2010

Parallel Lives and Literary Legacies: Crusoe's Elder Brother and Defoe's Cavalier

Andrea Walkden
Queens College

PARALLEL LIVES AND LITERARY LEGACIES: CRUSOE'S ELDER BROTHER AND DEFOE'S CAVALIER

BY ANDREA WALKDEN

The first sentence of *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), now known simply as *Robinson Crusoe,* may deserve more attention than it has traditionally received:

> I was born in the year 1632, in the city of *York*, of a good family, tho' not of that country, my father being a foreigner of *Bremen*, who settled first at *Hull*: He got a good estate by merchandise, and leaving off his trade, lived afterwards at *York*, from whence he had married my mother, whose relations were named *Robinson*, a very good family in that country, and from whom I was call'd *Robinson Kreutznaer*; but by the usual corruption of words in *England*, we are now call'd, nay we call our selves, and write our name *Crusoe*, and so my companions always call'd me.[1]

Here in miniature is the life of Crusoe senior: his emigration from Germany to England, his successful career in trade, and his socially advantageous marriage to a Yorkshire gentlewoman. The anglicization of the family surname from Kreutznaer to Crusoe marks the final stage of incorporation into the middle state of bourgeois English life, a state whose blessings Crusoe senior will attempt to inculcate into his youngest son.[2] With this brief paternal backstory Daniel Defoe shows how Crusoe inherits the mercantile values of his father even as he spurns his father's advice. His decision to leave home and his voyage from England to the Caribbean continue the westward movement that Crusoe senior, now confined by the gout, had already begun.

By choosing Bremen as the birthplace of Crusoe's father, Defoe connects Crusoe's family history to the larger outlines of European history and to the controversial foreign policy of George I, Elector of Hanover, in particular. In 1712, Hanover had seized the German duchies of Bremen and Verden from Sweden, and in 1715, less than a year after his coronation, George was urging the British fleet, originally sent to the Baltic to protect merchant shipping, to block Swedish supply lines to their military bases in Germany. This was illegal under the 1701 Act

of Settlement, which stipulated that a monarch who held territories independently of the British crown could not use British resources to defend or maintain them.[3] The resulting debate split the ruling Whig party in two, one side lobbying parliament to supply money for George's anti-Swedish policy, the other protesting that British money was being used to support Hanoverian expansion.[4] Bremen and Verden were only formally ceded to Hanover in the summer of 1719, a few months after the publication of *Robinson Crusoe,* and Defoe could reliably have expected his first audience to spot the political allusion. Buried within the family history of its eponymous hero, the reference to Bremen engages, if only momentarily, a contemporary debate over British foreign policy and mainland Europe. More importantly, it supplies a European context for its own story, making Crusoe and "the whole Anglo-Saxon spirit" (in James Joyce's words) embodied within him the product of European migration; the most enduring, if currently one of the least recognized, of Defoe's many ripostes to the nationalist ideal of the "True-Born Englishman."[5]

The alacrity with which *Robinson Crusoe* abandons these continental relations, both familial and geopolitical, and sets sail for North Africa and the Caribbean has long been interpreted as a marker of its ambition as well as a cause of its enduring success.[6] In a chronological foreshortening that puts the death of his eldest son at Dunkirk in 1658 prior to the first sea voyage of his youngest in 1651, Crusoe's father cautions Crusoe against ambition by reminding him of the fate of his brother, "to whom he had used the same earnest perswasions to keep him from going into the Low Country wars, but could not prevail, his young desires prompting him to run into the army where he was kill'd."[7] Yet from a literary, as opposed to a paternal, standpoint, the resemblance between the two prodigal brothers would seem to matter less than their opposition. Compressed into a single sentence, Crusoe's brother pursues the career that Crusoe avoids by leaving the old world behind; to this dead brother belongs the story that Defoe conspicuously chooses not to tell in *Robinson Crusoe.* Crusoe is identified with trade and mercantile activity, his elder brother with the traditional sword realm of military service. To the extent that the one represents the emerging culture of capitalism, the other the declining culture of feudalism, the choice of protagonist and the choice of first casualty in his plot seem satisfyingly appropriate for a work routinely associated with the rise of the new form of the modern English novel.[8] As a character type, Crusoe's brother is already dead when Crusoe sets sail on the open sea.

It remains the case, however, that Defoe kills off Crusoe's older brother, the superannuated solider fighting in the confessional conflicts of seventeenth century Europe—"a heap of conspiracies, rebellions, murders, massacres, revolutions, [and] banishments," according to the King of Brobdingnag in conversation with another sailor and younger son—only to remake him less than a year later in the *Memoirs of a Cavalier*.[9] Written consecutively during 1719 and 1720, the life stories of Crusoe and the Cavalier juxtapose mercantile and military adventurism, two ways of seeing the world that Defoe places in precise historical relation. For as they turn back to war torn Europe, the *Memoirs* supply a context that can modify a reading of *Robinson Crusoe*; they trace the years preceding and embracing the English civil wars and their impact upon their narrator-protagonist, the warmongering Cavalier. That this context is already instinct in the autobiographical preliminaries to Crusoe's narrative further suggests its explanatory—and imaginative—force.

If recognizing how Defoe sought to contextualize Crusoe, first in the brief family history that opens his narrative and then with an increased engagement in the *Memoirs*, requires one to apprehend the European dimensions of his story, it calls also for a reappraisal of Crusoe's fraternal counterexample, the functional character recuperated and given voice in the historical fiction of the Cavalier. Few in number, critical readings of the *Memoirs* have invested either in its high minded depiction of heroism and honor or in its plot of progressive disillusionment. Maximillian Novak advances the former viewpoint, styling its first person protagonist as "Defoe's version of the ideal Cavalier—brave, idealistic, fair—the model created by Clarendon in the character of Falkland in his *History of the Rebellion*."[10] Apparent in his aristocratization of the family name and in the coat of arms he displayed on the frontispiece to his epic poem *Jure Divino*, Defoe's social ambitions were clearly bound up with the glamour of martial heroism; in 1685 he joined the Duke of Monmouth's disastrous uprising against James II, and in 1703 he proposed military service as suitable atonement for his political satire, *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*.[11] Yet the *Memoirs* remain an unsatisfactory vehicle for chivalric nostalgia, especially in the form of autobiographical fantasy. Paula R. Backsheider and Sharon Alker have usefully foregrounded moments whose realism appears to imperil the world of heroic romance, if not also the psychological health of its narrator-protagonist.[12] Both read the *Memoirs* back through the Enlightenment antiwar project, locating Defoe at the forefront of a historical shift of attitudes towards warfare

and refashioning the Cavalier as a modern prototype, the terrorizing and traumatized soldier, no less than Crusoe himself.

My intention here is to build on these two different lines of critical inquiry by showing how Defoe uses the *Memoirs*, less readily allegorized than *Robinson Crusoe*, to lay bare competing models of social and political authority, specifically those of status privilege and sacral kingship. As Novak has recognized, the Cavalier's sense of himself, his obligations to other people, and his self presentation are very largely constructed out of the materials of aristocratic culture, but it is precisely these materials that come under increasing strain, culminating in a parodic escape narrative patterned upon Charles II's escape from the Battle of Worcester as it had been mythologized in Stuart historiography. Unlike Charles's person, the Cavalier's manuscript does not evade capture at Worcester. Seized as plunder, its loss and later discovery are recounted in an editorial preface that releases the *Memoirs* into Defoe's own historical moment when the Cavalier's narrative becomes identified as a site of potential resistance to Tory constructions of the seventeenth-century past. Thus ironized and resituated, the *Memoirs* negate the heroic aspirations of the Cavalier and advance a new historiography in the service of political partisanship. What this context suggests in turn is that war is not itself the subject of Defoe's narrative, that the *Memoirs* are not about the life and death business of killing or being killed; rather, these are the elements with which Defoe isolates an aristocratic outlook and relegates it, perhaps not without regret, to the losing end of history.

