

SENTIMENTALISM IN COL. JACK

By

SYED W. RIZVI

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School-Camden

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Arts

Graduate Program in English

Written under the direction of

Dr. Geoffrey Sill

And approved by

Dr. Geoffrey Sill

Dr. Ellen Malenas Ledoux

Camden, New Jersey

January 2017

THESIS ABSTRACT

Sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*

By SYED RIZVI

Thesis Director

Dr. Geoffrey Sill

I argue in this paper that Daniel Defoe's *Col. Jack* (1722) is a well-knit sentimental novel that shows the real eighteenth-century London where rampant poverty and destitution has rendered a large number of people to be criminals. To get a complete picture of sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, I have taken a brief survey of the views of critics about Defoe and his work, social history of London and the time within which *Col. Jack* is placed. I also argue about secularism and sentimentalism in the novel, *Col. Jack*'s sentimentalism in the light of psychoanalytical theory, and Defoe's realism and sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*. The discussion on 'secularism and sentimentalism' is not a critique of Defoe's religious belief. *Col. Jack* is a fictional work in the form of a biographical sketch of a rogue struggling with sin-virtue lifestyle; and Defoe portrays just that. Applying psychoanalytical approach to look at the sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, we find Freudian pleasure and reality principles and the phenomenon of Oedipus complex at work. The realism and sentimentalism in *Col. Jack* combine to provide complete picture of destitution and its effects, the necessity of reasoning and its effects, compassion and its effects, and the importance of consistent effort to change extenuating circumstances to make life useful for self and for others -- hallmark of sentimentalism. *Col. Jack* is all

about this, and a well-reasoned sentimental commentary on the societal incongruities that either make a man a sinful creature for none of his fault, or provide opportunity to a man to be a vitreous, useful gentleman.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my thesis director, Professor Geoffrey Sill, who guided me in selecting a topic for my thesis project. From the days of my undergraduate studies he knew where my interest lies, and what kind of literary genre would attract my attention. He advised me to read Daniel Defoe's work and see if I would like to write a paper on one of his novels. Finally, when it came to write a scholarly thesis as part of my Master's Candidacy Examination, Professor Sill gladly accepted my request to be my thesis director. He has been a source of my inspiration and enthusiasm to perform to the best of my abilities. His immense knowledge of the eighteenth century English literature and trends in the literary works of great craftsman of fiction, and his critical approach toward a thesis paper gave me courage to pick up Daniel Defoe's *Col. Jack* to explore elements of sentimentalism in it. He remained patient with my several drafts, often containing contradictory or circular arguments, and corrected my directions. His timely suggestions and his incisive questions on my claims motivated me to read more, search more, and come up with better drafts. The completion of this paper became possible because Professor Sill was there. Thank you Professor Sill for your continued support, help, and guidance to me in completing this thesis.

I would be failing in my duty if I do not recollect what Dr. Ellen Malenas Ledoux, has done for me. First, she very kindly agreed to be a committee member for examining my thesis, second, she acceded to my request for extra time to complete this paper, and third, she remained concerned about my health more than about the time within which I should complete my work. But this is not all. She has taught me for three semesters and made each semester memorable for me. She exposed me to a wide variety of literary texts

and trends and expanded my horizon of English literature. I am extremely grateful to her for making it possible for me to complete my thesis paper, and finally my studies at graduate level.

I must express my very profound gratitude to Professor M. A. Rafey Habib, Professor Howard Marchitello, and Dr. William Fitzgerald, for sowing the seeds of critical thinking and guiding me in research methods. Thank you professors for your continued help, guidance, and support at all levels of my studies.

I would like to remember my elder brother, Syed Wajahat Husain Rizvi, who passed away in 2013. He had encouraged me to do masters in English. Alas, he were here to see this day when I am fulfilling his desire. But, I know he is around and watching me making his dream a reality. God may bless his soul.

Finally, I would like to thank my brother, sisters, son, and daughters, and my wife, Shaher Bano, for providing me with unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. This work would not have been possible without them; their support and prayers kept me moving forward. Thank you my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iv |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Defoe and his critics | 11 |
| Defoe and his works | 16 |
| Defoe and his London | 24 |
| Sentimentalism | 28 |
| Col. Jack – secularism and sentimentalism | 35 |
| – Psychoanalytic approach and sentimentalism | 57 |
| – Realism and sentimentalism | 62 |
| – Slavery and sentimentalism | 72 |
| Conclusion | 76 |
| Bibliography | 82 |
| Works cited | 98 |

Sentimentalism in Col. Jack

Colonel Jack is the most (I should say the only) lachrymose novel by Defoe, both because of the character of its hero and the author's unusual exploitation of emotion. 'We may legitimately think of it as a sentimental novel in embryo

(Monk/ McBurney Col Jack xv).

Introduction

Before I explore sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, let me briefly talk about Daniel Defoe (1660-1731) who was the product of eighteenth-century political, religious and social environments. For considerable time he remained in the employment of both Tories and Whigs and successfully wrote pamphlets in support of their political moves. But, when he turned to writing novels, his critics, during his lifetime and after his death, remained in search of his literary worth. Generally it is held that “By birth, education, and occupations Daniel Defoe was a stranger to the sphere of refined tastes and classical learning that dominated polite literature during his lifetime” (Norton Vol 1. 2288).

This observation of Defoe's critics would have been true if he had died at the age of fifty-nine. But, when he was nearly sixty, he mustered enough courage to explore his creative genius hitherto unknown to him. He had experience in trade, commerce, journalism and political pamphleteering. His reward and remunerations for his services as a writer for hire were based on the negotiated terms and conditions with his customers. But when he entered into the profession of writing fiction, he knew that financial gains would be contingent on the recognition of his creativity and inventiveness by the end users of his products. His first creative work, *Robinson Crusoe*, appeared in 1719 and brought him both admiration and commercial gains; he became a household name. In

quick succession he produced four more novels: *Captain Singleton* (1720), *Moll Flanders* (1722), *Col. Jack* (1722), and *Roxana* (1724), and established himself as a writer worth taking notice of. These novels show that “Defoe spoke for and to the members of his own class” (Norton Vol. 1. 2289) to sensitize them to the necessity of rescuing the hopeless and helpless poor starving in early eighteenth-century London. Defoe in his novels paints moving images of poverty and goes to the extent of showing his anxiety over the moral depravity of an uncaring society where “Men rob for Bread, Women whore for Bread” (CJ xiii). Defoe knew the value of a piece of bread; and how difficult it was to procure it always remained a matter of concern for him.

His depiction of the poor, their pains, their struggle to survive, their crimes, and their sentimental moment of regrets and resolves to reform their environment took the form of biographical narratives of the rogues. These narratives did move the evaluators of his work, and his critics valued Defoe’s work as “great” and unique in style. For example, Virginia Woolf writes about Defoe’s work that “They stand among the few English novels which we can call indisputably great” (The Common Reader 1919, n. page), Sir Walter Scott brackets Defoe’s works “as the works of an extraordinary man” (Rogers 67), Samuel Taylor Coleridge remarks “Compare the contemptuous Swift with the contemned De Foe, and how superior will the latter be found” (Rogers 81), and Charles Lamb remarks that “*Roxana*, *Singleton*, *Moll Flanders*, *Colonel Jack* – are all genuine offspring of the same father” (Rogers 87). Whereas, Sir Leslie Stephens, Alexander Pope, Jonathan Swift, and John Gay see Defoe as a ‘dunce,’ and his works as of little value.

This indisputably controversial, and later to be recognized as a great novelist, Daniel Defoe, son of a prosperous butcher and tallow chandler James Foe and Ann Foe,

was born in St Giles, Cripplegate, London, in 1660. His mother died in 1668 when he was ten or eleven. Not much is known about his early childhood. In 1672 he “Probably attended boarding school of James Fisher, an independent clergyman in Dorking, Surrey, south of London” (MF xxxiv). As Foes were Dissenters and barred from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Daniel Defoe was admitted to an academy at Newington Green in 1674, just north of London, established by Rev. Charles Morton, “to provide alternative education to the sons of prosperous Dissenter who were intended mainly for the ministry” (Richetti 1). Richetti notes that Morton’s “curriculum stressed modern science and philosophy as well as proper use of the English language. . . . Morton’s writing exercises without doubt helped lay the groundwork for Defoe’s future accomplishments as a writer” (1). After three years at Morton’s school, Defoe’s educational career came to an end. In 1681 he decided against the ministry and became a wholesale hosier. Richetti tells us that Defoe once “wrote some years later of himself, ‘the pulpit is none of my office. It was a disaster first to be set a part for, and then to be set apart from, the honour of that sacred employ’” (2). In 1684, at the age of twenty-four, he married Mary Tuffley, with a dowry of £3,700. The marriage produced six daughters and two sons. We do not know how, and in what manner, Tuffley helped Defoe in setting objectives in his life, and in what manner she helped Defoe strengthen his business ventures. At this time, when “wages for eighteenth-century women could range from £2 or . . . between £6 and £8 for a housemaid, and up to £15 per annum for a skilled housekeeper . . . a figure closer to £40 was needed to keep a family” (Clive Emsley et al. Web), Tuffley had brought sufficient dowry to survive honorably for many years. But, this did not happen. From a letter of Defoe to his son-in-law, Henry Baker, we come to

know that “Daniel Defoe, junior, to whom Defoe probably transferred his property to protect it from his persistent creditors, had betrayed his father, forcing his sisters and ‘their poor dying mother to beg their bread at his door.’” (Richetti 14). Miserable Tuffley died in 1732 and was laid to rest beside Defoe. Neither Tuffley nor Defoe tells us much about their family life, but we are “certain about his involvement in the political upheavals of the time” (Richetti 3). On the one hand he had a family to care for and establish himself in financially rewarding ventures, and on the other hand political happenings engaged his attention. Beginning from hosiery business, he entered into shipping, import/export business, trading in tobacco, timber, wines and spirits and ended up as a “bankrupt with debts amounting to £17,000. This was the first of his many financial crises; crises that drove him to make his own way, like his own heroes and heroines, by whatever means presented themselves” (Norton 2288). He was “committed to the Fleet and later the King’s Bench Prison in 1692” for non-payment of his debts (Bree. *Moll Flanders* xxxv). Throughout his life he struggled to clear his debts; and, while still hiding from his creditors, he died of a stroke in Rope Makers’ Alley, close to his birth place, on 24 April 1731.

When we see Defoe as a writer, either as a pamphleteer or a literary craftsman depicting lives of the common man in London, we need to acknowledge his ability to articulate his thought based on the realities of life and its overall impact on the advancement of a just society. Defoe courageously writes about political, religious, and social events even at the cost of his personal safety. Chadwick argues that, “Defoe had a singular mixture of wit, respectability, and even personal vanity, on the one hand, and high, fixed, courageous moral principle, on the other” (5) to fight against his adversarial

circumstances. For example, Defoe reacts to the issuance of the *Second Declaration of Indulgence* in 1688. He publishes “his first pamphlet, *A Letter to a Dissenter from His Friend at the Hague*, alleging the insincerity of James II’s offer of religious toleration” (Bree, *Moll Flanders* xxxv). In another example, we see Defoe writes in 1702 *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, a satirical commentary on the extremism of High Church Tories, and faces humiliation and imprisonment. For writing this pamphlet in which the speaker appears to defend Anglican oppression of the Dissenters, Defoe “stood in the pillory three times and was sentenced to jail” (Norton 2288). His life was never smooth. He sums up his life in this distich. “*No Man has tasted differing Fortunes more, / And Thirteen Times I have been Rich and Poor*” (Richetti 14).

On the political front, Defoe had enemies in both camps Whigs and Tories. Mostly they were unknown to him. “In the autobiographical *Appeal to Honor and Justice* [1715] he [Defoe] complains that ‘every Libel, every Pamphlet, be it ever so foolish, so malicious, so unmannerly, or so dangerous’ was laid at his door” (Richetti 13). On the literary front, he had his bitter critics who ridiculed him as a person of low intelligence and attacked his literary works as inconsequential. In terms of Defoe’s disparager John Gay, Defoe’s work “will endure but one Skimming” (Rogers 39). Whereas, Defoe’s admirers remember Defoe in the *British Quarterly Review* (October 1869) “as Chaucer was the father of English poetry, so Defoe was the father of English novel-writing” (Rogers 191).

In view of the above discussion and a brief sketch of his life, it is no surprise to see that Defoe was liked and disliked in the same household for his literary pursuits. For example, Sir Leslie Stephen (1832-1904), rejects Defoe as one who “never seems to

know his own strength” (Rogers 172); whereas, his daughter Virginia Woolf accepts him as a creator of great novels. She compares Defoe with George Crabbe (1754-1832), famous for his poem *The Village* (1783) which depicts “the degrading effect of hopeless poverty” (Norton Vol. 1, 2886), and George Gissing (1857-1903) whose early novels such as *Workers in the Dawn* “are set among the London slums and deal with the life there in remorseless and penetrating, but not very sympathetic, detail” (Morton, Web. 22 May 2016). Woolf is of the view that Defoe knows his strength, and has deep knowledge of human nature. She argues that “He belongs, indeed, to the school of the great plain writers, whose work is founded upon a knowledge of what is most persistent, though not most seductive, in human nature” (The Common Reader, First Series). Whereas, Stephen, after rejecting Defoe as a writer, argues that Defoe’s stories are devoid of form, and the flow of his narration is restricted by limited choice of places where Defoe situates his characters. Stephen maintains that Defoe “follows the thread of his narrative into the back-slums of London, or lodging-houses of doubtful character, or respectable places of trade, with the same equanimity, at a steady jog-trot of narrative” (Rogers 172). Stephen goes further and says, “We do not imagine that *Roxana*, *Moll Flanders*, *Colonel Jack*, or *Captain Singleton* can fairly claim any higher interest than that which belongs to the ordinary police report. . . . The novel of sentiment or passion or character would be altogether beyond his scope” (Rogers 172).

I will argue in this paper that Daniel Defoe’s *Col. Jack* (1722) is a well-knit sentimental novel that shows the real eighteenth-century London where rampant poverty and destitution has rendered a large number of people to be criminals. Defoe is persistent in his approach to the issues of criminality, poverty, and the way collective moral

responsibility of the society has failed to protect the poor from the vicious circle of evil. In *Col. Jack*, Defoe paints in words the sentimental moments of the sinful people, their pathos – and their emotional anguish to achieve their objective – to be gentlemen and gentlewomen. Defoe's books are different in context, but they all are undeniably imaginative and present a unified idea about human life in eighteenth-century London. We need to recognize that Defoe's "books do possess an imaginative unity" (Richetti, 19). In the case of *Col. Jack*, its imaginative unity becomes more obvious when the gradual growth of Col. Jack's character, from criminality to civility, presents a unified picture of a reformed man. During this process of change, psychological implications in the life of Col. Jack, in the lives of Col. Jack's victims, his wives, and the slaves under his management in Virginia, play significant role. These characters in *Col. Jack* assume a posture similar to an explorer or discoverer of truth about their own lives. They invest their time in quiet introspection within the framework of moral reasoning. "Moral reasoning as a species of practical reasoning — that is, as a type of reasoning directed towards deciding what to do and, when successful, issuing in an intention" (Richardson, n page), and "Practical reason is the general human capacity for resolving, through reflection, the question of what one is to do. Deliberation of this kind is practical in at least two senses. First, it is practical in its subject matter, insofar as it is concerned with action. But it is also practical in its consequences or its issue, insofar as reflection about action itself directly moves people to act" (Wallace n page). Such as, when Col. Jack robs a woman and regrets his act as "a wicked abominable Thing" (CJ 83), or his first wife confesses and repents her wrongs. She says to Col. Jack, ". . . the Injuries I have done

you! I have paid dear for all my wickedness” (CJ 225), or his slaves acknowledge their faults and express their sentiments of gratitude toward him.

Defoe divides the novel into two distinctly different circumstances for Col. Jack to show two different situations that influence his life. He situates Col. Jack in London and then in Virginia – the transatlantic world. During the days in London, Col. Jack is exposed to the harshness of an urban society which mostly thrives on manual labor, mercantilism, and crimes; whereas, in the transatlantic world it is all about manual labor, indentured servants and slaves. If environment in London encourages him to commit crime and live as an outlaw, the transatlantic world exposes him to servitude, hard work, and a life of liberty and pursuit of happiness. In London Col. Jack finds occasions to regret after committing a crime; in Virginia, he has options to choose from a restricted life of an indentured servant to whom a place to live and food to survive is available, or to work hard and develop his own resources to become a prosperous gentleman. We see this phenomenon in Defoe’s *Moll Flanders* as well; Moll changes after her transportation to Virginia. However, the change in Col. Jack’s circumstances, and in subsequent events in his life, prove a turning point, and he reforms himself.

Defoe presents Col. Jack as a family man to negate any assumption that *Col. Jack* is a story of an ascetic in search of a formula for self-reformation. Rather it is a story of an ordinary man who has feelings and desires, emotions and reasons, and above all sentiments to be good to others. Some of these aspects of Col. Jack’s life are vividly portrayed through his restricted but greatly expanded sexual behavior as a reader may judge from his five marriages. He is attracted to women, but does not chase them to fulfil his desires. He is not hypersexual; rather a cool contemplator of sexual life with a

purpose. After he divorces one wife, as we know, he thinks of another marriage and says to himself that “a settled life was the thing I lov’d . . . I looked out for a Woman as suitable as I could, but always found something or other to shock my fancy” (CJ 234). In the discharge of his family responsibilities, Col. Jack displays remarkable quality of his compassion and sentimental attachment even with his divorced wives. He thinks about his second wife and says, “I ought not let her starve; and besides, Poverty was a temptation which a Woman could not easily withstand, and I ought not to be the Instrument to drive her to a horrid Necessity of Crime, If I could prevent it” (CJ 232). Defoe makes us believe that the story of a man, in search of a peaceful and honorable life, should begin from a peaceful home. Defoe’s obsession with a purposeful sexual life and marriage resonates in his other works as well. If in *Col. Jack* – Col. Jack marries more than once to find a peaceful home; in *Moll Flanders*, Moll marries more than once in search of a peaceful home.

However, to get a complete picture of sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, I take a brief survey of the views of critics about Defoe and his work, social history of London and the time within which Col. Jack is placed. I also argue about secularism and sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, Col. Jack’s sentimentalism in the light of psychoanalytical theory, and Defoe’s realism and sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*. The conclusion wraps up the discussion. A brief bibliographical note on useful resources in the study of Defoe and sentimentalism in *Col. Jack* is also appended. Some of the books which I have discussed in the annotated bibliography are not included in the works cited list as neither I have quoted from them nor rephrased ideas from them. But, certainly they have facilitated my understanding of both Daniel Defoe and *Col. Jack*. This paper should be valuable for

Defoe scholars who would like to see if a picaresque novel can legitimately be placed with classical literary text in which sentimentalism has a central role to play.

