



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**Daniel Defoe's Moral and Political Thought in Its  
Religious Context**

Chienyuen Chen

PhD Thesis

The University of Edinburgh

2019



## **Abstract**

This thesis aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the religious ideas of the famous English journalist and novelist Daniel Defoe. Today, Defoe is best remembered as a novelist, but most of his works are non-fictional works including a sizable number of didactic or supernatural writings. Even though there is a rising scholarly interest in Defoe's thoughts on subjects such as politics or Puritanism, there is hardly a single monograph devoted to Defoe's religious ideas. This thesis aims to fill the gap by examining Defoe's works throughout his career. It demonstrates that Defoe's Presbyterian upbringing was influential in his emphasis on the ideas of good work, practical godliness, and the development of good habits. Furthermore, this thesis will demonstrate that Defoe proposed solutions to the problems of alcoholism and swearing in England of his age, on the basis of a neo-Augustinian view of human nature and his ideas on how to correct corrupt passions by manipulating other passions. Thus, Defoe shows that even though self-love and pride are impossible to eradicate, it was viable for the social and political elites to design a proper mechanism for the public to satisfy their vanity and meanwhile unintentionally improve their behaviour. Furthermore, this study offers a detailed examination of Defoe's view of luxury in its contemporary context. It demonstrates that Defoe's neo-Augustinian ideas of original sin and self-love are crucial to his argument about the futility of prohibiting consumption. Since luxury is a necessary vice that supports the livelihood of a vast number of people, it is prudent to ponder on the delicate difference between harmful squandering and healthy consumption. This thesis uses Defoe's discussion of the dilemma of the businessmen

engaged in luxury trade to shed light on Defoe's contribution to the contemporary luxury debate. Following this, Defoe's political views are examined, in particular his criticism of divine right theory. There will be a particular focus on Defoe's emphasis on original sin and the corrupted nature of political leaders. Based on Defoe's close reading of the Old Testament, this thesis examines his explanation of Adam and the Fall, and the idea of the transition from patriarchy to monarchy. The thesis demonstrates that Defoe's use of the biblical accounts of Saul, Rehoboam and Jeroboam was part of his debate with the High-Churchmen concerning the legitimacy of the reign of William and Mary. Based on his distinctive combination of an Augustinian understanding of sin and human nature, natural law theories and biblical exegesis, Defoe provided original interpretations of the Old Testament and used Scripture to convey political messages. The final chapter examines Defoe's use of the past. Defoe insisted that Moses and the Hebrews were given the knowledge of letters directly from God, and this gift confirmed the status of the Hebrews as a chosen people. Moreover, Defoe had a particular interest in the Phoenicians' achievements in navigation and trade, which were another proof of God's favour. Defoe argued that, judging by the improvement England had achieved in his era, Britain was the genuine successor of these two ancient peoples. This thesis makes clear the central role that religion played in Defoe's works. By probing into his Augustinian understanding of human nature and his frequent references to the Old Testament, this research sheds light on and deepens the current scholarship's understanding of Defoe's ideas of morals, commerce, politics, and history.

## **Lay Summary**

This thesis provides an analysis of an understudied dimension of the thought of Daniel Defoe (1660-1731), a journalist, novelist, and historian. Remembered foremost as a novelist today, Defoe's non-fiction writings have long been neglected. Although scholars have begun to pay attention to Defoe's works on subjects such as politics, economics and history, his religious ideas have not been examined to the same extent. In contrast, this thesis places him within the contexts of French Jansenism and English Dissent, in particular. Defoe derives his main religious ideas, which later form the essence of his works, from these backgrounds. This thesis argues that Defoe's Jansenist view of human nature is reflected by his keen interest in pride, self-love and self-interest. These passions are so deeply rooted that they can never be removed. Instead of resorting to abstinence, Defoe proposes a practical solution of balancing passions with other passions. This attitude is central to his contribution to the Reformation of Manners movement during the turn of the 18th century, and to his apology for the luxury business against other intellectuals' critiques. Furthermore, the thesis points out Defoe's familiarity with and frequent quotations of the Old Testament, in particular in his moral and political thoughts. His critique of the divine right theory of the high churchmen was founded on Scripture and Defoe believed that the unfolding of human history offered an indication of God's will. His particular interest in the Phoenicians' achievements in navigation and trade can be seen in this light. He argued that the excellence of Phoenician trade was proof of God's particular blessing. Defoe argued that Britain was the genuine successor of this ancient race, because of the degree of

improvement England had achieved in his lifetime. This thesis provides a new in-depth study of Defoe's religious thought, and is based on fictional and non-fictional works from every period of his career. The deeper meanings of the understudied aspects of Defoe's intellectual world can only be uncovered, as this thesis shows, by focusing on the role played by his religious thought.

## **Acknowledgements**

This thesis could not have been finished without the guidance of my supervisors Professors Adam Fox and Thomas Ahnert. Throughout these years in Edinburgh they always provided me with insightful remarks and warm encouragement. I am deeply grateful to them. I also have to thank my examiners Dr Alasdair Raffé and Professor Richard Whatmore for their careful reading and penetrating comments. This thesis was funded by the scholarship of the Ministry of Education of Taiwan, which I gratefully acknowledge. I am also indebted to Mr. Hillel for his advice on my English grammar. I owe further thanks to the fellowship of the Edinburgh Japanese Church, especially to Iwama Nobuyuki for many pleasant and helpful conversation during the years. I express my special gratitude to Reverend Jae-Hun Park and Young-Sook Park. I also have to thank scholars and friends who have helped me in many ways over these years: Jeng-Guo Chen, Alvin Chen, Fu Yang, Chien-shou Chen, Alexander Kais, Nuala Zahedieh, Felicity Green and Harry Dickinson. Last but not least, I am very grateful to my family, and friends, especially to Xiaona Wang. I reserve my greatest indebtedness to my parents for their years of unwavering support and unconditional love.

## Abbreviations Used in References

- PEW*      *Political and Economic Writings by Daniel Defoe*, gen. eds W R. Owens and P. N. Furbank, 8 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000)
- SFS*      *Satire, Fantasy and Writings on the Supernatural by Daniel Defoe*, gen. eds W R. Owens and P. N. Furbank, 8 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003-4)
- TDH*      *Writings on Travel, Discovery and History by Daniel Defoe*, gen. eds W R. Owens and P. N. Furbank, 8 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001-2)
- RDW*      *Religious and Didactic Writings of Daniel Defoe*, gen. eds W R. Owens and P. N. Furbank, 10 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006-7)

## **Declaration**

I, Chienyuen Chen, declare that I composed this thesis, that all the work is my own and that the work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Chienyuen Chen

03 September, 2019



## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Lay Summary .....	5
Acknowledgements .....	7
Abbreviations Used in References .....	8
Declaration.....	9
Introduction.....	13
Biographical Sketch.....	14
The Intellectual Background of the Dissenters.....	25
Scholarship on Defoe’s Religious Thoughts .....	44
Introduction to the Source Material of Each Chapter.....	49
Chapter 1: Defoe’s Moral Thought and the Neo-Augustinian Tradition .....	59
Jansenism, Mandeville, and Defoe .....	59
Defoe’s View of Human Nature .....	72
The Reformation of Manners .....	75
The Royal Court and the Gentry.....	82
Duelling .....	93
Conclusion.....	104
Chapter 2: Defoe’s Economic Thought in the Context of the Debate on Luxury in the Early-Eighteenth Century.....	105
The Eighteenth-Century Debate on Luxury .....	106
<i>The Complete English Tradesman</i> .....	111
Defoe and Mandeville: Two Apologists of Luxury .....	124
Commercial Society, Providence, and England.....	136
The South Sea Bubble .....	147
Conclusion.....	154
Chapter 3: The Influence of Religion on Daniel Defoe’s Political Thought .....	157
Adam, the Fall, Human Nature.....	159

<i>Genesis</i> 1:28 .....	168
Nimrod and National Monarchy .....	175
Samuel and Saul .....	184
The Right of Resistance.....	188
Rehoboam and Defoe’s Defence of the Glorious Revolution .....	196
Conclusion .....	206
Chapter 4. Defoe’s Historical Thought .....	209
Histories of Trade and Navigation.....	211
Arts and Sciences.....	217
Providence in History: England as the Chosen Nation.....	225
Defoe’s Critique of Popery .....	232
The English Reformation.....	247
Conclusion .....	257
Conclusion .....	261
Bibliography .....	269

## **Introduction**

The present study aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the religious ideas of the famous English journalist and novelist Defoe, and it seeks to make clear the central role that religion played in his works. This study focuses on four of Defoe's intellectual concerns, morals, commerce, politics, and history, and seeks to probe them in greater detail. Even though scholars have begun to pay attention to Defoe's works on subjects such as politics, economics and history, his religious ideas have not been examined to the same extent. The study aims to provide a fuller picture of Defoe's ideas of morals, commerce, politics, and history by examining his Augustinian understanding of human nature and his frequent references to the Old Testament. In so doing the study will provide a new in-depth study of Defoe's religious thought, and show that the deeper meanings of the understudied aspects of Defoe's intellectual world can only be uncovered by focusing on the role played by his religious thought.

Before we start our examination of Defoe's religious thought, it will be useful to discuss Defoe's upbringing. Defoe's Presbyterian background was influential in his emphasis on the ideas of good works, practical godliness, and the development of good habits. An examination of this background will be followed by a reflection on the main scholarly interpretations of Defoe's overall career and by an investigation of how far they take notice of the religious aspect of his works. Before we embark on this investigation and critique of existing scholarly interpretations of Defoe's religious thought, it will be requisite to give a brief outline of Defoe's career.

## Biographical Sketch

Daniel Defoe, born around 1660, was the son of James and Alice Foe. James was a prosperous tallow chandler and a Presbyterian Flemish migrant. Daniel changed his name to the more distinguished-sounding De Foe or Defoe in 1703.<sup>1</sup> A prolific writer, Defoe published more than 560 books and pamphlets and is often considered the founder of British journalism. The Foes' family pastor was the leading Dissenter Samuel Annesley (c. 1620–1696). When Daniel was thirteen, he was not admitted to Oxford or Cambridge because his father had not pledged allegiance to the Church of England. Being recommended by Annesley, Defoe was admitted to the distinguished Dissenters' Academy in Newington Green, run by the Reverend Charles Morton (1627-1698).<sup>2</sup> This school was attended mostly by the so-called young Ducklings (a group of Dissenters led by Annesley, their name being a nod to their youthful willingness to 'take to the water' of separatism,) and the Independents.<sup>3</sup> According to Defoe's accounts, his literary skills were based mainly on his education at Morton's

---

<sup>1</sup> The following account of Defoe's life relies much on Maximillian E. Novak, *Daniel Defoe: Master of Fictions: His Life and Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Paula R. Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe: His Life* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); John J. Richetti, *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> J. Paul Hunter, *The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in Robinson Crusoe* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966). Cf. G. A. Starr, *Defoe & Spiritual Autobiography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965); Leopold Damrosch, *God's Plot & Man's Stories: Studies in the Fictional Imagination from Milton to Fielding* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

<sup>3</sup> N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987), 58. On the two major groups among the Presbyterians after the Restoration, see John Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), 138–39; D. N. DeLuna, "Ironic Monologue and Political and Economic Writings 'Scandalous "Ambo-Dexter" Conformity' in Defoe's *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 57, no. 4 (1994): 321–22; Roger Thomas, "Comprehension and Indulgence," in *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962*, ed. Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), 208–09, 236.

academy. Morton's courses were taught in plain English, not Latin or Greek. The school's focus was on geography and mechanics, rather than classical grammar, logic, or rhetoric valued by Oxford and Cambridge. Morton's teachings also include epistolary exercises where students learned to play characters and write in different roles such as the Anglican minister, courtier or businessman. It was from this training that Defoe developed the skill of constructing arguments according to the target audience and for diverse purposes. Defoe was intended for the ministry, even though after leaving the academy in 1681, he chose to pursue a career in business. The reason was unclear, while Defoe gave a hint of it in the introduction to *The Storm* in which he reported a storm which struck Britain in November 1703: 'Preaching of Sermons is Speaking to a few of Mankind: Printing of Books is Talking to the whole World. The Parson Prescribes himself, and addresses to the particular Auditory with the Appellation of My Brethren; but he that Prints a Book, ought to Preface it with a Noverint Universi, Know all Men by these Presents.'<sup>4</sup>

Defoe established his own family and business after leaving the academy. In 1684 he married Mary Tuffley (1663-1732) who brought him a dowry of £3,700. During the 1680s Defoe was persecuted along with other Dissenters, and in June 1685 he joined the Monmouth Rebellion, an attempt to overthrow King James II. Defoe escaped capture when the revolt was suppressed, and his punishment was waived in 1687. In the late 1680s, Defoe invested in numerous business trades such as children's clothing, socks, and civet perfume. Starting to invest in speculative trades such as diving bells

---

<sup>4</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Storm*, ed. Richard Hamblyn (London: Penguin Classics, 2005), 3.

in the early 1690s, Defoe went bankrupt in 1692 due to his failed speculation in the shipping business and his over-expansion of credit. After some negotiations, Defoe was still able to stay in the world of business, and he secured contracts with such prestigious projects as the building of the Greenwich Hospital for sailors and mariners. It was at the same time that Defoe began to write copiously. In 1697, he published his first long book *An Essay Upon Projects*.<sup>5</sup> The book explored ideas that may make England and its citizens better-off, outlining projects such as toll roads, national banks, women's colleges, new hospitals and health insurance. His first commercially successful work was the satirical poem *The True-born Englishman* (1701), which reached its fiftieth edition in the 1750s. The poem was written to refute the xenophobic attacks on the Dutch-born King William's legitimacy to the throne of England. Ridiculing the idea of pure Englishness, Defoe argued that countless peoples had inhabited England since ancient times, and it was impossible to define a true-born Englishman. The attack on King William's race or birthplace, therefore, was meaningless. In 1706, Defoe published a long philosophical poem *Jure Divino*, which was the most systematic demonstration of his life-long critique of absolute monarchy. The poem was mostly written during Defoe's time in prison, to which Defoe had been sent for his satire of Anglican high churchmen.

Between 1688 and 1706, Defoe often wrote tracts questioning the practice of occasional conformity, whereby dissenters occasionally went to the Church of England to receive the Eucharist, which made them eligible for employment and to hold

---

<sup>5</sup> Daniel Defoe, *An Essay upon Projects* (1687), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 8, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000).

government positions. For instance, on two successive Sundays in 1698 Sir Humphrey Edwin, the nonconformist mayor of the City of London, attended the service at St Paul's, but in the afternoon he dressed in official clothing and attended a nonconformist meeting at Pinners' Hall. Edwin's behaviour stirred a considerable controversy about the practice of occasional conformity, and Defoe contributed his pamphlet *An Inquiry into Occasional Conformity* (1698) to the polemic. Decrying Edwin's occasional conformity, he used provocative expressions such as 'playing Bo-peep with God Almighty' to blame his dishonest fellow dissenters.<sup>6</sup> The controversy intensified when the moderate King William passed away in 1702, and the accession of Queen Anne foreshadowed the rise in power of the High-Tories. At the same year, the Tories brought forth a proposal of a bill that prohibited nonconformists from taking occasional communion in the Church of England. It was widely believed that the purpose of the bill was to incapacitate dissenters.

Stout in his position against occasional conformity, Defoe recognised the prejudice and the extreme desire for oppression represented by the bill. After the accession of Queen Anne, Anglican high churchmen and the Tory writers published many sermons and pamphlets accusing the Dissenters of usurping political and clerical power. Intending to refute this hostile attitude and awakening the MPs who supported the bill,

---

<sup>6</sup> Daniel Defoe, *An Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters in Cases of Preferment* (1697), vol. 3, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 48. On the issue of occasional conformity, see Brent S. Sirota, "The Occasional Conformity Controversy, Moderation, and the Anglican Critique of Modernity, 1700–1714," *The Historical Journal* 57, no. 1 (2014): 81–105; J. A. Downie, "Defoe's Shortest Way with the Dissenters: Irony, Intention and Reader Response," in *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius* (London: Frank Cass, 1987), 120–39.

Defoe anonymously wrote an inflammatory pamphlet *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (December 1702) which exaggerated the arguments of the High-Tories. Contrary to Defoe's anticipation, the sarcastic phrases in *The Shortest Way* – such as 'root out this cursed Race from the World' – caused considerable controversy.<sup>7</sup> In order to quell the unrest, the government issued an arrest warrant for Defoe who had been identified as the author. After few months in hiding, Defoe was arrested and fined a substantial penalty that he was not able to afford. After being brought before the Queen, Defoe was put in the pillory for public display on July 29, 30 and 31 in 1703. Defoe's release from Newgate was arranged by the Lord Treasurer Sidney Godolphin and the newly elected speaker of the House of the Commons Robert Harley. Owing his freedom to Harley, Defoe began to work for Harley as an intelligence agent and an able writer in manipulating public opinion through various journals and newspapers. This was also the background of the launching of Defoe's *Review*, which lasted for nearly ten years (1704-1713) and was a pioneering journal that led British journalism in a new direction. Before the publication of the *Review*, published news was not explained in detail or even in context. The journal showed the possibility of exploiting history and news for propaganda purposes and can be regarded as one of Defoe's most remarkable works. From the first issue, on February 19, 1704, to the last, on June 11, 1713, Defoe wrote almost every word himself, no matter where he was or what was happening to him personally. The periodical was designed to serve as a mouthpiece of Harley's policy. For example, aiming to make the Union between Scotland and

---

<sup>7</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (1702), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 3, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 105.

England in 1706-07 more smooth, Defoe established the Edinburgh edition of the *Review* when he was sent there secretly by Harley. In another instance, seeking to resolve the troubles of religious affairs caused by the radical Whigs and Tories, Harley endorsed moderation, a value that avoided drastic changes to the status quo. Defoe's usually moderate views therefore made it possible for him to find common cause with Harley.<sup>8</sup> In dozens of issues of the *Review*, Defoe showed his promotion for moderation, which was used to counter the opinion of radical High-Church ministers like Henry Sacheverell. Because of his inflammatory remarks, Sacheverell was sentenced in 1709 to have two of his sermons publicly burnt and a suspension from the pulpit for three years.<sup>9</sup> This ruling caused riots across England, and Defoe in the *Review* and other pamphlets recorded and reprimanded such unrests. Defoe suggested that it was the oblivion of moderation and the preference for religious ideology over practical improvement, that caused such chaos.

Queen Anne's death in 1714 was followed by the imprisonment of Harley and the political decline of Viscount Bolingbroke, who had succeeded Harley's leadership of the ministry in the final days of Anne's reign. Losing his powerful political connections, Defoe faded from the political scene, although he was still active in the press. Defoe began to write for the Whig government in return for their pardoning of

---

<sup>8</sup> Sandra J. Sarkela, "Moderation, Religion, and Public Discourse: The Rhetoric of Occasional Conformity in England, 1697-1711," *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 15, no. 1 (1997): 53-79. See also Daniel Defoe, "Memorandum to Robert Harley (1704)," ed. P. N. Furbank, *PEW*, vol. 1 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 162.

<sup>9</sup> For the detail of the trial and its consequence, see Geoffrey S. Holmes, *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell* (London: Methuen, 1973); Mark Knights, ed., *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).

his slander on the Earl of Anglesey, which had brought his arrest and conviction in 1715. At the same time, Defoe had a busy schedule putting forward numerous works including *Appeal to Honour and Justice* (1715), which was set to clarify his integrity and political capability and *The Family Instructor*, his first book on moral conduct, which covers every stage of life and various classes of people.

Defoe's didactic writings were very popular at the time, and to improve sales, Defoe's name, which was not popular with all readers, was not printed on the book, but only the name of the printer. The first volume, for example, appeared in eight editions in five years, and by the end of the eighteenth century, twenty editions had been published. Although this genre of conduct or practical divinity book had already gained popularity in the previous century, Defoe added richer plots and exciting conversations to it. The religious messages conveyed in the conversations showed Defoe's religious training at Morton's Academy, his views of religion and morality, and the significant biblical passages for him. There were two sequels to *The Family Instructor* (1718 and 1727). Even though Defoe surely wrote it to profit from its sales, it was clear that he held a genuine belief in the importance of the moral practice in daily life. Similar didactic writings were regularly published in the 1720s including *Religious Courtship* (1722), which taught young couples how to avoid cheating and choose a virtuous partner, and *Conjugal Lewdness* (1727), which explained the purpose of marriage, condemning sexual intercourse during pregnancy, and offering much advice about everyday ethics.

The two volumes of *The Complete English Tradesman* (1725, 1727, *CET* hereafter) were from the conduct book tradition, following the style of works including *The Trades-man's Calling* (1684), written by Puritan minister Richard Steele, and *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678), a famous spiritual autobiography written by John Bunyan. But *CET* was original in reducing the proportion of religious teachings and in putting strong emphasis on offering advice for young businessmen. A complete English tradesman was defined as a person who understood all domestic trades, from the locations of raw materials and manufactured products to all methods of communication, payment, and transportation. As one of Defoe's most passionate and personal writings, *CET* described trade as a calling in which a businessman's 'Hand or Head' was 'always at work.'<sup>10</sup> Besides, an ideal businessman had to be mindful of his credit, which was the root of the development of the business. Part of these accounts was based on Defoe's experience, therefore, the depictions of the mental states of the debt-stricken and helpless dealers were pertinent. Grasping the mental conflicts of the struggling tradesmen, Defoe vividly described the psychological pressure of the debtors and the pressing necessity that often forced the poor to commit crimes. Illustrating the rapid progress of living standards in Britain, namely, Defoe also gave his views about the rise of luxury. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, luxury was a hotly-debated issue that involved thinkers including Bernard Mandeville, George Berkeley, Joseph Addison and others. They held diverse views on the moral implications and economic necessity of luxury goods. Even though Defoe had written

---

<sup>10</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Complete English Tradesman, Vol. II* (1727), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 8, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 96.

comparable arguments on luxury, scholars usually discuss his views on luxury separately, instead of putting Defoe into the context of the contemporary debate.<sup>11</sup> For Defoe, although luxury goods had no substantive meaning, they improved the taste of the general public, maintaining and enhancing the livelihoods of the poor. Therefore, there was a need for the existence of luxury goods. From these ethical works, it can be observed that Defoe used literary techniques such as dialogue and imaginary scenes flexibly, and these techniques would be fully expressed in his novels.

Defoe's first novel, *Robinson Crusoe*,<sup>12</sup> was published in 1719 when he was about 59 years old. Crusoe is a disobedient son who quarrels with his father about his desire to go out to sea. Crusoe goes to sea despite the dire warnings of his parents and God. At first, he profits from commercial opportunities in Brazil, but he is eventually shipwrecked on an island. He does not despair, nor does he succumb to fear or long solitude. Not only does he survive, but his body and spirit become stronger. In addition to reflecting on Defoe's views about the colonies and the expansion of the British economy, many scholars have already pointed out the relationship between *Robinson Crusoe* and the spiritual autobiography tradition of the Puritans. The novel also represents Defoe's views on subjects such as the immortality of the soul, the Revelation of God, and how to deal with the corresponding conflicts when people of different faiths, such as Catholics, Anglicans, and pagans live together. Themes of adventure and trafficking also appeared in works such as *Colonel Jack* and *Captain*

---

<sup>11</sup> This topic will be discussed in chapter 3.

<sup>12</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Life And Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 1, *The Novels of Daniel Defoe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008).

*Singleton*. Defoe had a keen interest in underclass crime and its causes, and the depiction of social problems was the common theme of *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana*. The new world became a place where one could start anew, as told in the stories of *Colonel Jack* and *Moll Flanders*.

*Moll Flanders* was acclaimed by many critics as a mature and original work. Combining literary and popular appeal, this novel was one of the most popular novels of the eighteenth century. The strong and optimistic heroine attracted a wide variety of readers with her numerous adventures, sorrows and escapes, as well as the happy ending of the story. A realistic portrayal of the social milieu of Defoe's time, *Moll Flanders* constantly challenged readers to face moral, economic and social problems of their age. Similar to Defoe's other novels, *Moll Flanders* addressed various questions about evil: what was evil? Where did it come from? What abilities did humans have? Was a person good or bad, or just a person's words and deeds? Was evil part of human nature, as essential as hunger or thirst? It addressed God's treatment of human beings, and how to deal with disasters in the world. These questions were also the central themes of his fictional work *A Journal of the Plague Year*, published in the same year as *Moll Flanders*. The protagonist H. F. lived in London during the plague of the year 1665, and hesitated between fleeing and staying, between pragmatic economic motives and emotional impulses. Covering ethics, public policy, and the limits of human agency, *A Journal* used the disaster to explain the nature of the universe and the relationship between the individual and God, pondering God's

arrangement of events in the world and how human beings could live through challenging situations.

In the same period, Defoe wrote *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1724-26), which was regarded by many historians as a prime source of understanding Britain in this era. Defoe's love of his country was everywhere in this nationwide survey. At the beginning of *A Tour*, he declared that his theme was about 'the most flourishing and opulent Country in the World.'<sup>13</sup> He described the landscape scene after scene and incorporated these descriptions into a broad and harmonious vision of Britain. Throughout this work, Defoe made remarks such as 'magnificent Buildings,' 'all the Beauties of Building,' and '...exceeding pleasant, especially for the most beautiful intermixture of Wood, and Water in the Park, and Gardens, and Grounds.'<sup>14</sup> At the same time Defoe held a confident attitude toward history and the commercial possibility of domestic travel. In *A Tour*, London was the trade centre of British trade and was praised as the most prosperous city in the world. This kind of praise of London is prevalent in Defoe's work during this period.<sup>15</sup> Last but not least, Defoe wrote several works about the supernatural and the Devil in the late 1720s, including *An Essay on the History and Reality of Apparitions*, *The Political History of the Devil* and *A System of Magick*. These books are a very useful source of observing the ways in

---

<sup>13</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain, Volume 1* (1724), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 1, *TDH* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), 47.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:109, 201, 183.

<sup>15</sup> See Daniel Defoe, *The Complete English Tradesman, Vol. 1* (1725), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 7, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006); *idem*, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements* (1725-26), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 4, *TDH* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001); *idem*, *A Plan of the English Commerce* (1728), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 7, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000).

which Defoe explained the Devil's role in the world and the meaning of its existence. For example, tyrannical kings were explained as the result of the Devil's occupation of their minds which were tainted by Adam's sin. These works on the supernatural and the devil were critical to understanding Defoe's ideas of human nature, politics, and history. On 24 April 1731 Defoe passed away in London hiding from his debtors. He died of a stroke and was buried in Bunhill Fields, the great nonconformist cemetery, on 26 April 1731.

### **The Intellectual Background of the Dissenters**

The education Defoe received in the dissenting academy had a lasting influence on his later works. On Defoe's education in Morton's dissenting academy, biographers like F. Bastian, Paula Backscheider and Maximillian Novak have done substantial work informing us of the curriculum and the reading material of the academy's students.<sup>16</sup> Ilse Vickers traces the Baconian teaching and the emphasis on science teaching in the academy, and Ian Bostridge has provided a short account of Morton's influence on Defoe's knowledge of natural philosophy and witchcraft.<sup>17</sup> What I would like to highlight here is the influence of a group of Dissenters on Defoe's religious thought. Some scholars have already paid attention to this group. Dewey Wallace has studied the moral ideas of the Dissenters in *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*.

---

<sup>16</sup> Frank Bastian, *Defoe's Early Life*. (London: Macmillan, 1981), 48–65; Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe*, 11–21; Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 32–50.

<sup>17</sup> Ilse Vickers, *Defoe and the New Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, 1996); Ian Bostridge, *Witchcraft and Its Transformations, c.1650-c.1750* (Oxford: Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 112–13.

He recognises the particular emphasis on practical work in the works of the leaders of the Dissenters such as Richard Baxter, James Owen and William Bates.<sup>18</sup>

Isabel Rivers has discussed the Dissenters like Baxter and John Bunyan, arguing that most of the Dissenters acknowledged ‘the importance of practice, about the centrality in the life of the elect of holiness.’<sup>19</sup> Rivers reminds us that the difference between faith and works was not as distinct as it appeared. ‘Faith and works were not perceived as opposites’, she adds, ‘rather, grace, faith, holiness, and works properly understood were an inevitable continuum.’<sup>20</sup> Rivers’s argument could be expanded by situating less-studied ministers including Samuel Annesley, Daniel Williams and Timothy Cruso into this context. They were closely related to Defoe, and were not given due attention by scholars.<sup>21</sup>

Annesley and Williams were the ministers of the Foes, and Annesley recommended Defoe entering Morton’s academy where he met fellow student Cruso. Morton was an admirer of the prestigious Baxter, whose works were included among the readings of the curriculum.<sup>22</sup> In Morton’s speech to the future graduating ministers,

---

<sup>18</sup> Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). For an overview of Nonconformity after 1662, see D. R. Lacey, *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661–1689: A Study in the Perpetuation and Tempering of Parliamentarianism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969), 15–18; Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 221; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*; Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*.

<sup>19</sup> Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment : A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780, Volume 1: Whichcote to Wesley* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 96.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>21</sup> They belonged to a close group, for instance, Williams held the funeral sermon for Dr. Annesley. Daniel Williams, *The Excellency of a Publick Spirit: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach’d (since Much Enlarged) at the Funeral of That Late Reverend Divine Dr. Samuel Annesley* (London, 1697).

<sup>22</sup> Lew Girdler, “Defoe’s Education at Newington Green Academy,” *Studies in*

he especially cited Baxter's work to encourage them to show affection in their future occupation. Defoe still made positive comments on the academy in his final years. On evaluating ministers, Defoe's position was similar to Morton's in arguing that ministers should be preoccupied with 'Study, and Human Learning,' and should be away from 'Enthusiasms, Revelations' and 'Extreams.'<sup>23</sup>

I argue that Defoe grew up and had a close relationship with a group of the Dissenters who held practical and moderate views on theological controversies and tended to avoid these. Based on this insight, Defoe's upbringing in this background had an evident influence on his religious view. This attitude was most apparent in his views on the Reformation of Manners movement. This background had a profound impact on Defoe's religious thoughts. To prove this point, we have to look into Defoe's friends and teachers and their religious ideas.

Morton and Annesley exerted influences on Defoe throughout his life, and Bakscheider points out that 'Practical Godliness' was one of the inspirations.<sup>24</sup>

---

*Philology* 50, no. 4 (1953): 583. See also E. Anthony James, *Daniel Defoe's Many Voices: A Rhetorical Study of Prose Style and Literary Method* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1972), 17–18. On Baxter's strong influence on Defoe's supernatural writings, see Paula R. Bakscheider, *Daniel Defoe: Ambition & Innovation* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 152–81.

<sup>23</sup> Quoted from G. A. Starr, "Defoe and Biblical Memory," in *New Windows on a Woman's World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*, ed. Colin Gibson, Lisa Marr, and Jocelyn Harris (Dunedin, New Zealand: Department of English, University of Otago, 2006), 334, note 17.

<sup>24</sup> Bakscheider, *Daniel Defoe*, 17. The dissenters who were close to Defoe also stressed the importance of practical godliness. See Samuel Annesley, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Reverend Mr. Will. Whitaker: Late Minister of Magdalen Bermondsey, Southwark* (London, 1673), 23; Samuel Annesley, "How Is the Adherent Vanity of Every Condition Most Effectually Abated by Serious Godliness?," in *A Continuation of Morning-Exercise Questions and Cases of Conscience: Practically Resolved by Sundry Ministers, in October, 1682*, ed. Samuel Annesley (London, 1683), 30; Timothy Cruso, *Twenty-Four Sermons Preached at the Merchants-Lecture at Pinnars Hall* (London, 1699), 183; John Shower, *A Funeral Sermon Preached upon the Death of Mr. Nathaniel Oldfield: Who Deceased Decemb. 31, 1696, Ætat. 32: With*

Defoe's moderate view of religious affairs and practical attitude toward the Reformation of Manners was similar to the beliefs of his senior Presbyterians.<sup>25</sup> Annesley and Williams were the Foe family's ministers. In 1662, Annesley established his dissenting meeting house at Little St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, London, and he remained a prestigious minister until his death. Defoe dedicated a eulogy to Annesley in 1697, and scholars believed that Defoe attended Annesley's funeral, or at least kept contact with him.<sup>26</sup> N. H. Keeble's monograph affirms Defoe's close association with Annesley and Samuel Wesley.<sup>27</sup> Glynis Ridley has argued that Defoe's writings show the influence of Annesley's sermons and Morton's lectures.<sup>28</sup> In the same vein, Penny Pritchard notes the standard technique of rhetoric that was used by Annesley, Defoe, Cruso and other dissenters.<sup>29</sup> What could be added to the contemporary scholarship is to place more stress on the religious thoughts of this group of Dissenters. Noticing a tradition of employing casuistry in the works of Baxter, Annesley and other dissenters,<sup>30</sup> Starr points out that the topic of moral dilemmas in real life such as remarriage which appeared in *Roxana* and *Moll Flanders* was one of the major

---

*Some Account of His Exemplary Character* (London, 1697), 31; John Shower, *The Mourners Companion: Or, Funeral Discourses on Several Texts* (London, 1692), 121.

<sup>25</sup> See Chapter 2 below.

<sup>26</sup> Richetti, *The Life of Daniel Defoe*, 4.

<sup>27</sup> Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*, 125.

<sup>28</sup> Glynis Ridley, "A Good Argument: Ciceronian Prescriptions, Pamphlet Literature and *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*," in *Positioning Daniel Defoe's Non-Fiction: Form, Function, Genre*, ed. Andreas K. E. Mueller and Aino Mäkikalli (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011), 14.

<sup>29</sup> Penny Pritchard, "Voices of Dissent: Rhetorical Strategies in Defoe's Writing Before 1719," in *Positioning Daniel Defoe's Non-Fiction: Form, Function, Genre*, ed. Andreas K. E. Mueller and Aino Mäkikalli (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011), 28–29.

<sup>30</sup> George A. Starr, *Defoe and Casuistry* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971), 12.

concerns of the casuistry tradition in the late seventeenth century.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, Starr suggests that the focus on various features of seventeenth-century casuistical divinity were passed down from Baxter to Defoe.<sup>32</sup> In sum, there has already been substantial study conducted on Bunyan and Baxter, while the studies on other lesser-known dissenters are still rare and thus require further research. Based on the studies discussed above, I will discuss the practical works of the Dissenters including Defoe.

Baxter was one of the leaders of the English Presbyterians in the middle of the seventeenth century. After the unrest of the Civil Wars and the Interregnum, Baxter wished to reduce the heat brought about by doctrinal controversy. He advocated 'the sufficiency of Scripture and relying upon reason as the only means by which to distinguish revealed truth.'<sup>33</sup> Moreover, he upheld practical reason as the basis for making judgments, and he focused on practical attitudes in everyday life.<sup>34</sup> This position was also accepted by Annesley who had close connections to Defoe. Annesley was an avid supporter of practical godliness,<sup>35</sup> and Williams, Defoe's family preacher

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 32–33.

<sup>33</sup> David L. Wykes, "The Contribution of the Dissenting Academy to the Emergence of Rational Dissent," in *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent*, in *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 121. See also N. H. Keeble, "Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposing On Others': Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition," in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 282–305.

<sup>34</sup> For Baxter's practical attitude, see Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*, chaps. 5–6; Alan C. Clifford, "Richard Baxter (1615–91)," in *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640–1790: An Evaluation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 17–24.

<sup>35</sup> John A. Newton, "Samuel Annesley (1620-1696)," *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* 45, no. 2 (1985): 41–42. See also Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 188–89.

who succeeded Annesley, was Baxter's protégé and a strong supporter of practical reason and the importance of practical godliness as well.<sup>36</sup> Taking the Baxterian attitude of avoiding controversies, Annesley advised it would be more fruitful if we avoided fierce doctrinal debates and concentrated on serious godliness. Moreover, 'things necessary to Salvation' were 'but few, and plain, easie to be (thro Grace) sufficiently understood and practised', Annesley suggested, 'tho there is not any thing so inconsiderable, but may exercise the greatest Parts and Learning attainable in this life.'<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, 'those great doctrines of Christianity' which learned churchmen debated, could be saved for 'Serious Christians.' Most Christians did not need to be involved in controversies surrounding 'the unaccountableness of predetermination, the supra- or infra-lapsarian aspect of the election, the controverted extent of redemption, the manner of the concurrence of the Divine and Humane will in Vocation.' What they genuinely needed was 'ordinary Knowledge' to 'admire the Grace of God in Christ' and pursue 'Holiness of Life' in behaviour.<sup>38</sup> However, this unwillingness to engage in doctrinal disputes did not signify being indifferent towards religion. Annesley suggested that hard work was proof of God's grace, and a man who was devoted to holy life would never be idle. 'The considerate Christian' he wrote, 'hath not one hour in his life wherein he hath nothing to do: he alone can make a virtue of necessity.'<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Daniel Williams, *A Sermon Preached at Salters-Hall to the Societies for Reformation of Manners, May 16, 1698* (London, 1698), 18.

<sup>37</sup> Samuel Annesley, "How May We Give Christ a Satisfying Account, Why We Attend upon the Ministry of the Word," in *Casuistical Morning-Exercises: The Fourth Volume*, ed. Samuel Annesley, 1690, 21.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 15–16.

<sup>39</sup> Samuel Annesley, "How Is the Adherent Vanity of Every Condition Most Effectually Abated by Serious Godliness?," in *A Continuation of Morning-Exercise Questions and Cases of Conscience: Practically Resolved by Sundry Ministers, in*

Related to the emphasis on practical godliness, this group of Dissenters believed that a gradual way was ideal to achieve the goal. As will be discussed in the second chapter below, Defoe's moral ideas were centred on continuous improvement. This was not Defoe's unique idea since figures such as Baxter and Annesley all took such a view on moral development. Baxter emphasised long-term commitment and hard labour,<sup>40</sup> and he called those who wished to get wisdom without effort (to 'study, labour and wait for') it lazy and cheap.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, maintaining 'Our Part of the Covenant is practical Faith,' Baxter stressed that this was the duty that God imposed on us — a duty which was necessary for us to perform.<sup>42</sup> Practical diligence, including labour, devoted to our holiness was needful,<sup>43</sup> and 'God's promise of reward doth tell' us that our labour would not be 'in vain.'<sup>44</sup> He also argued that since individuals' capabilities were different, it was not appropriate to expect everyone to experience a rare dramatic conversion experience. Additionally, Baxter suggested that we could not regard the experience of conversion as the sole certificate of grace. Gradual education was indeed 'God's ordinary way for the Conveyance of his Grace.'<sup>45</sup> This gradual and

---

*October 1682*, ed. Samuel Annesley (London, 1683), 21.

<sup>40</sup> Richard Baxter, *The Cure of Church-Divisions: Or, Directions for Weak Christians, to Keep Them from Being Dividers, Or Troublers of the Church. With Some Directions to the Pastors, How to Deal with Such Christians* (London, 1670), 5.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 158.

<sup>42</sup> Richard Baxter, *The Poor Man's Family Book* (1684) (Cornwall: W. Cock, 1815), 182. See Alan C. Clifford, *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640–1790: An Evaluation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 230–31.

<sup>43</sup> Baxter, *The Cure of Church-Divisions*, 301. See Philip Connell, *The Failure of Uniformity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 85; Tim Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 166–69.

<sup>44</sup> Baxter, *The Cure of Church-Divisions*, 303.

<sup>45</sup> Quoted from Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*, 161.

long-term way of understanding God's idea was more secure than a sudden or fanatical conversion. Thus, Baxter stressed that 'the Soul of a Believer groweth up by degrees' and 'the gradual proceedings' was a stable way to be rewarded God's grace.<sup>46</sup>

Given his emphasis on long-term performance, it was natural for Baxter to point out that we should not judge a man by some extraordinary action. Instead, we needed to judge a person by the 'main design' and 'scope and tenor' of his actions over a long period.<sup>47</sup> It was by performing work on a regular basis that men were entitled to be called righteous. On the contrary, corrupt habits blocked our paths to salvation. These habits were fixed in humans' way of living and became our second nature. God did not request us to be good immediately, but to achieve it gradually, and Baxter wrote that 'Christ never intended to justifie or sanctifie us perfectly at the first ... but to carry on both proportionably [sic] and by degrees.'<sup>48</sup> Defoe's respected pastor Annesley's practical faith also preferred practical work to the conflict between different doctrines. For 'serious Christians, of but ordinary knowledge,' Annesley suggested that whatever can be said on the doctrinal controversy was 'not worth mentioning.' The crucial thing Christians should pursue was 'the grace of God in Christ,' and the way to achieve it was by pursuing the 'holiness of life.' According to Annesley, '... the work of mortification is harsh, and the work of holinesse[sic] difficult, but practice will facilitate them, and make thee in love with them, so the more thou acquaintest thy self

---

<sup>46</sup> Quoted from Ibid. See also Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, 109–10; Watts, *The Dissenters*, 291.

<sup>47</sup> Baxter, *The Poor Man's Family Book*, 55.

<sup>48</sup> Quoted from Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*, 271. John Howe and Thomas Manton also espoused the same cause.

with God, the more thou canst not but love him.<sup>49</sup> Annesley reminded his listeners that we should not be anxious and impatient since the process was ‘an insensible efficacy’ and ‘a gradual increase of Grace.’<sup>50</sup> The same point could also be seen in Annesley’s preface to Richard Alleine’s *Instructions about Heart-work* that ‘unless we attend to plain practical godliness,’ it was ‘only a presumption to expect deliverance, and not faith.’<sup>51</sup>

Surely good works were not the atonement for our sins or the assurance of our salvation. Annesley stated that our good behaviour did not guarantee our salvation. We had to ‘walk acceptably’ before God, in spite of his silence to our wishes.<sup>52</sup> In short, practice spoke louder than other things for him. Annesley held to the notion of serious godliness across his works, but what is this seriousness? He defined it as an appropriate combination of faith and morality, since there was ‘no morality without faith ... no faith without morality.’<sup>53</sup> In Annesley’s sermons, both the terms of holiness and godliness were frequently used and used interchangeably. Both holiness and godliness were more important than one’s ‘intellectual endowments.’<sup>54</sup> Annesley warned that it

---

<sup>49</sup> Samuel Annesley, “How May We Attain to Love God With All Our Hearts, Souls, and Minds?,” in *A Supplement to the Morning-Exercise at Cripple-Gate: Or, Several More Cases of Conscience Practically Resolved by Sundry Ministers ...*, ed. Samuel Annesley (London, 1674), 24. See Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe*, 19.

<sup>50</sup> Annesley, “How May We Give Christ a Satisfying Account, Why We Attend upon the Ministry of the Word,” 20.

<sup>51</sup> Samuel Annesley, “Preface,” in Richard Alleine’s *Instructions about Heart-Work What Is to Be Done on Gods Part, and Ours, for the Cure and Keeping of the Heart, That We May Live in the Exercise and Growth of Grace Here, and Have a Comfortable Assurance of Glory to Eternity* (London, 1681), 3.

<sup>52</sup> Samuel Annesley, *The First Dish at the Wil-Shire Feast, Novemb. 9. 1654: Or, A Sermon Preached at Laurence Jury to Those That There Offered Their Peace-Offerings, and Went Thence to Dine at Marchant-Taylors-Hall* (London, 1655), 5.

<sup>53</sup> Annesley, “How Is the Adherent Vanity of Every Condition Most Effectually Abated by Serious Godliness?” 37.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

was ‘not enough to love God in our Will,’ and we had to resist temptations that were ‘contrary to the Love of God.’<sup>55</sup> An example of serious godliness was when people got ‘a savoury knowledge of necessary practical truths,’ and they increased ‘the knowledge of them by practice.’<sup>56</sup> Therefore, we must strive for a ‘Life of Holiness, to evidence the sincerity of’ Faith.<sup>57</sup> Annesley constructed a generally positive relationship between moral virtues and spiritual grace, arguing that ‘Divine love is supernaturally natural; it turns Moral virtues into Spiritual graces. It engageth men to attempt as much for the glorifying of God.’<sup>58</sup>

Similar to Baxter’s emphasis on habitual godly behaviour, Annesley recommended that ‘those of you that have repented, let your repentance daily supplant sin by taking it by the heel certainly to lame it; though you cannot take it by the head utterly to kill it.’<sup>59</sup> Morton also emphasised the importance of forming the right habits in his writings on education. He mentioned that ‘Acquired Habits do much Alter the Genius or Spirit,’ and learning about moral philosophy could foster our idea of prudence.<sup>60</sup> If Christians did not pursue God’s message and gift with ‘labour and diligence,’ then they would not be rewarded with any prize from God even though they

---

<sup>55</sup> Annesley, “How May We Attain to Love God With All Our Hearts, Souls, and Minds?,” 6.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>57</sup> Annesley, “How May We Give Christ a Satisfying Account, Why We Attend upon the Ministry of the Word,” 18.

<sup>58</sup> Annesley, “How May We Attain to Love God With All Our Hearts, Souls, and Minds?,” 3.

<sup>59</sup> Samuel Annesley, “How We May Be Universally and Exactly Conscientious,” in *The Morning-Exercise at Cripple-Gate: Or, Several Cases of Conscience Practically Resolved, by Sundry Ministers, September, 1661*, ed. Samuel Annesley (London, 1671), 22. See also Joel R. Beeke and Mark Jones, *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012), 10–11.

<sup>60</sup> Girdler, “Defoe’s Education at Newington Green Academy,” 577.

had the knowledge of the Bible and Jesus Christ.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, Christians ought to be ‘frequent in the examination of’ their ‘heart and life.’<sup>62</sup> Annesley pointed out if we did not pay ‘practical regard’ to Jesus’s lesson, our hope for salvation would be in vain.<sup>63</sup> Concerning the redemption of humankind, Annesley provided the listeners with practical advice that ‘things necessary to Salvation’ were ‘few and plain,’ and it was easy to be ‘(thro Grace) sufficiently understood and practised ... but may exercise the greatest Parts and Learning attainable in this life.’<sup>64</sup>

Another distinguished dissenting minister Daniel Williams also declared his dislike for the controversy of doctrines.<sup>65</sup> Similar to his senior Annesley, Williams stressed the importance of regular practice and habit development. He was sure that if we genuinely repented and opened our heart to Jesus's lessons in the Bible, our ‘Habitual Disposition’ would change. The practical amendment itself was necessary to our learning of Christ’s lessons.<sup>66</sup> In contrast, a man with ‘vile Dispositions’ would

---

<sup>61</sup> Annesley, *The First Dish at the Wil-Shire Feast, Novemb. 9. 1654*, 4.

<sup>62</sup> Annesley, “How We May Be Universally and Exactly Conscientious,” 24. See also Beeke and Jones, *A Puritan Theology*, 10–11.

<sup>63</sup> Annesley, “How May We Give Christ a Satisfying Account, Why We Attend upon the Ministry of the Word,” 9.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>65</sup> Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*, 171. See also Daniel Defoe, *Memoirs of the Life and Eminent Conduct of That Learned and Reverend Divine, Daniel Williams, D. D: With Some Account of His Scheme for the Vigorous Propagation of Religion as Well in England as in Scotland and Several Other Parts of the World* (London, 1718), 66; John Marshall, *John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 410; Randall James Pederson, *Unity in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603-1689* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 228.

<sup>66</sup> Daniel Williams, *Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated: Wherein Some of Dr Crisp’s Opinions Are Considered; and the Opposite Truths Are Plainly Stated and Confirmed*, The second edition. (London, 1692), 86. See also Pritchard, “Voices of Dissent,” 33; Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 125; Keeble, “Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposing On Others’: Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition,” 296–97.

not be allowed to accept the assurance of salvation.<sup>67</sup> Williams encouraged readers saying, even though the process was long, they should not think that it was ‘in vain to strive; nor let the uneasiness of the struggle tempt thee to give it over.’<sup>68</sup>

Williams's emphasis on practical works was also clear in his long-time critique of antinomianism. Antinomianism was the belief that good works did not earn one a place in Heaven, it was permissible to indulge in worldly and bodily pleasures.<sup>69</sup> Williams did not accept this argument since he believed that the deeds of men in this world impacted their salvation. In 1690, a new edition of the late Tobias Crisp's sermons from the 1640s that many Puritans considered Antinomian with an addition of ten more taken from Tobias's notes was printed by his son Samuel Crisp. These works were attacked by Williams as dangerous, and he was supported by other Baxterian ministers such as John Howe and William Bates.<sup>70</sup> Williams impugned the errors of Antinomianism that were demonstrated in the republished works. Crisp's opinion, he argued, was ‘unduly limiting the Offers of Salvation, and decrying Arguments to excite Sinners to use their Endeavours under the Assistance of Gospel Means and common Grace.’<sup>71</sup> Williams stated that every justified person was judged

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>68</sup> Daniel Williams, *Practical Discourses on Several Important Subjects*, vol. 5 (London, 1738), 231. See also David L. Wykes, “Religious Leadership and English Dissent after the Glorious Revolution: The Role of the Rev. Dr Daniel Williams (ca. 1643-1715/16),” in *Episcopacy, Authority, and Gender*, ed. Jan Wim Buisman, Marjet Derks, and Peter Raedts (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 127–38.

<sup>69</sup> Marshall, *John Locke*, 410. For Baxter's lifelong critique of antinomianism, see Clifford, *Atonement and Justification*, 24–25; Roger Thomas, “Presbyterians in Transition,” in *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism*, ed. C. Cordon Bolam (London: Allen & Unwin, 1968), 118–122; Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England*.

<sup>70</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 182. On Baxter's critique of Crisp, see Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England*, 153–83.

<sup>71</sup> Daniel Williams, *An End to Discord: Wherein Is Demonstrated That No Doctrinal*

by their own ‘personal, sincere Obedience’ rather than inscrutably chosen by God. More straightforwardly, Williams argued that ‘our own Obedience and good Works’ were ‘the Condition of the Continuation of our Justification.’<sup>72</sup> Even though the action of performing good works itself did not justify a man, the action was ‘by God's fixed Law necessary’ for being ‘justified by Christ's Righteousness.’<sup>73</sup> All in all, Williams stated that God’s grace was more important than good works, although the latter was the only thing a man was able to do. Believing in that practice itself was significant, and Williams argued that there were many promises in God’s plan for humankind, but we could not obtain them if we did not practice His teachings.

Although good works and holiness did not amend our sin or abate our debt to God, Williams elaborated that our capabilities to lead a holy life were the clear signs that the power of Christ was working ‘all Holiness in the Soul,’ and enabled us to perform good deeds. Jesus deemed those who committed themselves to a holy life as partakers of ‘true Holiness’ if they ‘do these good Works perseveringly.’ These were, therefore ‘the Way and Means of a Believer’s obtaining of Salvation,’ and those who neglected these duties were excluded from salvation.<sup>74</sup> Williams constantly stressed that those who will be saved are not elected at birth, because ‘Eternal Life’ is given to

---

*Controversy Remains between the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers Fit to Justify Longer Divisions* (London, 1699), 33.

<sup>72</sup> Williams, *Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated*, 150. See Cooper, *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England*, 68; Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 174–75.

<sup>73</sup> Daniel Williams, *A Defence of Gospel-Truth: Being a Reply to Mr Chancey's First Part, and as an Explication of the Points in Debate May Serve for a Reply to All Other Answers* (London, 1693), 26. See also Pritchard, “Voices of Dissent,” 33; Pederson, “Unity in Diversity,” 160–91. Novak suggested that in his memoir of Williams Defoe disagreed with Williams, but Novak does not provide a specific page number. Throughout the *Memoirs of the Life of Daniel Williams*, I cannot locate Defoe’s critique of Williams’ attitude toward Antinomianism. Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 125.

<sup>74</sup> Williams, *An End to Discord*, 16.

those who 'will repent, and truly believe' in God.<sup>75</sup> He warned those who had not yet repented that they should soon begin their repentance and exercise it daily. Williams continually accentuated the importance of repentance. 'Continued Repentance and Holiness' were 'necessary to our possession of eternal Life,' he wrote.<sup>76</sup> For Williams, our salvation came not merely by the imputation of Christ. On the contrary, we had to fulfil our duties: Jesus was 'willing to Pardon and admit us to his favour, provided that we on our Parts perform the Conditions of the New Covenant, Repentance and Faith.'<sup>77</sup>

Williams argued that the reason that we were able to perform 'sincere Obedience and good Works' was due to the working grace of Jesus. Therefore, good works and obedience were indeed the 'Ways and Means of a Believer's obtaining Salvation.'<sup>78</sup> The same point could be observed from the admonition by John Flavel (1630-1691): 'never wink at, but watch against small sins, nor neglect little duties.'<sup>79</sup> Williams found it was necessary for him to explain how his view differed from that of the Roman Catholic Church. He explained that good deeds were not necessarily meritorious of salvation and eternal life. What he aimed to argue was that Christ offered humankind a chance for salvation; however, it depended on the hard work of the Christians to fulfil the teaching of the Gospel.<sup>80</sup> In short, we could not be sure of salvation even if we lead a virtuous life, but it was sure that the door of Heaven was shut for those who

---

<sup>75</sup> Williams, *A Defence of Gospel-Truth*, 10.

<sup>76</sup> Williams, *An End to Discord*, 94.

<sup>77</sup> Daniel Williams, *The Answer to the Report, &c., Which the United Ministers Appointed Their Committee to Draw up, as in the Preface* (London, 1698), 71.

<sup>78</sup> Williams, *An End to Discord*, 16.

<sup>79</sup> Quoted from Martin J. Greif, "The Conversion of Robinson Crusoe," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 6, no. 3 (1966): 559.

<sup>80</sup> Williams, *An End to Discord*, 52.

acted against the teachings of the Gospels. According to Williams, while sincere obedience and good works did not necessarily atone for our past sins, Christ intended to let us have the ability to perform good works and obedience. It was reasonable to infer that these were ‘the Ways and Means of a Believer's obtaining Salvation and several other Blessings.’<sup>81</sup> He summarised that ‘God doth indispensably require good Works and Obedience in all that are justified; so that a justified State is inconsistent with the Neglect of them.’<sup>82</sup> Williams explained that his argument was different from the good works of Catholicism. He stressed that besides actual deeds, repentance and faith were still necessary for one's salvation. Moreover, one could not sit still and hope that Jesus's death was the sole promise of salvation. Faith and repentance were the works that had to be done by humankind. Jesus gives us the chance, but it was ‘our Duty’ to fulfil it ‘by Gods’ Command.’<sup>83</sup>

It was not surprising that Williams's view was similar to the mainstream Anglican view since Williams himself belonged to this group of moderate Presbyterians. For instance, John Sharp, the Archbishop of York, held a same view of good works: ‘Tho’ Christ by his Death reconciled us to God, and procured the Pardon of Sin for us; yet the actual Benefit of this Reconciliation, the actual application of this Pardon, did depend upon our performance of certain Conditions.’<sup>84</sup>

As we will see in the second chapter, this view of practical works was magnified

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 120.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 150. See also Ibid., 16, 100; Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, 10; Clifford, *Atonement and Justification*, 224.

<sup>83</sup> Williams, *An End to Discord*, 55.

<sup>84</sup> John Sharp, *A Sermon Preach'd Before Queen Mary at White-Hall: On Easter Day, March 27. 1692* (London, 1709), 14.

in the movement of the Reformation of Manners, in which the Dissenters and the Anglicans participated together. Just as Williams spoke in one of his sermons during the movement that there was ‘no such difference between Members of the Established Church, and the Dissenters.’<sup>85</sup> This practical view could also be found in the sermons of Defoe’s friend Timothy Cruso (1656-1697). Cruso was a prominent minister in London in the 1690s, and in one of his sermons advised that there was no shortcut to a life of holiness. In his words, ‘the best ground’ required ‘frequent culture,’ and God would not work ‘immediately upon our Conversion.’ Instead, he said, we were ordered to ‘abide here for a while, that we may be yet better prepar’d for his everlasting Presence.’<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, God may sometimes take immediate salvation, while more often our desires and inclinations ought to be ‘gradually mortified’ before we repented and made tangible progress in reforming.<sup>87</sup> The reformation of our mind and behaviour should not be irregular. Instead, we must prepare it industriously. Cruso admonished that ‘unless they are put in execution beforehand,’ all these groundless resolutions would be ‘worth nothing.’<sup>88</sup> John Shower (1657-1715), a respected minister in London in the 1690s who had graduated from Morton's Academy a few years before Defoe, also promoted such practical and habitual improvement in

---

<sup>85</sup> Williams, *A Sermon Preached at Salters-Hall to the Societies for Reformation of Manners*, preface (unpaged).

<sup>86</sup> Timothy Cruso, *The Christian Laver. Or, a Discourse Opening the Nature of Participation with, and Demonstrating the Necessity of Purification by Christ* (London, 1690), 75. On Cruso, see Thomas, “Presbyterians in Transition,” 120–21; Hunter, *The Reluctant Pilgrim*, 47, 49, 54; Pat Rogers, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Unwin Critical Library* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1979), 54, 60; Warren Johnston, *Revelation Restored: The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 213–14.

<sup>87</sup> Cruso, *The Christian Laver*, 75.

<sup>88</sup> Timothy Cruso, *The Period of Humane Life Determined by the Divine Will* (London, 1688), 24.

sermons. Therefore, repentance from a death-bed is ‘a very deceitful thing,’ as a ‘habitual obstinate Sinner’ is unlikely to repent in the last hour.<sup>89</sup>

Aside from accentuating practical works, this circle of dissenters also proposed rational self-love in the works. This was notable because self-love had usually been regarded as a negative concept. What was unique about this group of dissenters is that they started to claim that self-love or self-interest was not entirely undesirable. As long as we faced up to the problem of the depraved nature of humankind, it was feasible to fight passions with other passions. Annesley, for instance, cautioned the readers of ‘over-esteeming,’ that is, the wrong use of self-love, but he also proposed that it was possible to take advantage of this passion. Annesley noted that our self-love was inherently stronger than our love to others; ‘we are more concern’d for the cutting off our Finger, than the cutting off another man’s Head.’<sup>90</sup> He wrote: ‘let a well ordered Self-love steer you right in this matter,’<sup>91</sup> although Annesley was not fully open to the practical use of self-love, he still admonished listeners to ‘shake off your worldly wisdom [sic], your ignorant self-love, your abuse of mercies,’<sup>92</sup> and to embrace self-denial that was true self-love.

The emphasis on the tainted human nature was a feature of the Augustinian view of human nature. This emphasis was evident in the title of Williams’s work encouraging the Reformation of Manners: ‘The Vanity of Childhood and Youth,

---

<sup>89</sup> John Shower, *Heaven and Hell, or; The Unchangeable State of Happiness or Misery for All Mankind in Another World* (London, 1700), 103.