I.

The *Memoirs* introduce themselves as the autobiographical account of a Shropshire gentleman who, desirous to postpone "a very advantageous Match . . . with a young Lady of very extraordinary Fortune and Merit," sets out on a Grand Tour of Europe in the company of a university acquaintance, one Captain Fielding, in the spring of 1630.[13] By turning his back on domestic commitment, the Cavalier enlists in a distinguished company of anti-marital adventurers that includes Pantagruel and his sidekick Panurge from François Rabelais's *Le Quart Livre* (1552) and Bertram and his sidekick Parolles from William Shakespeare's *All's Well That Ends Well* (1602–1603). Uniting this anti-marital tradition with the biblical tradition of the prodigal son, Defoe describes the Cavalier's errant wanderings among the Catholic nations of Europe, France, Italy, and imperial Austria, which culminate

in his desire to see the army of the famous Spanish general Count Tilly, currently besieging the Protestant city of Magdeburg. The sack and torching of that city marks a turning point in the Cavalier's moral and confessional education—"a sad Welcome into the Army for me, and gave me a Horror and Aversion to the Emperor's People, as well as to his Cause" (*MC*, 47). Before the fires are out, he abandons the city and his previous notions of war as a spectator sport and joins the Protestant forces mustering to defend the nearby city of Leipzig from the imperial advance.

The remainder of part one of the *Memoirs* describes the Cavalier's military service in Germany. Spurred on by his companion Captain Fielding and by the acquaintance of a Scottish officer, Sir John Hepburn, the Cavalier enters the Swedish army as a volunteer, sharing in its victory at the Battle of Breitenfeld (1631). From this point onward, his fortunes rise with those of their king, Gustavus Adolphus, who quickly establishes *de facto* dominion over southern Germany. Adolphus's unexpected death at the Battle of Lützen (1632), together with the rout of the Swedish-Protestant army at Nördlingen (1634), marks the second turning point in the Cavalier's adventures. Disillusioned by defeat, he crosses from Germany into the United Provinces intending to observe the fighting between the Dutch Republic and Spain. But the tactical war of attrition, so different from the open battlefields and dashing gallantry of the German theater, soon tires him and he decides to return to England.

Back in his native Shropshire, the Cavalier becomes an avid consumer of continental news: "I could not but be peeping in all the foreign Accounts from *Germany*, to see who and who was together" (*MC*, 121). His admission represents a metafictional move on Defoe's part since the foreign newbooks or *corantos* which his hero seizes upon constitute the main source for the *Memoirs of a Cavalier.* Defoe drew in particular upon *The Swedish Intelligencer*, compiled by the Church of England clergyman William Watts, which celebrated the progress of Gustavus Adolphus, "that *Caesar* and *Alexander* of our times," in four parts and numerous issues between 1632 and 1634.[14] But the Cavalier's consumption of European news also serves a second, no less important, purpose by foregrounding his inability to return to the routines of civilian life. Hunting, traditionally the pastime of the warring classes, provides some distraction, but the Cavalier admits to hankering "after a warmer Sport" (*MC*, 121). His wish is answered by the deteriorating relation between Charles I and his Scottish subjects, who, refusing to accept the Anglican prayer book, move into open re-

bellion in 1639. The Cavalier seizes upon the opportunity for renewed action: "I confess I did not much trouble my Head with the Cause; but all my Fear was, they would not fall out, and we should have no Fighting" (*MC*, 121). Part one of the *Memoirs* ends with the uneasy détente between the English army and the Scottish rebels, setting the stage for part two, which follows the Cavalier's fortunes in the royalist army from the Second Bishops' War of 1640 to the disastrous defeat at Marston Moor in 1644 and his final surrender of arms in 1646.

At the beginning of part two of the *Memoirs* the Cavalier renounces his former eagerness to fight for fighting's sake and subjects himself to interpretative pressure for the first time in his narrative:

> I confess, when I went into Arms at the Beginning of this War, I never troubled my self to examine Sides: I was glad to hear the Drums beat for Soldiers; as if I had been a meer *Swiss*, that had not car'd which Side went up or down, so I had my Pay. I went as eagerly and blindly about my Business, as the meanest Wretch that listed in the Army; nor had I the least compassionate Thought for the Miseries of my native Country. . . . I had seen the most flourishing Provinces of *Germany* reduced to perfect Desarts, and the voracious *Crabats*, with inhuman Barbarity, quenching the Fires of the plundered Villages with the Blood of the Inhabitants. Whether this had hardened me against the natural Tenderness which I afterwards found return upon me, or not, I cannot tell; but I reflected upon my self afterwards with a great deal of Trouble, for the Unconcernedness of my Temper at the approaching Ruin of my native Country. (*MC*, 125)

This passage establishes the interplay between sinful action and retrospective atonement, familiar from the plot of spiritual autobiography, to which the Cavalier has frequent recourse during the second half of the *Memoirs.* Anxious to demonstrate repentance, he abases himself with two comparisons, the first to the professional mercenary ("a meer *Swiss*") and the second to his social inferior ("the meanest Wretch"). A third comparison follows between domestic and foreign bloodshed, but here the Cavalier is quick to distance himself from wartime savagery, positioning himself as a bystander and producing the Crabats or Croatians as its perpetrators. By conceding their temporary influence, the Cavalier establishes his essential difference: the "inhuman Barbarity" of the Crabats cannot finally expunge the "natural Tenderness" of his aristocratic English blood.[15]

This rhetoric of difference becomes understandably difficult for the Cavalier to sustain once his war narrative turns from Crabats to his own countrymen.[16] Finding himself deprived of a racialized enemy,

the Cavalier resorts to comparative assessments of the two wartime theaters, foreign and domestic, assessments now predicated on the relative difference of degree rather than the absolute one of kind: "What was our taking of *Leicester* by Storm, where they cried out of our Barbarities, to the sacking of *New Brandenburgh* or the taking of *Magdeburgh*. In *Leicester*, of 7 or 8000 People in the Town, 300 were killed; in *Magdeburgh*, of 25000 scarce 2700 were left, and the whole Town burnt to Ashes" (*MC*, 168). In order to assert these numerical differences, the Cavalier must perforce concede a more general similarity, aligning English royalists with Spanish imperialists whose tactics he once abhorred. Read uncharitably, the cost of excusing the sack of Leicester amounts to nothing less than a tacit admission of his own change of side.

Such ethical prevarications run through the second half of the Cavalier's *Memoirs* and go some way to explaining their curious form of ending when narrative is dispensed with and replaced by a list of providential judgments. To readers, the inclusion of these judgments has long posed a structural problem; their relation to the preceding narrative is not spelled out, their status further complicated by their derivation from the superstitious observations of "a *Roman* Catholick Gentleman of *Lancashire*" with whom the Cavalier happens to speak at his father's house (*MC*, 272).[17] Left open to interpretation, the Cavalier's providentialist turn might variously be considered a correction, cancellation, subordination, or supplementation of the narrative history which precedes it. Certainly, its outcome is not one of self appraisal, not even of the kind that Crusoe achieves by internalizing a providential order and applying it to his own life on the island, but a radical form of self avoidance. It takes the example of a third party for the Cavalier to begin parsing history in divine terms, but the ethical convenience of this method, and hence the psychological plausibility of its adoption, is surely what Defoe wants us to see. For by privileging divine control over human responsibility the Cavalier does not so much edit history as edit himself out of history, a tactic that must be perceived ironically given the trouble Defoe has taken to edit him in.