Defoe and his critics

Sir Leslie Stephen (1832-1904), editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and of the *Cornhill Magazine*, is of the opinion that Defoe's works read like an "ordinary police report" (Rogers 172), or "have no atom of sentiments" (Rogers 172), and "two-thirds of each of these novels are deadly dull" (Rogers 172). About Defoe, he says he, "may be said to have stumbled almost unconsciously into novel-writing" (Rogers 176). Contrary to censorious views of her father, Virginia Woolf approvingly writes in 1919 in *The Common Reader* and admires Defoe and his works. To her, *Robinson Crusoe* is "perennial and immortal;" whereas, referring to *Roxana* and *Moll Flanders*, she says, "They stand among the few English novels which we can call indisputably great" (*The Common Reader*, p-) Woolf vehemently argues about the genius of Defoe and acknowledges his unfaltering memory and skills to reproduce the real-life images. In her opinion, Defoe was fully equipped with rich experience of journalistic work, and had first-hand knowledge about castaway children, exploited and abandoned women, men degraded and branded as thieves -- all struggling to survive in a world of crimes -- where "violence, born of despair and greed, belonged to the poor alone" (Plumb 13). Woolf remembers Defoe's four characters: Roxana, Moll, Captain Singleton and Col. Jack, and recognizes Defoe's portrayal of these characters as realistic and nearer to a heart that feels the pinch of neglect. She argues:

He [Defoe] belongs, indeed, to the school of the great plain writers, whose work is founded upon a knowledge of what is most persistent, though not most seductive, in human nature. The view of London from Hungerford Bridge, grey, serious, massive, and full of the subdued stir of traffic and business, prosaic if it were not for the masts of the ships and the towers and domes of the city, brings him to mind. The tattered girls with violets in their hands at the street corners, and the old weather-beaten women patiently

displaying their matches and bootlaces beneath the shelter of arches, seem like characters from his books. He is of the school of [poet George] Crabbe and of [novelist George] Gissing, and not merely a fellow-pupil in the same stern place of learning, but its founder and master. (The Common Reader, First Series n. page)

Woolf is diametrically opposed to her fathers' assessment of Defoe; for Stephen, Defoe's works aim at reaching the lower class people and "scarcely satisfies a grown-up man with a taste of high art" (Rogers 175); whereas, for Woolf, Defoe's work is highly imaginative and touches the heart of its readers. She does not descend into the polemics of lower-upper class debate and straight away talks about the impression Defoe's novels create. It can be said without fear of contradiction that Woolf's 'tattered girls' and 'old weather-beaten women' are the products of emotions and sentiments Defoe's characterization of destitution could evoke in her. The way Woolf could relate the real life scenes from 'the view of London from Hungerford Bridge' with the characters from the Defoe's novels, shows the strength of Defoe's novels. Woolf saw beneath the surface of the text; whereas, some critics of Defoe did not consider giving a dignified treatment to Defoe's "picaresque" texts.

Most prominently, Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope evaluate Defoe and his work only after looking at the surface of the texts and describe him as any other Grub Street writer. Jonathan Swift and Alexander Pope, "traducer of Daniel De Foe" (Chadwick 198), remain critical of Defoe for most of the time. Swift rejects Defoe as "a Fellow that was pilloryed [sic] ... a rogue, that there is no enduring him.... Stupid illiterate ... being of a Levil [sic] with great Numbers among the lowest Part of Mankind" (Rogers 38). Alexander Pope equates "Defoe's name with those of such recognized dunces as Thomas Heywood, Prynne, and John Tutchin" (Rogers, 39). Pope in his second

book of his *Dunciad* speaks about Defoe: ‘Earless on high stood unabash’d De Foe, / And Tutchin flagrant from the scourge below’” (Rogers 51). Pope places Defoe and Tutchin at the same level of low intellectual and moral integrity and attempts to project Defoe simply as a dunce for reasons of professional animosity. Rogers, referring to Pope’s attitude toward Defoe, believes, “Much of it seems to us purely ‘personal’ in character” (10). Theophilus Cibber sees Pope’s attitude toward Defoe as malicious and argues: “De Foe can never, with any propriety, be ranked amongst the dunces; for whoever reads his works with candor and impartiality, must be convinced that he was a man of the strongest natural powers, a lively imagination, and solid judgment” (Rogers 51). Despite having “a lively imagination, and solid judgment” Defoe’s novels could not be taken as representatives of artistic and creative work of a man who had the ability to write on a variety of subjects. Richetti gives us a figure of “566 separate works, including substantial writing for twenty-seven periodicals” (Daniel Defoe 13) out of which only a few selected pieces of writings could attract the attention of critics in the lifetime of Defoe and after his death. Rogers laments this lack of interest in Defoe’s works and argues: “Defoe was chiefly regarded... as a polemicist and party worker.... His inclusion in *The Dunciad* seems to have occasioned little dismay at the time, and after his death there were few signs that the bulk of his work, in fiction and in other forms would hardly survive” (1). It seems appropriate to say that Defoe was treated as any other man who lived for some time and passed away just as any other man next door. His death was announced in the *Universal Spectator* in just one line:

“A few days ago died Daniel Defoe, Snr, a person well known for his numerous writings.” These words, from the *Universal Spectator* of 1 May 1731, express very fairly the contemporary estimate of Defoe. Nothing

here about the author of Robinson Crusoe and half a dozen other works of fiction that are still read today; only a comprehensive reference to his numerous writings, and the whole obituary disposed of in a single sentence. The notion that he would be remembered, more than two centuries after his death, as a famous English author would have seemed extravagant to most of his contemporaries. ... Pope did not hesitate to give him a place in the *Dunciad* along with the other Grub Street scribblers, and it is unlikely that many of his readers lifted an eyebrow at finding Defoe in such company. (James Sutherland 1)

Defoe knew that he would be forgotten after his death, and his contemporary critics and professional competitors would rejoice in him being gone. “De Foe, in his *Appeal to Honour and Justice*, affirms, ‘that no sooner was the Queen dead, and the King, as right required, proclaimed, but the rage of men increased upon me to that degree, that the threats and insults I received were such as I am not able to express’” (Chadwick 436). Also, nearing old age, he was in an unhappy relationship with his children. Defoe tells us: “I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me” (Chadwick 460). Children’s rebellion was a family matter, and Defoe had reasons to reconcile with its consequences, but the insult that he received from others, plunged him into darkness while he was still alive; and after his death, he was gradually scrubbed off from the memory of both friends and foes. Rogers in the preface of his book *Defoe: The Critical Heritage* has noted that “after a number of bitter personal attacks in his life time, Defoe’s name disappeared from serious criticism for three-quarters of a century,” (x). We see that very little was written to discover the real Defoe -- “a writer capable of many voices” (Richetti 1), and a person with an “unshaken probity in his moral conduct and an invincible integrity in his political sphere” (Rogers 51) during his lifetime; and in successive years after his death, critics seemingly remained contented with what had been written by their

predecessors. However, Defoe left behind him hundreds of documents and his books to rediscover him and his genius.

Defoe and his works

Out of the well-known six novels of Daniel Defoe (1660-1731) published in a short span of time (1719--1725), *Col. Jack* (1722) attracted less attention from the critics than his other novels. Linda Bree in her introduction to *Moll Flanders* quotes observations of George Chalmers, writer of the book *The life of Daniel De Foe* (1790), who assesses most of the Defoe's works as of inconsequential value. While writing of *Moll*, alongside *Colonel Jack* and *Roxana*, Chalmers comments "I am not convinced, that the world has been made much wiser, or better, by the perusal of these lives: they may have diverted the lower orders . . . But they do not exhibit many scenes which are welcome to cultivated mind" (*Moll* xxv). In addition to Chalmers' views about *Col. Jack*, whatever little has been written about it, is scattered and difficult to collect at one place to explore the possibilities of looking at this "sentimental novel in embryo" (Preface CJ xv) in its entirety. It can be said that writings about *Col. Jack* are restricted to the surface value of the text as an account of a man having "*a strange Rectitude of Principals [that] remained with him*" (Preface, *Col. Jack* 1). Defoe states in the preface to *Col. Jack* that the purpose of this publication is to discourage evil and encourage virtue in human beings. Defoe's explanation about the purpose of writing *Col. Jack* sufficiently restricts critical view against his clearly stated purpose; whereas, in my opinion, we do not need to accept a writer's claim without questioning the value of his text. Therefore, we find most of the critical literature on *Col. Jack* is about Col. Jack's evil doings and his conversion to religious beliefs and piety. Another reason why much critical literature on *Col. Jack* is not available, is as Samuel Holt Monk observes that, "Close reading was not the vogue in the 1720's; the novel was not written for critics" (CJ xxiii) to comment on its contents. Therefore some of the earlier

readers, read *Col. Jack* leisurely; whereas, some of the critics looked only at the surface of its text to form an opinion. William Hazlitt argues about Defoe's novels that "his other works of fiction [excluding *Robinson Crusoe*] have not been read . . . and one reason is, that many of them, at least, are hardly fit to be read . . . these works have an *immoral* tendency" (Rogers 108-109). Hazlitt's comments on *Col. Jack* and *Moll Flanders* are restricted only to the early pages of these two novels which are "the best part" for him (Rogers 110). Some of the later critics engaged themselves with such issues, as religion, economics, and crime in Defoe's novels and found it enough to be contented with their efforts to discover Defoe and his works. *Col. Jack*, as Richetti argues "can be read (i.e. explained) as a narrative treatise on the idea of natural goodness, Colonel Jack serving as Defoe's Emile and the novel itself recording the normally rough-minded Defoe's infection by the fashionable sentimentalism of the moment" (146). Richetti's emphasis on "can be read" rightly points out the diversity of Defoe's writing where his "Emile" needs deciphering, and the "fashionable sentimentalism of the moment" calls for further investigation. Therefore, on the surface of the text Defoe partly veils and partly exploits the elements of "strange" and "Rectitude" the way he thinks useful for his purpose, and leaves the interpretation of the subtleties in the text to the judgment of his readers.

Maximillian E. Novak recognizes both Moll and Jack as "perfect colonists" (*Economics and the Fiction of Daniel Defoe* 154); and about Defoe, he says, he "remained a conservative mercantilist" (13). Everett Zimmerman sees Jack as someone "guided by his notions of gentility" (127), and as far as Defoe's books are concerned, he argues that his novels "raise the issue of self and Identity" (5). Virginia Ogden Birdsall argues that "Self-transcendence by whatever means is invariably Jack's motive" (123). John J.

Richetti, apart from helping readers to understand Col. Jack as a composite product of his circumstances and experiences, says, “Jack offers the secular wisdom of history and society understood by participation, generalization about such matters informed by experience. ... Jack offers us wonder tinged with irony, openly promises us from his first sentence a genteel mixture of diversion and instruction which invites us to be skeptical about the moral contents ...” (Defoe’s Narratives 148). J. H. Plumb argues that Defoe responds to “the deepest human experiences” (163). Roger D. Lund argues: “*Family Instructor* exemplifies the strain of moralism that emerges in all Defoe’s novels” (3). William Chadwick sees Defoe as having “fixed, courageous moral character” (5). Critic Geoffrey Sill in his book *Defoe and the Idea of Fiction (1713-1719)* suggests that “the motive for Defoe’s recourse to fiction is broadly ideological, not merely theological, and that Defoe was at least as interested in influencing events in this world through his fiction as he was in preparing souls for the next” (111). Referring to *Moll Flanders* and *Col Jack*, Catherine Clark holds the view that “most of his writing in this period reveal a man frequently despairing over the depravity of his age” (144). Whereas, George Boulukos is of the opinion that Jack is the “inversion of sentimental hero ... *Colonel Jack* is different in kind from later full-blown sentimental novels” (79). However, he does not dispute the presence of sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, rather shows another shade of sentimentalism that confirms one of the effective characteristics of sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*. G. A. Starr, heavily relying on Leslie Stephen who refers to Defoe’s *Apparition of Mrs. Veal* and calls him a fabricator, holds that “despite increased interest in Defoe’s theory of fiction, the earlier view of Defoe as a brilliant liar persists” (190). Nicholas Marsh referring to three novels, *Captain Singleton*, *Memoires of a Cavalier* and *Col Jack*, says that “these are generally acknowledged to be

less like what we would call “novels” (226). However, he does not explain why and by whom these novels have not been considered as novels. Also, there are critics who find narrative similarity between *Col. Jack* and other Defoe’s novels, and if they do not reject it as a hotchpotch of Defoe’s previous stories produced for commercial purpose, they even do not grant it the legitimacy of a creative product. “*Colonel Jack*, James Sutherland has noted, is an amalgam of all the narrative arrangements displayed in Defoe’s previous books” (Defoe’s Narratives 146). This idea of “amalgam of all the narrative arrangement” may also be drawn from Sutherland’s concluding observation in his essay on *Daniel Defoe* published in *British Writers*, a publication of British Council: “There is all the difference in the world between this sort of story [Robinson Crusoe], which generates its own power, and the loose, picaresque narratives that Defoe went on to write afterward, where the interest can only be maintained by throwing a fresh log on the fire as the flames die down” (11).

After finding amalgam of all previous novels of Defoe in the form of *Col Jack*, some critics consider Defoe’s presentation as repetitive, faulty, dull, and incoherent. They maintain that his discursive presentations of the traits of his characters are trivial and therefore inconsequential and not worth taking notice of. His opponents find “in his work ‘a Heap of Words to no Purpose,’ ... ‘indigested Heap of malicious Suggestions,’ Heap of Thoughts not rightly digested,’ ... lack of skill in framing an argument,’ ... ‘the only Favour ... desire[d] of him, is to go first to the University, and learn the Art of close Reasoning” (Rogers 11). Defoe, as Rogers points out, is remembered as, “this mean mercenary prostitute’ of excelling only in detraction” (11). However, these comments do not belittle the quality of his writing and his command over his authorial decision as how

to communicate with his audience, and how to save himself from being misunderstood. We cannot avoid noticing that “when Defoe addresses a large, presumably untutored group of readers he consistently stoops to the most rudimentary simplicity, marked by assiduous use of such pedagogical tactics as repetition, definition, summary.... As well as an utterly unadorned, factual style” (Anthony James 36). There is a trend in his approach to reach out to his readers on one-to-one basis and interact with them on entirely personal level. Charles Mackay (1814-89) rebuts all charges of sloppiness in Defoe’s writing as Defoe’s well thought-out methodology to engage his audience and communicate with them in their own style. The plainness of his language shows Defoe’s ability to be conscious of his purpose of writing. He knows his readers’ ability to understand him, as well as his texts in its proper context. Mackey argues: “his prose is uniformly as plain and logical ... as a lawyer’s brief. He had the merits of precision and concision, and scarcely ever used a word that would not have been plain to the least educated” (Rogers 196).

These observations of critics have divergent views about Defoe and his work; whereas, to be brief, if we look at the views of only Novak, Zimmerman, Birdsall, Richetti, Plumb, Lund, Boulukos, Chadwick, Sill, and Clark placed together, we find that in one way or the other there is inter-subjectivity and they point out to Defoe’s sensitivity toward social and moral issues, and by implication to Jack’s sentimentalism. As far as Marsh’s observation, though he does not give reason, that ‘*Captain Singleton, Memoires of a Cavalier and Col Jack*’ cannot be classified as novels, is simply untenable if looked at from the point of view of Germaine de Staël who concisely gives ingredients of a text that qualifies it as a legitimate novel:

She divides fictions into three types: marvelous or allegorical; historical; and fictions, consisting of “events at once entirely invented and imitated, in which nothing is true but everything is believable” (EF,” 203) Only the modern novel, she says, can achieve the persistent and accurate usefulness we can get from the portrayal of our ordinary, habitual feelings. A novel need not be focused on one principle idea, since the author is bound to follow the rules of probabilitythe only truth fiction has is “the impression it producesVirtue must be “animated.” Novels make moral truths tangible by “putting them into action.” And more power the novel has for moving people, the more important it becomes to “extend its influence to the emotions of people of all ages and to the obligations of all classes” Of all creations of the human mind, the novel is the most influential on individual morality, which ultimately determines public morality The novel might foster the ability to be moved by examples of vice and virtue. (Habib 425-26)

^ To a great extent, Defoe’s novels conform to de Staël’s general prescription of novels. Defoe was writing both as a journalist and as a novelist addressing common man’s need to survive, and to assimilate in the main stream of social, political, and economic life. His novels contain plenty of examples of vice and virtue even to the extent that his characters Moll and Col Jack both examine their inner selves and presents their cases. Their transition from a sinful life to a virtuous life is a composite model of resistance needed to attack the inertness of a society that fails to deliver justice to its own members.

Defoe exposes the kind of society which angers him in his *Poor Man’s Plea*: “Defoe used the mask of indigence to attack a society whose magistrates were punishing men for being poor, which is no Crime at all. Yet in various stages of their lives Defoe’s heroes and heroines are punished for their poverty, if not by law, by the rules of the society itself” (Novak 67). Defoe’s criticism of the society is based upon his personal experience. He had observed the lives of the poor as a journalist and reported on the selective behavioral pattern of people in power. He knew that many people in desperate

need to get a loaf of bread resorted to petty crimes and finally got punished. Historian of eighteenth century Britain J. H. Plumb notes that “by 1740, for stealing a handkerchief worth one shilling, so long as it was removed privily from the person, children could be hanged by the neck until dead” (17). When Defoe depicts the insensitivity and insularity of his society and criminality of his characters, he does it with a sense of deep emotions and considerable perplexity over the ill-gotten wealth and value of money necessary for living; and “in all likelihood, it is Defoe’s sense of this fact that leads to Jack’s repeatedly associating stolen money with dirt.” (Birdsall 127). Views of Plumb and Defoe about the value of money may appear paradoxical, but in one case the love of money is a death warrant if it is procured by criminal means, and in the other, it is held in contempt as the cause of ‘the deceitfulness of Riches’” (CJ 24). However, the underlying effect in both cases is grief and a sense of repentance. Defoe’s characters commit all sort of crime, pickpocket, theft, prostitution and incest, but with a sense of guilt and a desire to “live without that wretched thing, call’d stealing” (CJ 117). Defoe’s characters do not forget the need to reform themselves and live as gentlemen or gentlewomen.

However, in view of all these criticism of Defoe and his work, Rogers is generous enough to give benefit of the doubt to Defoe’s critics who err on their judgment and reject Defoe as a literary craftsman; he argues: “it is not that Defoe’s successors wrote badly about his art; they were not really aware that he was an artist” (x); and the mid-nineteenth century literary historian William Chadwick reasons that “some of the De Foe’s work never were understood, for he worked alone, and on his own judgment and responsibility, and so was never appreciated” (87). As a note of caution, Everett Zimmerman in *Defoe and the Novel* argues that “Our difficulty in placing Defoe may result in part from the way in which

Tory satirists, especially Swift and Pope, have shaped our attitudes toward the eighteenth century writers: “They [Swift and Pope] abominated the writers of popular literature and political journalists for hire. The moralistic perspective perhaps leads us to ignore the fact that Defoe shared much of the intellectual world of Swift and Pope” (1-2). The validity of critics’ views, for or against Defoe and his work, are justified in the light of their respective ways of looking at Defoe’s novels, but only as long as they do not displace Defoe from “The age of Defoe” (Robert Moore, G. M. Trevelyan, and Peter Earle. qtd in Clark 1).

