'the authority of a father'." This paternal bond between the divine and the human perfectly corresponds to the Calvinist doctrine that man was created in His own image, for John Calvin believes that man is "the most noble and most excellent masterpiece, in whom the justice, wisdom, and goodness of God appears." The paternal figure in the image of God, for instance, is no stranger to Defoe's Captain Singleton. He reveres William the Quaker and calls him "my Ghostly Father." The title rightly suits him, as discussed in
Chapter 3. Besides William's foresight and prophetic power in his dream about meeting with Captain Avery, he has for many times saved Singleton from disasters; one among them is the narrow escape (Singleton thinks it is God's deliverance) from the Island of Ceylon where the savages try to entice Singleton and the crew to come ashore, a would-be catastrophe for Singleton. Also as Chapter 3 indicates, Roxana takes her Merchant as such a male incarnation of the supreme power. After the Merchant, who she later thinks is a prophet and has more than human knowledge (160), has helped her through the Jew's attempted blackmail, Roxana tells the reader: "Had I had any Religion, or any Sense of a Supreme Power managing, directing, and governing in both Causes and Events in this World, such a Case as this would have given any-body room to have been very thankful to the Power who had not only put such a Treasure into my Hand, but given me such an Escape from the Ruin that threaten'd me" (121). Had Roxana any sense of the "managing, directing, and governing" God, she would interpret the message as a reward, not punishment, by the supreme power for all her "mischiefs," quite opposite to the standard religious revelation. Even worse than that, Roxana juxtaposes the supreme power with the human power and shows her gratitude to the Merchant for her deliverance while she is aware that the religious creed ordains that power solely in God. Other than being unreligious, Roxana here ensures the paternal link between the divine and the human only to defy such paternal power in her maternal chora.
5.3. Roxana's Androgyny and the Degenderization of Man

In the late seventeenth century, as David Blewett points out, "the idea that mutual affection was an essential ingredient in marriage emerged and prevailed" against the patriarchal idea of property trading. The idea of mutual affection is advocated in Defoe's conduct books, where Defoe states that "the Matrimony Duty is all reciprocal" and that the union of the sexes is for "compleating their mutual Felicity." In similar fashion, the Dutch Merchant, a representative of the public voice, tells Roxana about matrimony that "where there was a mutual Love, there cou'd be no Bondage; but that there was but one interest; one Aim; one Design; and all conspir'd to make both very happy" (149). Roxana's marriage to the Merchant, however, complicates such an ideal. The marriage is not a symbol of mutual affection; the discussion about Roxana's feigned obedience in Chapter 3 proves that. If Roxana as a whore in the second phase, in the maternal chora, poses a threat to patriarchy, the married Roxana is no longer such a figure in the last part of the novel. Roxana knows that she cannot solve the problem of injustice in gender hierarchies by sustaining the terrifying Medusa's face to men as an evil woman, perpetuating the maternal chora and reversing the gender roles, preserving "herstory" in place of "history," or subsuming the other sex under dominance. It is also far from truth that Roxana in marrying the Merchant
returns to the proper sphere for women designed by the paternal order—losing her identity, as William Blackstone sees it in *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1753): "By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law: that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of husband." Instead, Roxana departs from those ideologies and idealizes her man-womanhood. Rather than incorporating "the very being of woman" into that of husband, or vice versa, her aim is truly to carve up men's territory of liberty, for she says "I knew no Reason the Men had to engross the whole Liberty of the Race" (171), and to claim her equal status in it. In so doing she ends up as an androgynous "Man-Woman" who embodies the cultural attributes of both sexes as an interplay, deterritorializes the either/or thinking in gender hierarchies, and degenderizes the human being.