II.

Having ended by abdicating from his own narrative, the Cavalier leaves it vulnerable to other owners, a situation Defoe promptly literalizes by having his manuscript seized as battlefield plunder by a parliamentarian. That seizure supplies the framing story of the *Memoirs*

when, in a move customary of his historical fictions, Defoe begins the text with an editorial statement relating the discovery of a manuscript and vouching for its authenticity.

> As an Evidence that 'tis very probable these Memorials were written many Years ago, the Persons now concerned in the Publication, assure the Reader, that they have had them in their Possession finished, as they now-appear, above twenty Years: That they were so long ago found by great Accident, among other valuable Papers in the Closet of an eminent publick Minister, of no less Figure than one of King *William's* Secretaries of State. (*MC*, 1)

Two paragraphs later the editors disclose a further piece of evidence: a memorandum attached to the manuscript whose contents they quote verbatim.

> I found this Manuscript among my Father's Writings, and I understand that he got them as Plunder, at, or after, the Fight at *Worcester*, where he served as Major of ___'s Regiment of Horse on the Side of the Parliament. L. K. (*MC*, 2)

With these brief facts of textual transmission, Defoe establishes a chain of ownership, from the Cavalier to the Parliamentary Major to his son, L. K., perhaps also the Secretary of State in whose closet the manuscript has been rediscovered. The manuscript first changes owners in 1651 during or following the Battle of Worcester, the final act in Charles II's abortive attempt to regain the English throne; it resurfaces sometime before 1700—the editors, writing in 1720, claim to have had it in their possession "above twenty Years"—during the reign of William III. Defoe is playing a historical dating game here, one that closely and self-consciously resembles the internal dating of his recent bestseller, *Robinson Crusoe.* In a now classic article on that novel's temporal markers, Michael Seidel demonstrates how Defoe aligns the twenty-eight years of Crusoe's island existence, starting in 1659 and ending in 1686–7 when he returns to England, with the twenty-eight years of Stuart rule from the Restoration of 1660 to the Glorious Revolution of 1688.[18] As a result, Crusoe's island becomes at once an exile from and an allegorical figuration of the home left behind, a figuration which assumes a high level of historical specificity and which Defoe clearly intended as a political commentary on the condition of England under Stuart rule. Written over seventeenth-century history, Crusoe's life and adventures are also a rewriting of that history, one that connects the *nostos* or homecoming to the new

possibilities of national identity and subjecthood under William III. The hero sits out, even as he replicates, the absolute rule of the Stuart kings on an island of his own.

A parallel temporal pattern informs the *Memoirs*, centered not on the biographical history of their narrator-protagonist but on the transmission and legitimation of his story. For the afterlife of both fictional characters, the Cavalier, through the chance discovery of his forgotten manuscript, and Crusoe, through his return to England after his island exile, are identified not with the Restoration regime (1660–1688) but with the Protestant succession and Williamite state (1688–1702). In the twenty-eight years between the Restoration and the Glorious Revolution, also the first twenty-eight years of Defoe's own life, Crusoe and the Cavalier's manuscript fall out of national time and history. More striking still, Crusoe first departure from England in the autumn of 1651 coincides with the battlefield theft of the Cavalier's manuscript at Worcester, a plot device that recalls the actual seizure of documents, including the royal correspondence between Charles I and Henrietta Maria at the Battle of Naseby some six years earlier.[19] Defoe's protagonists appear born to succeed one another: the textual—if not actual—death of the Cavalier on the English battlefield launches Crusoe on his epoch- and empire-making adventures.

If the preface is read in this way, as a series of temporal clues that acquire the force of a political allegory; if it is read also as part of an intertextual design that connects the Cavalier to Crusoe, the old world soldier to the new world merchant, then Defoe's ambition to write a revisionist history of the seventeenth century, one life at a time, starts to come clear. In the case of the *Memoirs,* this ambition is further complicated by being bound up with the political charges and countercharges that enlivened the battle over historical interpretation during the first decades of the eighteenth century.[20] Starting out as a historical dating game, Defoe's preface builds to a pointed attack on the earl of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, first published in three folio volumes between 1702 and 1704, and, with new editions and excerpts appearing in 1705, 1707, 1710, 1712, 1714, 1717, 1719, and 1720–1721, by far the most notorious and influential account of the civil wars in circulation during Defoe's lifetime.[21]

Having established the authenticity of the *Memoirs*, the editors offer a further rationale for their publication.

> In a Word, this Work is a Confutation of many Errors in all the Writers upon the Subject of our Wars in *England*, and even in that extraordinary

> History written by the Earl of *Clarendon*; but the Editors were so just, that when near twenty Years ago, a Person who had written a whole Volume in Folio, by Way of Answer to, and Confutation of *Clarendon's* History of the Rebellion, would have borrowed the Clauses in this Account, which clash with that History, and confront it: We say the Editors were so just as to refuse them. (*MC*, 3)

In their self-appointed role as the Cavalier's literary executors, the editors boast of their foresight in not releasing the *Memoirs* too hastily into the historiographical fray. Calculated to create demand for the very "clash" and "Confutation" they congratulate themselves on having avoided, their refusal serves as prologue to the present act of publication as the *Memoirs* belatedly take their place in the ongoing debate over how to interpret the national past. That they do so under the rubric of revisionism, practiced in order to dispute an accepted version of events, testifies to the ascendancy of Clarendon, and of a Tory endorsed orthodoxy, over the historical memory of the English nation.

From the publication of the first edition, timed to coincide with the election campaign of 1702, Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* was promoted as a Tory document, its author as a heroic defender of the established church and state. The prefaces to the second (1703) and third (1704) volumes dedicate the *History* to Queen Anne, Clarendon's granddaughter, recommending it to her as an advice treatise in the humanist tradition.[22] Unsigned, both were likely collaborations between Laurence Hyde, first earl of Rochester and Clarendon's younger son, and Henry Aldrich, dean of Christ Church, Oxford, and they set out a High Church agenda designed to "prevent the return of the same mischievous practices, and to restrain the madness of Men of the same Principles in this Age, as destroyed the last."[23] Printed and circulated at a time when High Church Tories were attempting to legislate against occasional conformity (the practice of taking Anglican communion once a year in order to qualify for civil office), the prefaces take advantage of anti-Presbyterian political rhetoric. Both attack the dissenting academies, styling them "Seminaries . . . where the Youth is bred up in Principles directly contrary to Monarchical and Episcopal Government."[24] In the 1704 preface this attack on the academies becomes incorporated into a broader assault on the Whig party, targeting both its smear tactics and antimonarchical feeling.

> They can have no better game to play, than to declare, that none but *Jacobites* alarm the Nation with these Apprehensions; and that *Jacobites*

> are much greater Enemies than Themselves to Your Majesty. . . . But whilst these Men most falsely asperse the Sons of the Church of *England* for being *Jacobites*, let them rather clear themselves of what they were lately charg'd before Your Majesty, that there are Societies of them which celebrate the horrid thirtieth of *January*, with an execrable Solemnity of scandalous mirth; and that they have Seminaries and a sort of Universities in *England*, maintain'd by great contributions, where the fiercest Doctrines against Monarchical, and Episcopal Government, are taught and propagated, and where they bear an implacable hatred to Your Majesty's Title, Name, and Family.[25]

Hyde and Aldrich make use of a contemporary allegation, that Whig clubs and societies were transforming the annual commemoration of Charles I's execution into a riotous celebration, in order to counter accusations of Tory Jacobitism and identity the Whigs with the rebels of 1649. Combined with disrespect for the king's martyrdom, the dissenting academies constitute a second charge of criminal misconduct, refocusing attention from how rebels behave to how they recruit and reproduce. By narrowing antimonarchical sentiment into a targeted attack on Queen Anne and her persecuted forebears, Hyde and Aldrich suggest at once the pathological nature and the organized infrastructure of the eighteenth-century republican cause.