Defoe and his London

Defoe's novels portray both human avarice and misery and attack the societal apathy to mitigate the sufferings of the marginalized people who desire to live honorably. Moll in *Moll Flanders* holds avarice responsible for her criminal life as she says, 'Poverty brought me into the Mire, so Avarice kept me in' (MF 170), and Col. Jack in *Col. Jack* reflects on his criminal life and says, "Miserable sink to the depth of their misery by a continu'd Series of Disaster, and are long in the Tortures and Agonies of their distress'd Circumstances" (CJ 4). In the process, *Col. Jack*, set in eighteenth century London, records the interpretative version of the social history of eighteenth-century London, where on the one hand trade and manufacturing gains new heights and brings prosperity to a minority, and on the other hand, the increasing numbers of the poor strive to survive but gradually recede in the poverty trap. Scarcity of resources has adverse effect on the poor who are forced to live in hovels and mostly sleep alongside their animals. Plumb notes that "one child in four, born in London, survived" (13) because of unhygienic living conditions and rare opportunities of having trained midwifery services. The death rate among the poor is higher than the rich. Money could buy a better place for burial of the rich; whereas, the bodies of the poor are deposited in "pits or Holes (called the Poor's Holes)" (13). These pits once opened, remained uncovered as long as more dead bodies could not be squeezed into it. Plumb says, "How noisome the stench is that arises from these holes" (13). Those children and adults who survived economic distresses and unhygienic environment subsequently joined the labor force. Options to choose a profitable profession was limited for the poor; mostly they competed to find a manual labor job "so the factories and the mines absorbed them; and child labor was more deliberately exploited than ever before.

Children coming home from the factory or the mines stab the conscience which is at rest so long as the drudge is in the home or workplace.... Exploitation of female and child labor was to be found in small-scale and domestic industry” (Plumb 88).

Col. Jack in *Col Jack* and Moll in *Moll Flanders* both are representative characters of this society – a product of an uncanny society where an individual is ill-equipped with needed skills to honestly earn for victuals. People having no means to fight against privation, had recourse only to such acts as circumstances could provide them. Most often, crime was the only option. As we see Col. Jack saying that he “was made a Thief involuntarily” (CJ 19), and therefore a thief among many other thieves in the pervasive and wicked socio-economic system in Defoe’s London. The very word ‘involuntarily’ depicts Col. Jack’s sense of helplessness and a sentimental response to the uncaring circumstances he had to bear with. Geoffrey Sill argues in his introduction to *Street-Robberies, Consider’d: The Reason of their being so Frequent*: “Defoe’s disapproval of crime is usually moralistic. To him it constitutes a degradation of honesty and self-respect. But this criticism is not only of the individual criminal, but also of the socio-economic system which fosters crime” (ii). No doubt Defoe is pragmatic and optimistic in his approach in his personal life, but his London, where his novels are grounded, is apathetic, and where “Chimney sweepers and prostitutes are casually expandable commodities in an economy that crushes and demeans” human needs (Byrd 159).

Defoe’s characters, Jack and Moll, live in London and learn their trades – pickpocket –as a first step toward their struggle against poverty. They gain experience of crime at a busy stock exchange where the exchange brings affluence for some, and

temptation to steal for the needy and financially oppressed people. As Max Byrd writing on Defoe's *London*: "*this prodigious Thing*" in his book *London Transformed: Images of the City the eighteenth-century* sees London as "a sink of corruption" (20) and finds London, ostensibly a place for seeking some relief from impoverishment, offers little to destitute to depend on. Byrd quotes Defoe as saying in his pamphlet *Augusta Triumphans; or, The Way to Make London the Most Flourishing City in the Universe* (London, 1728), "London, that us'd to be the most safe and peaceful City in the Universe ... is now a Scene of rapine and Danger" (20). Defoe is concerned with the plight of the adults living in this society and seeking a way out of the existing hardship. He is equally sad over the gloomy future of the impoverished children growing into adulthood and adding to the existing stock of crooks. Defoe expresses his views on the fate of these children in his pamphlet *Some Considerations on . . . Seamen* (London, 1728). Byrd quotes Defoe's words on the hopeless existence of London Urchins: "Many of them indeed perish young, and dye miserable, before they may be said to look into life, some are starved with Hunger, some with Cold, many are found frozen in street and Fields, some drowned before they are old enough to be hang'd" (Byrd 20-21). These same children may be found in the earlier pages of *Col. Jack*.

Defoe picks up such a waif, Col. Jack "a dirty Glass-Bottle House Boy" (CJ 7) from amongst thousands of such unloved children and records the various phases of his struggle to survive. Col. Jack knows only the dangers of his 'trade' and the compulsion of his basic need for food, both destructive in nature. Col. Jack says about his early life that he "was made a Thief involuntarily, and went on a Length that few Boys do, without coming to the common Period of that kind of Life, I mean to the Transportation Ship, or the Gallows"

(CJ 19). In other words, despite being a criminal to a certain length of time, and not caught for being so, Col. Jack expresses his regret over his “involuntarily” criminal behavior and pleasure over escaping punishment. By the time *Col. Jack* ends, Col. Jack is a reformed man and tells his sentimental story of hardship when in London, and changes in him when in Virginia.

Sentimentalism

Since sentimentalism in *Col. Jack* is my point of focus, therefore a brief discussion on sentimentalism seems appropriate. Sentimentalism is seen differently by different critics, therefore, a definition of sentimentalism or a sentimental novel is hard to find. Edwin J. Barton and Glenda A. Hudson in their book *A Contemporary Guide to Literary Terms* seem to suggest that ‘sensibility’ and ‘sentimental’ may be used interchangeably to label a feeling associated with virtue and benevolence. They explain sentimentalism in the context of novel of sensibility: “The novel of sensibility or sentimental novel was especially popular in the second half of the eighteenth century. The term sensibility referred to refinement of feeling. It was associated with virtue and benevolence” (137). Whereas, the Oxford English Dictionary defines sentimentalism as “the excessive expression of feelings of tenderness, sadness, or nostalgia in behavior, writing, or speech,” and defines sensibility as “the ability to appreciate and respond to complex emotional or aesthetic influences; sensitivity” (Web 20 May 2016). This explanation establishes a relationship between explanation --a statement or an account that makes something clear, and definition -- the statement of the exact meaning of a word as given in a dictionary. The nuance between the two words ‘sensibility’ and ‘sentimentalism’ is clearly marked by the function these two words perform in depicting feelings. Broadly speaking, such novels where refined feelings create a bond between two characters or between the text and the reader fall into the category of sentimental novels. Lawrence Lipking and James Noggle in their editorial note on *The Restoration and the Eighteenth Century (1660-1785)* discuss the social changes and new ideas that had brought people closer together and argue that the *Characteristics of Men, Manners,*

Opinions, and Times (1711) by the third earl of Shaftesbury asserts that “the naturally social meaning of human character and mediated on the affections, the witty intercourse, and the standard of politeness that bind people together. Such ideas led to the popularity around mid-century of a new word, *sentimental* which locates the bases of social conduct in instinctual feeling rather than divinely sanctioned moral codes” (Norton Vol. 1. 2064-65). Janet Todd looks at sentimental novels as a piece of literature that causes “arousal of pathos through conventional situation, stock familial characters and rhetorical devices [as] the mark of sentimental literature. Such literature buttonholes the reader and demands an emotional response” (Todd 2). *Col. Jack* conforms to this description of sentimental literature.

Approaches of other critics explain a sentimental text by pointing to a varying degree of subtle authorial intrusion by writers to bring the text and the readers closer to the feelings of a character where the truth value of feelings remains unaltered. They discount spontaneity of emotion as an intrusive element in a sentimental text. Fay Halpern, Professor in the Literature department at [University of Calgary](#), holds that ‘spontaneous outpouring of emotions, diminishes the truth value of sentimentalism’; D. W. Jefferson, former Professor in the English department at the University of Leeds, relates sentimentalism with ‘feeling’ rather than, “thought or moral reflection” (132), and Joycelyn Moody, Professor of English at University of Texas at San Antonio, sees sentimentalism as “emotional and moral alliance between reader and text” (9).

Halpern in her book *Sentimental Readers* quotes the Unitarian minister Henry Giles views published in 1860 to highlight the bias against the very concept of sentimentalism: “Satan, we are told, can clothe himself as an angel of light; and so vice,

by sentimentalism, assumes the guise of virtue. The sentimentalist is to ethics what the hypocrite is to piety, a striver of after Falsehood; the one struggles to *feel* a lie, the other struggles to *believe* a lie” (139). Giles is not a solitary example of critics who have delved into the component of sentimentalism to find its genesis and then to caution readers against its illusive nature that one lie is mystified with another. Halpern holds that “the idea of sentimental literature’s false aspect – which enables the critic to remove the mask and reveal to readers just what lies underneath – has lingered into the present day” (141). She rejects the opinion of Giles and the likes and argues that “Sentimental novels require their heroes and heroines to forget themselves at the moments when they are most persuasive in order to assure us that they are not being disingenuous, not motivated by self-interest” (77). She maintains that there should be a natural tendency in the plot to absorb sentimental moments of a narrative and blend it with the traits of a character in its natural and real life setting. She explains this phenomenon and argues that: “Authors of sentimental rhetoric want their writing to be seen as a spontaneous outpouring of emotion, not a crafted utterance for a morally dubious orator” (141) and holds that this desire -- spontaneous outpouring of emotion -- of writers creates a false idea of “sentimental literature” (141) and obstructs all investigation into the sentimental rhetoric which connects the reader with the text and “allows us to glimpse our own complex identities as readers” (159). As far as any “spontaneous outpouring of emotions” is concerned, she discards it as an unwanted element in a sentimental narration as it diminishes the truth value of sentimental narration. In other words, she explains: “When a passage aims at the status of spontaneous outpouring of emotions and the reader consciously realizes that the scene is written exactly the same way as another

“spontaneous” scene, the reader begins to doubt its authenticity” (195). In *Col. Jack* Defoe is mindful that sentimental moments maintain their truth values and the narration flows in a natural manner i.e., in consonance with real events in anybody’s life.

D. W. Jefferson in his essay *Laurence Sterne* (1713-1768) -- an Irish novelist and Anglican Clergyman -- talks in defense of sentimental elements in his work and maintains that the meanings of sentimental elements in a text need not be stretched too much. It leaves damaging effect on the context in which a passage in a text is introduced. Jefferson also cautions against attaching, out of proportion, the notion of ‘self-indulgence and self-provoking,’ while interpreting sentimentalism in a text. He quotes from a letter of Sterne, 12 November 1767, addressed to Mrs. William James where Sterne explains how sentimentalism should be looked at in a text: “I told you my design in it [i.e., *A Sentimental Journey*] was to teach us to love the world and our fellow creatures better than we do” (132). Sterne attaches a sense of personal care and sharing of feelings to make a situation sentimental. Jefferson explains that “to extract too much moral value from Sterne’s work on the authority of sentences he has used in the text of his novel “may do him a disservice by provoking the old objection that the sentiment he helped to make fashionable is largely of the self-indulgence and self-deceiving kind” (132). Jefferson, from a letter of about 1739-1740 Sterne had written to her future wife, traces the use of the term ‘sentimentalism’ in a literary context:

Sterne seems to have played a decisive part in helping to establish certain meanings of the word ‘sentimentalism’ in English. . . . this meaning of the word (“tender,” “full of emotion”) does not come into vogue until the 1760s, and then mainly through the writings of Sterne himself, the earlier meanings being based on the definition of “sentiments” as “thought” or “moral reflection” rather than “feeling.” Sterne, it is suggested, was influenced by

the French meaning of “sentimentalism” and was responsible for attaching it to the English word “Sentimental.” (132)

Moody, in her essay *Sentimental Confessions: Spiritual Narratives of Nineteenth-Century African American Women* quotes Elizabeth Barnes, professor of English and American Literature at College of William and Mary, from her article *Affecting Relations: Pedagogy, Patriarchy, and the Politics of Sympathy* that “sentimentalism is a manifestation of the belief in or yearning for consonance – or even unity – of principles and purpose. Sympathy complements the work of sentiment: each can be defined as a set of registered impulses psychologically connecting an individual to things and people outside of him or her” (9). In Moody’s opinion the term sentimental “applies to literature that paradoxically both assumes and seeks to bring about an emotional and moral alliance between reader and text ... an intimacy that is rooted in common cultural assumptions about virtue and piety” (9).

In *Col. Jack*, sentimentalism is well-defined; it brings readers and the text closer and reasons that sentimental behavior of a person has direct bearings on his psyche, and it is closer to the realities of life. Sentimentalism, in simpler words, is the reality of life; it is neither concoction nor a lie that appears in a text to raise emotional moments for the entertainment of readers. Sentimentalism does not depict any kind of emotional outburst giving rise to self-indulgence and self-deception. Critics have taken notice of this tendency of confusing falsehood with sentimentalism and its nature as a ‘lie’ that exists only as a manipulative tool to trigger emotions of a reader, rather than a trait that needs to be seen in its right proportion.

Keeping in view the above discussion we can say that Defoe is conscious of his story plot, and knows how he should portray true sentiments when criminal acts of his characters transgress societal moral norms, and when his characters feel the pain of their wrong acts. For example, Col. Jack feels the pain of robbing a poor woman of Kentish Town and decides to return her money. This is a critical moment of sentimentalism in *Col. Jack* that triggers a change in the life of Col. Jack. Monk in his introduction to *Col. Jack* argues: “It is characteristic of Defoe’s use of natural law that Jack comes to understand intuitively the criminality of his robbing the poor widow of Kentish Town of her last guinea and a shilling: he has here violated the law of nature, and it is a part of his character that he cannot leave London for Scotland, without restoring to the poor woman what he had taken from her” (xii). The purpose of quoting Monk is neither to contest or support the working of ‘natural law’ or to discuss the implication of the word ‘intuitively,’ but to show Col. Jack’s sentimental reaction to his own immorality and the consequential sufferings of his victim. As a result, he resolves “to leave off the wicked Course” (83). Therefore, in the light of Todd, Halpern, Jefferson, and Moody/Barnes’ explanations of sentimentalism, it seems appropriate to say that by nature Col. Jack is compassionate, and a believer “in the standards of politeness that bind people together” (Norton Vol. 1. 2065); and by circumstances, he is a fortune seeker. And, at times, he is a completely sentimental person who abhors his crimes and tries to console and compensate his victims, and at times, his actions have no other notions except his desire to become a gentleman irrespective of its consequences. John J. Richetti’s position on Col. Jack’s character, as he describes him in his book *Defoe’s Narratives: Situations and Structures*, that “Colonel Jack’s mysterious gentle origins allow him to illustrate natural and social necessities even as he violates them

extravagantly” (149) implicitly indicates Col. Jack’s sentimentalism. Seen in this way a sentimental novel, Such as *Col. Jack*, shows a natural tendency to absorb sentimental moment in real life setting, and restrict sentimentalism to what is plainly stated in the text.

Col. Jack – Secularism and sentimentalism

The discussion on ‘secularism and sentimentalism’ is not a critique of Defoe’s religious belief. *Col. Jack* is a fictional work in the form of a biographical sketch of a rogue struggling with sin-virtue lifestyle; and Defoe portrays just that. However, being an insightful writer sensitive to the realities of his time, he uses his work to point out incongruities in social, religious, and political system. His frequent use of religious allusions in *Col. Jack* depicts the life of a man who has no “Fund of religious Knowledge” (CJ 171). It is the least "religious" of Defoe's novels, and may be read as a secular text where religion or divine intervention in Col. Jack’s life seems to have a restricted role to play. Zimmerman argues that “Defoe’s adaptation of spiritual autobiography for his novelistic purposes suggests both his religious perspective and the difficulties of maintaining it” (18). This argument of Zimmerman, when remains before us while reading *Col. Jack*, gets further strength from the behavioral pattern of Col. Jack who continues to remain in search of the true nature of ‘repentance’ acceptable to God. Zimmerman provides a plausible answer to this dilemma:

In the event of daily life, they [Devout Christians of the seventeenth century] discerned an informing principle: God’s providential order. Defoe’s characters try to find this spiritual meaning, but the material of their lives is extremely stubborn. Defoe’s novels reveal the discordance of mind that result from a life having only a dubious relationship either to an inner principle or to a stable external one. (18)

To be more specific, we see that Defoe creates sentimental atmosphere in his novels where only evil exists, and fear of poverty sustains the evil. For example, Moll in *Moll Flanders* says about her sinful life: “Poverty brought me into it, so fear of poverty kept me in it” (MF 101). Col. Jack acknowledges Devil as his “Schoolmaster” (CJ 6), and

evil as “being not Evil” in his account (CJ 40). Most of Defoe’s characters commit crimes with complete impunity and gradually become skilled in their art of pick-pocketing, shoplifting, deceiving, stealing, and robbing people to fulfill their own day-to-day needs; but, their sense of guilt always pricks their conscience. They remain in search of an opportunity to reform themselves. Col. Jack once robs a woman, feels her pain of losing money and her sense of destitution, and decides that he “would never rob no more” (CJ 83). Later, he locates the woman and compensates her losses. The entire episode, beginning from the robbery to the restitution of the robbed money to its owner, is a sentimental account of Col. Jack’s abhorrence of his own crime, and his belief that self-correction is always within reach without any intervention of religious ideas of good and evil. We know that a major portion of Col. Jack’s life is spent in irreligious environment, and his understanding of crime is limited to his perception of crime as a “Trade,” which is secular in description. Monk argues that “Defoe held that when necessity presses, thieving is no sin or crime” (xiii). Similarly, Col. Jack’s understanding of compassion and benevolence is rooted in his irreligious environment. It is only in later stage of his life, in Virginia, he gets time to listen to religious ideas when his Tutor tries to instruct him into the benefits of religiosity. Col. Jack’s Tutor partly fails in his endeavor as Col. Jack agrees only to the secular portion of his teachings and leaves the rest. He says to his Tutor: “However, I cannot say my Thoughts were Ripen’d, for an Operation of that kind . . . As to commencing Penitent . . . I cannot say, I had any Convictions upon me, sufficient to bring on, nor I had Fund of religious Knowledge to support me in it; so it wore off again Gradually, as such things generally do, where the first Impressions are not deep enough” (CJ 171). The Tutor combines both secular and religious ideas into his

discussion and shows them operative in human lives. Col. Jack listens to him, and most of the time, agrees only with the secular portion of the discussion. Such as the Tutor's understanding of temptation and human nature is tied with need, Col. Jack condones crime as acts committed under compelling circumstances. Col. Jack agrees with his Tutor's perception about human nature, temptation, and crime that "Necessity is not only the Temptation, but is such a Temptation as human Nature is not empower'd to resist" (CJ 161). Col. Jack also sees that his Tutor ties "human Nature" with "Necessity" and subliminally talks about the over-stretched necessity that leads to crime. But in both the situation Col. Jack shows no inclination toward knowing how religion provides a solution when 'human nature,' and 'necessity,' combine and coax a man to commit a 'crime' which is, undoubtedly, a loathsome act. Going back to the incident of robbing the poor woman, we know that Col. Jack is a destitute and lives on robbed money, but when he decides to return the money he finds that his act had pained the woman who was more in need of the money than he was himself. The narrator tells us about the circumstances of the woman as "she was an honest poor industrious Woman, and by her Labor and Pains, maintain'd a poor diseas'd Husband, that had been unable to help himself some years" (CJ 84). There is no indication that Col. Jack is guided by any kind of religious thought, rather it is his consciousness about his own circumstances and the circumstances of the woman that leads him to revisit his act and take the right decision. He keeps his need for money to mitigate his sufferings aside and returns her original amount. In addition, he gives her "a Crown more" (CJ 86) to empathize with her. His approach toward his own crime and the sufferings of her victim is sentimental in nature and conforms to the idea of secular humanism. Humanism is defined as "An outlook or system of thought attaching

prime importance to human rather than divine or supernatural matters. Humanist beliefs stress the potential value and goodness of human beings, emphasize common human needs, and seek solely rational ways of solving human problems” (OED Web May 14, 2016).

