



3 1293 01419 5972

**LIBRARY
Michigan State
University**

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

THE ALIMENTARY STRUCTURES OF INCEST: EATING AND INCEST
IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH NARRATIVE

presented by

Minaz Jooma

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in English

Major professor

Date October 20, 1995

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
<u>03/04/01</u>	<u>DEC 21 2004</u> <u>072904</u>	_____
<u>05-08-03</u> <u>05-08-03</u>	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\otrc\datesdue.pm3-p.1

THE ALIMENTARY STRUCTURES OF INCEST: EATING AND INCEST
IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH NARRATIVE

By

Minaz Jooma

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1995

ABSTRACT

THE ALIMENTARY STRUCTURES OF INCEST: EATING AND INCEST IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH NARRATIVE

By

Minaz Jooma

Eating and incest appear frequently in major works by Milton, Defoe, Richardson and Fielding that are widely accepted as important to the development of modern narrative. These themes are linked to concerns about social and narrative authority, and they articulate anxieties about several forms of inheritance in the eighteenth century. Paternal authority in these works is validated by historical commensal patterns that facilitate the retention and consumption of certain family members by others. By elaborating complex power relations within the family, metaphors of eating and incest clarify how paternal authority is conceived and how it fosters a particular myth of male individuation in eighteenth-century narrative that retains its currency in modern thought.

Tensions at the heart of socially-sanctioned forms of sexuality and eating in Paradise Lost, Robinson Crusoe, Clarissa and Tom Jones, may be considered through feminist, anthropological and psychoanalytical theories which explain the interrelatedness of the codes that govern sexual and

eating practices. Transgressive eating and filial disobedience, represented through father-daughter seduction in Paradise Lost, help to perpetuate a discursive tradition that normalizes a pattern of paternal indulgence and filial indebtedness. As this pattern enables alimentary, libidinous and capitalist consumerism, it anticipates the operative discursive and transactional relations of eighteenth-century narrative.

Transactional relations are elaborated in Robinson Crusoe when underlying homosocial structures tie father-son relations to cannibalism, and when eroticized father-son bonds endorse Crusoe's project of colonization. As the exploitation of colonial and female bodies provides a basis for a materialist economy, Defoe's novel represents the consumption of minions as necessary to modern economic structures. Power differentials embedded in these structures are taken up and transformed as eighteenth-century narrative evolves.

The codification of domestic consumption that occurs in narratives of the 1740s may be considered through conditions governing commensality in Clarissa, and through patterns of kinship, property ownership, sexual access and food distribution in Tom Jones. The figures of incest and eating trace the accumulation of that cultural capital in eighteenth-century narrative which supports patterns of commensality and incestuous abuse in modern Western culture.

Copyright by

MINAZ JOOMA

1995

To Russell

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Department of English at Michigan State University for providing me with both a stipend and an opportunity to continue teaching; these initially made it possible for me to undertake a Ph.D. in the United States. Fellowships from the Graduate School and the College of Arts and Letters at Michigan State University subsequently gave me the chance to concentrate on the later stages of writing the dissertation and to take my work into the wider scholarly community. Travel awards from the Northeast American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies and the Graduate School at Michigan State University also helped me to remain active at professional conferences, and these meetings in turn provided ideal environments for questioning and refining my ideas.

I wish to distinguish a number of individuals who have enabled my work and to say--in what seems an oddly small way--how much I appreciate having had their support during my graduate career. My sincere thanks first go to the members of my doctoral guidance committee: to Ellen Pollak, the director of my dissertation, to Howard Anderson, to Victor Paananen and to Sheila Teahan. The linearity of

written language does not allow me to convey the dynamic intellectual milieu that was created by each member's willingness to comment on the work-in-progress in a distinctive and incisive way. And it is impossible to give both thorough and succinct expression to the many levels--personal as well as professional--on which I have been able to seek guidance and support. Suffice it to say that the members of my guidance committee have invited me into their homes and their families with the same warmth and collegiality as that with which they have welcomed me into their professional lives.

A sonorous thank you must next go to my dear friend, Jenifer Banks, who has listened with unending patience to untold variations on the tunes of incest and eating, and whose wisdom and sound judgement has steered me through many a crisis. During the course of many long and lively conversations Marilyn Brouwer has, likewise, proved a source of friendship and encouragement. Special thanks must also go to Steve Bamlett of the Roehampton Institute in London whose own rigorous scholarship first spurred a hopeful undergraduate to consider graduate work, and to Sue Carpenter of Michigan State University Libraries who graciously procured materials for me when I was compelled to work on the dissertation from a distance and whose efforts often prevented my work from coming to a standstill.

Although they live in England, my parents, Merziya Sachedina Jooma and Yusuf Jooma, have kept pace with my

project. It was they, after all, who brought me up on a glorious mixture of the foods and the folklores of three continents and who early schooled me in the nuances of language. Lillian Spagnola Angrisani and the late Frank James Angrisani have always derived immense satisfaction from my progress; they have often given me space in which to ruminate and have fostered in me an irrepressible love of the fête and the festive. I thank each of them for what they have taught me about food-related practices and for unwittingly moving me to ask leading questions about the ontological significance of food rituals and their intertwinedness with sexual taboos.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to Russell Angrisani who has, without a murmur, made very considerable sacrifices in his own career to support me in mine. The tenor of his friendship, the quality of his mind and the sheer generosity of his spirit have sometimes rendered me speechless--though, fortunately, never silent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Apple of Her Father's I	46
Chapter 2: Robinson Crusoe Inc(orporates)	98
Chapter 3: Bringing Up a Chicken for the Father's Table	157
Chapter 4: Bre(a)d, Bed, and Bawd	221
Conclusion	277
Bibliography	284

INTRODUCTION

Coming into the house, apply yourself immediately to your Parents; and having saluted them according to your duty, acquaint them with what proficiency you have made in your learning that day; be not absent when Dinner is on the Table, but present when Grace is said; and sit not down before you have done your obedience to your Parents, and the company then present. Keep your Clothes from greasing... and receive what is given to you, thankfully. Be not talkative at Table, nay nor do not speak, unless you are askt question. Eat not your meat greedily, nor fill your mouth too full....

--Hannah Wolley, "Advice to the Female younger Sort," in The Gentlewoman's Companion

Eating and incest are themes that reccur frequently in eighteenth-century literature yet they have only recently begun to receive sustained critical attention for their significance in the study of gender relations in eighteenth-century narrative. Even in recent work in gender and narrative, the themes have been dealt with as discrete entities. For example, Raymond F. Hilliard has published articles on oral violence toward women in Frances Burney's Evelina and in Samuel Richardson's Clarissa, and Paula Marantz Cohen has used systems theory to describe Clarissa as an anorectic daughter.¹ Each critic argues that eating is frequently linked to relations of power as they arise within the emerging bourgeois family which is characteristically

nuclear or elementary in form. They have recognized eating, and sometimes the act of not eating, as a powerful way of representing collective tension and perpetrating collective violence toward a member of the group who contravenes accepted codes of behavior and structures of paternal authority.

While studies of incest in Renaissance drama have been in evidence for some time,² incest, like eating, has only fairly recently begun to receive significant attention as a recurrent theme in eighteenth-century narrative. Of particular interest among the recent work on the subject are three articles, John Allen Stevenson's "Clarissa and the Harlowes Once More," T. G. A. Nelson's "Incest in the Early Novel and Related Genres," and Ellen Pollak's "Beyond Incest: Gender and the Politics of Transgression in Aphra Behn's Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister." These articles have linked incest and its thematic recurrence in a variety of ways to issues of power and legitimation, identity and agency from the eighteenth century to modern times. Lynda Zwinger's Daughters and Fathers: The Sentimental Romance of Heterosexuality, and a collection of essays titled Re-figuring the Father also examine features of parent-child relations in narrative in a thought-provoking manner, as does a chapter on Tom Jones that touches on incest in Christine van Boheemen's The Novel as Family Romance. These studies of incest have collectively suggested that incest functions as a figure for authority at

the level of the family in a manner akin to the way kingship implies authority at the level of the state and that this is why incest repeatedly gets written into attempts to imagine authority within and beyond the family in the eighteenth century.³

I believe that because the themes of incest and eating are each deeply concerned with the question of paternal authority, it is not by accident that they appear so frequently in tandem in English narrative of the eighteenth century which is a period that both historians of the family and historians of the novel have in different ways identified with the codification of the structure we now customarily refer to as the affective elementary or nuclear family and with the new conceptualization of bourgeois subjectivity.⁴ This is not to say that incest and eating do not occur together before the eighteenth century. For example in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Tereus' incestuous rape and mutilation of his wife's sister, Philomela, is avenged by the women killing Tereus' son, Itys, and serving him to his father as food. In the Tereus and Philomela tale, the marriage to Procne is contracted to bring about an alliance between Athens and Thrace (Tereus' place of origin). As Tereus wants to control Athens and his progeny represents the possible continuation of that control, the killing and eating of Itys causes the demise of Tereus' political power.⁵ Another example is to be found in King Lear. In this play, incest occurs as a submerged theme in Lear's

insistence that his daughters pledge to love him all--that is, to love him unreservedly over all other claims to their love. Lear eventually represents Goneril and Regan as sharp-toothed, devouring vipers for failing to live up to their pledge to love their father completely and unconditionally. Against the background of the Fool's likening of ungrateful children to the parasitic cuckoo that bites off the head of the host sparrow that has nurtured it (1.4.211-12), the play shows how Lear's attempt to retain control of his daughters through a coerced declaration of an affective tie leads first to the delapidation of the King's body and then to the demise of his kingship.⁶

In these examples from Ovid and Shakespeare, violent images of eating and powerful narratives of explicit or submerged incest converge to articulate concerns about generational tensions and the breakdown of a political order that may result from those tensions. The configuration of eating and incest that emerges in the eighteenth-century narratives that I consider in this study, however, is more markedly domestic. By this I mean that incest occurs with distinct patterns of eating in a coherent family structure, usually nuclear in form and affective in character, that is under internal stress, rather than the stress that results from a crisis at the level of the state. Taking my cue from Zwinger, who identifies novelistic familial ties as simultaneously affective and erotic, I argue that in eighteenth-century narrative the power differential between

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

familial head and family members is bound to the hierarchical structure of the family dominated actually and emotionally by the father.⁷ I suggest that incestuous and commensal relations, each of which operate along lines of power and authority, emerge forcefully in representations of the nuclear family while each also supports that family structure by deferring or averting its fragmentation through the formation of other affective ties.