Earlier the 1704 preface draws an explicit parallel between the accession of Anne in 1702 and the restoration of her uncle Charles II in 1660: "For in that time, as now in Your Majesty's, the People of this Kingdom ran chearfully into obedience; the chiefest Offenders lay quiet under a sense of their own Crimes, and an apprehension of the reward justly due to them; and all Your Subjects went out to meet Your Majesty with Duty, and most with Love."[26] By implication, the reign of William III corresponds to the Cromwellian protectorate; that of James II to Charles I, and the Whig party to the king killers of old. The parallel between William and Cromwell surfaces elsewhere, most notably in Jacobite propaganda but also, and for different reasons, in radical Whig publications such as Ludlow's *Memoirs*.[27] By contrast, Defoe's *Memoirs* pursue a rival parallel, one that Defoe had long been pushing in his propaganda pieces and which locates William within a confessional and European geography as opposed to an English and parliamentary one. Styling William as "the *Deliverer* of oppressed Nations," Defoe's 1694 pamphlet *The Englishman's Choice and True Interest* declares him without parallel "unless of the *Great Gustavus*, who rais'd and supported the *Protestant* interest in *Germany*."[28] The comparison is reiterated in *The Danger of the Protestant Religion* (1701)

which reminds its readers of the dangers of Catholic expansionism and invokes the example of the Thirty Years' War by aligning the condition of England in 1688 with that of Germany in 1630: "The Protestants in this Distress, as we did lately here in a like Case, fly to a Neighbouring Prince for Protection. *Gustavus Adolphus*, King of *Sweden*, a King who perhaps never had a Parallel till now, came to their Assistance with only Twelve thousand Men."[29] Defoe is far less forthright in the *Memoirs*, which are not propaganda in any straightforward sense, but the discovery of the Cavalier's manuscript in the closet of an eminent Williamite is receptive to the same ideological construction, at once a narrative of Protestant succession (from Adolphus to William) and of political conversion (from royalist to proto Whig).[30]

III.

In the editorial preface, the status of the Cavalier's manuscript as plunder is both a marker of authenticity, combining the romance topos of the discovered manuscript with the historical seizure of documents on the battlefield, and a means of political engagement, enabling Defoe to write across the period separating the English civil wars from the beginning of party politics and the end of Stuart rule. But plunder also emerges as a central theme of the *Memoirs*, combining the two distinct military theaters into a sustained assessment of social politics that culminates in a parodic, and violent, aristocratic escape narrative.

Recently coined either from the German verb *plündern* or from the Dutch *plunderen*, the English seventeenth century verb "to plunder" quickly acquired a political construction associated with its European provenance. According to the *OED*, an early, if not the earliest, instance of its use comes from the *coranto* or foreign newsbook, *The Swedish Intelligencer*, which speaks of how the "Swedish Dragoones . . . plundered the Townes of Wurtbach and Waldsee, neere unto Weingarten."[31] During the course of the English civil wars, the word became a favorite of parliamentary propagandists who used it to describe the conduct of royalist troops under their Bohemian commander Prince Rupert. In his 1647 *History of the Parliament*, Thomas May emphasizes the connection between the lexical origin of the word "plunder" and the barbaric wartime practices it picks out; both word and action, he suggests, are European imports of recent date: "Many Townes and Villages he [Prince Rupert] plundered, which is to say robb'd (for at that time first was the word plunder used in *England*, being borne in *Germany*, when that stately Country was so miserably

wasted and pillaged by forraigne Armies)."[32] A 1644 mock elegy puns opportunistically on Rupert's recent elevation to the English peerage, addressing him not as the duke of Cumberland but as the "Duke of *Plunderland*."[33] Defoe may not have been apprised of this seventeenth-century word history and its partisan interpretation, but his own politics of plunder tie one war narrative into the other and focus *The Memoirs* around social structures—their ideological rationales and celebratory/celebrity fictions.

In the first half of the *Memoirs* Defoe offers an idealized portrait of the soldier of fortune in the figures of the Cavalier, his servant, and the multinational volunteers serving in the Swedish army as it marches through southern Germany in the autumn and winter of 1631.[34] Historically the product of the decline of feudalism and of the feudal organization of military service, the professional solider is here represented not as an avatar of market forces, but as the upholder of the warrior ethos of honor and fealty he exists to replace.[35] Defoe juxtaposes and compares three stories of material advancement, each centered upon a different protagonist: the Cavalier's servant, George; a musketeer in the Swedish army; and the Cavalier himself. The stories form a tightly written sequence and are clearly intended to be read in relation to one another.

After the Swedish victory at the Battle of Breitenfeld, the Cavalier's servant spends three days looting the surrounding countryside while his master is busy attending to his wounded companion Captain Fielding. Before embarking upon this prolonged plundering spree, the servant disguises himself in the clothing of a gentleman from among the dead lying on the field. His strategy pays immediate dividends when he falls in with a party of Swedish dragoons who mistake him for an officer and place themselves under his command. The newly formed company takes a village, hurriedly abandoned by a regiment of the enemy's horse, whose plunder they promptly appropriate. Returning to his master, the servant proudly displays his share of the take: "60 or 70 Pieces of Gold, 5 or 6 Watches, 13 or 14 Rings, whereof 2 were Diamond rings . . . Silver as much as his Pockets would hold . . . three Horses two of which were laden with Baggage" and a small fardel or bundle which, on further examination, is found to contain linen, plate, rings, a pearl necklace, and more silver (*MC*, 66–67). The following day, as though to emphasize the limitless possibilities of wartime acquisition, they discover a silk purse full of gold ducats secreted inside the saddle of one of the three captured horses. "Thou art born to be rich, *George*," declares the Cavalier (*MC*, 69).

Two points need to be made about this little episode. First, although the Cavalier is a beneficiary of the wartime practice of plundering, he does not plunder for himself. Instead, he receives the goods by proxy from his servant who himself receives them by proxy from the fleeing imperial troops. By the time George claims them, the captured goods have already undergone a change of status from civilian to enemy property, allowing the episode to function as an act not of theft but of distributive justice, the plunderers plundered, and thus protecting the Cavalier and his servant from the more troubling implications of their good fortune. Second, the distribution of the prize reveals the degree to which a practice as apparently lawless and unregulated as pillaging tacitly upholds the hierarchical organization of society, and of the army as a social structure, by status.[36] Just as the dragoons give the servant who they mistakenly believe to be the ranking officer the lion's share of the plunder, so the servant, having reverted to his old clothes and former station, plans to give an equivalent share to his master. But the Cavalier refuses to accept the money, instructing his servant to "play the good Husband" by converting his newfound wealth into hard currency and sending it back to England in advance of his own return, for, he tells him, "with good Management you may put yourself in a good Posture of living with it" (*MC*, 67). Immediately, George disdains such economically self-interested terms: "I'd throw it all into the Elbe," he answers the Cavalier, "rather than leave your Service . . . I hope my Money won't make me the worse Servant, if I thought it would, I'd soon have little enough" (*MC*, 68). George's fear that wealth may be incompatible with a life of service is quickly assuaged by the Cavalier who orchestrates the transition from a waged based relationship to a feudal one, voluntarily entered into and voluntarily maintained: "I told him, I would accept of Part of his Present . . . and not suffering him to wear his Livery, made him put himself into a tolerable Equipage, and taking a young *Leipsicker* into my Service, he attended me as a Gentleman from that Time forward" (*MC*, 68).