In another incident, during his stay in Virginia when he is given the responsibility to manage slaves at a plantation, he “secularizes the disciplinary aspect of the fire and brimstone Protestantism for his pagan charges, extracting labor-management benefits without the bother of articulating a theology – or of conversion” (Boulukos 83). He applies compassion and creates an environment where slaves could express their feelings and ask for relief from hardship if circumstances so warranted. It is not an isolated event where Col. Jack secularizes his views on his relationship with slaves under his management in Virginia, but, on a broader scale, he looks at the relationship between the people in power and their subjects in a secular way and raises ethical questions related to acts of benevolence and gratefulness. Considering himself as in power and slaves as his subject, he thinks about managing ‘*Negroes*.’ He says: “this was the opportunity I had a mind to have, to trye whether as *Negroes* have all the other Faculties of reasonable Creatures, they had not also some Sense of Kindness, some Principles of natural Generosity, which in short, is the Foundation of Gratitude; for Gratitude is the Product of generous Principles” (CJ 136). He believes that “Nature is the same, and Reason Governs in just Proportions in all Creatures” (CJ143). Here at the plantation Col. Jack has control over the lives of his *Negroes* and the principle of ‘just proportion’ seems smoothly operative. But as the narration progresses, Defoe introduces another situation to take the narration to a new height and the ethical issue of “just proportion” assumes a new

dimension – who should deserve benevolence and who should deserve gratitude. Are these human traits subject to interpretation by the people in control of the lives of powerless people?

Following is an example of a sentimental moment where Col. Jack is shown trying to seek King's pardon to return to London without the fear of being caught. Readers see him involved in the paradox of gratefulness, obligation and benevolence where ethical issues are involved. Col. Jack comes to know about the issuance of "Act of Grace." He expresses his satisfaction over his escape from the immediate fear of King's wrath. He says, "Prince has given me Life" (CJ 276)". He further says that King George has signed an "Act of Grace, *that is to say*, a General Free Pardon . . . wherein it was manifest I was fully included" (CJ 276). He reacts in a sentimental manner and thinks about the value of gratefulness in terms of his obligations, and the rights of the pardoner in terms of his benevolence. We know that he believes that human 'nature is the same, and reason governs in just proportions in all creatures.' He says:

I became sincerely given in to the Interest of King GEORGE; and this from a Principle of Gratitude, and a Sense of Honor, and the debt of Gratitude remains with me: I mention this to him how far in such Cases Justice, and Duty to our selves commands us; namely, that to those who graciously give us our Lives, when it is in their power to take them away; those Lives are a Debt ever after, and ought to be set a part for their Service, and Interest as long as any of the Powers of Life remain; for Gratitude is a debt that never ceases while the Benefit receiv'd remains, and if my Prince has given me Life, I can never pay the Debt fully, unless such Circumstances as this should happen, that the prince's Life should be in my Power, and I as generously preserv'd it; and yet neither would the Obligation be paid then, because the Case would differ; thus, that my preserving the Life of my Prince was my Duty, whereas the Prince on his Side (my Life being forfeited to him) had no Motive but meer Clemency, and Beneficence. (276)

This is a crucial paragraph in *Col. Jack* which clearly shows that Col. Jack considers all matters between humans as secular in nature. His reference to the prince is not a reference to God, whom he wishfully replaces with himself and prepares to challenge his power. He shows that in worldly affairs man's fate is in the hands of another man, and it is in the power of a man either to preserve or to take away the life of another man. His belief is that 'benevolence' and 'principle of gratitude' are mutually interchangeable and related to the position of a man in a society where harmony in a society is conditional to 'circumstances' that men create for their wellbeing and for the wellbeing of others. Col. Jack leaves no doubt in the minds of the readers of *Col. Jack* that the Prince is the life-giver and his power is immense to reckon with. Col. Jack makes it easy to understand that the entire phenomenon where power demands subordination, and the negation of subordination results in destruction of the defiant subordinate. Col. Jack does not hesitate to sentimentalize the situation by thinking what would he do if he had the power to act as a Prince. Would he pardon the prince if he commits a sinful act, or punish him for his mischievousness? However, we do not know this. But what we know is that Defoe has effectively used Col. Jack, a man having no "Fund of religious Knowledge" to highlight and differentiate between religious and secular concept of power where a man has no option but to act as his circumstances demand. This need not be taken as Defoe's rejection of belief in religion or his acceptance of secularism as the answer to all worldly affairs; rather, it shows Defoe's depiction of Col. Jack's natural reaction to his existing circumstances. The sentimental tone of Col. Jack's expression of gratitude and his simultaneous desire to be powerful as a King is all worldly affair. To be more specific, Col. Jack draws a line of distinction between the two similar acts

performed by two different persons; one performer is all powerful and the other is powerless. If the King shows benevolence and saves the life of his subjects, he deserves gratitude; whereas, if a subject shows benevolence and saves the life of his king, he does not deserve gratitude because it is his duty to save the life of the king. Col. Jack is comfortable with this secular situation as the king has saved his life, but his conscience -- if prince's life should be in his power -- still needs a plausible solution. In other words, Defoe through Col. Jack asks his readers to look into the reality of life where displeasing compromises governs our lives.

Defoe in the preface to *Col. Jack* unveils another secular aspect of Col. Jack's life where Col. Jack examines, in Carl Jung's terms, his personal unconscious -- i.e., memories that have either been suppressed or forgotten such as childhood memories or traumatic memories, blocked by conscious memories. In other word, "the personal conscious is peculiar to one individual and not shared with any other" (Bressler 321). Defoe says that "*Colonel hath told his own Story*" from his memories to which he has given shape to make it useful for his "wicked readers," therefore there is a sequential arrangement of events in the narration where Col. Jack is critical of his own life as a criminal, and is sentimentally attached to his desire to be useful to others. I would say, the story begins when Col. Jack has "leisure to reflect" (CJ 308) and decides to narrate his story for the benefit of his readers. In Sill's words, "Defoe chose to write his fictions from the end of time, looking back at events whose meaning had been invisible or ambiguous to his narrator, because this method gave him the opportunity to review those moment as secret 'hints' of a moral order (175). Col. Jack recalls his childhood's travail as "a poor unhappy tractable Dog" (CJ 6) who had "the Devil for his School-Master" (CJ

6), and by the age of eighteen years, he “was in the high Road to the Devil and several times would stop short and ask me myself, if this was the Life of a Gentleman” (CJ 62). He finally repents his dishonorable adulthood when he has “a Life of levity, and profligate Wickedness” (CJ 308). As the narration progresses, Col. Jack sinks into the haunting memories of an amoral life and involves his readers in the morality of sin-virtue debate. “Although for Defoe, “necessity” is extenuation of crimes” (Zimmerman 144) which implies that a crime could be seen as an act that needs a secular interpretation. Defoe’s criminal characters long for a respectable life and reject their criminal life style; ‘wicked’ by all standards of morality. Defoe has skillfully constructed the narrative where Col. Jack is shown involved in worldly affair without making any reference to religious injunctions against his sinful life, or to his business ventures, or to his relationship with his wives. Col. Jack makes no reference to religion when he is kind toward his victims whom he harms and then atones for his mistakes.

For examples, if we go back to the story of the poor woman whom Col. Jack robs and later returns her the looted money, and the sinful acts of the other character in Defoe’s other novels, we see a pattern of repentance they show only after they have committed a crime. They consider their life of criminality as wicked, abominable, and fraudulent. They think in terms of making reparation to their victims. Col. Jack robs an old woman and later regrets his acts and resolves that he “would rob no more, for sure “‘its a wicked abominable Thing” (CJ 83), Moll, in *Moll Flanders*, thinks herself as “an abominable creature” (MF 152) and weeps “over the Remembrance of Past Follies, and the dreadful Extravagances of a wicked Life” (MF 158), and in *Street Robberies, Consider’d: The Reason of their being so Frequent* a young thief atones his guilty

conscience by resolving to compensate the “Fruit Woman.” The robber contemplates: “I muft own tho’ Young, a qualm of Confcience came over me for my Tricks, and the firft Thing I repented off, was, the Robbing the poor Fruit Woman; therefore I refolved with my felf to make it my Bufineff to find her out, and make her Reftitution” (20). These are three examples of sentimentalism and defining moments in three different novels when these three characters repent and resolve to reform themselves without resorting to any kind of religious principles of morality. Sentimentalism, we know from its definition “locates the bases of social conduct in instinctual feeling rather than divinely sanctioned moral codes” (Norton Vol. 1. 2064-65). Sill has rightly pointed out that “the repentance is not important itself – note that Defoe’s criminals only make reparations when they can easily afford them, as the grown man returning the shillings he stole as a boy from the woman fruit-peddler” (SRC *viii*). Monk is of the view that “neither Moll nor Jack is affected by Christianity” (CJ xvii). Col. Jack might have found the moral (religious) meaning in examining the events of his life retrospectively, but this does not indicate he amends his criminal life strictly in accordance with religious morality. Zimmerman argues: “Defoe will not abandon the broader moral issues raised by his picaros, nor will he have them renounce this world in favor of the next” (50). Therefore, Defoe’s characters are less inclined toward religion or enigmatic spirituality; rather, they are essentially motivated by secular humanism and moments of quiet retrospection that bring them peace of mind.

Furthermore, *Col. Jack* is an account of a man’s struggle against the harshness of man-made social and moral norms -- purely a worldly affair -- and any attribution of changes in a man’s life to divine intervention will create doubts about a man’s ability to

think and change his circumstances. By implication, critics who see spirituality as an agent of change depict man as a passive recipient of instructions from a transcendental world which absolves him of his sinful acts that had pained others for none of their faults. This approach to repentance in religious sense may be acceptable to some, but Defoe does not preach such notions in *Col. Jack*.

Defoe explains Jack's position in the preface: "*If he had come into the World with the Advantage of Education, and been well instructed how to improve the generous Principles he had in him, what a Man might he not have been*" (Preface to *Col. Jack*). This statement is categorical, and leads to the understanding that circumstances are responsible for Col. Jack's life, and he has to deal with worldly affairs using his own judgment without waiting for divine interventions. His conditional 'if' reflects his unfulfilled desire to be educated which was very much depended on his circumstance; whereas, his circumstances could not change at the appropriate time. Had the circumstances been in his control, he would have changed it much earlier. He does not blame God or holds the misnomer 'fortune' to say that his life was designed as such. To explain Col. Jack's attitude toward worldly affairs, we can look at this example. He loses his wealth in a ship accident and without holding any unforeseen power responsible for his 'misfortune', he reconciles with his losses and learns a lesson in accepting accidents as a part of struggle to survive. When Col. Jack is more than thirty years old and mature enough to differentiate between good and bad deeds, he says that one should purify his conscience by throwing away "ill-gotten" wealth (CJ 157) and be contented with honestly acquired material goods. It is one of the many specific examples of Col. Jack's

sentimental behavioral pattern where he discounts religion as a source of guidance for him, and values his ability to rationalize his situation in a secular way:

I cannot say that I had any serious Religious reflection, or that these things proceeded yet from the uneasiness of Conscience, but from mere Reasoning with myself, and from being arriv'd to a Capacity of making a right judgment of things more than before; yet I own I had such an abhorance of the wicked Life I had led, that I was scarcely easie, and had a kind of Pleasure in the Disaster that was upon me about the Ship and that tho' it was a loss I could not but be glad, that those ill gotten Goods were gone, and that I had lost what I had stolen; for I look'd on it as none of mine, and that it would be fire in my Flax. (CJ 157)

This is a comprehensive secularistic view of Col. Jack about life. His emphasis is on the value of reasoning in day-to-day affairs, honesty as a means of inner pleasure, and mishaps as experiences to learn from and reshape the life according to temporal moral principles. For him money matters, but ill-gotten wealth which pricks conscience is a detestable thing. As far as religion is concerned, Col. Jack distances himself from any religious knowledge that might have influenced his sense of satisfaction over the loss of ill-gotten wealth. A pertinent questions may arise at this place as Col. Jack says here, he was “easie” about the loss of his ship because he has repented of the “wicked Life” that he had led up to that time. Therefore, this penitence is evidence of a religious conversion, not of a humanistic ethical system. His penitence would have been true had he been conversant with the value of religion in one’s life at the time of this disaster.

Critics have differing interpretation of this paragraph on page 157 of *Col. Jack* which deals with the disaster of the ship and Col. Jack’s loss of wealth. If we look at ‘repentance’ or ‘penitence’ of Col. Jack, we cannot say with certainty that his repentance is an evidence of religious conversion. Critic Sill maintains that “Invariably, Defoe’s thieves are willing workers All of them sooner or later reach a point of repentance . .

. . Since most of them do not regard their adventures in crime as proceeding from any inherent sinfulness, they see no need to undergo punishment when it can be avoided, and so remain criminals. Thus their repentance is neither deep nor long-lasting” (SRC *iii*). In view of Sill’s generalized position on criminal characters that Defoe depicts in his different novels, religious conversion of Col. Jack seems a remote possibility. On the contrary, what is immediately understandable is that Col. Jack himself “Reflects” (CJ 156) and resolves to live by his “own Endeavours” (CJ 156), and that he would no more live “under the Necessity of being a Villain” (CJ 156). Impliedly, Col. Jack asserts that he is responsible for his acts and deeds, and accidents in his life are only events which could have happened to anyone else. Similarly, the changes he feels in his life are not the result of Religious reflection as he had no “serious Religious reflection” (CJ 156). G. A Starr in *Defoe and Casuistry* discusses ‘contraries’ in *Col. Jack* and refers to three main issues: moral, social, and psychological problems that engages a critic. He maintains: “What gives *Colonel Jack* its characteristic texture is the way these problems are stated: Defoe shifts attention from overt acts to their contexts, and brings out conflicting strands in the narrator’s Circumstance, motives, and reflections” (83). While pointing out to contraries in *Col. Jack*, and referring to the contents of the above quoted paragraph, Starr does not hesitate in making a categorical statement which brings into question Col. Jack’s morality in dealing with his personal affairs:

Diverse moral standards are brought to bear on the characters’ behavior, and these tend to be juxtaposed but not reconciled. . . . Defoe has created a hero who is at once a Christian and a gentleman. That contemporary writers were interested in synthesizing “The Christian Hero” is well documented in Professor Blanchard’s introduction to the work of that title by Richard Steel. That Defoe himself believed such a synthesis possible . . . Nothing could be plainer, yet it is equally plain that *Colonel Jack* embodies no such synthesis. He manages at different times to be a

Christian and a gentleman, but one or the other is always in abeyance. . . . At the end of the book there is a renewed burst of piety, but this occurs only after the hero is disabled from participation in the world of honor. . . . On occasion the dictates of honor and religion happens to coincide; more often each ethos goes its own way, and Colonel Jack oscillates between them. Not only there is no union of religion and honor, but since neither is treated as an ultimate point of moral reference, neither can be appealed to for authoritative judgments on the other. (87-88)

In view of Sill's doubt about the nature of 'repentance' and 'penitence' of Defoe's criminals, any religious conversion of Col. Jack becomes questionable. This argument gets strength from Starr's observation that Defoe's efforts to synthesize his Christian Hero and gentleman to present Col. Jack who is "at once a Christian and gentleman" does not yield result. On the contrary, there is no union of religion and honor, but since neither is treated as an ultimate point of moral reference, neither can be appealed to for authoritative judgment on the other." As far as the word "gentleman" is concerned, "Defoe fully exploits the conventional ironic verbal equation of gentleman and criminal" (Zimmerman 128). Zimmerman has argued that for Defoe, "repentance . . . was presumably more than a verbal trick. But with increasing clarity, he displays his characters' self-deceptions. Even repentance seems to be only the character's [Col. Jack] last effort to find another set of words to obscure the truth about himself" (Zimmerman 127-128). Therefore, Col. Jack's sentimental reaction on the loss of wealth in the shipwreck seems more secular than religious in nature.

Novak has argued against the use value of religion in the life of Col. Jack and rejects any such suggestion that Defoe tries to exploit the potential of spiritual acuity to raise the issue of vice and virtue. Defoe's interpretation of religious acts, and its resultant effect on man's life, is in its sublunary value. In other words religion should mean reliance on self-potential and hard work to succeed in this world. Novak agrees to this

understanding of religion in Defoe's works. He argues that "the blasphemy that Defoe suggests is that religion may not be an absolute compensation for poverty. . . . He [Defoe] wanted a religion that would encourage all men to work . . . not one that left the poor satisfied with their destitute condition" (71). E. Anthony James sees Defoe's excessive use of Biblical references as his "stylistic attributes," and argues that "ubiquity of scriptural references and quotations in Defoe's prose is thus an obvious outgrowth of his extensive knowledge of the Bible and his Dissenter's exploitation of it as a mine of authoritative analogues" (22). To strengthen his argument, James says "As Moore observes, one of Defoe's notable stylistic attributes is his ability to slip easily into Biblical diction" (23) which implies that religious elements in *Col. Jack* are secular tools to articulate and interpret human behavior. At the same time, it is necessary to add that Defoe wants a system that is both humanistic and consistent with the basic norms of religion, such as penitence and gratitude for the assistance of Providence, but he gives freedom to Col. Jack to act in a natural way and move toward making himself a gentleman.

Critics separate religion from the life of Col. Jack not to disparage Defoe's belief that religion is a necessary credo in moral conversion – from a sinful life to a virtuous life. Critics look only at the characters as they are, both as criminals and penitents. Samuel Holt Monk clearly separates the element of religion from the lives of Defoe's characters. He argues in the preface to *Col. Jack* that "neither Moll nor Jack is affected by Christianity.... And yet Jack quotes Scripture as readily, though for better purpose, as the Devil. But when he does so, we hear the voice of Daniel Defoe, not of his creature the Colonel" (xvii). James Sutherland has gone a little further in giving his views on Defoe's

religiosity and argues in his essay *Daniel Defoe* that “he was not, perhaps, a very religious man; he gives the impression of having thought in terms of right and wrong rather than of good and evil ... and if he spent so much of his time describing the very antithesis of these things, it was because he contemplated them with a kind of reluctant fascination” (British Writers 10). Novak is categorical in his approach toward Defoe’s novels and finds some of the critics’ views on Defoe that his writings are influenced by religious allusion is untenable. He argues:

Books by J. Paul Hunter and George Starr have argued forcibly for the presence of religious allusion and form like spiritual autography as guiding structures in Defoe’s fiction I feel that it has had the unfortunate result of creating the image of Defoe as an essentially pious man and a religious writer Yet he was anything but a religious recluse But there is no way of using an image of honest, pious Defoe as a basis for interpretation of his worldly writings. (2)

Precisely, in *Col. Jack*, Defoe through three phases of Col. Jack’s life; childhood as “a Beggar Boy ... despicable, and miserable” (7), adulthood as a thief – “for 26 Years, so old in the trade, and still unhang’d” (CJ 7) and, when he is a self-corrected man at the age of 34/36 years, and learns “to look back upon a long ill-spent Life” (CJ 307) creates a simple prototype of the destitute families in eighteenth-century London. Defoe focuses on the feelings of Col. Jack’s sentiments toward his own-self, toward others, and toward the society he lives in. Defoe’s characters in *Col. Jack* do not come from religious backgrounds, rather they are the ignorant poor people whose priority is food and shelter, and who live in “Ash-hole in the Glass-house” (CJ 9). Clearly, Defoe situates them in a temporal world and depicts the realities of life as his characters behave.