While Roxana's interplay between the paternal and the maternal is similar to Langbauer's discussion of the woman's double role in Mary Wollstonecraft, degenderization should be distinguished from such a double role. Roxana, while engaging an interplay, does not fall back into the Symbolic for a struggle for total control but is degenderized into the sexual androgyny state of the Lacanian triad. Such a degenderization does not consist in the reversed role of a woman, as in Roxana's maternal chora, or in a return to the paternal, but in the heroine's androgynousness that unifies both gender boundaries within one individual. According to Langbauer, the
mother in Wollstonecraft's novel *The Wrongs of Woman* (1798) is a half man and carries out a double role, both outside and inside romance. Romance, "female" in nature (a patriarchy-designated sphere proper only to women) and an inferior genre as the other of the novel, is derided just as woman is in patriarchy. Langbauer regards romance as a world of maternal chora and outside the male order. She re-evaluates this genre and gender subordination of romance and women as being excluded from the paternal power structure but re-inserts the dynamic force of genre and gender back into the paternal or the Symbolic to struggle for power in relation to the subject's use of language. The mother in Wollstonecraft, Langbauer writes, is both inside the Kristevan Symbolic (outside romance), a phallic mother "in command of language even to speaking new terms for her own self-definition," and at the same time outside it in the maternal chora (inside romance), "subverting the order and meaning of language, partaking of the romance of the infantile and unutterable." This double role or the Kristevan interplay between the paternal and the maternal is recognized in Maria's desire "to be a father, as well as a mother." However, Langbauer's half-man woman, after the interaction between the paternal and the maternal, progresses in the direction of the Lacanian triad not to the primordial sexual androgyny but back to the paternal Symbolic, for the double role, writes Langbauer, allows the woman writer "to make sense--and nonsense--within the paternal order." Just as she tries to establish "the novel's connections to the romance it
rejects" in positing that "women and romance also collapse back into the male order" (the novel) in Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote* (1752), Langbauer has thrust the dynamic interplay between the paternal and the maternal into the paternal order as a (female) subject's power struggle within the paternal Symbolic by using the subject's power of representation through language. The feminist power struggle within the paternal Symbolic is the inevitable outcome of Langbauer's genre and gender study, for she deems subordinating women and romance as patriarchal "local power" at best but women's "system of construction and representation" in the Symbolic as "total control." After the interplay between the Imaginary and the Symbolic, feminist characters in Langbauer's reading move in one direction, but Roxana moves in the other along the line of the Lacanian triad.

First, Roxana's marriage to the Merchant stands a sharp contrast to Pamela's to Mr. B., where Pamela makes all efforts to reconcile with the family and to get accepted finally by Lady Davers, Mr. B.'s sister. Similar to Langbauer's project, Richardson's novel in the first part creates a Pamela who obtains her social mobility through the subject's use of discourse (the paternal Symbolic), through her letters and the stories told in them, and her desire for reconciliation and acceptance in the second part secures her place in the paternal order. Roxana, however, does not marry the Merchant just to move back into the paternal order but to maintain her feminist self-government and be a married woman at the same time without coming to terms with the
laws of matrimony. She no longer wants to be a "She-Devil" to men as she used to be in her maternal chora, but she still preserves part of it and borders on her past devilish independence (masculinity) and her past virtues as a wife and a mother (femininity). She is both inside and outside a paternal institution like marriage and becomes a subverting force to the either/or thinking in gender studies, for to remain inside the paternal order or stays outside is to reinforce that distinctive thinking pattern or to reside in that gender "home." A Married woman in traditional views, as Roxana says to the Merchant when she refuses to tie the knot with him in her maternal chora, is "a meer Woman ever after, that is to say, a Slave" (148). The married woman envisioned in patriarchy is only the other to her husband. What Roxana longs to become is an androgynous being, for she asserts, "I wou'd be a Man-Woman; for as I was born free, I wou'd die so" (171). Her marriage to the Merchant epitomizes her ideal feminist vision of such an androgynous "Man-Woman" state.

By the time Roxana gets married again she is "pretty near Fifty, and too old to have any Children" (245). A woman already passing her child-bearing age and no longer performing her physiological function as a woman participating in the patriarchal reproduction cycle, Roxana tells her Merchant that she would like to offer what she has left with her--to "join Stocks" or combine the "two Pockets" with him. This is because, she says, "he had offer'd and promis'd that I shou'd keep all my own Estate in my own Hands; yet,
that since I had taken him, I wou'd e'en do as other honest Wives did, where I thought fit to give myself, I shou'd give what I had too" (250). It is mistaken to consider Roxana is surrendering control of her estate to the Merchant.\textsuperscript{124} While she still clings to her idea of independence and reminds the Merchant of his early promise not to touch her estate, Roxana is aware of the consequences of marriage that she has chosen to enter into; that is, she is aware of what expectations a husband has for a woman who is already inside matrimony. The laws of matrimony enable the man to take control of the woman's possessions, but since she has achieved economic independence outside marriage, Roxana can manage to remain outside his control. Even before her proposal for mixing the "two Pockets," Roxana has already given the reader a sign of being both inside and outside the paternal order, for she has had about eight thousand pounds in reserve and has kept it back from the Merchant, to provide for her two daughters (260). On the one hand, Roxana is not an honest wife after all as she protests in what is later shown as her faked attempt to join estates. Her cheating about the reserve reminds the reader of her wicked past, the demonic maternal side of her that is frightening to the male. On the other hand, she is also attached to the heart of an affectionate mother who worries about the fate of her two daughters (before the troublesome Susan turns up in her narrative), just as she is supposed to do as a caring mother when she is in the symbolic order in the first part of the novel.
Judging from the Merchant's promise and his character, Roxana knows she will not have to "join Stocks," but her tongue-in-cheek proposal is not risk-free. As Roxana shows the Merchant all the mortgages and rents she owns, all laid down on the table for him to take, she says "I trembled every Joint of me" because for her "all this was acting." Thank goodness, the Merchant "look'd at them a-while" and says "I will not touch them" (259). Roxana's estate, the Merchant says as he has promised as one of the terms of marriage (244), is "for your own Use, and the Management wholly your own." Given the fact of Roxana's "acting" and of her early equation of whoredom with business, the reader cannot miss the irony here when Roxana reasons to herself for not insisting on mixing her tinted money with the Merchant's honest estate: "Shall my ill-got Wealth, the Product of Prosperous Lust, and of a vile and vicious Life of Whoredom and Adultery, be intermingled with the honest will-gotten Estate of this innocent Gentleman...?" Besides this pretension, Roxana also, as Spiro Peterson notes, uses "the machinery of the trust" that was sanctioned in the late seventeenth century by the courts of equity, to acknowledge her right denied by common law, by declaring to the Merchant, "All the Pretense I can have for the making-over my own Estate to me, is, that in Case of your Mortality, I may have it reserv'd for me, if I outlive you" (259). No matter what pretensions she puts on, Roxana has successfully struggled to stay outside the paternal grips of marriage while inside it. Paradoxically, she works within the order
of marriage while accepting no rules like a free-woman mistress in her maternal chora, thus maintaining her balance between the paternal and the maternal and deterritorializing distinctive gender boundaries. Having now kept the "two Pockets" separated and preserved her right to govern her own estate, Roxana, out of her duty as a "good wife," asks the Merchant to save all his money and offers to use her own two thousand pounds a year ready-money as the spending for "the mutual Subsistence of the Family" (259). As a provider and an independent woman, Roxana is also apt to contribute to the paternal family; she is both a married woman subjugated to patriarchy and a masculine "independent mistress" free to manage her own estate.