The Cavalier's interest in the seizure and equitable redistribution of wartime prizes soon furnishes a second tale of feudal relations, the exemplarity of which is not lost upon him.

> A private Musqueteer at the storming the Castle of *Wurtzberg*, when all the Detachment was beaten off, stood in the Face of the Enemy and fired his Piece, and though he had 1000 shot made at him, stood unconcerned, and charged his Piece again, and let fly at the Enemy, continuing to do so three Times, at the same Time beckoning with his Hand to his Fellows to come on again, which they did, animated

> by his Example, and carried the Place for the King. When the Town was taken the King ordered the Regiment to be drawn out, and calling for that Soldier, thanked him before them all for taking the Town for him, gave him 1000 Dollars in Money, and a Commission with his own hand for a Foot Company or Leave to go home, which he would; the Soldier took the Commission on his Knees, kissed it, and put it in his Bosom, and told the King, he would never leave his Service as long as he lived. (*MC*, 75)

The spectacle of the musketeer, singled out from the rank and file in order publicly to be thanked and rewarded, showcases Gustavus Adolphus as the consummate politician of distributive justice. Royal beneficence is not only calculating but also, Defoe wants us to see, numerically calculated: just one page earlier the king rejects the Cavalier's proposal to serve as a musketeer because, he observes, "a poor Soldier at a Dollar a Week will do that" (*MC*, 74). Now he offers a prize one thousand times that weekly wage, a dollar for each shot the soldier braved without retreating from the enemy. The result is a piece of political theater, complete with accompanying stage gestures, the kiss and bended knee, which legitimizes the continuation of royal power. Previously the Cavalier had described the king's generosity as a innate attribute, "Bounty in him was his Natural Talent" (*MC*, 75), but now he acknowledges its political design: "This Bounty of the King's, timed and suited by his Judgment, was the Reason that he was very well served, intirely beloved, and most punctually obeyed by his Soldiers" (*MC*, 75).

The king's rewarding of the musketeer rewrites in a more heroic register the Cavalier's rewarding of his servant. In both tales, material gain precipitates not the disavowal but the reavowal of service; in both too, the generosity of the patron depends upon the success of the subordinates in his pay who secure the treasure trove—the castle, the bundle of jewelry, the purse of gold coins—and then relinquish it in order to have their share ratified and formally bestowed upon them. Defoe complicates the parallel by inserting between them a third tale of service and reward in which the role of the loyal subordinate is taken by the Cavalier himself, another grateful recipient of captured riches, in his case the horse and equipage of the Catholic bishop of Marienburg. The reward arrives immediately before the Cavalier's private audience with the king, a scene that moots the possibility of the Cavalier serving as a musketeer and whose purpose, I have suggested, is to prepare for the introduction of the actual musketeer as surrogate protagonist into the narrative just one page later. But the king's gift to the Cavalier has

more than monetary value and it shows how the public apparatus of praise and reward builds identities as well as fortunes.

Following their surrender, the burghers of Marienburg process bareheaded through the streets, carrying "three Tun of Gold as a Composition to exempt the City from Plunder" (*MC*, 73). Defoe lifts this scene directly from the second part of *The Swedish Intelligencer,* but, in addition to sanitizing its details—omitting entirely the scalping of the friars and the one hour permitted to common pillage—he also appends a brief encounter between the king and his fictional protagonist:[37]

> When the Ceremony of the Burghers was over the King came down into the Castle Court, walked on the Parade . . . and round the Walls, and gave Order for repairing the Bastion that was stormed by the *Scots*; and as at the Entrance of the Parade Sir *John Hepburn* and I made our Reverence to the King, *Ho Cavalier*, said the King to me, *I am glad to see you*, and so passed forward; I made my bow very low, but his Majesty said no more at that Time." (*MC*, 73)

This is the first mention of how the narrator, whose proper name we never learn, comes by his soubriquet of Cavalier. Englished from European forms—*cavallero* (Spanish), *cavaliere* (Italian), *cavalier* (French)—and referring equally to a knight or to a (mounted) gentleman, the title confers social as well as chivalric prestige upon its recipient, making the gift of the bishop's horses the material accessory to the main status prize. Here, identity is not something the individual creates for himself but something granted to him ready made, by an overlord and for the overlord's convenience. Later Defoe will suggest that the self embodied in the name represents all the self there is; the Cavalier's narrative breaks off once he formally surrenders his arms to the parliamentarians.

By inserting this scene between a king and his voluntary subject, Defoe supplies a personal origin myth for what was soon to become a pejorative political label. Like its opposite term "Roundhead," which referred derisively to the cropped hair of London apprentices, "Cavalier" was a calculated insult and caricature of the crown's supporters in the English civil wars, associating them with the bloodthirsty *Caballeros*, Spanish troopers deployed to put down the revolt of the Netherlands from Catholicism and the arbitrary power of the Hapsburg crown.[38] "Gentleman, your enemies call you Cavaliers, a name as they take it, of great reproach," declared the royal chaplain Edward Symmons in a sermon preached to the king's army at Shrewsbury and subsequently

published in 1644.[39] In an attempt to repristinate the label, Symmons offers his own portrait of "a complete Cavalier . . . a Child of Honor, a Gentleman well borne and bred" that leans heavily on xenophobic fears, pseudoreligious loyalty, and class pride.[40] Operating in a reverse direction, Defoe separates the Cavalier's conferred identity from the negative stereotype the better to plot their subsequent convergence as the triumphalism of the first half of the *Memoirs* becomes subject to the progressive ironization of the Cavalier's voice in the second, and the rising man abroad loses identity and self-integrity at home. The irony is heaviest in the final extended episode of the *Memoirs*, which narrates the Cavalier's picaresque wanderings through northern England, a miniature travel romance that involves him in a series of unsuccessful encounters with the local people.[41]

IV.

The upwardly mobile disguise of the Cavalier's servant after the Swedish victory at Breitenfeld (1631) is paralleled by the Cavalier's downwardly mobile disguise after the royalist defeat at Marston Moor (1644). Attempting with a party of horse to rejoin the remnants of Prince Rupert's scattered cavalry, the Cavalier disguises himself as a country ploughman, his two comrades as a farmer's wife and a cripple, and enters Leeds to gather news of the parliamentary army. Unlike his two companions who quickly assimilate themselves to their new surroundings and station, the Cavalier remains at a loss: "I walked up and down the Town, but fancied my self so ill disguised, and so easy to be known, that I cared not to talk to any Body" (*MC*, 208). Events appear quickly to catch up with this self-assessment when, on the road out of the city, the Cavalier encounters "three Country Fellows on Horseback" (*MC*, 209), one of whom stops to address him. Unable to understand the question being put to him and finding himself incapable of responding in the correct idiom, the Cavalier pretends not to hear and tries to ride on. Confronted for a second time, he loses patience:

> *Na, but ye's not gang soa,* says the Boor, and comes up to me, and takes hold of the Horse's Bridle to stop me; at which vexed at Heart that I could not tell how to talk to him, I reached him a great Knock on the Pate with my Fork, and fetched him off of his Horse. (*MC*, 209)