<sup>90</sup> Annesley, “How May We Attain to Love God With All Our Hearts, Souls, and Minds?” 9.

<sup>91</sup> Annesley, “How May We Give Christ a Satisfying Account, Why We Attend upon the Ministry of the Word,” 193.

<sup>92</sup> Annesley, “How We May Be Universally and Exactly Conscientious,” 9.

wherein the depraved Nature of Young People is represented and the means for their reformation proposed.’<sup>93</sup> On another occasion, Williams warned that those who indulged in their ‘corrupt Nature’ would ‘have an Aversion to Christ and his Interest’ and face self-destruction.<sup>94</sup> The writings of another dissenter John Shower also showed this Augustinianism or Augustinian view of human nature. Even though Shower did not argue outspokenly like Defoe or Williams that self-love could be more or less exploited, he noticed this was an essential part of human nature, which also illustrated the attention paid to the corrupt human nature of these dissenters. One crucial and oft-cited Bible verse for Augustine of Hippo and Augustinians was *1 John* 2:16: ‘For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.’<sup>95</sup> Shower cited this verse and warned listeners that ‘The Lust of the Eyes, or lusting after those things which Men see others enjoy, hath had the like Effects.’<sup>96</sup> In another sermon, Shower also used this verse to state that ‘By the Lust of the Eyes, our Desires are immoderate after Temporal and External Goods.’ He encouraged them to ‘to oppose and mortifie these Lusts’ and

---

<sup>93</sup> Daniel Williams, *The Vanity of Childhood & Youth Wherein the Depraved Nature of Young People Is Represented and Means for Their Reformation Proposed* (London, 1691).

<sup>94</sup> Williams, *A Sermon Preached at Salters-Hall to the Societies for Reformation of Manners*, 17.

<sup>95</sup> For the discussion of Augustine’s explanation of this verse, see Michael Moriarty, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves: Early Modern French Thought II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 171–72. On the relationship between ‘lust of the eyes’ and *Robinson Crusoe* and other novels, see Robert W Ayers, “Robinson Crusoe: Allusive Allegorick History,” *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (1967): 403–05; David Blewett, “The Retirement Myth In Robinson Crusoe: A Reconsideration,” *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15, no. 2 (1982): 45; Albert J. Rivero, “The Restored Garden and the Devil as Christ: Defoe’s Inversion of Biblical Images of Salvation in Roxana,” *Essays in Literature* 11, no. 2 (1984): 286.

<sup>96</sup> John Shower, *No Peace to the Wicked: A Sermon Preached on the Fast-Day, May 23. 1694.* (London, 1694), 9.

be aware of our ‘inordinate Love’ of ourselves.<sup>97</sup>

Williams’s idea of self-love was noteworthy. He said that selfishness was the biggest problem that hinders people from being saved. He decided to use the term rational Self-love, which was meant to remind the readers of the problems of selfishness. He wrote:

If you neglect National Reformation, you have not that true regard to your own Happiness, which rational Self-love directs. Carnal Self-love destroys Mankind, but Rational Self-love is that Principle by which God governs this World, and on which he grafteth Grace it self.<sup>98</sup>

Although Williams argued that self-love be mortified, the language he used showed that the key to one’s decision to do good things or evil things was one’s passions which included self-love. This was indeed Augustinian or Jansenist language.<sup>99</sup>

In summary, a group of Dissenters who were close to Defoe held an unmistakably similar practical view of moral and mental improvement. For them, good deeds were not sufficient for salvation, while faith alone without good works was not sufficient either. This attitude was most evident in their participation in the Movement of the Reformation of Manners, which came to a climax in the 1690s. The next chapter will look deeper into the Movement. Defoe himself was a London tradesman in the 1680s-90s, and the readers of his pamphlet were largely lower-middle class tradesmen.

---

<sup>97</sup> John Shower, *A New-Years-Gift: Containing Serious Reflections on Time, and Eternity* (London, 1699), 81.

<sup>98</sup> Daniel Williams, *A Sermon Preach’d before the Societies for Reformation of Manners, in Dublin July the 18th, 1700* (Dublin, 1700), 12.

<sup>99</sup> Thomas Ahnert, “Pleasure, Pain and Punishment in the Early Enlightenment: German and Scottish Debates,” *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik/Annual Review of Law and Ethics* (2004): 178.

According to Margaret Hunt, some of the core supporters of the Reformation of Manners were businessmen. They preferred ‘ethical and rational Christianity’ and ‘communally defined and.....secular virtue’ to theoretical doctrine.<sup>100</sup> Williams was an avid supporter of the Reformation of Manners movement, as was Defoe. Even though Defoe was not satisfied with the irresponsible behaviour of the leading reformers, his idea of moral reform and emphasis on good deeds was very similar to the Dissenters’ views discussed above.

### **Scholarship on Defoe’s Religious Thoughts**

This dissertation discusses Defoe’s religious thoughts. Modern scholarship on this dimension of Defoe focuses mostly on his novels such as *Robinson Crusoe* and *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana*. This can be traced back to the publication of Ian Watt’s *The Rise of the Novel* in 1957. Watt’s analysis of *Robinson Crusoe* involved numerous developments of the modern world, from Max Weber’s thesis of Protestant Ethics to the capitalist society of the twentieth century. In *Robinson Crusoe* himself, Watt saw some characteristics of modern civilisation. For instance, *Robinson Crusoe*’s character depends largely on the psychological and social orientation of economic individualism. The story on the island shows that *Crusoe* found satisfaction in taking on various tasks and increased economic specialisation. Behind the spiritual experience of *Crusoe*, there is a secular Puritan individualism, with a special emphasis on self-awareness. Simply put, *Crusoe* is regarded as a hero of self-sufficiency, isolation, and dull

---

<sup>100</sup> Margaret R. Hunt, *The Middling Sort* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996), 107.

capitalism. Watt suggests that religion is a relatively minor element in Defoe's fiction, and indeed, the Puritan legacy is too weak to explain Crusoe's experience. In short, Crusoe's religious beliefs had little impact on his behaviour. This indifference to Defoe's religious thought has attracted much criticism.

Revisionists pay much attention to the importance of the cycles of sin and regeneration. Two prominent works were published during the mid 1960s: J. Paul Hunter's *The Reluctant Pilgrim* (1966) and George Starr's *Daniel Defoe and Spiritual Biography* (1965). They linked the repentance and spiritual journey of the protagonists in Defoe's novels to the spiritual autobiographies of Puritan tradition, such as John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Both Starr and Hunter stress that Defoe's novels, especially *Robinson Crusoe*, could only be fully understood by considering their religious background. Starr points out that the conversion of Crusoe conformed to the tradition of spiritual autobiography of the seventeenth century.<sup>101</sup> Hunter explored fictions from the perspective of sub-literary forms such as Christian instruction books and guidebooks. In Defoe's novels, there is a tradition of providential explanation, which referred to the manifest intervention of God in human affairs, usually associated with shipwrecks. The findings of these two critics bring us closer to one of Defoe's important intentions in his fictions: as an imaginary autobiography centring around sin, repentance and conversion.

Indeed, these two studies have corrected Watt's dismissive attitude toward Defoe's religious ideas. Starr has proven the link between Puritans like Baxter and

---

<sup>101</sup> Hunter, *The Reluctant Pilgrim*; Starr, *Defoe & Spiritual Autobiography*.

Defoe. Furthermore, Hunter has linked Defoe's novels with the Puritan tradition of spiritual biography, and he also discusses Timothy Cruso and other Puritans' concerns and theology. What could be added to their findings is that Defoe's idea of moral improvement and good works was also derived from his Presbyterian forerunners. Although the two books were about Defoe's novels, from this time onwards people began to think of Defoe's work as having its own system. He is not a second-rate writer, and his original and profound ideas are worthy of serious research.

In the second half of the twentieth century and the first decades of the twenty-first century, a series of studies of Defoe's ideas emerged. Defoe's political works and their relationship with *Robinson Crusoe* were the subjects of many important studies. Manuel Schonhorn explored the complex political implications of Robinson Crusoe in *Defoe's Politics*.<sup>102</sup> The book also explores Defoe's belief in the Old Testament, and it is this belief that made him always appreciate and look forward to the arrival of warrior-kings, like William III. Therefore, there has been considerable discussion about the religious dimension of Defoe's novels, while the religious ideas of his non-fiction still need more research. This dissertation aims to fill the gap in Defoe's understudied religious thoughts expressed in his non-fiction works, as well as his novels. In the scholarship of the intellectual history of Daniel Defoe, the most critical study in recent years is Katherine Clark's monograph.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> Manuel Schonhorn, *Defoe's Politics: Parliament, Power, Kingship and "Robinson Crusoe"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

<sup>103</sup> Katherine Clark, *Daniel Defoe: The Whole Frame of Nature, Time, and Providence* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007).

Clark was the first to emphasise a key aspect of Defoe's religion, namely Trinitarianism and the resulting eschatology. She points out that Defoe's Christology occupies a central position for the understanding of his work. The book uses Defoe's thoughts on Trinitarianism to understand his beliefs on many issues. Clark stresses that Defoe took religion seriously and was a theologically orthodox Dissenter, specifically a Presbyterian. For instance, when he remarked on John Milton's description of the Devil in his poems, Defoe was committed to 'trying to shore up faith and a religious practice derived from late seventeenth-century Nonconformity.'<sup>104</sup> Furthermore, Defoe's religious position represented itself most vividly in his belief in Trinitarianism. She argues that this was Defoe's deep-seated belief and was the reason why he took issues with Deists such as John Toland and Matthew Tindal. Clark's research is inspiring especially in her emphasis on the less-studied dimension of Defoe's religious ideas, and she has stressed the Trinity as the centre of Defoe's religious thoughts. However, Clark does not write much about the specific substance of Defoe's Trinitarian belief.

Although Clark strongly emphasises Trinitarianism, it only has an important influence on the Salter Hall controversy in the whole book. Moreover, Defoe's belief in the Trinity is repeating the passage of the Trinity in the Bible, and in fact in all of his writings, he only mentioned it a few times. In most of the works, Defoe rarely mentioned the workings of the Holy Spirit in the world. It was only in his critique of the deists and the insufficiency of natural reason that Defoe would resort to the doctrine

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 210.

of the Trinity, which transcends reason. Therefore, that fact that whether Defoe was a Trinitarian or not does not seem to affect Clark's argument at all. It seems that the effectiveness of Clark's emphasis is limited. In addition, Clark explained Defoe's providential explanation of world trade as his 'Christian theology', but it is a pity that she does not give more details of this theology of Defoe, neither does she explain the link between this belief in trade and Defoe's Trinitarianism.

This dissertation does not object to Defoe's belief in the Trinity, and Clark's research is inspiring because she gives due attention to the consistency and depth of Defoe's thoughts. What can be added to Clark's research is that it would be more fruitful to not place labels or titles on Defoe. Clark is correct in pointing out that 'sin, repentance, and Atonement' are the key points in Defoe's thoughts. However, she does not cover this dimension satisfactorily.

Undoubtedly, Clark's analysis of Defoe as a serious religious thinker is correct, but many specific details are still needed. This is manifested on many levels, such as Defoe's frequent citing of the Old Testament, his Augustinian view of human nature, and his view of the balance between morality and commerce. It will be more appropriate to deal with these topics individually than to explain them pointing to a single idea of Trinitarianism. Moreover, Defoe's religious thought was not limited to his belief in the Trinity. On the contrary, his religious beliefs were embedded in and scattered throughout all genres of his writings, sometimes not only his belief in the Trinity but also his understanding of the Old Testament as well as his interpretation of the Reformation. Merrett's work in 1982 also paid attention to this issue, and the author

stressed Defoe's 'unwillingness to consider morality independently of religion.'<sup>105</sup>

What could be added is the explicit description of Defoe's exact mechanism for connecting morality with religion and his previous intellectual engagement with these ideas.

### **Introduction to the Source Material of Each Chapter**

Chapter 1 first provides an exposition of the Neo-Augustinian traditions themselves and the influence of the leading figures in Jansenism, before engaging directly with the evidence for Defoe's Neo-Augustinian thought. Based on this discussion, the chapter will examine Defoe's methods in dealing with the ordinary people's problems of alcoholism and swearing in the context of the Manners Reformation movement in England between the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. I point out that the values behind these approaches were derived from both his Augustinian view of human nature and his ideas on how to correct corrupt passions by manipulating other passions.

The most detailed demonstration of Defoe's philosophical ideas is the third volume of *Robinson Crusoe*, the *Serious Reflections*. The book is a collection of religious, moral, and other materials. The first volume of *Crusoe* was published in April 1719, and its last two pages already provide an abstract and an advertisement for the sequel. Four months later, *A Farther Adventure* was published. *Serious Reflections* was published in August 1720, which included material written in the same year, but

---

<sup>105</sup> Robert James Merrett, *Daniel Defoe's Moral and Rhetorical Ideas* (Victoria, [B.C.]: Department of English, University of Victoria, 1980).

also included materials written by Defoe during the reign of William III, on the topic of moral reform. Although it can be seen as a way to make more profit, many of Defoe's ideas were fully elaborated in the book. In the preface and the first article, 'On Solitude', there were many valuable clues to Defoe's views on human nature and the self. The pain of isolation had brought Defoe to a great argument of passion. One paragraph seems to be a particularly moving commentary on the isolation brought about by self-interest in human nature. For instance, all substantial reflection is directed to ourselves. Defoe wrote: 'our meditations are all solitude in perfection; our passions are all exercised in retirement; we love, we hate, we covet, we enjoy, all in privacy and solitude.'<sup>106</sup> *Serious Reflections* is not only the last sequel of the Crusoe trilogy, but also an early draft of his supernatural writings in the late 1720s: *The Political History of the Devil* (1726), *The System of Magick*, and *An Essay on the History and Reality of Apparitions* (1727). The common theme of the three works is in the same vein as the second half of *Serious Reflections*, which dealt with deviation and threats to sound faith. Defoe recognised and derided what he saw as the two main sources of threats to Christianity. First, he used terms such as freethinking, deism, and atheism interchangeably. The second source was superstition and enthusiasm. To address these extremes, Defoe's position was to maintain a balance between them. His position was a moderate, balanced, reformed Protestantism that was based on the

---

<sup>106</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Serious Reflections during the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1720), ed. G. A. Starr, vol. 3, *The Novels of Daniel Defoe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), 58.

authority of the Bible, and he proposed to deal with these issues with the reformation of the manners.

Another book related to Defoe's moral reforms was *The Poor Man's Plea. Concerning all the Proclamations, Declarations, Acts of Parliament, &c. Which have been, or shall be made, or Published, for Reformation of Manners, and suppressing Immorality in the Nation*. It was clear from the title that the book was meant to discuss the failure of the reform campaign. He believed that the flaws of the English legal system were mainly attributable to officials in the upper ranks not leading by example. Defoe condemned all the laws which allowed a magistrate to send a poor man to the stocks for one's immorality, meanwhile in practice, these laws never applied to nobles or gentlemen.

Defoe tracked vices, which meant drunkenness, swearing, and whoring, and he noticed that drunkenness that stemmed from the royal court had already spread to the aristocrats and gentlemen, and further into the whole nation. Often, those magistrates who sentenced men to the stocks were guilty themselves. The pamphlet was based on King William's speech to parliament on December 3, 1697. In the speech, William proclaimed to 'discourage Prophaneness and Immorality.'<sup>107</sup> Defoe portrayed a poor

---

<sup>107</sup> Quoted from P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens, *A Critical Bibliography of Daniel Defoe* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1998), 14. For other works were also influenced by William's speech, see Thomas Reynolds, *A Sermon Preach'd to the Societies for Reformation of Manners in the Citys of London and Westminster. February, 19. 1699* (London, 1700), 60–61; R. R Banks, *A Sermon Preach'd at St. Trinity's in Kingston, upon Hull To a Society There for the Reformation of Manners, September 20. 1699* (London, 1700), 18.

man at work, and stated that gentlemen and the clergy were ‘Lights erected on high places to guide and govern us’ for them.<sup>108</sup>

Defoe in turn argued that only when gentlemen and clergy begin to reform themselves could the corrupt customs of the society be arrested. *The Reformation of Manners* was a satiric poem concerning the same topic, that is, the hypocrisy of the officials in charge of the Reformation of Manners. In the poem, Defoe asked why London was degenerate but had not yet been punished by God? He listed many prominent figures in London such as Sir Robert Jeffries, Sir Robert Clayton, Sir Charles Duncombe and so on, condemning their immoral behaviour. In the second part, Defoe combined the attack on morals with a critique of deism. For Defoe, the crime committed by John Toland was similar to that of those drunk officials who ought to be the exemplars for the people,<sup>109</sup> since Toland himself was a minister who was supposed to be a leading example, rather than a dangerous freethinker.

Chapter 2 discusses Defoe’s view of luxury and the tradesmen’s dilemma between profits and morality. Having explained the theories of the most significant aspect in shaping Defoe’s religious thought, in chapter 2 I will turn to his economic thought which was intertwined with his Augustinian view of human nature. There was a debate on luxury in France and Britain in the age of Defoe. Thinkers such as Bernard Mandeville, Joseph Addison and the third Earl of Shaftsbury contributed to this debate, and numerous works have been published in recent decades dealing with their thoughts.

---

<sup>108</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea (1698)*, ed. J.A. Downie, vol. 6, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 30.

<sup>109</sup> Furbank and Owens, *A Critical Bibliography of Daniel Defoe*, 35.

In contrast, Defoe scholars tend to deal with Defoe's view of luxury separately, rather than putting it in its contemporary context. This chapter seeks to shed light on Defoe's significant position in the debate on luxury of his age.

The primary material is the two volumes of the *CET*, and it was written and published a few years before the author died. Defoe's years of practice in various industries and decades of discussion of business issues give this book a distinct authority and appeal. The book's loose structure makes it clear that Defoe conceived of it from the beginning as a single-volume publication since there is no mention of volume one in the original title page, nor is there any hint of continuation. But he changed his mind when he was writing.<sup>110</sup> An experienced English tradesman is knowledgeable about many industries and business techniques, the details of which are introduced time and again to provide insight into the highs and lows of trading life. Emphasising that tradesmen were fulfilling their religious duties while striving for business, Defoe elaborated that diligence in work would make him a fortune both in secular and future worlds at the same time. In comparison to his predecessors such as Steele and Bunyan, Defoe's secularism became more obvious, which made the trade as significant as redemption.

Defoe published *A Plan of English Commerce* ten months after the second volume of *CET*, in which he could fully elaborate his idea on the possible improvement of English trade without a word limit. The focus of this chapter is on Defoe's idea of luxury and the vision of the development of English commerce. In this almost final

---

<sup>110</sup> John McVeagh, "Introduction to *The Compleat English Tradesman*," in *RDW*, vol. 7, (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 1–32.

book, Defoe gathers years of scattered business advice into a comprehensive trade manifesto. He explained why the book was needed in the preface. There is also an overview and vision of the development of luxury goods and indeed of business in Great Britain as a whole. Individual traders know their small piece of land, but rarely know anything larger than it, yet, if properly understood, the themes of business are both astonishingly small and oceanic in scope. Much of the book celebrates this perception of things, but as Defoe's historical account of business continues, it also highlights opportunities for further improvement in all branches.

Having established a context for Defoe's ideal image of tradesmen, chapter 3 will look at the influence of religion on Defoe's political thought by examining Defoe's interpretation of Old Testament stories of Jeroboam and Rehoboam and his criticism of absolute monarchy. This will involve the adjustment for previous interpretations which paid insufficient attention to Defoe's emphasis on original sin and the corruption of human nature, and the transition of political institutions from the patriarchal family to monarchy. I argue that Defoe's explanations of human nature and the origin of society will be examined, and I conclude that from Defoe's distinctive combining of Augustinian understanding of sin and human nature, and his combination of natural law theories with biblical exegesis, there emerges a clearer picture of the importance of religion on his political works.

Defoe most extensively conveyed his criticism in *Jure Divino*, a 12-book, satirical poem that he started writing in 1703 and was published in the summer of 1706. As the title implied, it was an attack on the theory of the monarch's divinity, and the book had

a long foreword and extensive footnotes. The poem had a double dedication to ‘Most Serene, Most Invincible, and Most Illustrious Lady REASON: First Monarch of the World,’ and then to Queen Anne. In the preface Defoe argued that the notion of divine right used in contemporary political polemics was merely an attempt to justify tyrannical behaviour. The main target of *Jure Divino* was High Tory revived ideology of divine right.

Divine right theory first grew in importance during the reign of James I, and was subsequently advanced by church figures such as Archbishop Ussher and Jeremy Taylor. It received its classic narrative in *Patriarcha* by Sir Robert Filmer: a work written around 1642, though not published until 1680. Even though the term ‘divine right’ was itself new, it was linked to a much older doctrine of passive obedience. Even though the doctrines of divine right and passive obedience are logically different, Filmer combined them. He inculcated the duty of passive obedience to a monarch even if he was the most degenerate tyrant. After the revolution of 1688 the appeal of divine right theory dwindled, although the theory became powerful again after Queen Anne’s accession to the throne. The *Rehearsal*, a journal written by Non-Juror Charles Leslie (1650-1722), was symbolic of this wave of High Toryism. It was partly to refute the resurgence of divine right theory that Defoe published *Jure Divino*. In the preface, Defoe made clear that the targets of the poem were ‘rehearsers, Jacobites, Non-jurors, and the crowd of party-furies,’<sup>111</sup> although he did not deny that kings were divinely sanctioned. What Defoe disagreed over with the Filmerians, was that the monarch was

---

<sup>111</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Jure Divino* (1706), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 2, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 65.

above everything including popular sovereignty, namely Parliament in the case of England.

Defoe made ambitious and intelligent points, but he repeated them clumsily throughout the work. His footnotes were often sharper and more convincing than the text. The key idea was evident in its introductory lines:

Nature has left this Tincture in the Blood,  
That all Men would be Tyrants if they cou'd:  
If they forbear their Neighbours to devour,  
Tis not for want of Will, but want of Power.<sup>112</sup>

These verses were borrowed from Rochester's *Satyr against Mankind*. This Augustinian view of human nature and politics was the core of Defoe's political thoughts. Even though the taint in human nature could not be removed, Defoe argued that it was feasible to be vigilant and to build up precautionary measures. Therefore, Defoe was not entirely pessimistic about the inevitable corruption of monarchs, instead he believed this regularity made it 'self-regulating and a basis for civil society.'<sup>113</sup> As Defoe pointed out, 'The only Safety of Society, is, that my Neighbour's just as proud as I,' and 'I have the same Will and Wish, the same Design, and his Abortive Envy ruins mine.'<sup>114</sup> Defoe's idea of just and unjust monarchy scattered in different parts and innumerable biblical references of *Jure Divino*. This chapter focuses on Defoe's emphasis on the Old Testament, as he attributed the origins of different political institutions to Nimrod, Saul and Rehoboam. Moreover, Defoe cited the past to talk

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid, 71.

<sup>113</sup> P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens, *A Political Biography of Daniel Defoe* (Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 53.

<sup>114</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:71.

about the present when he referred to Saul, Rehoboam and others, and his interpretation provided justification for the new government after 1688.

Not only did Defoe's political thought stem from his religious thought; Defoe's historical ideas also had their origins in his religious ideas, and it is to these I will turn in chapter 4. The context for the developments of his political thought was the progressive model of the history of moral thought that came to dominate Defoe's work in the early decades of the eighteenth century. In contrast to Katherine Clark, Paula Backscheider and Robert Merrett who favoured specific models of Defoe's historical thought, this chapter deals with this problem in a comprehensive and systematic way. Defoe insisted that Moses and the Hebrews were given the knowledge of letters directly from God, and this award confirmed the status of the Hebrews as a chosen people. Besides, Defoe had a particular interest in the achievements of the Phoenicians in navigation and trade, which was further proof of God's favour. Defoe argued that, considering the economic improvement England had achieved in his time, Britain was the genuine successor to these two ancient peoples.

Many historical sources were used, but the most important was Defoe's *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements* published in four issues between October 1725 and May 1726. The book was written at the same time as the *CET* and *A Tour*. Similar to the two books, *General History* celebrated the dignity and dynamism of trade as the main motivation of human behaviour and achievement. The first part of *A General History* focused on the history of the Phoenicians, a people who were committed to trade and exploration. Defoe's account of the origin of Phoenician

civilization was largely based on the Old Testament, such as the story of Sidon, son of Canaan, and the foundations of the cities including Sidon and Tyre. Moreover, Defoe attributed the invention of alphabet to the Phoenicians, to which their advancement in business skills was largely attributable, although he stressed the first people who used letters were the Hebrews.

Based on his preference of the Phoenicians, it is not surprising that Defoe referred to the English as the modern Phoenicians as he regarded both nations as God's blessed ones, however there is yet to be any study of the materials Defoe used to make this argument. The comparison of England and Phoenicia was scattered throughout Defoe's various writings including *The Review*, *A Tour* and other writings, and this chapter puts them together and provides an explanation for Defoe's emphasis on Henry VII's improvement of English wool manufacturing.

## **Chapter 1: Defoe's Moral Thought and the Neo-Augustinian Tradition**

This chapter aims to discuss Defoe's moral thought with respect to the neo-Augustinian tradition. Defoe maintained that self-love and pride were ingrained in human nature, and that it was impossible to eradicate these passions. However, it was viable for the social and political elites in England to design a proper mechanism through which the public could satisfy their vanity and meanwhile unintentionally improve their social behaviour. This chapter focuses on Defoe's methods of tackling the problems of drinking and swearing among the English people in the context of the Reformation of Manners movements in England, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Notably, the beliefs behind these methods for reforming manners derived from his Augustinian view of human nature and his ideas on how to correct corrupt passions by manipulating the passions themselves.

### **Jansenism, Mandeville, and Defoe**

To understand Defoe's Augustinian views, it will be useful first to discuss Bernard Mandeville, Defoe's contemporary and author of *The Fable of the Bees*. In recent years, the scholarship on Mandeville's neo-Augustinianism has been plentiful.<sup>1</sup>

The important role this thread of thought played in Mandeville's works has now been

---

<sup>1</sup> John Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples, 1680-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 261–80; Pierre Force, *Self-Interest before Adam Smith: A Genealogy of Economic Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 48–63. See also: Edward J. Hundert, *The Enlightenment's Fable: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Daniel Luban, "Bernard Mandeville as Moralizer and Materialist," *History of European Ideas* 41, no. 7 (2015): 831–57; Mikko Tolonen, *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013).

widely recognised by intellectual historians. According to scholars, Mandeville somehow interweaved neo-Augustinianism with Epicureanism on the basis of their mutual recognition of the corruption inherent in human nature.<sup>2</sup> They had a common enemy in the numerous Stoic-influenced moral ideas that had been popular since early seventeenth-century France, which proposed that ‘virtue could be sufficient for happiness and associated that virtue with public-spirited action.’<sup>3</sup> Recognising the condition of man after the Fall, Mandeville made an explicit acknowledgement of the practical advantages of luxury and self-interest. He inherited the line of thought from the moralism of seventeenth-century France, exclaiming that virtue is vice and vice-versa. While the Augustinian Jansenists, Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), Pierre Nicole (1625-1695), or the more secular François de La Rochefoucauld (1613-1680) were preoccupied with the idea that self-interest or self-love (pride) was the root cause of human action, no matter how noble or self-sacrificing it may seem.<sup>4</sup>

Mandeville’s *Fable* was formed over a quarter of a century. First, the poem ‘The Grumbling Hive: or, Knaves Turn’d Honest’ was published in 1705. In 1714, Mandeville published *The Fable of the Bees, or, Private vices, Publick benefits*, in which the 1705 poem was reprinted, together with twenty ‘Remarks’ including both short comments and long essays elaborating on the meaning of the 1705 poem. However, the *Fable* did not receive attention until 1723 when an extended edition of

---

<sup>2</sup> Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*, 128–30.

<sup>3</sup> Christopher Brooke, *Philosophic Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012), 141.

<sup>4</sup> Luban, “Bernard Mandeville as Moralizer and Materialist,” 834. See also Force, *Self-Interest before Adam Smith*, 79–80; E. D. James, *Pierre Nicole, Jansenist and Humanist: A Study of His Thought* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972), 149–51.

the *Fable*, which also included an extended edition of ‘Remarks’ and two long essays. The Middlesex Grand Jury condemned the book as immoral, stressing the *Fable’s* defence of prostitution. The Grand Jury complained that the *Fable* was an advocate of ‘Luxury, Avarice, Pride and all kinds of Vices, as being necessary to Public Welfare’ and represented ‘Religion and Virtue as prejudicial to Society, and detrimental to the State.’<sup>5</sup> The Jury condemnation, however, caused a result contrary to its objective. The *Fable* attracted much more attention than before. It had received barely any when it was first printed.

Mandeville’s message, in short, was that most acts of public virtue stemmed from self-interest rather than higher concerns based on reason. Nearly all acts, even those considered to be noble, were influenced by our passion, especially pride. Mandeville argued that ‘Moral Virtues are the Political Offspring which Flattery begot upon *Pride*. [italics mine]’ ( In other words, what was crucial for the common good was a skilful government, since ‘Private Vices by the dextrous Management of a skilful Politician may be turned into Publick Benefits.’<sup>6</sup> Politicians, like all other men, are selfish and entirely devoted to the fulfilment of their own desires. But for Mandeville, these shortcomings did not affect individuals’ ability to advance the common good. What politicians required was not civic virtue, but rather practical knowledge and psychological insight.

---

<sup>5</sup> Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (1732), ed. F.B. Kaye, vol. 1, With a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory by F.B. Kaye (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1988), 385.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 369.

In early eighteenth-century England, few writers would dare to point out ‘private vices, public virtues’ except Defoe and Mandeville.<sup>7</sup> Although Defoe’s view of human nature was not as harsh as Mandeville’s, Defoe’s openness to the manipulation of the passion of self-love was uncommon in his age. The two writers’ ideas were strikingly similar in key respects. First, they both stressed that there was an instinct of imitation of humankind. Defoe argued that humans had a natural inclination to ‘look above our selves, and ... strive to imitate those, that some way or another are superior to us.’<sup>8</sup> Since the royal court was followed by all the subjects, Defoe advised that, it would be most beneficial to the reforming agenda if the manners of the royal family were presented as examples. Similar to Defoe’s emphasis on the potential of royal exemplar,<sup>9</sup> Mandeville pointed out that in England, both polite culture and the notion of honour were coined by the court—polite behaviour, words, and phrases were all invented there.<sup>10</sup> Any style of language was first adopted by the court and the upper class before it became popular among the common people. Second, Mandeville argued

---

<sup>7</sup> This reading is different from the one of Ashley Marshall, who argues that Defoe believed that ‘private vice jeopardizes the public interest.’ Marshall is partially correct, but she notices neither Defoe’s acknowledgement of the inevitability of private vice, nor his proposed manipulation of this passion. See Ashley Marshall, “Daniel Defoe as Satirist,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (2007): 561. In 1722 Matthew Tindal praised Mandeville, stating that ‘Private Vices, in this Case, are far from being publick Inconveniences, as is admirably made out by a late ingenious Author.’ Tindal’s point, however, was to uphold the developing of manufactures, while Defoe and Mandeville stressed more on the manipulating of human passions. See Matthew Tindal, *A Defence of Our Present Happy Establishment* (London, 1722), 19, quoted from J. A. W. Gunn, *Beyond Liberty and Property* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983), 107.

<sup>8</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:75.

<sup>9</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Defoe’s Review*, ed. John McVeagh (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 3:302.

<sup>10</sup> Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (1732), ed. F.B. Kaye, vol. 2, With a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory by F.B. Kaye (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1988), 347.

that honour and glory were invented by the clever politician since they grasped the psychological mechanism of the subjects.<sup>11</sup> People were willing to follow the example of the ruling class for their vain glory, and it would be easier for the latter's management of the government.

In 1709, Mandeville's article in *The Female Tatler* also stated that 'the strict Observance of the point of Honour' was a 'necessary Evil' for magistrates' governing.<sup>12</sup> The invention of honour was used for the 'Improvement in the Art of Flattery' of oneself, Mandeville claimed, because the working of the system of honour was 'ravishing to Human Nature.'<sup>13</sup> That is, by imitating the behaviour of the elite to acquire honours, humankind could satisfy their self-love and attain a respectable reputation at the same time. Even though Defoe and Mandeville both acknowledged the central role played by pride (self-love) in both the human mind and in the workings of society, there was a difference between the two. For instance, the Dutch doctor would have disagreed with Defoe's belief of the possibility of the virtuous pursuit of glory and honour. Instead, Mandeville argued that to 'covet Glory' was a perfect example of one's fear of shame, and it was not a genuine pursuit of honour.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> M. M. Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits : Bernard Mandeville's Social and Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 62.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted from *Ibid.*, 137. In *An enquiry into the origin of honour* (1732) Mandeville wrote that 'Honour was 'an Invention of Politicians, to keep Men close to their Promises and Engagements, when all other Ties prov'd ineffectual.' See Bernard de Mandeville, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War; by the Author of the Fable of the Bees* (London, 1732), 29–30. See also Markku Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 273, 296–97.

<sup>13</sup> Mandeville, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War; by the Author of the Fable of the Bees*, 43–44.

<sup>14</sup> Quoted from Christopher J. Berry, *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 134.

Among Defoe's literary contemporaries, there were few people who held a similar view toward self-love, except Mandeville. I argue that their resemblance was not a coincidence. The neo-Augustinian background of Mandeville's views of human nature and society could also be discerned in Defoe's writings. Mandeville and Defoe shared common ideas about human nature, and they both identified with the expedient use of self-love to promote the well being of society as a whole. As mentioned above, Mandeville attracted much attention because of his Jansenist intellectual origins, while scholars have yet to fully discuss the neo-Augustinian tradition's influence on Defoe. The following will explain that Defoe was also influenced by Pascal, Nicole and the French moralists including La Rochefoucauld, and it would be useful to explain the meaning neo-Augustinianism in the first place.

During the mid-seventeenth century in France, there was a revival of interest in St. Augustine of Hippo. One of the representative works of the revival was the Flemish Bishop Cornelius Jansen's influential *Augustinus* published in 1640. One central point of the book was to distinguish between those who were saved and those who could not be saved. The former loved God, Jansen concluded, while the latter loved themselves. This view was manifested in the works of Jansenist thinkers, such as Pascal and Pierre Nicole.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Thomas Ahnert, "Religion and Morality," in *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. James Harris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 643. For more details, see Thomas A. Horne, *The Social Thought of Bernard Mandeville: Virtue and Commerce in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), esp. ch. 2; Force, *Self-Interest before Adam Smith*, 48–63; Brooke, *Philosophic Pride*, 149–57; Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*, 127–30.

In general, the Jansenists followed Augustine of Hippo in the belief that the grace of God was indispensable for the salvation of humanity, contrary to the Jesuits' claim that good actions contributed to human salvation. The Jansenists emphasised the insufficiency of reason and that human beings were dominated by corrupt passions after the Fall. The hope of salvation was to rely on God's grace alone. In this degenerate state, all human behaviour was driven by self-love, which not only corrupted reason but also dominated all human emotions. According to Pascal, one of the most prominent Jansenist thinkers, humanity after the Fall had taken the wrong path, and their love of God was turned into self-love, which often led to their corrupt behaviour and crime. Since humans were guided by self-love they only pretended to love God. Pascal lamented that humans were 'only falsehood, duplicity, contradiction.'<sup>16</sup> However, this contradiction did not only have negative results. God had arranged matters in such a way that even when humankind was in the pursuit of malicious self-love, this often brought about unintentional beneficial results to all human beings.

Nicole, a writer who was active slightly later than Pascal, held similar ideas of self-love. Amour-propre (self-love), in his view of human nature, was the strongest passion. It was an illusory self-image, which was the motivation for most human behaviour and it existed in every aspect of our actions. Even if human beings

---

<sup>16</sup> Blaise Pascal, *Pascal's Pensées*, Introduction by Thomas S. Eliot (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1958), 102. See also Rudi Verburg, "The Dutch Background of Bernard Mandeville's Thought: Escaping the Procrustean Bed of Neo-Augustinianism," *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics* 9, no. 1 (2015): 34–35; Horne, *The Social Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 21.

performed good deeds out of goodwill, they must be complacent in consciousness because of these actions.<sup>17</sup> He pointed out that the fact that humans were profoundly guided by self-love was established in God's plan. Moreover, self-love could imitate genuine charity, because everyone has the desire to be loved, or in other terms 'pride.' This disposition is so subtle that 'there is no action into which it cannot creep; and it knows so well how to assume the appearances of charity that it is almost impossible to clearly distinguish the two; for by pursuing the same course and producing the same effects it obliterates with marvellous canniness all traces and all marks of the self-love that has given rise to it....'<sup>18</sup> In short, humans performed good deeds out of self-love, which in turn enabled more people to live together in a society.

Ideally, cooperation between people required love, charity, and respect for others. However, these were precisely the attributes that were destroyed (or primarily diminished) by the Fall. Nicole argued that God devised an alternative plan. He arranged the world in a way that fallen men were compelled to come to each other's assistance out of sheer selfishness. *Amour-propre* was perfectly capable of providing

---

<sup>17</sup> Moriarty, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves*, 353–54. On Nicole, see Nannerl O. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), 283–311; Dale Van Kley, "Pierre Nicole, Jansenism, and the Morality of Enlightened Self-Interest," *Anticipations of the Enlightenment in England, France, and Germany* (1987): 69–85; Johan Heilbron, "French Moralists and the Anthropology of the Modern Era: On the Genesis of the Notions of 'Interest' and 'Commercial Society,'" in *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750-1850*, ed. Johan Heilbron, Lars Magnusson, and Björn Wittrock (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publications, 1998), 77–106. On the Jansenist influence on the idea of commerce as a vent for selfish passions that are conducive to the greater common good—see Istvan Hont, "Jealousy of Trade: An Introduction," in *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 47–52.

<sup>18</sup> Pierre Nicole, "Of Charity and Self-Love," in *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant, An Anthology*, ed. J. B. Schneewind, trans. Elborg Forster, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 374.

a foundation for the proper ordering of civil society, of the political organisation, and of human life in general. Besides, this arrangement was a convincing demonstration of God's love for the world.<sup>19</sup> On the origin of human society, Nicole pointed out that everyone only cared about their own well-being. However, it was apparent that an individual human being was a vulnerable creature and was unlikely to survive in the wilderness alone. It was therefore essential for him to work with others to form a society. He believed that a society founded on selfish motive was more stable and productive than one that was motivated by charity.<sup>20</sup> The neo-Augustinian view that interests and passions were central to human affairs was also manifest in the works of La Rochefoucauld, the author of *Maximes*, and Pierre Bayle (1647-1706). In short, these seventeenth-century French Augustinian moral writers believed that mankind was guided by self-love rather than reason in everything they did.<sup>21</sup>

Defoe's moral thought was also part of the tradition that emphasised the dominant force of self-love in human actions. Defoe believed that every man loved himself more than the rest of humankind. When interacting with others, humans were seeking others' assistance in the pursuit of their own desires; 'the end is at home...all solitude and retirement; it is for ourselves we enjoy, and for ourselves we suffer.'<sup>22</sup> For another

---

<sup>19</sup> Brooke, *Philosophic Pride*, 87; Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France*, 294; Paul A Rahe, "Montesquieu's Anti-Machiavellian Machiavellianism," *History of European Ideas* 37, no. 2 (2011): 135.

<sup>20</sup> James, *Pierre Nicole, Jansenist and Humanist*, 153–54.

<sup>21</sup> Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*, 130. Defoe's admiration of the description of sinful human nature by the libertine poet the Earl of Rochester can be explained in this context. See John McVeagh, "Rochester and Defoe: A Study in Influence," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 14, no. 3 (1974): 327–41; John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: This Masquerading Age* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 91–92.

<sup>22</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:58. See also Damrosch, *God's Plot & Man's Stories*, 191–92.

instance, the most stable society was dependent not on the virtues of our neighbours, but on acknowledging and understanding that ‘my Neighbour is just as proud as I; Has the same Will and Wish, the same Design, and his Abortive Envy ruins mine.’<sup>23</sup> Defoe analysed how human behaviour motivated by such a selfish concern could benefit the well-being of others and society as a whole. There was no evidence of his reading of Nicole, but Defoe had read Pascal or at least read about him.<sup>24</sup> He had cited Pascal’s wager argument three times in different works,<sup>25</sup> and one of them was in the *Serious Reflections*, in which Defoe wrote:

What Assurance he has of the Negative, and what a Risque he runs if he should be mistaken? This we are sure of, if we want Demonstration to prove the Being of a God, they are much more at a Loss for a Demonstration to prove the Negative. Now no Man can answer it to his Prudence, to take the Risque they run, upon an uncertain supposititious Notion.<sup>26</sup>

Also, judging from his arguments about self-love and the origin of human society, even if neo-Augustinians did not directly influence his ideas, at least Defoe shared these views with them.

Another evidence of his familiarity with the French tradition was his interpretation of Rochefoucauld’s view that self-love was the centre of human actions. Similar to the French author, the emphasis on self-love could be recognised in Defoe’s

---

<sup>23</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 71. Cf. Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 280–81; Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 60–61.

<sup>24</sup> Defoe translated of a French tract *Extrait D’un Ecrit intitule: Les Bons Mots du petit peie Andre in the Bodleian* (c. 1716-17) into *A curious little oration, deliver’d by Father Andrew*, which demonstrated his enduring attention to the Jansenists. See Daniel Defoe, *A Curious Little Oration, Deliver’d by Father Andrew: Concerning the Present Great Quarrels That Divide the Clergy of France* (London, 1717).

<sup>25</sup> Apart from the one cites below, the other references were in Daniel Defoe, *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation: The Last of Defoe’s Performances*, ed. G. A. Starr (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 49, 58.

<sup>26</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:3: 116.

works. Defoe mentioned Rochefoucauld and quoted his *Maxims* that ‘all the Actions of Life may be reduced to the Two Principles of Vanity and Interest, or Self-Love.’<sup>27</sup> This was likely drawn from the Maxim 233, which read ‘Whatever other pretended cause we may father our Afflictions upon, it is very often nothing but Interest, and Vanity, that are the true causes of them.’<sup>28</sup> Defoe acknowledged that ‘Self-Love’s the Ground of all the things we do,’<sup>29</sup> but he worried that Rochefoucauld’s remark might give ‘the worst Turn to every thing,’ because ‘it is only the Excess and wrong Application of them, that makes them Vices.’<sup>30</sup> Defoe agreed that in most cases people based their behaviour on the principles of ‘Vanity and Interest,’ but individuals were sometimes still willing to sacrifice their own good to achieve virtuous ends. He added that ‘Charity begins at Home: And yet this does not hinder, but there may be Room enough left for many Acts of Generosity and Friendship, and that we may serve our Neighbour, and our Country, at the same Time that we serve our selves.’<sup>31</sup> In short, Defoe modified Rochefoucauld’s thesis by adding that humans would still help others as long as the act did not threaten their own interests.

Another aristocrat and cynical writer John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester (1647-1680) was one of Defoe’s favourite writers.<sup>32</sup> One of Defoe’s favourite lines from

---

<sup>27</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Commentator* (1720), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 9, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 61.

<sup>28</sup> François La Rochefoucauld, *Moral Maxims and Reflections in Four Parts* (London, 1694), 61. Defoe cited another entry of Maxim as his comment on Rochefoucauld’s remark on self-love. And the second citation was likely to be drawn from Maxim 35, which read: ‘The being proud our selves, makes us complain of others, and uneasie at their being so.’ See *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>29</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:152.

<sup>30</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:61.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:62.

<sup>32</sup> McVeagh, “Rochester and Defoe.”

Rochester's poetry was 'In my dear Self I centre every Thing, My God, my Soul, my Country, and my King,' to stress the point that 'Self, In a Word, governs the whole World.'<sup>33</sup> This sentence was reminiscent of Nicole's description of self-love, which read 'He wants every kind of property, honour, and pleasure ...' and 'Placing himself at the centre of everything, he would like to rule over everything ....'<sup>34</sup> In his *Serious Reflections*, Defoe repeated the point that 'Every Thing revolves in our Minds by innumerable circular Motions, all centring in our selves.'<sup>35</sup> These passages make evident how Defoe's writings were filled with the ideas of the French moralist writings in the late seventeenth century or were at least influenced by them.

In short, Defoe pointed out that our self-love dominated everything we do.<sup>36</sup> Words such as ambition, pride and lust were often used together in his work.<sup>37</sup> Humanity was tainted after the Fall, and human nature was so corrupt that it grew 'something Diabolical', and it drove men to harm 'fellow creatures.'<sup>38</sup> Pride, for example, was of particular concern for the Jansenists. Defoe also argued the same point in *The Commentator* in 1719: 'PRIDE' was 'necessary to the World.' Although he understood that pride could have many adverse effects, Defoe explicitly espoused 'the

---

<sup>33</sup> Willaim Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings, Extending from 1716-1729*, vol. 3 (London: J.C. Hotten, 1869), 346. The original verse of Earl of Rochester was 'In my dear self, I center ev'ry thing, My Servants, Friends, my Mrs., and my King. Nay Heav'n, and Earth, to that one poynt I bring.' Quoted from McVeagh, "Rochester and Defoe," 340. Cf. Merrett, *Daniel Defoe's Moral and Rhetorical Ideas*, 22–23; Maximillian E Novak, *Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1976), 35–36.

<sup>34</sup> Nicole, "Of Charity and Self-Love," 371.

<sup>35</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:57.

<sup>36</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:346.

<sup>37</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:288. For a discussion of the difference between these terms see Brooke, *Philosophic Pride*, 15.

<sup>38</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:223.

Usefulness and Necessity of the Virtue of Pride in the World.’ He even wrote, with some exaggeration for rhetorical effect, that pride was ‘almost grown up to a Virtue in its very Nature.’<sup>39</sup> Although this was not an ideal situation, Defoe believed that once we recognised that everyone was inclined to prioritise their own advantage over that of others, people’s choices become predictable.

The following chapter will be divided into three parts. The first part deals with Defoe’s view of human nature. He believed that after the Fall, human nature was so tainted that one could not control one’s (corrupt) passions. In eighteenth-century England, this was evident in the immorality in society. The second part discusses Defoe and the Reformation of Manners. His proposal to solve the problem was to use the ruling class including the nobility, the clergy and the gentry as exemplars. The third part explains that it was Defoe’s idea of self-love and pride that led him to advocate the method of imitation as a means of moral reform. Some other members of the Reformation of Manners movement will also be discussed. Although they resembled Defoe in some ways, few writers were as outspoken in advocating the use of pride or self-love as Defoe was. Love of praise or honour was an example of self-love. Defoe argued that it was a good idea to promote people doing good things by lure of honour, however, he added that it was important to distinguish true honour from false honour. In the case of duelling, it was obvious that this kind of honour had such a captivating force that people would risk their lives for it. Even though this proved his argument of the power of pride, Defoe argued that duelling was a false honour, and it was

---

<sup>39</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:174. See also Defoe, *Review*, 8:347-48.

detrimental to the reformation of manners and contrary to the teachings of the Bible. Therefore, since the reforming of national morals relied on upright examples of the ruling class, Defoe suggested that duelling was a disagreeable noble example, which was contrary to true honour, and it would deter the progress of the improvement of national morals.

### **Defoe's View of Human Nature**

In one of his earliest known works, *The Meditations*, Defoe expressed the idea that humankind suffered from Original Sin. There were the 'Corrupted rabbles of Desires' that resulted in sins, and it was difficult to curb these desires by reason or conscience.<sup>40</sup> Human beings were guided by corrupt passions, and they were not able to subject themselves to reason and self-control.<sup>41</sup> He added that if people did not endeavour to manage themselves or were not regulated by government, 'arbitrary Passions' would undoubtedly dominate them. Furthermore, if a man left his nature unchecked, he would indulge in the lowest of desires and despise reason and religion, because the evils of his heart controlled him.<sup>42</sup> This sinful nature affected not only one's spiritual life but also the progress of human society. Passions not only affected individuals, but they have also been a key cause of conflict between groups of people

---

<sup>40</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Meditations of Daniel Defoe: Now First Printed*, ed. George Harris Healey (Cummington, MA: Cummington Press, 1946), 23. Cf. Bastian, *Defoe's Early Life.*, 85–86.

<sup>41</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil* (1726), ed. John Mullan, vol. 6, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 284.

<sup>42</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:135; Daniel Defoe, *Conjugal Lewdness* (1727), ed. Liz Bellamy, vol. 5, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 199. See also Robert James Merrett, *Daniel Defoe: Contrarian* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 174–75.

and changes of government since the dawn of human society.<sup>43</sup> Based on this understanding of human nature, Defoe explained why crimes occurred in every country and society. Drunkenness was the most common evil, and this was especially true in English society. He used the term 'National Crime' to describe the severity of alcoholism.<sup>44</sup> It should be noted that the existence of alcohol itself was not a problem. What he criticised was the problem of over-drinking. It was necessary for the ruling class to intervene and devise a mechanism to promote a moderate way of drinking among the people.

Shame was a sentiment that was connected with fashion. Once a person noticed that his conduct was unpopular, he would feel ashamed of himself and stop. Therefore, the most effective way to complete the reformation of manners was resorting to shame. Defoe argued that once vice 'grow Scandalous' then people 'would be asham'd of it' because there was a 'Pride of imitating those ... above us,'<sup>45</sup> and 'Drunkenness and Oaths might once come into disesteem, and be out of Fashion and a Man be valued the less for them.'<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, the best way to keep one's honour was by 'his pride' and by his shame of being a dishonest man.<sup>47</sup> More straightforwardly, the improvement of manners 'must work upon our Shame, and not our Fear.' People would

---

<sup>43</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:8.

<sup>44</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:313.

<sup>45</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man's Plea*, 6:36; Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:440.

<sup>46</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man's Plea*, 6:35.

<sup>47</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:182.

feel shame if they were out of the fashion, so they would strive to become virtuous merely to satisfy their pride.<sup>48</sup>

Since self-love was the predominant passion of humankind, they feared being laughed at, and due to this pride, they would insensibly reform themselves. In other words, reforming one's manners may not be one's desire in the first place, but one somehow gradually achieved it in the process of the pursuit of self-love. Taking cursing as another example, Defoe suggested that the most effective way to eradicate it was resorting to 'Precepts' that were regarded as fashionable. Once the upper class discouraged cursing, then this would stop the bad behaviour and make the young beaux blush and refrain from it.<sup>49</sup>

Several scholars have discussed Defoe's moral thought and his involvement in the campaign of reforming manners. Most of them have noticed Defoe's emphasis on imitation. The most recent and comprehensive discussion is Stephen Gregg's *Defoe's Writings and Manliness*, which focuses on Defoe's ideal of manhood. He has remarked on Defoe's belief that 'the gentry and upper-station had the potential to be exemplars of moral behaviour.'<sup>50</sup> Katherine Clark noticed Defoe's recognition of the influential role the royal court played in shaping the language of the nation.<sup>51</sup> Other scholars have briefly touched on Defoe's confidence in the effectiveness of the exemplary power of people of a higher class. For instance, Andreas Muller notes that 'one of Defoe's

---

<sup>48</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:666. See A. G. Craig, "The Movement for the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1715" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1980), 157-58.

<sup>49</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:666.

<sup>50</sup> Stephen H. Gregg, *Defoe's Writings and Manliness Contrary Men* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 50.

<sup>51</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 25.

central ideas regarding the reformation of manners was ...[that] ... positive examples, rather than laws and punishment' steadily propels a general moral improvement.<sup>52</sup> Shelley Burttt compares the writings of Defoe and Jonathan Swift, noting that both men considered that the most powerful strategy for the reformation of manners was the example of the upper class.<sup>53</sup> Maximillian Novak also points out that Defoe believed that the upper class should be the role model for the lower class. However, Novak, like Clark and other scholars, did not provide a satisfying explanation as to why Defoe believed imitation was the most effective means.<sup>54</sup>

Defoe participated in a few Societies for Reformation of Manners (SRM) in London during 1690s and 1700s, and when he was writing pro-Union propaganda for Robert Harley during 1706-1707, he served as the correspondent between the London and Edinburgh societies.<sup>55</sup> From his involvement with the societies, Defoe grew disillusioned with the goals and hypocrisy of these reformers. Why did he criticise the SRM and why was the movement barely successful?

### **The Reformation of Manners**

Andrew Craig's dissertation on the Reformation of Manners movement is by far still the most reliable research on this movement. He noticed the political motive for Defoe's positive remarks on the idea of the movement,<sup>56</sup> and Defoe's dissatisfaction

---

<sup>52</sup> Andreas Mueller, *A Critical Study of Daniel Defoe's Verse* (Lampeter and Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010), 71.s

<sup>53</sup> Shelley Burttt, *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 61.

<sup>54</sup> Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 133.

<sup>55</sup> Craig, "The Movement for the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1715," 156–58.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 158.

with its effectiveness and differential treatment of groups of people based on wealth and social position.<sup>57</sup> Indeed, Craig has rightly pointed out that Defoe was disappointed rather than disapproving of the reformation campaign. The following part aims to dig into the underlying reason for Defoe's disappointment.

A movement of reforming the people's behaviour emerged in England in the 1690s. The first SRM was founded in the London neighbourhood of Tower-Hamlets. This neighbourhood was closely related to drunkenness and prostitution. Therefore, it was an ideal place to carry out the correction of manners. According to contemporary accounts, Edward Stephens claimed he had established two societies, one in Tower-Hamlets and one in the Strand. He argued that these societies would realise the ideals that had existed for a long time had not yet seen success. Stephens's activity stemmed from his dissatisfaction with the Church of England, yet some of the leaders of the Church such as Bishop John Stillingfleet sympathised with him and conveyed his ideas to the Queen. In 1691, Queen Mary wrote a letter to the officials in Middlesex, encouraging them to carry out the existing law more seriously.<sup>58</sup> This group consisted of many laymen of the Church of England and it promised to get rid of prostitution and other vices that brought down the morals of the entire country. Even though there were similar proposals from the Church of England during the Restoration era, the participation of magistrates and nonconformists in the times after the Glorious Revolution marked the beginning of a new age. They accepted the membership of Dissenters in 1694. By 1701 there were around twenty such organisations in London,

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 112, 143.

<sup>58</sup> Burt, *Virtue Transformed*, 42.

at least forty-two in the provinces and thirteen in Edinburgh.<sup>59</sup> These societies had received the royal proclamations against vice from the court in 1692, 1698, 1699, 1702, and 1703. They promised to convene on the first Monday of every month, focusing on figuring out ways to combat alcoholism, cursing and other sinful behaviours. It was a detailed plan, and they were scheduled to elect officials every year.<sup>60</sup> The SRMs had established a network of informers, and they had warrants that were already signed, so they could list the names and places of the crimes and hand it to the local magistrates. The societies zealously chased after drunkards, prostitutes, people conducting business on Sunday, gamblers and blasphemers. During their 45 years of activity, they prosecuted more than 10,000 citizens.<sup>61</sup>

In general, these groups appealed to government officials to ban brothels, blasphemy, and alcoholism. These problems were not new. England in the middle of the seventeenth century had already enacted laws aiming to discourage alcoholism and other forms of immorality, but they had never been rigorously enforced. To implement existing laws strictly was the purpose of the societies. Josiah Woodward, an active member of the Society and a prolific writer promoting the cause of the movement,

---

<sup>59</sup> Edward Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1977), 18.

<sup>60</sup> Tony C. Curtis and William A. Speck, "The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform," *Literature and History* 3 (1976): 45–46. See also Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 185–86.

<sup>61</sup> Burt, *Virtue Transformed*, 43; David Manning, "Anglican Religious Societies, Organizations, and Missions," in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism*, vol. 2: Establishment and Empire, 1662–1829 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 433–35.

called on officials to enforce the law because it was the most effective way to solve social problems.<sup>62</sup>

Defoe had been actively involved in a London SRM in the 1690s. He also joined the society of Edinburgh where he was promoting the Union of Scotland and England in 1706-07.<sup>63</sup> Whether in London or in Edinburgh, however, Defoe often criticised the effectiveness of the societies. The problem with English society at the time was that officials had not come up with a proper way to enforce the law. This was not a new point. In the Restoration era, works such as *The Whole Duty of Man* had already argued this point.<sup>64</sup> *Proposals for A National Reformation of Manners* published by the Society of the Reformation of Manners in 1694 likewise demonstrated that there already existed laws for punishing drunkenness and other vices. What needed to be done was to put them into practice. It wrote: ‘Non-execution (being equivalent to an actual Repeal) renders them useless.’<sup>65</sup> Defoe made similar appeals. In numerous

---

<sup>62</sup> Shelley Burt, “The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: Between John Locke and the Devil in Augustan England,” in *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660–1750*, ed. Roger D. Lund (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 152. For full accounts of the movement, see Curtis and Speck, “The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform”; Tina Isaacs, “The Anglican Hierarchy and the Reformation of Manners 1688–1738,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33, no. 3 (1982): 391–411; Hunt, *The Middling Sort*, 101–24; R.B. Shoemaker, “Reforming the City: The Reformation of Manners Campaign in London, 1690-1738,” in *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689–1750*, ed. Lee Davison et al. (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 99–120; John Spurr, “The Church, the Societies and the Moral Revolution of 1688,” in *The Church of England, c.1689–c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, ed. John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 127–42.

<sup>63</sup> Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe*, 236–37; Charles Eaton Burch, “Defoe and the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners,” *The Review of English Studies* 16, no. 63 (1940): 306–12.

<sup>64</sup> Hans H. Andersen, “The Paradox of Trade and Morality in Defoe,” *Modern Philology* 39, no. 1 (1941): 30; Hunter, *The Reluctant Pilgrim*, 24–25.

<sup>65</sup> Societies for the Reformation of Manners., *Proposals for a National Reformation of Manners Humbly Offered to the Consideration of Our Magistrates & Clergy* (London, 1694), 23.

issues of the *Review*, he criticised that England was notorious for having 'the best Laws the worst Executed of any Nation in the World.'<sup>66</sup> For another instance, 'Wickedness and publick Debauchery' were practised by the official who was responsible for cracking down on them in the first. Defoe in his persona of a 'poor Man' lamented that 'the Gentry and Magistrates of the Kingdom, while they execute those Laws upon us the poor Commons, and themselves practising the same Crimes.'<sup>67</sup> This fact implied that merely requesting the officials to enforce the rules was not enough.