Another indication of Roxana's man-woman status has to do with her relationship with Susan, her daughter, who is a reintroduction of Roxana's past to her peaceful married life. In response to the symbol of her past, Roxana demonstrates both her tender femininity and her evil masculinity that rejects such tenderness, revealing her degenderized identity of a man-woman. First, for Roxana, the present represents her virtuous life as an "honest wife" and the past her life of wickedness as a she-devil. Trying to prevent the Merchant's "discovering, that he had in his Arms a She-Devil, whose whole Conversation for twenty-five Years had been black as Hell," Roxana tells the reader that "all the Satisfaction I could make him, was to live virtuously for the Time to come, not being able to retrieve what had been in Time past" (301). The she-devil in her past maternal chora has reversed
her gender role as a female, but that masculine past always sneaks up on her so that she is ever locked in the past/present predicament, wandering between (masculine) wickedness and (feminine) virtuousness and embodying degenderization. Her dilemma with her past is clearly shown in her first decision for social apartness, which springs from her desire for breaking with her wicked past, "retiring from my old Acquaintances, and consequently from the vile abominable Trade I had driven so long" (207). She finds her "perfect Retreat" in the Quaker's country house. But the past keeps creeping back on her, and she says she is "like a Fish out of Water" while having a little peace and quiet in the country (214). What Roxana misses is the "tenderest" Merchant who, she is sure, is still under her control after eleven years since they broke off in Paris. "I flattered to myself, that if I cou'd but see him I could yet Master him" (214). Through her maid, Amy, who runs an errand for her in Paris inquiring about all her past acquaintances--the Brewer her husband, the Jew, the Prince as well as the Merchant--all the bits and pieces of information about Roxana's past, besides the "principal Errand" to find the Merchant, keep coming in, despite her initial desire for retirement. The interaction between the past and the present is a never-ceasing process in her seclusion.

Since Roxana has experienced both her feminine role of subjection (in the Symbolic) and her masculine role of power (in the Semiotic) in the novel, the past can designate both of these gender attributes. Hence, the
reintroduction of Susan complicates the mother's reaction to her past. According to John Richetti, "Susan's reappearance is the direct and ironic result of Roxana's attempt to return to her 'natural' (i.e. institutional) past without losing her apartness from its implications and responsibilities." Richetti is interested here in Roland Barthes' formulation of the social that is transformed into the natural. But Richetti's notion of "a novelistic dialectic," in Hegelian terms, is more relevant for the present scene. For Richetti, the "natural" (feminine) biological and psychological ties between Roxana and Susan can be regarded as the Hegelian thesis that has been negated by Roxana's (masculine) "freedom at the expense of social forms and institutions," that is, the antithesis. Roxana's return to the "natural" past then justifies the Hegelian synthesis where both the self (thesis) and the other (antithesis) are incorporated--the re-establishment of the mother-daughter ties without sacrificing the negating freedom.126