Nevertheless, despite being a criminal, Col. Jack carries the notion of a gentleman which raises his sentiments against his depraved acts and compels him to repent, reform

and face the real world. Defoe is conscious of the necessity of keeping Col. Jack awake to the realities of life, may these be moments of crime, flashes of sentimentalism, or intensity of compassion toward others. Defoe's conscious placement of Col Jack in the real world where his readers could identify with him and see that the thought of sin and the desire for a change is a complex truth. And the key to resolve this complex truth is reasoning appropriate in a given circumstance and a given event.

Let us look at a sentimental moment in *Col. Jack*. Col. Col Jack narrates an incident of pickpocketing a gentleman, Sir Stephen Evans, and finding bills and papers, beside money, in the pocket-book which was of no use for him and his partner criminals. For fear of being trapped if the bill is presented to the Goldsmith for payment, Col. Jack and his fellow rogues decide to destroy the bill, but on a second thought Col. Jack examines pros and cons of this proposal and weighs it against his crime and says, "I could not bear destroying their Bills, and Papers, which were things that would do them a great deal of hurt, and do me no good; and I was so Tormented about it, that I could not rest Night or day, while I made the people easie, from whom the things were taken (CJ 55). Here Col. Jack does not exploit any kind of religious morality, rather under the influence of his conscience and moral sentimentalism feels the pain of being hurtful to his victim.

Before defining moral sentimentalism, let me explain where does this "torment" come from? And, why should one man feel torment for the misfortunes of another, unless there is some secret governance at work in the world of the spirit? We know that Defoe argues strongly (in Vol. 3 of Robinson Crusoe, for example) that there *is* such a world of spirits, and it is responsible for our moral impulses.

Birdsall sees Crusoe's world of spirit in a different way and argues that, "Crusoe's God seems to be for him a failed immortality symbol---failed in that it does not prove effective for long in laying to rest his mortal fears. Crusoe experiences his most overwhelming terrors not before his conversion but afterward. And he does not conquer those fears by trusting his God but rather by confronting them reasonably" (26). Birdsall further qualifies this observation by making a categorical statement after looking into the "core of his [Crusoe] being" that "unquestioning trust in God is no part of his make-up" (26). The power of God to heal the wounds of the injured and to restore health to infirm people raises another question about one's belief in God; Crusoe is no exception to this situation. Birdsall points out to Crusoe's illness and argues:

Crusoe seems to belong fundamentally to the self-help school. In the very midst of his peroration on God's "sole Power," he recognizes no contradiction in his taking steps to "refresh and support" himself in his illness nor in his devising his own cure of tobacco soaked in rum. He seems, indeed, to feel that when it comes to dealing with physical afflictions, the solution devised by his own ingenuity is the best one---or at least constitutes a wise precautionary measures. Moreover, he takes similar precautions at the time of his "Deliverances," first from the island and later from the attacking wolves in the Pyrenees. He may afterward credit God with the deliverances and express his gratitude, but in both cases he lets us know that a substantial amount of credit goes to his own ingenious "stratagem." (26).

As I have already discussed above about *Act of Grace* where Col. Jack takes a secular view of men in power acting as God and men in subordinate position accepting them as God; similar situation arises in Robinson Crusoe where he acts in a secular way. Birdsall argues: "A number of recent critics of Defoe have recognized that Crusoe takes on toward the end of the novel something approaching divine power. Certainly he sees himself as the deliverer as often as the delivered. Of Friday he says, "I sav'd his life" and thereafter he is to Friday what God has been to him at the time of his conversion---an "infinite Power"" (Birdsall 29).

Further, John Richetti sees Crusoe's world of spirit with a tinge of skepticism and relates the entire text of *Robinson Crusoe* with Crusoe's "mere circumstances. . . . The mature Crusoe learns to see the dialectic between secular detail and divine order and to see that God works his uncommon ways with common things." (42). In his essay *Secular Crusoe: The Reluctant Pilgrim Re-visited* Richetti says:

Editing *Robinson Crusoe* this past year for a new Penguin edition, poring over every line of the text, I am struck by its tense and separate strands of moral theology, supernaturalism, and secular materialism. I am less confident than I was twenty-five years ago that the narrative is at all efficient at reconciling those notions (knitting these strands into a fabric of spiritual meaning) In the process Crusoe effectively takes leave of religious fear and trembling and establishing nothing less than a secular order and develops a sense of self able to define itself confidently and powerfully within such an order. (2)

Having said this much for Robinson Crusoe, we may look at Col. Jack's "torment." John Richetti provides a plausible answer to the phenomenon of "torment" and maintains that it has to do with Col. Jack's "intellectual curiosity and moral sensitivity" (*Critical Essays on Daniel Defoe* 128). He argues:

For Jack has a "strange kind of uninstructed Conscience" (CJ 55) that makes him, at least as he remembers it, less than a full participant in the criminal sub-culture in which he grows up. Unlike his mates, he has an awareness at once moral and economic, a reverence for the mysterious documents of the mercantile world that intertwines with his reluctance to hurt others. So he cannot bring himself to destroy the "Bills and papers" of the merchants whose pockets they pick: "things that would do them harm a great deal of hurt, and do me no good; and I was so tormented about it, that I could not rest Night or Day, while I made the people easie from whom the things were taken" (CJ 55). . . . A creature of his richly evoked environment and, like all of Defoe's irrepressibly self-inventing narrators, clever and resourceful at surviving within its possibilities, Jack by means of this intellectual and moral sensitivity dramatizes a confused awareness of a larger network of supervising social institutions. (129)

We can now come back to some explanation of moral sentimentalism of Col.

Jack. Gilbert Harman, professor of philosophy, Princeton University in his essay *Moral*

Agent and Impartial Spectator published in 1986 discusses Francis Hutcheson, David Hume and Adam Smith's concepts of 'impartial spectator' theory which is a key component of moral sentimentalism. "According to this sort of theory, whether something is right or wrong depend how impartial spectator would react to it" (1). Herman argues that Hutcheson, Hume, and Smith all put forward versions of impartial spectator. "All three agree that right acts are right because they would be favored by impartial spectators who favor these acts for other reasons than that the acts are right. But they disagree about what explains spectators' reaction and what accounts for moral motivation. They also disagree as to whether the same thing explains agent's motivation and spectators' approval" (17). Harman considers Smith's theory of impartial spectator superior to other versions. Smith explains moral sentimentalism as "Moral norms thus express the feelings of an impartial spectator. A feeling, whether on the part of a person motivated to take an action or on the part of a person who has been acted upon by others, is worthy of moral approval if and only if an impartial spectator would sympathize with that feeling" (Samuel. Web. 14 April 2016). The definition of impartial spectator has been discussed by many critics to explain it in simple terms. Martin Leroch argues: "the impartial spectator represents a universal judge about what is right and wrong. He is completely impersonal" (23). Col. Jack places himself in the place of his victim and sentimentalizes the whole issue in his victim's (Stephen Evans) favor and decides to return "Bills, and Papers, which were things that would do them a great deal of hurt, and do me no good" (CJ 55). This is not the first instance where Col. Jack places himself in place of his victim to evaluate his criminal acts and sentimentalize the situation. Even on occasion when he is supposed to act against his conscience we see him placing himself in

place of others and think. For example, when asked to be harsh with slaves, he refuses to punish them as he himself has “been a poor Naked miserable servant” (CJ 133).

However, there are indications that Col. Jack is in the process of growing up and strengthening his resolve to be morally upright and reform himself.

Defoe explains his idea of reform, independent of divine intervention, and makes his intention of writing *Col. Jack* clear in the Preface: “*Every wicked Reader will here be encouraged to a change ... if Discouraging every thing that is Evil, and encouraging every thing that is vertuous and good.*” Here, Defoe holds human beings responsible to ‘discourage evil’ and ‘encourage virtuous’ acts independent of any divine intervention. His plain and compassionate appeal to his readers is to take advantage from the text to identify how evil works, and how it may be checked if the notion of self-improvement and self-righteousness is permitted to monitor vice. Col. Jack is the true example of this phenomenon and representative of Defoe’s idea of reform in human behavior.

However, with reference to *Col. Jack*, I see Defoe’s exploitation of theological material as more materialistic and secularistic than religious. It is just one of the metaphorical trappings he uses to facilitate Col. Jack to examine his inner-self and see where he stands with his sinful past before his own conscience. Also, Jack is less inclined toward any spirituality that would miraculously change his life; rather, he examines his inner-self in the light of his moral sentimentalism and thinks to reform himself. Samuel Fleischacker, Professor in the Department of Philosophy, University of Illinois at Chicago, while writing about Adam Smith’s *Moral and Political Philosophy* argues about the ingredients that cause reformation of the self by self-examination: “If we are truly virtuous, a submission to certain rules will constrain everything we do, but within that

framework we will operate without rules, trying instead to mold ourselves with the know-how by which an artist molds his clay, such that we develop dispositions to proper gratitude, kindness, courage, patience, and endurance” (Web 14 April 2016). Defoe, from time to time, shows these elements taking firm roots in the personality of Col. Jack. By the end of the novel we see that Col. Jack has complete trust in those people with whom he had been kind. He retires in London after “leaving with full satisfaction the Management of all our Affairs in *Virginia*, in the same faithful Hands as before” (309).

It is therefore, on the surface of the text of *Col. Jack* there may be some contextualization of religious beliefs, but its use is rhetorical and does not disturb Col. Jack’s secular personality. John J. Richetti is of the view that “Jack offers the secular wisdom of history and society understood by participation, generalization about such matters informed by experience” (Defoe’s Narrative 148). Therefore, in the light of above discussion and Richetti’s assertion that ‘Jack offers secular wisdom,’ *Col. Jack* is an account of a journey of a man from a life of utter criminality and vulgarity to a life of thorough gentility and manners without any divine intervention. Col. Jack is guided by moral sentimentalism and judges his acts accordingly. Monk is categorical about the effect of any kind of religion on the life of Col. Jack. He refers to Col. Jack’s stay in Virginia and his interaction with his tutor on the necessity, or peripheral nature, of religion, and argues: “Jack’s penitent tutor, who weeps, kisses his Bible, and argues the Colonel to read it, has little effect on his master. ‘Almost thou persuades me’. Jack finally says, and there the matter rests” (CJ xvii). Despite a believer in religious morality and divine interventions in one’s life, Defoe does not inject his religious ideas into the character of Col. Jack and prefers to project him just as one of those men who are less

informed about religion. Nevertheless, religious allusions in Col. Jack coexist with secular morality that primarily governs the lives of Defoe's characters and shapes their moments of sentimentalism.

Col. Jack – Psychoanalytic approach and sentimentalism

The story of Col. Jack begins with painful moments in his life and gradually moves to a stage where he achieves moments of pleasure. There is a pattern in the movement of the story where Sigmund Freud's economic model of human psyche -- the pleasure principle and the reality principle-- is operative. Freud defines the pleasure principle as "that part of the human psyche that craves only pleasure and desires instantaneous satisfaction of instinctual drives. It ignores moral and sexual boundaries established by society" (Bressler 321), and the reality principle "recognizes the need for societal standards and regulations on a person's desire for pleasure" (Bressler 325). There are numerous events that conform to these two principles in *Col. Jack* and make it possible to read the entire novel in the light of Freudian economic model of the human psyche. In the beginning of the novel Col. Jack follows pleasure principles by ignoring moral boundaries, and after the age of twenty-six years reality principle guides his desire for pleasure.

Col. Jack claims with a sense of pleasure in being a "Thief involuntarily" (19). He draws pleasure from the fact that he is a thief and his wicked life provides him, if nothing else, at least some food to live on. Since he knows no good in his life, and evil "not being Evil" in his account (CJ 40), he thinks with a sense of satisfaction and pleasure that "not once for 26 Years, being so old in the Trade, and still unhang'd" (7) could be attributed to his mastery in the art of pickpocketing. Some of the events in his life show that he draws pleasure even at the cost of displeasure of others, including his rogue companions. For example, when the nurse who had brought up Col. Jack, asks her own son she had named Captain Jack, to call Col. Jack as Col. Jack, he (her son) protests to her mother against the

lower rank of ‘captain’ she assigns to him. Col. Jack says about this situation: “I heard her tell her own Boy, that I was a Gentleman, and therefore he must call me Colonel, at which her Boy fell crying, and he would be call’d Colonel; that part pleas’d me to the life, that he should cry to be call’d Colonel, for then I satisfi’d that it was above a Captain” (5). Here we see that the distress of Captain Jack – crying – brings Col. Jack ‘satisfaction’ and pleasure. Though, still a child and unable to differentiate between expressions of jealousy and expressions of resentments, Col. Jack sentimentalizes the whole situation by remaining quiet and feeling the joy of being placed at a higher place. The unconscious mind of Col. Jack governs his behavioral patterns. His repressed desire that he should be recognized as a gentleman finds its outlet and results in his pleasure. In fact, Col. Jack’s act is instinctual, and his response to his ever-present desire to be a gentleman is so over-powering that he even ignores moral boundaries and draws pleasure from the displeasure of Captain Jack. In another situation, Col. Jack is pleased when a munificent woman offers him to purchase clothes with good pockets to keep “Gold, or Watch in” it (CJ 27). Col. Jack says, “It struck me with a strange kind of joy ... pleas’d as a Prince is with his Coach and six Horses” (CJ 28). For Col. Jack his crime is “Adventure” (CJ 57); i.e. ‘adventure’ is a pleasurable event for him. However, when dealing with his victims, slaves and wives, his desire for pleasure is regulated by reality principle. When Col. Jack concludes his life story after the safe arrival of his wife from Virginia to London, he says, “she came over to me, leaving with full satisfaction the Management of all our Affairs in Virginia, in the same faithful Hands as before” (309), we find him enjoying a life of pleasure.

Beside pleasure principles, Col. Jack has signs of the Oedipus complex: “the boy focuses his sexual wishes upon his mother and develops hostile impulses toward his father” (Habib 575). Though, Defoe has no understanding of Freudian interpretation and application of the Oedipus phenomenon in a literary text, but when looked at Defoe’s introduction to a sort of father-mother-son relationship, half-way to the story, picture of the Oedipus complex emerges. Defoe inserts a provoking story of a Devil into the text to emphasize and “explain his [Col. Jack] wife’s [third wife of Col. Jack] intemperance” (Zimmerman 148) and Col. Jack’s reaction to her infidelity. Col. Jack becomes sentimental when he thinks about his love and affection toward his wife whom he had always considered “the best humour’d Woman in the world, a most accomplish’d beautiful Creature indeed, perfectly well Bread” (CJ 240) turns out an adulterous woman. Her complete betrayal of Col. Jack’s feelings, and her indiscriminate indulgence into lewdness devastates him when he sees her drunk and sexually engaged with “a Captain of a Ship” (CJ 242). “The drink,” Col. Jack says, “Made her and her Maid so Drunk together, that he [captain] lay with them both; with the Mistress the Maid being in the Room, and with the Maid, the Mistress being in the Room” (CJ 242). His opinion about his wife’s virtuosity dissolves into an uncanny -- frightening but familiar -- mix of pity and contempt; as his “well bred wife, grew a Beast” (CJ 240). Col. Jack resolves to take revenge and separate his wife from the man who had the possession of his wife’s body and supplanted himself with him (Col. Jack). Defoe’s purpose of the narration of the mythical story is strangely akin to Freud’s concept of Oedipus complex and explains how it works. There are cogent reasons to be sentimental on such occasions when somebody trespasses private space of others. The first four lines of the story give reason to act as the

provocation is great, and the remaining lines explain the phenomenon of Oedipus complex.

O! The Power of Intemperance! And how it Encroaches on the best Dispositions in the world; how it comes upon us gradually and insensibly, and what dismal Effects it works upon our Morals, changing the most Virtuous, regular, well instructed and well inclin'd Tempers, into worse than Brutal. That was a good story, whether real or invented, of the Devil tempting a young Man to murder his Father. No, *he said*, that was unnatural. Why, then *says the Devil*, Go and lye with your Mother: No, *says he*, That is abominable, Well, Then, *says the Devil*; If you will do nothing else to oblige me, go and get Drunk; Ay, ay, *says the Fellow*, I'll do that, so he went and made himself Drunk as a Swine; and when he was Drunk, he murdered his Father, and lay with his Mother. (CJ 241)

Everett Zimmerman discusses this situation in his book *Defoe and the Novel* and finds Oedipus phenomenon when he analyzes Col. Jack's attitude toward his wife who neglects Col. Jack as the legitimate owner of her body and prefers sexual relationship with another man – a merchant navy captain. Zimmerman comments on the relationship of Col. Jack and his father, and then discusses about Col. Jack's reaction toward his wife and her lover. He argues:

Jack's father abandons him, leaving the boy only the injunction to be a gentleman like his father, Jack tries desperately and with little success, especially in matters of love and war. But finally he asserts himself against the man who has debauched one of his wives: “. . . can'd him as severely as I was able . . . till he roar'd like a Boy soundly whipt” (Col. Jack 243). . . He has now asserted himself in the physical way that his father, the colonel, he also supplants him. Jack separates a grown man from his sexual partner, and reduces him to the condition of a boy. (148)

Though Col. Jack shows his rage against the lover of his wife, but he does not reprimand his wife for her sexual misconduct. He, however, separates himself from her. After, separation, Col. Jack continues to remain concerned about her financial needs. His compassionate self always suppresses his anger against his wives, and he remains sympathetic toward them. Col. Jack's five marriages, including the last marriage with the

first wife, and the account of these marriages, occupies nearly one thirds of the novel.

Each episode has element of sentimentalism to portray characters as normal men and women of feelings with whom readers can identify. We know that “sentimentalism understands sympathy to be both an affective experience and an ethical claim”

(Claybaugh163). Col. Jack shows these traits in plenty. The narrator describes wives of Col. Jack as both cunning and miserable. On the face of it, Jack’s wives are whores, prostitutes, and unfaithful, but looking beneath their suffering souls, all are victims of their circumstances. They hurt Col. Jack in many ways, but he forgives them. He is always prepared to reconsider their excuses, and take them back. He treats them with humility and tries to see them comfortable in their own places. He does not want them to remember the past as it would be painful for them. He asks his first wife that “she should name no more of the unkind things that had past, for that she had humbled herself more than enough” (CJ 257). He shares her grief and sorrows and consoles her with kind words. He says he would “forgive her former life,’ and suggests to begin a new life.

Col. Jack – Realism and sentimentalism

Defoe's realism and sentimentalism go together in *Col. Jack*. Before proceeding further, it seems appropriate to see how critics have viewed and interpreted realism and how it is relevant in interpreting *Col. Jack*. Gerridina Roorda in *Realism in Daniel Defoe's Narratives of Adventure* differentiates between idealism and realism and argues: "In his descriptions the idealist appeals to the imagination of the reader and is quite free in doing so His [idealist] aim is reached if only he succeeds for a time in creating poetic faith or the illusion of reality. Not so the realist" (6). Roorda further maintains that "the realist further heightens the effect of the characterization by adopting the diction to the individuality and the mood of the people portrayed" (7). Ian Watt argues: "the formal realism of the novel allows a more immediate imitation of individual experience set in its temporal and spatial environment than do other literary forms. In the strictest sense, of course, formal realism was not discovered by Defoe and Richardson; they only applied it much more completely than had been done before" (*The Rise of the Novel* 32).