The moral reformation had to be started by the social elites of England, officials in general, reforming themselves. The common people would then spontaneously learn from these good examples.<sup>68</sup> This inclination was rooted in human nature, and it was evident that 'the poorest Citizens strived to live like the Rich, the Rich like the Gentry, the Gentry like the Nobility, and the Nobility striving to outshine one another.'<sup>69</sup> In Defoe's Augustinian thinking, appealing to conscience or merely expecting the magistrates to obey the rules was impractical. The most efficient way was to find a role model for these leaders of society, and in turn, they would become models for the people of lower orders. Defoe believed that if his proposals to reform the court, the gentry and the clergy succeeded, the ordinary people who committed immoral acts would become minorities and they would start to feel ashamed of themselves because

---

<sup>66</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 2:169, 186. The same sentence could be seen in idem, *The Consolidator* (1705), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 3, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 124 and *CET 1*, 7:135.

<sup>67</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man's Plea*, 6:28. See Curtis and Speck, "The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform," 60–61.

<sup>68</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:31.

<sup>69</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:233.

they had lost their role models and excuses.<sup>70</sup> For instance, once the upper class stopped cursing, the beaux could no longer excuse themselves for cursing by following the high-ranking people. Instead, they would blush when they cursed, and soon this behaviour would run out of fashion and disappear. Defoe suggested that this would also be the case for vulgar dramas.<sup>71</sup> When all the gentlemen and the gentle ladies stopped attending those bawdy shows, Defoe argued, the audience would refuse to come again. In the end, vice would become ‘quite out of Fashion.’<sup>72</sup>

He regarded the immoral behaviour of the leaders of the moral-reforming campaign as the chief reason for the failure of the movement. From the Justices of the Peace to the clergy of the Church of England, most of them led disgraceful lives, indulging in drinking, whoring, and theatre-going. These leaders had set bad examples, but they were still endowed with the power to outlaw the ordinary people. The individuals who were punished by these officials could hardly feel satisfied.<sup>73</sup> As mentioned above, Tower Hamlets was a notorious part of London during the early part of the eighteenth century, and a rich man named Francis Tyson was the deputy lieutenant of the area. Defoe criticised him for infringing on God’s rule in *Exodus* that the civil officers shall provide out of ‘all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness.’ On the contrary, Defoe called Tyson ‘the vilest

---

<sup>70</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea*, 6:36; Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:440.

<sup>71</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:182.

<sup>72</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:665. See also *Ibid.*, 5:150; idem, *More Reformation* (1703), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 2, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 216.

<sup>73</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 2:169.

Magistrate.’<sup>74</sup> We do not know the contents of the mistakes Tyson committed that annoyed Defoe, but it was clear that the misconduct of the officials was one of the chief reasons for the failure of the Movement. ‘All Reformation’ would stop when vice took command, Defoe warned, and the result would be that ‘the Vices he should punish’ instead became encouraged.<sup>75</sup>

It was common among the moral writers during this period to utter criticisms of the leaders of the SRMs similar to Defoe’s. Earlier in 1700, Edward Stephens pointed out that many people who joined or established the societies were ‘so far from Reforming themselves, that they are rather sunk deeper into that empty Formality.’<sup>76</sup> Even though Stephens bluntly criticised the bishops, his proposal was not so much practical as it was religious, as his solutions, such as relying on God’s grace and requiring the clergy to retrieve the spirit of Reformation-era figures such as Thomas Crammer, were not new. In contrast, Defoe may be using similar religious appeals, but his argument was centred on corrupt human nature. If the official and the clergy hoped to reform the nation effectively, they had to rely on people’s self-love. It was this honest acknowledgement of the limits of human nature and his proposal to make use of it that distinguished Defoe from most writers of the Reformation of Manners campaign. I argue that this was based on his Augustinian ideas of original sin or pride.

---

<sup>74</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Reformation of Manners* (1702), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 1, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 171.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> Edward Stephens, *A Seasonable and Necessary Admonition to the Gentlemen of the First Society, for Reformation of Manners: Concerning Reformation of Themselves, of the Bishops, and of the House of Commons* (London, 1700), 6. See also Dudley W. R. Bahlman, *The Moral Revolution of 1688* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1957), 34–36; Craig, “The Movement for the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1715,” 153.

The key role for a national reformation had to be assigned to the supreme leader of the nation, namely the monarch.

### **The Royal Court and the Gentry**

Defoe regarded the highest leader in a country as an influential exemplar to guide his people in a better direction. However, this was not the case with the Stuarts. Edward VI and Elizabeth I had secured the accomplishments of the Reformation with their religious policies, but James I and his successors ruined this heritage. Since the accession of the James I in 1603, a lifestyle of luxury and pleasure had started to take root in England. James I was described by Defoe as ‘a most Horrible Swearer himself,’ and the worse thing was that ‘all the Court follow’d the Example.’<sup>77</sup> Defoe’s emphasis on swearing was not surprising. Even though all kinds of vices were deemed connected with each other, there was a hierarchy of all vices. Many reformers argued that the language that was against God such as swearing was deemed to be the worst and to be repressed as soon as possible.<sup>78</sup>

In general, James I under Defoe’s pen was a terrible king, for instance, he ‘let loose to his ungovern’d Passion’ and led a slothful and luxuriant life,<sup>79</sup> and alcoholism

---

<sup>77</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea*, 6:26.

<sup>78</sup> Shoemaker, “Reforming the City: The Reformation of Manners Campaign in London, 1690-1738,” 101. See also Hunt, *The Middling Sort*, 101–24; Martin Ingram, “Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England,” in *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, ed. Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle (London: Macmillan, 1996), 47–88.

<sup>79</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:172; idem, *Review*, 4:170. Defoe often linked the negative aspects of the Stuart court with the influence from France. See William Roosen, “An English View of Louis XIV’s Kingdom: The France of Daniel Defoe,” *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* 19 (1992): 80–81; Mueller, *A Critical Study of Daniel Defoe’s Verse*, 200.

was introduced to England, with the help of the King James.<sup>80</sup> At the end of his rule, the whole country was already in a degenerate state.<sup>81</sup> His successor Charles I was praised as a sagacious and diligent monarch in nature, although the court was so corroded by his father that even the new king himself began to degenerate. The Book of Sport which had been first issued by James I in 1617 was renewed by Charles I in 1633.<sup>82</sup> Defoe wrote: ‘The first violent Breach on the Morals of the Nation was that most infamous Book of Sports, licensing by Authority the Breach of the Lord's Day,’<sup>83</sup> and he lamented that Charles was guided by this ‘unhappy Council ... secret ill Fate ....’<sup>84</sup> This Book sanctioned recreational activities such as archery and dancing on Sundays, and Defoe called this book ‘the Shame and Reproach of those Times,’ and called Charles who reissued it as an ‘unfortunate Son.’<sup>85</sup> This sentiment was shared by the Puritans immediately after the Book was proclaimed because they felt that King James I and his son were destroying the obedience of the Sabbath Day.<sup>86</sup> Even worse, the constitutional order of England was undermined when he refused to be restrained by the House of Commons and resorted to ‘Extra-Parliamentary Methods.’ Defoe

---

<sup>80</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Fourth Essay, at Removing National Prejudices* (1706), vol. 4, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 125.

<sup>81</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd* (1724), ed. J.A. Downie, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 71.

<sup>82</sup> A declaration allowing recreations on the Sabbath Day.

<sup>83</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:750.

<sup>84</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man's Plea*, 6:26. For a discussion of the reaction to the Book of Sports, see Darryl P. Domingo, ed., “Unbending the Mind: Or, Commercialized Leisure and the Rhetoric of Eighteenth-Century Diversion,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (2012): 216–17; Spurr, *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*, 88–89.

<sup>85</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:160.

<sup>86</sup> Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 164; Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, “Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700,” in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (Palgrave, London, 1996), 23. For Defoe's description of the degenerate nature of the Book of Sports, see Defoe, *Review*, 6:329.

claimed that once the king got rid of supervision, his corrupt passions would be unhinged and law and order would be abandoned. All the cursing, swearing, and playing, in the end, culminated in a 'sad' Civil War.<sup>87</sup>

The Restoration was infamous for the prevalence of luxuriant and debauched fashions. Charles II, of course, was denounced by Defoe as the source of the general degeneracy in this era. His court was 'thronged with French of all kinds' such as 'French Silks, French Taylors, French Fashions.'<sup>88</sup> The restoration of the King was far from benefiting England. Instead, he brought back 'greater Profaneness and Debauchery.' Presbyterian John Woodhouse also lamented that since the reign of Charles II had begun, lewdness and blasphemy had become prevalent because it was regarded as fashionable.<sup>89</sup> Defoe described the court during this time being filled with 'Rochesters' and 'Sedleys,' whose writings admired sinful crimes and misused their 'Wit and Examples' to sanction 'all Manner of Lewdness, in defiance of Justice, and above the reach of Law.'<sup>90</sup>

The gentry and the clergy, according to Defoe, followed the example of Charles II. Resulting from this development, the 'Mirth and Gayety' of the court swept across the nation. Being influenced by the custom of this age, 'they cou'd find no way to

---

<sup>87</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:171.

<sup>88</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:440. For his critique of French things and the connection between France and the Stuarts, see Defoe, *Review*, 6:109, 7:660; Laura Ann Curtis ed., *The Versatile Defoe: An Anthology of Uncollected Writings* (London: G. Prior, 1979), 173–74; Paul Slack, "The Politics of Consumption and England's Happiness in the Later Seventeenth Century," *English Historical Review* 122, no. 497 (2007): 618.

<sup>89</sup> John Woodhouse, *A Sermon Preach'd at Salters-Hall to the Societies for Reformation of Manners, May 31, 1697* (London: John Lawrence, 1697), 36.

<sup>90</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:444.

Express an exceeding Joy, but by an excess of Crime; and particularly, that most brutish of all Crimes, Drunkenness, which overspread the Nation like a Winter-Flood.<sup>91</sup> As a result, the lower orders in society, in turn, copied their superiors, and the overall social climate became corrupt. Unfortunately, the succeeding King James II made the already terrible situation worse by forcing people to drink to his health in order to test their loyalty.<sup>92</sup>

The period from 1603 to 1688, in Defoe's view, could best be described in Archbishop Tillotson's words as a 'degenerate Age.'<sup>93</sup> It was this worsening situation that explained the reason William and Mary found it was necessary to promote the reformation of manners after the Revolution of 1688. The reformers regarded the King and the Queen as the models of piety and morals, and they were distinct from their awful predecessors.<sup>94</sup> In comparison to the preceding monarchs, William and Mary were praised as virtuous, and their behaviour was worthy of emulation. Apart from correcting the rampant wickedness of the society, they put what they preached into practice, making their 'Royal Example,' 'the mode for their subjects.'<sup>95</sup> Defoe praised Queen Mary for her 'Piety and blessed Example,' and noticed that her exemplary

---

<sup>91</sup> Defoe, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd*, 73.

<sup>92</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:64, 6:109; Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:440.

<sup>93</sup> John Tillotson, *The Works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson, Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: Containing Fifty Four Sermons and Discourses on Several Occasions. Together with the Rule of Faith* (London, 1720), 504.

<sup>94</sup> Karen Sonnelitter, "The Reformation of Manners Societies, the Monarchy, and the English State, 1696–1714," *Historian* 72, no. 3 (2010): 524.

<sup>95</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:64, 6:109. See also *Ibid.*, 4:170; Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, 201–2; David Blewett, *Defoe's Art of Fiction--Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, Colonel Jack & Roxana* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), 8–9; Robert James Merrett, "Pictorialism in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Visual Thinking and Narrative Diversity," in *Time, Literature and the Arts: Essays in Honor of S. L. Macey*, ed. T.L. Clearly (Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria, 1994), 160–61.

conduct had encouraged the magistrates to enforce the law. Since ‘Virtue and Good Manners became the Mode,’ officials were eagerly ‘at Work to reclaim’ the lost good custom.<sup>96</sup> Queen Anne's example was praised as well. Defoe pointed out that Anne was using herself as an exemplar to ‘Dethrone the Devil, and Depose his reigning Agents.’<sup>97</sup> She was ‘a Pious, Religious QUEEN,’ and her example ‘may have better Effects, than we can yet see,’<sup>98</sup> by ‘discouraging Immoralities’ and ‘suppressing Vice by Proclamation, and forbidding the lewd, riotous Meetings of loose People.’<sup>99</sup> In sum, she was a queen of ‘exact Piety, and consummate Vertue, [who] would do all that can be desir’d to make you Happy.’<sup>100</sup>

In his description of the beautiful gardens along the way from Richmond to London in *A Tour*, Defoe explained that this custom of gardening was derived from people’s imitation of King William’s habit.<sup>101</sup> This description showed the power of the Royals’ example, but this power had to be directed to positive aspects since it could also be harmful to the nation. For example, Queen Mary’s liking of East-India calicoes also broadened the appeal of the textile and caused the decline of the consumption of English woollen products.<sup>102</sup> A similar situation happened at the time of Queen Anne. In many issues of the *Review* in 1706, Defoe pointed out that there was a new fashion of dressing in black for funerals, and it had caused the bankruptcy of many clothiers. This style of dressing originated in the court, but the Royals did not intend to be

---

<sup>96</sup> Defoe, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider’d*, 72.

<sup>97</sup> Defoe, *A Fourth Essay, at Removing National Prejudices*, 4:125.

<sup>98</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:285.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:324.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:625.

<sup>101</sup> Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain, Volume 1* (1724), 1:200.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

imitated, or cause trouble for the clothiers. Even though Defoe's remarks were intended to criticise this foolish trend and to request the government to redress the problem, this incident also showed that the attractive force of the royal court, or in Defoe's words: 'Her Majesty's Houshold is now the Center of Fashions.'<sup>103</sup>

The royal court was the most influential place for national morals. However, according to Defoe's understanding of human nature, monarchs were under constant threat of corruption. Therefore, he made a few suggestions about how to prevent it from happening. First of all, the monarch and the Parliament must check each other's powers. Defoe wrote: 'The Power of every Branch of the English Constitution ... is a Check to one another; each Branch of the Government both supports and restrains the other.'<sup>104</sup> Second, the monarch must glorify God by making good use of the power He has bestowed upon him. Lastly, Defoe resorted to the principle of honour. Since individuals were filled with self-love, the monarch was no exception in desiring to be praised by others. Monarchs needed to be reminded that once they managed to govern well, their names and their 'happy examples' would be remembered by future generations.<sup>105</sup> Defoe believed that resorting to the vanity inside the heart of humanity was in the interests of monarchs, officials, and the people. If his proposals to reform were strictly put into practice, the number of crimes committed by common people would decrease. They would no longer have their models and excuses, so they would

---

<sup>103</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:73. Defoe also made similar statements such as 'the discouraging Immoralities by the Royal Authority in her Majesty's Houshold.' (Ibid., 6:324).

<sup>104</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:319. See also Ibid., 2:186.

<sup>105</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:111.

feel ashamed of themselves if they maintained an immoral way of life. Vice, in the end, would become ‘quite out of Fashion.’<sup>106</sup>

The influence of the court was disseminated from higher social orders to lower ones. Royal fashion was emulated immediately by the nobles and the gentry who were closest to the court, their behaviour then ‘made a general Sally into the Nation,’ changing the way of life of the ordinary people.<sup>107</sup> Therefore, ‘the greatest Encouragement to Vice, and Obstruction to our Reformation’ were propelled by ‘the Negligence and Evil Example of our Magistrates.’<sup>108</sup> Defoe’s argument was not uncommon from other moral writers. Daniel Williams, a friend and the household minister of the Defoe family, voiced the same opinion in his sermon to one branch of SRM in Dublin in 1700. He urged the reformers sitting in the audience to convince and persuade their parishioners by ‘good Examples’ rather than coercive measures.<sup>109</sup>

Defoe was convinced of the influence of the gentry on the general public. He claimed that the gentry were ‘the Original of the Modes, Customs, and Manners of their Neighbours’ and the gentry ought to be ‘our Pattern.’<sup>110</sup> Moreover, ‘the Examples of Magistrates and Rulers’ were like ‘the Pole-Stars of the People’ and ‘if the Town Clock’ stroke false, it influenced ‘the whole Parish.’<sup>111</sup> For another instance, if the gentry were able to let these indecent behaviours such as ‘Oaths, Drunkenness and

---

<sup>106</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:665.

<sup>107</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea*, 6:28. See Michael Shinagel, *Daniel Defoe and Middle Class Gentility* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 188–90.

<sup>108</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 169.

<sup>109</sup> Williams, *A Sermon Preach’d before the Societies for Reformation of Manners, in Dublin July the 18th, 1700*, 16.

<sup>110</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea*, 6:36.

<sup>111</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:491. See Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 24–25.

Lewdness' be 'left out of the Mode of Behaviour,' then the people of England would 'reform insensibly,' since it was natural for people to follow the Fashions.'<sup>112</sup> In his advice to young people in business, Defoe described how some apprentices fell in love with the fashion of their superiors. They dressed in long wigs and swords and fell into 'all manner of wickedness and debauchery.'<sup>113</sup>

As mentioned above, Defoe believed that the times of the Stuarts had a negative influence on all sorts of people. In Defoe's depiction, the gentry was undeniably contaminated. For example, drunkenness in the reign of James II was 'spread by the Example of the Gentlemen to the Tennants, to the common People in the Corporations.'<sup>114</sup> Apart from alcohol-drinking, the gentry's attendance to inappropriate plays was criticised by Defoe. These plays were full of blasphemy, and he called theatres 'Houses of Abomination.'<sup>115</sup> When the ladies and the gentlemen attended the plays, they did not merely hurt themselves, their examples would also attract the common people to the playhouses, hurting them in turn.<sup>116</sup>

The Church of England had to be blamed for the general degeneration of English society. A minister's primary duty was to provide the people with guidance in both his sermons and his behaviour. However, many of the ministers of the Church indulged in drinking and other indecencies.<sup>117</sup> Defoe found it ridiculous that John Dryden's play

---

<sup>112</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:31. For a similar simile, see Timothy Rogers, *A Sermon Preach'd to the Societies for Reformation of Manners: In the Cities of London and Westminster. October 7th. 1700* (London, 1701), 26.

<sup>113</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:104, 113.

<sup>114</sup> Defoe, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd*, 74.

<sup>115</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Friendly Epistle by Way of Reproof from One of the People Called Quakers, To Thomas Bradbury, A Dealer in Many Words*, 3rd edn (London, 1715), 24.

<sup>116</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:661.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:516.

*Spanish Fryar*, condemned in Jeremy Collier's influential pamphlet, was performed in a church, with many clergymen in the audience. Moreover, he criticised the plan of the Church in Haymarket, London of staging *Hamlet* in the church and selling tickets to fund the refurbishment of the building. This criticism was shared by other moral writers. Although the High-Tories and Defoe differed much on the divine right of the monarch, they interestingly shared the same opinion on the corroding effect of blasphemy. In 1705, the new playhouse in Haymarket opened, and Samuel Garth's congratulating poem read: 'The Architect must on dull Order wait; But 'tis the Poet only can create ...'<sup>118</sup> The verse was regarded by many as blasphemy and was immediately under enormous fire of criticism from numerous writers such as High-Churchmen Jeremy Collier and William Law as blasphemy. The leaders of the Non-Jurors also expressed their anger of the poem. The Non-Juror Charles Leslie who debated hotly with Defoe's *Review* in his *Rehearsal* also criticised the poet, and Defoe himself quoted the entire poem in the May 3, 1705 issue of the *Review*.<sup>119</sup> Moreover, he was critical of the University of Oxford for allowing a theatre company perform on a stage belonging to the university, letting the lewd play pollute 'the Sons of our chief Families ... [our] Nation's Instructors.'<sup>120</sup> A minister should be able to show people

---

<sup>118</sup> David Manning, "Anti-Providentialism as Blasphemy in Late Stuart England: A Case Study of 'the Stage Debate,'" *Journal of Religious History* 32, no. 4 (2008): 433. See also John Spurr, "Virtue, Religion and Government: The Anglican Uses of Providence," in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, ed. Mark Goldie, Paul Seaward, and Tim Harris (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 29–47.

<sup>119</sup> Charles Leslie, *A View of the Times, Their Principles and Practices: In the Rehearsal*, vol. 1 (London, 1750), 251; Defoe, *Review*, 2:152.

<sup>120</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:485. See also Idem, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd*, 71. On Defoe's comment on the theatre and its relation to the Church of England, see Defoe, *Review*, 4:516.

‘the Way,’ yet present and future ministers lost the knowledge of ‘the Way’ themselves in this kind of environment.<sup>121</sup>

Despite sharing viewpoints with the High-Churchmen in this regard, Defoe avoided mentioning the points he had in common with them, since he regarded these clergymen as representatives of his critique of the clergy's failure of fulfilling duties.<sup>122</sup> The High-Churchmen were singled out in his critique of the clergy. He accused them of relentless hostility toward the Dissenters and the principle of Toleration established in 1689. Defoe's moral and religious rhetoric converged here. The High Church Tory Henry Sacheverell and other High-Churchmen were linked with ‘Drunkards.’ Defoe rhetorically accused most of them of indulgence in alcohol. Their hostility toward the Dissenters was not based on sound reason but corrupt motives. For instance, Defoe depicted Edward Pelling (1640-1718) who was one of the leading High-Tories, as a man possessed by evil passions, especially pride.<sup>123</sup> Also, Jacobitism was the result of unruly passions. The Jacobites were so obsessed with ‘Pride and Passion’ that they supported the leaders who held the constitution in contempt.<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, the deists

---

<sup>121</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:517.

<sup>122</sup> James Alan Downie, “Defoe's *Review*, the Theatre, and Anti-High-Church Propaganda,” *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 15, no. 1 (1976): 26–27.

<sup>123</sup> Defoe, *Reformation of Manners*, 1:182–83. On Pelling's hostility toward the dissenters, see Mark Goldie, “The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England,” in *From Persecution to Toleration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 357; Maximillian E. Novak, *The Uses of Irony: Papers on Defoe and Swift Read at a Clark Library Seminar, April 2, 1966* (Los Angeles, CA: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1966), 19–21.

<sup>124</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:63, 106. See Daniel Defoe, *The Evident Approach of a War; and Something of the Necessity of It, in Order to Establish Peace, and Preserve Trade* (London, 1727), 26–27; Timothy Cruso, *The Usefulness of Spiritual Wisdom with a Temporal Inheritance: In a Sermon Preached March 11th 1688/9 at the Entrance of a Young Man upon His Habitation and Particular Calling* (London, 1689), 22; Virginia Ogden Birdsall, *Defoe's Perpetual Seekers: A Study of the Major Fiction* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press Associated University Presses, 1985), 164–65.

who were on the other end of the ideological spectrum in the Church of England were also setting bad examples for the people. If these ministers who followed ‘debauching religious Principles’ were not corrected, it was unlikely that the reformation of manners would be brought to pass.<sup>125</sup>

In the absence of the moral models provided by the clergy and the nobles, the social order was in danger of falling into a state of vacuum. Just as Burttt has argued, the writers during this era ‘cast problems of morality as problems of law and order.’<sup>126</sup> If the officials and the clergy showed a lack of morality, it meant that there were corresponding problems of social order. This lack of authority could also be found in a collapse of parental discipline. In his sermon to a SRM, Samuel Bradford, an Anglican minister and rector of St. Mary le Bow, argued that it was the responsibility of the head of the household to govern his family and to set an example of moral behaviour.<sup>127</sup> John Shower, a dissenting minister, graduating from Newington Green Academy like Defoe, also stressed the importance of family education with regards to moral reformation. If the father exhibited ‘a Pattern of Drunkenness, or Lewdness, of Injustice,’ he warned, it was unlikely that ‘Religion should thrive among Children and Servants,’ because the children would follow their parents ‘to their eternal Ruine.’<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:118.

<sup>126</sup> Burttt, *Virtue Transformed*, 45.

<sup>127</sup> Sonnelitter, “The Reformation of Manners Societies, the Monarchy, and the English State, 1696–1714,” 525.

<sup>128</sup> John Shower, *Family Religion in Three Letters to a Friend* (London, 1694), 74. See also Daniel Defoe, *The Family Instructor*, Volume 1 (1715), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 1, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 150; idem, *The Family Instructor*, Volume 2 (1718), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 2, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 42.

Defoe agreed with the idea that parents must strive to be the models for their children when officials failed to serve as exemplars.

Defoe said that ‘tis a very hard Thing for the wisest Men to escape a little Taint of Pride.’<sup>129</sup> Even though pride was a sinful passion, he concluded that instead of taking futile measure against pride, it would be better to figure out a way to make use of it. Honour, for instance, resulted from men’s pride, and Defoe suggested that if a man had ‘too much Pride to be base’ or ‘kept his Honour by his Pride,’ and then he would be ‘asham’d to be a Knave.’ In other words, honour had its potential to provide an effective way to reform the nation. However, there were forms of false honour that were often confused with genuine honour, and duelling was one of them.

## **Duelling**

Modern duelling in England was imported from the Continent by the end of the sixteenth century. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was mainly used to resolve disputes between rivals. The duel of honour was condemned by law and government but was carried out discreetly. On February 1614 James I and his ministers issued ‘A proclamation against private challenges and combats’. In this document, King James declared that duels seldom achieved justice, although this was commonly claimed. On the contrary, it merely led to ‘many other hurtfull and unlawfull Wares.’<sup>130</sup> Although it was blamed and prohibited by the King, the practice of duelling spread throughout

---

<sup>129</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:181.

<sup>130</sup> Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, 13. See also Anna Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 1–106.

the seventeenth century in England, only briefly being interrupted during the Commonwealth. It was revived in the Restoration.<sup>131</sup> This custom of fighting persisted and took place sporadically, even though many writers voiced their disapproval of duelling. The famous non-Juror Jeremy Collier, for instance, disagreed that duelling could be justified on the grounds of tradition or custom.<sup>132</sup> Thomas Comber, dean of Durham, also praised the act of refusing to duel. This brave refusal expressed ‘a great Reverence for the Laws of the Land,’ Comber suggested, ‘and a mighty Aversion to do anything that’ was evil.<sup>133</sup>

Mandeville, on the other hand, was one of the few writers arguing that it was futile to resort to laws to stop duelling, since a man often received ‘Honour for a Breach of the Law’ and this honouring satisfied his pride. As human nature would never change, neither would duelling.<sup>134</sup> Mandeville listed reasons why duelling should not be prohibited. Duelling was a notion of honour, and it helped the improvement of the military skill of nobles and created ‘artificial Courage among Military Men.’<sup>135</sup> He regarded honour as a useful tool, since it contributed to the

---

<sup>131</sup> Donna T. Andrew, “The Code of Honour and Its Critics: The Opposition to Duelling in England, 1700-1850,” *Social History* 5, no. 3 (1980): 410.

<sup>132</sup> Jeffrey Hopes, “Politics and Morality in the Writings of Jeremy Collier,” *Literature and History* 8 (1978): 170.

<sup>133</sup> Donna T. Andrew, *Aristocratic Vice: The Attack on Duelling, Suicide, Adultery, and Gambling in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 24.

<sup>134</sup> Irwin Primer, ed., *Bernard Mandeville’s “A Modest Defence of Publick Stews”-Prostitution and Its Discontents in Early Georgian England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 181.

<sup>135</sup> Mandeville, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War; by the Author of the Fable of the Bees*, 60. See also Andrea Branchi, “Courage and Chastity in a Commercial Society. Mandeville’s Point on Male and Female Honour,” in *Bernard de Mandeville’s Tropology of Paradoxes: Morals, Politics, Economics, and Therapy*, ed. Edmundo Balsemão Pires and Joaquim Braga, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015), 200–01.

stability of society, helping people keep pride under control. For instance, the system of honour in the army was, in essence, a ‘fear of shame’ and a pursuit of glory. Soldiers pursued virtues or honours because they desired to be ‘doubly repaid’ to their pride.<sup>136</sup> In Mandeville’s view, as long as soldiers fought bravely in the field, there was no need to question what their true motives were or whether it was performed out of selfish or unselfish motives.

Defoe, however, condemned duelling as a ‘scandalous Practice, unchristian and unlawful.’<sup>137</sup> All the practical benefits of duelling did not change the fact that participating in duelling was equal to committing suicide, which was directly against the teachings of the Bible. He thus called the custom ‘unchristian’ and a form of false honour because this was a wrong understanding of honour. He believed honour to be ‘the most Denominative of all possible Virtues.’<sup>138</sup> The false honour associated with actions such as duelling must be separated from genuine forms of honour. Just as Richard Allestree wrote in 1660 that a duel was ‘irreligion’ for Christians, and Richard Steele (1672—1729) commented in 1709 that duelling was ‘Unchristian-like.’<sup>139</sup> Defoe had discussed duelling in his *Review* mainly in two periods. One was between April and December 1704, and the other was in 1712. The Whig James, the fourth Duke of Hamilton (1658–1712), and the Tory Charles, the fifth Baron of Mohun (c. 1675–1712) had fought against each other over the estate of the Earl of Macclesfield

---

<sup>136</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:222.

<sup>137</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 1:96..

<sup>138</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:75.

<sup>139</sup> Richard Steele and Joseph Addison, *The Tatler*, ed. Donald F. Bond, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 271.

for eleven years. They held a duel on 3 November 1712 in which both men lost their lives. Defoe was upset by this incident and made his remarks on the custom of duelling in many issues after the duel took place. His critique of the tragic fates of these two leading men of English society expressed his disappointment that these two leaders failed to be exemplars for people.

Defoe's critique of duelling mostly relied on the biblical language, and this was common among the anti-duelling literature. Francis Osborne, for example, in his *Advice to A Son*, a popular book in the second half of the seventeenth century, called duel a trick played by the Devil in the world. Defoe also called this 'the Devil's new Management.'<sup>140</sup> He argued that we had to put the 'Honour and Essence of God' on the highest place and obey the rule of 'Divine Justice.'<sup>141</sup> Disagreeing with the defence of duelling in the name of custom, Defoe pointed out that it must be law that settles disputes in this world rather than 'Personal Revenge' or private punishment like bastinado.<sup>142</sup>

English writers generally praised the success of Louis XIV's prohibition of duelling in France. When they discussed the means of correcting the problem in England, they usually cited the development in France and compared it with the domestic situation. Defoe's fellow student in the Dissenting Academy, John Shower, praised 'the just Severity of the present French King' who 'in great measure

---

<sup>140</sup> Francis Osborne, *Advice to a Son* (London: D. Nutt, 1896), 35; Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:127.

<sup>141</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:119; idem, *Review*, 9:132.

<sup>142</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 5:232, 229.

extinguished [duelling] there.’<sup>143</sup> In the *Spectator* Joseph Addison praised the effective prohibition as ‘the most glorious Parts’ of his reign.’<sup>144</sup> Richard Steele in the *Guardian* no. 129 admired Louis’s ‘Edicts for Abolishing the Impious Practice of Duelling.’<sup>145</sup> Charles Leslie, a Nonjuror who debated with Defoe on divine right, praised the progress of France and ‘the Just Severity of the French King.’<sup>146</sup> Defoe agreed with his arch-rival on this issue, and he had attached the complete translation of Louis XIV’s law that prohibited duelling in the appendix of the first volume of the *Review*.<sup>147</sup>

These writers also pointed out that the notion of honour was at the heart of the issue. Steele made it clear that the honour attached to duelling was a ‘misnamed’ Honour.<sup>148</sup> Leslie also criticised those duellists of putting honour higher ‘than their life.’ Based on his belief in divine right, Leslie argued that the monarch was the sole source of honour and ‘the best judge of it.’ Duellists, therefore, should obey the decision of the King. When a duel took place, the participating duellists not only broke the Fourth Commandment (Honour thy father and thy mother); more seriously, they disobeyed the authority of the divine monarch.<sup>149</sup> Defoe agreed with one of Leslie’s

---

<sup>143</sup> John Shower, *A Discourse of Tempting Christ* (London, 1694), 48.

<sup>144</sup> Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, *The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 419.

<sup>145</sup> Richard Steele and Joseph Addison, *The Guardian: No. 83-176, June 16-Oct. 1, 1713*, ed. Alexander Chalmers (London: J. Johnson, 1806), 247. See also David Hayton, “Moral Reform and Country Politics in the Late Seventeenth- Century House of Commons,” *Past & Present* 128, no. 1 (1990): 87–88; Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, 210–11.

<sup>146</sup> Charles Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 3:194.

<sup>147</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 1:782-95.

<sup>148</sup> Addison and Steele, *The Spectator*, 1:359.

<sup>149</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 3:194.

points, that the king was ‘the Fountain of Honour.’<sup>150</sup> A wrong understanding of honour could also be seen as disrespect of monarch and the result of the battle of parties, especially in the reign of Queen Anne.

Peltonen points out that Defoe attributed party feud as one crucial reason for the increase in duelling in this age. Defoe also used this language to criticise the battle of the political parties. The high officials of the state used ‘injurious Backbitings, and unmannerly Railings’ in government. This was not only more terrifying than the actual fighting but was also one of the main reasons why duelling took place.<sup>151</sup> Even though Defoe was sympathetic to the Whigs on most topics, he regarded both parties as responsible for the duelling epidemic and believed they were ‘alike Guilty’ in encouraging the poisonous practice of duelling.<sup>152</sup> It was unlikely that duelling would be stopped if the party war continued.

Peltonen also argued that the politeness promoted by Steele and Addison was due to their effort to improve the out-dated civility of the past court and the out-dated civilities of contemporary English society. I argue here that Defoe could also be put into the context of politeness. Terms such as civility, polite, and good manners were often used in his writings. Addison and Steele stressed the importance of conversation and that a polite man had to make other conversation participants feel comfortable. When Defoe called for reforming manners, he also showed his concerns relating to

---

<sup>150</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 9:56. Bacon whom Defoe much admired also called a king is ‘the Fountain of Honour.’ See Francis Bacon, *The Essays; or, Counsels Civil and Moral, with The Wisdom of the Ancients, Revised from the Early Copies, Notes by S.W. Singer*, ed. S. W. Singer (London: Bell, 1857), 224.

<sup>151</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:400.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:137.

politeness and civility. A polite person ought to avoid ‘sullenness of Temper, haughty Behaviour, and affected Reservedness’ when talking with others.<sup>153</sup> When Defoe reflected on his education at Charles Morton’s Academy in Newington Green, he pointed out the shortcomings of the curriculum. There was not enough attention paid to the politeness of the English. An ideal education should polish ‘the Gentlemen in Discourse’, acquaint them ‘with Men and with Words’ and let ‘them into the Polite part’ of English.<sup>154</sup>

Duelling, according to Defoe, was contrary to civility. The connection of courage with duelling was a ‘sordid Misconstruction of Gallantry and Honour.’<sup>155</sup> When a man of honour was challenged to duel, he should not accept it, and it was irrelevant to honour or shame. Their pride possessed duellists like Mohun, therefore they could not have a sober look at themselves and were ‘afraid to be ashamed of’ other people’s negative opinion. As a result, they regarded themselves as ‘the worst of Cowards,’ because they could not ignore others’ malicious accusations [of cowardice].<sup>156</sup> On the contrary, it was ‘Courteous, Obliging, Gentlemanlike Behaviour’ to refuse deadly fighting.<sup>157</sup>

All of these topics were related to Defoe’s idea of the reformation of manners. His critique of duels was part of his understanding of politeness and honour. He compared duelling with blasphemy in his elaboration on the ways to reform, because

---

<sup>153</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:272.

<sup>154</sup> Quoted from Girdler, “Defoe’s Education at Newington Green Academy,” 582.

<sup>155</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 1:107. See also Gregg, *Defoe’s Writings and Manliness Contrary Men*, 44–45.

<sup>156</sup> Defoe, *Reformation of Manners*, 1:173.

<sup>157</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 1:633.

no misconduct ever happened in isolation. Defoe was in the same position as Steele's and Addison's opinions on the fops and the beaux, who were the complete opposite of civility and politeness. Their wit, in Defoe's opinion, was merely a 'wretched Claim for Wit.'<sup>158</sup> They merely pull down the level of wit, turning it 'Bawdy and Profane.'<sup>159</sup>

Although many noble families had past glory and select titles, Defoe lamented that the present nobles did not respect these legacies and they only focused on 'empty and swinish' appearances. He argued that true honour lay not in the beautiful outlook or presumptuous performance. Instead, it was based on everyday behaviours, such as 'Exactness of Conversation, or polite Behaviour.'<sup>160</sup> As the Devil was the mastermind behind duels, he was also manipulating fops and coxcombs as his agents on earth. Even conflicts between political parties were manipulated by Satan. In Defoe's interpretation, the High-Flyers, the fops and the duellers were all Satan's victims and agents.

The place where many civil conversations took place in this era was the coffeehouse. The Coffeehouse was introduced to England in the middle of the seventeenth century, and the number of coffeehouses soared during the Restoration. Writers praised Coffeehouses as places to practice and learn civility, to acquire news,

---

<sup>158</sup> Defoe, *Reformation of Manners*, 1:185.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:190.

<sup>160</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 5:474. See also Richard Steele and Joseph Addison, *The Tatler*, ed. Donald F. Bond, vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 251; Daniel Defoe, *The Compleat English Gentleman (1728-29)*, ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 10, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 23; Susan Fitzmaurice, "Changes in the Meanings of Politeness In Eighteenth-Century England: Discourse Analysis and Historical Evidence," in *Historical (Im)Politeness*, ed. Jonathan Culpeper and Dániel Z. Kádár (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011), 90–92.

and debate important issues.<sup>161</sup> In the *Spectator* and the *Tatler*, we could also see the same positive opinion on coffeehouse. But Addison and Steele also blamed some people such as ‘boasters, projectors, pedants, sardonic laughers’ for their inappropriate behaviour in coffeehouses.<sup>162</sup> Defoe had a sense of the ‘potential of the press in shaping the tavern and the coffeehouse conversation of citizens engaged in the ordinary business of life.’ Phillipson observes that Defoe regarded these places as ‘encouraging the friendly conversation that would prevent the spirit of raillery from turning into cynicism.’<sup>163</sup> But coffeehouses were frequently associated with embarrassing situations in Defoe’s descriptions, and the gentlemen and the High-Churchmen were the protagonists of these stories. Defoe reiterated an account by a minister named William Smithies. In his account, some gentlemen went to a coffeehouse after his sermon, and mocked the minister’s warning, claiming that swearing was not problematic at all. Defoe criticised the conversation as profane and wicked.<sup>164</sup> In another example, ‘two Beaus’ met in a coffeehouse and spoke in a cursing manner. Here all ‘Men of Wit’ or ‘Men of Fashion’ talked all the nonsense.<sup>165</sup> Defoe suggested that this kind of conversation was totally opposite to the ‘Exactness of Conversation’ and ‘polite Behaviour.’ A polite person would avoid ‘stiffness of

---

<sup>161</sup> Lawrence E. Klein, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 12.

<sup>162</sup> Quoted from Brian William Cowan, “Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37, no. 3 (2004): 356.

<sup>163</sup> Nicholas Phillipson, “Propriety, Property and Prudence: David Hume and the Defence of the Revolution,” in *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 307.

<sup>164</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:518.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:294.

Humour’ and ‘affected Gravity,’ and he should behave with ‘Manners without Meanness, and Modesty without Blushes.’<sup>166</sup> What was the exact conversation? In appeals to reduce swearing, Defoe provided examples of his ideal of a polite conversationalist: ‘a Man that has any Tast [e] of Eloquence, any Politeness of Diction, or regard to Cadence in Speech.’<sup>167</sup> Defoe’s language of diabolical intervention appeared again here. If duelling was a manipulation of the Devil, then gossiping in a coffeehouse or at a tea table was also caused by these ‘Human Devils.’<sup>168</sup> Defoe’s target audience was the middle-sort tradesmen rather than the gentlemen who were the main readers of the *Spectator*. So in his advice to young tradesmen, Defoe described coffeehouses as the ‘places of new invention for a depravation of our manners and morals.’<sup>169</sup> He reminded the young businessmen that this was the kind of place they should avoid.

According to Peltonen, politeness and civility were by no means the exclusive terms of the Whigs like Addison and Steele. The Tories, the Dissenters, and other groups all used these languages and had different agendas, but as we have seen above these groups of people also shared values such as anti-duelling or avoiding cursing

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 7:272. In a book about the art of converse published in 1683, ‘a just middle between an excessive Gayete, and too affected Gravity’ was also encouraged. See D. A., *The Whole Art of Converse: Containing Necessary Instructions for All Persons, of What Quality and Condition Soever: With the Characters of the Four Humours of the English and French, as to Their Way of Conversing* (London, 1683), 117. Defoe’s teacher Morton held similar view, see Edmund Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges, and Schoolmasters, Who Were Ejected and Silenced After the Restoration in 1660* (London: 1727), 200.

<sup>167</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:295. See also Laura A. Curtis, “A Rhetorical Approach to the Prose of Daniel Defoe,” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 11, no. 3 (1993): 295–96.

<sup>168</sup> Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:268.

<sup>169</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:156.

during a conversation. In parallel to his critique of the High-Church, moderation and morality promoted in Defoe's works were based on the interests of the Dissenters. The high Anglican clergy was portrayed as brutish and unforgiving. In contrast, those who tolerated the Dissenters and respected the Revolution Settlement were men of 'Courtesie, Civility and Good Manners.'<sup>170</sup>

Some writings such as *The Spectator* noticed that the motive behind the fighting was 'the Love of Praise' or other passions.<sup>171</sup> But what distinguished Defoe from these writers was his proposal to make use of pride, self-love or other, similar motives. Based on his understanding of civility and politeness, Defoe praised the value of honour but denied duelling as a false honour. Defoe's Augustinian thinking made him understand that the intention behind one endeavour to achieve noble work, was wanting to be praised by people. Many anti-duelling writers at the time shared Defoe's opinions; they regarded honour as a genuine virtue and denied that duelling was an honourable act. For instance, Jacques Abbadie (1654-1727) argued that we had to limit our self-esteem to 'the Good of Society, and the Exercise of Vertue' rather than paying too much attention to one's pride. Jonathan Swift also pointed out that many people who now chased after the name of honour were not in pursuit of virtuous acts. On the contrary, they merely cared about 'the Opinion, or the Fancy of the People.'<sup>172</sup> Defoe argued that false honour such as duelling must be separated from genuine forms of honour. He listed the Duke of Marlborough's valour in the battles on the Continent as an

---

<sup>170</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain* (London, 1707), 39.

<sup>171</sup> Quoted from Berry, *The Idea of Luxury*, 134.

<sup>172</sup> Quoted from Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, 255.

example of true honour. In his propaganda for Robert Harley, Defoe advocated for Marlborough, arguing that it was just for Marlborough 'to covet Glory' since he was fighting for the common good of England. It was a genuinely noble pursuit of his.<sup>173</sup>

In sum, Defoe did not regard duelling as an honourable act. This mistaken courage, he pointed out, was derived from their most profound fear: fear to be called a coward, or fear of shame.<sup>174</sup> Even though Mandeville also saw a positive effect of duelling, Defoe's view of duelling resembled that of Mandeville generally. This likeness demonstrated the argument at the beginning of the chapter that Defoe and Mandeville shared an incisive view of human nature, and hardly any other contemporary writer held a similar view.

## **Conclusion**

Defoe stressed the corruption of human nature throughout his writings. Pride, self-love and other passions occupied central places in his moral thought. He shared this Augustinian thinking with Mandeville. This article finds out that the two writers agreed with each other on human nature, and on playing passions against other passions. From this perspective, we could relate Defoe's opinion on social issues to his fundamental ideas on human nature and passions. Moreover, this gives us a more in-depth explanation for the reason why Defoe believed that the rulers' example was more effective than strict punishment.

---

<sup>173</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:302. See also Mandeville, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War*, by the Author of the *Fable of the Bees*, 41.

<sup>174</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:129.

## **Chapter 2: Defoe's Economic Thought in the Context of the Debate on Luxury in the Early-Eighteenth Century.**

The subject of this chapter is the economic thought of Daniel Defoe. This topic has been studied by many researchers. Moore claims that Defoe was the pioneer of 'modern' economics, Novak states that Defoe's economic idea was mercantilist, and Bram, in contrast, posits that his thinking was capitalist.<sup>1</sup> Andersen points out there existed a paradox between Defoe's ideas of economic gain and morality. Meier, on the other hand, puts forward a comprehensive examination, which balanced the opinions of the previous scholars. Meier argues that people can find all kinds of economic ideas in Defoe's works, even if they conflict with one another. However, Meier reminds us that Defoe's reasoning on economic affairs should be considered in its own historical context rather than in modern economic theories. James Hartley reinforces Meier's argument that there definitely will be many paradoxes if we randomly extract paragraphs from Defoe's copious works and judge them by modern criteria. Hartley suggests that the purpose of the individual book of Defoe was distinctive, and Defoe did not mind contradicting his own opinion in the past as long as he addressed the issue at hand.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> John Robert Moore, *Daniel Defoe: Citizen of the Modern World* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1958); Novak, *Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe*, 42; Bram. Dijkstra, *Defoe and Economics : The Fortunes of "Roxana" in the History of Interpretation* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987).

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Keith Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce* (English Literary Studies, Dept. of English, University of Victoria, 1987); James E. Hartley, "The Chameleon Daniel Defoe: Public Writing in the Age before Economic Theory," in *Money, Power, and Print : Interdisciplinary Studies on the Financial Revolution in the British Isles*, ed. Charles Ivar McGrath and Christopher J. Fauske (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 26–50.

Defoe's neo-Augustinian idea of self-love was evident in his discussion of luxury. The scholars on Defoe's economic thought tend to discuss him separately, therefore his role in the Europe-wide debate on luxury has not been discussed adequately. There have been a number of essential works dealing with the neo-Augustinianism of the early eighteenth-century and this chapter seeks to shed light on the connection between Defoe and this tradition by focusing on the topic of luxury, which was the common concern of most thinkers of this age. Defoe's *CET* fit into the debate, as the book focused on issues such as luxury, the current situation in Britain, and the issue of the decadence brought by luxury. This chapter will centre around *CET*, focusing on the ideas of original sin and self-love demonstrated in his discussion on the trade in luxuries. Based on his explanation of luxury and his defence of the necessary expediency of the businessmen engaged in luxury trade, this chapter brings Defoe's contribution to the debate to light.

### **The Eighteenth-Century Debate on Luxury**

The debate on luxury in England began in the middle of the seventeenth century with the expansion of English trade and the rise of the controversy over imports of luxury.<sup>3</sup> The question of luxury posed a tremendous moral challenge to seventeenth and eighteenth century thinkers. Although a large number of classical writers had long

---

<sup>3</sup> There is a well-established research tradition on luxury. Three authoritative studies are Maxine Berg, *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Berry, *The Idea of Luxury*; John Sekora, *Luxury: The Concept in Western Thought from Eden to Smollett* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977).

condemned luxury as ‘the root of all evil,’<sup>4</sup> some works of the seventeenth century's 'trade discourse' began to challenge this belief. For these writers, luxury played an essential role in encouraging business growth, innovation and production.

Historians date the birth of the consumer society to the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.<sup>5</sup> With the frequent and dominant appearance of luxuries in society, many people were worried about the way society was infected by luxury goods. Excessive luxury, in traditional views, weakened virtue and corrupted the country. Writers began to ponder how to strike a balance between accumulating wealth and the fate of the commonwealth. Some thinkers worried that the European countries would suffer a fate similar to the Romans, since they regarded luxury and convenience as deteriorating the spirit of citizenship, and this led to moral corruption and the decline of the state. François Fénelon (1651-1715), the French archbishop, was a critic of the economic policy of Colbert during the reign of Louis XIV, and a leading intellectual critic of luxury. He warned that luxury goods would replace the self-sufficiency of the rule of nature, subjecting humans to an unlimited indulgence of appetites and desires.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, Fénelon proposed to reform France by eliminating all luxury goods in

---

<sup>4</sup> A remark from Sallust, quoted from Scott Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley : Virtue and Society in the Anglo-Irish Context* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 75.

<sup>5</sup> John Brewer and Roy Porter, eds., *Consumption and the World of Goods* (London: Routledge, 1993); Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and John H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Europa, 1982).

<sup>6</sup> Rudi Verburg, “Bernard Mandeville’s Vision of the Social Utility of Pride and Greed,” *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 22, no. 4 (2015): 677. See also Istvan Hont, “The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,” in *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, by Mark Goldie and Robert Wokler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 383–87; Brooke, *Philosophic Pride*, 151–57.

order to curb their corrupting influence. His idea proved to be influential soon after the publication of *Telemachus*. A number of later writers' works on luxury aimed to have a dialogue with Fénelon, and Mandeville was one of them.

When discussing the debate on luxury in England, many scholars referred to Nicholas Barbon as a representative figure. He celebrated the necessity of luxury, promoting that 'prodigality is a Vice that is prejudicial to the Man, but not to Trade.' Further, Barbon noted the crucial role of trade because now it had become 'necessary to provide Weapons of War.'<sup>7</sup> But it will be appropriate not to overstate Barbon's influence since neither contemporary writers nor Defoe mentioned Barbon. Charles Davenant, the author who Defoe read and responded to, admonished that luxury goods corrupted people and weakened people, making workers 'unfit for Labour.'<sup>8</sup> In spite of this warning, according to Hont, Davenant acknowledged the fact that the power of the modern state depended on trade and luxury goods. Therefore, luxury was a necessary evil, since Davenant believed that public wealth was the basis for defending liberty and the virtue of a state. Any ill-timed intervention in trade could damage the power and economic strength of England.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, luxury had to be kept, but

---

<sup>7</sup> Nicholas Barbon, *A Discourse of Trade (1690)*, ed. Henry C. Clark, *Commerce, Culture, and Liberty: readings on capitalism before Adam Smith* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2003), 67.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Davenant, *On the Plantation Trade*, ed. Sir Charles Whitworth, vol. 2, *The Political and Commercial Works of that Celebrated Writer Charles D'Avenant* (London, 1771), 42.

<sup>9</sup> Istvan Hont, "Free Trade and the Economic Limits to National Politics," in *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 211.

luxury in his vocabulary was still an unpleasant concept. Davenant supported the simple model and did not believe that countries should get sucked into luxury.<sup>10</sup>

Hont points out that there were two debates about luxury. One ‘was a debate between “ancients” and “moderns”, echoing long-standing arguments originating in Greece, Republican Rome, and early Christianity.’ The other debate to which Davenant’s work belonged was ‘amongst the moderns themselves. The issue for them was not whether to accept modern economic growth, but how to make it politically and morally benign.’<sup>11</sup> For instance, Mandeville was one of the proponents of ‘refinement’ luxury, whereas Shaftesbury and George Berkeley belonged to a group of writers who only accepted well-balanced luxury. Shaftesbury held that those who indulged in excess were bound to upset their ‘self-system.’ Luxury of this kind was a ‘self-oppressor.’<sup>12</sup> Berkeley already acknowledged the power of fashion, although he supported a regulatory system of luxury and fashion. In this system, some unreasonable luxuries should be banned, and the pursuits of luxury and fashion should be regulated. Thus, he unquestionably believed in the effectiveness of sumptuary laws.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 209.

<sup>11</sup> Hont, “The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,” 380.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted from Ibid., 397. Cf. Hundert, *The Enlightenment’s Fable*, 189–90; Jacob Viner, *The Role of Providence in the Social Order: An Essay in Intellectual History*. (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1972), 68–69; John A. Bernstein, “Shaftesbury’s Optimism and Eighteenth-Century Social Thought,” in *Anticipations of the Enlightenment in England, France and Germany*, ed. Alan Kors and Paul A. Korshin (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 97–98.

<sup>13</sup> Hont, “The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,” 402–3.

Defoe's discussion of luxury was neither as classical as Davenant's or Berkeley's nor was it profoundly influenced by Roman historical tradition.<sup>14</sup> For the Roman writer Sallust, Carthage was the source of Rome's decline, and he advocated the idea that Carthage's wealth brought the whole world into confusion.<sup>15</sup> Other Roman writers followed Sallust's lead, ascribing the fall of Carthage to its abuse of luxury.<sup>16</sup> Augustine of Hippo in his *City of God* also expressed his worries on the fall of Roman virtue after its defeat of Carthage.<sup>17</sup> Defoe, however, admired Carthage as the pioneer in world trade and the role model for the English people. He never mentioned the corrupting power of luxury in Carthage.<sup>18</sup>

There has been much discussion about Defoe's view on luxury, and scholars debate on whether Defoe held a positive or negative view toward luxury. This chapter will clarify the difference between what were acceptable and reprehensible luxuries according to Defoe. Disputes in the past were partly caused by the confusion of the two. Defoe argued that vices like alcohol, gambling or prostitution should be strictly regulated, but other forms of enjoyment and conveniences should not be restricted.

---

<sup>14</sup> Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley*, 74.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>16</sup> Berry, *The Idea of Luxury*, 69.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 89. For the discussion of the impact of the history of Carthage on the eighteenth-century writers, see Christopher Brooke, "Eighteenth-Century Carthage," in *Commerce and Peace in the Enlightenment*, ed. Béla Kapossy, Isaac Nakhimovsky, and Richard Whatmore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 110–24.

<sup>18</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:53. 'I Can not say that the Genius of the Romans lay so much for Trade, and Discoveries or Improvements, as that of the Carthaginians, and the Phoenicians did, and therefore Navigation and the building of Ships, as also the Commerce of the World, rather receiv'd a Check for some time by the ruin of Carthage', nor did the Romans encourage Trade so much in proportion to their greatness as the other had done; for Rome was an inland Town, and the Romans were not enclin'd to Merchandize as the Phoenicians and Carthaginians were, or had been; consequently they did not at all encourage, much less improve the building of Ships, nor the making discoveries in the World, at least not for some Ages after that time.'

### *The Complete English Tradesman*

Defoe's ideal of a complete tradesman comprised aspects that would later appear in the well-known theory of Protestant ethic propounded by Max Weber and R. H. Tawney. Defoe was a convinced believer in the Puritan idea that the 'diligent hand makes rich. We know it is the hand of heaven that makes us rich; but the text gives it to the hand of diligence.'<sup>19</sup> Defoe regarded honesty and industry as core values for a tradesman to establish a sound reputation.<sup>20</sup> Aside from diligence, there were other requirements for this ideal businessman, such as modesty, prudence, gentility and polite manners.<sup>21</sup> On modesty, Defoe stated that 'I think a Purse-proud Tradesman [is] one of the most troublesome and intollerable of all God's two legg'd Creatures.'<sup>22</sup> Apart from the personal virtues, it was essential for a tradesman to have a professional knowledge of business. Therefore, a judicious tradesman must demonstrate knowledge of the 'universal Plan of Commerce' that was unknown to 'almost all the Branches of Business, and all the Classes of the Men of Business.'<sup>23</sup> In terms of broader learning, he ought to acquire a comprehensive range of knowledge such as languages and history.

---

<sup>19</sup> Quoted from Thomas Keith Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce* (Victoria, B.C.: English Literary Studies, University of Victoria, 1987), 40.

<sup>20</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Complete English Tradesman*, Vol. 1 (1725), ed. John McVeagh, *RDW* Vol. 7 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 258.

<sup>21</sup> Rebecca Anne Barr, "'Complete Hypocrite, Complete Tradesman': Defoe's *Complete English Tradesman* and Masculine Conduct," in *Positioning Daniel Defoe's Non-Fiction: Form, Function, Genre*, ed. Aino Mäkikalli and Andreas K. E. Mueller (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2011), 151.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Complete English Tradesman*, Vol. 2 (1727), ed. John McVeagh, *RDW* Vol. 8 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 116.

<sup>23</sup> Defoe, *PEC*, 7:118.

‘The True-Bred Merchant,’ Defoe wrote in 1706, was ‘a Universal Scholar’, and his Greek and Latin excelled that of scholars.<sup>24</sup>

Defoe’s advice to young businessmen was expressed systematically in his two volumes of the *CET* in the late 1720s, while his advice and warnings for tradespeople could be found as early as in the *Review*. Defoe was familiar with the thought and attitudes toward trade of the Puritans. Max Weber, in his classic work on the Protestant ethic, argues that the founding principle of the Protestant ethic was reinforced by seventeenth-century Calvinism and Puritanism, and the certainty of being God’s chosen one could only be achieved by well-ordered and incessant labour. For instance, Weber quotes the verse from *Proverbs* ‘Seest thou a man diligent in business, he shall stand before princes, he shall not stand before mean men’ (*Proverbs* 22:29) as proof of the Puritan work ethic.<sup>25</sup> This verse was also quoted in Defoe’s *CET*, and Puritan writer Richard Steele (1629-1692) in his *Religious Tradesman* also quoted this verse as a warning against sloth.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, Defoe quoted many biblical paragraphs, which were also frequently quoted by other Presbyterians. He quoted the proverbs of Solomon as admonitions to the businessman to work diligently. For example, ‘the diligent Hand makes rich,’<sup>27</sup> and ‘He that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man: he that

---

<sup>24</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:13.

<sup>25</sup> Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Routledge, 2005), 19.

<sup>26</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:61, 67. Defoe also used Proverb. xxii. 29. Richard Steele, *The Trades-Man’s Calling: Being a Discourse Concerning the Nature, Necessity, Choice, &c. of a Calling in General: And Directions for the Right Managing of the Tradesman’s Calling in Particular* (London, 1684), 53. See also Francis Bacon, *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. John M. Robertson (London: Routledge, 1905), 588.

<sup>27</sup> *Proverbs* x: 4 in Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:8:95.

loveth wine and oil shall not be rich.’<sup>28</sup> For another instance, ‘He that is slothful in business, is brother to him that is a great waster’ and ‘The sluggard shall be clothed in rags.’<sup>29</sup> These were all commonly quoted by some other Puritan writers to promote diligence. John Shower, a minister who studied in Morton’s academy like Defoe, also stressed the importance of using time wisely. Shower argued that ‘God calls me to Diligence and Labour; the Work he calls me to is excellent, and the Reward glorious; to know, and love, and serve, and obey him, in order to eternal life.’<sup>30</sup> Besides, Weber stressed the wise use of time as a characteristic of their work ethic. This emphasis on the wise use of time was a marked trait of seventeenth-century English Puritans. Richard Baxter warned readers to ‘use every minute of it as a most precious thing.’<sup>31</sup> Defoe was also familiar with this tradition and wrote that ‘time is no more to be unemploy’d, than it is to be ill employ’d.’ He argued that the tradesmen ought to ‘keep as due a balance of his time, as he should of his book, or cash.’<sup>32</sup> In Defoe’s novels such as *Robinson Crusoe* and *Memoirs of a Cavalier*, the protagonists not only treasured their time but also kept figuring out how to improve their arrangements of time.<sup>33</sup> For a responsible businessman, there were two things that they had to be wary of. One was ‘Duties of religion, or things relating to a future life,’ and the other is

---

<sup>28</sup> *Proverbs*, xxi: 17 in Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:71.

<sup>29</sup> *Proverbs*, xviii: 9, xxiii: 21 in *Ibid.*, 7:64.