The Cavalier quickly makes off, but, finding himself pursued, is obliged to stab one of the men with his farmer's fork and shoot the other with

his pistol. Reunited with his two companions, he learns that the fellow was enquiring about his horse which he recognized as belonging to his brother: "They said the Cavaliers stole him," one of the injured men tells the soldier disguised as a farmer's wife, "but 'twas like such Rogues; no Mischief could be done in the Country, but 'twas the poor Cavaliers must bear the Blame" (*MC*, 210–11). Arriving at the next village, the three royalist outlaws are welcomed by the inhabitants who offer them shelter. The Cavalier tries to sleep but is disturbed by the groans of his host lying in the bed next to him, who, he shortly discovers, is none other than his unfortunate victim from the day before. The host does not recognize his assailant and is duped into taking back his brother's horse, but this act of restitution, and the comic plot it completes, does not resolve the more troubling implications of the episode. The countryman becomes the butt of the joke because he refuses, in the face of all evidence to the contrary, to connect the Cavalier with the horse thief. His refusal identifies him with the rest of the rural community who collectively deny that the recent lawlessness, the acts of brigandage, of thuggery and of murder carried out in their midst, are the work of the royalist cavalrymen.[42]

The Cavalier's irascibility and propensity to violence reveal the unsavory side of aristocratic privilege, but his travels incognito among the rural peasantry develop a more pointed satire designed to expose the political fiction of sacral kingship.[43] For the entire narrative sequence—the flight from the battlefield, the days spent in disguise hiding in country towns or in the woods and mountains, the cast of loyal but credulous and ruthlessly exploited villagers—is a revisionist and deflationary rewriting of the most famous episode in Stuart historiography, Charles II's escape from the Battle of Worcester in 1651. The stuff of popular legend, featured prominently in coronation poems, printed in numerous versions during the Restoration, and endlessly retold by Charles himself, who dictated an official version to Samuel Pepys at Newmarket in September 1680 (at the height of the Exclusion Crisis when the idea of sacral majesty must have held particular appeal), the narrative outlines of the escape plot would have been immediately recognizable to Defoe's first readership.[44] Disguised first as a country man, then as a serving man and finally as a wood cutter, and aided by a cast of loyal English subjects, Charles successfully eluded the parliamentary forces for six weeks by taking refuge in country houses, barns, and, most famously, in the branches of an oak tree before his safe transport to the Continent could be arranged. Restoration retellings emphasize the details of Charles disguise—his

shorn hair, his face and hands "made of a reechy complexion, by the help of the Walnut-tree leaves"—so as to emphasize in turn the impossibility of disguising the authority and aura of kingship.[45] Writing in support of the re-embattled Stuart monarchy under James II, Aphra Behn incorporates this romance ideal of inalienable majesty into her account of the royal slave, *Oroonoko* (1688). Like Charles, Oroonoko dresses down in order to avoid discovery; like Charles, he finds that his natural nobility admits of no disguise: "He shone through all, and his osenbrigs (a sort of brown Holland suit he had on) could not conceal the graces of his looks and mien; and he had no less admirers than when he had his dazzling habit on; the royal youth appeared in spite of the slave."[46] The romance of Charles at Worcester, together with the political reading of sovereignty it supported, was also positioned within a larger providentialist and biblical framework of exile and return. In an elaborate *occultatio*, James Heath declares his intention to pass over the abortive invasion of 1651 because "these Providences were as the cloud, wch concealed and obscured him: We will only observe the Pillar of Fire, which after it had purified him in the Night of his Humiliation and Affliction, at the end of that Darkness, revealed him in Glory."[47] Here the typology of kingship supplants, even as it recapitulates, the romance formula of descent, disguise, and restoration.

As Defoe was no doubt aware, the royalist subgenre of the escape narrative developed rapidly into a surprisingly inventive and flexible apology for Stuart kingship. Although most accounts focused on the paradox of the disguised but unmistakable sovereign, at least one insisted upon the consensual basis of Charles's descent from king to country fellow, treating his disguise as a form of reverse coronation by the people. In *An Exact Narrative and Relation of his Most Sacred Majesties Escape* (1660), an anonymous retelling rushed into print at the Restoration, Charles's change of dress is carefully itemized as a series of separate donations: Richard Pendrill contributes "a Jump and Breeches of Green course Cloth and a Doe skin Leather Doublet"; his brother, Humphrey, a hat, "an old Gray one that turned up its Brims"; Edward Martin "the Shirt (which in that Countrey Language they call'd an Hurden or Noggen Shirt, of Cloath that is made up of the coursest of the Hemp)"; and William Creswell his shoes.[48] As with Behn's account of Oroonoko's osenbrigs, the author displays a self-conscious mastery of sartorial parlance, retaining the "Countrey Language" of his historical characters for the benefit of a sophisticated London audience. The literal investiture of Charles' disguise is both a form of constitutional beggary and an argument for divine right mon-

archy and it takes place with all the solemnity of a public rite. Once Charles looks the part, he is taught to act the part: "They had much adoe all that day to teach and fashion his Majesty to their Country guise, and to order his steps and straight body to a lobbing, jobsons gate, and were forced every foot to mind him of it; for the Language, his Majesties most gracious converse with his People in his Journey to, and at *Worcester*, had rendered it very easie and very tunable to him."[49] Charles's difficulty at bending his straight and upright body is countered by the facility with which he speaks to his subjects. Like Shakespeare's Prince Hal, linguistic dexterity makes Charles the "king of courtesy," the model prince.[50]

In contrast, Defoe's Cavalier displays none of the magnanimity so prominent in royal escape narratives. His disguise is not the voluntary gift of the people, having been obtained by force "at a Farmer's house, which for that particular Occasion we plundered; and I cannot say no Blood was shed in a Manner too rash . . . but our Case was desperate, and the People too surly, and shot at us out the Window" (*MC*, 207). The Cavalier's hostile investment offers a version of kingship in which status is wrested from the people without their consent. An opponent of indefeasible hereditary right, Defoe here reduces the grounds of royal privilege to an original act of thuggery. His usurpation accomplished, the Cavalier next proves contemptuous of the common tongue which Charles, the romance hero, imitates so readily. His failure to communicate with the country fellows whom he meets on the road is less a function of innate inability, however, than of an exalted and inexpugnable sense of his own superior station. The idea of moving unrecognized around the kingdom is inconceivable to the Cavalier, and he waits for the moment when his true nature will betray itself and differentiate him from his disguise. That moment of recognition, and the naturalized aristocratic status confirmed by it, is never forthcoming. Defoe frustrates the expected plot progression from disguise to revelation, presenting instead an aristocrat who is unidentifiable as such because he cannot measure up to the idealizing expectations of the English people.

The progressive implications of Defoe's parody are particularly clear in its final episode when the Cavalier and his renegade companions find temporary respite in the forest of Swale. In contrast to Boscobel with its hospitable oak tree, Swale is an uninhabited wilderness, framed by "vast Mountains" (*MC*, 217) that loom large in the Cavalier's proto-romantic imagination. History recedes, "for no Soldier had ever been here all the War, nor perhaps would not, if it had lasted 7 Years"

(*MC*, 217), as the locale of the chivalric quest reasserts itself. Akin, on the one hand, to Crusoe's Caribbean island and, on the other, to the forest of Epping where the group of exiled Londoners take refuge in *A Journal of the Plague Year* (1722), Swale becomes a testing ground for self-sufficiency and individual endeavor. But in a landscape so barbaric that it cannot support acts of barbarism, the Cavalier and his retinue of aristocratic warriors have nothing and nobody to live on, and they depart after only four days of pastoral retirement, rejoining Prince Rupert and the war at Kendall. Unlike Crusoe or the enterprising band of London artisans—middle class heroes all—the Cavalier proves incapable of sustaining himself on the land. Instead, Defoe shows him and his class to be parasitical on the people they oppress and on the wars that license their self-interested aggression. The demonstration is built into the structure as well as the plot of the *Memoirs*: just as the eruption of war between England and Scotland became the condition of the narrative's continuation from part one to part two so the Cavalier's renunciation of arms marks its terminus. To be sure, Defoe toys with the idea of a lost sequel in the editorial preface and the manuscript is discovered on a future battlefield, but the ideological energy of the *Memoirs* works against the Cavalier's authorial survival because it works against his social survival too. The overriding sense at the end of the *Memoirs* is one of superannuation; the textual death of the Cavalier acts out a historical terminus that Defoe had already designated—and now overdetermines—as the starting point for Crusoe's global adventures. For finally it is that intertextual teleology that the *Memoirs* seem designed to serve, reinstating Crusoe within a family history that is also an outline of European history, the first, if by no means the final, account of the origins of the English novel.