Because sexual and food-related behavior in eighteenth-century narrative frequently have a great deal more to do with power than with reproduction or hunger per se, I maintain that both erotic behavior and the provision or withholding of food function as a display of domination. In a display of erotic behavior between father and daughter for example--especially if one partner is unwilling--the display may articulate, and in some ways validate, the father's claim to supreme power.⁸ In narratives of the period, conflicts over power are frequently characterized and measured in terms of quotidian family life. At the same time, the wider social and political implications of the way in which power operates are relegated to a less prominent--but ultimately not less important--position.

Milton's poem, Paradise Lost, for example, is a narrative moment that dramatizes the new emphasis on the familial and the domestic. As Satan is traditionally seen as a figure for Charles I's absolutism, his incest with Sin does at one level emerge as part of an attempt to wrest

political power. Yet when Milton makes Satan an incestuous rapist, he couches the bid for political power in the language of a domestic struggle between a father and his usurpatory son. Represented in this way, Satan upsets a well-regulated domestic paradigm in the poem within which father and sons have hitherto existed in a clearly delineated social/power structure. As Paradise Lost tells its story of domestic crisis, the poem links that crisis with, and prepares the ground for, the larger concern with transgressive eating in the poem. Satan's libidinous consumption of his own daughter early in the narrative sequence establishes both the conditions for her to be devoured by her offspring, and the prehistory to Eve's later eating of the forbidden fruit. The central episode of transgressive eating in Paradise Lost therefore emerges through incest, and both eating and incest are utilized as ways of talking about a type of domestic generational conflict. This configuration of the subjects of incest and eating is strongly in evidence in eighteenth-century narrative, the subject of which is so frequently intrafamilial relationships and the tensions that arise from them. I place these relationships and tensions at the center of my study.

Before I proceed to the theoretical bases of my project, I wish to explain my particular uses of the term incest, and to show how I arrive at the definitions of family that are used in this study. My aim is not to

interrogate incest in eighteenth-century narrative in terms of changes in laws regulating marriage and debates about the degrees within which marriage has been permitted by the Church or by civil law at different historical moments. This decision is based primarily on the fact that, in the works under consideration, the incest theme does not arise most forcefully out of a question about whether a man and a woman may be licitly joined in matrimony in the sense of marriage as a religious sacrament (as it had been viewed by the Church since the twelfth century), or as a civil contract (as it became defined in 1653 during the Puritan Commonwealth when the civil marriage service became required by law).⁹ Indeed, in these works, marriage per se is often a less direct concern than sexual relations and gendered behavior. Incest more often surfaces as a cause for concern in sexually-fraught and erotically-charged situations within several of the considerable number of elementary families in the works under consideration. Hence, for the purpose of this study, I define incest more narrowly than it was defined prior to the Reformation (when marriage or sexual relations within the seventh degree of kinship according to the German system of computation were considered incestuous), and more narrowly than the definition of incest in the Christian West based upon the Levitical prohibitions that became codified in England in the Table of Kindred and Affinity in 1560 and 1563.¹⁰ I use the term incest first to describe sexual relations between members of an elementary

121

by S

def

text

the

22

1

of

22

22

ti

a

t

f

f

n

family linked--or believed to be linked--by consanguinity or by surrogacy. Although this may seem a rather modern definition for a project dealing with eighteenth-century texts (it was not, after all, until the twentieth century that the definition of incest in England was legally narrowed to sexual relations with a close blood relative),¹¹ I use this definition because I am concerned with a series of relationships in the narratives that do not rely on legal or ecclesiastical clarification to be considered incestuous. The relationships to which I give my attention operate at the level of sexual relations between, or sexual desire for, a near relative--usually a child or sibling--that belongs to the natal or surrogate family.

I also use the term incest more widely as a metaphor for a particular relationship of power between parent and child generated by the emotional obligation that the child incurs of his or her parent because the parent gives him or her nurture in the form of food and shelter. My thinking on this point has been shaped by two scholars working on incest in historical and modern family relations. Florence Rush's study of ancient Judaeo-Christian cultures and psychiatrist Judith Lewis Herman's study based upon case studies in contemporary North America have identified the key structures that have obscured, and the cultural codes and biblical apparati that have enabled, erotic, power, and sometimes sexual relations between family members--and fathers and daughters in particular--to go uncommented

upon.¹² Rush and Herman have analyzed the kinds of obligations that are generated when an inferior in terms of power, social status, and the capability to provide for himself or herself accepts nurture and shelter from his or her superior. Herman expresses this most succinctly when she argues that children are a "captive population" entirely dependent upon their parents or other adults for their basic needs, and that they are for this reason compelled to do whatever they perceive to be necessary to preserve a relationship with their caretakers (Herman, 27). Herman's point is very pertinent to the present study when one considers that the kind of domestic arrangement and household she describes gradually evolved during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from significantly different forms in feudal times. By the eighteenth century, the household consisting of the parents and children of the natal family living under one roof to the virtual exclusion of the extended family had largely displaced earlier feudal household arrangements. The gradual movement toward the nuclear style of household is discernible in changing patterns of commensality between the Middle ages and the eighteenth century.

Food historians and students of English eating habits and dietary practices before the eighteenth century agree that the celebratory banquets of the Middle Ages and Renaissance known to us from literary and other sources were the privilege of the few. Even though the peasant orders did

participate in lavish banquets, such events usually punctuated their more everyday experience of scarcity and enforced frugality.¹³ These scholars further suggest that the internal structure of the medieval banquet gives an insight into the respective roles of powerful nobles and the peasant orders. They cite evidence of exacting attention to seating arrangements and to who was served first and from which dishes, to argue convincingly that the medieval banquet was not primarily a gastronomic event, but that it served ritual, aesthetic and religious needs, and that the banquet was extensively guided by social imperatives. For example, although banquets took place in a common hall, clear distinctions were made between upper and lower tables. Providing lavish food and beverages in significant quantities was a way of emphasizing the power of a regional 'king' and of attracting supporters with a display of resources. Those who partook of the food confirmed their allegiance to the provider and their willingness to go to battle to protect his interests so that the banquet served as a form of patronage;¹⁴ selling one's services, oneself, or one's children into slavery in return for a guarantee of food was an established practice in England from the early fifth century to the end of the first feudal age (circa 1100).¹⁵ The sending down of dishes from upper to lower tables during feudal times might therefore be better understood as a demonstration of the provider's resources and his prerogative to supervise lower orders than a

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

generous and disinterested attempt to combat hunger or to fulfill an ideal of Christian charity.

At the beginning of the second feudal age, everyday eating observed similar distinctions within the common arena of the great hall. However, with the successive phases of the granting of fiefs during the first feudal age (initially to enable knights to accomplish certain defensive functions), the gradual enrichment of some nobles by gaining ascendancy over lesser nobles, the growth of towns and trading centers, improvements in agricultural methods making lands more profitable and so worth retaining, and the related shift to a system of rents, the internal order of the medieval hall gradually began to alter.¹⁶ At the same time that the rent system began to reshape feudal ties between nobles and vassals, enfeoffed nobility that had enlarged their wealth were able to develop relative self-sufficiency so that a noble household might easily live off the products of its estates. As this phase of increased self-sufficiency continued, and certainly by the middle of the fourteenth century, it became increasingly common for noblemen to eat in a separate chamber and to delegate to their stewards the supervision of the high table in the hall.

Food historians Stephen Mennell and Bridget Ann Henisch both observe that the shift toward eating in a private chamber with one's immediate family marks a sharp distinction in an otherwise relatively organic household

with several intermediate ranks of gentlemen, yeoman and menial servants. The removal of the proprietor and his family to a separate chamber, Mennell further suggests, not only alters the social functions of the commensal table by generating a greater privacy for the noble and a greater social distance between a noble and his minions, but it also creates changes in the kinds of dishes served--as evidenced by the development of a haute cuisine at this time in England.¹⁷ In the same way that fine distinctions within seating arrangements and in who was served first and with which dishes offered codes for creating and cementing differences in rank and status in the earlier feudal period, so the segregation of those of the highest order provided such a code for the later feudal period. Because the act of secluding oneself during mealtimes is predicated on a notion of exclusivity, whom one includes in the exclusive group attains great significance; any invitation to dine at the more private table would have been deemed a mark of privilege.

Such changes in eating arrangements during the later Middle Ages and in the sixteenth century are clearly discernible in a number of the cookbooks that were beginning to appear in Europe at this time. Cookbooks of the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries do not simply presume that a more private chamber is to be used for the noble and his family to eat in, and that a more exclusive group is to be fed; their recipes also contain information

about the higher quality and smaller quantity of individual dishes to be served. In Italian and French cookbooks, for example, the attention to delicacy, the choice and novelty of ingredients, the specialized skills required to prepare those ingredients and the elegance with which food was served suggests that a nobleman was no longer distinguishable by his ability to provide and consume a large amount of food, but by the sophistication and subtlety of his table.¹⁸ A similar conclusion might be drawn about English nobility based upon the earliest known example of a printed cookery book in England. In this English cookbook, entitled This Is The Boke of Cokery (1500), food is treated as though it were to be enjoyed as much with the eye and for the technical virtuosity involved in its preparation as with the palate or for its properties of dispelling hunger. Like a large number of the early cookbooks that follow it in the sixteenth century, This Is The Boke Of Cokery is male authored and it is of a medieval and courtly character in that it gives receipts for elaborate dishes which take time to prepare. This Is the Boke of Cokery is clearly addressed, like the better known Boke of Kervynge (1508), to the knowledgeable professional male cook (women were not employed as cooks in noble households) engaged in the preparation of lavish dishes with many costly ingredients for the noble household; elaborate details as to which of these dishes might be served together and how they might be presented are also given. Although the commensal group

sharing food is less extensive in the sixteenth century than formerly, it still consists of a noble household with courtiers. The omission of details about the procuring of food and the processing and preserving of ingredients in cookbooks of this period suggests that these tasks were performed by menials rather than the specialist male cook who dressed dishes for the table.