<sup>30</sup> John Shower, *Serious Reflections on Time, and Eternity: With Some Other Subjects, Moral and Divine. To Which Is Prefix’d an Introduction Concerning the First Day of the Year; How Observed by the Jews, and May Best Be Employed by a Serious Christian* (London, 1689), 43.

<sup>31</sup> Aino Mäkikalli, *From Eternity to Time: Conceptions of Time in Daniel Defoe’s Novels* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007), 247–48.

<sup>32</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:67.

<sup>33</sup> Mäkikalli, *From Eternity to Time*, 249.

‘Duties of the present life, viz. business and calling.’<sup>34</sup> If a man did not seize time wisely, Defoe warned, then he only had to wait ‘a little Time just to drop into the Grave, and be forgotten.’<sup>35</sup>

Punctuality is closely related to time. A tradesman must treasure his time and never waste it. On a larger scale, he compared officials in control of England’s national credit to ‘Springs and Wheels’ in a clock.<sup>36</sup> ‘Exactness’ and punctuality were common features of clocks and officials. The force behind these, argued Defoe, is God. In Defoe’s words, it is ‘the Force of its true original Motion, according to the exquisite Design of the Director of the whole Frame.’<sup>37</sup> Besides satisfying the basic needs of life, there were only two important things for tradesmen. One is ‘Duties of religion, or things relating to a future life,’ and the other is ‘Duties of the present life, viz. business and calling.’<sup>38</sup> If a man does not seize time wisely, Defoe warned, then he only had to wait ‘a little Time just to drop into the Grave, and be forgotten,’<sup>39</sup> just as alcoholism should be reprimanded, partly because it made people ‘loytering away an unreasonable deal of time.’<sup>40</sup> The drive to hard work in Defoe’s thinking was more than simply a Puritan hard-work ethic.

Yet there was a debate on the effectiveness of the notion of ‘calling’ (*Beruf* in German). Even if the tradesman had earned a fortune, writers disputed on whether he

---

<sup>34</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:61.

<sup>35</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:124.

<sup>36</sup> Daniel Defoe, *An Essay upon Publick Credit* (1710), ed. John McVeagh, *PEW*, vol. 6 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 55.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:56.

<sup>38</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:61.

<sup>39</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:124.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:211.

was not allowed to buy lands and titles in order to move to a higher social status. Yet, Defoe's encouragement to businessmen was different from the Puritans' insistence on a stratified society. He said that businessmen could go into other businesses: 'Sir Josiah Child, originally a very mean tradesman; the late Mr. Lowndes, bred a scrivener.'<sup>41</sup> Besides, Defoe did not mention that wealth accumulation or success in business operations could be a sign of calling or divine grace.<sup>42</sup>

The debate and controversy of the Weber thesis will not be discussed in detail here. These sources were used to indicate that Defoe was familiar with the traditional ideas of the Puritans. This was the heritage behind his explanation on luxury.<sup>43</sup> In the *CET*, Defoe recommended that a tradesman should strive to lead a frugal life. In contrast to an extravagant lifestyle, the ideal way of living was portrayed as 'Frugality or Living within Compass.'<sup>44</sup> Similar to his attitude toward the Reformation of Manners, Defoe argued that although human nature is full of pride, which is impossible to remove, it is still better to be cautious and preventative rather than be possessed by pride, because taking some preventive measures makes a difference. However, in the new age, the growth of commodities had inevitably engaged tradesmen in the business of luxury, which was associated with pride.

In the final part of *CET*, Defoe discoursed luxury and trade and the positive effects they brought to humankind. He imagined that if human society was stripped of luxury goods brought by trade, then this society would be reduced to a primal condition,

---

<sup>41</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:61.

<sup>42</sup> Hunter, *The Reluctant Pilgrim*, 36; Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:61. Cf. *Ibid.*, 7:229.

<sup>43</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:211.

<sup>44</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:55.

and ‘therefore a life [not] worth living.’<sup>45</sup> John Sekora has commented that Defoe’s major non-fiction works were in defence of ‘the commercial interests against the prevailing attack upon luxury.’<sup>46</sup> Sekora is right on this point, although Defoe was not entirely opposed to the ‘anti-luxury’ argument, and his definition of luxury was not as clear-cut as Sekora has suggested. According to Meier, Defoe did not tolerate a kind of luxury that was ‘the darkest vices of human beings,’<sup>47</sup> but he accepted the luxuries that were beneficial to society. Defoe surely understood the criticism of fops and alcoholism, and he supported the reformation of manners. However, he stated his stance clearly: ‘a Reformation might effect [sic] Trade in many particular things, but need not overthrow and destroy it in general.’<sup>48</sup>

I argue that the meaning of vices in Defoe’s writings was two-fold. His Puritan background could be encapsulated by the following sentence: ‘we must Encourage our Vice for the Encouragement of our Trade.’ According to the context of this sentence, Defoe was referring to good clothes such as ‘Embroideries’ and ‘Laces’ as vices.<sup>49</sup> This kind of vice was by no means equal to what Meier calls ‘the darkest services,’ such as homicide or robbery. By contrast, those vices related to luxury ‘were largely those of overindulgence rather than criminality.’<sup>50</sup> Novak calls this attitude ‘moral

---

<sup>45</sup> John McVeagh, ‘Introduction,’ in *The Complete English Tradesman, Vol. 1* (1725), ed. John McVeagh, *RDW*, Vol. 7 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 22.

<sup>46</sup> Sekora, *Luxury*, 117.

<sup>47</sup> Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*, 86.

<sup>48</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:236.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:211. See also Daniel Defoe, *A Brief State of the Question between the Printed and Painted Callicoes: And the Woollen and Silk Manufacture, as Far as It Relates to the Wearing and Using of Printed Callicoes in Great Britain*, the second edition. (London, 1719), 11. Cf. Andersen, “The Paradox of Trade and Morality in Defoe,” 43–44; Leon Guilhamet, *Defoe and the Whig Novel: A Reading of the Major Fiction* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2010), 138–39.

<sup>50</sup> Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*, 88.

sophism.<sup>51</sup> However, based on the discussion of the previous chapter, Defoe was immersed in the neo-Augustinian tradition, and his explanation of luxury was comparable to Mandeville's thesis of 'odious pride.' This pride created jobs and both Defoe and Mandeville supported it.<sup>52</sup>

Defoe sensed that the age he lived in was different from the past, and his definition of luxury was not as simple as 'overindulgences.' Instead, he argued it was no longer possible to close one's eye to luxury. The details of 'vicious' luxury he listed were things like the exchange of stocks between nations or the purchases of Indian prints or French toys. This kind of 'crime' was fundamentally different from the crimes of theft and homicide. The strong adjective 'vicious' seemed to be rhetorical here. In order to stress English interest, Defoe was not alone in this stance. Richard Baxter (1616-1691), one of the prominent dissenters, also argued that in an imperfect world, some compromises were inevitable.<sup>53</sup>

In the section discussing credit in *CET*, Defoe distinguished good credit from the good personality of a tradesman just as he separated the salesman and the buyer of luxury products. He claimed that a man could be a 'Knaves at the Bottom, and that in Trade too, and yet his Credit for Payment be perfectly good.'<sup>54</sup> Defoe maintained that credit was different from reputation, which was built on one's integrity and inner

---

<sup>51</sup> Novak, *Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe*, 73.

<sup>52</sup> Laurence Dickey, "Pride, Hypocrisy and Civility in Mandeville's Social and Historical Theory," *Critical Review* 4, no. 3 (1990): 409. See also Horne, *The Social Thought of Bernard Mandeville*, 59–62.

<sup>53</sup> Evelyn D. Bebb, *Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life, 1660-1800: Some Problems of the Present as They Appeared in the Past* (Philadelphia, PA: Porcupine Press, 1981), 115.

<sup>54</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:106.

personality. He argued that a man of bad reputation and good credit was welcomed in trade because in commercial society, people placed a reliance on the law, rather than placing trust on one's reputation, which made the wicked man willing to fulfil his deal. Therefore, Defoe considered that it was impossible to establish friendships in the world of trade, because this world was a world of personas, and thus it was useless or even harmful to follow one's natural feelings in this world. As Barr argued, the reason for a tradesman to be disciplined in hiding his emotions was to try to reduce the 'vulnerability of the tradesman.'<sup>55</sup> Barr suggested that a tradesman had to suppress his true feelings in order to stimulate the market and he must conform to the respected forms of politeness in society.<sup>56</sup> For example, regarding female customers, a tradesman had to subordinate his own emotions to the need to induce them to make purchase of his goods.<sup>57</sup>

To Defoe, crimes such as excessive drinking, prostitution, and blasphemy were intolerable, while distilling or comfortable furniture should be allowed. The vices listed by Defoe had to be considered in context. He maintained that the greatest vice of businessmen was the 'neglect of his business' because it would easily destroy a businessman, but the neglect of business was certainly not an evil. Vices in his works were not necessarily equal to sins or crimes. As a man who was ready to be a minister before he left the Dissenting Academy, Defoe was versed with this kind of language. Defoe called luxury 'vice' in the context of his age. Many contemporary writers

---

<sup>55</sup> Barr, "Complete Hypocrite, Complete Tradesman': Defoe's *Complete English Tradesman* and Masculine Conduct,' 158.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>57</sup> McVeagh, 'Introduction,' 14.

anxiously pointed out that any business related to pleasure or even slight portion of drink was evil. Judging from many of his publications on luxury, it was clear that Defoe did not regard luxury as evil. The confusion between the two definitions of vices was partly the reason behind the rising of the controversy over Defoe's paradox of trade and morality, as Andersen called it.

Lincoln Faller also noted this subjection of feelings was 'the creation of a modern subjectivity arising out of the commercial contract.'<sup>58</sup> Thus, in commercial society, it was better to curb one's emotions when interacting with other people. Any transaction made by a tradesman was not because this man had any blood relation or friendship with the other person in the deal, but because each had to barter with the other. It was noteworthy that there were different implications for consumers and tradesmen. For tradesmen, luxury was merely their commodity, because it was through frugality that they could 'grow rich by their trade.'<sup>59</sup> In contrast, for consumers it was natural for them to have a craving for extravagance, and this could not be curbed. Defoe wrote that:

There is a just Impartiality which a Tradesman may observe between his Interest and his Customer; if the Buyer comes and directs him to make this or that particular thing, of such and such materials, and in such and such a form, it is his Business to perform it, and the Extravagance is indeed the Fop's that Imposes it upon him.<sup>60</sup>

Defoe called luxury an indispensable part of English society and suggested that the desire to pursue extravagant things was deeply fixed in the minds of Englishmen.

---

<sup>58</sup> Lincoln B. Faller, *Crime and Defoe: A New Kind of Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 192.

<sup>59</sup> Defoe, *CET 1*, 7:204.

<sup>60</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:226.

The consumption of luxury contributed to England's economy. If it were forcibly removed, then it would cause 'the expence of our Trade, and the ruin of an infinite number of People.'<sup>61</sup> Although this addiction to luxury was an 'unhappy thoughtless custom,'<sup>62</sup> Defoe designated luxury as

the Vices that propagate Trade, and it was upon the Foundation of these, that we ventur'd to say, our Vices are become Virtues in Commerce, propagate Trade, Labour, Manufacture, and the encrease of Employment of the Poor in all parts of England, and even Abroad as well as at Home.<sup>63</sup>

In the scholarship on Defoe's thoughts about the relationship between luxury and morality, Anderson's article, though published seventy years ago, is still often cited and is regarded as a classic work. In a nutshell, Andersen's point was: 'business was an independent compartment with rules of its own.' In taking this view, Defoe was appealing to a cleavage between business and religion that was being generally recognized in his age.'<sup>64</sup> One of Andersen's proofs was Defoe's attitude toward slavery. He argued that Defoe was morally nervous about the cruelty under which slaves suffered, but he still supported it out of its economic advantage. However, the campaign for the abolition of slavery would only begin to be seen in England at the middle of the eighteenth century. Defoe in other works, also used the reason of economic profit to criticise the cruelty. So this evidence could not support Andersen's thesis. Meier points out that 'while it is socially reprehensible to advocate slavery in

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 8:203.

<sup>62</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Compleat English Gentleman* (1728-1729), ed. W. R. Owens, *RDW*, Vol. 10 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 180.

<sup>63</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:234.

<sup>64</sup> Andersen, "The Paradox of Trade and Morality in Defoe," 37.

the twentieth century, it was socially acceptable to do so in the eighteenth.<sup>65</sup> Defoe's argument for the abolition of slavery was based on his conviction that abolition was economically advantageous. Masters should not abuse and mistreat slaves, but it was out of economic concern rather than humanitarian considerations. This instance did not support the argument that Defoe regarded business as an amoral domain. In addition, one source Anderson used to argue Defoe's critique of slavery was from two verses of the poem, *Reformation of Manners*:

The ling'ring Life of Slavery preserve,  
And vilely teach them both to Sin and serve.<sup>66</sup>

Judging from the context of the verses, however, the main target of Defoe's criticism was blasphemy. The slaves mentioned here had suffered not from physical abuse but from exposure to their master's cursing. Slavery was not the central theme of the poem, and overall, Defoe did not consider slavery as an immoral institution.<sup>67</sup>

Secondly, Anderson supported his argument that Defoe drew a clear line between business and religion citing the sentence 'Trading is a Matter entirely independent in its nature' from the periodical *The Mercator* (1713-14) that supported the signing of the Anglo-French Treaty of Commerce of 1713 and peace of Utrecht. But, the next sentence following Anderson's quote was 'To bar up Trade with a Nation, because we

---

<sup>65</sup> Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*, 82–83.

<sup>66</sup> Defoe, *Reformation of Manners*, 1:166. See also Mueller, *A Critical Study of Daniel Defoe's Verse*, 76–77; Patrick J. Keane, "Slavery and the Slave Trade: Crusoe as Defoe's Representative," in *Critical Essays on Daniel Defoe*, ed. Roger D. Lund (New York: G.K. Hall, 1997), 102–103; Srinivas Aravamudan, "Defoe, Commerce, and Empire," in *The Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe*, ed. John Richetti (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 45–63.

<sup>67</sup> For details, see Patrick J. Keane, *Coleridge's Submerged Politics: The Ancient Mariner and Robinson Crusoe* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1994), 93–94; Keane, "Slavery and the Slave Trade: Crusoe as Defoe's Representative."

differ in State-Matters and Politick Interest, is the greatest Absurdity, that a Nation can be guilty of.’<sup>68</sup> Therefore, what Defoe was arguing was that Britain and France should keep trading with each other. Trade must not be interfered with because of political parties or the ongoing war. This issue of the *Mercator* could not support Andersen’s argument that trade for Defoe was insulated from ethical or religious concerns.

Using another passage from the *Mercator* as an example, Anderson cites ‘it matters not to us what God they worship, what Religion they own, with whom we Trade; our Commerce worships but one Idol, viz. GAIN’ to argue that Defoe agreed that ‘slavery and luxuries were obviously useful in so far as they also served this idol.’ However, the issue was not about luxury goods. Instead, it was focusing on the fact that Britain did not have to stop its beneficial trade with France because of the war because the surplus from trade also supported Britain’s military expenditure. In short, it would have caused more losses to Britain rather than gain.

Andersen concluded that Defoe’s main concern was the national interest. Therefore, he used justifications such as ‘the security of the nation,’ and ‘obvious benefits to the state’ to justify ‘moral errors.’ He adds that Defoe ‘never permitted ethical considerations to interfere with business.’ The evidence he used was ‘CUSTOM indeed has driven us beyond the limits of our morals in many things...if no man must go beyond, or defraud his neighbour.’<sup>69</sup> Indeed, Defoe admitted that necessity would force people to break the rule, but it was misleading to argue that he ‘never permitted’ ethical considerations in business. Throughout Defoe’s career, his

---

<sup>68</sup> Defoe, *The Mercator*, 27 (23–25 July, 1713).

<sup>69</sup> Defoe, *CET I*, 7:186.

works showed concern for moral issues. For instance, there were detailed instructions in *Conjugal Lewdness* (1727). He warned the readers that delicate food and good clothes posed potential dangers to our health and national morale. It is obvious that here Defoe did not view luxury goods from the perspective of commercial gain but from the perspective of morality and the impact on personal health. Furthermore, Andersen argues that Defoe's support of the concern for profit 'shielded the tradesman from moral restrictions,' but the very fact that Defoe had elaborated at length on drinking, in fact, reflected his concern and worries about it. He did make some restrictions on the consumption of alcohol and other aspects of money-spending, but for Defoe the disadvantageous things were 'not our Drink, but our Excess,' 'not our needful, but our superfluous Drink.'<sup>70</sup> He continued: '... our own Malt Liquors, especially common Draught Beer, is most wholesome and nourishing.'<sup>71</sup> Defoe advised people to consume within their means, and they should never borrow money to pursue their favourite items. In Defoe's words, 'To buy nothing but what they could immediately Pay for.'<sup>72</sup>

In sum, Defoe had moral concerns in economic affairs. He understood that human beings were not able to 'transcend the demands of the passions of the world,' but if men were aware of the existence and pervasiveness of passions and their possible

---

<sup>70</sup> Defoe, *PEC*, 7:227. See also the quote from *CET*: '... as in the case of drunkenness, the grape, and the malt, are not chargeable; they are an innocent product.' (Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:211.) Cf. James, *Daniel Defoe's Many Voices*, 87–88.

<sup>71</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Augusta Triumphans* (1728), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 8, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 279.

<sup>72</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:94.

dangers, then this awareness may contribute to the possibility of finding a way to ‘pit the passions against passions.’<sup>73</sup>

### **Defoe and Mandeville: Two Apologists of Luxury**

As mentioned in the previous chapter, one of Defoe’s essential ideas was that pride of human beings was impossible to eradicate. In a consumer society like England in the early eighteenth century, it was impossible to restrict people from purchasing fancy things and clothes. As Defoe put it: ‘you may restrain their Extravagance, but you can’t promise to restrain their Pride.’ It was, therefore, futile and impractical to prohibit the consumption of luxuries. Prohibition of luxury was not only useless but also harmful: ‘All your sumptuary Laws do nothing to reform the Vice, and yet they injure the Trade.’<sup>74</sup> Since pride was inevitable, the measure Defoe thought feasible and practical was to admit those harmless extravagances and be careful not to indulge in it.<sup>75</sup>

John Robertson and Edward Hundert have discussed the neo-Augustinian tradition and Epicurean tradition in the works of Pierre Bayle and Mandeville, who was heavily influenced by Bayle.<sup>76</sup> Furthermore, scholars have already dealt with Mandeville’s influence on contemporaries such as third Earl of Shaftesbury, Berkeley and Francis Hutcheson. Defoe had discoursed extensively on luxury, fashion, and

---

<sup>73</sup> Albert O. Hirschman, *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before Its Triumph* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977), 33. See also Defoe, *Review*, 6:31.

<sup>74</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:212.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:236.

<sup>76</sup> Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*, 256–324; Hundert, *The Enlightenment’s Fable*, 29–37.

human nature, the topics that concerned all other major thinkers of this time. He also participated in this intellectual dialogue, there is not much research that tries to link the scholarship of Defoe with this debate on commerce and morality. Therefore, this section aims to fill this gap by putting Defoe into this debate sparked by Fénelon. Since there was already much scholarship on Mandeville's importance in this debate and the Augustinian thought in his works, it will be proper to begin with a comparison between Defoe and Mandeville.

Paul Slack mentions that Mandeville influenced Defoe, and the proof is that Defoe's argument that 'reforming our vices' would 'ruin the nation' is drawn from Mandeville. Slack used Defoe's case to support his argument that 'luxury was being accommodated...or more or less quietly accepted, because it contributed to material progress.'<sup>77</sup> John Robert Moore, on the other hand, maintains that Defoe 'held a very different ultimate view from that of Mandeville' despite many similarities. Moore supported this argument with a quotation from Defoe that 'the luxury of the age will be the ruin of the nation, if not prevented.'<sup>78</sup> In the context pertaining to this quotation, luxury referred to two things: one was the change of ordinary people's breakfast habit, from a porridge breakfast and milk soup to coffee and tea; and the other was the abuse of a sickening gin called 'GENEVA.'<sup>79</sup> According to Defoe's other writings, coffee and tea became basic and essential in this age, and they were anything but problematic.

---

<sup>77</sup> Paul Slack, *The Invention of Improvement: Information and Material Progress in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 211–12.

<sup>78</sup> Moore, *Daniel Defoe*, 323. The quote was from Defoe, *Augusta Triumphans*, 8:278.

<sup>79</sup> Defoe, *Augusta Triumphans*, 8:278. See also Defoe's discussion of the 'excessive Drinking of Geneva' from Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:407.

What should be prevented was the excessive drinking of the gin, while coffee, another luxury, should not be banned. Moreover, Defoe in the same paragraph advocated a scheme of a two-hour business time on the Sabbath Day. The reason was to avoid the waste of food, and he wrote that ‘Meat might be kill’d in the cool of the Morning, viz. One or Two of the Clock, and sold ‘till Nine.’ This was a vivid example of Defoe’s flexibility. He understood the controversial nature of the idea, but he defended this adjustment, arguing it was aiming not to ‘abuse God's Mercies.’<sup>80</sup> In short, Moore’s citation of Defoe does not support the hypothesis that Defoe’s view was ‘very different’ from Mandeville’s.

Novak’s classic work also touched on the relationship between the two thinkers. He correctly points out that ‘in his seeming acceptance of the balance between the prodigality of the rich and the necessity of the poor, Defoe did not appear very different from Mandeville.’<sup>81</sup> But he suggested Defoe was critical of ‘Perriwig-makers’ and of ‘Pastry-cooks,’ because these impractical industries did harm to the larger industries. In the *CET* Defoe had mentioned ‘Perriwig-makers’ two times. The first one was to show that there were countless ‘Perriwig-makers’ in London because it was a more advanced place than Turkey.<sup>82</sup> The second one was to show that these wig sellers were numerous because a ‘flourishing of Pride has dictated the new Methods of Living to the People.’<sup>83</sup> Defoe argued that they were symbolic of a new way of living in a commercial society, and there was no mentioning of any adverse effect. As for ‘Pastry

---

<sup>80</sup> Defoe, *Augusta Triumphans*, 8:278.

<sup>81</sup> Novak, *Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe*, 138.

<sup>82</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:209. See also *idem*, *Review*, 3:63.

<sup>83</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:233.

cooks', they were cited by Defoe to describe the rich variety of food in England, which resulted from societal progress and the flourishing of enjoyment. In Defoe's words, now 'many Trades are depending upon these unhappy Articles,'<sup>84</sup> therefore, there was again no evidence of the marginalising of useful industries.

Furthermore, Novak attributed *An Essay on Ways and Means for the Advancement of Trade* to Defoe, using the book as evidence to show Defoe's approval of the regulation of luxury goods. However, among researchers only Novak agrees that Defoe wrote this book. The message of the pamphlet was to impose control on the taste and style of the upper class, and this argument was not to be seen in any of Defoe's writings. However, Defoe did suggest that some government measures were necessary to reduce problems like excessive drinking. Otherwise, he rarely advocated for regulating people's tastes. The two thinkers, therefore, were not as different as scholars have argued. Let us have a closer look at the relationship between them.

Defoe had mentioned Mandeville directly in his writings only once.<sup>85</sup> They both lived in Hackney in the same period,<sup>86</sup> and the publisher John Brotherton who published Mandeville's *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour* in 1732 was also responsible for Defoe's *Fair Payment no Spunge* in 1717, *Captain Singleton* in 1720, *Religious Courtship* in 1722, and *Colonel Jacque* in 1723. In addition to these backgrounds, there were further similarities. They both admitted that self-love was an

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 8:205.

<sup>85</sup> '.....but our Vices are so unhappily mingled with our Interest in Trade, that as a late Author, writing on that Subject, says well, Our Luxury is become a Virtue in Commerce, and our Extravagancies are the Life and Soul of our Trade.' (Defoe, *PEC*, 7:228.)

<sup>86</sup> John Robert Moore, "Mandeville and Defoe," in *Mandeville Studies*, ed. Irwin Primer (Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975), 122.

important source of a country's wealth. Defoe pointed out that this could be proven by the 'number of Tradesmen employ'd in' industries of enjoyment.<sup>87</sup> They agreed that the poor or the tradesmen who were employed in the service of the rich and indulged themselves in a life of luxury should not be blamed. There were good people and bad people in every business, thus it was not fair to criticise the whole profession because of few irresponsible members. As Defoe put it: 'the Man is the Criminal, not the Trade.'<sup>88</sup>

This argument reminded us of Mandeville's defence of the druggists and sword-cutlers. Mandeville argued that virtue 'made friends with vice.' These businessmen earned 'a Livelihood by something that chiefly depends on, or is very much influenc'd by the Vices of others, without being themselves guilty of, or accessory to them.'<sup>89</sup> Defoe offered a similar reasoning and defence of these tradesmen employed in the occupations related to luxury. In Defoe's words, 'the Trade does not make the Vice, but the Vice makes the Trade.'<sup>90</sup> In the case of alcohol, Defoe argued that grapes and malt were innocent, so were spirits and beer as long as they were consumed moderately. The shops selling beer and wine were not responsible for alcoholism, because they did not force people to drink excessively. Defoe also praised 'that this Distilling Trade, as

---

<sup>87</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:201. See also *Ibid.*, 8:236: 'our Trade might be supported, our Tradesmen be kept employ'd.'

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:225.

<sup>89</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:85. See also T. W. Hutchison, *Before Adam Smith: The Emergence of Political Economy, 1662-1776* (Oxford: Basil Blackford, 1988), 115–22; Rogério Arthmar, "Mandeville and the Markets: An Economic Assessment," in *Bernard de Mandeville's Topology of Paradoxes* (Amsterdam: Springer, 2015), 185–87.

<sup>90</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:211. Cf. Guilhamet, *Defoe and the Whig Novel*, 137; Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*, 86; John J. Richetti, *Daniel Defoe* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987), 41–42.

thus improved and encreased, adds exceedingly to the numbers of our Tradesmen, and has even erected several new species of Traders, which were little or not at all known or understood before.’<sup>91</sup> In commercial society, we should not expect a perfect shopkeeper or tradesman. ‘An honest Man; for as to Perfection’ Defoe reminded us that we were ‘not looking for it in Life.’<sup>92</sup>

Based on his understanding of human nature, Defoe was sure that it was unlikely that pride could not be repressed at all. Sumptuary laws, as mentioned above, would be more harmful than useful for the economy. National power and the livelihood of the poor were two major points in Defoe’s economic thought. One of England’s main export commodities in Defoe’s time was woollen products, so he stressed the selling of these high-class clothes, which were crucial to the economy of the country, not to mention the fact that innumerable poor people were employed in this trade. Therefore, he stated that we must either ‘sell them fine Clothes,’ or they would still purchase it abroad. Defoe asked readers to face reality, shouting ‘Hail, Virtuous Pride! Regular Vanity! and Necessary Luxury! ... for the preserving the Poor from Want.’<sup>93</sup> England had ‘come to an Age’ of new ideas and reality, so the changes must be accepted.<sup>94</sup>

Fashion and mode might be ridiculous, but they were the driving forces behind commerce and manufacturing in his time, and Defoe was determined to accept them.

---

<sup>91</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:198.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:29. See Sandra. Sherman, *Finance and Fictionality in the Early Eighteenth Century Accounting for Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 123–25; Martin Price, *To the Palace of Wisdom: Studies in Order and Energy from Dryden to Blake* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), 273–74.

<sup>93</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings, Extending from 1716-1729*, ed. William Lee, vol. 2 (London: J.C. Hotten, 1869), 103.

<sup>94</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:225.

He argued that it was true that businessmen benefitted from and were dependent on fops by providing them with ‘Gaieties’ and ‘Feathers.’<sup>95</sup> Again, Defoe defended the sellers, because they did not force fops and beaus to show off. Furthermore, If they could not buy ‘fine silk, satin and velvet’ here, those beaus and the ladies would head to France. Government might ‘reduce the national Pride with sumptuary Laws’ for a while, but since the power of mode and fashion were so powerful ‘the gay temper may remain.’ The result would mean trade would be ruined but vice would remain.<sup>96</sup> Mandeville held a similar point that ‘as long as Men have the same Appetites’ he argued that ‘the same Vices will remain.’<sup>97</sup> Human society and its progress had to be sustained and moved by pride, Mandeville argued, and ‘without desires and passions, society may be justly compared to a huge windmill without a breath of air. It was pride that created economic man.’<sup>98</sup> ‘Pride was just the incentive that the economy needed, both on the demand and the supply sides, for it was relentless and insatiable.’<sup>99</sup>

There is a clear difference between the two writers. Mandeville did not reserve himself on those controversial points, while Defoe often added some pacifying remarks or additional explanations to soften his argument. For instance, in his fable of small beer, Mandeville satirized people who evidently enjoyed drinking, but dared not admit their love for small beers. They only found the excuse of its advantage for the colour of complexion. Mandeville argued that everyone loved drinking alcohol but

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 8:211. Cf. Gregg, *Defoe’s Writings and Manliness Contrary Men*, 26–27.

<sup>96</sup> Defoe, *CET 2*, 8:212.

<sup>97</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:118.

<sup>98</sup> Hont, “The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,” 393.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid. Mandeville criticised another kind of pride such as asceticism

because of hypocrisy, those who dared to show that they enjoyed quenching their thirst with alcohol would be accused of drunkenness. On the same issue, however, Defoe did not discuss it as bluntly as Mandeville. Defoe repeatedly stated that it was acceptable to drink, only if you did not drink too much and had not directly stated that drinking was not involved with morals. Defoe did not defend 'Drunkenness,'<sup>100</sup> and we have to keep in mind that Mandeville never said that excessive drinking was a good thing. Unlike Defoe, Mandeville stated that everyone loved to drink and did not need to be hypocritical about the alcohol industry. Defoe would add that if you really intended to drink, then you should drink English ale rather than French wine. One reason was for the balance of trade, and another reason was that he advocated the quality of ale was better than that of wine. This kind of remark on the acceptance of drinking would be difficult to find in other contemporary writers' work besides Mandeville's.

The fundamental question was that what was luxury to Defoe, and what was not? He acknowledged and did not criticise the love of enjoyments, and he did not 'Love to stint Mankind in their Beloved Gaiety.'<sup>101</sup> His definition of luxury was 'the exorbitances of Life; such as...needful for Trade, but in the main...not necessary to the being of Mankind.'<sup>102</sup> In the strictest sense, even spices were luxury, because humans could survive without it. There were only a small number of the necessities of

---

<sup>100</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Some Objections Humbly Offered (1729)*, ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 8, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 299.

<sup>101</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:94.

<sup>102</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:207.

life in one country need to be purchased from another.<sup>103</sup> Many things were unnecessary if you were only seeking to survive, Defoe argued, and that was similar to the way of living of the natives in America.

Their Houses were moveable Hutts, which they built; where, and as often as they wanted them, the wild Beasts were their Food, just as much of them as they could kill; Bow and Arrow was their Weapons; sharp Stones or Sticks their Knives; and Fire was the greatest Assistant they had.<sup>104</sup>

These natives ‘secur’d them[selves] from some Crimes’ and ‘they coveted nothing, Money they had none, for it was of no Use to them; they had nothing to sell, nor wanted to buy.’<sup>105</sup> Apparently, this was hardly the case of Defoe’s age, and it was impossible for a commercial society like England to regress to a hunting society.

Being aware of the fact that England had entered a brand new era, Defoe resorted to the argument of Providence to argue that those unnecessary things in life were given by ‘the Wise Providence.’<sup>106</sup> Our needs were more than food, shelter, clothing and so on. All these necessaries, Defoe argued, were the basis for ‘forming’ a more comfortable life that was filled with ‘the Pleasures and Conveniences of Life.’<sup>107</sup> Defoe argued that different societies were at different stages of civilisation, so if the government violently forced an advanced society to regress back to a more primary state, he stating that it would be similar to bringing ‘the People back to Originals,

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 8:206.

<sup>104</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:587.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 3:588.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 9:216.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., 6:187. Cf. Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*, 84; Peter Earle, *The World of Defoe* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976), 48–49.

transpose, disperse and confine the People’ and would ‘unhinge Trade, lessen Employment, defeat Industry, and weaken the Nation.’<sup>108</sup>

Scholars like Nicholas Phillipson and Lawrence Klein have explored the language of politeness in Defoe’s era, focusing on figures such as Joseph Addison, Richard Steele and the third Earl of Shaftesbury. According to Phillipson, conversation and interaction between men in coffeehouses and teahouses could reform their morals, and modify their passions and pride.<sup>109</sup> Here I suggest that Defoe’s works on tradesmen also fit this picture.

Defoe argued in the *CET* that, faced with customers or partners in business, a true tradesman had to hide his feelings. A tradesman should not be moved by ‘Heat and Passion’ but act by ‘mere absolutely necessary Care of your Interest.’<sup>110</sup> Examples of politeness appeared numerous times in the *CET*. He suggested that tradesmen should have ‘Civility in Conversation’ because this was ‘a Test of good Manners.’<sup>111</sup> In the business world tradesmen ought to treat customers as their superiors. Therefore, no matter how disrespectful or arbitrary buyers were, businessmen must respond with utmost patience and propriety. Defoe suggested that ‘patience which is needful to bear with all sorts of impertinence, and the most provoking curiosity that it is possible to imagine the buyers, even the worst of them, are or can be guilty of.’<sup>112</sup> As McVeagh has pointed out:

---

<sup>108</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:27.

<sup>109</sup> Nicholas Phillipson, “Propriety, Property and Prudence,” 308.

<sup>110</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 148.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 141.

<sup>112</sup> Defoe, *CET* 1, 90.

To do this the tradesman would find it necessary to sublimate (to use the Freudian term). He must find pleasure as well as duty in work and must love conducting the business of his shop.<sup>113</sup>

A tradesman had to find pleasures in business, when facing customers, this business ‘must have no flesh and blood about him, no passions, no resentment; he must never be angry, no not so much as seem to be so.’<sup>114</sup> Defoe even added what seems to be an exaggerated case when a tradesman went upstairs, beating his wife and children to ease his anger, and afterwards put on a renewed smile to come downstairs to resume his business.<sup>115</sup>

Following the thread of politeness, one of Defoe’s depictions of the tradesman’s environment was that the tradesman was under constant supervision or gaze of his neighbours, and these eyes and opinions had an influence on the tradesman’s credit. He wrote that: ‘a tradesman’s welfare depends upon the justice and courtesy of his neighbours, and how nice and critical a thing his reputation is.’<sup>116</sup> It was this concern that kept tradesmen humble and mindful of other people's feelings. In other words, tradesmen must care about other people’s interests in order to further their own. Thus, when Hans Andersen said that Defoe’s ‘practice of simply ruling the ethical objections out of immediate consideration’<sup>117</sup> it meant that this view must be considered questionable. According to the instances described above, Defoe’s complete

---

<sup>113</sup> McVeagh, ‘Introduction,’ 13.

<sup>114</sup> Defoe, *CETI*, 90.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>117</sup> Andersen, ‘The Paradox of Trade and Morality in Defoe,’ 34.

tradesman not only had to obey the ordinary laws of morals, but was also advised to follow a higher and stricter standard of morals.

Scholars argued that Mandeville had an insight that luxury was not only a manifestation of human greed and enjoyment but also a driving force for the advancement of civilised manners. Hont specified that ‘the novelty was not in claiming that envy and emulation promoted economic activity, but that trade and technology could not develop far without them.’<sup>118</sup> Peltonen points out that Mandeville showed that ‘there was an exceptionally close link between politeness and luxury.’ Politeness was closely related to pride, and also closely intertwined with luxury.<sup>119</sup>

According to the previous discussion, Defoe shared with Mandeville this novel idea of the close relationship between luxury and manners. Therefore, he pointed out that

It is next to Incredible, what a share the Luxury of the Age has, in the Employment of Families, and in the multiplying of Tradesmen in this Nation, among whom no one article they deal in, may be call'd a necessary to Life, or even to the real comforts of Life.<sup>120</sup>

People, of course, could lead a poor life without superfluities, but this was not an advanced and civilised country. On the other hand, different from Mandeville, Defoe made reassuring remarks that there would ‘for ever, therefore, remain a Difference, between Living Plentifully and Freely, and yet Honestly; and Living Profusely and Extravagantly, and Destroying their Estates.’<sup>121</sup> His ideal surely was ‘Living

---

<sup>118</sup> Hont, “The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,” 393.

<sup>119</sup> Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, 299.

<sup>120</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:203.

<sup>121</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:95.

Plentifully.’ Defoe’s description of luxury and his argument were partly similar to Hutcheson’s argument twenty years later, that it was impossible to ban luxury. Therefore, he advocated acceptable luxury: ‘Luxury is the using more curious and expensive habitation, dress; table, equipage, than the person’s wealth will bear.’<sup>122</sup> As long as the customer could afford the merchandise, then its purchase should not be called a vice. Defoe also advocated this method, as long as a man saved a certain amount of money, then he could use it freely. He argued that this was ‘a fine management of our fashion and custom,’ and the goal was not to ‘overthrow Decency’ and not to ‘Destroy Trade.’<sup>123</sup>

### **Commercial Society, Providence, and England**

To convince readers of the value of commercial society, Defoe turned to the non-commercial Turkish society for a contrary example. In Turkey, Defoe wrote, only the nobility wore beautiful clothes, and the living standard of ordinary people was low. Many people were unemployed because the luxury industry had not developed there, so there was not much need for workers. Defoe explained that this was the reason ‘why our Poor live well’ while their poor were miserable. This also supported his point that ‘the extravagant pride of the age’ nourished trade ‘and consequently the Poor.’<sup>124</sup> Since there was not much of an alcohol industry in Istanbul, it was difficult to find

---

<sup>122</sup> Francis Hutcheson, *Reflections Upon Laughter, and Remarks Upon the Fable of the Bees* (London, 1750), 56.

<sup>123</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:65.

<sup>124</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:211. See also *idem*, *Review*, 2:88-89; Meier, *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*, 85–86.

‘Maltsters, Malt-makers, Brewers and their Servants, Tapsters, and all the nameless crew of Masters and Servants, Horses, Carriages, Framers, Ploughmen’ and those who got ‘their Bread by the Drinking-trade.’<sup>125</sup>

The luxury that Defoe advocated was not the luxury enjoyed by the ancient Egyptians or Persians. Instead, the luxury that Defoe advocated was a product that made people live a more comfortable life. Writers such as Postlethwayt and Defoe recognised that ‘luxury was thus not just about goods, but about social behaviour. It was increasingly perceived as a sociable activity, generated by cities and participated in by the middling as well as the upper classes.’<sup>126</sup> This was evident in the lifestyle of non-commercial Turkish society. The food that was enjoyed by an average English family was higher than ‘fine Eating and nice Feeding’ by the standard of Turkish society. Defoe favoured the former society in which most people can live a good life. This idea of advanced life and its co-existence with luxury could also be found in his novels.

‘Gayty’ has become a key to measuring the strength and weakness of one nation. In *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, when the protagonist visited China, he made the following comment: ‘What is their Trade, to the universal Commerce of England, Holland, France and Spain? What are their Cities to ours, for Wealth, Strength, Gaiety of Apparel, rich Furniture, and an infinite Variety?’<sup>127</sup> Furniture and

---

<sup>125</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:208.

<sup>126</sup> Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Eger, “The Rise and Fall of the Luxury Debates,” in *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 13.

<sup>127</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 2, *The Novels of Daniel Defoe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), 173.

apparel were put in line with the building and national strength. Any one of them would be used to examine the power of one nation. If England wanted to avoid finding itself in a situation like Turkish or Chinese society, the Englishmen must depart from an ideal idea of being a 'sober, religious, temperate Nation.'<sup>128</sup> According to the discussion above, we are clear that Defoe did not mean he would allow an atheist nation or a nation of drunkenness. His message was that the strict adversity to luxury or alcohol did not work anymore. If we are going to survive in this time, it is not possible to limit life to 'the Necessary Things of Life,' or the life of England would end up like the one which was based on 'the Necessary Things of Life' like Turkish society. He repeated that because this age was different from the previous one, so 'the Excesses of the Age'<sup>129</sup> could not be denied at once. Instead, people had to come up with a new way of thinking to accommodate this new way of life. He pointed out:

To say, let Luxury and Extravagance abate, it will perhaps reform the Town, is to say nothing; for the Question does not lye that way: It is not whether the Luxury will abate, but will our Trade abate or not; if the Trade abates, as it certainly will, my Argument is good.<sup>130</sup>

Although Defoe used vices, or excesses to describe this new age, he was proud of the development judging from his tone of writing. For instance, 'two hundred thousand quarts of Malt...15000 hogsheads of Cyder...50000 ton of Wine.....'<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:205.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid*, 8:208.

<sup>130</sup> Defoe, *Some Objections Humbly Offered*, 8:298.

<sup>131</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:208. Defoe wrote in *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* that '....., the Cyder which I have mentioned already, and which takes up the South Part of the County, between Topsham and Axminster, where they have so vast a Quantity of Fruit, and so much Cyder made, that sometimes they have sent Ten, or Twenty thousand Hogsheads of it in a Year to London.' See Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, Volume 2 (1725), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 2, *TDH* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), 20.

For another instance, Defoe admired that ‘all the Coach-makers, Chair-makers, Harness-makers, &c. Trades so prodigiously multiply’d...in this City, with all the numberless Artificers depending upon and employ’d by them.’<sup>132</sup> Defoe wrote these sentences with pride, and he preferred English society to Turkish society. As Mandeville insinuated, ‘all the cardinal virtues together won't so much as procure a tolerable coat or a porridge pot among them.’<sup>133</sup> This idea was quite similar to Mandeville's saying that frugality means self-denial.

Defoe argued that if Britain chose to abandon the trade that was unnecessary to life, it would destroy the power and wealth of Britain at once. Besides adopting the discourse on civilisation, Defoe also based his argument on a providential argument that was briefly discussed above.

Woollen manufacture was one of his favourite topics, and he considered it a gift that God had granted to England. Trade in this world was devised by the grand plan of God. Different nations were scattered around the world, and this was designed to make people communicate and trade with each other, and that made it possible for more people to survive. Looking back at the history of England, Defoe pointed out that the woollen manufacture and other ‘happy Gaiety and comfortable Splendour’ began to develop in England in the reign of Henry VII. And because of providence, all these manufactures had grown to quite a remarkable degree and combined with long-term

---

<sup>132</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:209. See also Merrett, *Daniel Defoe: Contrarian*, 166–67; Robert Merrett, “Daniel Defoe and Islam,” *Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*/*Lumen: Travaux choisis de la Société canadienne d’étude du dix-huitième siècle* 24 (2005): 26–28.

<sup>133</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:271. See also Jennifer A. Herdt, *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 270–72; Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 154–55.

accumulation. These things may potentially corrupt people, but they at the same time they supported the livelihoods of many, saving them from starvation on the streets.<sup>134</sup>

The wool industry had always been described by Defoe a sign of God's preference for England. For instance, wool was given to England 'by the Infinite Wisdom of Providence,' and it was based on this gift that England was able to 'work that Wool into Cloth.'<sup>135</sup> This was God's plan for the different parts of the world, and he used the language to justify the wool industry in England. Another piece of evidence was that he called the woollen products 'Blessings Heaven has bestowed on it.'<sup>136</sup> Furthermore, he argued that the Union of 1707 was providence. Combining the two threads of arguments together, Defoe claimed that high-quality wool could only be produced with British soil and water and after the Union of Scotland and England in 1707. After the Union, Defoe would begin to rephrase his praise of English wool saying 'the Wool is a Creation of Britain.'<sup>137</sup> Scotland played the role of material supplier and they should ship it to England, which Defoe claimed was according to God's design.

---

<sup>134</sup> Defoe, *Some Objections Humbly Offered*, 8:299.

<sup>135</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:14. Defoe in 1713 again wrote: 'To Purchase these Materials in those Remote Parts, something equally Valuable must be Exported from the Country wanting them, to that Country where they are to be had, or a medium of Trade produced to pay the Price of them, and this is called Trade: The Reason and Foundation whereof, as is already hinted, was with Infinite Wisdom so provided for by the Creator in the first Disposing the Order of the World.' See Daniel Defoe, *A General History of Trade (June)*, vol. 1 (London, 1713), 34.

<sup>136</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:163. See other instances, such as 'the Wool, as I have said, is an exclusive Grant from Heaven to Great Britain' (Defoe, *PEC*, 7:215.); 'The Wool, which were peculiar to Great Britain, and which no other Nation in the World had' (Defoe, *Review*, 7:186.)

<sup>137</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:163. See also Earle, *The World of Defoe*, 81–82.

Furthermore, Defoe considered a woollen product mixed with Spanish wool as a luxury product. It seemed conflicting because Defoe associated wool with God's blessing, while luxury was associated with vices. Therefore, it is interesting to notice that Defoe called this product both providential and 'vice' (according to Defoe's language) at the same time, but it was unlikely that Defoe would equate God to vice. Therefore this instance would support my previous argument that there were 'innocent' vices and real vices in Defoe's writings. The woollen clothes, which were God's sanctioned vice, definitely belonged to the former category. Defoe was clear that his defence of luxury was susceptible to criticism. He called his own defensive argument 'a Corrupt use of just reasoning, that it needs no great art to overthrow it.' However, it was a 'tacit liberty' and prudent way of living in a modern age. He announced that 'a Time of Reformation w[as] to come' but he suspected that it would be 'but too far off.'<sup>138</sup>

Defoe argued that 'the gay Dress may be forbid[den], yet the gay temper may remain.'<sup>139</sup> In other words, it was futile to ban the clothes in trend, because when the older one disappeared in the market, a new one would always emerge. The instinct to chase fashion was rooted in human nature. So Defoe pointed out that 'Habit, *Fashion*, and Custom in Apparel' (italics added) no longer needed to be demonized, but could be enjoyed reasonably and healthily.<sup>140</sup> The power of fashion and imitation, as we saw in the last chapter, had the potential to determine people's actions. In business, fashion

---

<sup>138</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:236.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:212.

<sup>140</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:95. Cf. Moore, "Mandeville and Defoe," 123–24.

stimulated expenditure, as Barbon put it: it was out of the love of fashion that people would spend money paying ‘the Expence of Cloaths before the Old ones’ were worn out. This was ‘the Spirit and Life of Trade.’<sup>141</sup> And there was a contrasting voice concerning luxury in this age. On the other end of the spectrum, though he admitted trade was a necessary evil that kept England competitive in international competition, Charles Davenant (1656-1714) was not in favour of fashion, he preferred the ‘simplicity of manners,’ and pointed out that ‘the Trade, without doubt, is in its nature a pernicious thing; it brings in that wealth which introduces luxury.’<sup>142</sup> Even though Davenant eventually did not deny the importance of luxury and its effects, he still viewed trade with suspicion. Furthermore, he argued that it was necessary to struggle against corruption within a commercial state, because it was crucial to have public frugality.<sup>143</sup> The best policy to perpetuate national frugality was ‘to preserve men of native simplicity, striving not to increase their numbers, let them never be acquainted with superfluities, but stay away from anything that might raise their desires or improve their understanding.’<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Barbon, *A Discourse of Trade* (1690), 90.

<sup>142</sup> Charles Davenant, *Discourses on the Public Revenues, Part II*, ed. Sir Charles Whitworth, vol. 2, *The Political and Commercial Works of that Celebrated Writer Charles D’Avenant, LL.D* (London, 1771), 275. See J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975), 442–43; Shigemi Muramatsu, “Andrew Fletcher’s Critique of Commercial Civilisation and His Plan for European Federal Union,” in *The Rise of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, ed. Tatsuya Sakamoto and Hideo Tanaka (London: Routledge, 2003), 15–17.

<sup>143</sup> Istvan Hont, *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation State in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 207.

<sup>144</sup> Hont, ‘The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury,’ 392.note

Defoe has accepted the power of fashion, as it can be observed from the reality such as ‘the poorest Citizens strive to live like the Rich, the Rich like the Gentry, the Gentry like the Nobility, and the Nobility striving to outshine one another.’<sup>145</sup> Similarly, Defoe recognised the power of imagination, ‘liberty we give to our Fancy, to guide, change, and direct our Customs in Apparel.’<sup>146</sup> Defoe made a stipulation that ‘but I wou'd recommend it to such Tradesmen to act with some Caution in these Cases’ and embrace ‘otherwise lawful and allowed Pleasures.’<sup>147</sup> Now the change of Fashion such as ‘of Dress, of Furniture’ had supported ‘so many millions of poor People.’ Because people change their ‘Equipages as often as [they] fancy, not [by] necessity,’ because of ‘fancying them out of Fashion.’<sup>148</sup>

Defoe was similar to Mandeville in this regard. They both acknowledged that pride was the central and predominant passion of men.<sup>149</sup> The similarity of Defoe’s and Mandeville’s ideas could be evaluated when we compare them with Berkeley’s idea of fashion. The bishop wrote that ‘modes or fashions’ like ‘things depending on fancy,’ or ‘a chimera, an enthusiasm ... uncertain and changeable.’ He considered the vice of luxury ‘foolhardy at best and harbored the potential for national catastrophe at

---

<sup>145</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:233.

<sup>146</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:68.

<sup>147</sup> Defoe, *Conjugal Lewdness*, 5:257.

<sup>148</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:225.

<sup>149</sup> Picchio in her article uses *Robinson Crusoe* as the sole source of Defoe when she compares the economic thoughts of Mandeville and Defoe. She argues ‘Defoe held that the behaviour of economic agents might be good or bad.....Mandeville considered that behaviour could be both good and bad at the same time being characterised by a moral dualism.....one rigorous.....and the other utilitarian.’ (16) However, according to the discussion here, Defoe in some cases also held that economic agents were good and bad at the same time. This is not the essential difference between the two writers. See Antonella Picchio, “Needs and Passions Of Human Subsistence in The Moral Economy of The Early 18th Century: Defoe and Mandeville,” *History of Economic Ideas* 11, no. 2 (2003): 7–29.

worst.’<sup>150</sup> In the *Querist* (1737), he advocated for reforming the gentry class’s obsession with luxury, while advocating ‘low-level’ luxury and ‘reasonable fashions.’ These fashions only appealed to the appetites of the lower middle class because he was worried about its corrupting impact on the upper class.<sup>151</sup> Defoe argued that it was human nature to imitate people who were better than oneself. It was unlikely for him to imagine that there would be any society in which the upper class practised self-control, while the lower class indulged in luxury. Defoe, however, agreed with Berkeley’s idea that ‘the vanity of our ladies in dressing, and of our gentlemen in drinking, contributes to the general misery of the people.’<sup>152</sup> Even though they had some worries of the luxury, they realise its necessity and importance to the British economy. Therefore, if luxury became indispensable, the only thing they could propose was that at least British people should consume domestic commodities instead of foreign ones, which were important sources of national wealth.

Besides the luxury industry, Defoe also defended industries that relied on people’s love of fashion. He regarded critical opinions like Davenant’s as ‘melancholy reflection[s]’ that would cause ‘the ruin of an infinite number of People.’<sup>153</sup> ‘All the Haberdashers of Hats, and Glovers, all the Hat-makers and Glove-makers,’ warned Defoe, ‘wou’d be dismiss’d at once, and most of the Shoe-makers also; so that the spoil wou’d fall among the Handicrafts also, as well as among the Tradesmen’.<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley*, 119.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 129–30.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>153</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:203.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:210.

Even though he ridiculed those who spent a huge amount of money in funerals as ‘Geugaws,’ ‘Pomp’ and ‘Foppery,’ Defoe defended the importance of this sort of consumption on the ground that it supported English textile manufactures.<sup>155</sup>

The silk industry in England, for instance, had developed to a certain degree in the 1720s. Since this was nationally manufactured, Defoe asked English customers to support it rather than purchase foreign goods. It was against the will of God to intentionally encourage people to ‘run into Extremes and Extravagancies in Dress to promote the Silk Manufactures.’<sup>156</sup> But since this silk industry made our lives better, a certain degree of development was necessary because it ‘[is] necessary to us in Trade,’ so it ought not to be ‘charg’d to the Account of our Vice or our Pride.’<sup>157</sup> Mandeville had a similar point on fashion:

We all look above our selves, and, as fast as we can, strive to imitate those, that some way or other are superior to us .... The poorest Labourer’s Wife in the Parish ... half starve her self and her Husband to purchase a second-hand Gown and Petticoat.<sup>158</sup>

Mandeville argued that it was the constant changing of fashions that set the poor to work, and encouraged the artificer to crave and achieve further improvements.<sup>159</sup> Furthermore, Pride encouraged ‘every Body’ to be ‘conscious of his little Merit,’ as if he was in ‘any ways able, to wear Clothes above his Rank.’<sup>160</sup> Luxury goods were

---

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., 8:234.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., 8:236.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid.

<sup>158</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:129.

<sup>159</sup> Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment*, 268.

<sup>160</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:131. See also Dickey, “Pride, Hypocrisy and Civility in Mandeville’s Social and Historical Theory,” 407–8; Edward Hundert, “Mandeville, Rousseau and the Political Economy of Fantasy,” in *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*, ed. Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Eger (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), 29–30; Ben Dew, “Spurs to Industry in

particularly attractive to women, Mandeville pointed out, London's prosperity owed much to the 'vile stratagems' of women<sup>161</sup> Defoe had a similar argument:

...a Limitation of Fashions, would be Ruinous and Destructive, not only to the particular Tradesmen, whose Employment lay in some Manufactures that were more than ordinarily affected by it; but to Trade in General, to the Gross of the Consumption, and to the General Expence.<sup>162</sup>

Mandeville and Defoe observed that the love of fashion was rooted in human nature. Mandeville pointed out that people enjoyed dressing up because it temporarily satisfied their vanity, enabling them to change their identity, and be esteemed as being of a higher level in society. Defoe noticed the same mechanism. He was aware that there was 'an invincible Pride in the ordinary People, of being counted' as what they were not.<sup>163</sup>

In two novels, Defoe showed his understanding of this power clothing can have in hiding and transforming a person's identity. In *Roxana*, the protagonist admired her mistress Amy so much that she:

made quite another Figure than she did before; for she went in my Coach, with two Footmen after her, and dress'd very fine also, with Jewells and a Gold Watch; and there was indeed, no great Difficulty to make Amy look like a Lady.<sup>164</sup>

---

Bernard Mandeville's Fable of the Bees," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 151–65.

<sup>161</sup> Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, 1:227–28.

<sup>162</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:68.

<sup>163</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Just Complaint of the Poor Weavers Truly Represented: With as Much Answer as It Deserves, to a Pamphlet Lately Written against Them Entitled The Weavers Pretences Examin'd, &c* (London, 1719), 24–25.

<sup>164</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Fortunate Mistress: Or, A History of the Life and Vast Variety of Fortunes of Mademoiselle de Beleau, Afterwards Called the Countess de Wintelsheim, in Germany, Being the Person Known by the Name of the Lady Roxana, in the Time of King Charles II*, ed. P. N. Furbank, *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*, vol. 9 (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), 165.

In *Moll Flanders* we can also see he described the people of London tended to value people by their clothes.<sup>165</sup> One of the many lovers of Moll hired ‘a rich Coach, very good Horses, a Coachman, Postilion, and two Footmen in very good Liveries’ in order to ‘look like Quality’ and the ‘Servants all call’d him my Lord.’<sup>166</sup> The difference between Defoe and Mandeville again was that Defoe added some cautionary opinion that the tradesmen had to be cautious of the possible corrupt impact of commodities, even though he defended their selling of luxury goods because custom cannot be changed.

### **The South Sea Bubble**

Besides drunkenness and prostitution, another business that Defoe reprimanded was stock-jobbing. He regarded this behaviour and occupation as having no intrinsic value. He compared gambling with stock-jobbing because the two things did not create any extra value.<sup>167</sup> No matter how high the stock market reached, there was no real value produced. It was similar to taking money from the left hand and giving it to the right hand. Even though in his defence of fashionable goods, Defoe admitted the power of imagination, but sometimes this imagination could go wrong when being abused.

---

<sup>165</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders (1721)*, ed. Liz Bellamy, vol. 6, *The Novels of Daniel Defoe* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008), 126.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:67. Although Defoe grasped the desire of female servants to imitate their mistress, he was critical of this phenomenon. ‘..... the Servant thus exalted, how can it be expected she shou'd not be above herself, much more above her Business.’ See Defoe, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd*, 50.

<sup>167</sup> Defoe advocated putting restraints on gambling: ‘if Cards, Dice, ire. were totally suppress'd, Industry and Arts would encrease the more; Gaming may make a Man crafty, but not polite; one may understand Cards and Dice perfectly well, and be a Blockhead in every Thing else.’ See Defoe, *Augusta Triumphans*, 8:276.

The South Sea Bubble in 1720 was one of them.<sup>168</sup> He described the stockjobbers' merciless seizure of the investors' corrupt human nature. They lured 'the Bladders of the People's Imagination,'<sup>169</sup> and they made people imagine that the stocks they held 'had an inherent Worth in themselves.'<sup>170</sup>

The South Sea Bubble of 1720 was one of the most famous early examples of financial bubbles. The price of the London stock market had risen to an unsustainable high before collapsing in the autumn of 1720. This boom was mainly related to a company called the South Sea Company. The company was founded in 1711 to help the British government repay war debts, when the Spanish Succession War (1702-1713) was still being fought. It was granted the right to purchase £10 million worth of government debt in return for a monopoly of trade in the South Seas (Spanish South America).<sup>171</sup> The South Sea Company received an interest of 6 percent in perpetuity on this loan. Therefore, the original South Sea Company, resembling the Bank of England, also launched a scheme to finance government debt. The right to trade that was awarded to the South Sea company was not particularly good, so between 1713-1719 the company only generated a minor income for the national debt service.<sup>172</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Important historical studies include John Patrick Carswell, *The South Sea Bubble* (London: Cresset Press, 1960); P. G. M. Dickson, *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit, 1688-1756*. (London: Macmillan, 1967); Helen J. Paul, *The South Sea Bubble: An Economic History of Its Origins and Consequences* (London: Routledge, 2011); Julian Hoppit, "The Myths of the South Sea Bubble," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (2002): 141–65; Gary Hentzi, "'An Itch of Gaming': The South Sea Bubble and the Novels of Daniel Defoe," *Eighteenth-century Life* 17, no. 1 (1993): 32–45.

<sup>169</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:262.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

<sup>171</sup> Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley*, 81.

<sup>172</sup> The below description of the Bubble is indebted to Malcolm Balen, *A Very English Deceit: The Secret History of the South Sea Bubble and the First Great Financial*

Therefore, on the eve of 1719, the South Sea Company was an institution that had a certain financial influence in government circles, but it did not show huge growth potential. The turning point was in 1719, when the directors of the company, inspired by John Law's contemporary Mississippi Scheme, carried out a massive restructuring of the company.