Roxana's degenderization or androgyny involves a synthesis of both her feminine "natural or biological destiny" (her virtuous feminine past) and her masculine negating freedom (her masculine evil past), instead of her mere return to her feminine "institutional" past in which the male ideology allocates her. Such an interaction between her feminine and masculine past resides in the play of passion and judgment or emotionality and rationality in the climax of the episode when she kisses Susan. Rather than a return "to the only real identity women are granted, the natural or biological destiny
contained in the social forms of marriage and the family," as Richetti maintains, the emotional climax here indicates that Roxana embodies within herself both a desire for the re-establishment of what Schofield would call her "female emotionality" and a desire for masculine judgment. The eighteenth century was fascinated with such a gender distinction. Hannah More in *Essays on Various Subjects* (1791), for example, writes that "one sex will think it betrays a want of feeling to be moderate in their applause, the other will be afraid of exposing a want of judgement by being in raptures with any thing. --Men refuse to give way to the emotions they actually feel, while women sometimes affect to be transported beyond what the occasion will justify." The notion about lack of judgment in women, though rendered as man's own making, is always on Defoe's fancy. In his *Review*, Defoe states that "we always thought the Women had the quickest and justest Notions of things at first sight, tho' we have rob'd them of the Judgment, by denying them early Instruction." Defoe's contemporaries, such as the satirist and philosopher Bernard de Mandeville, also think along similar lines. Lucinda, a fictional character in Mandevill's *The Virgin Unmask'd* (1707), admits that "a sound and penetrating judgement only belongs to man, as the masters of reason and solid sense." One can identify a fusion of these gender distinctive qualities, passion and judgment, in Roxana as she kisses Susan. First, Roxana tells the reader, "it was secret inconceivable Pleasure to me when I kiss'd her, to know that I kiss'd my own Child; my own Flesh and
Blood, born of my Body" (277). Roxana's past femininity she has experienced in the first part of the novel in the paternal Symbolic returns to her, and secret passion takes over her. The pleasure, the child, and her own flesh and blood and body all suggest the "institutional" past to which the patriarchal system intends to nail her by the ideology that conceives the family as her proper place in society and her biological and psychological destiny with her daughter as the "natural" bond between women. However, Roxana does not return to her "natural" past, for this part of her feminine past contradicts her masculine one that enables her to enjoy power. Her masculinity has to keep her femininity in secrecy and in balance. Her passion for Susan or her feminine "Disorder had almost discover'd itself," Roxana says, and "I rous'd up my Judgment, and shook it off" (277). Here Roxana employs her reason or judgment to control her passion and feelings towards Susan, feminine feelings balanced by masculine judgment, feminine feelings she has to entertain for the rest of her life. That is one of the reasons why she cannot approve of Amy's proposal to murder the troublesome wench.

The human being's sexual androgyny is a homeless voice in Defoe's fiction, for it has never been articulated in the Western civilization until now in critical theory, at least not as articulated as it is in the phenomenon of the "berdache" in American Indian culture. A "berdache" is an American Indian boy raised up as a girl and has both male and female qualities. This is a natural phenomenon for American Indians because "the Great Spiritual
"Being" in Indian tribal religions is conceived as an androgynous combination of both male and female. The closest thing to the degenderization of man in the Western civilization is perhaps in John Locke's political thinking. For Locke, man and woman have an equal place in the eyes of God and therefore in their political rights, but he never conceives man as an androgynous being in gender terms. Placing an emphasis on the sole political right of the male is for Locke "half Reason." In his critique of Robert Filmer's argument for patriarchal monarchy "to confirm the Natural Right of Regal Power in Patriarcha," Locke writes "I hope 'tis no Injury to call an half Quotation an half Reason, for God says, Honour thy Father and Mother; but our Author contents himself with half, leaves out thy Mother quite, as little serviceable to his purpose." His stance is certainly not feminist, for Locke resorts to a distinctive gender hierarchy in the domestic life of family. Locke argues that if God gives "any Power to Adam, it can be only a Conjugal Power, not Political, the Power that every Husband hath to order the things of private Concernment in his Family." Locke also considers the husband as "a Master of a Family with all these subordinate Relations of Wife, Children, Servants and Slaves united under the Domestick Rule of a Family." Locke still wants to preserve paternal authority. What he renounces is Filmer's analogy between the authority of the king in the state and the authority of the father in the family.
The homelessness of the voice also applies to an implication of the degenderization of God as an androgynous Being. The religious notion of man created in the image of God enables Althusser to assert that while God's people are subjects, God is the Subject: "the Subject needs to become a subject, as if to show empirically, visibly to the eye, tangibly to the hands (see St Thomas) of the subjects, that if they are subjects, subjected to the Subject, that is solely in order that finally, on Judgement Day, they will re-enter the Lord's Bosom, like Christ, i.e. re-enter the Subject." Inherently, both the male and the female subjects, for Althusser, will eventually "re-enter" the Body of the Subject on Judgment Day. Also Spacks has a similar notion about the subjects as an integral part of the Subject in her interesting critical observation about the sentimental novel after the middle of the eighteenth century. In light of Adam Smith's distinction between "soft power" and "stronger power" against Edmund Burke's analogy between fathers' authority over sons and the link of God to humanity, Spacks argues that sentimental novels of the period sometimes do not correspond to Burke's elucidation. "If God retains the power of the father, He may assume also attributes of the mother." Spacks notes in Henry Brooke's novel The Fool of Quality (1766) this degenderizing aspect of God: the female "sunshine and gentle dews of his providence and benignity" in contrast to his male "lightnings and thunders, his clouds and his tempests." Woman's disguised form of soft power, for Spacks, is associated with God's "sunshine and gentle dews."131 Although
Spacks still thinks of the female as distinct from the male, her argument about God's two sides of gender implies His androgynous qualities. Thus, the male He God should have the female She attached to Him and be rewritten as a She/He God or with the She/He combined as a SHe God. Even if there was no such thing as a SHe God, the degenderized human subjects, following Althusser's logic, would eventually re-enter the Subject and bring to It the she/he attributes on Judgment Day.