In the last two decades of the sixteenth century and by the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, a rather different type of cookbook is in evidence in England. Thomas Dawson's The Good Huswife's Jewell of 1585, and Gervase Markham's The English Hous-Wife of 1615, signal a departure from the courtly style of cookbook. Written, as their titles suggest, for the 'hous-wife', Dawson's and Markham's books include instructions on the practical details of running a household--baking, brewing, dairy work, preserving--as well as receipts for 'Physicke.' The change in emphasis discernible in the cookbooks when they identify gentlewomen as the overseers and managers of smaller households rather than having these functions performed by hired servants or vassals, concurs with the widespread belief among family historians about the kinds of radical changes that had taken place in the conceptualization and organization of the domestic unit by this time. The cookbooks--particularly Markham's--make assumptions about the ready availability of certain ingredients and about the housewife's access to a large garden or country estate from which these ingredients

might be freshly gathered--once she has carefully garnered and germinated the seeds that enable their growth.¹⁹ Of particular interest from the point of view of the present study is these cookbooks' elaboration of a discourse of housewifery that links a woman's success in the management of food to her success in managing herself, her body, and her immediate environment. Before giving instructions on brewing, baking, weaving, physic and cookery, Markham describes these skills in the subtitle to his book as "The inward and outward Vertues which ought to be in a compleat Woman...". In his first chapter he further associates what is wholesome with what the household can provide for itself and he enjoins the housewife to

Let her dyet be wholesome and cleanly, prepared at due hours, and cookt with care and diligence: let it be rather to satisfie nature, than our affections, and apter to kill hunger than to revive new appetites; let it proceed more from the provision of her own yard, than the furniture of the Markets; and let it be rather esteemed for the familiar acquaintance she hath with it, than for the strangeness and rarity it bringeth from other Countries.

To conclude, our English Houswife must be of chaste thought, stout courage, patient, untired, watchful, diligent, witty, pleasant, constant in friendship, full of good Neighbour-hood, wise in Discourse, but not frequent therein... secret in her affairs. (emphases added)²⁰

Markham's placement of women at the center of his discourse of domestic management and self management heralds a new era in the cookbook genre. This is not to suggest that the courtly style of cookbook written by men to be used by

professional male chefs in noble kitchens disappeared altogether in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, for there were a number of cookbooks of this kind printed between 1660 and 1730.²¹ However, books of the courtly kind were clearly eclipsed in the latter half of the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century by a vast array of books written by women explicitly for gentlewomen readers and for female cooks preparing food for much smaller households.

During the latter half of the seventeenth century, two cookbook writers, Shirley John and Hannah Wolley, were very popular. Wolleys's The Gentlewoman's Companion (1673) is particularly interesting in the way that it moves from general advice on conduct and demeanor, to etiquette, and only then to cookery; before Wolley brings her gentlewoman reader to the table to eat the food that the gentlewoman herself has prepared, Wolley presents a series of codes by which women are to govern their bodies and temper their desire for food. Her advice on serving food not only reflects a wider trend of the separation of each diner's personal dish and utensils from his or her neighbor's, but it couples this with ways in which the gentlewoman might graciously preside at table.²² Hence advice about not appearing greedy by overfilling the mouth is juxtaposed with a caution to the gentlewoman to exert herself in a way that will not make her sweat profusely while carving.²³ Efficient and thrifty household management through the processes of

preserving, distilling and curing is everywhere stressed, leading one analyst of the the period's cookbooks to describe the female-authored books as characterized by "a pleasant ingenuity of adaptation and economy".²⁴

Later cookbooks by women, such as Eliza Smith's The Compleat Housewife (1727), Hannah Glasse's The Art of Cookery Made Plain and Easy (1747), and Elizabeth Raffald's The Experienced English Housekeeper (1769)--all of which went through multiple editions--underline the considerable changes that had taken place in household arrangements to create the gentlewomen who oversaw provisions and who extensively supervised the preparation of food for a smaller household.²⁵ Among these changes, as Mennell points out, is a distinct departure from medieval ideals of "lavish charity and keeping open house" (118). Following in the footsteps of Markham, the instructions that eighteenth-century cookbooks offer to the gentlewoman whose skill at housewifery is to transform the produce of landed estate and trade into domestically-consumable goods is everywhere permeated with a spirit of thrift; her mission is defined not in terms of the resources she will expend, but in terms of the resources she will conserve and create for the benefit of the household. And because that household is organized along markedly different lines from the extended household consisting of lords and vassals, the domestic table, with its more private mealtimes, implies a very different kind of domestic economy than that of the great hall.²⁶ First of all, the domestic

table situates the gentlewoman manager of food at its center and makes her accountable in a new way for the preparation of food and beverages. Because this type of commensality marks a domestic economy in which food consumption can be monitored, measured and controlled with ease, the cookbook's monitoring of table manners and recommendation of female gustatory self-restraint creates an analogical link between the privately-consumable food and the woman who regulates its consumption in conjunction with the regulation of her own body. Finally, the domestic table contracts the concept of household to a kernel consisting primarily of family members and dependents as a commensal group.

As a result of these changes in household composition and the contraction in household size, and the coincidence of these with developments within the nuclear family toward a more recognizably modern form, I modify my use of the term family in this study to include not only those linked by consanguinity or by virtue of surrogacy, but also those dependents--particularly domestic servants--who had long been regarded as the 'children' of the male householder in family obedience literature.²⁷ Information available in the cookbooks about who was responsible for food preparation, how food was served and by whom, the size and structure of household that recipes were geared to, suggests that domestic arrangements and patterns of commensality from the early eighteenth century anticipate the arrangement Herman describes in her analysis of caretaker and dependant. These

commensal arrangements are very much in evidence in the eighteenth-century narratives that I consider, where they are vitally important in understanding the various configurations of obligation and debt, and of women's household management and self-management, that produce the conditions for sexually-predatory and incestuous behaviors. In the chapters that follow, then, I do not place my primary emphasis on the physical consumption of food and actual occurrences of incest defined as relations between members of a single kinship group within prohibited degrees of consanguinity as designated by law in a given historical moment. Instead, I consider incest and eating as both metaphors and symbolic systems--as ways of framing and talking about familial economies and transactional relationships therein.

I turn now to the theoretical underpinnings of my work which derive from several disciplines--psychoanalysis, structuralist anthropology, and feminist cultural and literary theories--and begin with the account of incest offered by Sigmund Freud. In Totem and Taboo (1913), Freud claims that the incest prohibition came into being as a result of rivalries between men--the father and his sons--in the patriarchal horde. According to Freud, the sons wanted to be like their father, and yet they were ambivalent about the father because of their desire to possess their mother. Because the sons were prevented from having access to the maternal object of desire, they killed their father and the

incest prohibition came into being at this founding moment of culture to prevent the future reinauguration of hostilities within the kin group over competition for women.²⁸

Although I believe that rivalries between men have an important part to play in the analysis of incest and eating as interrelated concerns, I feel that two elements of Freud's theory require some modification if they are to be useful to such an endeavor. Firstly, if attention is to be given to the proposition that sons seek to be like their fathers through the heterosexual appropriation of a woman that belongs to the father, then the daughter is as suitable a candidate for the sons' attention as the mother--indeed sometimes a more suitable one--because the daughter can be understood as 'belonging' most unequivocally to the father by virtue of his paternity. Secondly, Freud's assumption of a heterosexual matrix of desire--of son desiring mother--needs examination. In Totem and Taboo, the moment in which incest comes into being implicitly follows an earlier understanding that sexual desire is heterosexual desire. Yet when in his essay of 1927, "The Ego and the Super-Ego (Ego Ideal)", Freud introduces the Oedipus complex to elaborate on the way in which 'ego formation' occurs, he suggests that gendered identity emerges through the effective operation of the incest taboo. In this discussion 'male' and 'masculine' are not coupled in a pre-given way. Because the male child *initially* identifies with the parent of the same sex, his

father, Freud remarks that that each individual has a "constitutional bisexuality": it is when the mother is chosen as a love-object over the father that the Oedipal situation arises, and only from this point on does the son's identification with his father "tak[e] on a hostile colouring and chang[e] to a wish to get rid of the father in order to take his place with his mother".²⁹

Freud's argument in "The Ego and the Super-Ego (Ego Ideal)" works from the premise that two choices, identification with the mother or identification with the father, are available, and he describes the former as "more normal". But in following this line of reasoning, as Judith Butler has observed, Freud resolves the Oedipus complex by presuming that a taboo against homosexuality is operative prior to the heterosexual incest taboo.³⁰ Thus the child entering the Oedipal situation is already 'predisposed' to a heterosexuality that is created by the taboo that forbids erotic attachments between people of the same sex. This suggests that desire in the Freudian realm of culture is effected through a series of displacements and, if this is the case, then further displacements ought to be possible. If the father is the more direct object of his son's desire as Freud's notion of a "constitutional bisexuality" would seem to imply, then it is important that any study of incest that makes use of Freud does not wholly put aside same-sex attraction by assuming that a heterosexual matrix predates desire. Indeed, what is explained by Freud as a heterosexual

competition between men over women might be readily viewed as a feature of an ambivalent--part homosocial, part homoerotic--bond between men that may be subsequently displaced onto other objects of desire.³¹

I elaborate on the subjects of the father's charge or ownership of the daughter and the ways in which ties between men operate by drawing on Lévi-Strauss' well-known argument in The Elementary Structures of Kinship that women are the 'gifts' that are given through the institution of marriage by one patrilineal clan to another. A woman who is exchanged serves the social function of facilitating commerce (by which is meant interaction as well as trade) between the separate clans. The exchange of women gives rise to exogamy. The exchanged woman also performs an important symbolic function of differentiation and identification. She signifies and underlines the separate collective identities of the two groups and yet highlights their commonality as complete patrilineal systems which expel some women and receive others. In this sense, as Gayle Rubin has pointed out, exchanged women are relational terms, or conduits, between groups of men.³² Lévi-Strauss' argument is valuable for its identification of the bonds that exchange generates between men and for suggesting that there may be a greater impetus for groups of men to be aligned rather than for them to be in conflict. But while Lévi-Strauss' theory establishes exchange as important to the consolidation of group identity and the group's differentiation of itself

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

from its exchange partner, it assumes that exchange occurs relatively unproblematically. Because of this assumption, the theory of exchange does not explore the tensions that are inherent in the giving away of a valuable item to a group with whom one's own group is in most respects in competition, or the psychic effects of the breach in group integrity that is signaled by the loss of one of its members.