By 1719 the British government had to deal with national debts of nearly £9 million deriving from the 1711-12 lotteries, and it also had to deal with Bank of England debts. The government came up with an idea to deal with the problem, namely by using the South Sea Company as an intermediary between the government and the annuitants. In the spring of 1720, the transfer of part of the National Debt to the South Sea company at highly advantageous rates of interest caused a frenzy of buying and selling stocks, which intensified through the summer. The South Sea Company's share price rose dramatically after taking over the national debt, which led to a race for wealth and eventually led to a catastrophic bubble. Shares soared from a price of roughly 120 pounds in early 1720, to more than 1,000 pounds in July of the same year. However, a number of 'bubble companies' immediately emerged in the market, trying to take advantage of the sudden rise. By September, the price of the stock had dropped from £1,100 to £190, leaving ruin in its wake, with the Company Board accused of corruption and the Whig government implicated. After the bubble burst in 1720, the Parliament's investigation of the company's actions led to the shame and punishment of many responsible persons, and many people lost nearly everything.

---

*Scandal* (London: Fourth Estate, 2002). For a recent study, see Paul, *The South Sea Bubble*.

Scholars have touched on Defoe's view of stocks and the crisis in 1720. Sherman has focused especially on Defoe's idea behind his metaphor of 'Lady Credit,' and 'market instability resisted the stabilizing force of morality, exposing the incompatibility of credit's descriptive and prescriptive modes.'<sup>173</sup> Katherine Clark has provided a brilliant summary of Defoe's works and remarks on credit and the stock market.<sup>174</sup> Here I argue that Defoe used the bubble as proof of his view of human nature being filled with self-love (in this case, greed). Moreover, Defoe and Berkeley shared some views on the bubble and new credit system. This under-studied relationship will be discussed here.

In Defoe's opinion, stock-jobbing did not offer any positive help for business. Gary Hentzi has pointed out that Defoe assumed that stock-jobbing did not create any 'concrete value.' In the stock market, 'half the stock of the Nation' was 'diverted from the channel of Trade to run waste.'<sup>175</sup> He compared the stock-jobbers to the cannibals who killed and fed on their own kind.<sup>176</sup> Defoe was not critical of the stock market itself. Instead, he argued that it was the greed of speculators that was to blame. He wrote: 'the Machines themselves have been plain, honest and fair Things, in all the Parts of them; so that if there has been any Knavery, it has been in the Managers, not in the Design itself.'<sup>177</sup> This argument was in concert with the one he made on luxury. Luxury, knives and the stock market all contributed to the convenience of human life.

---

<sup>173</sup> Sandra Sherman, "Promises, Promises: Credit as Contested Metaphor in Early Capitalist Discourse," *Modern Philology* 94, no. 3 (1997): 328.

<sup>174</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 143.

<sup>175</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:152.

<sup>176</sup> Hentzi, "An Itch of Gaming," 35.

<sup>177</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Director* (1720-21), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 6, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 247.

What made it inconvenient was the greed of people. The south sea bubble was the same situation when unbounded avarice grew out of control.

In the climax of the south sea bubble, Defoe's magazine *The Commentator* recorded the mania. In the issue of May 9, 1720, he expressed disappointment when he heard other people whisper about the stock price in the church. 'The Church-yard,' he wrote, became 'another Exchange-Alley,'<sup>178</sup> and Defoe lamented that these men completely ignored God's Worship. Even these clergymen were obsessed with 'Jobbing, and the Stocks,' for Defoe it was a manifestation of their 'private interest.'<sup>179</sup> This was the worst manifestation of human nature and these ugly behaviours themselves, and it demonstrated the cause of such a great bubble.

Breuninger, in his monograph on Berkeley, argued that 'unlike a number of contemporary analyses that blamed...the directors of the South Sea Company...Berkeley argued that they took root due to a failure of the population to embrace virtue.'<sup>180</sup> Defoe's critique of the bubble did not fall solely on the directors either. The bubble was not derived from a few executives. Instead, the problem was due to the fact that many investors were caught up in the frenzy. Defoe looked back at the frenzy in 1721, commenting that:

The Baits were laid so superficially, and the Hook appeared so open, that had we not been blinded by a voracious Avarice, it had been impossible to have brought a whole Nation to be plundered as they were.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:162.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley*, 84.

<sup>181</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Case of Mr. Law Truly Stated* (1721), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 6, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 201.

Although the trap was not too secret to tell, most people were easily tricked. It was because stockjobbers lured the avarice in the hearts of many people, with their ‘whispering imaginary Terrors, Frights, Hopes, Expectations, and then preying upon the Weakness of those, whose Imaginations they have wrought upon, whom they have either elevated or depress’d.’<sup>182</sup> As a result, ‘our own Avarice led us on, and we came to the South-Sea House so eager to be undone.’ This was described as a general Frenzy of the Age, to talk of it as a Distemper, nay as a Contagion, for it spreads like a Plague.’<sup>183</sup> Scholars have pointed out that the *Journal of the Plague Year*, published in 1722, was a metaphor for London's suffering from the stock market crash. Defoe wrote in May 1720 that ‘a spread abroad among other Parts of our Commerce’ was in the minds of many people. If the government doesn't step in, it will be ‘a Trade Plague it infects the whole Body.’ In the end ‘Divine Justice’ would end the problem in ‘its own Hand’ and more radical result.’<sup>184</sup>

Berkeley’s work on the aftermath of the 1720 incident also compared the event to God’s divine punishment:

since it hath pleased God to visit this land, and make us feel the fatal effects of our corruption and folly, it should be our care to profit by this judgment and make it an occasion of our reformation rather than of our final ruin.<sup>185</sup>

The bishop lamented that Britain had been influenced by an ‘atheistical narrow spirit, centring all our cares upon private interest.’<sup>186</sup> The lure of private interests had

---

<sup>182</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Anatomy of Exchange-Alley* (1719), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 6, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 130.

<sup>183</sup> Defoe, *The Director (1720-21)*, 6:222.

<sup>184</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:163.

<sup>185</sup> Quoted from Breuninger, *Recovering Bishop Berkeley*, 84.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.

damaged society and contributed to a series of vices. In contrast, Defoe would not have attributed 'private interest' to the cause of the stock market problem. But he was of the same opinion that the bubble showed the damage that atheism had done to Britain. He further argued that the devil was the mastermind behind it. Defoe's educational background of the Academy of Charles Morton may be one of Defoe's intellectual resources. Riccardo Capoferro has argued that Defoe embraced the natural theology from the dissenting tradition. He believed Providence and the Devil were the forces voluntarily affecting the working of nature.<sup>187</sup> Atheism and greed, therefore, were both the Devil's intrigues. However, sometimes these were not the direct effect of the intervention of Satan; sometimes chaos in the world was the result of the corrupt natures of humankind, whereby even honest men were not safe from temptation. Defoe described that in 'the Year Twenty when so many honest Men turn'd K—, and Conscience was Bubble-ridden and Stock-jobb'd.'<sup>188</sup> There as the seed of greed, self-love in everyone's mind. If it did not cultivate well, then it would lead to one's devastation.

Mark Knights has pointed out that Defoe's language of credit could be applied to his ideas of party politics and also to other dimensions that 'it is no surprise that Defoe,

---

<sup>187</sup> Riccardo Capoferro, *Empirical Wonder: Historicizing the Fantastic, 1660-1760* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), 130. When Roxana asked herself why she sold her body for money, the answer was: it was convenient to blame the Devil for intervening 'a Share in all such things.' But she added, 'the Devil himself cou'd not form one Argument, or put one Reason into my Head now, that cou'd serve for an Answer.' She confessed that her resorting to prostitution was resulted from her weakness to resist temptations such as 'Trifles we pretend to satisfie ourselves' and pursuits 'of agreeable Crime.' Defoe, *Roxana*, 9:170, 171.

<sup>188</sup> Defoe, *CET* 2, 8:22.

and others, made the connection between politics and stock-jobbing.<sup>189</sup> For Defoe, Jacobitism was stock-jobbing for a baseless company. He wrote that ‘the Jacobites will still call themselves a Party, tho’ without a Foundation, they may properly be ranked with a Company, that has a Being, but not a Capital,’ and he later wrote that ‘I chuse [sic] rather to consider Parties and Stocks, as the Interests of them are interwoven one with another, and as they affect each other.’<sup>190</sup>

Furthermore, Defoe often depicted Jacobitism as a black art. The people were merely deluded by the illegitimate prince. They were similar to those who were jobbed or bankrupted by the evil scheme of the South Sea. In Defoe’s language of the devil, therefore, all the things that were damaging to Protestant interests were combined together. The French king, of course, was always named as one of the agents of the Devil. Only protestant countries could resist the devil. The establishment of the wool industry was also the result of the rejection of French Catholicism. It was a gift from God giving England grounds to claim its position as God’s favoured nation.

## **Conclusion**

Defoe once asked ‘how then can the Gentlemen of the Pulpit find in their Hearts to Preach against Riot and Luxury, against the Pride and Vanity of the Age, against Drunkenness and Excesses in a trading Nation?’<sup>191</sup> Based on the preceding discussion, the one thing mentioned above that he would oppose was drunkenness. This was ‘the

---

<sup>189</sup> Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 317.

<sup>190</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:53.

<sup>191</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 9:164.

Vicious part of this Trade may be restrain'd, and so far as it touches our Morals, ought to be Restrain.'<sup>192</sup> However, things like 'Coffee and Tea,' 'Earthen Ware, the Trumpery of China,' and the trades like chocolate were the goods that made life comfortable. They were sometimes called vices but this chapter argues that Defoe did not regard them as real vices. Instead, he argued that these products should be spared from blame and even many of 'our Clergy of late, as well Church of England as Dissenters' understood not to oppose them.<sup>193</sup>

This chapter focused on Defoe's view that human nature is dominated by pride and greed, and looks at his views on luxury, consumption, fashion, stocks and similar issues. Scholars have called Defoe's attitude paradoxical, but vice in Defoe's writings had a two-fold meaning. The chapter clarifies this issue by arguing that the things Defoe referred to as vices were actually not crimes or evils. His attitude toward these vices indicated that he considered them harmless. Secondly, this chapter put Defoe in the debate involving Mandeville, Berkeley, and other thinkers. Previous research on the comparison between Defoe and Mandeville are mostly general. This chapter, therefore, has provided a specific examination of their idea of pride, and the importance of pride in propagating the progress of civilisation. When comparing Defoe's ideas with those of Davenant and Berkeley, their similarity becomes more evident. Defoe also embraced imagination and fashion as spurs to the developments of the economy and politeness. However, imagination could also bring disaster if unchecked, an example being the South Sea Bubble catastrophe. This was one of the

---

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., 3:95. Cf. Moore, "Mandeville and Defoe," 122–23.

<sup>193</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 9:163.

few cases where Defoe appealed to the government to step in to restrain the autonomous development of the economy.

### Chapter 3: The Influence of Religion on Daniel Defoe's Political Thought

Defoe's belief in original sin and the corrupt nature of humankind dominated his political works. Based on this understanding of human nature, he criticised tyranny and warned of the inevitable abuse of power of the ruler. Defoe proposed power-balancing mechanisms such as Parliament or the people's right of resistance to address the problem. This chapter uses *Jure Divino*, the long poem Defoe composed in 1706, as the primary text for discussion. In the poem, Defoe gave accounts of key episodes in the Old Testament, such as Adam's Fall, the Deluge, and the rise of Saul. He elaborated on these events to refute the theory of divine right and argued that the constitutional monarchy brought about by William III was the most ideal political system.

Previous studies have paid insufficient attention to Defoe's emphasis on original sin and the corruption of human nature. Katherine Clark stresses the roles played by sin and the Devil in Defoe's political thought and argues that Defoe believed that through obedience and law-abiding action, men would learn to repent and improve their spiritual lives. In *Defoe's Politics*, Manuel Schonhorn stresses that the tendency of scholars like Paula Backscheider to read Defoe as a follower of John Locke overlooks a crucial thread of Defoe's thought. Schonhorn argues that Defoe welcomes an authoritarian leader, and Defoe supported the military authority of a monarch, and it was only by this power that a king could accomplish God's work.<sup>1</sup> However, Schonhorn does not touch on Defoe's warning that all political leaders including King

---

<sup>1</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*; Schonhorn, *Defoe's Politics*; Paula R. Backscheider, "The Verse Essay, John Locke, and Defoe's *Jure Divino*," *ELH* 55, no. 1 (1988): 99–124.

William would become tyrants if their powers were not checked. Defoe acknowledged his debt to Locke and Algernon Sidney in *Jure Divino*, although Defoe argued that he had some unique points, scholars have tended to ignore this and have done little to explore the nuanced difference between Defoe and the two Whigs. Coby Dowdell rightly notices the influence of Sidney on Defoe's *Jure Divino*. However, he highlights the frequency with which Defoe cites Sidney and fails to point out that Defoe and Sidney shared a similar interpretation of the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> Dowell argues that Defoe was an avid supporter of the positive effect of self-interest before 1720, and he claims that *Jure Divino* did not mention 'the damaging impact of self-interest.' This is partly correct because if we examine terms used in the poem like pride, avarice or ambition, we can interpret a number of warnings about the double-edged character of self-love.<sup>3</sup> However, Defoe argued that the rule of law was necessary to regulate popular behaviour from an early stage in his career and not merely from the mid 1710s,<sup>4</sup>

The chapter begins with Defoe's explanation of Adam and the Fall. Based on his understanding of original sin, Defoe's explanations of human nature and the origin of society will be examined. The second part focuses on the transition of political institutions from the patriarchal family to monarchy. The symbol of this shift was Nimrod. In using this biblical figure, Defoe contributed to the debate between Filmer,

---

<sup>2</sup> Coby Dowdell, "'A Living Law to Himself and Others': Daniel Defoe, Algernon Sidney, and the Politics of Self-Interest in *Robinson Crusoe* and *Farther Adventures*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 22, no. 3 (2010): 424.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 427.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 430.

Sidney, and Locke, who all invoked Nimrod in their political discourses. Sharing ideas with all of them, Defoe also provided his distinctive explanation. The third part deals with the establishment of Israel's first king, Saul. Saul's title as king was not only bestowed by God, but also by the agreement of the Israelites. Defoe explained that a king was not justified if he was absolute, but he had to be accountable to his subjects. The next section examines the strife between Rehoboam and Jeroboam and the separation of the ten tribes from the Kingdom of Judah. This episode in Jewish history was essential because Defoe and the High-Churchmen debated the legitimacy of the reign of William and Mary through this episode of the Old Testament. Defoe warned that kings were vulnerable to ambition and greed. It was therefore lawful for the tribes of Israel to abandon Rehoboam. However, Jacobite propagandist Charles Leslie offered a contrary interpretation of the same passage. Besides exploring Defoe's political ideas, this section also offers an example of the usage of the Bible for political purposes in the early eighteenth century. The chapter concludes that from Defoe's distinctive combination of Augustinian understanding of sin and human nature, along with his combination of natural law theories with biblical exegesis, there emerges a clear picture of the importance of religion on his political works.

### **Adam, the Fall, Human Nature**

Defoe believed in the original sin of humankind, that self-love was the most dominant passion and that human nature was tainted with sin because of the fall of

Adam.<sup>5</sup> Scholars have noticed Defoe's concern with human nature. Maximillian Novak argues that 'in spite of Defoe's attacks on Hobbes's lupine concept of humanity, he was strongly influenced by his ideas on human depravity.'<sup>6</sup> This is partly true, Defoe did agree with Hobbes's idea of depravity, but there was no reference to Hobbes when he touched on the topic. Defoe was more likely influenced by the Puritan tradition and his reading of the French Jansenists.<sup>7</sup> Second, Novak cites *The Storm* to support Defoe's knowledge of Hobbes.<sup>8</sup> However, the exact sentence was that 'Mr. Hobbs' had so few to his General Knowledge, and an exalted Spirit in Philosophy.'<sup>9</sup> Defoe's remark was aimed at Hobbes's atheism rather than his idea of human nature. Besides, Novak includes *Madagascar: or, Robert Drury's Journal* (1729) as his proof, but scholars have disputed Defoe's authorship of this book. Even if *Drury's Journal* was indeed written by his hand, Novak was mistaken to argue that the depiction of the fondness of a man over his wife and children conflicted with Hobbes's thesis.<sup>10</sup> Besides, Sungho Lee has touched on Defoe's unique combination of the passion of self-love with Locke's theory of 'the individual's natural rights.' Lee's focus, however, is on how the English imperialists justified their 'egoistic appetites' by 'providentialist rhetoric' in *Captain Singleton* rather than on Defoe's idea of self-love.<sup>11</sup> Robert

---

<sup>5</sup> Defoe, *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation*, 41.

<sup>6</sup> Maximillian E. Novak, *Defoe and the Nature of Man* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), 16.

<sup>7</sup> See chapter 1.

<sup>8</sup> Novak, *Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe*, 34.

<sup>9</sup> Defoe, *The Storm*, 13. See also Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 201–02.

<sup>10</sup> Novak, *Defoe and the Nature of Man*, 16. Baine has argued that Defoe is not the author of this book. Rodney M. Baine, "Daniel Defoe and Robert Drury's Journal," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 16, no. 3 (1974): 479–91.

<sup>11</sup> Sungho Lee, "Mercantile Gentility Out of Reach: Moral Cartography and Rhetorical Guidance in Defoe's *Captain Singleton*," *Modern Language Review* 112, no. 2 (2017): 304.

Merrett maintains that Defoe acknowledged the irresistibility of the love of self. Although this selfish sentiment could not be suppressed, Defoe ‘admitted the necessity of self-interest in certain circumstances’ and that it could even accomplish things in the religious sense.<sup>12</sup>

Based on Merrett’s point, this chapter not only pays attention to the relation between Defoe’s idea of self-love and religion but also connects the ideas with the origin of human society and how selfish humankind is able to live together. Furthermore, Defoe’s ideas in relation to Grotius and Jansenist thinkers and the combination of the natural law tradition and Augustinianism will be discussed. His nonconformist background and education at the Dissenting Academy made Defoe familiar with Calvinistic ideas. The fundamental points of Calvinism include unconditional election, total depravity, and irresistible grace. On election or predestination, Defoe believed that only ‘a part of Mankind would be saved, and this was ‘Predestinated.’<sup>13</sup> As Starr has argued, Defoe’s religious thinking was within the Calvinist tradition of the belief in predestination or ‘God’s Eternal Decree’, even though he had some reservation on it.<sup>14</sup> The ‘original Depravity of human Nature’, Defoe pointed out, was testimony to ‘our Propensity to Evil rather than Good.’<sup>15</sup> On

---

<sup>12</sup> Merrett, *Daniel Defoe’s Moral and Rhetorical Ideas*, 22–23.

<sup>13</sup> Daniel Defoe, *An Enquiry into the Case of Mr. Asgil’s General Translation: Shewing That ’tis Not a Nearer Way to Heaven than the Grave* (London, 1704), 40. See also idem, *Serious Reflections*, 3:134.

<sup>14</sup> G. A. Starr, “Introduction,” in *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation: The Last of Defoe’s Performances*, ed. G. A. Starr, by Daniel Defoe (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), xlv.

<sup>15</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:228.

grace, he remarked that ‘it was only through ‘the wonderful Power of the invisible irresistible [sic] Grace’<sup>16</sup> that God showed us his love.

These points are similar to the Augustinianism, which was influential in the works of the Jansenists in the mid and late seventeenth century.<sup>17</sup> Defoe read François de La Rochefoucauld’s *The Maximes* and proposed views similar to those of Pierre Nicole and Blaise Pascal. Even though everyone was preoccupied with the love of oneself, it was through this love that men were able to live together in order to survive. Defoe stated that ‘Self-Love’s the Ground of all the things we do,’ and everyone would choose to ruin others if one’s destruction could be prevented. This was why men agreed upon setting up government since this plan proved to be effective to ensure that everyone had the secure right of property.<sup>18</sup>

Defoe believed that the sins of humankind were passed down from Adam. He quoted Paul’s words that ‘the first Man offended God,’ and then ‘sin entered into the World.’ (Romans 5:12)<sup>19</sup> This was upheld by St. Augustin and his followers.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, Defoe argued that following the fall of Adam, ‘mankind are tainted; the whole Race is touch’d with the Infirmity.’ Mankind’s weakness included ‘Pride, Envy, distemper of the Soul’ and more. This was ‘the original Propensity to offend’ in

---

<sup>16</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 5.

<sup>17</sup> The similarity and difference between the ideas of Augustine and Calvin are not the concern of the current discussion, while according to John M. Rist, Calvin’s account was ‘genuinely Augustinian.’ Van Kley’s discussion of Pierre Bayle also indicated Bayle’s Calvinism led him to ‘a very similar conclusion’ to the Jansenist. John M. Rist, *Augustine Deformed: Love, Sin and Freedom in the Western Moral Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 191. Van Kley, “Pierre Nicole, Jansenism, and the Morality of Enlightened Self-Interest,” 79.

<sup>18</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:153.

<sup>19</sup> Defoe, *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation*, 30, 40.

<sup>20</sup> Richard Swinburne, *Theodicy in Christian Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 38.

essence.<sup>21</sup> This understanding occupied a central place in Defoe's works throughout his career. In one of his early poems, he wrote that 'So swift are Men to desperate ills design'd/ To ill spontaneous, and in good confin'd.'<sup>22</sup> In *Jure Divino*, Defoe described this as human 'nature receiving a general Taint,' and Adam's posterity 'must bear the Taint of thine Infirmary.' And to stress the point, he quoted the fifth verse of *Genesis* 6: 'The Imagination of the Heart of Man is Evil, and only Evil, and that continually.'<sup>23</sup> Defoe warned that the human mind was filled with 'strong lusts,' and from our 'base heart' betrayed 'pride and all the Lusts.'<sup>24</sup>

Passions such as greed, lust, and pride constantly appeared in his satires on tyranny and in other works throughout his career. Defoe noted that the dominant passion was pride, and it was the worst sin in the Augustinian tradition. 'Pride will all other Crimes of Men explain' Defoe cautioned, 'Tis grafted in the Nature of the Man,'<sup>25</sup> and 'there is always some Vice gratify'd; Ambition, Pride, or Avarice, make rich Men Knaves, and Necessity, the Poor.'<sup>26</sup> Human beings were merely the instruments of Providence. The history of this world was propelled by 'Avarice, Ambition, and Rage of Men,' and men had no idea of the cause. Some 'glorious Ends of Providence' were produced by fallen human nature, and it was how the untended results were achieved.<sup>27</sup> The tyranny of King James II was an illustrative example.

---

<sup>21</sup> Defoe, *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation*, 40–42.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A New Discovery of an Old Intreague* (1691), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 1, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 51.

<sup>23</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:217.

<sup>24</sup> Defoe, *The Meditations*, 4.

<sup>25</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:184.

<sup>26</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:79.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:211.

The flattery and cunning of the High-Churchmen swelled ‘his [King James II’s] Pride,’ and prompted him to ‘exercise Tyrannick Power’ to devour the people.<sup>28</sup> If there had been no such abuse of power, then Defoe assumed there would not have been a revolution. In other words, although pride was an imperfect passion that was part of the original sins of humankind, it was so prevalent that it became predictable. As long as kings such as James II attempted to get rid of the supervision of the English Parliament, then God would definitely turn this overt self-love into ‘the kindest Thing that could have befallen the British Nation.’<sup>29</sup> In this case, it was the coming of a new regime, and the introduction of partial religious toleration.

### **Laws of Nature, Self-Defence and the Formation of Society**

Defoe used self-defence as the explanation of the Revolution of 1688. On the topic of self-defence, he wrote that ‘for all men...Self-preservation is the only law, That does involuntary duty draw.’<sup>30</sup> At the same time, he also stressed the love of self. He assumed that ‘Self-Love, which seems to be the predominant Affection of Nature,

---

<sup>28</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:159. See also idem *Serious Reflections*, 3:211: ‘Thus Heaven serves it self of Mens worst Designs, and the Avarice, Ambition, and Rage of Men, have been made Use of to bring to pass the glorious Ends of Providence, without the least Knowledge or Design of the Actors.’

<sup>29</sup> Defoe, *Serious Reflections*, 3:211. See also Defoe’s remark in *A Commendatory Sermon Preach’d November the 4th, 1709*: ‘But an English Man cannot look round him a Day in his Life, but he is as necessarily brought to a Remembrance of King William. I had almost said, as he is of a Governing Providence in the World. Nor is any thing prophane to joyn them; For by Him, as Instrument, has Providence brought to pass for us all the Wonders of the last Age—An Age big with mighty Events, swell’d with the glorious Revolutions of Kingdoms, and the mighty Downfall of Hell’s monstrous Schemes, laid deep, and politickly derved [sic] at the Interest and Kingdom of Christ Jesus in the World.’ (3)

<sup>30</sup> Defoe said this was the trait that human beings shared with the ‘meanest Creature.’ They all had the basic instinct to protect themselves. See, Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:135.

as Self-Preservation, is the first Law of Nature.<sup>31</sup> In another work, he argued that when the ruler attempted to devour his people, then it was just for ‘all Men [to] claim the Right of Self-Defence.’<sup>32</sup>

Like the French Jansenist Pierre Nicole, Defoe noticed that even though human beings were selfish, it was from the love of self that man chose to cooperate with others on the grounds of self-preservation and the improvement of life.<sup>33</sup> On the corrupt nature of man, Defoe found that the poems of the libertine John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester went straight to the heart of the matter. Rochester celebrated the fact that everyone in the world was pushed by the pursuit of his or her self-interest. Defoe agreed with this point and added that if we did not ‘play upon the Square’ when living in this unsafe world, that if we were not more cunning when we dealt with cunning people, then we would inevitably ‘be undone.’<sup>34</sup> But this fact did not obstruct the formation of society. Therefore, Defoe stated that ‘the only Safety’ of a stable society was that our neighbours were ‘*as proud as I am* (italic added).’<sup>35</sup> Defoe asserted there was ‘an Appendix of Nature’ to humankind, and people would naturally seek to form

---

<sup>31</sup> Defoe, *The Commentator*, 9:61–62.

<sup>32</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:641. In *The Adventure of Robinson Crusoe*, the protagonist asked himself the same question. Even the cannibals did not notice his existence yet, and Crusoe could not prove that even if both sides had been encountered, he would be eaten right away. But he argued that ‘it was Self-preservation in the highest Degree, to deliver my self from this Death of a Life.’ Then after a long pondering, he decided to take the initiative to capture one of the savages. See Defoe, *The Life And Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe (1719)*, 1:203–4. The setting of a primitive society and a man who was stripped of almost everything was also a similar setting for German jurist Samuel Pufendorf.

<sup>33</sup> Hont, “Jealousy of Trade: An Introduction,” 47–48.

<sup>34</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 5:713. John Wilmot, ‘Satyr’ (1614) in Keith Walker ed., *The Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Shakespeare Head Press, 1984), 96.

<sup>35</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:71.

a government with others. Society was ‘naturally’ pursued by man since ‘the Wit of Man could never yet invent, A Way of Life without a Government.’<sup>36</sup> Even though part of human nature was corrupt, God also endowed us with the power of reason. Defoe did not support the idea of a state of nature. He did not believe that there was a time that everyone was living by himself alone. Humankind naturally formed into government. Forming a government with others was ‘rational and ‘of [the] Divine Original.’<sup>37</sup>

This government, in fact, was a large family. Defoe suggested that the first stage of human society was a patriarchy that was ruled by an elderly male. In this time ‘all his Kingdom was his Family.’<sup>38</sup> He assumed that before the emergence of monarchy, humans’ ‘First Government was Nat’ral all and Free.’<sup>39</sup> This government was ‘Patriarchal, the Father of every Tribe being the Sovereign, or King of all the subsequent Branches,’<sup>40</sup> and ‘in the Paternal Right no Man could reign, Farther than his own Houshold.’<sup>41</sup> This was the situation of the world after Adam and it emerged again after the Flood. After a few generations, different families occupied their own territories next to each other. Since the governing ability of this ‘narrow’d rule’ was

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 2:108. Cf. Merrett, *Daniel Defoe’s Moral and Rhetorical Ideas*, 38–39; Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 292–93.

<sup>37</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:108.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 2:102.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 2:113. Cf. William Lloyd, *A Discourse of God’s Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms. Part 1 by the Bishop of S. Asaph, Lord Almoner to Their Majesties*. (London, 1691), 16–17; M. M. Goldsmith, “Liberty, Virtue, and the Rule of Law,” in *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649-1776*, ed. David Wootton (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), 209–10. For Locke and Filmer’s opinioin on the first governemt, see Marshall, *John Locke*, 112–16.

<sup>40</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:32.

<sup>41</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:103. See also Ibid., 2:49.

limited, they began to fight each other.<sup>42</sup> Scholars have noticed Defoe's similarities with Locke, while his relation with Hobbes is seldom mentioned. This chaotic situation of battles between families in pre-historic times was similar to the state of nature described by Hobbes. According to Schochet, Hobbes likewise remarked that 'a war of every man against every man' could be understood as 'every father' fought against other fathers.<sup>43</sup> Defoe argued that humankind was endowed with a natural tendency to form government with others, and Novak remarks that Defoe saw 'government as a result of human sociability.'<sup>44</sup> In ancient times however, this sociability was only limited to one's own kin group. This kind of society was what Defoe meant by 'Humane Society' before Nimrod's rule of 'Patriarchal Monarchy,'<sup>45</sup> in other words, before chaos erupted in Noah's era.

Defoe quoted Samuel Pufendorf's *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, pointing out that during the age of Noah, the world was full of 'Enormities, of which God Almighty was oblig'd to purge the World by a Universal Punishment.'<sup>46</sup> He agreed with Pufendorf, 'this Learned Author', that 'Patriarchal Power was not adapted to Rule great Nations, but that infinite Feuds and Petty Wars would succeed, which must end in Conquest and Monarchy.'<sup>47</sup> The world

---

<sup>42</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:103.

<sup>43</sup> Gordon J. Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1975), 238.

<sup>44</sup> Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 281; Carol Kay, *Political Constructions: Defoe, Richardson, and Sterne in Relation to Hobbes, Hume, and Burke* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), 69–70.

<sup>45</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:346.

<sup>46</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:104; Samuel Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe* (1695), ed. Michael J. Seidler, trans. Jodocus Crull (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2013), 13.

<sup>47</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:104.

before the Deluge was so chaotic that God decided to punish its inhabitants with the flood. After all the chaos on Earth was wiped out, Defoe argued that the establishment of the first monarchy of Nimrod was a new way to solve the problem of the fighting between families. This point will be discussed later, while at first we have to go back to Adam because there was a debate between Defoe and his opponents over whether Adam was the first genuine monarch.

### **Genesis 1:28**

*“And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.”*  
(Genesis 1:28)

Sir Robert Filmer, the chief theorist on the royalist side of the Civil War, cited this verse in his *Patriarcha*, published posthumously in 1680, in justification of the view that Adam was ‘monarch of the whole world’ and all his successors inherited such supremacy.<sup>48</sup> John Locke offered a systematic critique of Filmer’s points, but Filmer’s book itself was not the reason for Locke’s response. It was the rise of the divine right theory in the early 1680s that Locke thought urgent to counter.<sup>49</sup> Locke refuted Filmer and argued that the twenty-eighth verse only meant that ‘nothing to be granted to Adam here but property.’ Adam only had ‘right in common with all mankind.’<sup>50</sup> To use Pufendorf’s words, ‘donation of God...sets forth not a definite

---

<sup>48</sup> Robert Filmer, *Observations Concerning the Original and Various Forms of Government* (London, 1696), preface, unpagged.

<sup>49</sup> Marshall, *John Locke*, 114.

<sup>50</sup> John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 157.

form of dominion, but only an indefinite right to apply things to uses which are reasonable and necessary.’<sup>51</sup>

Moreover, Filmer argued that this dominion over the whole earth gave Adam the title of monarch. Locke refuted the idea that Adam did not have a private right over the world, ‘neither was he Monarch.’<sup>52</sup> Filmer’s explanation of Psalms 115:16 as ‘Adam and his Heirs’ had the exclusive rights of the earth was wrong, and Locke insisted it was given ‘to Mankind in common.’<sup>53</sup> Defoe added that Filmer was mistaken in his reasoning from this passage that Adam was a monarch was mistaken. There was no mention of ‘any Imperial Authority’ here and the real dominion of Adam was merely Eve.<sup>54</sup> Besides, Noah was not a king either, since he ‘had no more than the distinct Rule of his own Family.’<sup>55</sup>

In *Jure Divino* and the *Review*, Defoe aimed to deconstruct Leslie and other High-Churchmen’s advocacy of divine right theory. He thus had to debunk Filmer’s argument in *Patriarcha*, on which the divine right theorists’ pamphlets were based. Defoe put forward a view that was similar to those of Locke and Pufendorf. He explained that the twenty-eighth verse was ‘a Grant of Property’ and ‘it was lawful, and doubtless is still, for any of Adam’s Posterity to seize upon’ those lands that had

---

<sup>51</sup> Quoted from Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, “Needs and Justice in the Wealth of Nations: An Introductory Essay,” in *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, ed. Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 32.

<sup>52</sup> Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, 157.

<sup>53</sup> See Stephen Buckle, *Natural Law and the Theory of Property: Grotius to Hume* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 174–75.

<sup>54</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:555.

<sup>55</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Protestant Jesuite Unmasked* (London, 1704), 12.

not been inhabited.<sup>56</sup> He explained that the right to occupy empty land belonged to all the offspring of Adam.<sup>57</sup> It was not a right only given to Adam, neither did people have to agree by ‘a Deed of Gift or Sale from him [Adam] , or some of his Posterity’ when they could acquire land legally.<sup>58</sup> Defoe’s argument in the *Review* was actually a response to Leslie’s critique in the *Rehearsal*.

Leslie modified Filmer’s point that Adams’ dominion of the earth was passed down ‘to his whole race.’ But people had to be ‘in subordination to their superiors and governors, as it was then, and is at this day.’ Leslie stressed that Adam not only possessed everything on the earth, but also had dominion. Therefore, the property right of the people ‘must give place to dominion in all cases.’<sup>59</sup> Leslie inferred that even though every one had property rights, they all had to be ‘in subordination to their superiors and governors.’<sup>60</sup> He also read Defoe’s works closely and noticing Defoe had remarked that the sons of Noah established ‘the patriarchal primogenial monarchy.’<sup>61</sup> The author of the *Rehearsal* concluded that Mr. Review [Defoe] rather came to follow the points in Filmer’s *Patriarcha*. However, even Defoe had a different

---

<sup>56</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:555. See also Novak, *Defoe and the Nature of Man*, 15–16; Sara Soncini, “The Island as a Social Experiment. A Reappraisal of Daniel Defoe’s Political Discourse(s) in *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures*,” in *Wrestling with Defoe. Approaches from a Workshop on Defoe’s Prose.*, ed. Mariluisa Bignami (Bologna: Cisalpino, 1997), 28–30.

<sup>57</sup> Though Locke and Pufendorf have different notions of property, they agreed that the great common of the earth was open to any taker: it was a negative community, neither individuated to Adam, nor given to a positive community.’ Hont and Ignatieff, “Needs and Justice in the Wealth of Nations: An Introductory Essay,” 36.

<sup>58</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:555. See Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and His Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 189–90.

<sup>59</sup> Charles Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 2: 362.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>61</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:556. Cf. Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 2:363.

understanding of the word ‘dominion’ and although Defoe traced the origin of monarchy, he did not argue that it was ‘nature and from the beginning’ an argument Leslie had attributed to him.

For Defoe, the meaning of ‘dominion’ in the twenty-eighth verse was closer to the meaning of property in eighteenth-century England. The word ‘dominion’ was a mere ‘deputed Right of Possession,’ in other words it was ‘a Grant of Property.’<sup>62</sup> Against the thesis that Adam was the sole possessor of dominion, Defoe concluded that it was ‘priority of Possession’ that was ‘a just Right of Property since every Man has in this Grant a full Dominion over all the rest.’<sup>63</sup> It was incorrect to argue that Adam’s dominion over his wife would seamlessly imply his dominion over the whole world.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand, Filmer appropriated the verse ‘over the fish of the sea’ to advance the point that all seas were not free to all. Instead, all seas were Adam’s dominion. Filmer cited John Selden’s *Mare Clausum*, arguing that the biblical verse ordained that Adam’s ‘Children had their distinct Territories by Right of private Dominion.’ In the same vein, Filmer disagreed with Selden’s rival Hugo Grotius. Grotius asserted that ‘every man might snatch what he would for his own Use ..... for what every one so snatched, another could not take from him but by Injury’. Filmer argued that this ‘Assertion of Grotius’ was ‘repugnant’ ‘to the truth of the Holy

---

<sup>62</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:555. For Filmer and James Tyrrell’s explanations of ‘a grant of property’ see Julia Rudolph, *Revolution by Degrees: James Tyrell and Whig Political Thought in Late Seventeenth Century* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 48–50.

<sup>63</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:555. For Defoe’s idea of land and property manifested in *Robinson Crusoe*, see Jessica Whyte, “The Fortunes of Natural Man: Robinson Crusoe, Political Economy, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,” *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 5, no. 3 (2014): 305–7.

<sup>64</sup> See Goldsmith, *Private Vices, Public Benefits*, 12–13.

Scripture.<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, he inferred that Grotius's principle would lead to danger for a monarch's rule since it indicated that 'in great and certain danger, men may resist their Governours' and 'every private man may be Judge of the Danger, for other Judge he [Grotius] appoints none.'<sup>66</sup>

In the *Second Treatise*, Locke argued that God commended that if a man wanted to possess a land of his own, he had to put his labour into it. After that it 'was his property which could not be taken from him wherever he had fixed it.'<sup>67</sup> It was unlikely that Adam or any other man 'could subdue, or appropriate all' lands.<sup>68</sup> Defoe's argument here was in line with Locke's argument. And since Defoe was critical of Filmer's position, it is not surprising that Defoe adopted Grotius's points in this regard. Defoe agreed with Grotius's point in *Mare Liberum* that 'the Sea seems to me to be the great Common of all the Creation; all have a Right to Range in it, none have an Exclusive Property in any part of it.'<sup>69</sup> In other words, what God bestowed to Adam was property on the earth, rather than dominion over the earth. And therefore what God deputed to Adam was not 'Power of Government.'<sup>70</sup> Filmer and Leslie misinterpreted the lesson from the Bible, Adam was not a monarch, and it was not true that all monarchs possessed a divinely sanctioned dominion over their people. According to Defoe's reading of *Genesis*, under God's grant 'it was lawful, and

---

<sup>65</sup> Filmer, *Observations Concerning the Original and Various Forms of Government*, 210.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 215.

<sup>67</sup> John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed. Ian Shapiro (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 114.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 115.

<sup>69</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:75.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:554.

doubtless is still, for any of Adam's Posterity to seize upon, and possess as his own, any part of the Creation of God, not inhabited or possess'd before.'<sup>71</sup>

As mentioned above, Defoe believed that humans were sociable animals, and they would form a society for mutual help. However, the maximum size for a group of people to live peacefully seemed to be the size of a kinship group, such as a clan. Before there was need for a larger group of people to bond together, there was hardly a group of people larger than at a patriarchal level that could live peacefully together. If it were not out of necessity, then humans would not be able to live together instinctively. Before the age of Noah, there was no such thing as 'Magistracy, or any Civil Constitution' in the world.<sup>72</sup> The society of mankind was led by each father of families. Once families began to expand, each household would be involved in fighting each another. It was indeed a state of 'Eternal Wars and undecided Strife.' It was difficult to imagine that 'such abominable Disorders should have been introduc'd, where the Power of Magistrates and Laws was exercis'd.'<sup>73</sup> This situation was depicted as 'Each Man had all the World, and all his own.' Or,

The numerous Monarchs quarrelsome and proud,  
Involv'd their little Governments in Blood.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 3:555.

<sup>72</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:104.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 2:104–5. Defoe's borrowed the idea from Pufendorf. See Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, 13. See also Maximillian E. Novak, *Realism, Myth, and History in Defoe's Fiction* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 11–12.

<sup>74</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:105.

In order to survive the constant conflicts and to secure their properties, different groups of families started to form a government,<sup>75</sup> because the previous governing body, namely, ‘Patriarchal Monarchies,’ were ‘wholly unqualified for large Communities.’<sup>76</sup> This was why men created governments that were no longer led by the patriarch of one’s family. Defoe argued that it was this new kind of government that could ‘Guard just Right, and Injury prevent.’<sup>77</sup> Why did Defoe argue that humans must enter into a government if the rulers were highly susceptible to degenerating into tyrants? He explained that this was part of human nature. The instinct of humans drew them into regulation, ‘as naturally as Means pursue their Ends.’ Furthermore, the chaotic situation of the world in the period between Adam and Noah further proved that it was the original sin of human kind that put everyone ‘in need of Government’ to ‘Guard just Right’ and property.<sup>78</sup>

Defoe used the time before Noah to explain this necessity. Citing the fifth verse of *Genesis 6* (*And GOD saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually*), Defoe argued that the world would always fall into chaos if people just lived under their own patriarch. The taint of original sin was passed on from Adam to all succeeding generations. The eleventh verse of *Genesis 6*, ‘the whole Earth was fill’d with Violence’, was a depiction of the miserable life of this epoch ‘like the Brutes, the

---

<sup>75</sup> Novak, *Defoe and the Nature of Man*, 17. For another instance: ‘Government is Nature directing Man how to live — And how to live like a reasonable Creature...I give you the Power of governing one another, and making Laws.’ (Defoe, *Review*, 3:56.)

<sup>76</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:114.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:108.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

Strong devouring the Weak.’<sup>79</sup> This period was the age of Noah. Defoe argued that the passages in the Bible were directed at the shortcomings brought about by patriarchal monarchy. The only solution was a deluge, which was ‘a general Destruction’ which would ‘sweep them away,’ to ‘clear the Earth of them, and put an End to the Wickedness at once.’<sup>80</sup> Patriarchal monarchy ‘was not suited to larger societies or nations.’<sup>81</sup> The solution Defoe proposed was a government whose leaders were not the subjects’ patriarchs . Patriarchal monarchy had to be replaced by ‘National Monarchy,’ and Nimrod was the first monarch of this system.<sup>82</sup>

### **Nimrod and National Monarchy**

According to Manuel Schonhorn, Nimrod was Defoe’s paragon of the tyrant who could be applied to all nations in human history. Nimrod’s ‘lust and pride’ could be detected in all monarchs throughout the long histories of ‘universal holocausts and world conflagrations.’<sup>83</sup> What Schonhorn does not point out is the Augustinian influence on the reasoning behind Defoe’s emphasis on Nimrod.

Even though the leaders before the Flood were full of ‘inhuman and unnatural Lusts,’ people still erected a king in order to cease the quarrels.<sup>84</sup> The agreement reached between people and tyrants like Nimrod was a kind of

Compact and mutual Treatises of Accord

---

<sup>79</sup> Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:130.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:114.

<sup>81</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:6.

<sup>82</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:346. *idem*, *Jure Divino*, 2:106.

<sup>83</sup> Schonhorn, *Defoe’s Politics*, 124.

<sup>84</sup> Daniel Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature* (1726), ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 4, *TDH* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), 238.

Between a willing People and their Lord.’<sup>85</sup>

The situation after the rise of ‘national monarchy’ was better than at the time of ‘patriarchal monarchy,’ since there were at least some ‘Laws of Government.’<sup>86</sup>

However, the corrupt human nature of monarchs still drove their ambition beyond reasonable limits, and ‘Custom has always taught the Kings to ride, Oppress the Subject to support their Pride.’<sup>87</sup>

Defoe’s interest in using Nimrod as the model of a tyrant was partly based on Filmer’s work.<sup>88</sup> Filmer claimed that Nimrod subdued those ‘fathers of families’ to establish his authority. His ‘Fatherly Right of Sovereign Authority’ originated not from the people, ‘but as being substituted properly by God, from whom he receives his Royal Charter of an [sic] Universal Father.’<sup>89</sup> This God-given authority proved his divine right, preordained to be passed directly to his heir. Filmer’s thesis was that ‘By the uniting of great families or petty Princedoms, we find the greater monarchies were at first erected.’<sup>90</sup> Locke agreed that these ‘fathers of families’ indeed later became the monarchs, this was not ordained by God, but was based on ‘an insensible change.’<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:103.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 2:148.

<sup>88</sup> Defoe also based his illustration of Nimrod on the accounts of Walter Raleigh and John Milton. For Defoe’s saturation of Milton, see John Mullan, “Introduction,” in *The Political History of the Devil* (1726), ed. John Mullan, vol. 6, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 23–25.

<sup>89</sup> Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha: Or the Natural Power of Kings* (London, 1680), 22. See also Cesare Cuttica, *Writing in the Early Caroline Regime and the Issue of Patriarcha’s Non-Publication* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 148–9.

<sup>90</sup> Quoted from Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought*, 239.

<sup>91</sup> Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, 132; Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought*, 257.

Locke aimed to destroy ‘the identity of familial authority and political authority.’<sup>92</sup> On this topic, Defoe added that this custom or an insensible change may keep people low and obedient for a short time. However, in the end he argued that tyranny would not last long, since ‘Fraud only can Uphold, what Force has Gain’d.’<sup>93</sup> The ideal government should still be founded on compacts (the agreement of people).

Algernon Sidney, another Whig writer mentioned by Defoe also disagreed with Filmer’s theory, arguing that all kings were not ‘not the natural fathers of their people.’<sup>94</sup> Besides, according to the Filmerian theory, Nimrod was not a legitimate king since his father and grandfather were still alive when he was on the throne. It was clearly the case that Nimrod ‘did not reign in the right of fathers.’<sup>95</sup> Further, Sidney argued that:

Cush, Ham and Noah were his elders and progenitors in the direct line, and all the sons of Shem and Japheth, and their descendants in the collaterals, were to be preferred before him.<sup>96</sup>

Even if Filmer wanted to use divine right theory to justify Nimrod, Sidney argued that Nimrod was not legitimate in this kind of interpretation. Furthermore, Sidney pointed out that ‘absolute monarchy’ like Nimrod’s reign would lead to ‘corruption and decay.’ For Sidney, the truly just government was the one whose ‘power is conferr’d upon the chief magistrates.....by the free consent of a willing people.’<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> J. C. D. Clark, *English Society, 1660-1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancien Regime*, the second edition. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 131–32.

<sup>93</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:109.

<sup>94</sup> Algernon Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government* (LF Ed.) (1698), ed. Thomas G. West (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1996), 40.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 189.

Defoe agreed with Sidney on the point of the consent of people. What was different between them was that Defoe's theory was mixed with both popular right and divine right theories. Nimrod's reign, for Defoe, was a usurped power. It was not because he took the power from his father or grandfather. Rather, it was because he did not abide by the rule of law. Real majesty was based on the compact that the monarch made with the people, and the foundation of such an agreement was the rule of law. Otherwise, it was an 'Excentrick Tyranny' that was based on force and fraud.<sup>98</sup> Depicting it in Augustinian terms, Defoe pointed out it was because of a lack of 'Grace' that the 'tainted Blood' and corrupt self-love drove tyrannical monarchs' 'Hellish Lusts' and 'Insatiate Avarice' to abuse their people. When kings were rightful then they were 'Gods: That Title' 'they must' own. However, if lust overcame them, then the divine sanction disappeared and 'all the Godhead' failed.<sup>99</sup> The power of this monarch therefore must be checked. Filmer's definition of monarch, Defoe claimed, exalted this man on the throne to such height that he seemed to 'merit some other Title than that of a Man.'<sup>100</sup>

Arguing against the divine right theory, Defoe held that God would transfer the blessings from rulers to people once the former had become tyrants. When the situation worsened into a situation in which 'the Monarch [was] free, the Men confin'd,' then God would bless 'the just Effects of Poplar [sic] Rage,' and the compact between God

---

<sup>98</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:109.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:112.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:110.

and the tyrant became 'void.' Furthermore, because God bestowed the power of the king, therefore it was also of the Lord's power to withdraw the 'Jus Divinum.'<sup>101</sup>

Milton was one of Defoe's revered authors, and his *Paradise Lost* and critique of absolute monarchy was closely followed by Defoe. Milton also discussed Nimrod. In Milton's writings Nimrod was a vivid example of the absurdity of the divine right theory embraced by James I and Charles I. He described Nimrod as 'Of proud ambitious heart' and

Hunting (and Men not Beast shall be his game)  
With War and hostile snare such as refuse  
Subjection to his Empire tyrannous.<sup>102</sup>

In the context of English civil wars, Milton's use of Nimrod was in a milieu in which both Parliamentary and Royalist writers cited the stories and the meanings of Nimrod and his erecting of Babel.<sup>103</sup> This custom of using Nimrod continued into the time after the Glorious Revolution. For instance, a writer argued in 1689 that the time of Nimrod meant the end of 'the Patriarchal Government' that was in 'a state of War.'<sup>104</sup>

Defoe's view was similar to that of Milton. For instance, they both depicted Nimrod as the Hunter who did not hunt animals but 'the weak helpless People.'<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 2:111, 154.

<sup>102</sup> John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Philip Pullman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 352, xii: 25, 30-32.

<sup>103</sup> Helen Lynch, *Milton and the Politics of Public Speech* (New York: Routledge, 2016), 41; Elizabeth Sauer, *Barbarous Dissonance and Images of Voice in Milton's Epics* (Montreal ; Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996); Michael Austin, "Saul and the Social Contract: Constructions of 1 Samuel 8-11 in Cowley's *Davideis* and Defoe's *Jure Divino*," *Papers on Language and Literature* 32, no. 4 (1996): 412.

<sup>104</sup> T N. and B A., *Some Remarks upon Government, and Particularly upon the Establishment of the English Monarchy Relating to This Present Juncture*. (London, 1689), 7.

<sup>105</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:43. See also Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:117: '... his Hunting was of Men more than Beasts.' Jonathan Swift cited Milton's point on Nimrod 'made men, and not beasts, his prey' as well. See

Also, Defoe's association of Nimrod and the Devil was one of Milton's innovative ideas.<sup>106</sup> When Defoe discussed Nimrod, he quoted and agreed with Raleigh's point that 'he first brake the rule of eldership and paternity, laying the foundation of sovereign rule.'<sup>107</sup> However, Raleigh did not regard Nimrod as a tyrant. He was only 'a bitter or severe Governour'. Nimrod built the tower of Babel by 'just authoritie' rather than usurpation. Defoe acknowledged Nimrod was 'the first, and most early Monarch' or a 'King indeed.'<sup>108</sup> Nimrod signified 'the beginning and establishing of Government' and ranked him as positive power.<sup>109</sup> But Nimrod was a usurper and an awful embodiment of 'Ambition and Lust of Men,'<sup>110</sup> even though he put a stop to the chaos of endless fights between families of previous ages. Even though Defoe criticised Nimrod's misdeeds as a tyrant, he did not deny the divine nature of monarchy. A corrupt monarch did not disown the system of monarchy, because the system was divinely ordained, it was 'Heaven's first Dictate.' He added that 'Nothing in this Book

---

Michael Deporte, "Avenging Naboth: Swift and Monarchy," *Philological Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (1990): 425.

<sup>106</sup> Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993), 376.

<sup>107</sup> Sir Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World*, ed. William Oldys and Thomas Birch, vol. 2, *The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh* (Oxford: University Press, 1829), 355. See also Stephen R. Haynes, *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 54–55. For the extensive usage of Nimrod during the seventeenth century England, see Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*, 217–20. However, Raleigh did not regard Nimrod as a tyrant. He was only 'a bitter or severe Governour'. Nimrod built the tower of Babel by 'just authoritie' rather than usurpation. See Nicholas Seth Popper, *Walter Raleigh's History of the World and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012), 215–16.

<sup>108</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:37; idem, *A Hymn to the Mob* (1715), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 1, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 419.

<sup>109</sup> Popper, *Walter Raleigh's History of the World and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance*, 219.

<sup>110</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:346.

is design'd, or can be construed to Decry or Expose Monarchy, or the Sovereignty of Government by Kings.'<sup>111</sup>

'Providence permitted' Nimrod to rule, Defoe argued, but this did not justify his atrocity towards his subjects. Defoe distinguished the difference between government and governours.<sup>112</sup> The error of the High-Churchmen lay in their confusion of the two. Kings had 'no Powers immediately Deputed from Heaven superiour and unsubjected to the Good of those they govern.'<sup>113</sup> Although God's plan in the world was inscrutable, it was blasphemous to say that God commanded the tyranny. The divine right of monarchs was given by God to promote the welfare of people, while the original sins in monarchs' hearts caused the abuse of this divine right and tyrants were easily tempted by the Devil because of their sins. In *The History of the Devil*, therefore, Nimrod was described as being manipulated by the Devil. Satan aroused him with 'dreams of Empire' and 'universal Monarchy' and played upon 'the Frailty of Princes, and ensnar'd the greatest of them.'<sup>114</sup>

When Nimrod succumbed his soul to 'Tyrant SIN,' this was how an 'Arbitrary Government' began. This sin was passed down from Adam. Pride became native.<sup>115</sup> Tyrants were born with 'tainted Blood' and full of 'Insatiate Avarice.'<sup>116</sup> Nimrod made

---

<sup>111</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:101.

<sup>112</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:347, 345. If men 'had the true Account of their dissolute, exorbitant, and inhumane Lives' of the tyrants like Nimrod, they would be ashamed to revere them. (idem, *The Storm*, 5). See also, idem, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:131.

<sup>113</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:101.

<sup>114</sup> Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:130.

<sup>115</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:218. However, Defoe argued that with proper limitation on the power of the leader, the tyranny could be addressed. He wrote that tyrant was 'in need of Experience, and all common Helps to improve him, and to recover the Illumination.' (Ibid., 2:219).

<sup>116</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:109–10.

all ‘the Patriarchal Power comply’ and he turned the old rule into national ‘Monarchy,’ but his regime was ‘Erected purely to’ be ‘pull[ed] down.’<sup>117</sup> Nimrod’s regime was not commanded by God, therefore it did not have a divinely supreme right or power. Nimrod’s ascension was merely meant to end the previous chaotic period, rampant with mischief and crime. However, this reason did not legitimize Nimrod’s regime, In Defoe’s words, the purpose of Nimrod’s rule was to pull previous political leaders down.<sup>118</sup> He was not a just monarch. Under his tyrannical rule, men subjected themselves to the government not because they appreciated its justice but because they could not resist.<sup>119</sup>

Nimrod’s government was ‘in opposition to the Divine Power’ and foretold the fate of later monarchs. In the Old Testament, Nimrod was described as a hunter, and Defoe made it clear that tyrannical Nimrod was indeed ‘a Hunter of Men.’ He was ‘of a furious, bloody, tyrannick Disposition’ and ‘hunted down the weak helpless People, and set up a Kingdom under himself, till then unknown in the World.’<sup>120</sup> He was the first Man that ‘Usurp’d Superiority of Power, and form’d Men into Governments, under his absolute Rule.’<sup>121</sup> Nimrod established a kind of rule that ‘Rob’d the most, could Rule the best.’ It was unlikely that there was ‘Heaven concern’d in this.’<sup>122</sup> Defoe argued that it was consistent with providential order that tyrants be removed by

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 2:113.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 2:118.

<sup>120</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:42–43.

<sup>121</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:79.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 2:117.

Nimrod, but it did not ensure that subsequent rulers including Nimrod could govern without check.

Although Defoe agreed with Filmer that every ruler was endowed with divine sanction, this approval was not permanent. Furthermore, Filmer contradicted his theory of patriarchy in the case of Nimrod, conceding that Nimrod built his empire ‘by seizing violently on the rights of other lords of families,’ but he argued that this did not lessen the divine right at all.<sup>123</sup> Defoe maintained that from the fact of this tyranny, Filmer was mistaken in making such a conclusion. As we discussed above, Sidney had argued that when Nimrod was in charge of power, his father, grandfather, and even Noah were still alive. Nimrod, Defoe criticised, ‘broke the Rule of Eldership, and Paternity.’<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, Defoe agreed that the rule of primogeniture existed in Nimrod’s age, but it was the ‘meer Consequence’ of the ‘natural progressive Circumstances’ of human society. There was not ‘any particular Command or Grant from God Almighty’<sup>125</sup> for this custom, and Filmer’s theory did not make sense in this aspect. Filmer’s follower Leslie, unsurprisingly refuted Defoe’s reading of *Genesis*, arguing that Adam and all his descendants including Nimrod, possessed the God-given power to rule over the world.<sup>126</sup> When Defoe and Leslie argued over the meaning of the Bible, they were using these passages to fight for the legitimacy of the 1688 Revolution and the illegitimacy of the Jacobites in France.

---

<sup>123</sup> Quoted from Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*, 220.

<sup>124</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:43.

<sup>125</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:556. See also *Ibid.*, 3: 500.

<sup>126</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 2:365.

## Samuel and Saul

In Defoe's argument, God gave power to kings, but this did not mean that divine right allowed a king to do whatever he wanted. Firstly, a king had to obey the rule of law. Secondly, he must defend the right of property of his subjects. When the monarch fulfilled the duty, his reign was in concert with the 'laws of nature,' and procured the 'Jus Divinum.'<sup>127</sup> However, in human history, the case was normally that monarchs were haunted by their 'Lust and Pride' and became tyrants.<sup>128</sup> Defoe argued that Nimrod was a tyrant, and all his descendants were incapable of governing the people. Until the age of Samuel and Saul, the Jews were in a state of constant civil warfare. The people of Israel urged Samuel select a king for them. Defoe based his argument on the eighth chapter of the first Book of Samuel, suggesting that God's appointment of Saul as the Israelites' anticipated king was His judgment 'for the Punishment of a Nation,' since Samuel had already expressed what the future king would afflict on these people.<sup>129</sup> However, Defoe had a unique interpretation of Samuel's declaration of the foundation of the Kingdom of Israel.