Habib considers realism in the light of broad historical background and concurs with Professor of Comparative Literature (Duke University) Fredric Jameson and Professor of Comparative Literature (University of North Carolina) Lilian Furst (died 2009) that realism records the "truth of social reality" (475). George Eliot goes a little more into the specifics of realism and divides her interpretation of realism into four broader principles. First, "is the artistic pursuit of truth, ... based on direct experience of the world ... second, the representation of experience must be authentic ... third... accept people in their actual, imperfect, state and fourth,... love that other beauty too, which lies in no secret of proportion, but in the secret of deep human sympathy" (Habib 477). To

sum up, realism “seeks to represent human experience as realistically and truthfully as possible” (Barton 177).

On the issue of Defoe’s realism, Monk argues that he is admired for “achieving an almost photographic impression of reality, piling up one petty detail after another until the reader cannot fail to be convinced that the novel is a literal transcription from life” (CJ xix). Gladfelder argues that “Defoe’s distinctive brand of realism is most evident in passages in which intensity of emotion infuses physical description with a sharpened, distended lucidity” (107). As the narration of *Col. Jack* is in first person, and “Defoe’s distinctive brand of realism is most evident in passages in which intensity of emotion infuses physical description with a sharpened, distended lucidity” (Gladfelder 107), Col. Jack presents interpretative history of eighteenth-century London where poverty and crime coexist peacefully. Col. Jack is the archetypical representative of those who inhabit this city and struggle to survive. Defoe’s attempt remains centered on the truth value of stories about his characters. These characters create a real world and facilitate the readers to identify with them and their circumstances. Also, Defoe leaves little room for the narrator to take any position contrary to what exists on the ground. Events in *Col. Jack* are narrated as they occurred, and the reactions are recorded as they affected the characters and gave rise to their sentiments. For example, in the beginning of the novel Defoe chooses to share basic information about Col. Jack. Defoe fills beginning paragraph with verisimilitude to let his readers know what has gone into the making of Col. Jack’s psyche. Col. Jack thinks of himself with a sense of rejection, sentiments of self-pity and self-praise, and says:

As for my person, while I was a dirty Glass-Bottle House Boy, sleeping in the Ashes, and dealing always in the Street Dirt, it cannot be expected but that I look'd like what I was, and so we did all; that is to say, like a *Black your Shoes your Honor*, a Beggar Boy, a Black-Guard Boy, or what you please, despicable, and miserable, to the last Degree; and yet I remember, the people would say of me, that Boy has a good Face; if he was wash'd, and well dress'd, he would be a good pretty Boy, do but look what Eyes he has, what a pleasant smiling Countenance, 'tis Pity! I wonder what the Rogues Father and Mother was, and the like; then they would call me *Jack*. But what's your Sir name, Sirrah? Says they: I don't know says I: Who is your Father and Mother/ I have none, said I. What, and never had you any? Said they: No, says I, not that I know of: Then they would shake their Heads, and cry, poor Boy! and 'tis a Pity! *and the like!* And so let me go. But I lay'd up all these things in my heart. (7-8)

This paragraph presents a realistic picture of destitution and sentimentalism of Col. Jack. The language is that of a common man, not much literate to articulate his thoughts. It touches the heart of a reader who can feel what would it mean to be “despicable, and miserable, to the last Degree,” and what would be the effect when someone would say “tis Pity!” after looking at a child who is still unable to see beyond his present surroundings. Col. Jack's three short answers to the strangers' probing questions show a deep sense of his rejection of those people who know about him, and still like to probe into his life. He is conscious that people look at his existing life with pity and disgust in total disregard to the fact that by doing so they damage his self-image of being a gentleman. In this question-answer dialogue, Col. Jack does not use any word that may be interpreted as his grievance against his circumstances or against the stranger. Col. Jack knows that the stranger explores his life to extinguish his inquisitorial impulses. The wide scale destitution in Defoe's London is not a secret phenomenon, and its victims are in plenty; Col. Jack is a representative character of this spectacle where “Sorrow and Sadness sat upon every Face” (from Defoe's *Journal*, Byrd 31). During this question/answer session Col. Jack's entire behavioral pattern is guided by the notion of a ‘gentleman.’ This notion of gentleman was

ingrained in his temperament by his nurse, who had followed Col. Jack's mother's instruction to keep on reminding him to "*remember, that I was a gentleman*" (Col. Jack 3). Col. Jack has a sentimental attachment with the notion of 'gentleman.' Defoe maintains 'gentleman' as a motif in *Col. Jack* which Col. Jack never hesitates to make use of when faced with any awkward situation such as this question/answer session with the stranger. The wider application of this motif, in different situation and context brings moments of realism and sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*. For example, Col. Jack stoically ignores contemptuous attitude of the stranger when he asks Col. Jack his sir name and about his parents, or when the stranger refers to his parents as "Rogues Father and Mother" (CJ 7).

The dialogue between Col. Jack and the stranger is important in two other ways as well. Firstly, it introduces Col. Jack as a sensitive non-complaining person who refrains from indulging into diatribes against his tormentors. Rather, Col. Jack's attitude toward his tormentor highlights the dubious selective morality of societal norms where people are recognized as good or bad on the basis of their lineage in total disregard to their circumstances. This kind of recognition often follow arbitrarily assigned ignoble identities. If Col. Jack has no Sir name, if he does not know his parents, and if he is a bastard, who should be held responsible for these inadequacies in his life. Defoe has preferred to raise these questions through skillfully drafted text. He does not pass any judgment. Defoe presents facts in such a manner that a reader can always draw conclusions. For example, in the case of Col. Jack, we see that his poverty and his criminal life in London gradually dissolves into his prosperity and comfortable retirement in London. Both phases of his life take place at the same place and before the same people. First they identify him as a bastard and thief, and later, as a gentleman. Defoe

does not involve himself into the rhetoric of identity, and leaves the judgment to the prudence of his readers to establish what a composite personality of “A Man of Breeding” should mean (CJ 61). But, as Defoe reminds that “The Man is not Rich because he is honest, but he is Honest because he is Rich” (Preface xiii) makes the whole issue clear. Here we see that the morality of labelling a man as bad or good is subjective.

Secondly, Defoe shows contrast between the existing societal moral norms and its incongruity with the existing realities of life. For example, if we read the above question/answer dialogue in conjunction with the contents of the preface to *Col. Jack*, where Defoe excuses Jack’s “early life of crime not on the grounds that the child is innocent, but that he is ignorant” (Preface to *Col. Jack* xv), or as Col. Jack asserts, that he “knew no Good, and had tasted no Evil” (CJ 40), the whole issue of crime and punishment becomes a subject of debate. The society looks at the ignorance of the law in the light of societal moral codes as inexcusable; whereas, the morality of compassion asserts tolerance followed by correction of imbalance in the socio-economic system that breeds crime. Defoe obliquely asks his readers to look for causal relationship between socially accepted moral norms and psychological and material needs of the poor. In other words, while the law may not leave room for compassion in favor of punishment for stealing bread; moralists who consider the role of psychological and material needs may plead for compassion. For moralist, “when necessity presses, thieving is no sin” (Preface xiii). Any exercise to resolve such social issues is bound to be subjective, and Defoe is capable of answering such moral issue as he sees ‘sorrow and sadness on every face,’ he is in no mood to impose his judgment.

However, to facilitate impartial judgment, he uses first person point of view and places facts of Col. Jack's life and the prevailing circumstances shaping his life, before his readers -- as truthfully as possible -- to draw conclusions. Sill argues in praise of Defoe's grip over first-person narrative and subjectivity which covers Defoe's entire work: "The insistence on subjectivity -- or perhaps imprisonment in it -- is one of Defoe's outstanding contributions to literature. Certainly first-person narratives had been written before, but not until Defoe did a writer immerse himself so deeply in the consciousness of the personage described that all other viewpoints were closed off completely" (SBR vii). In the light of Sill's view that Defoe immerses himself deeply in the consciousness of the personage described, we find that Defoe portrays his characters as common men living around us. They have weaker sides of their lives which they would not like to share with us. He portrays Col. Jack as a sensible sentimentalist who avoids telling too much about his personal life to protect his notion of 'gentleman.' For example, Col. Jack distances himself from the past of her mother whom he refers to as "Gentlewoman" and refuses to talk about her as "that part belongs to her Story (Col. Jack, c). He also remembers his father as a "Man of Quality" (CJ 3) and restrains himself from explaining the meanings of 'Man of Quality.' However, soon a reader comes to know that his parents were "Rogues Father and Mother" in the eyes of other people, and that he was born out of wedlock; and therefor, was a bastard. However, going back to the question/answer dialogue between the stranger and Col. Jack, we see that Col. Jack has never met his father and knows that he is a bastard. He is conscious that if he veils the truth with lies, it would protect his parent's neglect of him, and his parents debauched relationship would remain unknown; and if he is truthful, it would blacken their faces. Col. Jack is watchful

of his reaction to provocative questions about his parents. He shows a ‘deep sense of human sympathy’ toward his unseen parents and protects their reputation befitting a gentleman. He does not want to lose the opportunity of proving himself a well-behaved and responsible son. He prefers to lie than to be truthful. He resolves to keep his reactions to the inquiry about him and his parent to himself. He says, “But I lay’d up all these things in my Heart” (CJ 8). Col. Jack knows that he is a product of his circumstances, and any reaction to provocative questions would be counter-productive to his notion of an honest gentleman. His sentiments toward the notion of ‘gentleman’ are deeply rooted in his belief that circumstances of a man’s life determine his place in a society.

When Col. Jack looks back and thinks about his childhood circumstances, he is most sentimental about his wasted abilities that could have been put to use in his childhood to raise him as a civilized honest man. He says, “and (as I remember, my very Thoughts perfectly well) I had no Evil in my Intentions; I had never stolen anything in my life, and if a Goldsmith had left me in his Shop with heaps of Money, strew’d all around me, and bad me to look after it, I should not have touch’d it, I was so honest” (CJ 19). The ‘if’ which I have underlined above, tells the whole story of a melancholic and repentant, in secular sense, man who had the ability to reform himself provided apposite circumstances would have permitted him. His lamentation over the lost opportunities to become a morally upright man is a sad commentary on the external factors – his destitution, economic hardship and criminal environment – which proved detrimental to his growth as a virtuous man.

The outside world, and these external factors, wakes him up to the realities of life and guides him to choose the best course to have a secured and safe future as a

gentleman. To secure a safe future for himself, Col. Jack thinks that people around him should also be guided to think about improvement in their lives so that an environment congenial to change could be created. Defoe uses Col. Jack to suggest that improvement in a society is a collective responsibility of its members and it should begin with an individual's contribution toward the betterment of society how insignificant it may be. Defoe's emphasis is on conscious effort to overcome difficulties; for him difficulties are not merely obstacles, but occasions to think about our own attitude toward our own lives. To concretize Defoe's suggestion of conscious efforts, Freudian explanation of conscious seems appropriate. "The conscious, Freud argued, perceives and records external reality and is the reasoning part of the mind We operate consciously, believing that our reasoning and analytic skills are solely responsible for our behavior" (Bressler 125).

Col. Jack is obsessed with the issue of 'reasoning and analytic skills.' We see that he uses 'reason' excessively in his day to day interaction with his fellow rogues in London, and with slaves under his management in Virginia. He is desperate to change himself and his fellow rogues. Defoe constructs a mode of narration of events that conforms to the necessity of believing in the power of reasoning as a motivating force to act according to the dictates of reasons. For example, the twenty-seventh line of the preface to the novel reads with an intense sense of sentimentalism: "*what a Man might he not have been,*" and which is further explained in the following nine lines of the preface lead to what Defoe is thinking about. The reasoning part that precede this quote is in subjunctive mood, and clearly states about the past shortcomings of Col. Jack that he would have been a better man "*If he had come into the World with the Advantage of education*" (Preface to Col. Jack 1). Defoe successfully incorporates elements of realism

and sentimentalism to show how human beings suffer from none of their faults, how lost opportunities for self-improvement haunt them, and how the struggle to achieve objectives of self-reform is tied up with the overall improvement of a society. Col. Jack's dialogue with a colleague rogue provides a vivid example where Col. Jack shows two significant traits of his character; first is his sense of contentment that checks greed an obvious inducement to crime, and the second is his resistance to the idea of attaining the status of a gentleman through criminal means.

In the beginning of the novel we come across an event where *Will* enters into an Ale-House and whisks away a bag of money of a trader and then gives Jack's share. Jack expresses his satisfaction whatever he gets. Col. Jack says, "Well, he parted his Money into three, that is to say, into three Shares two for himself, and one for me, and ask'd if I was contended, I told him yes, I had reason to be Contented ..." (CJ 44). Here, Defoe shows the element of contentment, lack of greed, and a sense of self-respect as traits of Col. Jack's character. These features of Col. Jack's character becomes more understandable when we look at the following dialogue between Col. Jack and Will:

When *Will*, his criminal colleague, asks him to rob people on the highways, Jack asks the rationale of this crime: "says he [*Will*], we will take the Highway like gentlemen, and then we shall get a great deal of Money indeed; well, *says I*, what then? Why then, *says he*, we shall live like Gentlemen. ... Why *Will*, do you call this way of living the Life of a Gentleman?" (CJ 67). Here, Col. Jack is trying to understand *Will's* proposal. He is conscious that he needs to talk to *Will* and be useful to him and to himself as well, if not materially, at least in moral sense. Here, both are thinking, and both are sentimental in terms of becoming "Gentlemen," and both are discussing a crime without knowing where

the discussion is going to take them, but at least an effort to use reasons as a guide to justify their motives is there. Both are sentimental to the utility value of crime and trying to reason out if crime is the only answer to their struggle to become a gentleman. Critics often imply that sentimentalism is “the result of sin and human fallibility Life was not given to gratify but ‘to be useful to others’” (Todd 137). Applying Todd’s view of sentimentalism, we find that Col. Jack is useful, compassionate, and sentimental when he thinks about his partner in crime and his (*Will*) notion of ‘gentleman’. Both want to become gentleman, both are sentimental in their approach to their objectives, Col. Jack does not yield to the lure of looted money as a quick way of buying the status of a gentleman, whereas *Will* insists on robbing the man and using the money for this purpose. Col. Jack believes that “Men never know themselves till they are tried, and Courage is acquired by time, and Experience of things” (208) to resist the temptation which blurs the distinction between good and bad.

Col. Jack – Slavery and sentimentalism

Col. Jack argues with his plantation owner how mercy works. He says: “Nature is the same, and Reason Governs in just Proportion in all Creatures; But having never been let Taste what Mercy is, they [slaves] know not how to act from a Principle of Love” (CJ 143). Col. Jack’s argument that slaves need to be treated as humans and that they deserve mercy is embedded in his experience as a hated child who had lived on wickedly acquired money. He was pitied too often for his degraded life, but had no memory of mercy shown to him, or if he was ever encouraged to live an honorable life. The story of Colonel Jack’s captivity and his forced journey to Virginia is in itself remorseful, and his description of the working condition at the plantation is touching. It is in Virginia he gets the real taste of human sufferings as some “servants, as well as *Negroes* [slaves] . . . grew infirm and unable to work . . . and other died . . . and by these and other accidents the number would diminish” (CJ 119). The pathetic condition of the lives of slaves pricks his heart and he decides to be considerate to the slaves and loyal to his master. The relationship between Col. Jack and his master improves with a little effort. Col. Jack succeeds in invoking in him the feeling of sympathy toward his subjects, and convincing him of his capacity to differentiate and pick the best option that suits his business. In a very sentimental situation where Col. Jack and his master argue about the application of brutal methods to tame the errant slaves, Col Jack says to his master: “How could I, that was but just come out of the Terror, of it my self, and had but the Day before been a poor Naked miserable servant my self, and might be to Morrow reduc’d to the same Condition again” (CJ 133). Col. Jack places himself in place of the slaves and feels the pain of being helpless and prone to planters’ brutality. His sympathetic attitude toward the slaves

brings sentimental moments that may correspond to anybody's condition who lives in the hope of a better tomorrow. Claybaugh explains this phenomenon and says that "Sentimentalism derives its authority not from preexisting texts but rather from interior states that all humans putatively share, thus relying on sympathy" (163). Col. Jack opts for sympathetic attitude toward slaves as a better option to regulate their affairs. He decides to defy the unwritten harsh code of conduct that planters employ to extract work from the slaves. We see that when Col. Jack's master asks him to punish the undisciplined slaves, he politely refuses and reasons out his disobedience to his master on the ground that "brutal temper of the *Negroes* was not rightly managed; that they did not take the best course to make them sensible, either of Mercy or Punishment" (CJ 128), and therefore, brutal treatment of slaves to extract work from them needs to be changed. Col. Jack emphasizes that genuine, not pretentious, benevolence and gratitude are always productive and mutually beneficial for masters as well as for the slaves. Boulukos argues that "gratitude of sentimental protagonists, or gentlemen, must be unsolicited to be genuine and to influence their behavior. Indeed, sentimental feelings depends on reason and on the ability to maintain integrity and independence, or else even the sympathy it promotes ceases to be meaningful" (22) . Col. Jack's approach toward the management of slaves is to humanize the working conditions at the plantation is in conformity to this idea of 'gratitude of sentimental protagonist'-- and it works well.

It is, therefore, Col. Jack in response to his master's desire to punish servants and slaves, says that "worst of temper might be brought to a compliance without the lash" (CJ 129) and at least with much less infliction of pain as slaves generally need. Col. Jack deals with slaves on the basis of equality. He respects their sense of self respect, and

whenever possible, tries to restore their lost self-pride. However, we need not forget the limited space Col. Jack has to act according to his notion of equality between master and servant. Col. Jack lives in eighteenth-century, and in the historical background of early eighteenth century where “relation between masters and servants were highly exploitative ‘a servant was a ‘thing’ a commodity with a price’ to be bought and sold” (Armitage 159), Col. Jack needs to be careful. Despite being responsible for slave’s management, he is himself an indentured servant, therefore he has limited space to act in favor of the slaves and his master. Also, being in Virginia, he has hopes to be free if he continues to obey his master’s command, and he would not put at risk this opportunity to be free someday. Col. Jack knows that the masters were safe at their plantations, but the slaves “were prone to acts of insubordination and to desertion, and in turn they were subjected to an often brutal discipline . . . They had hopes of freedom and even of advancement if they survived the conditions of their servitude and the catastrophic morality of the early Chesapeake settlements” (Armittage159). On the basis of this reality, and argument in favor of equality between the slaves and their master to tame the slaves, Col. Jack succeeds in his work.

However, the novel opens as a realistic narrative of life of a criminal and concludes on a sentimental note of learning from his circumstance and becoming a gentleman -- Col. Jack. Col. Jack learns not only to be civilized and compassionate with others, “but above all he learns the sentiment of gratitude, a sentiment that surpasses fear and sorrow in its power to motivate persons to act as they ought” (Sill 9) to act -- as gentlemen. Defoe begins the novel on a strong note of realism and goes a long way before he introduces elements of sentimentalism and his characters begin to take shape as

sensitive to their own feelings, and the feelings of others. As “the novel of sensibility or sentimental novel and the term sensibility refers to refinement of feeling ... it is associated with virtue and benevolence and shedding of tears, especially in response to the suffering of others is regarded as a benevolent act. (Barton, Hudson Ed.138). *Col. Jack* conforms to this definition and tradition of a sentimental novel.