Unlike her denouncement of the (male) divine order in her maternal chora, Roxana's attitude towards Providence undergoes a modification in the last part of the novel, and this modification also shows the homeless voice about a SHe God. Roxana no longer defies the male supreme power; instead, she relies on her benign female God ("the sunshine and gentle dews") without denying the punishing male God (His "thunders" and "tempests"), a degenderization of the Supreme Subject in whose image the human subject has been created. Calvinist apologists of Defoe's time, who had exerted enormous influence on Defoe, justified God's role as governor of the universe and of human affairs. Likewise, many of Defoe's fictional characters, at some point in their lives, sense the governing power of Providence. After Robinson Crusoe is driven by the violent storms to the island, he contemplates that "I had great Reason to consider it as a Determination of Heaven, that in this desolate Place, and in this desolate Manner I should end my Life." Having been kidnapped to Virginia plantations by slave smugglers, Colonel Jack, too,
believes "God had order'd every thing, the most Minute, and least Transaction of Life, insomuch, That not a Hair of our Heads shall fall to the Ground without his Permission." But Providence in Roxana works on the benign female side, providing Roxana with "soft power" to escape the "tempests" and the "lightnings" of the male side of the Supreme Subject that punishes evil. The omnipresent God who governs the least as well as the greatest affairs of men more than once has delivered Roxana from what would otherwise be disasters and the ruin of her in the last part of the novel. First, before setting out for Holland by boat, the Captain invites Roxana and the Merchant to dine with his family on board the ship. That is the climax scene where Roxana and Susan confront each other. The last thing Roxana would see happen to her is Susan's recognition of her at that critical moment. Roxana tells the reader, "it is hardly possible for me to conceive what wou'd have been our Part in this Affair, had my woman Amy gone with me on-board this Ship; it had certainly blown-up the whole Affair, and I must for-ever after have been this Girl's Vassal" (280). Amy, who has been in charge of handling Roxana's children and has met with Susan before for many times, is luckily "not at home when we accepted this Invitation, and so she was left out of the Company" (275). If God's "tempests" have arranged Susan coming out of nowhere to this meeting to ruin Roxana, His "sunshine and gentle dews" have reduced the punishment and prevented the key witness from being part of the company. Later on when Susan and the Captain's wife barge into Roxana's house to see
her, the benign God is on Roxana's side again. "Had not the kind QUAKER, in a lucky Moment, come running in before them, they had not only clapp'd in upon me, in the Parlour, as it had been a surprise, but, which wou'd have been a thousand times worse, had seen Amy with me" (282). After Roxana separates from Amy and retreats to another abode unknown to Susan, the troublesome "Hound" somehow manages to find it and stops by for the last time, and Roxana has to sneak out of the back door and hide in the neighbor's house. But "it was a very good Chance in the middle of a bad one, that my Husband had taken out the Coach that very Morning, and was on to London" (318), so the Merchant will not be able to know anything about it. Even the ending is vague about punishment for Roxana's crime (see Chapter 3). It says nothing about punishing her for her past wicked life as a whore. Roxana only says the divine wrath falls on her for the murder of Susan, which is obviously not her own doing. Time and time again God has forgiven Roxana whom the reader would see punished for poetic justice. "The Fortunate Mistress" finally maintains her "Man-Woman" identity and disappears, so to speak, out of the last page of the novel into a distant no-home land.
A final word about the three "vocal" modes of interpretation in the alternative Marxist approach. Since the public and private voices of the self are related to dominant and radical ideologies, it is important to distinguish between the ideologies that are dominant and established and those that are not in a particular historical period, and this distinction can be made by historical studies. Dominant and radical ideologies, for instance, can be distinguished by a historical study of the attitudes towards religion in the latter half of the sixteenth century, which are related to the dominant Calvinistic doctrines and a radical Epicurean revival. According to Epicurus's principle of happiness, the gods will not bother to interfere with the affairs down below. "Now human happiness," Epicurus writes, "consists of the absence of worry or, at least, this absence of worry is its condition.... The same considerations apply to the gods. It is absurd, then, to imagine that the gods constantly concern themselves with the government of the universe and human affairs." In refutation of this Epicurean revival, John Calvin asks, "to what end serveth it to confess as Epicure doth, that there is a God which doth onely delight himself with idlenesse, having no care of the world?".133 About the issue of religion in Defoe's day, one can also discern its dominance over secular beliefs through evidence in Defoe's other works such as Religious Courtship, Conjugal Lewdness, his Review, etc. Especially in Religious
Courtship, marriage to an atheist or a truly religious man determines a woman's fate of misery or happiness in life. Concerning the dominant place of religion in Defoe's works and his time, critics like Backscheider, Hunter, and Starr, among others, have offered us convincing and stimulating insights. As for the homeless voice of the self, it indicates an obliteration of relations with Defoe's ideology and historical ideas, although the present study exercises only part of its implications, its over-lapping with the influence of the institutional discourse over the reader's interpretations of Defoe (e.g. deterritorialization, romantic irony, and feminist theory). It would be senseless for any critic to suggest that he or she is an "initiator of discursive practices" and has established a new paradigm of critical thinking. Critics may consciously depart from one paradigm or another, to argue against the established notions in a particular field, but their critical consciousness, as Said has noted, often fluctuates between "filiation" and "affiliation" or between different modes of the institutional discourse. Theoretically speaking, there is no way critics themselves would know they have reached the distant real that is shaped by the future reader's interpretive paradigms, which is for the future critic to assess, and also theoretically speaking, the homeless voice of the self may exist outside the constraints of the "interpretive community," which characterizes the alternative nature of the current Marxist approach.
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of the positive, but does not reach the Hegelian Absolute and will beget other cycles of the continuous process of becoming. Also see Jameson, *Marxism and Form*, 171, 331. Althusser, *For Marx*, 101-04. For Jameson, Hegel's notion of art is its self-transcendence into pure thought. In Hegel's scheme of things, "art ultimately tends to transcend itself by becoming theology and philosophy, and abolishes itself as sensuous play as it grows increasingly nearer to that full self-consciousness which is Absolute Spirit." Althusser argues that in each term of the Hegelian dialectic (thesis, antithesis, and synthesis), "consciousness lives and experiences its own essence (the essence corresponding to the stage it has attained) through all the echoes of the essence it has previously been, and through the allusive presence of the corresponding historical forms." This essence, or the Idea or the Absolute, is the center of the dialectic process and pre-exists in all concrete historical contents, engulfing the past, permeating the present, and surpassing the future.