Even though God's appointment of Saul was a punishment to the people of Israel, this punishment was not enforced by supernatural power. Instead, God designed a process that was propelled by humans themselves. In the *1 Samuel* 10:25, Samuel 'told the people the manner of the kingdom.'<sup>130</sup> Defoe interpreted this verse as signifying

---

<sup>127</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:104.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:184.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:120.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:121. A pamphlet often attributed to Defoe offered a similar interpretation: 'For had God designed that the King's Will should have been his only Law, it had, I'm sure, been a very superfluous, if not an impossible Task, for Samuel to have writ that down: And besides, the laying it up before the Lord, does infer something of

that what Samuel announced was ‘the Constitution of the Government.’ Moreover, the declaration also stated that Saul’s duty was ‘to rule the People according to Justice and Laws.’ God had declared Saul’s incoming downfall, this collapse would begin only when Saul began to deviate from ‘Justice and Laws.’<sup>131</sup> Defoe had a unique combination of divine right and popular right theories, in which he interpreted popular action as God’s will. Defoe inferred from 24th verse of *I Samuel* 10 ‘Samuel said to all the people’ to argue that ‘the Consent of the People’ was requisite for the making of a king.<sup>132</sup> God allowed ‘Nature’s Law, that Men Should Choose their Kings.’<sup>133</sup> Moreover, according to ‘Nature’s Law,’ ‘Men Should Choose their Kings.’<sup>134</sup> This was an illustrative example of the compact between king and people. Once the agreement was broken, ‘God and the People’ may take ‘juster Vengeance.’<sup>135</sup>

Saul’s kingship was established because people were ‘united by consent.’ There were ‘Compact and mutual Treatises of Accord’ made ‘Between a willing People and their Lord.’<sup>136</sup> However, this compact seemed uncertain because the content of the agreement was that people were willing to forfeit the liberties that God had given to them. Samuel initially announced this agreement, and all the people of Israel stuck to

---

extraordinary weight and sacredness in that Book, that was to be placed in that holy Repository, with the Records of that Covenant which God himself had vouchsafed to make with his People.’ See Anon., *Reflections upon the Late Great Revolution. Written by a Lay-Hand in the Country, for the Satisfaction of Some Neighbours* (London, 1689), 29. On the attribution of the author of this pamphlet, see K. R. P. Clark, “Defoe, Dissent, and Early Whig Ideology,” *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 3 (2009): 595–614.

<sup>131</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:121.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid., 2:124. See also Kevin Killeen, “Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in Early Modern England,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2010): 503–4; Schonhorn, *Defoe’s Politics*, 127–28.

<sup>134</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:124.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 2:122.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 2:103.

their decision despite God's warnings. 'The great Vox Dei's in the Publick Choice,' Defoe believed, and 'Heaven' always concurred with 'general Voice.'<sup>137</sup> The Biblical verse to which Defoe gave particular emphasis was *I Samuel* 8:18: 'And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye have chosen you, and the Lord will not hear you in that day.' It was God's warning of the impending tyranny, but he did not make it legitimate for the tyrant to torture people. In other words, God directed 'his Providence to work upon the Peoples' Judgments,' and even did so 'by a Miracle.' But God's ultimate purpose was to teach the people of Israel a bitter lesson.<sup>138</sup>

God gave what the people of Israel 'pretended to require/ But in the Gift he punish'd the Desire.'<sup>139</sup> This did not mean that the people were destined to suffer tyranny, they could justly rise against misrule. The eleventh verse of *Book of Hosea* 13, 'I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath,' was used by Defoe to explain that Saul was an example of God's punishment. God's using of Saul as an example let the people learn some lessons. First of all, humankind should always abide by God's order. Secondly, kings were divinely sanctioned, but since their nature was tainted, they must rule under the consent of their people. If the king oppressed his subjects, such as severe taxes or heavy labour, the Scripture ordained that the people 'had a Right not to be so impos'd upon.'<sup>140</sup> In short, people had a right sanctioned by God to resist. A tyrant who was 'damn'd by Natures Law, his Reign must end.'<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 2:182.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., 2:187–88.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 2:120.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 2:191.

<sup>141</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:640. See also idem, *Jure Divino*, 2:213.

In contrast the author of the *Rehearsal*, Leslie, came up with a distinctive answer from the same verse that Defoe interpreted. ‘The voice of the people’ that requested a king from God and declined Samuel’s advice, Leslie argued, was ‘always against God, still provoking him; it was the voice of Belial, rather than of God!’<sup>142</sup> In another issue, Leslie commented that the ‘voice of the people’ had ‘taken government from off its original and only foundation of jure divino,’ and caused ‘continual revolutions and havoc of the people.’<sup>143</sup> He called Defoe’s argument ridiculous, and he denied the claim that people had ‘a divine right to choose their government and governors.’<sup>144</sup> Another High-Churchman, Francis Atterbury, voiced the same distrust in the common people. Atterbury suggested that ‘the Voice of the People’ was ‘the cry of Hell, leading to idolatry, rebellion, murder and all the wickedness the Devil can suggest.’<sup>145</sup>

Defoe did not agree with the arguments of the high-churchmen like Leslie and Atterbury. Although the people of Israel were wrong in requesting the ascension of Saul to the throne, God had already foreseen that the people would regret this decision before long and asked for help. Although the people were wrong at one time, God still gave them a chance. Defoe pointed out that Leslie’s interpretation was wrong since Samuel’s warning did not give the king a right to impose tyranny on the people. Centring on tainted human nature, Defoe reminded his readers that Samuel’s message was to warn that the ‘Lust and Ambition’ of the kings undoubtedly would lead to

---

<sup>142</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 2:60.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid, 4:290.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid, 2:184.

<sup>145</sup> Francis Atterbury, *The Voice of the People no Voice of God* (London, 1710), 4. Quoted from Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain*, 267.

tyranny.<sup>146</sup> Besides, he argued that the establishment of either Saul or David showed that the Filmerian theory of divine right was wrong, because neither Saul nor David was the eldest son or from a noble family.<sup>147</sup> In this aspect, Defoe's stance was closer to Sidney. They both agreed on the fact that even though Saul was God's anointed, 'it were madness to think he became God's anointed by being king.'<sup>148</sup> Defoe argued that the God's anointed was sacred indeed, but the anointed kings were still 'limited by the People, in case of Tyranny and Illegal Governing.' Moreover, the holy nature of this anointed became invalid when the king broke the compact, and this would 'leave the Subject free.'<sup>149</sup> In sum, Defoe and Leslie's debate on the Old Testament passages was due to their different political positions and their different explanations of the new regime of 1689. Therefore, after Defoe's explanation of the attack on 'the Lord's Anointed,' he added that the Acts of Settlement, which passed into law on June 1701 were agreed and recognised by 'the Right of the People.'<sup>150</sup>

### **The Right of Resistance**

Although Defoe argued against Filmer and the divine right theory, he did not oppose the idea that the divine sanction of a king was the source of his legitimacy. He suggested that 'Kings that by Law and Justice Rule the Lands, Have Heaven's High

---

<sup>146</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:188.

<sup>147</sup> Defoe, *A New Discovery of an Old Intreague* (1691), 1:42.

<sup>148</sup> Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, 332.

<sup>149</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty* (1702), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 3, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 71–72. See also Tim Harris, *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715* (London: Longman, 1993), 157–58.

<sup>150</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty*, 3:72.

Name Imprest on their Commands.’<sup>151</sup> If the subjects resisted the normal rule of a monarch, it was an insult to God and should be punished. What Defoe reflected here was the tough question of the timing and necessity of people’s rebellion against tyranny. Defoe quoted Grotius’s *The Laws of War and Peace*, but he only partially agreed with the Dutch jurist’s assertion that ‘even in the case of great necessity’ the people ‘could not justly take up arms.’ The reason Defoe cited Grotius’s work was the next sentence: ‘yet will it not yet thence follow, that other princes may not take arms in their own defence.’ (italics added)<sup>152</sup> Defoe’s priority in his early 1700s political writings was to justify the overthrow of the reign of James II, and this citation was no exception. He resorted to Grotius to justify the Dutch invasion (one of the *other princes*) against James II. Moreover, his reading of the story of Saul supported the idea that only balanced government, like the parliamentary monarchy after 1688, could check the corrupt nature of all the political leaders.<sup>153</sup> Even his favourite king William III had to be checked under proper mechanism of supervision.

To justify the new parliamentary monarchy after 1689, Defoe called the ‘Presidents of the Kingdoms, Governors, Princes’ in *Book of Daniel* 7:6 as ‘their House of Commons.’ They gathered together to ‘establish a Royal Statute.’ Even King Darius

---

<sup>151</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:144. See also ‘... to Resist them while they justly execute that Power, is to Resist not their Persons, but the Government, and this is certainly to Resist the Ordinance of God, which whoever Resist, receive to themselves Damnation.’ (idem, *Review*, 7:348.)

<sup>152</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:144. The quotation also included Seneca’s sentence that ‘I may make War upon a Man, tho’ he and I are of different Nations.’ Hugo Grotius, *The Rights Of War And Peace*, ed. Richard Tuck (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2005), 1162.

<sup>153</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:186.

of Persia ‘had...to approve and sign the Decree.’<sup>154</sup> Defoe made another argument based on the twelfth verse of the same book: ‘The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.’ The law of the Medes was enacted by Arbaces, the first king of the Medes. Moreover, Arbaces was the model that Defoe compared to William III in *Jure Divino*, as a man who deposed a tyrant.<sup>155</sup>

Courtney Weiss Smith notices Defoe’s use of the story of Arbaces and she argues that the ‘link between nature and Arbaces’ indicates how nature taught humankind to resist tyranny. Smith assumes that Defoe was largely inspired by the natural world. For instance, ‘Arbaces himself acts after the exemplary model of an animal with claws.’<sup>156</sup> She explains that Defoe used the term ‘nature’ to mean natural instinct, and Arbaces exemplified the instinct of self-preservation. However, the beast-like resistance was not the main message in Defoe’s account of Arbaces. Instead, the point of the story of Arbaces lay in the fact that this defeat of the tyrant Sardanapalus was an act of ‘Justice,’ and the new regime was superior to the previous throne.<sup>157</sup>

However, beast-like resistance was not the main message in Defoe’s account of Arbaces. Instead, the ancient sovereign won over the tyrant as the result of ‘Justice,’ and by his victory ‘Law a Seat above the Throne obtain’d.’<sup>158</sup> Furthermore, Smith does not mention the possible source of Defoe’s argument. Defoe’s sources may have been some of his favourite writers, Raleigh and Sidney. Raleigh had mentioned

---

<sup>154</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:544.

<sup>155</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:245.

<sup>156</sup> Courtney Weiss Smith, *Empiricist Devotions: Science, Religion, and Poetry in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Charlottesville, VI: University of Virginia Press, 2016), 164.

<sup>157</sup> Defoe, *A Hymn to the Mob*, 1:420.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*

Arbaces a number of times in *The History of the World*, but he did not put much emphasis on his rebellion against tyranny. Sidney argued that Arbaces's victory symbolised the inevitable destiny of Nimrodic rule.<sup>159</sup> The purpose of using the ancient history of Arbaces and the sacred history of the Israelites was to support Defoe's stance defending the Protestant government after 1689. He summarised his points that 'the Limitation of Power and Superiority of Laws in Matters of Government have an Original in the very early Ages of the World; and the *Holy Text* (italics added) gives such an Instance of the limited Power of Kings.' The conclusion was that 'the making of Laws was in the People, and when made, they will be superior even to the King himself.'<sup>160</sup>

Justification for rebelling against tyranny was not difficult to find in the Bible. Writers frequently cited certain favourite verses and Defoe also cited passages from the Scriptures to justify the deposing of a tyrant, such as Adonibezec, Ahab, Haman, and others. Adonibezec was guilty of the 'unbounded Insults of his Pride,' and was punished by 'Heaven's Justice.' In *1 Judges* 1:7, the Canaanite king said that 'as I have done, so God hath requited me.' In the case of Ahab (in *1 Kings* 21) Defoe also stressed the corrupt human nature, namely his 'Lust of a Tyrant.' Naboth's land was next to

---

<sup>159</sup> Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, 137. There were other sources Defoe may have consulted. 'Belesus, or Belesis, General of the Babylonians, and the most famous Astrologer of the Chadeans, being informed hereof, solicited [sic] Arbaces to free the Medes from their Servitude, either out of Kindness to him, or Hopes to find his own Advantage in such a Revolt.' (Pufendorf, *An introduction to the history of the kingdoms and states of Asia, Africa and America*, 132). Pufendorf also offered a different explanation of Arbaces's rise: 'The Run of this Empire under Sardanapalus, is not so much to be ascribed to his Effeminacy, as to...allowed too much power the Governors of Provinces of so vast an extent. These grew at last too powerful for the Kings themselves...Out of the Ruins of the Assyrians Empire...Arbaces taking upon himself the Sovereignty of Media, where he was Governour.' (Ibid, 16).

<sup>160</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:544.

Ahab's, and the latter conspired to purchase Naboth's property. Ahab's wife came up with the trick to frame Naboth, letting Naboth get killed. Therefore, when Ahab infringed Naboth's property, it was destined that God punish him as well.<sup>161</sup> When Defoe described William III's defeat of James II, he gave a short summary of this idea:

In deposing Princes, and those that have born Authority, God did not always use his immediate Power, but sometimes he used other Means, such as in his Wisdom he thought good; as by Asa, he removed Maacha, his own Mother; by Jehu, he destroyed Joram; and by divers others he deposed from the Government those whom he had established before by his own Word.<sup>162</sup>

Although Defoe had compared a number of biblical figures to William III, the most frequently-used one was Jeroboam, who was the first king of the northern Kingdom of Israel after the ten northern Israelite tribes revolted against Rehoboam. Defoe used the separation between Rehoboam and Jeroboam as an allegory for the revolution of 1688. Defoe had used the story of Jeroboam before. When he criticised Charles I's re-issuing of the Book of Sports in 1633, he said the king was similar to Jeroboam.<sup>163</sup> Furthermore, he described the Old Pretender as Rehoboam who was 'effectually as the Kings of Judah.'<sup>164</sup> Even though the comparison was not perfect, Defoe's opponent Leslie also used the stories of Rehoboam and Jeroboam to defend the legitimacy of the Jacobites. In this context, by probing into Defoe and Leslie's debate on the interpretation of the revolt of the ten northern Israelite tribes against

---

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 4:639. The story was from *1 Kings* 21:1-24. See also Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:306; Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, 346.

<sup>162</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland* (1717), ed. N. H. Keeble, vol. 6, *TDH* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), 44.

<sup>163</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:750. See Novak, *Daniel Defoe*, 406-7.

<sup>164</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:347.

Rehoboam, we also gain an insight into the political use of the Bible in the late Stuart age.

In *Jure Divino* Defoe claimed that the revolution of 1688 was God's command.<sup>165</sup> The first and foremost law of nature was to preserve one's life, and blind obedience to tyrannical rule was equal to suicide, which was against God's rules. In this case, rebellion against tyrants was justified. This right, deriving from natural law, ensured that as long as governors invaded people's rights, they 'may be Deposed by the People they Govern.'<sup>166</sup> Defoe supplemented it with the religious view that self-defence was also a pursuit of 'the Ends of Providence.'<sup>167</sup> Defoe argued that the fall of James II was justified by quoting God's message to Rehoboam that 'I set it up, but 'tis your selves pull down.'<sup>168</sup>

In the natural law tradition, it was the priority for a man to secure his life when encountering dangers, as Defoe wrote that 'self-Defence is the Sovereign Law of Nature,'<sup>169</sup> or 'the great Fundamental Law of Nature, is Self-preservation.'<sup>170</sup> This kind of self-love was justified. It was one's responsibility to pass on our fathers' blood entirely and handed it to posterity. Defoe used this line of thinking to refute the argument of the High-Church churchmen. Besides, it was hypocritical for these people

---

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., 5:44-45.

<sup>166</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:101.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., 2:136. Defoe kept stressing that 'the Sin of Self-murder cannot be repented of.' (Ibid, 2:137)

<sup>168</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:193. For a general discussion on the use of the two leaders see the sixth chapter of Kevin Killeen, *The Political Bible in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

<sup>169</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:175.

<sup>170</sup> Defoe, *The Protestant Jesuite Unmasked*, 27. See also T. J. Hochstrasser, *Natural Law Theories in the Early Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 97-98.

to advocate the theory of divine right after they themselves had abandoned their allegiance to James II in 1688. Ironically, their betrayal perfectly proved the formidable force of the law of nature. Defoe pointed out that when the property and the safety of these High-Church people were threatened, they ‘unanimously opposed their Sovereign.’ This fact proved his thesis that once the king infringed on the properties of his people, the king lost his divine legitimacy since ‘Heaven’s no Heaven to us if Property’s away.’<sup>171</sup>

The right of resistance was also based on the ‘mutual Compact between King and People.’ This agreement was terminated if the following situations arose: ‘Incapacity for Government, Tyrannical Usurpation, or other Male-Administration [sic].’<sup>172</sup> If a king became a tyrant, then the bond was dissolved and the subjects become free.<sup>173</sup> Throughout the history of the world, many kings who claimed to possess divine right were overthrown or killed. These facts did not support the theory of divine right, sometimes a tyrant was able to hold on to his power, not because of divine right, but because of the people’s ‘Custom and want of Means.’<sup>174</sup>

Defoe wielded biblical language and natural right at the same time. He assumed that the people should enjoy both the love of God and natural right. If both were protected, they should not be enslaved or threatened by sword.<sup>175</sup> For instance, when the tyrant damaged the rule of law, then he was ‘damn’d by Nature’s Laws,’ and

---

<sup>171</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:152.

<sup>172</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:71.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:72.

<sup>174</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:109.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:152.

because natural law was in harmony with God's law, then the king's divine sanction was annulled immediately, when he broke laws of nature. It was mistaken to swear 'absolute undisputed Obedience' to a king.<sup>176</sup> In an issue of the *Review*, Defoe stated that even in the instance of divine right that was advocated by Leslie, they themselves could not find a king who was able to claim that he was derived from 'an uninterrupted Succession of Blood, from some Monarch who had such a Divinely Instituted Original.'<sup>177</sup> The theory was regarded by Defoe as false, Defoe asked if the theory were true, why did Leslie and other High-Tories desert King James II in 1688?

Kevin Killeen has shown that in the second half of the seventeenth century, biblical figures such as Rehoboam and Jeroboam were 'appropriated by Anglican-Royalists, English and International Catholics, and fiercely anti-Jacobean Protestants.'<sup>178</sup> Killeen uses the pamphlet *Reflections upon the Late Great Revolution* to study Defoe's use of the Bible. This pamphlet used to be attributed to Defoe, but his authorship is now in doubt by some Defoe scholars.<sup>179</sup> I argue that this political use of Scripture continued into the eighteenth century. The following section argues that even if Defoe did not write this pamphlet, it was evident that the interpretation of the Bible for diverse political purposes was demonstrated in most of Defoe's works.

---

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., 2:214.

<sup>177</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:607.

<sup>178</sup> Killeen, "Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in Early Modern England," 505.

<sup>179</sup> K. R. P. Clark, "Defoe, Dissent, and Early Whig Ideology," *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 3 (2009): 595–614.

According to Defoe's understanding of natural law, it was not rebellious to defend one's basic rights and to resist oppression with violence.<sup>180</sup> Defoe borrowed the term from the Bible to describe that the Old Pretender's aim was to chastise English people 'with Scorpions.'<sup>181</sup> The term 'with Scorpions' was from the First Book of Samuel. When the people asked Rehoboam for the relief of their burden, the king answered: 'My father disciplined you with whips, but I will discipline you with scorpions.'<sup>182</sup> Michael Austin has shown that in *Jure Divino* Defoe 'compared King William's ascendance over the Catholic James II to David's royal succession at the expense of the unrighteous Saul.'<sup>183</sup> Austin is correct to notice that 'any debate about social, political, cultural, or economic policy was, at least to some degree, a debate about what the Bible said or meant for the modern world.'<sup>184</sup> It could be added that Defoe also used other biblical figures to defend William III's action against James II. In addition, I would also put Defoe in the context of other literary contemporaries to broaden Austin's point.

### **Rehoboam and Defoe's Defence of the Glorious Revolution**

Rehoboam was Solomon's son and the heir of the throne. When he became the king, Rehoboam proclaimed that he would enforce a stricter rule than his father. The ten tribes of Israel therefore refused to live under his rule. These people established

---

<sup>180</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:203. Thompson, "Daniel Defoe and the Formation of Early Eighteenth-Century Whig Ideology," 112-13.

<sup>181</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 5:45.

<sup>182</sup> 1 Kings 12:14.

<sup>183</sup> Austin, "Saul and the Social Contract: Constructions of 1 Samuel 8-11 in Cowley's *Davideis* and Defoe's *Jure Divino*," 413.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, 411-12.

their own kingdom, Judah, and chose Jeroboam as their new king. The Whig James Tyrrell (1642-1718), a critic of Filmer's divine right theory, also cited the example of Rehoboam to highlight the difference between tyrant and king.<sup>185</sup> Sidney in his *Discourses Concerning Government* used the folly of Rehoboam and God's appointing of the succession of Jeroboam to refute Filmer.<sup>186</sup> In his *Court Maxims*, Sidney likewise argued that even though Rehoboam was 'made king by God's designation,' he was still 'thrown by the commandment of God from the government of the ten tribes.'<sup>187</sup> Locke challenged the Filmerian thesis by asking why God gave the reign to Jeroboam who was not the son of any previous king.<sup>188</sup>

In Defoe's narrative, Rehoboam was compared to James II, and God made Rehoboam a King instead of a tyrant. Even though he was of noble blood, Defoe used the instance of Rehoboam to argue that James II was not 'fitter to reign,' merely 'because his father was a king.'<sup>189</sup> Rehoboam 'was of the Line, for he was the Son of Solomon, but inherited his Dignity without his Wisdom.'<sup>190</sup> Defoe explained that judging from Rehoboam's fate, Filmer's theory of divine right was not convincing. To refute Filmer's defence of Rehoboam as a rightful heir of the preceding king, Defoe cited the instance of Solomon, stressing Solomon's yoking of people: 'not Heavy only, but Greivous.' It was an allusion to Charles I when he said the father of the tyrant

---

<sup>185</sup> James Tyrrell, *Patriarcha Non Monarcha* (London, 1681), preface, unpagged.

<sup>186</sup> Sidney, *Discourses Concerning Government*, 14, 37.

<sup>187</sup> Algernon Sidney, *Court Maxims*, ed. Hans W. Blom, Eco Haitsma-Mulier, and Ronald Janse (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 59.

<sup>188</sup> Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, 259.

<sup>189</sup> Defoe, *The Compleat English Gentleman*, 10:91.

<sup>190</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:191.

violating people's right and 'raising Money without Consent of Parliament.'<sup>191</sup> Leslie, Defoe's arch-rival in the divine right theory debate, rebuffed Defoe's claim, pointing out that it was not legitimate to revolt against Rehoboam. Since King Solomon was a wise king, Rehoboam should not be blamed when he hoped to increase the measures that Solomon had enforced earlier. King Solomon was 'the wisest man' of all mankind who 'promised trade mightily, and made his people wondrous rich,' Leslie argued, and the burden laying on the people was a part of Solomon's wise plan.<sup>192</sup> Conflicting interpretations of the same biblical passages were not unusual in England. For instance, Joseph Hall (1574-1656) in 1628 suggested that there was nothing to be blamed in Solomon's reign, and Jeroboam's separation from Rehoboam's rule was illegitimate. In contrast, in Francis Bacon's *History of Henry VII*, he remarked that 'Salomon [sic] also was too heauie upon his people in Exactions.'<sup>193</sup>

The parting of ten tribes that Defoe referred to as English people, was justified by God, and Rehoboam's (James II's) tyranny was blameable. Defoe depicted James II as Rehoboam, the two were similarly deserted by their people. The Tories were supposed to support King James, however they eventually abandoned this 'wheed'd Wretch to fight alone.'<sup>194</sup> Even if Rehoboam had descended from the House of David and with 'an intail of the Messiah upon his Blood,' this kinship did not justify his ruthless actions. The legitimacy of his rule vanished due to his tyranny and the

---

<sup>191</sup> Ibid.

<sup>192</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 5:55.

<sup>193</sup> Michael Kiernan, ed., *The Oxford Francis Bacon VIII: The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh and Other Works of the 1620s* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 162.

<sup>194</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:160, 194. Cf. idem, *Review*, 7:213.

infringement of the properties of the people. Therefore, the resistance of the ten tribes was successful and it was based on the 'particular influence' that God exerted.<sup>195</sup>

Leslie defended James II and questioned the legitimacy of the revolution of 1688. Leslie's *Rehearsal* and Defoe's *Review* exchanged fire in the first decade of the eighteenth century, and both writers used the story of Rehoboam and Jeroboam to debate the legitimacy of the revolution of 1688. Leslie understood that the reason Defoe retold the story of Rehoboam was to accuse James II or the Old Pretender. Therefore, in the *Rehearsal*, Leslie kept defending Rehoboam's legitimacy and attacked the illegitimacy of the revolt of the ten tribes. He also cited passages in which the priests of the tribe of Levi later turned away from the Northern Kingdom. The reign of the kingdom of Judah was disastrous, therefore, these priests 'came themselves to Jerusalem, to strengthen the hands of Rehoboam, but they brought with them as many as they could from Jeroboam.'<sup>196</sup>

In the first half of 1708 the two periodicals heatedly debated the legitimacy of Rehoboam. Leslie lamented that Rehoboam 'was young and tender-hearted, and not able to withstand the conspiracy of Jeroboam.'<sup>197</sup> The *Review* mocked Leslie's using of the term 'tender-hearted' to describe the heir of Solomon. Defoe questioned how Rehoboam's harming his subjects with scorpions merited the name of a very tender-hearted prince. Defoe stressed the legitimacy of the revolt, citing the passage that God

---

<sup>195</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:194.

<sup>196</sup> Charles Leslie, *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontificat Stated*, the second edition. (London, 1701), 39.

<sup>197</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 5:4.

forbade Rehoboam taking any revenge against the new kingdom of Israel to justify the separation of the ten tribes.

The *Rehearsal* replied that the ten tribes were ‘neither humble nor just,’ so ‘the insolent demands of rebels are not to be answered as they deserve.’ The weakness of Rehoboam was not tyranny but his folly of ‘governing with too loose a reign.....All the effects rather of a weak than a tyrannical prince.’<sup>198</sup> Leslie made excuses for Rehoboam’s intent to impose more burdens on his people. He argued that Rehoboam was merely making a declaration, but ‘before he had done any one Act of Government either Good or Evil,’ ‘the Folly of the People’ made them rebel against the king.<sup>199</sup> Leslie cited the verses from *2 Chronicles* 13:4-6 to refute Defoe’s claim that the revolt of the ten tribes was justified. Instead, God did not give any command for the ten tribes to resist. Leslie emphasised the term ‘rebellion’ used in the sixth verse, and he pointed out that this was the truth of the ‘Conspiracy of Jeroboam.’<sup>200</sup> Furthermore, the *Rehearsal* refuted Defoe’s explanation of God’s forbidding of Rehoboam’s revenge. Leslie explained that ‘to forbid his marching is one thing, but to own or approve of their taking arms is another thing.’<sup>201</sup> If God indeed acknowledged the legitimacy of the new nation, Leslie asked, then why did Abijah the son of Rehoboam successfully invade them, and why was Jeroboam struck dead by the Lord?

Similar citations of the conflict between Rehoboam and Jeroboam could be observed in other contemporary writings. For instance, other supporters of passive

---

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 5:54.

<sup>199</sup> Leslie, *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontificat Stated*, 39.

<sup>200</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 5:6.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid., 5:56.

obedience employed tactics similar to Leslie's. Charles Palmer, the vicar of Towcester, pointed out that after Jeroboam had established the kingdom of Israel, almost all the successive kings suffered short-term reigns, and 'they scarcely had one good King amongst them all, to Nine of them died violent Deaths.' Palmer summarised that this was all caused by 'Rebellions and Treason.'<sup>202</sup> In contrast, the Anglican churchman Philip Stubbs argued that even though Jeroboam 'made all the Ten Tribes accessory to his Abomination,' he had his missions at the same time, since God made 'this very Man an Instrument to humble the Line of David.'<sup>203</sup>

Defoe's critique of tyranny was based on his Augustinian understanding of human nature. Therefore, when he criticised the imprudence of Rehoboam, it was pertinent to attribute his tyranny to his 'Scepter'd Pride.'<sup>204</sup> Rehoboam's answer to his people's request 'my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions,' was interpreted by Defoe as the new king was bloated with 'Pride and tyrannical Humour.'<sup>205</sup> Defoe's use of the biblical accounts of Rehoboam and Jeroboam demonstrated his Augustinian understanding of sin and human nature. He stressed Rehoboam's want of supervision led him to abuse his pride which was 'grafted in the Nature of the Man,' and made him sin 'with a greater Gust.'<sup>206</sup> Furthermore,

---

<sup>202</sup> Charles Palmer, *A Defence of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, to Supreme and Sovereign Powers* (London, 1710), 35.

<sup>203</sup> Philip Stubbs, *For God or for Baal: Or, No Neutrality in Religion*. (London, 1702), 6, 5.

<sup>204</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:192. Cf. Schonhorn, *Defoe's Politics*, 138–39.

<sup>205</sup> Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:150. See also Cruso, *The Usefulness of Spiritual Wisdom with a Temporal Inheritance*, 22.

<sup>206</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:184. See also idem, *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland* (1717), 6:125. On the interpretation of the Bible for political use in the seventeenth century, see Kim Ian Parker, "'A King like Other Nations': Political Theory and the Hebrew Republic in the Early Modern Age," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530–1700*, ed. Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel

once he was controlled by his corrupt passions, he aimed to cast off any ‘Bounds’ on him, and started to make ‘the tyrannick Argument of his own Arbitrary WILL.’<sup>207</sup>

Even though the establishment of the new kingdom of Judah was justified in the first place, he did not defend Jeroboam’s subsequent transformation into a tyrant. Defoe defended Jeroboam in that, at the beginning of his reign he was a rightful king with divine sanction, however, he was possessed with pride when he set up the two Golden calves.<sup>208</sup> Again, Defoe cautioned that all humankind had to be aware of its corrupt nature. If Jeroboam’s faith had not degenerated into superstition, he would not have had such a miserable ending.

When Defoe cited passages from the Old Testament, it was often in relation to pride or other destructive passions. For instance, in the *2 Kings* Book 10, even though Jehu was ordered by God to extinguish the house of Ahab, he committed the same superstition as Baal out of pride, just like Jeroboam’s idolising of the two golden calves.<sup>209</sup> Moreover, Defoe argued that ‘Ambition, where it Reigns, prompts all the Tyrants to do’ cruelty, like the bloody battle between Abijah King of Judah, and Jeroboam King of Israel, which cost many lives.<sup>210</sup> Leslie also stressed the degenerate nature of humankind after the Fall, but he came up with a different solution. He warned that ‘the People is an Uncertain thing’ and ‘Monarchy is a Greater Security than any other Forms of Government in many Respects.’ A king shared the same benefit with

---

Willie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 384–96; Warren Cherniak, “Biblical Republicanism,” *Prose Studies* 23, no. 1 (April 1, 2000): 154–56.

<sup>207</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:190. See also idem, *Review*, 5:19, 671.

<sup>208</sup> Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:150.

<sup>209</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Honesty* (1704), ed. John McVeagh, vol. 3, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 193.

<sup>210</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 2:163.

his people, and ‘he cannot Hurt them, without Hurting himself.’ Since he was wiser than the people, for the welfare of the nation the people should follow the rule of the king. Leslie asserted that Jeroboam’s revolt was similar to the rebellion of Zedekiah or Absalom. These men were God’s instruments to send warnings to monarchs, but these rebels were merely tools, and this purpose did not justify their rebellion. Evil things that were sent from God had their purpose, Leslie argued, but we could not equate these evildoers with God himself. The twenty-fourth verse of *IKings* 12 ‘Ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren the children of Israel: return every man to his house; for this thing is from me’ did not substantiate God’s sanction of Jeroboam. Instead, it was only God’s message and lesson to Rehoboam. Jeroboam’s sudden death after the establishment of the new kingdom proved he was merely a tool. As Leslie concluded: ‘it would be abhorrent to think, that God did approve of’ his monstrous sins: ‘on the contrary, we find that God did severely punish him for them, particularly for his rebellion, in which he died in a very strange manner.’<sup>211</sup>

Leslie read Defoe’s works carefully and cleverly. Leslie quoted the *Review*’s sentence ‘when the Sons of Noah and their Sons divided the Nations, the Patriarchal primogenital Monarchy...was establish’d’ to argue that Defoe contradicted himself on the topic of the power of patriarch. Besides, Leslie noticed the difference between Defoe and the Whigs like Sidney and Locke. For instance, he wrote ‘The *Review* seems to give up that notion of a general level of individuals, advanc’d by Mr. Lock, Sidney.’<sup>212</sup> Moreover, as we discussed above, Defoe agreed that the monarchy had

---

<sup>211</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 5:57.

<sup>212</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 2:363.

begun in the age of Nimrod, but he did not believe this monarchy belonged to the same family forever, and this was not ‘Command or Grant from God Almighty.’<sup>213</sup> Here is another instance of Leslie’s shrewd reading of Defoe. Since Defoe did not explicitly write about the people’s rebellion in the case of Nimrod, Leslie sharply noticed that Defoe did not address this point clearly and pointed out that ‘the division of the nations after the flood was not, nor cou’d have been made by the decision of the people.’<sup>214</sup> In the case of Saul, Defoe refuted Leslie and argued that Samuel’s warning to the people of the possible tyranny of Saul did not signify this was ‘what he ought to do’ or that Saul had a ‘Right ... to exercise all these Tyrannies.’<sup>215</sup> Defoe assumed that the Scripture did not predict empowerment. From the later example of the revolt of the ten tribes, Defoe inferred that if the king violated the people’s right to property, then the people surely had the right to revolt. Furthermore, the warning to Samuel of future tyranny did not mean God approved of it.

Defoe and Leslie could offer contrasting explanations from the same event. For instance, on the Norman conquest of England, Defoe explained that when the tyrant was deposed ‘the Right does with the Property remain: People may crown the Man that they approve.’<sup>216</sup> But Leslie argued that it could hardly be the ‘Consent of the People.’ The government’s legitimacy could only possibly come from God, and the result would be ‘Absolute Jure Divino and Passive-Obedience.’<sup>217</sup> Despite all their

---

<sup>213</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:556.

<sup>214</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 2:368.

<sup>215</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:188.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:302.

<sup>217</sup> Leslie, *The Rehearsal*, 5:62.

disagreements, Leslie and Defoe actually shared some opinions. For example, the two agreed that the origin of government must be ‘an Authority more than Human.’ They did not believe the thesis of the state of nature, and they both cautioned against the corruption of human nature.

Defoe had bitter arguments with the High-Churchmen, but their political ideas were not utterly incompatible.’ The thirteenth chapter of the *Book of Romans* was one of the High-Churchman’s favourite parts of the Bible. The second verse, for example, is: ‘Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.’ William Beveridge, the Bishop of St. Asaph, appropriated the chapter to uphold absolute obedience to magistrates. He wrote that ‘whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God.’ Defoe criticised Beveridge’s explanation, suggesting this was an ‘Absolute Blind Obedience.’<sup>218</sup> Defoe did not state clearly which book of Beveridge he was refuting. However, a similar idea could be found in one of Beveridge’s sermons on ‘Obedience to Govenors.’ In the sermon, Beveridge pointed out that it was ‘contrary to the word of God’ to imagine ‘that the king receives his power from the people.’<sup>219</sup> Furthermore, he criticized these points as ‘seditious principles and unchristian doctrines, which are destructive of government.’ Even if the king neglected his duty, Beveridge cautioned, ‘they [the people] are not bound to’ perform discipline on the king.<sup>220</sup> On this issue, Defoe did not disagree with Beveridge, and he also pointed out that unless under very

---

<sup>218</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:59.

<sup>219</sup> William Beveridge, *Obedience to Governors* (1710) in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, Dr. William Beveridge*, 2 vols, (London, 1729), 2: 371.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid*, 371-72.

urgent circumstances, magistrates were ‘not in any Case to be Resisted.’ The crowd who rebelled against officials who governed according to the rule of law were not justified. Defoe also borrowed the second verse of Romans 13 cautioning that to resist magistrates who justly executed their power, certainly amounted to resisting the ‘Ordinance of God’ and they ought to ‘receive to themselves Damnation.’<sup>221</sup> In the end, Defoe summarised that:

Here they are not in any Case to be Resisted; for as to obey, is a Debt not to their Persons meerly as Men, but to the Government they are trusted with the Magistracy of; so to Resist them while they justly execute that Power, is to Resist not their Persons, but the Government, and this is certainly to Resist the Ordinance of God.<sup>222</sup>

### **Conclusion**

This chapter has discussed Defoe’s political ideas and their religious dimension by paying attention to his understanding and use of the Old Testament. In his discussion on Adam, Nimrod, Saul, Rehoboam and so on, Defoe’s political thoughts were mixed with the ideas of divine right, natural right, and neo-Augustinianism. Although Defoe criticised divine right theorists such as Filmer and Leslie, they shared similar ideas at the same time. They agreed that divine sanction was the justification of monarchy. Defoe stated that when kings ruled according to law and the common good, they were then sacred and blessed by God, and ‘the Stamp of Sacred plainly

---

<sup>221</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:348. See also H. T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Methuen, 1979), 24.

<sup>222</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 7:348.

would appear.<sup>223</sup> However, for Defoe, this commendation did not make the monarch divine. Since human nature was filled with corrupt self-love, the monarch was also susceptible to degeneration. Once a king abandoned the responsibility to care for the welfare of the people, he was not divine anymore, and this argument was distinct from divine right theory. As Defoe stated that ‘Doom’d down Tyrants by the Peoples Hand;’ and ‘Oppression ruins the Divine Intent.’<sup>224</sup> Furthermore, when criticising tyranny, he also argued in Augustinian language and paid attention to corrupt human nature in sentences such as ‘Princes that give their Will its eager Gust: And Sacrifice the Nations to their Lust.’<sup>225</sup> Besides, Defoe did not find the divine nature of the monarch conflicting with popular rights. He claimed that the people had ‘[a] natur[al] right to be Governed’ according to their wishes, and kings agree on these terms when they ascended the crown. This was the ‘Jure Divino’ and this agreement best illustrated the meaning of ‘Vox Populi be Vox Dei.’ In sum, Defoe fashioned his political thought by combining these conflicting ideas, and his understanding of the Bible heavily influenced him. Citing his debate with the High-Churchmen, this chapter shows Defoe’s distinctive reading of the Old Testament and how he made use of the Scriptures to put forward his political ideas.

---

<sup>223</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:185.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:204.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:111.



## Chapter 4. Defoe's Historical Thought

This chapter discusses the influence of Defoe's religious thought on his historical works. Some scholars have already written on this subject. Katherine Clark studied Defoe's writings on the Phoenicians and Henry VII and explained that his argument belonged to the 'historiography which postulated...the transition from feudal to commercial society.'<sup>1</sup> Clark also argues that Defoe's historical interpretation should have received more credit for its originality, since he wrote his works 'almost sixty years earlier than Millar 'highlighting, the central importance of woolen manufactures as a catalyst for social change in early-modern England.'<sup>2</sup> Paula Backscheider in the chapter on Defoe's historical works gives a detailed account of Defoe's attention to and treatment of history throughout his life. Backscheider emphasises the structure of Defoe's historical work, which was firmly related to the goals he wanted to achieve and the messages he conveyed. She notes that Defoe used God's plan as justification for the 1707 union between England and Scotland. Backscheider quotes sentences such as 'the working out of Providential design, as the two nations were being pulled toward Union as well as being pushed' and 'how Providence has led the Nations, as it were, by the Hand.'<sup>3</sup> From these quotations, she argues, it is evident that Defoe aimed to explore the revelation of the divinity and its specific content in the long course of history. In addition, Defoe's interest in the development of ancient civilisation is the same case, from which he was also eager to discern God's will in the development of

---

<sup>1</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 163.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>3</sup> Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe*, 83.

human civilisations.<sup>4</sup> Backscheider suggests that ‘the second motif that Defoe draws from religion is that God designed the world as a treasure trove for man.’<sup>5</sup> The observation that Defoe regarded nature as a repository of divinity is essential. It explains why Defoe praised the Phoenicians for developing commerce and navigation. Another scholar, Robert Merrett, is concerned with Defoe’s use of contraries to promote and reinforce his claims, but he is somewhat aware of Defoe’s interpretation of divine will in history, for instance, how ‘anniversaries in the Civil War and Glorious Revolution’ were interpreted as ‘signs obliging individuals to develop retrospective awareness concerning worldly rewards.’<sup>6</sup> Moreover, Merrett’s research also provides examples of Defoe’s biblical knowledge and his appropriating of these allusions into his narrative.<sup>7</sup>

Although the above studies have discussed the religious aspects of Defoe’s historical writings, this chapter differs from them for the following reasons. First, although Clark acknowledges and discusses Defoe’s preference for Phoenicians in her work, she only notes that Defoe was influenced by Walter Raleigh. I point out here that Defoe’s intellectual resources included, in addition to Raleigh, several other writers who paid attention to ancient history. By linking Defoe with these writers, this chapter thus situates Defoe’s idea into the context of the strong intellectual interest in ‘ancient wisdom’ common to the second half of the seventeenth century. Defoe’s view of this point in the past has not received the attention it deserves. Second, Defoe argued

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>6</sup> Merrett, *Daniel Defoe: Contrarian*, 92.

<sup>7</sup> See *ibid.*, 109-36.

with other writers about which nation invented writing first. In the midst of this controversy, we see that Defoe was not, as past researchers have pointed out, merely following Raleigh's point. On the contrary, he critically used the works of many other writers, such as Pierre Daniel Huet. Moreover, Defoe's historical thinking and genius were most clearly displayed in the ways he chose and tailored his materials. In order to grasp how Defoe explained how the will of God revealed itself in history, this chapter goes on to discuss the Reformation both in England and the relevant issues such as religious dissent and martyrdom during the seventeenth century. The last part of this chapter discusses how Defoe explained the rise of the papacy. As a devout Calvinist, Defoe's aversion to the system of Popery is not surprising. This part will focus on how he used history to discuss the rise of the Papal system and its ramifications, especially the primitive Christian church, the martyrs, and the degeneration of the church as a result of the emergence of the papacy. The conclusion summarises how Defoe responded to his religious concerns in his interpretation of history.

### **Histories of Trade and Navigation**

As mentioned above, Defoe's view of ancient history relied on several sources, one of which was Francis Bacon (1561-1626), and this can be seen from the myth of Prometheus. Defoe held that the meaning behind Prometheus's story was that it represented the achievements of ancient civilisation, an explanation similar to that of Prometheus by Bacon. Bacon argued that the story of Prometheus 'doth clearly and

elegantly signifie [sic] Providence.’ Moreover, Bacon suggested that the significance of this story was humans’ arrogance about their own achievements. Although the story showed how God's providence allowed human beings to progress, it also ‘shew[ed] little Reverence to the divine Nature, by equalizing, in a manner, their own Defects with God’s Perfection.’<sup>8</sup> Defoe took the same view, that is to say, the meaning of the parable was that ‘before Prometheus Mankind was little better than a lump of Earth, so grosly Ignorant, Brutish, and Stupid, that he had nothing of supernatural Knowledge.’ When Prometheus arrived, he introduced people to ‘Divine Wisdom, and the knowledge of the true God’ and then they began to improve in arts and sciences.’<sup>9</sup> Defoe explained that the spring and the director behind the development of human civilisation was God. Accordingly, if humankind was ungrateful and unfaithful to God, the painful end of Prometheus was a clear warning.

In light of Defoe’s conception of history, we shall examine his discussion of the Phoenicians, who were his favourite subject in his writings on ancient history. Defoe praised the Phoenicians for their achievements in trade, arts and sciences. He then sought to connect the ancient race, distinguished in commerce and trade, with modern England. Defoe, therefore, spent much time explaining how the Phoenicians engaged in the ‘Manufacture of Cotton Wooll, which in those early Times, they brought to great perfection.’<sup>10</sup> Defoe’s account of the Phoenicians was similar in many ways to Pierre-Daniel Huet’s *The History of The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients*. Defoe

---

<sup>8</sup> Francis Bacon, *The Essays, or Councils, Civil and Moral, of Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban* (London, 1696), 74, 77.

<sup>9</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:79.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:70.

may have consulted this text. Huet based his book on materials from the works of the ancient Roman writers. These Phoenicians, known in Roman times as the Carthaginians, were described as ‘the Authors of Commerce,’ ‘the Commerce Was carry’d on by Sea and Land in the Eastern World’ and they were attributed to have established a great Number of Colonies.<sup>11</sup>

There are many similarities between the two authors. Both men, for example, believed that the Phoenicians were the first people in the world to develop the skills of navigation, and they passed them down to other civilisations: ‘the Phoenician...and Cilicians,’ were ‘the first Nations situated upon the Sea-shores’<sup>12</sup> and passed the art of navigation to the Egyptians and the Greeks. Besides, the two writers also believed that the Phoenicians were the foremost pioneers of business in human history. Defoe wrote that ‘the first communication for Commerce, which the Tyrians, a People naturally inclin’d to Merchandize, were said to make the was with the Egyptians,’ and the Phoenicians were ‘Industrious, and addicted to Commerce.’<sup>13</sup> Defoe’s remarks were similar to Huet’s conclusion. Aside from Huet, Defoe also cites the writings of the Greek geographer, Strabo, to link the Phoenicians to the English. Defoe argued, according to Strabo, that the Phoenicians had arrived in England in ancient times, and that there was trade between them. Also, during this era, the Phoenicians brought the technology of wool manufacturing to England.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Pierre-Daniel Huet, *The History of the Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients* (London, 1717), 16–17.

<sup>12</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:68. See also *Ibid.*, 4:46.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:68.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:70.

The political implication of Defoe's discussion of the Phoenicians was that their growth and prosperity were the manifestations of God's plan and therefore were an excellent source for investigation. The business success and the increase of one nation's population were because they were 'obeying the Directions of their Maker,' 'to replenish the Earth.' The Phoenician achievements of increasing traffic, the growth of commerce and the plantations in the newly discovered places were all men's work to glorify God.<sup>15</sup> The Phoenicians' accomplishment of reaching America and other achievements fully illustrated God's admiration for the Phoenicians, even though most of these achievements were forgotten after the destructions brought about by Nebuchadnezzar II and Alexander the Great. Another aspect of God's particular providence to them was shown in their success in bringing a huge variety of 'Plants and Drugs' to other parts of the world and transmitting the 'first Improvement' of Navigation to the world. The high level of navigation and the 'Industry and Application' of 'the People of Sidon and Tyre' left these precious legacies to England.<sup>16</sup> As modern England, according to Defoe's accounts, had many similarities to these ancient peoples that God had favoured, in this sense, the English were of course blessed by God.

Although the Phoenicians were pagans, Defoe recognized and praised their achievements in navigation and trade. He called the achievement of the Phoenicians 'the first beginnings of the Art of Navigation.'<sup>17</sup> Furbank has pointed out that Defoe

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 4:77.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 4:78.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 4:60.

somehow avoided mentioning the fact that the Phoenicians were cruel pagans.<sup>18</sup> Clark points out that Defoe relied on the Book of Ezekiel for information about the Phoenicians' achievements in navigation, but Defoe avoided the criticism of the Phoenicians and God's judgment that they were doomed to perish.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, as these scholars argue, when Defoe interpreted the Old Testament, he deliberately refrained from mentioning any biblical criticism of the Phoenicians. Moreover, from his careful and comprehensive ways of reading the Bible, such as quoting the Books of Isaiah and Ezekiel many times, it can be reasonably argued that he deliberately evaded the fact that the Phoenicians were eventually punished by God.

This kind of ambiguous attitude is unique in this era. By examining the sermons of church ministers who were contemporaries of Defoe, it was evident that they held negative opinions about the Phoenicians in their sermons. In those sermons, the city of Tyre and the Phoenicians were often associated with the negative results brought by pride. For instance, in a sermon in 1698, the dissenter John Howe put Tyre and Sidon along with Sodom and Gomorrah in a group of people full of 'vile and stupifying Lusts.'<sup>20</sup> In contrast, Defoe's remark on the fall of the Phoenicians was ambivalent, even though he cited Isaiah's prophecy and Ezekiel's critique that: 'twas suppos'd, represented the strong Castle of Sidon, said by the Prophet Isaiah to be built in the

---

<sup>18</sup> P. N. Furbank, "Introduction," in *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements (1725-26)*, ed. P. N. Furbank, vol. 4, *TDH* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001), 4.

<sup>19</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 168.

<sup>20</sup> John Howe, *A Sermon Preach'd Febr. 14. 1698. And Now Publish'd, at the Request of the Societies for Reformation of Manners in London and Westminster* (London, 1698), 29–30.

midst of the Sea.’<sup>21</sup> Defoe admitted that according to the passages in the Book of Isaiah, pride was the main reason for the fall of the Phoenicians. Defoe still praised the ancient race for their remarkable achievements in navigation and trade, but he added that there was a limit for the progress of the pagan civilisation. It was regrettable that they only relied on ‘Principles of Natural Religion’ then ‘they afterwards run farther into this Sorcery and Southsaying.’ This plight was not limited to the Phoenicians only, the same situation also happened in the times of the Chaldeans (Babylonians), the Carthaginians and the Romans.<sup>22</sup>

Defoe nevertheless preferred the Phoenicians to other pagan civilisations, and always referred to the English as modern Phoenicians. There were several reasons for this preference. First of all, although the Hebrews were the chosen people, the Phoenicians also had a purpose from God to fulfill. As Furbank has argued, Defoe underlined that the Phoenicians’ ‘industriousness, rationalism and pragmatism’, ‘enabled them to exploit the resources which God had offered,’ and bought forth these merits to people elsewhere.<sup>23</sup> Even though the Phoenician civilization declined due to its pride and paganism, this waning was at the same time part of a providential plan. It was because they had been destroyed that their knowledge and inventions were able to be spread everywhere. They were ‘Instructors to the Nations wherever they came, to pursue the same Industry, and maintain themselves by Trade, which before, 'tis very

---

<sup>21</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:235.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A System of Magick* (1727), ed. Peter Elmer, vol. 7, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003), 157.

<sup>23</sup> Furbank, “Introduction,” 3.

likely, they knew little or nothing of.’<sup>24</sup> Last but not least, this preference was based on his belief that the Phoenicians were the Englishmen of that Age. Defoe believed that Phoenician refugees had brought the technology for wool and linen production to Flanders. The booming wool industry in Elizabeth’s reign was the result of French religious persecution, which saw Flemish Huguenots fleeing to England. Through such connections, Defoe established historical links between the Phoenicians and the English. Furbank observes that Defoe made ‘the Phoenicians become the founders of England's greatest glory, its wool-trade.’<sup>25</sup> What could be added is that Defoe’s praise of Elizabeth’s policy on the Huguenot refugees was partly based on his own family who were also Protestants that had fled from persecution. His praise of the Phoenicians could also be explained in this way. Finally, since one of the main reasons for the Phoenicians’ failure was their pagan beliefs modern England which was a Protestant nation, was in a better position to continue their unfinished work.

### **Arts and Sciences**

Defoe’s ideas of ancient wisdom and history can be placed into a broader context. According to Dmitri Levitin, the discussion on the cultural heritages of the ancient peoples such as the Hebrews and the Phoenicians has a long history. Moreover, this was a topic that was hotly debated by seventeenth century intellectuals. One of the

---

<sup>24</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:72. See also G. A. Starr, “Defoe and Disasters,” in *Dreadful Visitations: Confronting Natural Catastrophe in the Age of Enlightenment*, ed. Alessa Johns (New York: Routledge, 1970), 47–48.

<sup>25</sup> Furbank, “Introduction,” 4.

most important writers was Huet who has been mentioned above. Huet believed that the written characters and other scientific achievements in the early stage of human history were derived from the Hebrews. It was since then that these achievements had been passed on to the Egyptians and other civilisations.<sup>26</sup> As Levitin has pointed out, Theophilus Gale (1628-1678) was another well-known adherent of the explanation maintaining that the origin of characters used by Western civilization could be traced back to the Hebrews in the age of the Old Testament. Defoe agreed with this point, arguing that Gale's ideas were in concert with 'Reason, and the Nature of things.'<sup>27</sup> Defoe suggested that Hebrew was the most absolute and earliest language, bestowed directly by God. The Phoenicians', Egyptians' and Chaldeans' knowledge of characters and astrology was all learned from the Hebrews. Defoe concluded that 'both the Egyptians and Phoenicians had no other knowledge of Literature, but what deriv'd from this solemn Beginning' of Moses.<sup>28</sup>

This theory of the Hebrews' pioneering role in the development of sciences and arts could also be found in the writings of Raleigh whom Defoe much admired. Raleigh proposed the idea that Egyptian and Greek characters originated with the Hebrews. He argued that the Hebrews had 'delivered literature to the Aegyptians,'<sup>29</sup> and the

---

<sup>26</sup> Dmitri Levitin, "John Spencer's *De Legibus Hebraeorum* (1683–85) and 'Enlightened' Sacred History: A New Interpretation," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76, no. 1 (2013): 58.

<sup>27</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:251. See also idem, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:45; Simon Schaffer, "Defoe's Natural Philosophy and the Worlds of Credit," in *Nature Transfigured: Science and Literature 1700–1900*, ed. John R. R. Christie and Sally Shuttleworth (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989), 25–27.

<sup>28</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:80.

<sup>29</sup> Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London, 1614), 318–20.

invention was ‘no probabilitie at all’ to be made by Moses. Raleigh admitted that it was probable that Moses himself did not invent letters since it was common for the ancient historian to attribute the fame of invention to political leaders. Besides, Raleigh explained that ‘this invention was also ascribed to Moses, for the reason before remembred; that is, because the Hebrews and the Phoenicians had them first from him. For Nation gave unto those men the honour of first Inventors, from whom they received the profit.’<sup>30</sup> Defoe’s idea was close to Raleigh, and this fact demonstrated his close reading of Raleigh. Raleigh claimed that Hermes Trismegistus, the purported author of the Hermetic Corpus, was a contemporary of Moses or Moses himself, and Trismegistus’ knowledge of letters was learned from Moses. Defoe accepted this interpretation, remarking that ‘if Trismegistus us’d Letters, ’tis more than probable that he had them from Moses.’<sup>31</sup>

Furthermore, other sources used by Defoe show the breadth of what he read. For example, Defoe cited from the work of the Spanish writer Juan Luis Vives (1493-1540) that ‘Moses was the most wise Man in the World, and the Inventaer of Letters, which he deliver’d over to the Jews, from whom the Phenicians who were Neighbours to the Jews, receiv’d them, and the Grecians by Cadmus from the Phenicians.’<sup>32</sup> Defoe defended the idea that Hebrew writing was the earliest writing system and it was therefore the purest one. The material he consulted to support this claim was Louis

---

<sup>30</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 168.

<sup>31</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:253.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:251.

Moréri (1643-1680)'s *Great Historical Dictionary*.<sup>33</sup> Moreri, a French priest, believed that Cadmus, the reputed inventor of the Greek writing, acquire his knowledge of writing from Phoenicia. Defoe agreed with this judgment, and he argued that Cadmus's writings actually imitated Hebrew, but he inverted the system of writing from right to left.<sup>34</sup>

Defoe maintained that Moses was the first inventor of the letters, although he admitted that the inquiry about the origin of the alphabet must be based on a belief in the Bible, otherwise it would be difficult to establish the argument. He was aware that this enquiry on the origin of letters 'after the strictest enquiry' was 'not yet ascertained, much less agreed upon by Men of Learning.'<sup>35</sup> One of these scholars was the Scottish linguist James Hepburn (1573-1620). Hepburn admitted that letters were first used by the Hebrews, but the first man who invented them was Enoch rather than Moses. Defoe refuted the material on which Hepburn based his arguments. Defoe retorted that the evidence the writer relied on, *Henochi literas*, was controversial and should not be trusted. Hepburn and some other writers assumed that letters had existed before the Flood. Defoe answered that, if these materials had existed, there should have been tablets with written letters on the ark, but nothing relevant could neither be found there

---

<sup>33</sup> Moréri's *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique* was first published in Lyon in 1674, and the first English version was published in 1694. The *Dictionary* contained a mixture of historical and geographical information, Pierre Bayle regarded his *The Historical and Critical Dictionary* (1697) as a correction of Moréri's work. See Mara van der Lugt, *Bayle, Jurieu, and the Dictionnaire Historique Et Critique* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 16.

<sup>34</sup> 'Cadmuis' in Louis Moréri, *The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary*, trans. Jeremy Collier (London, 1701).

<sup>35</sup> Defoe, *A System of Magick*, 7:119.

nor recorded in the Scripture.<sup>36</sup> Enoch's prophecy was passed down after the flood, not by words, but by oral tradition, common to ancient times.<sup>37</sup> Similarly, Defoe spent much ink trying to rebut the Danish scholar Thomas Bangius's account of Hebrew history, denying Bangius's claim that Noah invented writing.<sup>38</sup> He also refuted French ecclesiastical historian Louis Ellies Du Pin who argued that according to existing records there was a writing system before Moses.<sup>39</sup> The famous ancient historian Josephus also wrote that there were antediluvian columns with inscriptions that had survived the Deluge. Defoe likewise denied this argument, writing that Josephus's 'Credit, I must always premise, goes but a very little way with me.'<sup>40</sup>

Based on the discussion in the previous paragraphs, it is evident that letters were one focus of Defoe's historical works. This is because he believed that the origin and transmission of letters were filled with God's blessing and messages. He emphasised that the origin of writing was the two tablets that Moses received at Mount Sinai: this was the origin of humanity's writing system. Part of the reason for Defoe's stressing

---

<sup>36</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:255.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:256.

<sup>38</sup> Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 135. The title of Bangius's work is *Caelum Orientis et Prisei Mundi* (1657).

<sup>39</sup> Louis Ellies Du Pin, *A Compleat History of the Canon and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Testament: by Way of Dissertation with Useful Remarks on That Subject* (London, 1699), 133.

<sup>40</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:170. In some cases Defoe seemed to misread or was confused by Josephus. The Jewish historian argued that there were written records before Moses, but Defoe suggested that 'we find no certain Notice, even in Josephus or any other Author.' Mark Goldie, "The Damning of King Monmouth: Pulpit Toryism in the Reign of James II," in *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-1691 and Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*, ed. Tim Harris and Stephen Taylor (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), 33–55. Another instance of misquoting Josephus happened in Daniel Defoe, *An Essay on the History and Reality of Apparitions* (1727), ed. G. A. Starr, vol. 8, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2005), 268, which Defoe added some his own words to Josephus' credit.

of Moses's importance was that he aimed to rebut the deist John Toland, since Toland attributed the origin of letters to the Egyptian or the Phoenicians.<sup>41</sup>

In his study, John Reed has highlighted Defoe's condemnation of the Deists' praise of the pagan civilisations in his historical works, and Reed pointed out that Defoe's discussion of ancient characters was partly aimed at Toland. However, some issues need to be addressed here. Firstly, the work Reed centred on was *A Vindication of the Press*, however most Defoe scholars do not regard the pamphlet as Defoe's own work. Secondly, Reed argued that Defoe had linked Hebrew letters and their legitimacy with England, claiming that Defoe justified 'alphabetic history by linking writing, sanctity, and the English nation.'<sup>42</sup> However, this argument only appeared in *A Vindication of the Press*, and there was no mentioning of this connection in other works by Defoe. Even though Defoe wrote that 'in England, where the Art of Writing is carried to the highest Perfection of any Part of the Globe,' he did not use this instance to advocate England's sanctity, as Reed has claimed. Defoe here was stressing that the art of writing matured in England, where many styles such as 'Italian, Round, and Running-Hand' had developed.<sup>43</sup> There was no relation of this to the providential plan of the English here. Therefore, Reed's argument that Defoe intended 'the English ... [to be able to] claim the origins of writing as their national heritage' cannot be established.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Joel Reed, "Nationalism and Geoculture in Defoe's History of Writing," *Modern Language Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (1995): 31.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>43</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:296. See also Aileen Douglas, *Work in Hand: Script, Print, and Writing, 1690-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 43–74.