Conclusion

I have argued in this paper that Daniel Defoe's *Col. Jack* is a well-knit sentimental novel that shows eighteenth-century London where rampant poverty had rendered a large number of people to be criminals. Defoe situates Col. Jack first in London, then in Virginia – the transatlantic world, and finally brings him back to London. If London's environment encourages Col. Jack to commit crimes where "Men rob for Bread, Women whore for Bread" (CJ xiii); the environment in Virginia exposes him to servitude, hard work, and prospects for self-reformation, financial gains, and liberty. There is no over-emphasized sexual content in *Col. Jack*, but women with distorted conception of sexual activity and its utility value exist. When Defoe's miserable characters interact in *Col. Jack*, Defoe interprets their acts and motives from different perspectives. We find secularistic, psychoanalytic, and realistic forces at work and precipitating in the display of sentimentalism. Sentimentalism, in turn, enables readers to understand both – the process of change in the lives of characters and the process of self-liberation, i.e., making a commitment to act in a certain way; for example making a commitment not to steal. Self-liberation in the context of *Col. Jack* may be understood by seeing Col. Jack saying "I would never rob no more, for sure 'it's a wicked abominable Thing" (CJ 83), or when the tutor of Col. Jack says, "for Necessity is not only the Temptation, but is such a Temptation as human Nature is not empower'd to resist: How good then, says he, is that God, which takes from you Sir, the Temptation, by taking away the Necessity" (CJ 161), or when Col. Jack's wife confesses her guilt and says, "I am your miserable divorce'd Wife" (CJ 255), or when Col. Jack consoles her and says, "She should name no more of the unkind things that had past" (CJ 257). In all these

instances of sentimental moments in *Col. Jack* readers can see the direction in which Defoe's character are moving, and the with what motives their actions are guided toward virtuosity. I would say Col Jack moves toward both, self-reformation and reformation of others. Defoe has skillfully prepared the text of *Col. Jack* to present his ideas of change in a society. Col. Jack, Defoe's representative model of sentimentalism, highlights the psychological and secular needs of the poor and leaves enough material spread over more than three hundred pages of *Col. Jack* to feel the meanings of struggle for change in an unkind society. Precisely, the novel takes its readers through a gradual realization that poverty leads to crime, and the realization that crime is abominable lays the foundation for self-correction. Col. Jack being in the "trade" for twenty-six years feels "still unchanged" (CJ 7) despite frequent repentances and commitments with his self that he would "rob no more"(CJ 83). It is throughout the novel that Col. Jack tells us to struggle against own criminal impulses which by extension will change the society. He exemplifies this when he rejects his fellow rogue *Will*'s offer to rob people in the highway. Will says, we will take the Highway like Gentleman, and then we shall get a great deal of money We shall live like gentleman" (CJ 67). Col. Jack asks *Will*, "do you call this way of Living the Life of a Gentleman" (CJ 67). He questions the validity of a status attained through criminal means. He wants to be recognized as a gentleman through his "own Endeavours" (CJ 156), and not being "under the necessity of being a Villian" (CJ 156) and rich. As Col. Jack gains maturity in his physical age, Defoe begins to inject in him a sense of pride in being sensitive to his own needs of self-reformation and the needs of the others to survive in eighteenth century London where poverty and crimes make it difficult to remain honest. Col. Jack at the age of about ten years had a

“Devil for his School-Master” (CJ 6), at the age of thirty years had an “excellent Scholar” to teach him “Latin Tongue” (CJ 158), and by the time he retires to a secure life in London, he finds peace in repenting his past criminal life. Col. Jack’s sentimental journey from liking a pair of shoes and stockings when he is a pickpocket child to liking books at the age of “above thirty” in Virginia shows his struggle for self-correction. Defoe connects each event in the life of Col. Jack in a realistic manner and facilitates his readers to identify with Col. Jack at one stage or the other.

Critic Janet Todd looks at sentimental novels as a piece of literature that cause “arousal of pathos through conventional situation, stock familial characters and rhetorical devices the mark of sentimental literature. Such literature buttonholes the reader and demands an emotional response” (Todd 2). *Col. Jack* conforms to this description of sentimental literature. The novel shows the natural tendency to absorb sentimental moment in real life setting by restricting sentimentalism to what is plainly stated in the text – truthful statement sans exaggeration. The narration brings about emotional and moral alliance between the text and the readers. For example, the scene where Col. Jack robs poor Dame *Smith* and regrets his act as ‘wicked.’ He decides to return her money. Along with regrets, Col. Jack uses compassion as his tool to regulate human relationship. His compassion brings him closer to Dame Smith who addresses Col. Jack and says, “You are very Compassionate.” She prays “God give him Repentance, who ever he is” (CJ 85). In another examples, Col. Jack’s life in Virginia shows that he is equally compassionate with the desires of his master at the plantation to make slaves productive; and for slaves, he uses compassion and mercy to make them productive for the master. Col. Jack reasons out “that they [slaves] never had any Mercy shew’d them . . . they

were spar'd, but punish'd with the utmost Cruelty . . . but that if they were used with Compassion, they would Serve with Affection" (CJ 143). Col. Jack is compassionate even with his wives who 'prov'd *Whores*,' and hurt his self-pride. For example, he talks about his second wife whom he would not let starve for it would lead her to crimes. After keeping his emotional self apart, Col. Jack finds reasons to be compassionate toward his wife, he says: "The latter part of this story mov'd me indeed, for I thought however it was, I ought not to let her Starve; and besides, Poverty was a Temptation which a Woman could not easily withstand, and I ought not to be the Instrument to drive her to a horrid Necessity of Crime, If I could prevent it" (CJ 232). He is useful to himself and to his wives. We see his moral sentimentalism at work.

Defoe has taken care that religion does not unwittingly annihilate the "secular wisdom" (Richetti 148) of Col. Jack and blur sentimentalism, an outstanding feature of *Col. Jack*, and convert a secular text into any kind of text which moralize on the benefits of religion in one's life. In fact, religion has limited role to play in Col. Jack's life. It is only after "a long ill-spent Life" (CJ 307) he finds "just Reflection were the utmost Felicity of human life" (CJ 307) and realizes that moral improvement should have been the guiding principles for him to make his life a life of a gentleman. He remembers that his nurse used to remind him repeatedly "that I was a gentleman." (CJ 3). However, we are not looking at the concluding remarks of a retired Col. Jack where he shows his doubt about his repentance as "how far it pleases God" (CJ 309), rather we are taking into account how he managed his entire active life and the kind of morality he had followed to regulate his personal affairs.

Col. Jack's attitude toward his personal life is secular as he marries five times and none of his marriages is solemnized in a religious manner. He has always preferred his marriages to take place 'privately' (CJ 239). His marriages were never successful, and he is not seen holding his fate, under control of a numinous being, responsible for his failed marriages, or for that matter any other event, good or bad, taking place in his life ever remained mysterious to him. He always finds reasons for bad events in his life and tries to amend them. Also, we do not see Col. Jack questioning God's wisdom in justifying his [Col. Jack] wickedness or goodness. In other words, Col. Jack's attitude toward his life is secular. With reference to *Col. Jack*, I see Defoe's exploitation of theological aspects of life as materialistic and secularistic than religious. It is just one of the metaphorical trappings he uses to facilitate Col. Jack to examine his inner-self and see where he stands with his sinful past before his own conscience. *Col. Jack* is, therefore, a journey of a man from a life of utter criminality and vulgarity to a life of thorough gentility and manners without any divine intervention in his life. Col. Jack says, "I cannot say that I had any serious Religious reflection, or that these things proceeded yet from the uneasiness of Conscience, but from mere Reasoning with myself, and from being arriv'd to a Capacity of making a right judgment of things more than before" (CJ 157). Honest to his experience in the art of journalistic writing, Defoe does not let his religious belief interfere with Col. Jack's beliefs. He facilitates Col. Jack to appear before the readers of his life's account as he pleases. John J. Richetti is of the view that "Jack offers the secular wisdom of history and society understood by participation, generalization about such matters informed by experience" (Defoe's Narrative 148).

Applying psychoanalytical approach to look at the sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, we find Freudian pleasure and reality principles and the phenomenon of Oedipus complex at work. Col. Jack draws pleasures from his acts of compassion. We see Col. Jack pleased when a munificent woman offers him to purchase clothes with good pockets to keep “Gold, or Watch in” it (27). Col. Jack says, “It struck me with a strange kind of joy ... ples’d as a Prince is with his Coach and six Horses” (28). There are numerous examples of his pleasure such as his tenderness toward his wife, his sense of accommodation of feelings of slaves, and finally settling down in England after handing over the control of his plantation in the hands of his indentured servant. The story of Devil which incites complexities of Oedipus complex and Col. Jack’s revenge against the man from whom he takes back the possession of the body of his wife and thus succeeds in restoring his own sexual rights is an example of both Oedipus complex and sentimentalism. These incidents depicts his sentimentalism toward his rights to possess what he legitimately deserves. The realism and sentimentalism in Col. Jack combine to provide complete picture of destitution and its effects, the necessity of reasoning and its effects, compassion and its affects, and the importance of consistent effort to change extenuating circumstances to make life useful for self and for others -- hallmark of sentimentalism. *Col. Jack* is all about this, and a well-reasoned sentimental commentary on the societal incongruities that either make a man a sinful creature for none of his fault, or provide opportunity to a man to be a vitreous, useful gentleman.

Sentimentalism in Col. Jack

Annotated bibliography

Out of the well-known six novels of Daniel Defoe (1660-1731) published in a short span of time (1719--1725), *Col Jack* (1722) has attracted less attention from the critics than his other novels. Some critics have even rejected *Col Jack* as a novel considering it an amalgam of his previous writings, and some would make a reference to it just in passing, others being more generous to *Col. Jack*, devote a brief chapter in their voluminous books to support some of the claims they make about Defoe's literary works. Seemingly, whatever little is written about *Col. Jack*, has mostly remained restricted to the surface value of the text as an account of a man having "*a strange Rectitude of Principals [which] remained with him*" (Preface, *Col. Jack* 1). I do not say that these wide-ranging writings of acclaimed Defoe-scholars do not portray Col. Jack as Defoe's protagonist struggling to become a gentleman, but certainly leave aspects of sentimentality in some degree of obscurity. Here, I have discussed only twelve books written by Defoe scholars which have direct bearing on my paper – *Sentimentalism in Col Jack*. The other books, which I have included in the work cited page, are equally researched documents and provide material which help understand the complex make up of characters in Defoe's novels; when they commit crime, pursue material gains, exploit spiritual guidance, behave in secular manner, or act under the sway of emotional and sentimental energy.

Since sentimentalism in *Col. Jack* is my point of focus, therefore a brief note on sentimentalism seems appropriate. Sentimentalism is seen differently by different critics, therefore, a definition of sentimentalism or a sentimental novel is hard to find. However,

most appropriate perception of sentimentalism applicable in the analysis of Col. Jack comes from these definitions and explanations of sentimentalism, sentimental novels, or novel of sensibility. Edwin J. Barton and Glenda A. Hudson in their book *A Contemporary Guide to Literary Terms* seem to suggest that ‘sensibility’ and ‘sentimental’ may be used interchangeably to label a feeling associated with virtue and benevolence. They explain sentimentalism in the context of novel of sensibility: “The novel of sensibility or sentimental novel was especially popular in the second half of the eighteenth century. The term sensibility referred to refinement of feeling. It was associated with virtue and benevolence” (137). Whereas, the Oxford English Dictionary defines sentimentalism as “the excessive expression of feelings of tenderness, sadness, or nostalgia in behavior, writing, or speech,” and sensibility is defined as “the ability to appreciate and respond to complex emotional or aesthetic influences; sensitivity” (Web 20 May 2016). This explanation establishes a relationship between ‘explanation’ --a statement or an account that makes something clear, and ‘definition’ -- the statement of the exact meaning of a word as given in a dictionary. The nuance between the two words ‘sensibility’ and ‘sentimentalism’ is clearly marked by the function these two words perform in depicting feelings.

Broadly speaking, such texts, in which refined feelings create a bond between two characters or between the text and the reader, fall into the category of sentimental novels. Critic Janet Todd looks at sentimental novels as a piece of literature that cause “arousal of pathos through conventional situation, stock familial characters and rhetorical devices the mark of sentimental literature. Such literature buttonholes the reader and demands an

emotional response” (Todd 2). I have found that *Col. Jack* conforms to this description of sentimental literature.

Boulukos, George. *The Grateful Slave: The emergence of race in eighteenth-century*

British and American culture. Cambridge University press, 2008.

Boulukos is a professor of English at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. Focus of his book is on gradual development and application of ‘grateful slave trope’ in the eighteenth-century literature. While discussing the development of ‘grateful slave’, he takes an overview of slaves’ circumstances, how they transformed from the position of labor and became slaves and, by the eighteenth-century, how writers began to situate them in their fictions. Chapter three of the book traces this history of the evolution of the grateful slave. Boulukos relies on major works of Daniel Defoe: *Robinson Crusoe*, *Captain Singleton*, and *Colonel Jack*, and Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko*, Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, Trevor Burnard’s *Mastery, Tyranny and Desire* and many more texts pointing to the philosophical, historical, social, religious and racial input in the evolution of grateful slave trope. He discusses sentimentalism and gratefulness in the context of its use value. In other words, Boulukos looks at sentimentalism as a management tools which, he thinks, Col. Jack applies in the management of slaves for his master’s benefits. Boulukos says: “*Colonel Jack* has two notable differences from other versions of the grateful slave trope: first, Jack indulges in a momentary outburst of racist theorizing, which he then abandons to return to his project of sentimental manipulation; second, he treats his sentimental connection with the slaves not as real ... but as a tool for manipulating his African charges” (34). However, my concern is only to find how sentimentalism exists in

Colonel Jack, and not how it is manipulated or used by the characters in *Colonel Jack*. Boulukos' book is exhaustive, and references from other sources are wide-ranging. It introduces nuances of various position that may be taken into consideration when reading *Colonel Jack* as a sentimental novel.

Chadwick, William. *Life and Times of Daniel Defoe: With Remarks Digressive and Discursive*. John Russell Smith, London, 1859.

This book is Chadwick's attempt to rescue Defoe from obscurity and defend his creative genius, and political and financial acumen. The book contains lengthy extracts from Defoe's work, official documents, and records of political events to visualize social and political conditions under which Defoe lived and worked. Chadwick has reported from the letters Defoe wrote to his son-in-law Henry Baker which show moments of Defoe's helplessness and inability to correct some of his misjudgment about himself, his family and his elder son whom he trusted, and who in return cheated him and his family. In one of his letters addressed to Baker, Defoe writes: "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me" (460). These letters show Defoe's deep emotional discomfort and his sentimental lamentations against what he desired to get, and what he got. While rediscovering Defoe, the painful aspects of his life tells us more about him than what we may claim to know about him. Since this book was written about one hundred twenty-eight years after Defoe's death, we may consider it as a sample of pro-Defoe sentiments, as well as a sort of a rebuttal of anti-Defoe criticism. For the purposes of my paper, last chapter, chapter X, is more useful which tells about Defoe's sentimentalism

which he seems to have restructured and embedded in his characters, such as Col. Jack, Moll Flanders, Captain Singleton, Roxana to name a few..

Halpern, Faye. *Sentimental Readers: The Rise, fall, and Revival of a Disparaged Rhetoric*.

University of Iowa Press, Iowa City. 2013.

She is associate professor of English, University of Calgary and teaches nineteenth-century American Literature. Her book is primarily to be read in context with debate on sentimentalism and women writers. She has extensively used nineteenth century novels of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852), and Louisa Mary Alcott's *a story of Experience* (1872) to advance her discussion on sentimentalism. However, the book is relevant to my search for a possible explanation of sentimentalism.

Her approach to sentimental elements in a text, or in the personality of a character, depends upon the aesthetics of the term. She rejects all approaches to sentimentalism if these are devoid of an explanation to its cause. She emphasizes that we need to look at "sentimentalism as less *what* than *how*: "how does a sentimental text direct its audience to read (xv). The introduction to the book discusses *The how of Sentimentality*, and from here she proceeds to discuss *Where does Emotion Come From?* (104) to *Unmasking Sentimentality* (139). In between she looks into *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *A story of Experience* to support her argument that sentimentalism has reason and roots for its existence. However, the 'what' and 'how' factors in *Colonel Jack* are in plenty, and each factor seems to contribute toward shaping Colonel Jack's personality. Halpern provides a framework within which Col. Jack may be fitted as a sentimental character.

Hilson, J. C., M. M. B. Jones and J. R. Watson eds. *Augustan Worlds*. Leicester University Press,

U.K, 1978.

This book is a collection of essays to which the editors lovingly call “*Festschrift*” published in memory of Professor Arthur Humphreys (1911-1988), Chair of English at the University of Leicester (1947-1976). These essays are issue-centered and focus on the study of Augustan Age writers – their lives and their works. There are eighteen essays in the book, out of which I find two essays *Hume: the Historian as Man of Feeling* by J. C. Hilson, University of Leicester, and *A Sentimental Journey and the Syntax of Things* by Martin C. Battestin, University of Virginia, relevant to my discussion on sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*. Both these essays show how sentimentalism shapes the structure of a text, and how such texts become a powerful tool to communicate with readers. There are arguments to recognize fictive techniques that go into the making of creative works with seemingly obscure meanings and look infested with illusive ideas lacking truth --- not as spoilers of the text --- but as pointers of subtleties and sensibility that convert a simple piece of writing into a creative work.

For example, Hilson discusses Hume’s *History of England* and responds to his critics who label Hume’s writing as obscure. He suggests reading of Hume’s *History* as a literary work is the right way to approach his works. In defense of Hume, he argues: “Like sentimental novelist, Hume internalizes his hero’s anxieties and uncertainties, and reveals his thought-process to us on a number of occasions when he is in doubt and perplexity” (214). To further his argument, he says, “Abandoning taxonomy, I wish ... to suggest ...

study of Hume's *History* as a literary work. Namely, the sentimental tradition in mid-century ethics and aesthetics" (206). His assertion implies that sentimental writings may be heterogeneous, but need to be looked holistically to find how events and responses go together and shape characters. As Hume himself differentiates textual infrastructure of different kinds of writings and maintains that "The unity of Action ... which is to be found in Biography or History, differs from that of Epic Poetry, not in Kind, but in degree.... In all these genres the 'Imagination, both of Writer and Reader ... is the central issue; and the author-reader compact is the matrix of the process of unification in literary composition" (207).

The essay by Martin C. Battestin on *A Sentimental Journey and the Syntax of Things* takes into account Laurence Sterne (1713-1768) works and argues about his syntax which gives meaning to an expression. To find meanings in a literary work, remains the job of a reader as well as that of a critic. In defense of ambiguity, Battestin argues that "it is the ambiguity of words that enable Sterne to achieve a simultaneity of thematic, as well as comic implication ..." (231). In *A Sentimental Journey*, as readers might have noticed, sentences are broken and much depends upon the reader how he decodes a text. Battestin argues in defense of the protagonist Yorick: "For, as Yorick has been at some pains to make clear in relating his sentimental journey, the imagination is our means of apprehending the syntax of things" (237). These two essays show how sentimentalism may be seen operative in a text, and how the text is to be interpreted to draw conclusion.