73. Mellor, 3-4.
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78. Ibid., 112, 113. Also see Ellen Pollak, "Moll Flanders, Incest, and the Structure of Exchange," The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation 30,1 (1989): 16. For Pollak, the incest manifests Moll's transgressiveness (in her quest for female power against the cultural gender codes) and its limit (in her ultimate repudiation of the incest). Moll's transgressiveness can be looked at as her de-creation of the moral self while her repudiation of the incest as her re-creation of the self in alignment with the cultural codes.
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89. Such a reading of the narrator who drives the reader away from herself is different from Nicholas Hudson's notion of Fielding's technique of "negative orientation" in Tom Jones. Hudson argues that the response of the "good" or "grave" reader to the novel stems from the reader's "spontaneous impulses of the good-heart" activated by Fielding's rhetorical device of driving readers away from the "bad" or "profane" reader addressed in the text. The "good" reader is created by the author with the Iserian "controls" in the text. Here, Hudson assumes a connection between authorial intention and the reading activity. See Nicholas Hudson, "Fielding's Hierarchy of Dialogue: 'Meta-Response' and the Reader of Tom Jones," Philological Quarterly 68,2 (1989): 179, 187-88. Also, there is a vital difference between the double role of the Schlegelian narrator and the lack of control of the picaresque narrator. The Schlegelian narrator keeps the narrative moving and draws the reader into the chaotic world so that the reader's world identifies with the narrator's chaotic fictional world, but the reader for the picaresque novel stays above the chaotic world of the picaro and laughs at the narrator's blunder in his inability "to keep his narrative on the path." See Miller, 106.