<sup>44</sup> Reed, "Nationalism and Geoculture in Defoe's History of Writing," 44.

Finally, Defoe praised the scholars for their excellent handwriting, but the key point of the passage was to make a mockery of the poor writing skills of English common people. He was amazed at the fact that ‘none of them [common people] that I have met with, spell their Words so ill, or are, in general, so Ignorant in the Orthography of their Speech as the English.’<sup>45</sup> Even though Defoe attributed the origin of letters to the Hebrews, he did not regard this aspect of civilisation as more crucial than the Phoenicians’ achievement in commerce. In his reasoning, the latter enjoyed more of God’s blessings, therefore Defoe would place the English closer to the Phoenicians. The excellency and legitimacy of England were more to do with their commercial accomplishments (the Phoenician heritage) rather than English handwriting (the Hebrew heritage).

The Phoenicians achieved much in science, even though they were eventually conquered and destroyed. The historical role Defoe attributed to them was an intermediary one. He lavished great praise on the Phoenicians’ achievements in arts and sciences, however he did not consider them inventors of these. On the contrary, he followed or shared Walter Raleigh’s idea that according to ‘Eupolemus and Artapanus,’ it was ‘Moses found out Letters and taught the use of them to the Jewes; of whom the Phoenicians their Neighbours received them; and the Greekes of the Phoenicians by Cadmus.’<sup>46</sup> Defoe further argued that the knowledge of letters of all races was from

---

<sup>45</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:299.

<sup>46</sup> Raleigh, *The History of the World*, 319. See also Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:77–80; Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 168–69; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714*, 87–120.

Moses, therefore it was ‘Hebrew original.’<sup>47</sup> In other words, the Phoenicians’ knowledge of letters originated from the Hebrews. They were, at best, improvers, not inventors.

Defoe agreed on the Hebrew heritage with his fellow dissenter Theophilus Gale. Gale pointed out that ‘ancient pagan learning and literature was derived from, and at best, a misunderstanding, at worst a diabolical perversion of the Hebrew traditions preserved in the Old Testament.’<sup>48</sup> Gale was influenced by another writer Samuel Bochart (1599-1667), and Defoe expressed his admiration of both men in his books. Gale and Bochart agreed that the first people upon whom God had bestowed letters and writing was the Hebrews, and Defoe added that the exact improvement advanced by the Phoenicians was transforming letters into alphabets and making them known to the world.<sup>49</sup> Defoe also agreed with Gale that the letters of the Hebrews had a ‘heavenly and original Purity.’<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, Defoe disagreed with Gale’s idea that the Hebrews had invented all the important arts and sciences. Gale believed that ‘prelapsarian wisdom, a divine product of the Creation, was preserved in some form among the Jews after the Fall, and that all subsequent learning was indebted to this Jewish learning and, by extension, its divine original.’<sup>51</sup> Defoe, on the other hand,

---

<sup>47</sup> Defoe, *An Essay upon Literature*, 4:253.

<sup>48</sup> Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*, 167.

<sup>49</sup> Furbank, “Introduction,” 2. However, in a note in *The Political History of the Devil* Defoe wrote that Bochart believed the existence of letters in the time of Noah. See Defoe, *The Political History of the Devil*, 6:135. I am not able find corresponding evidence in Bochart’s *Geographia Sacra*. Bochart was the teacher of Pierre Daniel Huet.

<sup>50</sup> Clark, *Daniel Defoe*, 169.

<sup>51</sup> Stephen J. Pigney, “Theophilus Gale and Historiography of Philosophy,” in *Insiders and Outsiders in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, ed. Tom Sorell, Graham Alan John Rogers, and Jill Kraye (London: Routledge, 2010), 78.

only attributed the first usage of letters to the Hebrews, and he credited other arts and sciences to other races. As mentioned above, Defoe credited the invention of navigation and trade to the Phoenicians.

### **Providence in History: England as the Chosen Nation**

Defoe believed that the wheels of human history were moved with God's plans and will. Since he did not express his ideas on this providential plan directly, we have to discuss some cases in order to get a clearer picture of this historical view. For instance, during the long war against France in the first decade of the eighteenth century, the English army lifted the siege of Brussels in 1708, and this rescue was successful because there was a late winter that year. Defoe explained the advantage of the weather as 'Immediate Hand of Heaven concurring to assist in this Siege.'<sup>52</sup> In another example, in 1706 when the attempts of the English military action were impeded by harsh weather, Defoe likewise warned that this 'early Check given by the immediate Hand of Heaven to the most reasonable and best concerted Expedition' was God's warning to the English. Englishmen must have done something disrespecting to God, therefore Defoe appealed to the readers that they should repent, and get 'on their Knees fast and pray.'<sup>53</sup> Moreover, Defoe used the unusual weather to compare contemporary politicians to biblical figures, strengthening their political legitimacy. John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough, the general-in-chief in the war against the French during 1700s, was blessed on the battlefield as Joshua was in the Old Testament,

---

<sup>52</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 5:465. See also *Ibid.*, 3:571.

<sup>53</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:542.

therefore Providence caused ‘the Sun to stand still’ to assist Marlborough’s military campaign. Defoe argued that there were numerous instances illustrating that ‘great many more Circumstances, in which Providence has concurr'd for’ the triumph of Duke of Marlborough.<sup>54</sup>

Manuel Schonhorn has noticed that in Defoe’s earliest work on history, he had transcribed histories written by Richard Knolles, Plutarch and other historians. Schonhorn points out that Defoe paid particular attention to the anecdotes of how ancient monarchs like Selymus and Iphicates punished reckless soldiers. Based on this finding, Schonhorn argued that Defoe showed ‘a fascination with the right relations between commanders and the rank-and-file.’<sup>55</sup> Aside from the historians Schonhorn has identified, Defoe’s lists of well-known ancient rulers could be found in Francis Bacon’s essay ‘Of Empire’ which was probably Defoe’s source of reference.<sup>56</sup> Schonhorn supposed that Defoe praised Selymus’s punishment of soldiers for maintaining the military hierarchy, but Defoe’s disgust with the violence of these monarchs was evident in his writings.<sup>57</sup> However, many competent military leaders such as Timur, Nero, Julian the Apostate, Diocletian and Selymus were in fact described by Defoe as being struck by God, losing their lives unnaturally. This was in contrary to Schonhorn’s premise of Defoe’s admiration of excellent military leaders. In fact, Defoe’s admiration was mostly reserved for Protestant generals and kings. So

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 5:465, see also 4:617, 3:397.

<sup>55</sup> Schonhorn, *Defoe’s Politics*, 16.

<sup>56</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:656. Bacon also relied on Knolles’ writings as sources. See Bacon, *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon*, 757–59.

<sup>57</sup> Schonhorn, *Defoe’s Politics*, 16.

Defoe called Selymus the ‘most furious Emperor of the Turks, who having sworn to turn their Arms against the Christian World.’<sup>58</sup> From these descriptions, it is clear that Defoe did not approve of it unconditionally.

Examples of divine intervention such as the sudden deaths of kings were not limited to ancient times. For example, Defoe believed that the death of Queen Mary I of England was the result of her brutal persecution of the Protestants and God had consequently prevented her from dying a natural death. This explanation of providence also applied to King Louis XIV of France who was always criticised by Defoe for the ambition of universal monarchy. Another reason why Defoe referred to the unnatural deaths of the ancient emperors in his work was to censure Louis XIV's policy. Louis XIV's son and grandson both died before him, so Defoe used this as a reference to say that God has done this by ‘his own Hand’ to punish the injustice of the French Catholic regime.<sup>59</sup>

Craig Rose has pointed out that in late seventeenth-century England people tended to believe that God would directly intervene in the affairs of humankind. There were many sermons, for example, which conveyed worries that the indecency of the English people would provoke God to make the English army sick and weak.<sup>60</sup> Defoe's work should also be surveyed in this context. He explained, for example, that the attack of 1706 had been perfect, but that the wind had changed because of God's displeasure with England, and the military campaign had to be suspended. He also

---

<sup>58</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:656. See also idem, *The Compleat English Gentleman*, 10:168.

<sup>59</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:659.

<sup>60</sup> Craig Rose, “Providence, Protestant Union and Godly Reformation in the 1690s,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, no. 3 (1993): 165.

believed that sometimes people could influence God's decisions by fasting and through mortification. Therefore, Defoe argued that if French people went to Church, 'fasted and prayed on their Knees,' and the English, by contrast, erected Play-houses, and swore and insulted Heaven; it was not surprising that France's victory would result.<sup>61</sup> From the victories and losses in human history, God's will behind it could be worked out eventually. Defoe concluded: 'the Almighty Power, which is the God of Battles, is the only Giver of Victory, is the Agent in all Actions of such Moment.'<sup>62</sup>

From Defoe's interest in Henry VII we can also see his understanding of how God manifested himself in the rise of England in history. Defoe's account of the reign of Henry VII was largely based on John Speed's *The History of Great Britain* (1611), and Francis Bacon's *the History of the Reign of King Henry VII*.<sup>63</sup> Peter Heylyn's *Mikrokosmos* was another source of Defoe's knowledge of the history of the rise of English wool manufacturing. Defoe agreed with Heylyn's remark that 'From England Wooll: All Lands, as God distributes.' In other words, wool and its associated manufactures were signs of God's particular fondness for England. The difference between the two writers was that Heylyn argued that the key figure to establish the

---

<sup>61</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:542. For same proposal on fast, see *Ibid.*, 4:623.

<sup>62</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:571. See also *idem*, *Serious Reflections*, 3:219.

<sup>63</sup> John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine under the Conquests of Ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans. Their Originals, Manners, Warres, Coines & Seales: With Ye Successions, Lives, Acts & Issues of the English Monarchs from Julius Cæsar, to Our Most Gracious Soueraigne King James* (London, 1631); Francis Bacon, *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII and Selected Works*, ed. Brian Vickers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Defoe transcribed Speed's work in his early anecdotes of historical works. See Furbank and Owens, *A Critical Bibliography of Daniel Defoe*, 264.

English wool manufacture industry was Edward III, however according to Defoe, this pioneer was actually Henry VII.<sup>64</sup>

What was Henry VII's extraordinary achievement in the wool industry that was praised by Defoe? Defoe continually emphasised that it was from the era of Henry VII that England's epoch-making breakthrough began to emerge. In other words, the King's achievement was that he began the prohibition of the export of raw wool and the development of domestic wool manufacturing. Defoe's source of information about King Henry may again be Francis Bacon's *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII*. Like Bacon, Defoe stressed King Henry's determination to develop English national industry. The treaty between England and the Flemish, Bacon praised, let 'that idleness be avoided, and the draining out of our treasure for foreign manufactures stopped.'<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, Bacon wrote 'the better to keep treasure within the realm, for that gold was the metal that lay in least room.'<sup>66</sup> This argument again could be easily recognised in Defoe's remarks on Henry VII.

As mentioned above, in Defoe's interpretation, divine providence appeared in all aspects of the history of humankind. The English wool industry in his interpretation was full of religious implications. He interpreted the wealth created by English wool or other resources as blessings from God.<sup>67</sup> If the English did not cherish and fully utilise the gifts given by God, it would undoubtedly amount to contempt of God.

---

<sup>64</sup> Peter Heylyn, *Mikrokosmos. A Little Description of the Great World*, 4th edn. (Oxford, 1625), 464.

<sup>65</sup> Bacon, *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII and Selected Works*, 54.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>67</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A General History of Trade* (August) (London, 1713), 3:7.

Therefore it was praiseworthy of Henry VII to open his subjects' eyes.<sup>68</sup> To reinforce the importance of such claims, Defoe extended the length of the history of English wool. It was at this point that he linked the praise of the Phoenicians with the times of the Tudors. Defoe's reverence for Phoenician history, as we discussed earlier, became relevant at this moment. Defoe argued, the Phoenicians came to England to get their wool back in the days when they explored the seas to develop trade. He argued that the excellence of English wool could be proven from the history that the Phoenicians in the past had come here to bring it home. Moreover, in a later era, when the Romans controlled England, they exported high-quality English wool to Flanders.<sup>69</sup>

According to Defoe's narrative, the Flemish sourced raw wool from England. Moreover, it was thanks to English wool that Flemish woollen products dominated the Continent before the rise of competing English goods. The English had the best raw materials, and what they lacked was a valuable manufactured good. That was what Henry VII accomplished. As Defoe believed that 'every Nation has its peculiar Blessing, as the exclusive Gift of Heaven to itself, given it to enable the Inhabitants to bear their Part in Universal Commerce.'<sup>70</sup> And 'the Wisdom of Providence has lodg'd them in the World ; in what particular Climates, Provinces and Parts; how distant, how divided from one another and why so divided.'<sup>71</sup> Even though the English in the past did not make best use of their wool, its high quality was obvious judging from the fact

---

<sup>68</sup> Defoe, *PEC*, 7:204.

<sup>69</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:137.

<sup>70</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 9:217. See also idem, *An Essay upon Publick Credit*, 6:52; William Deringer, "'It Was Their Business to Know': British Merchants and Mercantile Epistemology in the Eighteenth Century," *History of Political Economy* 49, no. 2 (2017): 187–88.

<sup>71</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Trade* (June), 1:9.

that Flanders had been the most successful area of woollen manufacture in the world for such a long period. If the blessed resource was not cherished, it would amount to contempt of God. Scotland's poverty was an alarming instance of this: the rich fisheries were a gift from Heaven, however Scottish people did not make good use of them. Defoe criticised this waste as 'threw[ing] this Blessing out of their Hands.'<sup>72</sup>

Defoe regarded King William and Queen Mary as instruments of God because they were 'fighting against Idolatry and Oppression in the World, and deposing Tyranny at Home;' the Glorious Revolution was an example of the 'usual Method of Providence in the Government of the World.'<sup>73</sup> Moreover, 'God and the Prince of Orange, the one as Author, the other as Instrument, help'd us out; and I say without flattery, No Man can have a sense of the Goodness of the First, and have no Gratitude for the Good-will of.'<sup>74</sup> For another instance, Defoe praised King William as 'a Governing Providence in the World,' and he was God's instrument 'to pass for us all the Wonders of the last Age.'<sup>75</sup>

When Defoe recalled the final days of the reign of James II, he often portrayed the dissenters as the courageous Englishmen who helped their former prosecutors fight against James. At this moment the 'Church of England and Dissenter, at such a time as that; they joyn'd heartily as one General Body of Protestants United in Interests,

---

<sup>72</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Trade* (August), 3:36.

<sup>73</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:616. Cf. Matthew Adams, "Daniel Defoe and the Blooding of Britain. Genealogy, Gender and the Making of a National Public," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 27, no. 1 (2004): 4–5.

<sup>74</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The Danger of the Protestant Religion Consider'd, from the Present Prospect of a Religious War in Europe* (London, 1701), 8. See also idem, *Review*, 4:589.

<sup>75</sup> Defoe, *A Commendatory Sermon Preach'd November the 4th, 1709. Being the Birth-Day of King William, Of Glorious Memory*, 3.

United in Doctrine, however differing in Opinions and Circumstances; and Capitulating for their Liberty only, they universally joyn'd in Blessed Revolution of this Island.'<sup>76</sup> Defoe's recounting of this episode in the very recent English history had a two-fold meaning. First, he aimed to use it as a vision of Protestants living with each other in harmony in the future. Especially after the revolution of 1688, the polemic between the Dissenters and the Anglicans resumed, and the oppressive measures against the Dissenters became harsher. The second meaning was Defoe's disgust with the high-churchmen. Defoe stated that James II's dethronement was part of a providential plan, and most of the high-churchmen were in support of the Williamite camp during the revolution of 1688. Therefore, Defoe was disgusted with the fact that some High-Tories expressed their support of the Jacobites and chose the stance of non-resistance soon after the revolution. Defoe aimed to remind those who were ready to welcome the Jacobites that the succession of William and Mary was a sign of God's blessing. The High-Tories disobeyed God's will when they kept insulting the heritage of the Glorious Revolution. After this discussion of Defoe's view that God's will was revealed in human history, the next section will focus on few specific cases to examine Defoe's religious ideas in his historical writings.

### **Defoe's Critique of Popery**

Among the religious aspects of Defoe's historical works, one of the topics he focused on in particular was the transformation of Christianity from a persecuted faith

---

<sup>76</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 38.

into the state religion of the Roman Empire, and the rise of the papacy in the following centuries. As mentioned above, Defoe had his own interpretation of the divine will behind historical events. When Defoe wrote about the rise of Christianity, he noticed that the political leaders who persecuted Christians often died in the prime years of their lives. Defoe here mentioned two particular political leaders, Tamerlane and Solyman, who persecuted Christians.<sup>77</sup> It was not common for seventeenth and eighteenth century writers to put these two rulers together. Even though Defoe did not cite any book in his article, it seems that the two emperors only appeared together in Bacon's essay 'On Empire,' and Richard Knolles's *The Generall Historie of the Turkes*, which was the source on which Bacon's works were based. Since Defoe did not provide the citation in the article, and both Bacon and Knolles had been cited by Defoe, it can be argued that Defoe's view was based on the account from at least one of the two writers.<sup>78</sup>

Furthermore, Defoe also offered the examples of two other Christian-persecuting rulers who died at a young age, the Byzantine emperor Julian the Apostate, and Selymus.<sup>79</sup> The two emperors were not recorded in Knolles's book in this case, and it is more likely that Defoe quoted the two leaders from Bacon's essay. In the same vein, 'Nero, Domitian, Maximin, Dioclesian [sic],' the names on Bacon's list, also appeared

---

<sup>77</sup> For instance, Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:28. Tamerlane, or Timur Beg (1336-1404), Sultan of Samarkand. Solyman or Suleiman I (1494-1566), Sultan of the Ottoman empire from 1520.

<sup>78</sup> For Defoe's citation of Knolles's *Turkish History*, see Defoe, *Review*, 8:435; idem, *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press* (1704), ed. P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens, vol. 8, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 157.

<sup>79</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:656. Selymus or Selim I (1467-1520), Sultan of Turkey, defeated the Mamelukes and incorporated Egypt as a province of the Ottoman Empire.

in Defoe's essay. Therefore, it is more likely that Defoe based his argument on the material drawn from Bacon's essay. Nevertheless, Defoe did not merely repeat Bacon's argument. The theme of Bacon's essay was to consider the reasons behind the decline and the revolts during the reigns of the emperors. In contrast, Defoe's focus was on the reason behind God's punishment of these tyrants' suffering unnatural deaths. He summarised from numerous historical accounts apart from Bacon's, pointing out that the fundamental reason for it was that they had obstructed God's will of the development of Christianity. Regardless of historical accuracy, Defoe ascribed Constantius's short reign (305-306) to his persecution of Christians. In the same vein, Julian the Apostate's unnatural death, according to Defoe, was caused by his efforts to restore the pagan religion and to reverse his uncle Constantine's policy.<sup>80</sup>

Defoe relied on a variety of materials and books when he discussed Roman history, citing the works of Thomas Fuller and Peter Heylyn. According to Justin Champion, the two writers were critics of John Wycliffe.<sup>81</sup> Heylyn was a prominent apologist of William Laud and chief writer to 'weaken Foxe's *Books of Martyrs*' influence.'<sup>82</sup> Defoe frequently accused High-Churchmen of being closet papists and implied that the Roman Catholic Church had secret ties with the Devil.<sup>83</sup> Although

---

<sup>80</sup> Daniel Defoe, *The New Family Instructor* (1727), ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 3, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 75. Defoe was interested in the case of Julian the Apostate, see idem, *Jure Divino*, 2:90; idem, *An Essay on the History and Reality of Apparitions*, 8:71.

<sup>81</sup> J. A. I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 73.

<sup>82</sup> Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation: the second edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 41. See Robert Mayer, "The Rhetoric of Historical Truth: Heylyn Contra Fuller on The Church-History of Britain," *Prose Studies* 20, no. 3 (1997): 1-20.

<sup>83</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 2:695, 723, 6:733; idem, *The Political History of the Devil*, 160-62.

He agreed with Foxe's assigning of Wycliffe and Hus to the line of reformers who had challenged the Roman Church, he still could take advantage of the useful material in the works of Fuller and Heylyn. Another important source of Defoe's knowledge of history of the Roman Empire was the writings of Samuel Pufendorf. For instance, when Defoe discussed the reason of the decline of the empire, he attributed this to the fact that it was built on conquest:

Puffendorf [sic] in his Introduction to the History of Europe, argues very well, that the Constitution of the Roman Empire being settled, after it became a Monarchy, upon the precarious Will of the Souldiery, could not be of any long continuance, but prepar'd the Way for its own Ruin.

and Defoe continued:

The Romans lost by Conquest, nothing but what they first gain'd by Conquest, and the Sword took from them nothing but what they had taken by the Sword from the Innocent and rightful Possessors.<sup>84</sup>

Defoe's judgment was based on the explanation of Pufendorf, even though Pufendorf was mainly discussing the consequence arising from conquest, such as the often turbulent way in which the imperial title was passed on from one emperor to the next, rather than conquest per se. The German jurist who wrote that 'this Monarchy being founded upon the Souldiery, ... [there] came nothing but Misery and Confusion in the Roman Empire, the Life of each Emperor depending on the Will of the covetous and unruly Souldiers.'<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:260, 262. See also Thomas Ahnert, "Historicizing Heresy in the Early German Enlightenment: 'Orthodox' and 'Enthusiast' Variants," in *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Ian Hunter, John Christian Laursen, and Cary J. Nederman (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 131–32.

<sup>85</sup> Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, 25.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, when Defoe discussed the history of the Hebrews over the ages in the Old Testament, he was at the same time competing for the discursive power against the High-Church writers. The history of the Roman Empire was another battlefield for the historical interpretations between Defoe and the High-Church supporters such as Leslie and Luke Milbourne (1649-1720). Milbourne was Rector of Osmandiston in Norfolk until 1702, and from 1704 of St Ethelburga in Bishopsgate, London, a fiery High-Church preacher who was famous for his sermons in memory of Charles I and his support of Henry Sacheverell.<sup>86</sup>

When they discussed whether the primitive Christians should obey the orders of the Roman officials who persecuted them, Milbourne argued that according to historical accounts, these Christians obeyed the magistrates unquestioningly: that was the way it should be, because in the history of Rome, everyone was unconditionally obeying the order of their superior. But Defoe could easily find opposite cases in Roman history. Many of the emperors who later came to the throne were the ones who rose to power as insurgents. This proved that political leaders recorded in history were by no means inviolable. Defoe added that ‘those very Roman Emperors deriv’d their Dominion and Authority from ... [the] Resistance of the preceding Emperor, who they violently depos’d.’<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, Defoe responded to Milbourne that according to the teaching of St. Paul he would also recognise the legitimacy of those who ‘had formerly resisted and depos’d preceding Emperors.’<sup>88</sup> Defoe pointed out that it was

---

<sup>86</sup> J. A. W. Gunn, *Beyond Liberty and Property* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983), 142.

<sup>87</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:714. See also *Ibid.*, 6:89.

<sup>88</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:715.

completely legitimate for the primitive Christians to refuse unconditional submission and rebel against leaders who ruled without legitimacy.

Aside from different interpretations of Roman history, it was not surprising that Defoe was distinct from Milbourne in his interpretation of the Bible. Defoe argued that ‘if the tyrants infringed the right of people, even some of the Apostles themselves, who, we all allow to be equally inspir’d with the Spirit of God, as St. Paul, or at least to be inspir’d with the same Spirit, did thus recognize the Resistance of Princes.’<sup>89</sup> In the *Book of Romans* 13:1–2 Paul wrote: ‘Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.’ Defoe agreed with Paul, arguing that there was no one who could defy ‘the invincible Agency of Sovereign Grace.’<sup>90</sup> As mentioned above, the destruction of the Phoenician civilisation was a manifestation of divine grace, because it allowed their achievements in arts and sciences to be spread to the world. Similarly, Defoe also argued that since the world is dominated by God, the religious persecutions, whether in Roman times or in the time after the Civil War like the persecution of the Covenanters in Scotland, were ‘sad and astonishing Providence.’ He believed that those who sacrificed for their belief would be rewarded, and he added that the martyrs in the early church or the Covenanter in near past were ‘strengthened and fill’d with so much Grace and Glory to bear Testimony to His Name’ and received ‘the Confirmation of ... His Salvation.’<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

<sup>90</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:170.

<sup>91</sup> Defoe, *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, 6:217.

Defoe concluded that ‘the Divine Wisdom which has always thought fit to exercise his Church with Tribulation and Affliction.’<sup>92</sup> God would not ‘force the Man upon sinning’ of the offense against political leaders. However, the people would be forced to rise against the oppression of a tyrant. Paul’s message did not forbid people from challenging oppression under any circumstance, and he did not equate resistance to crime. Defoe stressed this kind of reading was ‘contrary to the Nature of God, and Meaning of all Religion.’<sup>93</sup> Relying on John Foxe’s books on the martyrs, Defoe paid respect to those martyrs in ancient Rome, praising people who were willing to sacrifice their lives rather than compromise their beliefs. These pious believers were ‘suffering the greatest Evils rather than committing the least Sin.’ God will be pleased with these acts, regarding them as ‘acceptable Sacrifice’ and ‘reasonable Service.’<sup>94</sup> Defoe admired those martyrs who

dyed in a Righteous Cause, not as they dyed for refusing to pray for the King; but as they chose to dye rather than to violate their Obedience to the Sovereignty of Conscience, which is a Principle every Christian ought to adhere to.<sup>95</sup>

Furthermore, Defoe’s reflection on Roman history was closely related to England’s situation at the time. Paul’s teachings on obeying magistrates applied to most regular situations. However, it was not against justice to resist authority in times of necessity. In Defoe’s personal experience, the revolution of 1688 was undoubtedly

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 6:161.

<sup>93</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:170. On the political use of the Bible in the second half of seventeenth century England, see Mark Goldie, “The Damning of King Monmouth: Pulpit Toryism in the Reign of James II,” in *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-1691 and Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*, ed. Tim Harris and Stephen Taylor (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), 33–55.

<sup>94</sup> Defoe, *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, 6:216.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 6:215.

justified and divine, even though Christians had to endure tyrant kings to a certain extent, because ‘it was lawful for the Christians to submit to Martyrdom, and patiently to suffer.’<sup>96</sup> Nevertheless, as Defoe’s interpretation of God’s love for the world suggests, human endurance of suffering was limited. If the king went too far, then ‘when the Deposer of a Tyrant was set up by the People, the Christians recogniz’d the Resistance of the Former, by yielding equal Obedience to the Latter.’<sup>97</sup> Although Defoe did not emphasise the subversion of the people, he said that once a monarch abused his power too far and was replaced by a more just leader, then the Christian subjects should accept the replacement: ‘when the Deposer of a Tyrant was set up by the People, the Christians recogniz’d the Resistance of the Former, by yielding equal Obedience to the Latter.’<sup>98</sup> It was obvious that Defoe was referring to the English revolution in 1688. Defoe could always find reasons to defend William III’s taking over of the throne, suggesting the development was in accordance with God’s promise. He argued that the day William landed in England was the anniversary of the failure of the Gun-Powder plot. This day ‘that God has hallow’d or set apart to be praised in, for that unvalued Blessing of King William’s Life.....as he is of a Governing Providence in the World.’<sup>99</sup> Furthermore, the year 1688 marked the centenary of the defeat of the Spanish Armada. All these ‘concurring Circumstances’ led Defoe to argue

---

<sup>96</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 6:714.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:715.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>99</sup> Defoe, *A Commendatory Sermon Preach’d November the 4th, 1709*, 2–3.

for the direct intervention of Providence throughout the course of the history of England.<sup>100</sup>

Apart from the history of the persecution of Christians, the rise of the papacy was another subject of interest to Defoe. He cited and agreed with the remarks of the dissenting minister David Clarkson (1622-1686) that the original meaning of bishop was akin to parish minister in the eighteenth century. The present system of bishops had been distorted, and it was far from its original purpose at the time of Christ. A bishop should not be a magistrate or even a nobleman, but a parish minister. Defoe argued that this distortion of the purpose of bishops began after the third century AD. He cited Clarkson and Lauder saying ‘the first Episcopal Church in the World was a Presbyterian Church.’<sup>101</sup> That is to say, the clergymen at those times were not leaders like present bishops, and the actual leader of a church was the presbytery, namely the elders of the church. ‘The Church of Rome was once a true Christian Church,’ but it was untrue to assume it was the highest Church above others.<sup>102</sup> Reflecting on this degeneration, Defoe traced the beginning of papacy to the legalisation of Christianity by Constantine.

Although Constantine's legalisation of Christianity was good news for the Christians, this legalisation paradoxically also gave ‘such a Loose to their Pride [as Priests].’<sup>103</sup> It has been mentioned above that Defoe’s explanation for the decline of Rome was based on Pufendorf’s statement, but his judgment of legalising Christianity

---

<sup>100</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:405.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:810, see also 5:421.

<sup>102</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:108.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:73.

in Constantine's reign was different from that of Pufendorf. Pufendorf believed that the emperor legalised Christianity because Christians were already too strong at the time, so Constantine chose to work with them due to political considerations. This legalisation was not based on religious beliefs, but on rational political judgment. Defoe, on the other hand, said of Constantine that he was 'a wonderful Prince for his Zeal, and sincere Affection to the Christian Religion.'<sup>104</sup> Although Defoe believed that the emperor had changed his policies towards Christianity out of piety, such policy had caused the clergy to acquire excessive powers. Defoe's explanation was the standard Protestant narrative of the second half of the seventeenth century,<sup>105</sup> and this kind of account argued that the establishment of bishops and popes led to the degeneration of the Christians from primitive piety to support for the papacy. The emperor gave too much power to the Church out of his devotion, and this measure instead contributed to the rise of the later papacy, resulting in the division of sects and ensuing contentions. Worse still, the resulting confusion between religious and secular matters made the extent of Popes' abuses of power even more serious.

Defoe's antipathy to the Pope was a sentiment shared by many Whig writers at the time. The attack on Popery also extended to the House of Stuarts. Defoe described the persecution of the Presbyterians in the Restoration as a continuation of 'the first

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> W. R. Owens, 'Introduction,' in *The New Family Instructor (1727)*, ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 3, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006), 11. See also James R. Jacob, *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 72-73; Mark Goldie, "Civil Religion and the English Enlightenment," in *Politics, Politeness and Patriotism*, ed. Gordon J. Schochet, Patricia E. Tatspaugh, and Carol Brobeck (Washington, DC: Folger Institute, 1993), 38-39.

Ten Persecutions' of the Primitive Church.<sup>106</sup> According to Mark Goldie the persecution of the dissenting Protestants in the England in the 1680s was one of the cruellest persecutions of Protestants in history, and there were numerous pamphlets raging against priestcraft.<sup>107</sup> Priestcraft was a common target for Whig writers, and Defoe was one of them. The Convocations of Canterbury and York were symbolic of the ecclesiastical authority of the Church of England. Thus, Defoe argued that these institutions should be closed, their power should be entirely restored to the 'Queen's Authority,' and the encroachment of the power of the Ecclesiastical on that of the Civil Magistrate had to end.'<sup>108</sup> Based on the accounts of the Whig writer Henry Care, Defoe enumerated Papists' intimacy with 'Wizards, Conjurers, Murtherers, Rebels, Traitors.' Even Nero or Domitian of 'Heathen Rome,' could not ever match their infamy.<sup>109</sup> This sort of argument was quite common in the Protestant writings of the time. Even the Anglican minister William Cave, who supported the oppression of the Dissenters and advocated Anglican orthodoxy, also denounced the papists in this manner.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:603. The term 'ten persecutions' were likely borrowed from John Foxe's influential Protestant martyrology, *Acts and Monuments of Matters Happening in the Church* (first published in Latin in 1554 and in English in 1563), popularly known as *Book of Martyrs*. Foxe opens this work with an account of 'the ten first Persecutions in the Primitive Church.' See also Defoe, *A New Family Instructor*, 71 note 43.

<sup>107</sup> Mark Goldie, "Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism," in *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 213.

<sup>108</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:340.

<sup>109</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:121.

<sup>110</sup> Cave had published several works on church history in the 1670s and 1680s. He was chaplain to Charles II and in 1684 was installed as canon of Windsor. See Thomas Ahnert, *Religion and the Origins of the German Enlightenment: Faith and the Reform of Learning in the Thought of Christian Thomasius* (New York: University of Rochester Press, 2006), 64–65.

In his discussion of Roman history, Defoe relied heavily on Pufendorf's works,<sup>111</sup> but on the topic of the Papacy Defoe did not cite the German jurist's opinion, even though their views were primarily the same. They both held that there was no reasonable proof that the Bishop of Rome was superior to other bishops and clergymen. Besides, Pufendorf argued that the purpose of the system of Popery was utterly artificial, and there was nothing divine at all. He added that there was 'no footsteps of a Divine Institution to be met withal....nor can any reason be alledged [sic], why the Bishop of Rome' possessed 'the first Rank.'<sup>112</sup> Defoe had a similar view. This system was gradually developed over the centuries after Christ ascended to heaven. This invention was 'corrupted with Traditions, Innovations, and humane Inventions,' and it gradually 'degenerated into a Mass of Error and Superstition.'<sup>113</sup> Defoe also agreed with Pufendorf that the primacy of Peter, the most frequent justification of the Pope's legitimacy, was merely a rationalisation.<sup>114</sup> Defoe attributed the cause of the invented Papal authority to the secret agreement between Phocas (547–610) and Gregory I (c. 540–604) and Boniface III. Gregory I was elected Pope in 590. He strongly objected to the use of the title 'Oecumenical Patriarch' by the Bishop of Constantinople, because it challenged the Pope's unique supremacy, but the Emperor Maurice rebuked him for this. Phocas became Emperor following a military insurrection and the murder of the Emperor Maurice in 602. Even though Phocas granted Gregory the title of 'Universal

---

<sup>111</sup> Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:94, 104, 260.

<sup>112</sup> Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, 441.

<sup>113</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Continuation of Letters Written by a Turkish Spy at Paris* (1718), ed. David Blewett, vol. 5, *SFS* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2005), 121.

<sup>114</sup> Pufendorf, *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe*, 440.

Bishop,' he did not stop the Patriarch of Constantinople St John IV bequeathing the title to his successors.<sup>115</sup> It was only after Boniface III was elected Pope in February 607 that the situation changed. Phocas was close to Boniface III,<sup>116</sup> who occupied the papacy from February to November 607, and later issued a decree for Boniface III, that the Roman Pope was to be regarded as 'universal bishop' of the Catholic church, therefore, putting a stop to the use of the title 'Oecumenical Patriarch' by the Bishop of Constantinople.<sup>117</sup>

Defoe's knowledge of the history of Gregory, Boniface and Phocas was likely from John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of the Christian Church*, which he often consulted.<sup>118</sup> The sources Defoe cited also included Gilbert Burnet's *History of Reformation*,<sup>119</sup> Bartolomeo Platina's *The Lives of the Popes*, and the Whig Henry Care's *Weekly Pacquet*. Defoe's critique of Gregory's invention of the worship of the Virgin Mary and 'Image-Worship and Praying to Saints' was drawn from Care's journal.<sup>120</sup> Defoe argued that Gregory I was the main genius behind Phocas' treason and murder. Gregory 'in his Life Time' even 'congratulated the Murtherer,'<sup>121</sup> because

---

<sup>115</sup> Richard Baxter also paid attention to the rise of the term 'Universal Bishop,' see Richard Baxter, *Church-History of the Government of Bishops and Their Councils Abbreviated Including the Chief Part of the Government of Christian Princes and Popes, and a True Account of the Most Troubling Controversies and Heresies till the Reformation*. (London, 1680), 189–90. See also Johnston, *Revelation Restored*, 163–65.

<sup>116</sup> The history of Phocas and Gregory was recorded in John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (1576 edition) (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011), 174. Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 19.04.17].

<sup>117</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:75. See also Defoe, *Jure Divino*, 2:94.

<sup>118</sup> Defoe cited Foxe several times. For example, Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:71, 144; idem, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 10; idem, *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, 6:216. For Burnet, see idem, *Jure Divino*, 2:54. For Platina, see idem, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:77.

<sup>119</sup> See Defoe, *Review*, 4:140.

<sup>120</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:134.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:64.

the bishop could take advantage of this and expand his own power. Even though Boniface III was the first Bishop of Rome who was named ‘Universal Bishop,’ Defoe and Pufendorf agreed that the system was actually established by Gregory I. Defoe stressed that the historical facts behind the holiness of the papacy were shameful. To satisfy his ambition to be a ‘Universal Bishop,’ Gregory collaborated with Phocas, and even murdered Emperor Maurice in 602. Based on this and other shocking incidents, Defoe argued that the papal system was clearly founded not on the primacy of Peter at all. The Roman Catholic Church had ‘introduced so many Innovations, such Idolatrous Practices, and so many detestable Additions.’ All of these were contrary to the doctrines ‘left them by the Messiah.’<sup>122</sup> On the contrary, the origins of the system were evil since it was ‘first design’d by a double Conspiracy of Treason and Murther.’<sup>123</sup> Worse still, Popery for Defoe was close to ‘one entire System of Antechristian Magick; its Constitutions are all Sorcery and Witchcraft; they prevail upon Sense by Nonsense.’<sup>124</sup>

The father in the *New Family Instructor* detailed the conflict between Gregory I and the Bishop of Byzantium concerning the title of ‘Universal Bishop.’ They fought each other with lies and hypocrisy, and the popery they boasted of was actually ‘from what Springs of Blood, Treason, and Usurpation, all the Streams which have hitherto watered the Roman Church, have flow’d.’<sup>125</sup> Therefore, either side was using evil means to attack each other. Defoe, from a historical point of view, argued that even if

---

<sup>122</sup> Defoe, *A Continuation of Letters Written by a Turkish Spy at Paris*, 5:82.

<sup>123</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:64. See also *Ibid.*, 3:90.

<sup>124</sup> Defoe, *A System of Magick*, 7:252.

<sup>125</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:77.

the Bishop of Rome prevailed over his counterpart in Byzantium, the claim of the primacy of the Roman Bishop was itself a usurpation. Moreover, Defoe wrote that ‘it was never claimed by any of the Bishops of Rome it self, for Six Hundred Years after Christ.’<sup>126</sup> The system was an ‘unscriptural Bondage.’<sup>127</sup> For another instance, Defoe cited one of his favourite writers, Walter Raleigh’s, account of the Byzantine Empire to examine the papal system. Defoe suggested that the Byzantine Emperor Justinian II was cruel to innocent people and defiant toward God, and he mocked that Justinian ‘was a Christian Emperor too, and one whom the Pope rejoiced over, and Congratulated with a Letter of Religious Compliments, upon his Restoration.’<sup>128</sup>

Defoe argued that the Christian religion was predestined to be successful and to rise in the providential plan. Therefore, these ‘Firebrands of God’s Church’ were ‘snatch’d away in the heat of their Fury.’<sup>129</sup> This was providence giving time to the Christians to revive and grow stronger. The short but bloody reign of Queen Mary of England was explained in this way. As Mary I had ‘overturn[ed] the whole Structure of the Reformation,’ Defoe did not have a high opinion of her.<sup>130</sup> Defoe argued that if Mary had lived longer, the Protestants in England would have been rooted out. To prevent this from happening ‘God cut her off in the midst of her Day, and sav’d the Remnant for a Foundation to the Interest of true Religion in the World.’<sup>131</sup> He held

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 3:90.

<sup>127</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 7.

<sup>128</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:214.

<sup>129</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:656. See Joseph Hone, *Literature and Party Politics at the Accession of Queen Anne* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 131; Marshall, “Daniel Defoe as Satirist,” 558.

<sup>130</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:62.

<sup>131</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 8:657.

that the rebellion of Protestants under Queen Mary was justified, and ‘if they did not Depose and Destroy her, it was because they cou’d not; and if they had done it, no doubt they had Cause sufficient to justifie them before God and Man.’<sup>132</sup>

In sum, even though Defoe severely criticised the Papal system, he was not against the clerical system in Roman times. The Roman bishops, in Defoe’s understanding, were similar to ministers in Protestant churches. He praised the courage of those bishops in times of persecution and in times of chaos after the fall of the West Roman Empire. Defoe believed that ‘God was pleased’ with their sincerity, and it was ‘an acceptable Sacrifice’ and ‘reasonable Service.’<sup>133</sup> The main message of Defoe was that Christians must reclaim the original Christian spirit that was tainted by the establishment of the papacy, and the representative campaign of this reclaiming was the Reformation initiated by Luther, Calvin and others. Since Defoe did not write much about the two religious leaders, the next section will focus on his views of the English Reformation.

### **The English Reformation**

While Defoe frequently attacked heretics such as the Arians, the Socinians and the Pelagians,<sup>134</sup> he admired the figures before Martin Luther such as John Wycliffe and John Hus and called them the ones who ‘first saw thro’ ...Fables [of the Popery], began to expose them to the World.’<sup>135</sup> Wycliffe, he said, was the ‘first preacher of

---

<sup>132</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:74.

<sup>133</sup> Defoe, *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, 6:216.

<sup>134</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:340.

<sup>135</sup> Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:70.

the Reformation in England.<sup>136</sup> Further, ‘Lollards, Wickliffians, Hussites’ were all precursors of the Reformation.<sup>137</sup> Waldenses in France were praised as ‘a painful, honest, industrious People.’ God had shown ‘a true Light’ to ‘Waldenses, Albigenses, and other suffering Christians.’<sup>138</sup>

In addition to espousing the legitimacy of Reformation, Defoe, of course, applied the history of this religious reform to argue on behalf of the Dissenters of the present age. A recurring argument in his book is that figures like Hus or Wycliff were essentially the Dissenters of their time. Before the Revolution of 1688, Defoe believed that the Dissenters were persecuted for their religious beliefs, and this persecution was what they were asking for. However, after the Revolution, since there was a new policy of religious tolerance, the liberty of conscience of the Dissenters’ was supposedly no longer restricted, and the Dissenters should not have had any worries of persecution anymore. Defoe’s retelling of the history of Reformation was a reminder that ‘the present Church of England Party was the Dissenters, the Schismaticks and Phanaticks, in the Days of King Henry VIII.’<sup>139</sup>

When Defoe paid attention to the reign of Henry VIII, his concern was surely the Reformation. Defoe did not acknowledge that the Reformation was Henry’s genuine

---

<sup>136</sup> Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 2:205.

<sup>137</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:63. See also Defoe, *The New Family Instructor*, 3:70; Ahnert, “Historicizing Heresy in the Early German Enlightenment,” 133.

<sup>138</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 4. The Waldense and the Albigenses were discussed together in John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, which Defoe has quoted a number of times elsewhere. See John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (1570 edition), 4, 1125. (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 18.04.17].

<sup>139</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:63.

effort. Instead, this reform resulted from his lust and God used ‘him as the Instrument, without giving him the Principle.’<sup>140</sup> In Defoe’s historical thinking, it was not unusual that ‘the very worst and wickedest of Men’s Designs shall concur to bring to pass the best and greatest of his glorious Works.’<sup>141</sup> This was exactly the case of Henry VIII. Defoe’s evaluation of Henry VIII was very similar to that of Gilbert Burnet, who wrote that:

... if we consider the great things that were done by him, we must acknowledge that there was a signal providence of God, in raising up a king of his temper, for clearing the way to that blessed work that followed; [...] it was no new nor unusual thing in the methods of God’s providence, to employ princes who had great mixtures of very gross faults to do signal things for his service.<sup>142</sup>

Defoe added that although the reign of Henry VIII seemed to be filled with many troubles, he admitted that ‘GOD’s Providence has wonderfully produc’d Order out of these Confusions, and Good out of all this Evil, yet a View both of the Confusions themselves, and the wonderful Connections of Providence, in issuing them, as I say, in his [Henry VIII’s] Glory and the publick Good.’<sup>143</sup>

Defoe’s historical writings demonstrate not only his extensive reading but also his genius in consolidating diverse materials. Another of Defoe’s sources was Edward

---

<sup>140</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 6. We can see similar view of God’s will in human history from Defoe’s works. For instance, ‘God may make use of improper Methods, and unlikely Instruments when he pleases to bring to pass what his Providence has design’d.....God may make use of improper Methods, and unlikely Instruments when he pleases to bring to pass what his Providence has design’d.’ See Daniel Defoe, *The Six Distinguishing Characters of a Parliament-Man* (1700 [for 1701]), *PEW*, vol. 2, ed. J. A. Downie, (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 37.

<sup>141</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:141.

<sup>142</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet’s History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, new edn, 6 vols (London: R. Priestley, 1820), 1:xvii, xx.

<sup>143</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:134.

Herbert's *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth*.<sup>144</sup> When Defoe discussed the education of Henry VIII and his children in *Royal Education*, his material was largely from Herbert's volume.<sup>145</sup> Echoing Herbert's judgment, Defoe held that Henry's reformation was incomplete. Thomas Wolsey was Defoe's recurring target of critique. He claimed that the Cardinal 'has not at all lessened the People's suffering, but rather encreased them.'<sup>146</sup> Although the King's decision to put Thomas Wolsey to death was correct, the overall reformation was not successful because it was not done thoroughly. This failure thus left the 'English Church [to be] reformed into Episcopacy, and a Pompous Hierarchy, rather than a Calvinistical Parity.'<sup>147</sup>

When Defoe criticised the incomplete outcome left by Henry VIII, he was evaluating the Church of England in his own age. The system of the Anglican Church was depicted as 'brooding Snakes of Ecclesiastick Tyranny,' and resulted from this unfinished reformation.<sup>148</sup> Because of this incomplete reformation, Defoe argued that the true Reformation had not genuinely begun until King Edward VI. He claimed that 'Our first Reformation from Popery was in the Days of King Edward the VI. I call it the first, because 'twas under him that the whole Nation and the Government embrac'd the Protestant Reform'd Religion; this Protestant Religion was establish'd by that Zealous King, and by his Parliament, back'd with the Force of Laws, and confirm'd

---

<sup>144</sup> Edward Herbert of Cherbury, *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth* (London, 1649).

<sup>145</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Of Royal Education*, ed. W. R. Owens, vol. 10, *RDW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 235; Edward Herbert of Cherbury, *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth*, 2.

<sup>146</sup> Lee ed., *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings*, 3:215.

<sup>147</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 8.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

by all the Sanction of Authority it was capable of, and here it began to be call'd the Church of England.'<sup>149</sup>

The Reformation in England had never borne fruit due to the short life of King Edward and Queen Mary I of England's pursuit of the restoration of Roman Catholicism. As mentioned above, Queen Mary and other monarchs who persecuted Protestants were described as being condemned by God to die of unnatural causes. On the contrary, Defoe held the Christians who were persecuted, either in the age of the Roman Empire or in the age of Mary, in high regard. The clergymen who died in Mary's reign were revered by Defoe, such as 'that glorious martyr, Dr. Ridley,' (Bishop of London) and John Hooper.<sup>150</sup> Defoe said that they were men of 'the Essentials of Religion' and they were 'constant and Laborious in Preaching, of firm and unshaken Faith, of invincible Fortitude in the Cause of Christ, and sealed the Reformation with their Blood.'<sup>151</sup> Also, in the *Tour*, Defoe stood before the stature of Rowland Taylor (1510-1555) who was an English Protestant martyr in Mary's reign, praising that the memory of him would live 'in the hearts of the people ... as long as this island shall retain the Protestant religion.'<sup>152</sup> Defoe added that while he did not admire the Anglican hierarchy, he believed that all Protestant churches were similar in a certain way. The Dissenters were closer to the Anglicans than the Catholics, and Defoe believed that somehow their differences could be reconciled, as long as the Church of England would loosen its pressure on the Dissenters. He argued that 'the Root of

---

<sup>149</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty*, 3:62.

<sup>150</sup> Merrett, *Daniel Defoe: Contrarian*, 115.

<sup>151</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 9.

<sup>152</sup> Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 1:92.

Religion might be sound, where the Blossom had not the same fragrance; that the Faith, Hope, Love, and other Christian Graces might be preserved, where they differed in the Circumstances.’<sup>153</sup>

After Mary’s short but turbulent reign, her successor Queen Elizabeth introduced a ‘via media’ religious policy. Even though Elizabeth did not cleanse the remnants of the Catholic customs in the Church of England, Defoe presented a largely favourable view of the Queen. He defended the Queen’s policy of moderation, explaining the Queen’s decision to mix Catholic ceremonies with the Protestantism by saying that she ‘was a Politick Princess, surrounded with Enemies.’<sup>154</sup> The Queen was reluctant to adopt this measure but she had to implement it in order to preserve the Protestant cause. This favourable view of the Queen was unmistakable when Defoe mentioned the persecution of the Puritans during her reign: Defoe’s remark was light and brief, saying that ‘as good a Queen as she was, [she] put some of them to Death.’<sup>155</sup> Elsewhere, Defoe wrote that if the Queen ‘was in any thing tyrannical more than ordinary, it was in Matters of Religion, and some Blood is laid to her Door on that Account; of which since I can say nothing to defend it, I shall say nothing at all.’<sup>156</sup>

Defoe argued that it was better that the Queen chose to go back a little ‘in the Reformation of Ceremonies,’ rather than ‘foreward [sic] in destroying them.’ While the Queen’s hesitation of an abrupt reform was the main cause of the policy, Defoe meanwhile implied that ‘her natural Gayness of Temper, which enclin’d her to be much

---

<sup>153</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 9.

<sup>154</sup> Defoe, *A New Test of the Church of England’s Loyalty*, 3:62.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:62–63.

<sup>156</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:151.

in Love with the Pomp and Shows of Religion,' may be another factor.<sup>157</sup> The Queen 'rather went back again in the Reformation, than carry'd it on farther; I mean respecting King Edward's Standard.'<sup>158</sup> Even though he sporadically criticised the Queen for the fact that she 'indeed proceeded very severely with' those who disagreed with her measures, Defoe had a rather favourable overall opinion of the Queen.<sup>159</sup>

Defoe's preference for Queen Elizabeth could be viewed in terms of the previous discussion on his belief that wool was a gift from God. First of all Defoe regarded the establishment of wool manufacture since Henry VII as part of God's plan for England. Defoe argued 'from the Year 1489, when King Henry VII began to encourage the Manufacture in England, to the Year 1587, when Queen Elizabeth may be said to see it arriv'd to its Perfection, that this great Work was gradually encreasing and bringing forward.'<sup>160</sup> After decades of industry and wise governing of the Queen, the manufacture was successful, and it was proof of England's piety to respond to God's plan. Secondly, Defoe assumed that the golden age of English commerce and manufacture was dated back 'from the Middle of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.' God's promise for England was also revealed in the expeditions of Francis Drake, Sir Walter Raleigh and others under the patronage of the Queen.<sup>161</sup> Defoe therefore described the

---

<sup>157</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 8–9.

<sup>158</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 4:151.

<sup>159</sup> Defoe, *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*, 10.

<sup>160</sup> Defoe, *PEC*, 7:192.

<sup>161</sup> Daniel Defoe, *A Brief Deduction of the Original, Progress, and Immense Greatness of the British Woollen Manufacture: With an Enquiry Whether It Be Not at Present in a Very Declining Condition: The Reasons of Its Decay; and the Only Means of Its Recovery* (London, 1727), 26.

discovery and domination of many islands such as Bermuda as ‘great and singular Providence.’<sup>162</sup>

Defoe’s concerns in the history of the Stuarts were centred on the preservation and the dissolution of the legacies of Elizabethan religious policies, since he believed that Protestantism was the direction that God recognised. Although the Dissenters had already been persecuted in Elizabethan times for disobedience, Defoe believed that the problem became more severe after the accession of King James I. Defoe argued in favour of Elizabeth I, declaring that even though the Queen had persecuted the Catholics, the latter had not been wholly forbidden from taking any public office. Defoe’s preference for her was so obvious that even when she took hard measures against the Catholics, he defended that it was ‘reason of State, and not of Religion, which oblig’d her to treat them so roughly.’<sup>163</sup>

It was the marked development of the exploration from the reign of the Elizabeth I that prompted Defoe to stress his hypothesis that the Carthaginians were the first European people to arrive in North America. Englishmen, or the modern Phoenicians, were recovering the forgotten achievements of the ancient race. After the Carthaginians were defeated by the Romans, Defoe believed that some of the remaining Carthaginians escaped there.<sup>164</sup> These achievements were forgotten after

---

<sup>162</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Trade* (June), 1:40. As in Novak’s study of Defoe’s *Further Adventure*, it was clear that part of the story was based on John Smith’s *The General Historie of the Bermudas*. See Maximillian E Novak, “Crusoe the King and the Political Evolution of His Island,” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 2, no. 3 (1962): 349.

<sup>163</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Peace without Union. By Way of Reply, to Sir H---- M----’s Peace at Home. The fourth edition. To Which Is Added a Preface* (London, 1704), 5.

<sup>164</sup> Defoe, *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements*, 4:75.

the Romans' victory since they disdained trade. These achievements became 'sunk back again towards their original Obscurity.' England in the reign of the Queen recovered and surpassed all these accomplishments. As we have discussed in previous sections, the Phoenicians' decline and fall was largely due to their paganism. In contrast, the Englishmen were Christians, and they were Protestants especially. The English on the one hand inherited the commercial legacies of the Phoenicians, but on the other hand they thoroughly corrected the reasons for which the Phoenicians were punished. Defoe argued that present-day England therefore was definitely God's chosen nation since they achieved God's promise of commercial success and their realisation of Protestantism further fortified his blessings upon them.

In summary, Defoe's admiration for the Carthaginians and the Phoenicians in history was in essence, his praise for modern English people. This praise was clear from his claim that 'the Phoenicians were the Englishmen of that Age.'<sup>165</sup> The long history Defoe gave to English wool and its link with ancient Phoenician navigation was his effort at giving more legitimacy to England, and offering proof of the blessing of Elizabeth. Defoe had a low opinion of the Stuarts, as he wrote that '... after the Death of Queen Elizabeth, when King James the First came to the Crown, things immediately began to take a new turn.'<sup>166</sup> Defoe wrote that the court of King James I was filled with 'the excessive Vanity and Luxury' and the Civil War erupted 'in the Reign of his Son, absolutely finish'd the Ruin of the English Gentry, and oblig'd them

---

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., 4:74, 76.

<sup>166</sup> Defoe, *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd*, 70. See also idem, *A Brief Reply to the History of Standing Armies* (1698), vol. 1, *PEW*, ed. P. N. Furbank, (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 86–87.

to be meer Slaves to the Errors of the Times.’<sup>167</sup> In other passages when Elizabeth and James I appeared at the same time, Defoe was generally more favourable to the Queen.<sup>168</sup>

Last but not least, Protestantism and woollen production were also central to Defoe’s account of the Union of England and Scotland in 1706-7. Echoing his emphasis on the woollen trade and the special blessing of Britain, Defoe argued that in the time of the Union the new trade with North America and India was the new blessing, and this blessing was meant to be achieved by both British kingdoms. Since ‘parts of Trade, which Providence seems to have reserv’d for a General Union of both Nations, and which we seem almost incapable of carrying on, without one another.’<sup>169</sup> Scotland will contribute its cheap labour and materials and England would contribute its superior technique and the excellent position of London served as the emperor of the British Empire. Protestantism was another topic Defoe used to align both kingdoms, saying:

But some People will have Breaches seem wider than they really are, in order to fright the Lovers of Union, from the Attempt of closing. I could heartily wish there were no such Thing as a Difference in the Opinions of Christians, worshipping the same Original Author and Maker of all Things; professing the same Faith in the same Redeemer; the same Hope, and on the same Terms with one another.<sup>170</sup>

---

<sup>167</sup> Defoe, *Review*, 3:64.

<sup>168</sup> Defoe, *The Poor Man’s Plea*, 6:26.

<sup>169</sup> Daniel Defoe, *An Essay at Removing National Prejudices ... Part II* (1706), vol. 4, *PEW* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000), 86.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:54.

God frequently arranged something in the wheels of human history, but men on the earth could not foresee and understand it. The conflicts within the Christian Church arose soon after the death of Christ and, Defoe argued that it was 'neither possible nor needful for us to know' this 'Inscrutable Providence.' Even though humans could not understand it, God must have his purpose in allowing the conflicts to happen. Christians must try hard to fulfil their duties even in adverse circumstances. For instance, Defoe as a Dissenter chose to accept the Church of England as the national church, however he stood firmly on the different understandings and practices of prayers and baptism at the price of losing the right to bear public office and other civil rights. Defoe praised the courage and honesty of the Covenanters and compared them to the original Christians. But he was also glad that the Dissenters at least enjoyed toleration after 1688, even though it was limited and insufficient.

## **Conclusion**

In this chapter, we have analysed the impact of religion on Defoe's views concerning history. More precisely, through the themes of trade, arts and sciences, and the rise of England after its Reformation. In Defoe's discussion of trade, we can see his admiration of the Phoenicians. Defoe praised the Phoenicians for spreading the knowledge of navigation and the skills of woollen manufactures to England. In contrast to the negative view of the pagan Phoenicians of his contemporaries, Defoe has made an original point that God had purposes for all the humankind; even the pagans could be of use to the Christian nations. In Defoe's discussion of the arts and

sciences, we can also discern his firm belief in the accounts of the Old Testament at work, and how this belief shaped his contemporary outlook. For instance, the historical debate regarding the earliest letters led Defoe to highlight the role of the trading Phoenicians. Particularly, the Phoenicians improved the Hebrew letters and transformed them into alphabets, which were more convenient for trade. This argument in turn fed into his life-long support of the development of English trade, and Defoe praised the Englishmen as modern Phoenicians since they both excelled in improving the existing systems rather than creating a new one. The third part discusses Defoe's examination of the rise of England after its reformation, which was regarded by Defoe as God's particular providence. Defoe believed that human history was filled with the divine will as long as we had to read it carefully. For instance, Queen Mary, who persecuted the English Protestants, was interpreted by Defoe as being struck by God, not able to die a natural death. This interpretation, in turn, was linked to his political and religious stances. Defoe argued that the Anglicans were also the dissenters during Mary's reign. In light of this history of suffering, they ought not to persecute a new generation of the dissenters when they regained the status of the established church, and the unnatural death of Queen Mary was the vivid warning. The component parts of this chapter are connected to the overmatching argument of the thesis that Defoe's historical ideas had their origins in his religious ideas. Protestantism was one of the core topics in Defoe's historical works. This chapter looks into Defoe's interpretation of different aspects of history and proves that Defoe's Protestant belief

influenced his narratives and explanations of histories, whether of ancient peoples or recent events.