Hunter, J. Paul. *The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in*

Robinson Crusoe. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. 1966.

Contrary to Novak's position that Defoe's novels do not have to do anything with religion, this book explores the text and traces what has gone into the making of *Robinson Crusoe*, and how Defoe's Puritan thoughts have influenced the structure of his novels. Hunter focuses on the moral and social aspects which his novels highlight and relates to Defoe's Puritan values. Hunter also examines "Puritan subliterate traditions" (xii) which, he thinks, is "relevant to the mind and imagination that produced *Robinson Crusoe*" (xii). His effort is to establish Defoe as a religious moralist. For the purposes of my study of sentimentalism in *Col. Jack*, and to see if Col. Jack conforms to the idea of religious moralism, this book is helpful. The book is also a guide to knowing how far Col. Jack's sentimental behavior may be attributed to Defoe's Puritan thoughts.

Lund, Roger D. ed. *Critical Essays on Daniel Defoe*. G. K. Hall & Co. An Imprint of Simon & Shuster Macmillan, Broadway, New York, 1977.

This book contains thirteen 'articles and essays' covering different aspects of Defoe's work. It is a valuable source material on Defoe and his work. It saves time and extensive search on Defoe and provides information about reference material indispensable for Defoe scholars. Information about *Col. Jack* is scattered but helpful. My interest is in two articles on *Moll Flanders* on page 181 and 202. In the first essay Moll is seen as a tool in the hands of Defoe who "uses Moll's roles as criminal and women --- both outsiders --- to criticize emergent capitalism" (182). In the second Moll, is at the center of her crimes, robbery, incest, and marriages and struggles to be a gentlewoman. These two essays are

helpful in seeing Moll's life more closely, and finding out if she has moments of sentimentalism similar to Col. Jack's.

Novak, Maximillian E. *Economics and the Fiction of Defoe*. Russell & Russell, New York.

1962 and revised in 1976.

Novak remained associated with University of California, Los Angeles for 39 years and retired in 2001. This book, to which John J. Richetti refers to as a "careful monograph," (Defoe's Narrative, footnotes p. 5) is an authentic source for the study of Daniel Defoe. The book sees Defoe as a mercantilist and his novels as representatives of his mercantilist ideology. Novak in the preface of his book says "The purpose of this study is two-fold: to provide an exposition and interpretation of Defoe's economic thought and to explicate the meaning of his fiction in the light of his thought" (2). He discusses Col. Jack as a complex character who pursues only his desire to become prosperous and attain the position of a gentleman. Novak describes his actions calculated, and his morality and emotions conditional. Novak says, "His attachment to the gold is the greatest emotion of his life" (82). He considers him as both "thoughtful and timid" (83). After categorizing Jack as non-sentimental figure, Novak argues: "Nineteenth-century fiction often sentimentalized the little beggar boy or girl, but there is little sentimentality in Defoe's novel" (80). After reading this statement, I tried to find out if Novak has defined or explained what constitutes sentimentalism, but I could not find any material to understand sentimentalism the way he thinks about it. But, the book helps us understand why Col. Jack is not a sentimental book. He discounts Jack's sense of care for others as only mechanical and impulsive as Jack remains in a "States of Innocence," as he calls it" (81). But, the question is, does innocence

take away human sentiments? Probably not. A reader may reasonably be tempted to ask why Novak does not recognize that Jack's business activities have moments of sentimentalism. Such as, his decision to handover the management of his plantation to his indentured servants, or his decision to return stolen money to the old women whom he had robbed, or when he asks his master, whose plantation he manages, to be compassionate to his slave, or when Col. Jack weeps on occasion and repents his crimes. These moments occur when Col. Jack is not doing any kind of business, rather thinking about others when they suffer pain in their lives. Col. Jack connects himself with them in their moments of emotional distress; for example, meeting his first wife who would be his fifth wife, at his Virginia plantation. However, Novak rejects the idea of labelling Col. Jack and Moll as sentimental characters. He holds them as "perfect colonists" (154). Also, Novak is very categorical in assessing Defoe's novels and making a judgmental statement that "there is little sentimentality in Defoe's novels" (80). He also rejects the idea that *Col. Jack* may be read as a moralizing text which requires his readers to realize importance of religion in their lives. For the purposes of my paper, I find Chapter IV *Defoe's Social Fiction and the Problems of Poverty* (67-126) useful where Novak comments on Defoe and his four major works.

Richetti, John J. *Defoe's Narratives: Situations and Structure*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

1975.

--*Daniel Defoe*. Twayne Publishers, Boston. 1987.

Richetti is A.M. Rosenthal Professor of English Emeritus at the University of Pennsylvania. His book discusses six works; *Robinson Crusoe*, *Captain Singleton*, *Moll Flanders*, *Colonel Jack*, *Roxana* and *A Journal of Plague Year*. He focuses on the pattern of textual arrangement Defoe adopts to communicate with his readers. In the process, Richetti attempts to define and interpret Defoe as a writer whose person is yet to be described with certainty. And to know about his novels, he argues it “requires a willingness to participate at one and the same time in thoroughly observed fact and in extravagant fantasy” (18). His treatment of Defoe’s novels is straightforward and based upon his approach to “watch the narratives as their various tasks rather than to impose some larger unity with criticism’s usual superiority” (20).

In his other book, *Daniel Defoe*, he deals with Col. Jack and Moll and assigns “moral sensitivity” (76) to Jack, and courage that a female needs to “survive in a masculine world” (87) to Moll. When the two books are read together, a conventional picture of human figure, both Col. Jack and Moll, emerges with its sins and virtues prominently displayed. In one novel Defoe rehabilitates a criminal man, and in the other he rehabilitates a criminal woman and in between leaves traces of sentimentalism.

Richetti finds subtle elements of spirituality in Defoe’s work and argues: “cheerful insertion of occasional tributes to ethics and piety” (5) which may be interpreted as moment of introspection for characters as we see them finally reformed. He quotes Martin Price’s remarks on Defoe’s narratives that “exemplify ‘the troubled conscience of a Puritan tradesman, aware of the frequent conflict between the demand of commercial gains and those of spiritual salvation’” (5), which in turn seem embodied in the characters of Col. Jack

and Moll. These books provide an opportunity to see such causes which may give rise to sentimentalism. Footnotes and references provide guidance for further research on the issues he discusses in these books.

Rogers, Pat ed. *Defoe: The Critical Heritage*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London. 1972.

Rogers, retired professor, University of South Florida, presents an account of how Defoe was seen by critics between 1775 and 1875. The book covers a wide range of discussion on comments of Defoe's contemporaries on his literary career. Rogers has included text of original writings of Defoe's critics both against and in his favor. This makes it easy to have a brief account of comparative analysis of Defoe's work which is otherwise scattered in different books. On the whole Rogers' effort is aimed at restoring Defoe to his literary worth. Defoe remained ignored, and it took more than "hundred and fifty years to reclaim him as a serious creative property" (2). Thirty-one pages of introduction to the book, including three pages of notes, are devoted to overviews of the critical approach to Defoe's life and work. These pages aptly set the tone of the book and make it easy to read it in chronological order. The chronological order also shows how opinion about Defoe gradually changed over a period of time. The book, as a whole, is rich in references and useful for the study of Defoe. But for the purposes of my study, extracts drawn from Walter Wilson's three-volume: *Memoires of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe* (1830) where Wilson discusses *Robinson Crusoe*, *Moll Flanders*, *Colonel Jack*, *Memoires of a Cavalier*, *A Journal of the Plague Years*, *On religious Courtship*, *Roxana*, *Remarks on Defoe as a Novelist*, and squeezed by Rogers into sixteen pages titled as *A Major study* (90-106) is helpful.

Sill, Geoffrey. *Defoe and the Idea of Fiction --1713-1719* -- Associated University Presses, 1983.

Sill is Professor of English, at Rutgers-Camden, the State University of New Jersey. He tells us about his book: “One of the purposes of this study, then, has been to sketch in the web of ideological connections that helps explain the existence and intention of one title in terms of the other that Defoe is known to have written” (13). It is safe to say that the book is a literary history of Defoe and his work. The book has six chapters; it begins from *Ideology and the Idea of Fiction* and concludes at *Ideology and the Island*. In addition, notes, epilogue, bibliography and index is very useful in organizing sources for further research on Defoe and his work. The book covers only a brief period of Defoe’s creative writing -- six years from 1713 to 1719 -- that was more productive and offered Defoe and his work a secure place to survive till this day.

For my analysis of *Colonel Jack* as a sentimental novel, last sixty-eight pages (138-176) are meaningful. In these pages Defoe’s ideology and fiction coexist. Plenty of material on Defoe’s humanness is available to relate with both Defoe and his works. Defoe’s humaneness, which to my understanding, has gone into the making of his various novels lay buried in these pages in its nascent stage. For example, Sill argues, when Defoe felt that though George I (speech in April 1717) intends to pardon those persons who were involved in the rebellion excepting those “accused of acting in the Pretender’s interest in the last ministry” (140), Defoe pleads their case for pardon. “Defoe endeavored to explain in a pamphlet entitled *A General Pardon Considered* why they should not be excepted from the contemplated Act of Grace. Adopting the language of liberal humanism, Defoe

applauded the idea of a pardon ..." (140). His plea for pardon "even those who have no need of a pardon will 'find yet a secret involuntary, Pleasure, in seeing other people forgiven'" (140). His humaneness is neither manipulative nor outcome of any kind of desire to indulge into an exercise in personal aggrandizement, but it is simply a reflection of his moral sentiments. Though, Sill does not address the issue of sentiment in his book as it does not have direct bearing on the issue of Defoe's idea of ideology and fiction as such, but it helps us to see Defoe in a wider perspective – much beyond a political writer, propagandist, polemicists, a moralist, or an ideologist. The book, rescues Defoe from such criticism which belittle his stature as a creative writer. Also, the book gives a clear picture of a man who has the ability to deal with the components of emotions and sentiments as constituents of a compassionate heart which Colonel Jack certainly has.

Starr, G. A. (University of California, Berkeley). *Defoe & Casuistry*. Princeton University Press, 1971.

Starr explains casuistry as: "That Part of Ethics which resolves cases of conscience, applying the general rules of religion and morality to particular instances in which "circumstances alter cases," or in which there appears to be a conflict of duties. Often (and perhaps originally) applied to a quibbling and evasive way of dealing with difficult cases of duty. OED" (v). His book needs to be read in the light of this definition of casuistry. He is of the view that "role of seventeenth-century casuistical divinity in the genesis of his [Defoe's] writing" (vii). Starr also rejects Novak's stand that Defoe's novels do not have religious contents. Starr also points out contraries in *Col. Jack*. He argues that Defoe raises moral issues and leaves them unresolved. One plausible reason for leaving issues

unresolved is, as Starr says, that “Defoe [himself] says in an early work that ‘Contraries may Illustrate but Contraries never incorporate’; in *Col Jack* patterns of contraries define and animate but fail to harmonize different system of values” (Starr 82). In Starr’s view Colonel Jack’s behavioral pattern is the result of events that drive him to react against a particular situation without being conscious of his feelings, and without being aware of contradictions in his acts. To me, the recurrence of unresolved issues look like Defoe’s fictive technique, purposely designed to be resolved by the readers. I tend to agree with Hume who maintains that “author-reader compact is the matrix of the process of unification in literary composition” (83).

Starr considers five books in some detail and his chief aim is to show “how Defoe drew on the materials and methods of traditional casuistry for his own use” (xii). He refers to five novels; whereas, only four are listed on the content list: *A journal of the Plague Year*, *Colonel Jack*, *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana* and analyzes the texts. I have concentrated on pages 82-110 where Starr has discussed narrative complexities in *Colonel Jack*. In these novels he points out to the patterns of contraries typical of Colonel Jack’s character, and Defoe’s conscious adoption of a pattern of narration where contraries are at work – shaping Jack’s life and moving the narration forward. Starr’s views on casuistry and contraries that form the structure of Defoe’s novels is instructive and show a different way of reading and analyzing Defoe’s novels. Starr is critical of critics and argues that, “critics have shed valuable light on some of its theme, but have tended to obscure the full range of competing norms which Defoe has worked into *Colonel Jack*” (85). However, my interest is limited to Starr’s discussion on *Colonel Jack*, and to an extent on *Moll Flanders*. There is a strong possibility that contraries might have given rise to sentimental moments in the novel, and

which may be found by means of close reading. One may ask, why these elements, which seem blurred, should not be looked into some more detail to be able to understand Colonel Jack's emotional truth and his moment of sentimentalism.

Works Cited

- Armitage, David and Michael J. Braddick, Eds. *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, Second Edition Palgrave Macmillan, Printed in China. 2009. Print.
- Barton, Edwin J., Glenda A Hudson, Eds. *A Contemporary Guide to Literary Terms*. Third Volume. Wadsworth Cengage learning, USA. 2012. Print.
- Bressler, Charles E. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*, Fifth Edition. Longman Pearson. United States. 2011. Print.
- Bridsall, Virginia Ogden. *Defoe's Perpetual Seekers: A study of the Major Fiction*. Bucknell University Press London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, Inc. Cranbury, New Jersey. 1985. Print.
- Boulukos, George. *The Grateful Slave: The emergence of race in eighteenth-century British and American culture*. Cambridge University Press, New York. 2008. Print.
- Byrd, Max. *London Transformed: Images of the City in the Eighteenth Century*. Yale University Press, New Haven and London. 1978. Print.
- Chadwick, William. *The Life and Times of Daniel De Foe with Remarks Digressive and Discursive*. London: John Russell Smith, Soho Square. 1859. Print.
- Clark, Katherine. *Daniel Defoe: The Whole Frame of Nature, Time and Providence*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. 2007. Print.
- Claybaugh, Amanda. *The Novel of Purpose: Literature and social Reform in the Anglo American World*. Cornell University Press. Ithaca, London. 2007. Print.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The History and Remarkable Life of the Truly Honourable Col. Jacque Commonly Called Col. Jack*. Edited with an introduction by Samuel Holt Monk. Oxford University Press, New York, Toronto. 1965. Print.
- . *Moll Flanders*. Edited by G. A. Starr and Linda Bree. Oxford University Press Inc. New York. 2011. Print.
- . *Robinson Crusoe*. Oxford world classics. Thomas Keymer ed. Oxford University Press. New York. 2007. Print.
- . *Street-Robberies, Considered: The Reason of their being fo Frequent*. First printed in 1728. Introduction and notes by Geoffrey M. Sill. Carolingian Press in Stockton, NJ. 1973. Print.
- Emsley, Clive, Tim Hitchcock, and Robert Shoemaker. *London History - Currency, Coinage and the Cost of Living: Old Bailey Proceedings Online* (www.oldbaileyonline.org, version 7.0, 10 July 2016.)
- Fleischacker, Samuel, "Adam Smith's Moral and Political Philosophy", *The Stanford*

Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2015 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), Web 14 April 2016 URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/smith-moral-political/>>.

Gissing, George: An Introduction. Victorian Web. <<http://www.victorianweb.org/>>. Web. 7 June 2016.

Gladfelder, Hal. *Criminality and Narrative in Eighteenth-Century England: Beyond the Law*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London. 2001. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen, general editor. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Eighth Edition, Vol.1. W. W. Norton & Company, New York, London. 2006. Print.

Habib, M. A. R. *A History of Literary Criticism and Theory: From Plato to the Present*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. USA. 2008. Print

Halpern, Faye. *Sentimental Readers: The Rise, Fall, and Revival of a Disparaged Rhetoric*. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City. 2013. Print.

Harman, Gilbert. *Moral Agent and Impartial Spectator*. The University of Kansas (1986). <https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/12400/Moral%20Agent%20and%20Spectator-1986.pdf?seq> (Web. 18 July 2016).

Hunter, J. Paul. *The Reluctant Pilgrim: Defoe's Emblematic Method and Quest for Form in Robinson Crusoe*. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. 1966. Print.

Jefferson, D. W. *Laurence Sterne*. British Writers, Vol. III. Publication of the British Council. Ian Scott-Kilvert, Ed. The Gothic Novel Charters Scribner's Sons/NY. 1980. Print.

James, E Anthony. *Daniel Defoe's Many Voices: A Rhetorical Study of Prose Style and Literary Method*. Rodopi NV, Amsterdam. 1972. Print.

Kauppinen, Antti, *Moral Sentimentalism, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (Ed.). Web 17 April 2016. URL <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/moral-sentimentalism/>>.

Leroch, Martin. *Adam Smith's Intuition Pump: Impartial Spectator*. Institute of SocioEconomics, IAW, University of Hamburg, Hamburg Germany. www.accedoverlag.de Web 22 July 2016.

Lund, Roger D, Ed. *Critical Essays on Daniel Defoe*. G. K. Hall & Co. New York. 1997. Print.

Marsh, Nicholas. *Daniel Defoe: The Novels*. Palgrave Macmillan, UK. 2011. Print.

Moody, Joycelyn. *Sentimental Confessions: Spiritual Narratives of Nineteenth-Century African American Women*. The University of Georgia Press, Athens and London. 2000. Print.

Novak, Maximillian E. *Economics and the Fiction Daniel Defoe*. Printed in the United States of America by Sentry Press, New York. 1976. Print.

Oxford Dictionary. Web 14 April 2016. www.oxforddictionaries.com/.../definition/.../red

Plumb, J. H. *England In The Eighteenth Century*. Penguin Books. Hunt Barnard Printing Limited, Aylesbury, UK. 1950. Print.

---. *The Origins of Political Stability, England (1675-1725)*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. 1967. Print.

Richardson, Henry S., *Moral Reasoning, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/reasoning-moral/>](http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/reasoning-moral/). (Web 10 July 2016).

Richetti, John J. *Daniel Defoe*. Twayne Publishers. A Division of G. K. Hall & Co. Boston, Massachusetts. 1987. Print.

---. *Defoe's Narratives: Situations and Structures*. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1975. Print.

Rogers, Pat, ed. *Defoe: The Critical Heritage*. Routledge & Kegan Paul: London and Boston. 1972. Print.

Roorda, Gerridina. *Realism in Daniel De Foe's Narratives of Adventure*. Folcroft Library Edition. 1970. (Only 150 copies of this dissertation were published. December 1929).

Sill, Geoffrey M. *Defoe and the Idea of Fiction (1713-1719)*. Associated University Presses, Inc. New Jersey. 1983. Print.

--- Defoe and the Sentimental Novel. Rutgers University, Camden (Sakai)

Starr, G. A. *Defoe & Casuistry*. Princeton University Press, USA. 1971. Print.

---. *Defoe & Spiritual Autobiography*. Gordon Press. New York. 1971. Print.

Sutherland, James. *Daniel Defoe*. British Writer Vol. III. Ian Scott-Kilvert, ed. Publication of the British Council. Charles Scribner's Sons/NY. 1980. Print.

Todd, Janet. *Sensibility, An Introduction*. Methuen & Co. New York. Print. 1986.

Watt, Ian. *The Rise of The Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California. 1957. (Web 18 May 2016).

Wallace, R. Jay, *Practical Reason, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/practical-reason/>](http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/practical-reason/). (Web 10 July 2016).

Woolf, Virginia. *The Common Reader*, First Series. eBooks@Adelaid, The University of Adelaide Library, University of Adelaide, South Australia 5005. Web. Jan. 24, 2016.

Zimmerman, Everett. *Defoe and the Novel*. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London. 1975. Print.