Through her study of pollution and taboo, anthropologist Mary Douglas examines precisely such tensions as they arise around the practice of exchanging women in marriage. In Purity and Danger, Douglas establishes the base for her commentary on bride exchange by arguing that the body is initially identifiable through culturally-coherent codes that enable humans to comprehend its boundaries. Humans understand what is the body by deciding what is not the body. In this process, body orifices--the sites at which sexual acts and food ingestion and expulsion take place--are experienced as sources of anxiety because they mark breaches in the wholeness of the body. Although ideas about what constitutes the body operate at the physical level, they gain their meaning through psychic distinctions that operate in many cultures through the concepts of pollution and taboo. And these concepts in turn gain their force through a culture's expectations of the danger that will be unleashed by the transgression of cultural codes regulating bodily acts.³³ Douglas therefore sees the body as a model for other

forms of regulation--especially dietary regulation and regulation through exogamy. She argues that dietary regulation and restrictions concerning with whom one may have sexual relations each constitutes a coherent system of social interaction, or a sign system, that operates through the observation of accepted cultural codes of behavior.

When she analyzes exogamy per se, Douglas considers it in terms of the psychic effects of adherence to, or a breach of, such cultural codes. She suggests that because the exogamous arrangement is both a way of codifying a power structure and defining specific clans' positions within it, and a way of articulating the identity of individual clans, the woman who moves from one clan group to another is both the system's most perfect representative, and most surrounded by disorder because she will break the closure of her own group to join another. Douglas further argues that where a wife comes from a group with which her husband's group ordinarily competes for resources, the marital arrangement is often a source of conflict over material interests. Firstly, a married daughter is a human resource that her own community is not allowed to utilize, even while she is the means by which her husband's group increases its human resources. Secondly, if and when the married daughter bears children, her progeny, already a cause for concern because they swell the number of the rival group, *simultaneously* and alarmingly bring together the crossing of *community* and blood lines.³⁴ The daughter's anomalous

position as a part of two groups yet on the margins of each, makes her an object of fear: she becomes--as do other marriageable women--the focus of attention in family relations and in a variety of questions about the kinds of authority and coerced loyalty that arise from paternity and from the sibling bond. It is through Douglas's understanding of the body as a signifying system--and the critical role of the daughter's body in making meaning--that I approach my subjects of eating and incest in eighteenth-century narrative.

While I have already indicated that my concern in this study is more with the deployment of eating and incest as metaphors than with actual acts of incest and eating, the physical body--because it is the corporeal entity from which such metaphors derive their force--inevitably surfaces in my discussion. In looking at representations of the female body in individual works in the chapters that follow, I have drawn on a wide range of feminist scholars, two of whom, Florence Rush and Judith Lewis Herman, I have already mentioned in connection with the indebtedness of children to their parents. Rush's examination of biblical laws and Herman's analysis of the incest prohibitions in Leviticus that make the daughter a focus of desire have also been extraordinarily useful to me in thinking through the corporeal dimensions of the father-daughter erotic. Nancy Armstrong's 'political history' of the novel, Desire and Domestic Fiction, which early identified the performative

functions of early modern narrative and its contribution to the construction of gendered identity has had a pervasive influence on my work as has Judith Butler's Gender Trouble. Armstrong's insights on the preoccupation with the female body and its regulation in seventeenth-century conduct books, on master and domestic servant relationships, and the increasingly private sphere of the bourgeois household in eighteenth-century narrative dovetail with the way I frame incest and eating as metaphors that gain particular meanings in that sphere. Butler's questioning of heterosexual and homosexual as exclusive categories has provided me with a way of thinking through a spectrum of desire orientations, and of examining various representations of male and female bodies, particularly in the second of the chapters that follow.³⁵

My readings have been considerably enriched by thinking of gender as a construct in line with Armstrong's and Butler's use of Foucauldian theory in their analyses of gender.³⁶ However, my attention to hierarchical structures within the nuclear family and my use of particular anthropological models to examine these structures has led me to place greater emphasis than Armstrong and Butler on the symbolic weight of paternal authority wielded by a patriarch. By the eighteenth century this concept of authority had already had currency in the Western mind for at least two centuries. Contemporary ideas about authority--including John Locke's widely-read and highly-influential

Two Treatises of Government (1690)--were shaped by the revival and extension in the seventeenth century of the sixteenth-century debate about the nature of patriarchal authority which had in turn repeatedly used the analogue of the father's position as family head as a way of framing arguments for and against absolutism.³⁷

From the point of view of the present essay and its use of Milton's epic poem to mark a shift in emphasis in narrative toward domestic matters, Paradise Lost offers itself as an illustration of the central importance of the father figure. When Milton wrote Paradise Lost he did so both out of and against a tradition of conceptualizing political power in terms of a father and his children. Although Milton uses Satan to cast Charles I as a tyrant and misuser of power in Paradise Lost, the germ of this representation can be found much earlier in his Eikonoklastes (1649), written explicitly to refute a royalist work, Eikon Basilike that was apparently in circulation on the day of the king's death but that was not published until February 1649. Written as though by the king himself, and characterizing Charles as a Christ-like martyr through a series of reflections and meditations, Eikon Basilike unabashedly attempts to link fatherhood and kingship to generate an emotive argument about the kinds of duty that ought to arise from filial-paternal affection.³⁸ These are precisely the concerns that repeatedly come up in Paradise Lost and the three prose narratives that I consider

in this essay, as indeed they do in wide range of eighteenth-century narrative, from Aphra Behn's epistolary Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister (1684-87), John Dryden's Absalom and Achitophel (1681) and Jonathan Swift's Tale of a Tub (1704), to later century works such as Tobias Smollett's Humphry Clinker (1771), Frances Burney's Evelina (1778), Elizabeth Inchbald's A Simple Story (1791), and Matthew Lewis' The Monk (1796).

The figure of the father has traditionally had an important influence on ways of thinking about power relations within the family and beyond, and in the way that power is deployed. This figure also looms large in works of the period that raise questions about the proper use of power and the ownership of narrative authority. For these reasons I suggest that, within the narrative representation of the nuclear family, the figure of the father helps to generate a discourse of eroticized affective desire and that it offers a way of comprehending that discourse. Although I do draw on insights from Armstrong's and Butler's uses of Foucauldian theory to demonstrate that female figures in the narratives I consider are at least partially gendered through contemporary ideas about female sexuality, about women's bodies, their reproductive functions and the kinds of work for which they are deemed suitable as a result of these ideas, I also argue that these figures are *simultaneously* constructed through, and often *incomprehensible* (as in Milton's myth) without explicit

reference to, the father as a primary--though not exclusive--source of authority.

I have attempted to treat each of the four narratives in this study as discrete works while simultaneously extending my argument about the deep-seated importance of food and sex as systems of signification in the eighteenth-century literary imagination, in the emerging bourgeois novel with its strong emphasis on family life and domestic relations, and in the period's ideas about gendered identity. To this end, each successive chapter either teases out the arguments of earlier chapters or builds upon them by returning to recurring patterns of family organization and commensality and by examining similarities and differences in the way these are treated. The canonical stature of each of the works, the wealth of critical materials that each has generated, and the need to give due attention to situating my work in relation to the criticism that has preceded it, have also contributed to my decision to have each reading stand in its own right. This approach has raised an array of questions about how incest and eating have been treated as separate concerns in the four works, and it has yielded some tentative suggestions as to why substantial discussions of the recurrent concerns of incest and eating in eighteenth-century narrative have not been undertaken.

In the first chapter, I lay out the groundwork of my argument by isolating thematic patterns and metaphors in Paradise Lost that reappear in the later prose narratives

and by considering how psychoanalytical and anthropological theories can provide ways of making sense of these. I then consider Milton's attempt to imagine an authoritative subject through a genealogically-based model which deploys incest to represent Satan as a tyrannical father and a rebellious son. Situating myself in relation to the widely-accepted reading of the Satan-Sin union as a parody of right relations between Adam and Eve, I show that the Satan-Sin union loses some of its force as such a parody when it is retraced first in the Sin-Death coupling, then in their Hell-hound progeny's rape of Sin, and finally in the union of Adam and Eve. By showing that the coupling of Sin and Satan and the rape of Sin by her son, Death, and then by their hell-hound progeny is predatory in both libidinous and alimentary senses, I demonstrate that the primary assertion of male appetitive impulses in Paradise Lost simultaneously disallows female appetite, female sexual desire and female agency. As a result of Eve's inability to have being separate from her author, Adam, the main episode of transgressive eating in the poem cannot originate with the daughter, and this problematizes Milton's concept of volition. Because desire is shown to originate with Eve's creator, moreover, I suggest that Eve's quest for god-like knowledge actually stands in for the son's desire for his father's knowledge. As a result, when elements of the incestuous father reappear in Adam's union with Eve, and 'Eve's' search for knowledge takes the form of imbibing

knowledge of a forbidden variety, the twinned themes of incest and eating provide a clearer understanding of how deeply filial indebtedness is embedded in the concept of paternity in Milton's narrative. Finally, I argue that a complicated relation exists between the early injunction against eating, a filial rebellion that is heralded by an act of father-daughter incest, and an act of transgressive eating for which the daughter is held responsible.

In the second chapter, I identify a particular culture of indebtedness--a politics of consumption, or a politics of food--that emerges in the interstices between homeroticism and homosociality in Robinson Crusoe. Drawing on recent scholarship that shows that sexual identity did not function discretely and unproblematically along axes of masculine and feminine in eighteenth-century culture, I demonstrate the power of cannibalism as a metaphor for articulating sexually-predatory relations between fathers and sons, and masters and minions. Through the deployment of the politics of consumption, I show how a particular variety of exploitation, modeled extensively on domestic arrangements in Crusoe's native England, facilitates the growth of a consumption-oriented new world economy on Crusoe's island in which the son moves beyond rivalry with the father to become like his father. This occurs in two phases, first by means of predatory father-son relations, and then through a displacement of the son's subject position onto the maternal

body resulting in the incestuous cannibalization of that body.