90. For instance, Nussbaum notes that "oppression based on gender, mediated by testimonies of benevolent domination, cuts across class lines." Also see Nussbaum's discussion of William Blackstone's passage about how a woman is "held in place by a domination based on gender." Her politics of class and gender means to show that although women can disrupt social power relations, they still reflect the male social formation and are still fixed as subjects by the dominant male ideologies (52, 137-41, 146-49). Mary Anne Schofield also maintains that "women are to remain virtuously immobile and undefined, whereas men actively seek self-definition and justification, and tangentially provide women with a self," and that "this controlling ideology firmly fixes a woman to her subordinate, second-class state." (Masking and Unmasking the Female Mind: Disguising Romances in Feminine Fiction, 1713-1799, Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990, 19). Patricia Meyer Spacks has also exposed the male fantasy of fixing an ideal woman in Pamela, Fanny, or Amelia as a changeless character in virtue, as a toy for pleasure, or as a manageable Other. (Desire and Truth: Functions of Plot in Eighteenth-Century English Novels, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990, 93-9).
91. Schofield's discovery of the female disguised voice in eighteenth-century romance, for example, indicates a transcendence of ideology and an expression of women's true experiences. She "attempts to reveal the power that lies beneath the disguise of feminine submission and marital compliance, romantic love and female powerlessness, the controlling ideologies of the eighteenth century" (10).

92. Laurie Langbauer has focused on women's power to "move within and use the language and structure of dominance itself, simply by operating as subjects who use language." She argues that "subordinating women and romance grants those ranked above them at best local (although effective and destructive) power, for total control resides in the system of construction and representation in which all terms are determined." One such system of construction and representation, ensuring women's implication of authority and control, is the female body as the site of discourse rather than the site of disease. (Women and Romance: The Consolations of Gender in the English Novel, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990, 9, 120-26).

93. According to Nussbaum, Hester Thrale's resistance to prescribed identities lies in her recording the "trivial details of a woman's lived experience" and in insisting on "an inverted hierarchy of values in that private sphere" (xxi). K. K. Ruthven notes that resistance of the male order can find one form of transcribing "history" as "his story" and then "countering it with the neologism 'herstory' as a feminist righting of a patriarchal wrong." (Feminist Literary Studies: An Introduction, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984, 57-8). Langbauer argues that romance is "an appropriate sphere" for women; it is a world of female power rather than prison; it is a world outside the male order and out of boredom, seclusion, and submission (85). Living outside the male order is also crucial for a woman in eighteenth-century fiction. Spacks writes that "only in isolation and social alienation can she function effectively. Then she can demonstrate her fortitude, her faithfulness--even her sexuality, denied and obscured before." Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 61.

94. Ruthven, 99. Since Kristeva focuses on the interaction between the maternal Semiotic or le semiotique ("an alternative mode of signification to the Symbolic") and the paternal Symbolic, Ruthven argues that from Kristeva's position, "it would be somewhat naive to conceive of the relationship between men and women as oppositional, for if women can be 'masculine' and men 'feminine' in negotiating the transaction between le semiotique and the Symbolic, there is no point in isolating 'women' as a special category on biological grounds and inventing something called
feminism to protect their interests." Langbauer, 101-8, 120-26; Spacks, Desire and Truth, 122-23.

95. Note that Roxana's private voice starts with her relationship with the Jeweller in Chapter 3 because she is breaking the laws of matrimony. But in terms of gender roles in the present chapter, Roxana is conceived in this first stage as a "commodity" dependent on the male. In this sense, her feminine role as a whore is part of Defoe's public voice defined by male ideologies.


98. Silverman, 36. For a more detailed discussion about Roland Barthes' theory of the cultural codes in relation to a symbolic order, see Silverman 274-83.

100. The notion of man as the self and woman as the other is first developed by Simone de Beauvoir in her exposition of "alterity or otherness." The Second Sex, trans. and ed. H. M. Parshley (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), 71. Following Levi-Strauss' anthropological observations, Beauvoir holds that women have always been regarded as the "absolute Other" and have never been "a separate group set up on its own account" over against the male grouping. They have never entered into a direct and autonomous relation with the men." Shoshana Felman also writes that "theoretically subordinate to the concept of masculinity, the woman is viewed by the man as his opposite, that is to say, as his other, the negative of the positive" ("Woman and Madness: The Critical Phallacy," Diacritics, 5, Winter 1975, 3). Also see Ruthven, 41. "Beauvoir," Ruthven argues, "starts from the insight that societies are organised on the assumption that man is Self and woman Other, and that the consequences are always deleterious to women. The reason for this is that the Self treats the Other as either a supplement or a threat."