Queens College, City University of New York

NOTES

I would like to thank David Quint, Steven Pincus, and participants in the British Historical Studies Colloquium at Yale University for their help with the conception, writing, and revision of this essay.

[1] Daniel Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*, ed. John Richetti (London: Penguin, 2003), 5.

[2] For the symbolic implications of Crusoe's original surname, see Robert W. Ayers, "*Robinson Crusoe*: 'Allusive Allegorick History'," *PMLA* 82 (1967): 399–407, esp. 404–5n28; and David Marshall, "Autobiographical Acts in *Robinson Crusoe*," *ELH* 71 (2004): 899–920, esp. 901–2.

[3] For the Act, see the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of William III*, 6 vol. (London, 1860–1938), 6:481.

[4] For George's policy and its domestic ramifications, see John J. Murray, *George I, the Baltic, and the Whig Split of 1717: A Study in Diplomacy and Propaganda* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969); and Jeremy Black, *The Continental Commitment: Britain, Hanover and Interventionism, 1714–1793* (London: Routledge, 2005), 48–58.

[5] James Joyce, "Daniel Defoe," trans. and ed. Joseph Prescott, *Buffalo Studies* 1 (1964): 24–25. Written to answer John Tutchin's poem *The Foreigners* (1700), Defoe's verse satire *The True-Born Englishman* (1701) ridiculed English distrust of foreign immigrants and of their foreign King William III. It proved an immediate success, running through ten editions as well as numerous pirated copies to become the best-selling poem of the reign of Queen Anne.

[6] The novel's relation to colonial history is now inescapable, producing powerful rewritings, including those by Derek Walcott, "Crusoe's Island" (1964), *Pantomime* (1978); and J. M. Coetzee, *Foe* (1987), as well as persuasive readings by, among others, Peter Hulme, "Robinson Crusoe and Friday," *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1787* (New York: Methuen, 1986), 175–222; and Roxann Wheeler, "'My Savage,' 'My Man': Racial Multiplicity in *Robinson Crusoe*," *ELH* 62 (1995): 821–61.

[7] Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe,* 7.

[8] In his pioneering study of fifty years ago, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1957), Ian Watt proposed that the decline of feudalism and the growth of individualism, both socioeconomic and spiritual, provided the cultural conditions for the new form of the novel to develop in England. Watt's thesis has been subject to frequent and important reassessment, most comprehensively by Michael McKeon who, taking issue with its Whig methodology, replaced signs of progress (the development of capitalism, the growth of a reading public) with sites of contention (the ideological struggle between conservative and progressive ideologies and the epistemological one between romance idealism and a skeptical empiricism), but its essential point, that the rise of new social formations coincided with and contributed to the rise of the novel, has received general acceptance across the disciplines and interdisciplines of modern literary studies. See McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600–1740* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2002). See also Lennard J. Davis, *Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1983); Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987); J. Paul Hunter, *Before Novels: The Cultural Contexts of Eighteenth-Century English Fiction* (New York: Norton, 1990); and for a non-Anglocentric view, David Quint, *Cervantes's Novel of Modern Times: A New Reading of Don Quijote* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2003). On the interdependence of historiography and the early novel, see Everett Zimmerman, *The Boundaries of Fiction: History and the Eighteenth-Century British Novel* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1996); and Robert Mayer, *History and the Early English Novel: Matters of Fact from Bacon to Defoe* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997). On the vogue for the memoir novel in late seventeenth and early eighteenth century France, see Philip Stewart, *Imitation and Illusion in the French Memoir-Novel, 1700–1750: The Art of Make Believe* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1969).

[9] Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Peter Dixon and John Chalker (London: Penguin Classics, 1985), 172. The King of Brobdingnag may have reacted so forcibly because his own grandfather had to fight a civil war to secure his reign (179).

[10] Maximillian E. Novak, *Daniel Defoe, Master of Fictions: His Life and Ideas* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001), 591.

[11] See Novak, 82–85; 181–83. Queen Anne ignored the suggestion, sentencing Defoe to the pillory and jail time instead.

[12] See Paula R. Backsheider, *Daniel Defoe: Ambition & Innovation* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1986), 123–135; and Sharon Alker, "The Soldierly Imagination: Narrating Fear in Defoe's *Memoirs of a Cavalier*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 19 (2006–2007): 43–68.

[13] Defoe, *Memoirs of a Cavalier*, ed. James T. Boulton (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), 9. Hereafter abbreviated *MC* and cited parenthetically by page number. The full title to the 1720 first edition reads: *Memoirs of a Cavalier: Or A Military Journal Of The Wars in Germany, And the Wars in England; From the Year 1632, to the Year 1648. Written Threescore Years Ago by an English Gentleman, who Served First in the Army of Gustavus Adolphus, the Glorious King of Sweden, till his Death; and after That, in the Royal Army of King Charles the First, from the Beginning of the Rebellion, to the End of that War*. Defoe's name does not appear on the title page. In many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editions, including that of Sir Walter Scott (*The Novels of Daniel Defoe,* Edinburgh, 1810), the Cavalier is positively identified as Andrew Newport, second son of Sir Richard Newport, a Shropshire gentleman who gave money to the King in exchange for a barony in 1642.

[14] See "The Preface to the Reader," in *The Swedish Intelligencer, The First Part*, comp. William Watts (London, 1632). Arthur W. Secord discusses Defoe's stitching together of this and other sources, "The Origins of Defoe's *Memoirs of a Cavalier*," in *Robert Drury's Journal and Other Studies* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1961), 72–134.

[15] In having the Cavalier vilify the Crabats, Defoe was likely following the lead of contemporary English propaganda which persistently linked them to civilian atrocities, and, in particular, to cannibalism. *The Lamentations of Germany,* a loyalist pamphlet published in London in 1638, is typical in this respect: "among the Imperialists is a base sort of rascally horse-men which serve them, and are called Croats. The tenth part of them are not of that Countrey: for they are a miscellanie of all strange nations, without God, without religion, and have only the outsides of men, and scarce that too. They make no conscience of murthering men or women, old or young, yea, the very innocent babies; and like the beasts among whom they are bred, do sometimes eate them, when other food might be found" (Philip Vincent, *The Lamentations of Germany* [London: 1638], 30). A companion woodcut shows a man dangling a naked baby from one leg and carries the uncompromising caption: "Croats eate Children" (27).

[16] An anonymous 1644 pamphlet *A Copie of the Kings Message Sent by the Duke of Lennox* collapses the very difference the Cavalier would maintain, reproducing the violent iconography of the Croats from *The Lamentations of Germany* in its frontispiece illustration of Cavaliers cheerfully impaling and slaughtering children. This visual echo is underscored by the pamphlet's opening clause: "As our cunning Enemies have still laboured to involve these three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland into equall misery with Germany and other desolate Countries" (*A Copie of the Kings Message* [London, 1644], 1). See Tamsyn Williams, "Magnetic Figures: Polemical Prints in the English Revolution," in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c. 1540–1660*, ed. Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion Books, 1990), 86–100, 91–2.