In the third chapter, I turn my attention to the ramifications that the culture of indebtedness has for the eponymous daughter when it reappears in the mid-century English country house of Clarissa. I explore the tensions between the socio-cultural need for giving the daughter in exogamous marriage and the paternal, fraternal and avuncular imperatives to retain Clarissa as at once the symbol and the embodiment of family unity and wealth. Contextualizing my discussion of Clarissa's value in these respects against biblical commentary in the novel about licit and illicit uses of the daughter in the father's house and explicit codes governing commensality, I suggest that the daughter's tremendous value as a forbidden object of desire ruptures the myth of the nuclear bourgeois family as the locus of affective ties and as a safe haven for nurture. By identifying the daughter as the family member who must yield to familial demands or be denied community and commensality, I trace similarities between the uncles, the brother, and the father who would hoard Clarissa for intrafamilial enjoyment rather than give her in marriage, and a rapist, would-be husband that forces her to accept commensal terms that culminate in her starvation.

Whereas the son's oral aggressiveness has been associated with the process of individuation from the mother in Robinson Crusoe, the daughter's emaciation emerges in

Clarissa as a feature of her father's capacity to effect her diminution. I emphasize the rejection of food by a woman, rather than its assimilation by a man as in the previous chapter, to argue that Clarissa's food refusal presents itself as the asymmetrical counterpart to the voracious male that Western culture dominated by the heterosexual matrix offers to the female. Although the Harlowe house, with its private, modest and closely-monitorable eating arrangements, contrasts strongly with the distributive and more public eating arrangements of an earlier period, it nevertheless relies upon an assumed power differential between food providers and receivers of food for its survival as an integral body.

In the last chapter I examine the implications for the nuclear family unit of retaining woman as erotic object and valuable property within the enclosed natal family. I demonstrate that although incest is only explicitly named in one of three important bed episodes in Tom Jones, a philosophy of retaining game animals exclusively for the use of landowners underwrites the latent irregularities of the other two bed episodes. In this discussion, the issues of rightful access to landed property and rightful access to women become conflated in Fielding's extended use of a hunting analogy that casts marriageable women as prized game, and masculine heterosexual prowess as coextensive with the capacity to eat large quantities of animal flesh. In contrast to Clarissa, in which marriage ultimately remains a

source of tension between the natal family and the potential marital family, the final bed episode in Tom Jones celebrates a marriage in which the fragmentation of landed estates is averted, a complete transfer of property along blood lines is achieved, and domestic harmony is reestablished. When the resulting household subsequently yields issue in the form of a single boy and a single girl, it not only reproduces itself, but it duplicates the brother-sister household of Paradise Hall whence the illegitimate Tom Jones sprang. My closing chapter therefore traces in Tom Jones a return to a mythical self-contained paradise very like that first encountered in Paradise Lost: it shows that Fielding's country-house version of paradise relies as profoundly as the model that it follows upon the assumption that certain intrafamilial relations and certain conditions governing food distribution and consumption are tacitly endorsed.

Rather than explaining incest solely in terms of a need to contain father-son conflict as does Freud, or exclusively in terms of a need for harmonious bonds between men, in Lévi-Straussian fashion, Douglas' theory of food and the body as signifying systems, as it dovetails with certain strands of feminist scholarship, enables me to argue that the culture of indebtedness I have identified has a significant role to play in the reproduction of a particular familial power structure along lines of gender in eighteenth-century narrative. Through my focus on incest and

eating, which have not hitherto been given sustained attention as interrelated concerns in eighteenth-century studies, I seek to foster a discussion of the kinds of filial obligation which arise from parental nurture to support incestuous erotic and sexual behaviors within the family. At the same time I hope to suggest through the currency of many of the gender configurations I examine in this essay that the permutations of masculine and feminine gender identity I have observed in eighteenth-century narrative have some bearing on the way gender is conceived in our own age through food practices and sexual relations.

Notes

1. Raymond F. Hilliard, "Clarissa and Ritual Cannibalism," PMLA 105, no. 5 (1990): 1083-97; Raymond F. Hilliard, "Laughter Echoing From Mouth to Mouth: Symbolic Cannibalism and Gender in Evelina," Eighteenth-Century Life 17 (1993): 46-61; Paula Marantz Cohen, The Daughter's Dilemma: Family Process and the Nineteenth-Century Domestic Novel (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), chap.

2.

2. Discussions of incest in literary studies of the Renaissance include Lois Beuler's "The Structural Uses of Incest in English Renaissance Drama," Renaissance Drama 15 (1984): 115-45; Lynda E. Boose's "The Father's House and the Daughter in It: The Structures of Western Culture's Daughter-Father Relationship," in Daughters and Fathers, ed. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 19-74; Bruce Thomas Boehrer's Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England: Literature, Kinship and Kingship (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992); and Richard McCabe's, Incest, Drama and Nature's Law 1550-1700 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

3. John Allen Stevenson, "The Courtship of the Family: Clarissa and the Harlowes Once More," English Literary History 48 (1981): 57-77; T. G. A. Nelson, "Incest in the Early Novel and Related Genres," Eighteenth-Century Life 16, no. 1 (1992): 127-62; Ellen Pollak, "Beyond Incest: Gender and the Politics of Transgression in Aphra Behn's Love-Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister," in Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism, ed. Heidi Hutner (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 151-186; Lynda Zwinger, Daughters, Fathers, and the Novel: The Sentimental Romance of Heterosexuality (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991); Beth Kowaleski-Wallace and Patricia Yaeger ed., Re-figuring the Father: New Feminist Readings of Patriarchy (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989); Christine van Boheemen, The Novel as Family Romance: Language, Gender, and Authority From Fielding to Joyce (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987), chap. 2.

4. For histories of the family that deal with the emergence of the nuclear family structure and the growth of individualism in this period, see Lawrence Stone, The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800 (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), chap. 6; Edward Shorter, The Making of the Modern Family (New York: Basic Books, 1975), chap. 6; and Jack Goody, The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1,

129, 152. Although Goody challenges Stone and Shorter by suggesting that the family characterized by 'companionate' marriage and bound by affective ties was already in evidence as early as the twelfth century in some parts of Europe, his claim that the family emerged in its modern form largely through the gradual secularization of marriage is important for the way he codifies the nuclear family. As Goody's argument links the development of the nuclear affective family directly with the increasing secularization of marriage, he would seem to indicate that this form of family became fully fledged sometime in the latter half of the seventeenth century--that is--after the civil marriage service was first required by law in 1653. For treatments of the family in histories of the novel, see Ian Watt, The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), 138-50; W. Austin Flanders, Structures of Experience: History, Society, and Personal Life in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1984), chap. 3; Nancy Armstrong, Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), chaps. 1 and 2; Michael McKeon, The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 180-81, 221-25, 228.

5. On the Tereus and Philomela story, see Patricia Klindienst Joplin, "The Voice of the Shuttle is Ours," Stanford Literature Review 1 (1984): 25-53.

6. On the conflict between giving up a daughter and retaining her in Shakespeare's plays, see Lynda E. Boose, "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare," PMLA 97, no. 3 (1982): 325-47.

7. Zwinger, 9, 11, 13.

8. On this point, see W. Arens, The Original Sin: Incest and its Meanings (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 147-48, 140

9. Goody, 151-2.

10. Goody, 135-37, 172-73, 175-76. The shift from the Roman to the Germanic system of computing degrees of kinship occurred in the eleventh century. Goody is especially clear in his explanation of the differences between the two systems.

11. Sybil Wolfram, In-Laws and Out-Laws: Kinship and Marriage in England (London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1987), 143, 157 n. 30; McCabe, 11.

12. Florence Rush, The Best-Kept Secret: Sexual Abuse of Children (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980), chaps. 3 and 10; Judith Lewis Herman, Father-Daughter Incest (London and Massachusetts, 1981), chap. 1.

13. Massimo Montanari, The Culture of Food (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 57; Philippa Pullar, Consuming Passions: A History of English Food and Appetite (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1970), 87, Ann Hagan, A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Food Processing and Consumption (Middlesex: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1992), 76.

14. Hagen, 76; Bridget Ann Henisch, Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1976), 56-57.

15. Hagen, 103.

16. Stephen Mennell All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present (Oxford and New York: Basil Backwell, 1985), 54-55, 58-9.

17. Henisch, 204; Mennell, 57.

18. Piero Camporesi, Exotic Brew: The Art of Living in the Age of Enlightenment, trans. Christopher Woodall (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994), 92.

19. Thomas Dawson, The Good Huswife's Jewell. Wherein is to be found most excellend [sic] and rare Deuises for Conceits in Cookery, found out by the practice of Thomas Dawson. Wherevnto is adjoynd sundry approved receipts for many souveraine oyles, and the way to distill many precious waters, and diuers approued medicines for many diseases. Also certain approued points of husbandry (London, 1585).
Gervase Markham, The English Hous-Wife, containing The Inward and outward Vertues which ought to be in a compleat Woman (London, 1664), 3. Markham was well known for a number of books on husbandry. In 1623, a number of his more popular works on planting, enriching barren soil, and animal husbandry and medicine, were gathered together and published in London under the title, A Way to Get Wealth, Containing fix Principall Vocations, or Callings, in which every good

Husband or Hous-wife, may lawfully imploy themselves. Here, as in The English Hous-Wife, Markham makes the housewife, and not her husband, responsible for seed collection and germination.

20. Markham, The English Hous-Wife, 3-4.

21. Among the courtly style of cookbook are Robert May's, The Accomplish't Cook, or the Art and Mystery of Cookery (1660), William Rabisha's, The Whole Body of Cookery Dissected (1661), Patrick Lamb, Royal Cookery; or the Complete Court Cook (1710), Robert Smith's, Court Cookery (1723), and Charles Carter's, The Complete Practical Cook (1730).

22. Stone, 256-57.

23. Hannah Wolley, The Gentlewoman's Companion; or, a Guide to the Female Sex: containing Directions of [sic] Behaviour, in all Places, Companies, Relations, and Conditions, from their Childhood down to Old Age... With Letters & Discourses upon all Occasions. Whereunto is added, A Guide for Cook-maids, Chamber-maids, Dairy-maids and all others that go to Service. The whole being an exact Rule for the Female Sex in General (London, 1673), 71, 65.