102. Defoe, An Essay Upon Projects (1697), a facsimile (Menston, England: The Scolar Press Limited, 1969), 284-85, 292-93, 290, 296, 302-3. For Defoe's satire on the female take-over of the government, see Mason, 15-7. One can connect Defoe's ideal woman in this pamphlet to that in other novelists' fantasies to render the "public character" of women in order to hold them in place as the Other. See Spacks, Desire and Truth, 93-9.

103. Marx and Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, 502. Lukacs, History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge: The M.I.T Press, 1971), 14, 83, 86, 94. Berman, 141. In light of the notion of reification, Watt has commented on the equation of the women on Robinson Crusoe's island with commercial goods and necessaries (The Rise of the Novel, 68). In the eighteenth century, the husband regarded his wife as his goods and could put her up to "auction to be sold to the best bidder, as though she was a brood-mare, or a milch-cow," although it was practiced "among the common people" and was "grossly against public decency and good manners." Anon, from The Laws Respecting Women (1777), in Eighteenth-Century Women: An Anthology, ed. Bridget Hill (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984), 118. Also see Langbauer, 114-16, for her comments on Marx's notion of the prostitute as a symbol for property.

104. Langbauer, 118. For comments on the alignment of the materiality of the female body with material conditions and historical fact in Marx, see Langbauer, 114. Langbauer's emphasis on the female body is meant to transcend its materiality and to turn it into a metaphor for writing or into the female body as discourse in Wollstonecraft in order to initiate a power


110. Cixous, 311.

111. Backscheider, Daniel Defoe: Ambition & Innovation, 186, 208-9. Backscheider argues that Roxana's relationship with the Merchant indicates one of the three strains in women's fiction; that is, "she is one of the newly fascinating evil women." One of the "dangerous' characteristics men assign to women," Backscheider maintains, is that "she weakens and unmans." Spacks, Desire and Truth, 112-3. Spacks contends that Roxana is one of the eighteenth-century characters who resist men's notion of an ideal woman as "changeless" and that her character change in the novel "endangers herself and implicitly endangers men." Nussbaum, 113. For Nussbaum, women in James Boswell's journals "destroy male identity but they also, through sexual license, confuse traditional class and gender hierarchies." Ray states that "it is only through masculine succor that she is saved from starvation and, in turn, launched on her infamous career.... Roxana, thus, rejects the traditional economic role of women and prefers to be her own person, financially and socially" (30). At this second stage, Roxana surely has a masculine role in the novel. Then, Richetti is certainly partly right when he argues that Roxana is not quite a plausible figure and remains "untouched by the special quality of female experience" because, Richetti thinks, she is a male creation. "The Portrayal of Women in Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Literature," in What Manner of Women: Essays on English and American

112. For Defoe, to make a whore of the very woman a man intends to marry is to defile his own bed, pollute his own seed, and spread bastardy in his own race, Conjugal Lewdness, 65-6.


114. Chaber, 213, 221. Chaber delights the reader with an interesting comment on the governess' maternity ward in Moll Flanders as the approximation of the mass production, where the unwed mother is considered the producer (of babies) and the governess the capitalistic entrepreneur. If it holds true that Roxana considers her whoring as an industry, her later concern about not mixing her tinted money with "the honest well-gotten Estate" of the Merchant is an ironic pretense for separating her estate from his. For a more detailed discussion, see Section III of the present chapter. Carol Houlihan Flynn, The Body in Swift and Defoe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1, 5, 67. Flynn's book studies the body economy in relation to Swift's and Defoe's response to a struggle between idealization (the soul) and materiality (the body). Both authors, Flynn argues, "reflected the struggle against materiality that characterized their age."


117. Mason, 30. Also see Kanowitz, 36. Ray, 25. About Roxana's affliction with matrimonial law, see Peterson, 185-90. Watt also notes that to achieve economic independence outside marriage, under the common law, was increasingly difficult in the eighteenth century (142). Defoe actually advises the wife not to leave the husband because "the Law gives him great Advantages, and Custom Loads her with Numberless Difficulties." Defoe, Review, Saturday, February 3, 1705, Vol. I, 399.


120. About the notion of women posing the Medusa's face as a threat to turn men into petrification, see Allan Gardner Lloyd-Smith, *The Uncanny American Fiction: The Medusa's Face* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), 46, 59, 71. About the substitution of "history" with "herstory," see Ruthven, 57-8.


124. Novak, "Crime and Punishment in Defoe's Roxana," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 65 (1966): 455. Novak believes it is punishment for Roxana that she is "married to an upstanding middle-class merchant to whom she has surrendered control of her wealth."

125. Peterson, 189-90.


Punishment," 455-46. Novak has discussed the combat between Roxana's "strong natural affection for Susan" and her judgment, and he rightly regards it as part of the punishment for Roxana, although he does not look at it as a symbol of Roxana's both female and male qualities.


130. Locke, Two Treatises of Government, 163, 192, 341. Stone, 239.
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