[17] The editors of the 1759 Edinburgh edition of the *Memoirs* believed the ending to be spurious, "added and interpolated after the MS was out of the possession of the author," although by author they meant the Cavalier himself and not Defoe (*Memoirs of a Cavalier* [Edinburgh, 1759], iv). Among modern critics, Backsheider terms the

list "hasty and artless" (124); Boulton "unsatisfactory and discrepant," a providential scheme clumsily appended to a secular narrative (xxxvi). By contrast, Alker suggests that the list be read as evidence of the Cavalier's psychological breakdown, a "final descent into imaginative excess" under the pressures of wartime experience (66). Like Alker, I read the list at the level of character, although my argument differs fundamentally from hers.

[18] See Michael Seidel, "Crusoe in Exile," *PMLA* 96 (1981): 363–74. J. Paul Hunter also notes the temporal parallel (*The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and the Quest for Form in Robinson Crusoe* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1966], 204).

[19] Richetti notes that the first edition gave 1661 as the date of Crusoe's original departure. This error was quickly corrected in the second and subsequent editions (see Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*, 248n6).

[20] This battle is discussed by Mark Knights, "The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties," *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 353–72.

[21] Philip Hicks notes that an octavo edition of Hyde's *History* was quickly made available in 1705 although, at a price of thirty shillings, its cost would still have been prohibitive. In all, he estimates that close to 16,000 copies of the *History* were printed between 1702–1704 and 1731–1732 (*Neoclassical History and English Culture: from Clarendon to Hume* [New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996], 67–68).

[22] For further publication details, see Hicks, 62–72.

[23] Laurence Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion. . . . Volume the Third* (Oxford, 1704), c2v.

[24] Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion. . . . Volume the Second* (Oxford, 1703), br-v. The Tory bills against occasional conformity were thrown out of the 1702, 1703, and 1704 sessions of parliament, but a Whig supported bill was passed in 1712. The Schism Act of 1714 further discriminated against dissenters by banning their schools and academies from meeting; however, its measures were never systematically enforced.

[25] Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion. . . . Volume the Third*, dr.

[26] Hyde, *The History of the Rebellion. . . . Volume the Third*, br.

[27] As, for example, in the Jacobite verse satire: "On the Late Metamorphosis of an old Picture of Oliver Cromwell's into a New Picture of King William: The Head Changed, the Hieroglyphics Remaining" (quoted in Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989], 51). For the radical Whig version of the Cromwellian parallel, see Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, 2001), 73–80.

[28] Defoe, *The Englishman's Choice and True Interest* (London, 1694), 9.

[29] Defoe, *The Danger of the Protestant Religion* (London, 1701), 4.

[30] Prince Rupert provides a real life example of this ideological progress, evolving from a Stuart absolutist to a Whig or proto Whig exclusionist by the time of his death in 1682. See Ian Roy, "Rupert, prince and count palatine of the Rhine and duke of Cumberland (1619–1682)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004); online edition, ed. Lawrence Goldman, May 2007, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24281.

[31] *OED*, 2nd ed., *s.v.* "plunder," 1a.

[32] Thomas May, *The History of the Parliament of England, The Third Booke* (London, 1647), 3.

[33] John Taylor (?), *A Dogs Elegy, or Rupert's Tears* (London, 1644), 8, quoted in T. N. Corns, W. A. Speck, and J. A. Downie, "Archetypal Mystification: Polemic and Reality in English Political Literature, 1640–1750," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 7 (1982): 5. The tagging of Rupert's black mongrel Boy as a "Shagg'd Cavalier" on the elegy's frontispiece makes play with the common identification of the king's supporters by their long hair. See Will Fisher, *Materializing Gender in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007), 142–44.

[34] Michael Howard notes that at the time of Gustavus Adolphus's death in 1632, less than ten percent of his army were Swedish nationals (*War in European History* [Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976], 58).

[35] The rise of large-scale mercenarism in Europe is usefully summarized by Janice E. Thomson in *Mercenaries, Pirates and Sovereigns: State-Building and Extraterritorial Violence in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1996), 26–31.

[36] John Cruso's *Militarie instructions for the cavall'rie . . . collected out of divers forrain authors ancient and modern, and rectified and supplied, according to the present practice of the Low-Countrey warres*, first published in 1632 and republished in 1644, contains a chapter "Of distributing bootie" that codifies the ratio of reward to rank: "The bootie being reported, every company giveth 10 *per centum* to their Captain of what is gotten, though he were not present: to the chief of the troop (though but a private Souldier) two parts, and so to the guides," (*Militarie instructions for the cavall'rie* [Cambridge, 1632], 20).

[37] "Among the dead, were there some skore of lusty sturdy *Fryers* found armed: who had their crownes (poore men) new shaven with a sword, in stead of a razor: and receiving here their *ultimam tonsuram,* had no other complement of Anointing to it, but that of their owne blouds" (*The Swedish Intelligencer, The Second Part*, comp. William Watts [London, 1632], 14–15).

[38] For an extended discussion of these competing representations, see Corns, Speck, and Downie, 1–9; Williams, 89–93.

[39] Edward Symmons, *A Militarie Sermon* (Oxford, 1644), 16.

[40] Symmons, 16.

[41] As Novak points out, this picaresque interlude anticipates Defoe's domestic travel narrative, a *Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1724–1726) (592).

[42] This inset episode is discussed by Alker who argues that the Cavalier's "compulsive insistence on his distinctness from the English farmer attempts to retain the divide that military narratives create between the 'enemy' and the self" (63).

[43] The character of Wellbred from Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humor* defends the prerogatives of the irascible aristocrat, declaring: "Anger costs a man nothing: and a tall man is never his own man, till he be angry," (*Every Man in his Humor*, in *Five Plays*, ed. G. A. Wilkes [Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988], act 4, scene 8, lines 4–8).

[44] For Samuel Pepys's account, see *Charles II's Escape from Worcester: A Collection of Narratives Assembled by Samuel Pepys*, ed. William Matthews (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1966). For John Ogilby's coronation entertainment and other triumphal renderings of Charles's escape from Worcester, see Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship Under Charles II* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1996), 25–49. For coronation tropes and their coded advice to the newly crowned monarch, see Gerard Reedy, "Mystical Politics: The Imagery of Charles II's Coronation," in *Studies in Change and Revolution: Aspects of English Intellectual History, 1640–1680*, ed. Paul J. Korshin, (Menton, Yorkshire: Scholar Press, 1972), 19–42.

[45] Thomas Blount, *Boscobel: Or, the History of his Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous Preservation After the Battle of Worcester* (London, 1660), 41.

[46] Aphra Behn, *Oroonoko and Other Writings*, ed. Paul Salzman (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994), 39. The scene and its connection to Charles are discussed by Elliott Visconsi, "A Degenerate Race: English Barbarism in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* and *The Widow Ranter*," *ELH* 69 (2002): 673–701, esp. 684–85.

[47] James Heath, *The Glories and Magnificent Triumphs of the Blessed Restitution of his Sacred Majesty K. Charles II* (London, 1662), 2–3, quoted in Reedy, 25.

[48] *An Exact Narrative and Relation of his Most Sacred Majesties Escape* (London, 1660), 6.

[49] *An Exact Narrative*, 8.

[50] William Shakespeare, *1 Henry IV* in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, gen. ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), act 2, scene 4, lines 10–11.