24. Pullar, 139, 161.

25. On the changing nature of women's work, and the gradual exclusion of women from many commercial occupations including brewing and baking, see Alice Clark, The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century (1919, reprint, New York: A. M. Kelley, 1968), 286, 39.

26. Stone notes the frequent use of the 'dumb waiter' as a way of increasing family privacy at mealtimes. He also notes that house plans of the eighteenth century begin to allocate space to corridors in order more rigorously to separate public rooms for mass entertaining from family rooms, servants quarters and entrances, and nursery areas for children. While the trend toward architectural privacy mainly affected the wealthy, similar practices of division were discernible in the houses of yeomen and tradesmen (253-55).

27. On this point, see Gordon J. Schochet, Patriarchalism and Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975), 64-83. The family obedience genre, representing servants and dependants and other members of the household as the children of the householder, has a long tradition. See, for example, Robert Cleaver, A Godly Form of Household Government, for the Ordering of Private Families (London, 1598); Thomas Cobbet, A Fruitful and Usefull Discourse Touching the Honour Due from Children to Parents (London, 1656; William Fleetwood, The Relative Duties of Parents, Husbands, Masters (London, 1705); and Daniel Defoe, The Family Instructor (London, 1715).

28. Sigmund Freud, Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement Between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

trans. James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1950), 13-16.

29. Sigmund Freud, "The Ego and the Super-Ego (Ego Ideal)," in The Ego and the Id, trans. Joan Riviere, ed. James Strachey (London: The Hogarth Press, 1974), 21, 22.

30. Judith Butler, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (New York and London: Routledge, 1990), 63-65.

31. On the continuities between heterosexual bonds that underwrite men's concern for the interests of other men, and homoerotic impulses that give rise to homosocial bonds between men, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), chap. 1.

32. Claude Lévi-Strauss, The Elementary Structures of Kinship, ed. Rodney Needham, trans. James Harle Bell and John von Sturmer (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 480, 491, 496; Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in Toward an Anthropology of Women, ed. Rayna Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 159.

33. Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 4, 113-14.

34. Douglas, 146-47.

35. Armstrong, 5, 20, 23, 95; Butler, chap. 2.

36. See Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), chaps. 1 and 2.

37. Arguments in support of absolutism include a tract, God and the King, that James I had published in 1615 and that was presumed to be written by Richard Mocket, John Swan's Redde Debitum: or, A Discourse in Defense of the Three Chief Fatherhoods (paternity, magistracy and priesthood), which was published in 1640, and of course Robert Filmer's Patriarchia, written in 1640, and published some forty years later. Arguments in support of populism include Henry Parker's response to Charles I's "'Answers' to Parliament's 'Nineteen Propositions'" entitled Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses (1642) and his later Jus Populi (1645), Samuel Rutherford's Lex, Rex, the Law and the Prince (1644) and John Locke's sustained criticism of Filmer's Patriarchia, Two Treatises of Government (1690). Schochet is very useful for identifying major currents in the seventeenth-century revival of the debate that prepared the way for what is often dubbed the Filmer/Locke debate later in the century.

38. Milton's criticism of Charles I being represented as a fatherlike king is particularly fierce in part twenty-seven of Eikonoklastes which responds to passages in chapter twenty-seven of Eikon Basilike that are styled as Charles writing to his son, the future Charles II, in the persons of father and king. John Gauden, later made Bishop of Exeter by

Charles II, is widely believed to have been mainly responsible for Eikon Basilike. On the authorship and reception of Eikon Basilike, see Philip A. Knachel's introduction to Eikon Basilike, The Portraicture [sic] of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings, Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization Series (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966), xi-xxxii. On Milton's use of Satan as a figure for Charles I's absolutism, see Joan S. Bennett, "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits," PMLA vol. 92, no. 3 (1977): 441-57.

Chapter 1: The Apple of Her Father's I.

Shalt thou give Law to God, shalt thou dispute
With him the points of liberty, who made
Thee what thou art...?

--John Milton, Paradise Lost.

My Author and Disposer, what thou bidds't
Unargu'd I obey; so God ordains,
God is thy Law, thou mine: to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.

--John Milton, Paradise Lost.

Milton scholarship of the last fifteen years has shown a persistent attention to the question of sexuality in Paradise Lost. Even among scholars who hold self-consciously opposed positions such as those of the so-called feminist and opposition camps of Milton criticism, there is a general consensus that sees Adam and Eve's marital relations as temperate, licit sexuality. Within this consensus there are critics who are primarily concerned with what they identify as 'licit' marital sex, and those that focus on 'illicit' sex. The latter is usually defined as sexual expression that lies beyond the prelapsarian edenic marriage, and criticism

of this kind has tended to concentrate on the pointedly incestuous union of Satan and his daughter, Sin.¹

The Satan-Sin incest is commonly seen as a deliberately shocking parody of other socio-familial relations in the poem that serve, by their propriety, to define right relations between man and woman within the poem's broader framework of right relations established by God. Edward Le Comte who associates the incest with Death's kingdom of Hell, for example, argues that "[t]he love of the angels, the unfallen marriage of Adam and Eve... have their distorted reflection, their perversion in hell," so that the Satan-Sin union is explained as one of the author's 'contraries.' In a similar vein, Jean Hagstrum's study of love identifies Satan and Sin with eroticism, and Adam and Eve with an ideal heterosexual marital state. Hagstrum suggests that eroticism throws the ideal into relief to establish reciprocity as a model for appropriate human socio-familial, and particularly marital, relations.² In conceiving of one set of relations as a distortion or parody of another, Le Comte and Hagstrum imply that the converse of these relations is already in place in the ideal of Adam and Eve's marriage and reciprocal marital sexuality. However, neither Le Comte nor Hagstrum accounts for the fact that the Satan-Sin incest, recounted by Sin in Book 2, actually occurs before Satan is ejected from heaven, and before the creation and physical union of Adam and Eve.

This chronological sequence of events is, according to Noam Flinker, by no means incidental to the purposes of Paradise Lost. Noting that Satan's incest with his daughter precedes most of the action of the poem, Flinker argues that this incest is introduced early in Paradise Lost to help the reader later to understand his or her misguided sympathy with a number of Satan's attractive and seemingly heroic followers.³ Even though the reader responds with horror to the Satan-Sin incest, s/he is liable to admire Thammuz-Adonis who appears in the catalog in Book 1; it is only the hidden incest theme as it relates to Thammuz-Adonis (in Ovid, the product of father-daughter incest) that enables the thinking reader to recognize the dangers of attractive exteriors that conceal baseness. When Flinker argues that Paradise Lost first warns of the nature of evil and then represents evil in a way which seems to ignore the warning, he suggests that incest exists to support a teleological method of Christian historiography in which later events are prefigured and their significance clarified by earlier events (119-20).

William Kerrigan, who also notes that the Satan-Sin incest occurs prior to the union of Adam and Eve, claims the incest and its resultant births establish a model of death for posterity and that Death's "unappeasable hungers... become our dark heritage."⁴ Whereas Flinker and Kerrigan differ in the importance they allocate to the chronological positioning of the Satan-Sin incest within Paradise Lost,

they nevertheless agree with Le Comte and Hagstrum in seeing incest as an inappropriate intrafamilial relationship.

Because the Satan-Sin incest is seen as a negative exemplum against the positive exemplum of Adam and Eve's prelapsarian marital union, critics generally continue to treat incest as subsidiary to the epic theme of generational rebellion of son against father.⁵ As a result, none has fully or satisfactorily explored the significance of the fact that the Satan-Sin union occurs in Heaven at the time of Satan's rebellion, and that it takes place chronologically and narratively before the physical union of Adam and Eve.

Although Kerrigan and Flinker acknowledge when and where the incest takes place, they do not address some of the questions that their observations raise. As the narratively central figure of Satan exemplifies the falsity of attractive exteriors, why should it be important to establish a secondary ploy to teach the lesson of concealed baseness? If we accept that a secondary ploy is operative, then why is the incestuous desire of a father an apt prelude to an ingrate's rebellion against his creator? As the poem nowhere suggests that Satan's incest is explicitly punished, how does incest become a reiterative device to underscore appropriate socio-familial relations? If we assume that the Adam-Eve and Satan-Sin unions represent respectively appropriate and inappropriate forms of sexual appetite, is it expedient to underscore the latter and to situate its consummation in Heaven (the realm of right) prior to that

which it supposedly parodies? These questions raise others about the significance of incest to the poem's broader theme of forbidden appetite; how does the form of sexual appetite figured as incest inform our understanding of the carnal hunger which precipitates the fall? And is it possible to see the link between eating and incest in the poem as purely incidental as critics seem to have tacitly assumed?

More than one theorist of incest has observed that sexual and alimentary appetites are subject to analogous prohibitions in many cultures. In Totem and Taboo, Sigmund Freud rejects eugenic and horror explanations of the incest taboo on the grounds that the application of the prohibition varies from culture to culture.⁶ For Freud, incest prohibition came into being as a form of social control and it is central to exogamy and to totemic kinship systems. He claims that because the totem (an animal or artifact, or a food item whose consumption is prohibited) is revered and identified with a group's origins, it is deemed by the group to be akin to the father. Freud explains incest prohibition through an originary narrative: a group of sons in the patriarchal horde are united in their wish to kill the father who prevents access to the maternal object of desire. The sons express kin solidarity through symbolic parricide and the ritual consumption of the totem object that represents the father; the incest prohibition that follows prevents a recurrence of conflict between kin over their desire for the same woman.

In his Elementary Structures of Kinship, Claude Lévi-Strauss, like Freud, rejects eugenic and horror explanations of incest. But Lévi-Strauss also rejects the idea of a totem whose consumption is unequivocally prohibited.⁷ Because a totem may be eaten in certain ritualized circumstances, Lévi-Strauss argues that there is no prohibition against the actual eating of a particular item, only against its use based upon its symbolic value. Influenced by Marcel Mauss' theory that gift-giving is the basis for social exchange in simple societies, Lévi-Strauss marks women as the most valuable gifts to be given, and marriage as therefore the most basic exchange between different social groups. The incest prohibition ensures that social interaction between different kinship groups or clans continues, and exogamy results from an ongoing exchange that presupposes that each group will not consume what it can offer to another to forge a social or political alliance.