## **Conclusion**

This thesis has shown the wide-ranging impact of religion on the thought of Defoe. Be it his stance on morals and consumerism or his political views, Defoe's values and arguments alike were consistently informed by religious themes and ideologies, the main one being a Neo-Augustinian current of thought, which particularly conditioned his worldview. This current indicated that humankind could not avoid sinning, because of the Fall, and because human nature is so corrupted by original sin that human beings have no real freedom of will. Mankind is guided by self-love rather than reason in everything it does. This Augustinianism is important, because it allows us to put Defoe's ideas in the context of the contemporaneous debates on topics such as human nature and the reformation of manners. By comparing Defoe with leading thinkers such as Mandeville and Berkeley, we understand that he not only shared insights into critical social issues with well-known writers, but also offered his original solutions to various problems. Moreover, Defoe's religious thought shaped his political, economic and historical outlook. We cannot appreciate Defoe's intricate solutions to alcoholism or blasphemy if we do not have a clear idea of his view of human nature. The thesis represents a new, in-depth study of Defoe's religious thought based on fictional and non-fictional works from every period of his career. The deeper meaning of the understudied aspects of Defoe's intellectual world can only be recovered, as this thesis shows, by focusing on the role played by his religious thought.

As the introductory chapter explains, the centrality of his religion was rooted in Defoe's upbringing. Even though scholars have occasionally touched on this point,

Defoe's connections with Annesley, Williams and other renowned Dissenters, both personally and intellectually, are thoroughly discussed here. For them, good deeds were not sufficient for salvation, but neither was faith alone without good deeds. They also acknowledged the inevitable existence of self-love and tried to make the best of this complex situation. This attitude corresponded closely to the ideas of French Jansenism, whose influence can also be seen in Defoe's writings.

The introduction is followed by an overview of Neo-Augustinian traditions, before engaging directly with the evidence for Defoe's Neo-Augustinian thought. Based on the understanding of Defoe's Augustinian view of human nature, the chapter proceeds to his concern with moral conduct. Defoe's involvement in the Reformation of Manners movement in England is the central theme here and shows that Defoe's approaches were derived from both his Augustinian view of human nature and his ideas on how to correct corrupt passions by manipulating other passions.

Based on the examination of his moral ideas, we can see that Defoe's concern with morals also manifests itself in his discussion of luxury and the dilemmas faced by luxuries tradesmen. On the basis of his view of human nature, Defoe argued that, since it is impossible to root out the existence of luxury and human lusts, it would be futile to prohibit the consumption of pleasure. Defoe's view of luxury was regarded as inconsistent, but the chapter argues that, although Defoe may use contradictory ideas in different works to address different audiences, his views of human nature and Providence were consistent. As it is impossible to root out one's self-love, Defoe proposed a mechanism that would allow people to benefit the whole of society while

still pursuing their own interests. This unintended consequence of self-love was a proof of God's love of humankind.

After establishing the influence of religion on his moral and economic views, Defoe's political views are examined, in particular his criticism of divine right theory. It is shown that Defoe's Augustinian view of human nature and the origins of society were central to his explanations of Adam and the Fall, the transition from patriarchy to monarchy and the criticism of divine right theory. In the contention between Defoe and Leslie, both used the biblical accounts of the separation of the ten tribes from the kingdom of Judah to advance contrary propositions of the legitimacy of the revolution of 1688. This instance is important because it reflects a long-standing tradition. Both Filmer's espousal of the divine right of monarchy and Locke's rebuttal of Filmer advance their arguments by referring to the conflict between Rehoboam and Jeroboam.<sup>1</sup> The debate shows that Defoe's Augustinian explanation of the corrupt self-love of Rehoboam was more evident when compared with the explanations of other writers, despite all being based on the same passages.

We can discern the influence of religion on Defoe's use of the past. Defoe used specific historical narratives related to the Old Testament and the Church to stress that the unfolding of human history offered an indication of God's will. In contrast to his contemporaries' negative view of the pagan Phoenicians, Defoe's particular interest in the Phoenicians' achievements in navigation and trade can be explained in this light. Defoe argued that God had purposes for all of humankind; even the pagans could be

---

<sup>1</sup> Yechiel Leiter, *John Locke's Political Philosophy and the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 81-83.

of use to Christian nations. Englishmen had not only inherited from ancient peoples, including the Phoenicians, but had also replicated their successes, resulting in the improvements that England was experiencing. Apart from his focus on England, Defoe consistently paid attention to religion when reading history. By utilising the material scattered throughout Defoe's writings, it has been shown here that his explanations of the primitive Christian church, the Reformation and its long-term consequences in the subsequent centuries demonstrate the central role that religion played in Defoe's writings.

The most recent and profoundest intellectual study of Defoe is Clark's intellectual biography of him in 2007. Clark's overarching argument is that Defoe is a Trinitarian, and his Trinitarianism could be seen in all aspects of his works. Clark's work successfully proved that Defoe was a serious thinker, and his thoughts on nearly all aspects of human life were more than superficial or partisan. Following Clark's lead, this thesis has added to the field of Defoe's religious thought by focusing on an unnoticed aspect of him: Augustinianism. Even though Defoe is not an author with a systematic way of forming arguments, this research overcomes this constraint by studying many cases in detail from those understudied aspects of Defoe's view of religion, such as his view of the Papacy and his reading of the Scripture for various purposes. The current dissertation proves that Defoe's Augustinian thinking is the key to grasping some previously unnoticed parts of Defoe's thoughts, and the Augustinian explanation also situates Defoe in a broader context. Thus, this research sheds light on the Defoe scholarship and links Defoe to a more comprehensive research field.

There are a number of areas in which the work in this thesis might be taken forward. This thesis has brought Augustinianism into the conversation about Defoe's intellectual world. In doing so, it has opened up possible new avenues for the study of other relevant fields. The first concentrates on the Augustinianism of the English Presbyterian Dissenters, and the second on themes like moderation, manners and politeness.

The first direction involves the Dissenters, especially the Calvinists, to which Defoe belonged. The chapter on Defoe's upbringing noted that the Dissenters, led by Annesley and Williams, held a practical attitude toward passions such as pride and self-interest. This attitude was similar to their French counterparts, the Jansenists. This observation can be extended to the question of the relationship between Augustinianism and Calvinism. The difference between the two traditions is still a topic of scholarly debate; although the question of the difference between the two traditions is too great to be described here, it can be pointed out that the works of the Dissenters could serve as cases for the discussion. They shared the same view of human nature, and their realistic attitude toward self-love might be an ideal starting point for future research on this understudied group. Furthermore, past studies of the Dissenters have focused heavily on Baxter, Bunyan, Owen and Flavel, while the voluminous works of Williams, Shower and Cruso are still in need of examination. Their association with Augustinianism, which is brought to light in the thesis, may be a source of fruitful research in the future.

The second direction in which this thesis might be taken forward would be an exploration of the yet unclear relationship between values like moderation, manners and politeness. The first step in such an examination would be to compare Defoe's ideas of manners and moderation with Addison's and Steele's ideas of politeness in their periodicals, especially *The Spectator*. The current research has pointed out that Defoe's proposal for the reformation of manners was to rely on people's self-love. Defoe argued that the government could take advantage of people's inclination to imitate the social elite to devise a mechanism that allowed reformation of behaviour and immoralities, such as blasphemy and swearing, while still satisfying their vanity. The care given by Defoe to the reformation of manners in his writings reveals his unique point of view on moderation and good manners, which might also be called Defoe's politeness. What can be drawn from this argument is that the noted advocates Addison and Steele also recognised that the most common source of human action is pride. They noticed that the nature of humankind is filled with self-love and pride; they therefore hoped to cultivate a kind of civic virtue through dialogue. By this cultivation, they hoped that people would not be manipulated by imagination and passions. Although Defoe's concerns were more practically oriented, and his readers were lower-middle-class people in comparison to those of *The Spectator*, both were sympathetic to the Toleration Act and Occasional Conformity. Furthermore, one of the understudied aspects is their shared opposition to priest-craft and Sacheverellite religious intolerance. Defoe espoused the language of moderation to ease enthusiasm and to legitimise revolutionary principles. Also, one of the goals of *The Spectator* was

to develop a sense of restraint by practising respect for others in conversation. Its aim was to mitigate enthusiasm and defend the heritage of the Revolution of 1688. Scholars such as Klein and Phillipson<sup>2</sup> have contributed much to the study of politeness, while Defoe and other Dissenters have largely been overlooked. However, based on the above observation, Defoe's moderation and *The Spectator's* politeness overlapped in many aspects. The similarities and distinctions between moderation, manner and politeness in early eighteenth-century England would be expected to become more evident in a comparison of the works of Defoe, Addison and Steele.

---

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Lawrence E. Klein, "Property and politeness in the early Eighteenth-century Whig moralists" in John Brewer and Susan Staves (eds.), *Early Modern Conceptions of Property* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 221-33; Klein, *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Nicholas Phillipson "Politeness and Politics in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hanoverians," in *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet, and Lois G. Schwoerer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 211-45; Phillipson, *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian* (New Haven, CT, 2011), 16-31.



## Bibliography

### Printed Primary Sources

Addison, Joseph, and Richard Steele. *The Spectator*. Edited by Donald F. Bond. 5 vols.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Annesley, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of Reverend Mr. Will. Whitaker:*

*Late Minister of Magdalen Bermondsey, Southwark*. London, 1673.

———. “How Is the Adherent Vanity of Every Condition Most Effectually Abated by Serious Godliness?” In *A Continuation of Morning-Exercise Questions and Cases of Conscience: Practically Resolved by Sundry Ministers, in October, 1682*, edited by Samuel Annesley, 1–33. London, 1683.

———. “How May We Attain to Love God With All Our Hearts, Souls, and Minds?” In *A Supplement to the Morning-Exercise at Cripple-Gate: Or, Several More Cases of Conscience Practically Resolved by Sundry Ministers*, edited by Samuel Annesley, 1–40. London, 1674.

———. “How May We Give Christ a Satisfying Account, Why We Attend upon the Ministry of the Word.” In *Casuistical Morning-Exercises: The Fourth Volume*, edited by Samuel Annesley, 1–33, 1690.

———. “How We May Be Universally and Exactly Conscientious.” In *The Morning-Exercise at Cripple-Gate: Or, Several Cases of Conscience Practically Resolved, by Sundry Ministers, September, 1661*, edited by Samuel Annesley. London, 1671.

- . “Preface.” In Richard Alleine’s *Instructions about Heart-Work What Is to Be Done on Gods Part, and Ours, for the Cure and Keeping of the Heart, That We May Live in the Exercise and Growth of Grace Here, and Have a Comfortable Assurance of Glory to Eternity*. London, 1681.
- . *The First Dish at the Wil-Shire Feast, Novemb. 9. 1654: Or, A Sermon Preached at Laurence Jury to Those That There Offered Their Peace-Offerings, and Went Thence to Dine at Marchant-Taylors-Hall*. London, 1655.
- Anon. *Reflections upon the Late Great Revolution. Written by a Lay-Hand in the Country, for the Satisfaction of Some Neighbours*. London, 1689.
- Bacon, Francis. *The Essays, or Councils, Civil and Moral, of Sir Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban. With a Table of the Colours of Good and Evil. And a Discourse of the Wisdom of the Ancients*. London, 1696.
- . *The Essays; or, Counsels Civil and Moral, with The Wisdom of the Ancients, Revised from the Early Copies*. Notes by S.W. Singer. Edited by S. W. Singer. London: Bell, 1857.
- . *The History of the Reign of King Henry VII and Selected Works*. Edited by Brian Vickers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon*. Edited by John M. Robertson. London: Routledge, 1905.
- Banks, R. R. *A Sermon Preach’d at St. Trinity’s in Kingston, upon Hull To a Society There for the Reformation of Manners, September 20. 1699*. London, 1700.

- Barbon, Nicholas. *A Discourse of Trade* (1690), reprinted in *Commerce, Culture, and Liberty: readings on capitalism before Adam Smith*, ed. Henry C. Clark. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2003.
- Baxter, Richard. *Church-History of the Government of Bishops and Their Councils Abbreviated Including the Chief Part of the Government of Christian Princes and Popes, and a True Account of the Most Troubling Controversies and Heresies till the Reformation*. London, 1680.
- . *The Cure of Church-Divisions: Or, Directions for Weak Christians, to Keep Them from Being Dividers, Or Troublers of the Church. With Some Directions to the Pastors, How to Deal with Such Christians*. London, 1670.
- . *The Poor Man's Family Book* (1684). Cornwall: W. Cock, 1815.
- Beveridge, William. *Obedience to Governors* (1710) in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, Dr. William Beveridge*, 2 vols, (London, 1729), 2:369-72.
- Burnet, Gilbert. *Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1679-1715), new edn. 6 vols. London: R. Priestley, 1820.
- Calamy, Edmund. *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges, and Schoolmasters, Who Were Ejected and Silenced After the Restoration in 1660, by Or Before the Act for Uniformity: To Which Is Added, The Church and Dissenters Compar'd as to Persecution, in Some Remarks on Dr. Walker's Attempt to Recover the Names and Sufferings of the Clergy That Were Sequestred, &c., Between 1640 and 1660*. London, 1727.

Cruso, Timothy. *The Christian Laver. Or, a Discourse Opening the Nature of Participation with, and Demonstrating the Necessity of Purification by Christ.* London, 1690.

———. *The Period of Humane Life Determined by the Divine Will.* London, 1688.

———. *The Usefulness of Spiritual Wisdom with a Temporal Inheritance: In a Sermon Preached March 11th 1688/9 at the Entrance of a Young Man upon His Habitation and Particular Calling.* London, 1689.

———. *Twenty-Four Sermons Preached at the Merchants-Lecture at Pinner's Hall.* London, 1699.

D. A. *The Whole Art of Converse: Containing Necessary Instructions for All Persons, of What Quality and Condition Soever: With the Characters of the Four Humours of the English and French, as to Their Way of Conversing.* London, 1683.

Davenant, Charles. *Discourses on the Public Revenues, Part II.*, Edited by Sir Charles Whitworth. Vol. 2. 5 vols. *The Political and Commercial Works of that Celebrated Writer Charles D'Avenant, LL.D.* London, 1771.

———. *On the Plantation Trade.* Edited by Sir Charles Whitworth. Vol. 2. 5 vols. *The Political and Commercial Works of that Celebrated Writer Charles D'Avenant.* London, 1771.

Defoe, Daniel. *A Brief Deduction of the Original, Progress, and Immense Greatness of the British Woollen Manufacture.* London, 1727.

- . *A Brief Reply to the History of Standing Armies* (1698). *PEW*, edited by P. N. Furbank, 1:81–98. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *A Brief State of the Question between the Printed and Painted Callicoës: And the Woollen and Silk Manufacture, as Far as It Relates to the Wearing and Using of Printed Callicoës in Great Britain*. The second edition. London, 1719.
- . *A Commendatory Sermon Preach'd November the 4th, 1709. Being the Birth-Day of King William, Of Glorious Memory*. London, 1709.
- . *A Continuation of Letters Written by a Turkish Spy at Paris* (1718). Edited by David Blewett. Vol. 5. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2005.
- . *A Curious Little Oration, Deliver'd by Father Andrew: Concerning the Present Great Quarrels That Divide the Clergy of France*. London, 1717.
- . *A Fourth Essay, at Removing National Prejudices* (1706). Vol. 4. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *A Friendly Epistle by Way of Reproof from One of the People Called Quakers, To Thomas Bradbury, A Dealer in Many Words*. The third edition. London, 1715.
- . *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements* (1725-26). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 4. 8 vols. *TDH*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.
- . *A General History of Trade (June)*. Vol. 1. 4 vols. London, 1713.
- . *A General History of Trade (August)*. Vol. 3. 4 vols. London, 1713.
- . *A Hymn to the Mob* (1715). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 1. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.

- . *A New Discovery of an Old Intreague* (1691). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 1. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *A New Test of the Church of England's Honesty* (1704). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 3. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *A New Test of the Church of England's Loyalty* (1702). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 3. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *A Plan of the English Commerce* (1728). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 7. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *A Short View of the Present State of the Protestant Religion in Britain*. London, 1707.
- . *A System of Magick* (1727). Edited by Peter Elmer. Vol. 7. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, Volume 1 (1724). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 1. 8 vols. *TDH*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.
- . *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, Volume 2 (1725). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 2. 8 vols. *TDH*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.
- . *An Enquiry into the Case of Mr. Asgil's General Translation: Shewing That 'tis Not a Nearer Way to Heaven than the Grave*. London, 1704.
- . *An Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters in Cases of Preferment* (1697). Vol. 3. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *An Essay at Removing National Prejudices Part II* (1706). Vol. 4. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.

- . *An Essay on the History and Reality of Apparitions* (1727). Edited by G. A. Starr. Vol. 8. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2005.
- . *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press* (1704). Edited by P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens. Vol. 8. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *An Essay upon Literature* (1726). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 4. 8 vols. *TDH*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.
- . *An Essay upon Projects* (1687). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 8. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *An Essay upon Publick Credit* (1710). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *Augusta Triumphans* (1728). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 8. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation: The Last of Defoe's Performances*. Edited by G. A. Starr. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012.
- . *Conjugal Lewdness* (1727). Edited by Liz Bellamy. Vol. 5. 8 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings, Extending from 1716-1729*. Edited by William Lee. Vol. 2. 3 vols. London: J.C. Hotten, 1869.
- . *Daniel Defoe, His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings, Extending from 1716-1729*. Edited by William Lee. Vol. 3. 3 vols. London: J.C. Hotten, 1869.
- . *Defoe's Review*. Edited by John McVeagh. 9 vols. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.

- . *Jure Divino* (1706). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 2. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland* (1717). Edited by N. H. Keeble. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *TDH*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.
- . *Memoirs of the Life and Eminent Conduct of That Learned and Reverend Divine, Daniel Williams, D. D: With Some Account of His Scheme for the Vigorous Propagation of Religion as Well in England as in Scotland and Several Other Parts of the World*. London, 1718.
- . “Memorandum to Robert Harley (1704).” Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 1. 8 vols. *PEW*, 151–64. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *More Reformation* (1703). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 2. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *Of Royal Education*. Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 10. 10 vols. Defoe: Religious and Didactic Writings. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.
- . *Peace Without Union*. In *A True Collection of the Writings of the Author of The True Born English-man*, Volume 2. London, 1705.
- . *Peace without Union. By Way of Reply, to Sir H---- M----’s Peace at Home. The Fourth Edition. To Which Is Added a Preface*. London, 1704.
- . *Reformation of Manners* (1702). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 1. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.

- . *Serious Reflections during the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1720). Edited by G. A. Starr. Vol. 3. 8 vols. *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008.
- . *Some Objections Humbly Offered* (1729). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 8. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *The Anatomy of Exchange-Alley* (1719). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *The Case of Mr. Law Truly Stated* (1721). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *The Commentator* (1720). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 9. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . *The Compleat English Gentleman* (1728-29). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 10. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.
- . *The Complete English Tradesman*, Vol. 1 (1725). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 7. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.
- . *The Complete English Tradesman*, Vol. 2 (1727). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 8. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.
- . *The Consolidator* (1705). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 3. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *The Danger of the Protestant Religion Consider'd, from the Present Prospect of a Religious War in Europe*. London, 1701.

- . *The Director* (1720-21). Edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *The Evident Approach of a War; and Something of the Necessity of It, in Order to Establish Peace, and Preserve Trade. To Which Is Added, an Exact Plan and Description of the Bay and City of Gibraltar*. London, 1727.
- . *The Family Instructor*, Volume 1 (1715). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 1. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . *The Family Instructor*, Volume 2 (1718). Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 2. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . *The Fortunate Mistress: Or, A History of the Life and Vast Variety of Fortunes of Mademoiselle de Beleau, Afterwards Called the Countess de Wintelsheim, in Germany, Being the Person Known by the Name of the Lady Roxana, in the Time of King Charles II*. Edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 9. 10 vols. *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*. London ; Brookfield, Vt: Pickering & Chatto, 2008.
- . *The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders* (1721). Edited by Liz Bellamy. Vol. 6. 10 vols. *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008.
- . *The Great Law of Subordination Consider'd* (1724). Edited by J.A. Downie. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . *The Just Complaint of the Poor Weavers Truly Represented: With as Much Answer as It Deserves, to a Pamphlet Lately Written against Them Entitled The Weavers Pretences Examin'd, &c*. London, 1719.

- . *The Life And Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 1. 10 vols. *The Novels of Daniel Defoe*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008.
- . *The Meditations of Daniel Defoe: Now First Printed*. Edited by George Harris Healey. Cummington, MA: Cummington Press, 1946.
- . *The New Family Instructor* (1727). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 3. 10 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . *The Political History of the Devil* (1726). Edited by John Mullan. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- . *The Poor Man's Plea* (1698). Edited by J.A. Downie. Vol. 6. 8 vols. *RDW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.
- . *The Protestant Jesuite Unmasked....Beware of False Prophets, Which Come to You in Sheeps-Cloathing, Matth. 15.7*. London, 1704.
- . *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (1702). Edited by W. R. Owens. Vol. 3: Dissent. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *The Six Distinguishing Characters of a Parliament-Man* (1700 [for 1701]). Edited by J. A. Downie. Vol. 2. 8 vols. *PEW*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . *The Storm*. Edited by Richard Hamblyn. London: Penguin Classics, 2005.
- Edward Herbert of Cherbury. *The Life and Raigne of King Henry the Eighth*, 1649.

- Filmer, Robert. *Observations Concerning the Original and Various Forms* (1696).  
Edited by Johann P. Sommerville. *Patriarcha and Other Writings*. Cambridge:  
Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . *Patriarcha: Or the Natural Power of Kings: By the Learned Sir Robert  
Filmer, Baronet*. London, 1680.
- Grotius, Hugo. *The Rights Of War And Peace*. Edited by Richard Tuck. Indianapolis,  
IN: Liberty Fund, 2005.
- Heylyn, Peter. *Mikrokosmos. A Little Description of the Great World*. 4th edition.  
Oxford, 1625.
- Howe, John. *A Sermon Preach'd Febr. 14. 1698. And Now Publish'd, at the Request  
of the Societies for Reformation of Manners in London and Westminster*. Lodon,  
1698.
- Huet, Pierre-Daniel. *The History of the Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients*.  
London, 1717.
- Hutcheson, Francis. *Reflections Upon Laughter, and Remarks Upon the Fable of the  
Bees*. London, 1750.
- Laura, Ann Curtis ed. *The Versatile Defoe: An Anthology of Uncollected Writings*.  
Lodon: G. Prior, 1979.
- Leslie, Charles. *A View of the Times, Their Principles and Practices: In the Rehearsals*.  
6 vols. London, 1750.
- . *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontificat Stated*. The second edition.  
London, 1701.

- Lloyd, William. *A Discourse of God's Ways of Disposing of Kingdoms. Part 1 by the Bishop of S. Asaph, Lord Almoner to Their Majesties*. London, 1691.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . *Two Treatises of Government: And a Letter Concerning Toleration*. Edited by Ian Shapiro. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.
- La Rochefoucauld, François. *Moral Maxims and Reflections in Four Parts*. London, 1694.
- Mandeville, Bernard. *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (1732). Edited by F.B. Kaye. Vol. 1. 2 vols. With a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory by F.B. Kaye. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1988.
- . *The Fable of the Bees or Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (1732). Edited by F.B. Kaye. Vol. 2. 2 vols. With a Commentary Critical, Historical, and Explanatory by F.B. Kaye. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1988.
- . *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour and the Usefulness of Christianity in War, by the Author of the Fable of the Bees*. London, 1732.
- Moréri, Louis. *The Great Historical, Geographical, Genealogical and Poetical Dictionary*. Translated by Jeremy Collier. London, 1701.
- N.T., and B. A. *Some Remarks upon Government, and Particularly upon the Establishment of the English Monarchy Relating to This Present Juncture*. London, 1689.

- Nicole, Pierre. *Of Charity and Self-Love*. In *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant, An Anthology*, edited by J. B. Schneewind, translated by Elborg Forster, 1:370–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Palmer, Charles. *A Defence of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, to Supreme and Sovereign Powers*. London, 1710.
- Pascal, Blaise. *Pascal's Pensées*. Introduction by Thomas S. Eliot. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1958.
- Pufendorf, Samuel. *An Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe* [1695]. Edited by Michael J. Seidler. Translated by Jodocus Crull. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2013.
- Raleigh, Sir Walter. *The History of the World* (1614). Edited by William Oldys and Thomas Brch. Vol. 2. 8 vols. *The Works of Sir Walter Raleigh, Kt: Now First Collected to which are Prefixed The Lives of the Author*. Oxford: University Press, 1829.
- Reynolds, Thomas. *A Sermon Preach'd to the Societies for Reformation of Manners in the Citys of London and Westminster. February, 19. 1699. Published at Their Request*. London, 1700.
- Rogers, Timothy. *A Sermon Preach'd to the Societies for Reformation of Manners: In the Cities of London and Westminster. October 7th. 1700*. London, 1701.
- Sharp, John. *A Sermon Preach'd Before Queen Mary at White-Hall: On Easter Day, March 27. 1692*. London, 1709.
- Shower, John. *A Discourse of Tempting Christ*. London, 1694.

———. *A Funeral Sermon Preached upon the Death of Mr. Nathaniel Oldfield*.  
London, 1697.

———. *A New-Years-Gift: Containing Serious Reflections on Time, and Eternity*.  
London, 1699.

———. *Family Religion in Three Letters to a Friend*. London, 1694.

———. *Heaven and Hell, or, The Unchangeable State of Happiness or Misery for All  
Mankind in Another World*. London, 1700.

———. *No Peace to the Wicked: A Sermon Preached on the Fast-Day, May 23. 1694*.  
London, 1694.

———. *Serious Reflections on Time, and Eternity: With Some Other Subjects, Moral  
and Divine. To Which Is Prefix'd an Introduction Concerning the First Day of  
the Year; How Observed by the Jews, and May Best Be Employed by a Serious  
Christian*. London, 1689.

———. *The Mourners Companion: Or, Funeral Discourses on Several Texts*. London,  
1692.

Sidney, Algernon. *Court Maxims*. Edited by Hans W. Blom, Eco Haitsma-Mulier, and  
Ronald Janse. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. *Discourses Concerning Government* (LF Ed.) [1698]. Edited by Thomas G.  
West. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1996.

Societies for the Reformation of Manners. *Proposals for a National Reformation of  
Manners Humbly Offered to the Consideration of Our Magistrates & Clergy*.  
London, 1694.

- Speed, John. *The History of Great Britaine under the Conquests of Ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans. Their Originals, Manners, Warres, Coines & Seales: With Ye Successions, Lives, Acts & Issues of the English Monarchs from Julius Cæsar, to Our Most Gracious Soueraigne King James.* London, 1631.
- Steele, Richard. *The Trades-Man's Calling: Being a Discourse Concerning the Nature, Necessity, Choice, &c. of a Calling in General: And Directions for the Right Managing of the Tradesman's Calling in Particular.* London, 1684.
- Steele, Richard, and Joseph Addison. *The Guardian: No. 83-176, June 16-Oct. 1, 1713.* Edited by Alexander Chalmers. London: J. Johnson, 1806.
- . *The Tatler.* Edited by Donald F. Bond. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- . *The Tatler.* Edited by Donald F. Bond. Vol. 3. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- Stephens, Edward. *A Seasonable and Necessary Admonition to the Gentlemen of the First Society, for Reformation of Manners: Concerning Reformation of Themselves, of the Bishops, and of the House of Commons.* London, 1700.
- Stubs, Philip. *For God Or for Baal: Or, No Neutrality in Religion. A Sermon Against Occasional Communion, Preach'd on Sunday Oct. 4th. 1702.* London, 1702.
- Tillotson, John. *The Works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson, Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: Containing Fifty Four Sermons and Discourses on Several Occasions. Together with the Rule of Faith.* London, 1720.
- Tyrrell, James. *Patriarcha Non Monarcha.* London, 1681.

- Williams, Daniel. *A Defence of Gospel-Truth: Being a Reply to Mr. Chancey's First Part, and as an Explication of the Points in Debate May Serve for a Reply to All Other Answers*. London, 1693.
- . *A Sermon Preach'd before the Societies for Reformation of Manners, in Dublin July the 18th, 1700*. Dublin, 1700.
- . *A Sermon Preached at Salters-Hall to the Societies for Reformation of Manners, May 16, 1698*. London, 1698.
- . *An End to Discord: Wherein Is Demonstrated That No Doctrinal Controversy Remains between the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers Fit to Justify Longer Divisions*. London, 1699.
- . *Gospel-Truth Stated and Vindicated: Wherein Some of Dr Crisp's Opinions Are Considered; and the Opposite Truths Are Plainly Stated and Confirmed*. The second edition. London, 1692.
- . *Practical Discourses on Several Important Subjects*. Vol. 5. 5 vols. London, 1738.
- . *The Answer to the Report, &c., Which the United Ministers Appointed Their Committee to Draw up, as in the Preface*. London, 1698.
- . *The Excellency of a Publick Spirit: Set Forth in a Sermon Preach'd (since Much Enlarged) at the Funeral of That Late Reverend Divine Dr. Samuel Annesley*. London, 1697.

———. *The Vanity of Childhood & Youth Wherein the Depraved Nature of Young People Is Represented and Means for Their Reformation Proposed*. London, 1691.

Woodhouse, John. *A Sermon Preach'd at Salters-Hall to the Societies for Reformation of Manners, May 31, 1697*. London, 1697.

### **Secondary Works:**

Adams, Matthew. "Daniel Defoe and the Bleeding of Britain. Genealogy, Gender and the Making of a National Public." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 27, no. 1 (2004): 1–15.

Ahnert, Thomas. "Historicizing Heresy in the Early German Enlightenment: 'Orthodox' and 'Enthusiast' Variants." In *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Ian Hunter, John Christian Laursen, and Cary J. Nederman, 129–42. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

———. "Pleasure, Pain and Punishment in the Early Enlightenment: German and Scottish Debates." *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik/Annual Review of Law and Ethics* (2004): 173–87.

———. "Religion and Morality." In *The Oxford Handbook of British Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by James Harris, 638–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

- . *Religion and the Origins of the German Enlightenment: Faith and the Reform of Learning in the Thought of Christian Thomasius*. New York: University of Rochester Press, 2006.
- Andersen, Hans H. "The Paradox of Trade and Morality in Defoe." *Modern Philology* 39, no. 1 (1941): 23–46.
- Andrew, Donna T. *Aristocratic Vice: The Attack on Duelling, Suicide, Adultery, and Gambling in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- . "The Code of Honour and Its Critics: The Opposition to Duelling in England, 1700-1850." *Social History* 5, no. 3 (1980): 409–34.
- Aravamudan, Srinivas. "Defoe, Commerce, and Empire." In *The Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe*, edited by John Richetti, 45–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Arthmar, Rogério. "Mandeville and the Markets: An Economic Assessment." In *Bernard de Mandeville's Topology of Paradoxes*, 181–97. Amsterdam: Springer, 2015.
- Austin, Michael. "Saul and the Social Contract: Constructions of 1 Samuel 8-11 in Cowley's *Davideis* and Defoe's *Jure Divino*." *Papers on Language and Literature* 32, no. 4 (1996): 410–36.
- Ayers, Robert W. "Robinson Crusoe: Allusive Allegorick History." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (1967): 399–407.

- Backscheider, Paula R. *Daniel Defoe: Ambition & Innovation*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1986.
- . *Daniel Defoe: His Life*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- . “The Verse Essay, John Locke, and Defoe’s *Jure Divino*.” *English Literary History* 55, no. 1 (1988): 99–124.
- Bahlman, Dudley W. R. *The Moral Revolution of 1688*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Baine, Rodney M. “Daniel Defoe and Robert Drury’s Journal.” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 16, no. 3 (1974): 479–91.
- Balen, Malcolm. *A Very English Deceit: The Secret History of the South Sea Bubble and the First Great Financial Scandal*. London: Fourth Estate, 2002.
- Barr, Rebecca Anne. “‘Complete Hypocrite, Complete Tradesman’: Defoe’s *Complete English Tradesman* and Masculine Conduct.” In *Positioning Daniel Defoe’s Non-Fiction: Form, Function, Genre*, edited by Aino Mäkikalli and Andreas K. E. Mueller, 149–68. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2011.
- Bastian, Frank. *Defoe’s Early Life*. London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Bebb, Evelyn D. *Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life, 1660-1800: Some Problems of the Present as They Appeared in the Past*. Philadelphia, PA: Porcupine Press, 1981.
- Beeke, Joel R., and Mark Jones. *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.

- Berg, Maxine. *Luxury and Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Berg, Maxine, and Elizabeth Eger. "The Rise and Fall of the Luxury Debates." In *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century*, 7–27. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Bernstein, John A. "Shaftesbury's Optimism and Eighteenth-Century Social Thought." In *Anticipations of the Enlightenment in England, France and Germany*, edited by Alan Kors and Paul A. Korshin, 86–101. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- Berry, Christopher J. *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Birdsall, Virginia Ogden. *Defoe's Perpetual Seekers: A Study of the Major Fiction*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press Associated University Presses, 1985.
- Blewett, David. *Defoe's Art of Fiction--Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, Colonel Jack & Roxana*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- . "The Retirement Myth In *Robinson Crusoe*: A Reconsideration." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15, no. 2 (1982): 37–50.
- Bostridge, Ian. *Witchcraft and Its Transformations, c.1650-c.1750*. Oxford: Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Branchi, Andrea. "Courage and Chastity in a Commercial Society. Mandeville's Point on Male and Female Honour." In *Bernard de Mandeville's Tropology of*

- Paradoxes: Morals, Politics, Economics, and Therapy*, edited by Edmundo Balsemão Pires and Joaquim Braga, 199–211. Dordrecht: Springer, 2015.
- Breuninger, Scott. *Recovering Bishop Berkeley : Virtue and Society in the Anglo-Irish Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Brewer, John, and Roy Porter, eds. *Consumption and the World of Goods*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Bristow, Edward. *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1977.
- Brooke, Christopher. “Eighteenth-Century Carthage.” In *Commerce and Peace in the Enlightenment*, edited by Béla Kapossy, Isaac Nakhimovsky, and Richard Whatmore, 110–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- . *Philosophic Pride: Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Buckle, Stephen. *Natural Law and the Theory of Property: Grotius to Hume*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Burch, Charles Eaton. “Defoe and the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners.” *The Review of English Studies* 16 (1940): 306–12.
- Burt, Shelley. “The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: Between John Locke and the Devil in Augustan England.” In *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox*

- Writing and Cultural Response, 1660–1750*, edited by Roger D. Lund, 149–69.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688–1740*. Cambridge:  
Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Capoferro, Riccardo. *Empirical Wonder: Historicizing the Fantastic, 1660–1760*.  
Bern ; New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Carswell, John Patrick. *The South Sea Bubble*. London: Cresset Press, 1960.
- Champion, J. A. I. *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and Its  
Enemies, 1660–1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Chernaik, Warren. “Biblical Republicanism.” *Prose Studies* 23, no. 1 (April 1, 2000):  
147–160.
- Clark, J. C. D. *English Society, 1660–1832: Religion, Ideology and Politics during the  
Ancien Regime*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,  
2000.
- Clark, K. R. P. “Defoe, Dissent, and Early Whig Ideology.” *The Historical Journal* 52,  
no. 3 (2009): 595–614.
- Clark, Katherine. *Daniel Defoe: The Whole Frame of Nature, Time, and Providence*.  
Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007.
- Clifford, Alan C. *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640–  
1790: An Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

- . “Richard Baxter (1615–91).” In *Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical Theology 1640–1790: An Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Connell, Philip. *The Failure of Uniformity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Cooper, Tim. *Fear and Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: Richard Baxter and Antinomianism*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Cowan, Brian William. “Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37, no. 3 (2004): 345–66.
- Curtis, Laura A. “A Rhetorical Approach to the Prose of Daniel Defoe.” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 11, no. 3 (1993): 293–319.
- Curtis, Tony C., and William A. Speck. “The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform.” *Literature and History* 3 (1976): 45–64.
- Cuttica, Cesare. *Writing in the Early Caroline Regime and the Issue of Patriarcha’s Non-Publication*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012.
- Damrosch, Leopold. *God’s Plot & Man’s Stories: Studies in the Fictional Imagination from Milton to Fielding*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- DeLuna, D. N. “Ironic Monologue and ‘Scandalous “Ambo-Dexter” Conformity’ in Defoe’s *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*.” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 57, no. 4 (1994): 319–35.
- Deporte, Michael. “Avenging Naboth: Swift and Monarchy.” *Philological Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (1990): 419–33.

- Deringer, William. “‘It Was Their Business to Know’: British Merchants and Mercantile Epistemology in the Eighteenth Century.” *History of Political Economy* 49, no. 2 (2017): 177–206.
- Dew, Ben. “Spurs to Industry in Bernard Mandeville’s Fable of the Bees.” *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28, no. 2 (2005): 151–65.
- Dickey, Laurence. “Pride, Hypocrisy and Civility in Mandeville’s Social and Historical Theory.” *Critical Review* 4, no. 3 (1990): 387–431.
- Dickinson, H. T. *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. London: Methuen, 1979.
- Dickson, P. G. M. *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit, 1688-1756*. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Dijkstra, Bram. *Defoe and Economics: The Fortunes of Roxana in the History of Interpretation*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987.
- Domingo, Darryl P., ed. “Unbending the Mind: Or, Commercialized Leisure and the Rhetoric of Eighteenth-Century Diversion.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (2012): 207–36.
- Douglas, Aileen. *Work in Hand: Script, Print, and Writing, 1690-1840*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Dowdell, Coby. “‘A Living Law to Himself and Others’: Daniel Defoe, Algernon Sidney, and the Politics of Self-Interest in Robinson Crusoe and Farther Adventures.” *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 22, no. 3 (2010): 415–442.

- Downie, J. A. "Defoe's Shortest Way with the Dissenters: Irony, Intention and Reader Response." In *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius*, 120–39. London: Frank Cass, 1987.
- . "Defoe's Review, the Theatre, and Anti-High-Church Propaganda." *Restoration & 18th Century Theatre Research* 15, no. 1 (1976): 24–32.
- Durston, Christopher, and Jacqueline Eales. "Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560–1700." In *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700*, 1–31. Palgrave, London, 1996.
- Earle, Peter. *The World of Defoe*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.
- Faller, Lincoln B. *Crime and Defoe: A New Kind of Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Fitzmaurice, Susan. "Changes in the Meanings of Politeness In Eighteenth-Century England: Discourse Analysis and Historical Evidence." In *Historical (Im)Politeness*, edited by Jonathan Culpeper and Dániel Z. Kádár, 87–116. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Force, Pierre. *Self-Interest before Adam Smith: A Genealogy of Economic Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Furbank, P. N. "Introduction." In *A General History of Discoveries and Improvements (1725-26)*, edited by P. N. Furbank. Vol. 4. *TDH*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2001.
- Furbank, P. N., and W. R. Owens. *A Critical Bibliography of Daniel Defoe*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1998.

- . *A Political Biography of Daniel Defoe*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- Girdler, Lew. “Defoe’s Education at Newington Green Academy.” *Studies in Philology* 50, no. 4 (1953): 573–591.
- Goldie, Mark. “Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism.” In *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Nicholas Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, 209–231. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . “The Damning of King Monmouth: Pulpit Toryism in the Reign of James II.” In *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-1691 and Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*, edited by Tim Harris and Stephen Taylor, 33–55. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013.
- . “The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England.” In *From Persecution to Toleration*, 331–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Goldsmith, M. M. “Liberty, Virtue, and the Rule of Law.” In *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649-1776*, edited by David Wootton, 197–232. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- . *Private Vices, Public Benefits: Bernard Mandeville’s Social and Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Gregg, Stephen H. *Defoe’s Writings and Manliness Contrary Men*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Greif, Martin J. “The Conversion of Robinson Crusoe.” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 6, no. 3 (1966): 551–74.

- Guilhamet, Leon. *Defoe and the Whig Novel: A Reading of the Major Fiction*. University of Delaware Press, 2010.
- Gunn, J. A. W. *Beyond Liberty and Property*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1983.
- Harris, Tim. *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*. London: Longman, 1993.
- Hartley, James E. "The Chameleon Daniel Defoe: Public Writing in the Age before Economic Theory." In *Money, Power, and Print : Interdisciplinary Studies on the Financial Revolution in the British Isles*, edited by Charles Ivar McGrath and Christopher J. Fauske, 26–50. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- Haynes, Stephen R. *Noah's Curse: The Biblical Justification of American Slavery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Hayton, David. "Moral Reform and Country Politics in the Late Seventeenth- Century House of Commons." *Past & Present* 128, no. 1 (1990): 48–89.
- Heilbron, Johan. "French Moralists and the Anthropology of the Modern Era: On the Genesis of the Notions of 'Interest' and 'Commercial Society.'" In *The Rise of the Social Sciences and the Formation of Modernity: Conceptual Change in Context, 1750-1850*, edited by Johan Heilbron, Lars Magnusson, and Björn Wittrock, 77–106. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publications, 1998.
- Hentzi, Gary. "'An Itch of Gaming': The South Sea Bubble and the Novels of Daniel Defoe." *Eighteenth-century Life* 17, no. 1 (1993): 32–45.

- Herd, Jennifer A. *Putting on Virtue: The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*. London: Allen Lane, 1993.
- Hirschman, Albert O. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before Its Triumph*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Hochstrasser, T. J. *Natural Law Theories in the Early Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Holmes, Geoffrey S. *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell*. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Hone, Joseph. *Literature and Party Politics at the Accession of Queen Anne*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Hont, Istvan. "Free Trade and the Economic Limits to National Politics." In *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective*, 185–266. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
- . "Jealousy of Trade: An Introduction." In *Jealousy of Trade: International Competition and the Nation-State in Historical Perspective*, 1–156. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.
- . "The Early Enlightenment Debate on Commerce and Luxury." In *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought*, edited by Mark

- Goldie and Robert Wokler, 377–418. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Hont, Istvan, and Michael Ignatieff. “Needs and Justice in the Wealth of Nations: An Introductory Essay.” In *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment*, edited by Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, 1–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hopes, Jeffrey. “Politics and Morality in the Writings of Jeremy Collier.” *Literature and History* 8 (1978): 159–74.
- Hoppit, Julian. “The Myths of the South Sea Bubble.” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 12 (2002): 141–65.
- Horne, Thomas A. *The Social Thought of Bernard Mandeville: Virtue and Commerce in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Hundert, Edward. “Mandeville, Rousseau and the Political Economy of Fantasy.” In *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*, edited by Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Eger, 28–40. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003.
- . *The Enlightenment’s Fable: Bernard Mandeville and the Discovery of Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Hunt, Margaret R. *The Middling Sort*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996.

- Hunter, J. Paul. *The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in Robinson Crusoe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.
- Hutchison, T. W. *Before Adam Smith: The Emergence of Political Economy, 1662-1776*. Oxford: Basil Blackford, 1988.
- Ingram, Martin. "Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England." In *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England*, edited by Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle, 47–88. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Isaacs, Tina. "The Anglican Hierarchy and the Reformation of Manners 1688–1738." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33, no. 3 (1982): 391–411.
- James, E. Anthony. *Daniel Defoe's Many Voices: A Rhetorical Study of Prose Style and Literary Method*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1972.
- James, E. D. *Pierre Nicole, Jansenist and Humanist: A Study of His Thought*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972.
- John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. *The Poems of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Shakespeare Head Press, 1984.
- Johnston, Warren. *Revelation Restored: The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011.
- Kay, Carol. *Political Constructions: Defoe, Richardson, and Sterne in Relation to Hobbes, Hume, and Burke*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Keane, Patrick J. *Coleridge's Submerged Politics: The Ancient Mariner and Robinson Crusoe*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1994.

- . “Slavery and the Slave Trade: Crusoe as Defoe’s Representative.” In *Critical Essays on Daniel Defoe*, edited by Roger D. Lund, 97–120. New York: G.K. Hall, 1997.
- Keeble, N. H. “Take Heed of Being Too Forward in Imposinge On Others’: Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Baxterian Tradition.” In *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, edited by David Loewenstein and John Marshall, 282–305. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- . *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987.
- Keohane, Nannerl O. *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Kiernan, Michael, ed. *The Oxford Francis Bacon VIII: The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh and Other Works of the 1620s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Killeen, Kevin. “Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in Early Modern England.” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73, no. 3 (2010): 491–506.
- . *The Political Bible in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Kim Ian Parker. “‘A King like Other Nations’: Political Theory and the Hebrew Republic in the Early Modern Age.” In *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible*, edited by Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie, 384-96

- Klein, Lawrence E. *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness: Moral Discourse and Cultural Politics in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . ‘Property and politeness in the early Eighteenth-century Whig moralists.’ In *Early Modern Conceptions of Property*, edited by John Brewer and Susan Staves (New York: Routledge, 1995), 221-33
- Knights, Mark, ed. *Faction Displayed: Reconsidering the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- . *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Kramnick, Isaac. *Bolingbroke and His Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Lacey, D. R. *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661–1689: A Study in the Perpetuation and Tempering of Parliamentarianism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.
- Lee, Sungho. “Mercantile Gentility Out of Reach: Moral Cartography and Rhetorical Guidance in Defoe’s *Captain Singleton*.” *Modern Language Review* 112, no. 2 (2017): 299–319.
- Leiter, Yechiel. *John Locke’s Political Philosophy and the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

- Levitin, Dmitri. "John Spencer's *De Legibus Hebraeorum* (1683–85) and 'Enlightened' Sacred History: A New Interpretation." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76, no. 1 (2013): 49–92.
- Luban, Daniel. "Bernard Mandeville as Moralizer and Materialist." *History of European Ideas* 41, no. 7 (2015): 831–57.
- Lynch, Helen. *Milton and the Politics of Public Speech*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Mäkikalli, Aino. *From Eternity to Time: Conceptions of Time in Daniel Defoe's Novels*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Manning, David. "Anglican Religious Societies, Organizations, and Missions." In *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, 2: Establishment and Empire, 1662–1829*: 429–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- . "Anti-Providentialism as Blasphemy in Late Stuart England: A Case Study of 'the Stage Debate.'" *Journal of Religious History* 32, no. 4 (2008): 422–38.
- Marshall, Ashley. "Daniel Defoe as Satirist." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (2007): 553–76.
- Marshall, John. *John Locke: Resistance, Religion and Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Mayer, Robert. "The Rhetoric of Historical Truth: Heylyn Contra Fuller on The Church-History of Britain." *Prose Studies* 20, no. 3 (1997): 1–20.
- McKendrick, Neil, John Brewer, and John H. Plumb. *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*. London: Europa, 1982.

- McVeagh, John. "Introduction." In *PEW*, edited by John McVeagh. Vol. 7. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2000.
- . "Introduction to *The Compleat English Tradesman*." In *RDW*, 7:1–32. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.
- . "Rochester and Defoe: A Study in Influence." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 14, no. 3 (1974): 327–41.
- Meier, Thomas Keith. *Defoe and the Defense of Commerce*. Victoria, [B.C.]: Department of English, University of Victoria, 1987.
- Merrett, Robert. "Daniel Defoe and Islam." *Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies*/*Lumen: Travaux choisis de la Société canadienne d'étude du dix-huitième siècle* 24 (2005): 19–34.
- . *Daniel Defoe: Contrarian*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.
- . *Daniel Defoe's Moral and Rhetorical Ideas*. Victoria, [B.C.]: Department of English, University of Victoria, 1980.
- . "Pictorialism in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Visual Thinking and Narrative Diversity." In *Time, Literature and the Arts: Essays in Honor of S. L. Macey*, edited by T.L. Clearly, 157–91. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria, 1994.
- Moore, John Robert. *Daniel Defoe: Citizen of the Modern World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- . "Mandeville and Defoe." In *Mandeville Studies*, edited by Irwin Primer, 119–25. Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975.

- Moriarty, Michael. *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves: Early Modern French Thought II*.  
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Mueller, Andreas. *A Critical Study of Daniel Defoe's Verse*. Lampeter and Lewiston,  
NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010.
- Mullan, John. "Introduction." In *The Political History of the Devil* (1726), edited by  
John Mullan. Vol. 6. *SFS*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2003.
- Muramatsu, Shigemi. "Andrew Fletcher's Critique of Commercial Civilisation and  
His Plan for European Federal Union." In *The Rise of Political Economy in the  
Scottish Enlightenment*, edited by Tatsuya Sakamoto and Hideo Tanaka, 8–21.  
London: Routledge, 2003.
- Newton, John A. "Samuel Annesley (1620-1696)." *Proceedings of the Wesley  
Historical Society* 45, no. 2 (1985): 29–45.
- Novak, Maximillian E. "Crusoe the King and the Political Evolution of His Island."  
*Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 2, no. 3 (1962): 337–350.
- . *Daniel Defoe: Master of Fictions: His Life and Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford  
University Press, 2001.
- . *Defoe and the Nature of Man*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- . *Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe*. New York: Russell & Russell,  
1976.
- . *Realism, Myth, and History in Defoe's Fiction*. Lincoln, NE: University of  
Nebraska Press, 1983.

- . *The Uses of Irony: Papers on Defoe and Swift Read at a Clark Library Seminar; April 2, 1966*. Los Angeles, CA: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1966.
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The Debate on the English Reformation*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Osborne, Francis. *Advice to A Son*. London: D. Nutt, 1896.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Reading Between the Lines*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Paul, Helen J. *The South Sea Bubble: An Economic History of Its Origins and Consequences*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Pederson, Randall James. *Unity in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603-1689*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Peltonen, Markku. *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Phillipson, Nicholas "Propriety, Property and Prudence: David Hume and the Defence of the Revolution." In *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Nicholas T. Phillipson and Quentin Skinner, 302–20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Politeness and Politics in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hanoverians." In *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*, edited by J. G. A. Pocock, Gordon J. Schochet, and Lois G. Schwoerer, 211-45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *David Hume: The Philosopher as Historian*. London: Penguin Books, 2011.

- Picchio, Antonella. "Needs and Passions Of Human Subsistence in The Moral Economy Of The Early 18th Century: Defoe and Mandeville." *History of Economic Ideas* 11, no. 2 (2003): 7–29.
- Pigney, Stephen J. "Theophilus Gale and Historiography of Philosophy." In *Insiders and Outsiders in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, edited by Tom Sorell, Graham Alan John Rogers, and Jill Kraye, 76–98. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Popper, Nicholas Seth. *Walter Raleigh's History of the World and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Price, Martin. *To the Palace of Wisdom: Studies in Order and Energy from Dryden to Blake*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.
- Primer, Irwin, ed. *Bernard Mandeville's A Modest Defence of Publick Stews-Prostitution and Its Discontents in Early Georgian England*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Pritchard, Penny. "Voices of Dissent: Rhetorical Strategies in Defoe's Writing Before 1719." In *Positioning Daniel Defoe's Non-Fiction: Form, Function, Genre*, edited by Andreas K. E. Mueller and Aino Mäkikalli, 17–38. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011.
- Rahe, Paul A. "Montesquieu's Anti-Machiavellian Machiavellianism." *History of European Ideas* 37, no. 2 (2011): 128–36.

- Reed, Joel. "Nationalism and Geoculture in Defoe's History of Writing." *Modern Language Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (1995): 31–53.
- Richetti, John J. *Daniel Defoe*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987.
- . *The Life of Daniel Defoe: A Critical Biography*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2005.
- Ridley, Glynis. "A Good Argument: Ciceronian Prescriptions, Pamphlet Literature and The Shortest Way with the Dissenters." In *Positioning Daniel Defoe's Non-Fiction: Form, Function, Genre*, edited by Andreas K. E. Mueller and Aino Mäkikalli, 3–16. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2011.
- Rist, John M. *Augustine Deformed: Love, Sin and Freedom in the Western Moral Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Rivero, Albert J. "The Restored Garden and the Devil as Christ: Defoe's Inversion of Biblical Images of Salvation in *Roxana*." *Essays in Literature* 11, no. 2 (1984): 285–91.
- Rivers, Isabel. *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780, Volume 1: Whichcote to Wesley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Robertson, John. *The Case for the Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples, 1680-1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Rogers, Pat. *Robinson Crusoe. Unwin Critical Library*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1979.

- Roosen, William. "An English View of Louis XIV's Kingdom: The France of Daniel Defoe." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History* 19 (1992): 77–87.
- Rose, Craig. "Providence, Protestant Union and Godly Reformation in the 1690s." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, no. 3 (1993): 151–70.
- Rudolph, Julia. *Revolution by Degrees: James Tyrell and Whig Political Thought in Late Seventeenth Century*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Sarkela, Sandra J. "Moderation, Religion, and Public Discourse: The Rhetoric of Occasional Conformity in England, 1697-1711." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 15, no. 1 (1997): 53–79.
- Sauer, Elizabeth. *Barbarous Dissonance and Images of Voice in Milton's Epics*. Montreal ; Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996.
- Schaffer, Simon. "Defoe's Natural Philosophy and the Worlds of Credit." In *Nature Transfigured: Science and Literature 1700–1900*, edited by John R. R. Christie and Sally Shuttleworth, 13–44. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Schochet, Gordon J. *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1975.
- Schonhorn, Manuel. *Defoe's Politics: Parliament, Power, Kingship and Robinson Crusoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- Sekora, John. *Luxury: The Concept in Western Thought from Eden to Smollett*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.
- Sherman, Sandra. *Finance and Fictionality in the Early Eighteenth Century Accounting for Defoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . “Promises, Promises: Credit as Contested Metaphor in Early Capitalist Discourse.” *Modern Philology* 94, no. 3 (1997): 327–349.
- Shinagel, Michael. *Daniel Defoe and Middle Class Gentility*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Shoemaker, R.B. “Reforming the City: The Reformation of Manners Campaign in London, 1690-1738.” In *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689–1750*, edited by Lee Davison, Tim Hitchcock, Tim Kearns, and R.B. Shoemaker, 99–120. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992.
- Sirota, Brent S. “The Occasional Conformity Controversy, Moderation, and the Anglican Critique of Modernity, 1700–1714.” *The Historical Journal* 57, no. 1 (2014): 81–105.
- Slack, Paul. *The Invention of Improvement: Information and Material Progress in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- . “The Politics of Consumption and England’s Happiness in the Later Seventeenth Century.” *English Historical Review* 122, no. 497 (2007): 609–31.

- Smith, Courtney Weiss. *Empiricist Devotions: Science, Religion, and Poetry in Early Eighteenth-Century England*. Charlottesville, VI: University of Virginia Press, 2016.
- Soncini, Sara. "The Island as a Social Experiment. A Reappraisal of Daniel Defoe's Political Discourse(s) in *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures*." In *Wrestling with Defoe. Approaches from a Workshop on Defoe's Prose.*, edited by Mariluisa Bignami, 11–43. Bologna: Cisalpino, 1997.
- Sonnellitter, Karen. "The Reformation of Manners Societies, the Monarchy, and the English State, 1696–1714." *Historian* 72, no. 3 (2010): 517–42.
- Spurr, John. *England in the 1670s: This Masquerading Age*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- . *English Puritanism, 1603-1689*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.
- . "The Church, the Societies and the Moral Revolution of 1688." In *The Church of England, c.1689–c.1833: From Toleration to Tractarianism*, edited by John Walsh, Colin Haydon, and Stephen Taylor, 127–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Virtue, Religion and Government: The Anglican Uses of Providence." In *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, edited by Mark Goldie, Paul Seaward, and Tim Harris, 29–47. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Starr, G. A. *Defoe & Spiritual Autobiography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.

- . “Defoe and Biblical Memory.” In *New Windows on a Woman’s World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*, edited by Colin Gibson, Lisa Marr, and Jocelyn Harris, 316–35. Dunedin, New Zealand: Department of English, University of Otago, 2006.
- . “Introduction.” In *Christianity Not as Old as the Creation: The Last of Defoe’s Performances*, edited by G. A. Starr, by Daniel Defoe. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012.
- . *Defoe and Casuistry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Swinburne, Richard. *Theodicy in Christian Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Thomas, Roger. “Comprehension and Indulgence.” In *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662-1962*, edited by Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick, 191–253. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- . “Presbyterians in Transition.” In *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism*, edited by C. Cordon Bolam, 113–74. London: Allen & Unwin, 1968.
- Tolonen, Mikko. *Mandeville and Hume: Anatomists of Civil Society*. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2013.
- Van Kley, Dale. “Pierre Nicole, Jansenism, and the Morality of Enlightened Self-Interest.” *Anticipations of the Enlightenment in England, France, and Germany* (1987): 69–85.

- Verburg, Rudi. "Bernard Mandeville's Vision of the Social Utility of Pride and Greed." *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 22, no. 4 (2015): 662–91.
- . "The Dutch Background of Bernard Mandeville's Thought: Escaping the Procrustean Bed of Neo-Augustinianism." *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics* 9, no. 1 (2015): 32–61.
- Vickers, Ilse. *Defoe and the New Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Viner, Jacob. *The Role of Providence in the Social Order: An Essay in Intellectual History*. Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1972.
- Wallace, Dewey D. *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- . *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714: Variety, Persistence, and Transformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England, 1500-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Whyte, Jessica. "The Fortunes of Natural Man: Robinson Crusoe, Political Economy, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." *Humanity: An International*

*Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 5, no. 3 (2014):  
301–21.

Wykes, David L. “Religious Leadership and English Dissent after the Glorious Revolution: The Role of the Rev. Dr Daniel Williams (ca. 1643-1715/16).” In *Episcopacy, Authority, and Gender*, edited by Jan Wim Buisman, Marjet Derks, and Peter Raedts, 127–38. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. “The Contribution of the Dissenting Academy to the Emergence of Rational Dissent,” in *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent.* In *Enlightenment and Religion: Rational Dissent in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, 102–12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

#### **Unpublished thesis**

Craig, A. G. “The Movement for the Reformation of Manners, 1688-1715.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1980.