Underpinning both Freud's and Lévi-Strauss' views of incest and, I would argue, providing the basis for incest prohibition as a whole, is the psychological propensity to distinguish the self or social/kinship group from all others; logic dictates that a taboo prohibiting the use of one part of a group works on the assumption that a boundary already exists to distinguish groups from one another. Such boundaries are crucial to anthropologist Mary Douglas' theory that at the heart of incest taboo lies the human drive for systemization. In Purity and Danger, Douglas

argues that within the larger framework of rituals concerned with the purity of cultural signifiers, eating and incest each occupy a highly ambiguous space: as each occurs at a site--a body orifice--where inside/outside divisions may blur, the symbolism of body boundaries articulates what a group construes as dangerous to its definition.⁸ Body orifices symbolize particular vulnerability because they are points at which the boundary between the self-contained and the uncontained becomes indistinct. Because group and body margins are encircled by rituals which seek at once to maintain integrity and to negotiate the breach, moreover, situations of entry and departure--where the psychic conception of autoplasmic and alloplasticism is usually subject to revision--are fraught with tension. Hence for Douglas, it is never solely the act of incest that is at stake, but the cultural significance of the act; incest prohibition both comprises and is ensconced within a symbolic system that continues to inform culture.

Returning via Douglas to the sexual acts cast as alternately licit and illicit in the dichotomy established by both 'feminist' and 'opposition' critics of Paradise Lost, it is pertinent to think of specific acts in terms of their symbolic value: only in this way can their import in relation to the larger structure--the dual narratives of rebellion and prohibited eating--be purposefully examined. As features of a symbolic system, similarities between different types of sexual act or forms of eating are of

greater interest than supposed dissimilarities. Furthermore, as there are certain sexual acts and forms of eating that are the same in physical terms but that bear decidedly different meanings, I would like to reconsider the relatedness of these sexual and alimentary acts in Paradise Lost. Viewing consumption in Paradise Lost--especially the eating of the forbidden fruit--as a metaphorical counterpart to the poem's representations of sexuality, I shall suggest, unsettles the ease with which Eve's disobedience may be read as simply a transgressive act.

Let us first assume that the union of Satan and Sin in Paradise Lost is problematic because the dominant Western cultural tradition prohibits consanguineous sexual unions. Seen in terms of Douglas' elucidation of incest and definitional kinship boundaries, the Satan-Sin incest is aptly related by Sin at that moment in Book 2 when established father-son relations in Heaven are under acute stress (indeed, when they are on the point of rupture) and when Satan is bent on corrupting Man in revenge for being ejected from Heaven by the father-God. The disclosure of incest occurs at a symbolic division between realms, the Gates of Hell, where Satan, on his way to destroy the Garden, encounters Sin and Death. As the disclosure constitutes Sin's attempt to prevent Satan and Death's threatened mutual destruction, its circumstances suggestively juxtapose the theme of incest with that of enmity between fathers and sons. Interestingly, however,

while Sin promotes harmony between Satan and Death here, she performs a rather different office elsewhere in Paradise Lost.

Sin's tale of her birth, for example, reveals that she is born at the very moment that Satan articulates his rebellion against God-the Father: "In Heav'n... in sight / Of all the Seraphim with thee combin'd / In bold conspiracy against Heav'n's King, / / Out of thy head I sprung...."⁹ Sin's role in these two father-son relationships (God and Satan, Satan and Death) points up the ambiguous role and the unstable position of daughters in the poem: Sin is alternately cast as bringing father and son together and as a divisive force in father-son relationships. The latter role is stressed when Satan simultaneously conceives rebellion and gives birth to become a self-authorizing father on the brink of his ejection from the domain of his own father/creator.

In this moment of triple inception, each of Satan's creations is associated with the others and rebellion is inseparable from hermaphroditic self-perpetuation. Satan's hermaphroditism in conceiving and giving birth to Sin is paradoxically compounded in the incest because the sexual union brings together two distinct bodies even as it collapses distinctions between bodies from the same source. Sin appeals to Satan, moreover, because she is the fleshly counterpart of that self which conceives the conspiracy to usurp the Father/Creator. The story of Satan's sexual desire

in Paradise Lost is therefore interspersed with that other narrative of a desire for power, so that even as Satan is impregnating Sin, Heaven is at war:

I pleas'd, and with attractive graces won
The most averse, thee chiefly, who full oft
Thyself in me thy perfect image viewing
Becam'st enamor'd, and such joy thou took'st
With me in secret, that my womb conceiv'd
A growing burden. Meanwhile War arose....
(emphasis added, 2.762-67)

As it is expressed here, the father's desire for his daughter displays self-interest of a corporeal kind in that sexual attraction becomes a form of self-gratification; if Satan's sexual attraction to Sin is attributable to her appearance, that appearance pleases by its likeness to his own. The incest is therefore both an articulation of self, and a consolidation of self to self through a form of familial cannibalism whence the father libidiously consumes his own creation.

The association of explicitly incestuous desire with the propensity to usurp one's creator is amplified when it is placed within the context of building Pandemonium in Book 1. In Pandemonium, a symbolic act of incestuous rape is necessary to defying God-the-Father when the fervor to establish an alternate kingdom to God's links male sexual desire with violence perpetrated on a form identified as female. The alternate kingdom, it should be noted, is oddly like the Heavenly kingdom for it seeks to replicate Heaven's

splendor. The search led by Mammon for materials with which to reconstruct the magnificence of Heaven in Pandemonium, adopts the language of mother rape:

Men also, and by [Mammon's] suggestion taught,
Ransack'd the Center, and with impious hands
Rifl'd the bowels of thir mother Earth
For Treasures better hid. Soon had his crew
Op'n'd into the Hill a spacious wound
And digg'd out ribs of Gold. (1.685-90)

A lust for political power rendered as the gouging of a mother's entrails, conflates the desire to possess a valuable commodity with male sexual appetite. Mammon's example figures rebellion against the father specifically in terms of 'rifling' that female who, as Freud would have it, most properly belongs to the father. The rape of 'mother' earth, her enforced yielding of consumables and her bodily disfigurement are predicated upon the assumption that they will provide the means to generate an alternate kingdom in Pandemonium. Each of these actions is graphically replicated in Book 2 of Paradise Lost when Satan encounters Sin and Death guarding the Gates of Hell.

In the figure of Death, in his rape of his mother, and in the hell-hound progeny born of that union, male sexual and oral appetite are closely associated with a lust for power. When Death scorns Satan's treason against his father he does so primarily to protect his own 'kingdom' (2.688-99) as becomes clear when father and son prepare to do battle at Hell's portal (2.711-24). Viewed from the scene at the

portal, Death's incest with Sin becomes a figurative counterpart to his challenge of his father for, in raping his mother, Death perpetrates an act of rebellion against his father analogous to that which his father, Satan, has in turn committed against God. The result--perpetual rape and the devouring of the mother's innards by the incest-bred hell hounds--is a circular system that reproduces nothing beyond itself:

... of that rape begot
 These yelling Monsters that with ceaseless cry
 Surround me, as thou saw'st hourly conceiv'd
 And hourly born, with sorrow infinite
 To me, for when they list, into the womb
 That bred them they return, and howl and gnaw
 My Bowels, thir repast; then bursting forth
 Afresh with conscious terrors vex me round
 (2.794-801)

This representation clearly establishes incest as a form of familial cannibalism;¹⁰ the hell hounds eat that forbidden flesh, the body of the mother, that is properly reserved for the father. Interestingly, however, the role of their father, Death, is to encourage the hounds, to "se[t] them on," in lieu of consuming the mother himself (Death "his Parent would full soon devour / ...but that he knows / His end with mine involv'd. I / Should prove a bitter Morsel..." [2.806-8]). The hell hounds' eating thus reenacts Death's rape of his mother. As displaced eating, the hell-hounds' incest marks Death's competition with his father as a competition that is meaningful only in the body of the

mother through a rapacity at once alimentary and libidinous. The complex system of signification that emerges from the Satan-Sin and Death-Sin unions shows that when the poem's metaphors of sexual and alimentary consumption are seen in terms of the figure of incest, they establish incest as not simply a means of disclosing false exteriors, nor a wrongheaded rebellion, not indeed a parody or hellish perversion as some critics have suggested. Viewing the Satan-Sin and Death-Sin incests in terms of successive acts of prohibited consumption gives access to a particular generative economy which in turn gives meaning to the nature of familial relations between fathers and sons, and fathers and daughters, in Paradise Lost.¹¹

Within this economy, Sin's consumption by the hell hounds derives its force from what Satan's and Death's sated appetites have established as a donné of male power expressed in sexual and alimentary violence toward mothers and daughters. The unquestioned acceptance of these male appetites, however, belies popular contemporary beliefs about female appetite. It is important to acknowledge that the trepidation inspired by female appetites--for food, for power and for sex--were not confined to this period and that women exhibiting such appetites had for centuries been considered monstrous.¹² But the way that these fears are taken up by Milton from the contemporary milieu significantly affects how we read the Satan-Sin incest and the conditions surrounding the more prominent transgressive

acts of his narrative of origin.¹³ For example, Sara Van den Berg has convincingly argued that Milton constructs Sin according to a conception of witchcraft peculiar to the seventeenth century. She places Milton's depiction of Eve against the background of a 1604 statute that made witchcraft a capital crime; comparing descriptions of Sin in Paradise Lost to contemporary witchcraft fantasies, Van den Berg argues that witchcraft fantasies attribute evil to insatiable female appetites. According to Van den Berg, the charge of insatiable female appetite derives from what, in psychological terms, "was most feared about the mother--that she would devour rather than nurture her child" (353).¹⁴

This last point is particularly interesting in light of the different representations of Sin as daughter and as mother in Paradise Lost. Although daughter Sin reportedly wins notice because of her "attractive graces" in Heaven, mother Sin and her progeny are linked with a mélange of popular and learned misogynistic ideas about perverse female sexuality, women's infanticidal tendencies, bestiality and quintessentially female ugliness when she is encountered by Satan at the Gates of Hell:

Far less abhorr'd than these [hell hounds]
Vex'd Scylla bathing in the Sea that parts
Calabria from the hoarse Trinacrian shore:
Nor uglier follow the Night-Hag, when call'd
In secret, riding through the Air she comes
Lur'd with the smell of infant blood, to dance
With Lapland Witches.... (2.660-65)

Powerful though these images are, Sin's likeness to predatory figures is undercut by the fact that it is Sin who is acted upon. The hell hounds that constitute Sin's nether regions might be deformities that emblemize her depravity: "Woman to the waist and fair, / But ended foul in many a scaly fold / Voluminous and vast, a Serpent arm'd / With mortal sting..." (2.650-53). But they also create depravity:

... about her middle round
 A cry of Hell Hounds never ceasing bark'd
 With wide Cerberean mouths full loud, and rung
 A hideous Peal: yet, when they list, would creep,
 If aught disturb'd thir noise, into her womb,
 And kennel there.... (2.653-58)

Thus before Sin's voluminous genitalia can be dismissed as a version of the horrifyingly predatory vagina dentata which appears in the Christian West and cross-culturally, it must be noted that it is Sin who is perpetually devoured by her children, preyed upon by her father, and consumed by Death who is at once brother, child and father (2.803-6).¹⁵

Sin's grotesque mutilation as the child begotten by Satan rips through her belly to be born ("Thine own begotten, breaking violent way / Tore through my entrails, that with fear and pain / Distorted, all my nether shape thus grew / Transformed... " [2.782-85]), underscores the potential for violent bodily control which lurks in the father's command over his daughter. Associated in this period with both gustation and gestation, the entrails are emphasized here, not for their role in Sin's self

nourishment, but with her potential to nourish others-- principally the father and son. Incest makes the daughter into figurative and literal flesh of Satan's flesh: she is libidinally consumed by Satan and is food for Satan and Death's progeny. Ordinarily reliant upon the parent for nurture and for sustenance, the daughter is transfigured by incest and cannibalized into a nourishing mother.¹⁶

Corporeal and consumable, her bowels torn usunder, Sin recalls the "Rifl'd bowels" of the nurturing mother, earth, and so draws attention to the fact that, in Milton's version of the creation myth, the mother who is biologically central to the reproductive process, is conspicuously absent at crucial moments of origin.¹⁷ What is yet more notable about mother earth vis-à-vis the dearth of mothers and the preponderance of fathers in Paradise Lost (God, Satan, Death, Adam) is that in Milton's creation myth, mother earth, authored by God-the-Father (7.232), is also unavoidably a daughter: 'she' is the sibling of the rebellious "third part of Heav'n's sons" (2.692) who, led by Mammon, divest her of her treasures with impious hands.

Figured as a means to satisfy a specifically male lust for political power, the rifling of the mother/daughter/sister earth for her "ribs of Gold" represents the reproductive female body as a valuable, exploitable resource in a manner consistent with contemporary writings on pregnancy and motherhood. As Ruth Perry has argued, women became constructed increasingly as

nurturers of the nation in the early modern period; at the same time there was a growing attention to what they ate and especially to what was eaten during pregnancy. Perry convincingly links the sentimentalization of motherhood with an increased need for human resources in the project and processes of colonialist expansion. Although her emphasis is on the growing constraints upon mothers and upon women's bodies, bodily functions and diet toward the middle of the eighteenth century, Perry indicates that, as early as Nicholas Culpeper's well-known manual on midwifery, A Directory for Midwives or, A Guide for Women in Their Conception, Bearing and Suckling Their Children (London, 1651), what women ate and their capacity as nourishers were deemed to be intimately connected. That a mother's appetite might negatively affect her offspring is clearly an important notion in the case of Sin, just as it is later in Paradise Lost in which the satiation of the "Mother of all Mankind" curtails the immortality of her offspring, making them fit fodder for Death.¹⁸

That procreation itself may yield valuable resources is signalled in the mother's ribs of gold, and these ribs anticipate the use of a parental rib in another act of creation in Paradise Lost. As the mother's ribs of gold are later recalled in Adam's rib, they highlight the very different positions occupied by the life-giving mother and life-giving father in Milton's poem. Whereas the rape of mother earth for the treasure within her bowels is replete

with the language of enforced submission, the removal of the father's rib--which occurs in response to his request for meet companionship--has a considerably less violent tone:

"[Hee] stooping op'n'd my left side, and took / From thence a Rib, with cordial spirits warm, / And Life-blood streaming fresh; wide was the wound, / But suddenly with flesh fill'd up and heal'd" (8.465-68). Adam's fleshly rib is returned to him in a highly acceptable--even desirable--form when it is made to gather flesh to form Eve.

The contrast in the ways that these ribs are figured and the manner in which they are taken focuses attention on the curious location of Eve, the archetypal mother, within the particular set of relationships between begettors and begotten in the poem. The nature and significance the poem's familial relationships becomes clearer if one recalls that, even though she has not been widely identified as such in Christian myths of origin, Eve the archetypal mother is also (and unavoidably given the single male original in Paradise Lost) a 'begotten': Eve is the daughter both of the man from whom she sprang and a creation of the father-God.¹⁹ As such, Eve too is pointedly a resource: as the mother is to be retained by the father, the woman who is most clearly the father's to bestow upon others is the daughter whom he has begotten and who consequently owes to him her very being.

The relationship between Adam and Eve in the poem must be rethought in light of this debt of the daughter to her creator. I have said that the Satan-Sin father-daughter

pairing has been problematic for readers of Paradise Lost primarily because it is a consanguineous sexual relationship. But, as Adam and Eve stand in precisely the same relation to one another (father-begetter to daughter-begot) as Satan and Sin, doesn't the union of Adam and Eve become as problematic as that of Satan and Sin? Isn't Adam, like Satan, a father who hermaphroditically conceives a daughter and engages in sexual relations with his daughter to make of her a mother? And doesn't the union in each case ultimately result in the birth of a predatory deathliness? Even in this simple mapping of parallels, there are too many similarities between the two pairs to dismiss easily. The points of contact between the two pairs create a disturbing resonance which suggests that the Satan-Sin union is not diametrically opposed to the Adam-Eve union but coterminous with relations between Adam and Eve. And if the prelapsarian union of Adam and Eve reproduces a heavenly union, it has a model in the relationship between father and daughter as these are established in Heaven prior to Satan's fall.²⁰

I am by no means arguing here that because the Adam and Eve union is incestuous, the Satan-Sin incest is instinctual, natural, or appropriate. I am suggesting, however, that the myth of origin offered by Paradise Lost presumes certain power relations--between men, and between men and women--which suggest that this originary myth is bound up with the structures of power within the family as they are emerging during a period of intensifying

materialist values. Christine Froula's work on how woman is represented through figures of the procreative family in Paradise Lost crystalizes this paradigm of familial indebtedness within a paternally-autocratic structure; she shows that relations between males and females in the poem are dependent on this paradigm. Within a larger discussion of canon formation and the role of women readers of Paradise Lost, Froula notes that Satan, Sin and Death are frequently aligned with the Holy Trinity and that this alignment has often been used to claim that the former trio parodically recreates the latter. Given the dearth of females in Milton's cosmos, the translation of the mother into the Holy Ghost is noteworthy for Froula because it supports the exclusion of women from structures of power.²¹ Whereas in Heaven it occupies a position akin to the mother, the Holy Ghost does not re-translate into the mother in the Satan-Sin-Death trio. In this 'family,' the position that a parody of the Holy Ghost might occupy becomes a form of the mother which collapses the daughter into the mother; father and son are left as the principal, because most clearly identifiable, members of the family while daughter and mother occupy positions which are ambiguous because they are peripheral.

Because the Adam-Eve, Satan-Sin, and even the Sin-Death 'families' each replicate this collapsed model, the supposedly non-incestuous nature of the first cannot be held up as its distinguishing feature. Of greater consequence in

making distinctions between the unions is whether a given pairing is sanctioned within the structure of an originary myth which establishes generation as explicitly male by rendering it in terms of the transmission of political power from father to son.²² This concept of generation implies, if not the invisibility, then at least the exchangeability of daughters as 'gifts' to render them facilitators in a narrative of male succession rather than beneficiaries of lineal and political succession.

For an elaboration of this notion, I turn briefly to anthropologist Gayle Rubin's well-known essay, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." Rubin explores what she names the "sex/gender" system, which is "the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity," and the way these transformed sexual needs are satisfied.²³ Drawing on Lévi-Strauss, Rubin claims that in return for the son abiding by the incest prohibition that denies him his mother, he is rewarded by the father with a woman of his own (192). Rubin's essay is important because it places exogamous marriage within a kinship economy and refines the theory of women as the gifts exchanged between men. She goes some way toward explaining how men come to be principal members of the family by suggesting that the reciprocal giving of women forges alliances between men while it confers no comparable benefit to the 'gifts' themselves: "If it is women who are being transacted, then it is the men who

give and take them who are linked, the woman being a conduit of a relationship rather than a partner to it.... it is the partners, not the presents, upon whom reciprocal exchange confers its quasi-mystical power of social linkage.... women are in no position to realize the benefits of their own circulation" (174).

Yet while Rubin's discussion of the system of gift exchange between kinship groups and the resulting system of exogamy is persuasive, the notion of an equivalent indebtedness between giver and receiver is, as she acknowledges, less plausible if taken outside a very specific context.²⁴ When Rubin refers to the son's abstinence from his mother and the woman with whom his father rewards his abstinence, for example, it is implied that the giver and receiver are differentially empowered: the woman is not given as a gift per se, for the father/giver cannot expect a like return. As a result the given woman is not ascribed a value as woman but a point at which shared cultural values inhere and gain meaning. For this reason, I see Rubin's alternative to the system she describes--her valorizing of a liberatory androgyny--as misleading. Liberatory androgyny both assumes a certain fixity of the cultural meanings of gender and intimates that incestuous desire is in some sense natural and precultural.²⁵

Whereas Rubin's understanding of desire through androgyny presumes that desiring parties can be equally

empowered, Mary Nyquist explores the limits of such an assumption in the context of God's ambiguously framed giving of Eve to Adam in Paradise Lost to show that Eve's erotic value is embedded in her value as a conduit. Nyquist rejects what she terms the appeal of "originary androgyny" to argue that the milieu into which Eve is born is already gendered, not least of all by the relation of Adam to God. Referring to certain ceremonial utterances of Genesis, she considers the implications of the fact that Milton's use of Genesis attributes key utterances to an Adam whose "legitimate desires pre-exist the creation of the object that will satisfy them":

In Milton's exegesis, the significance of the gift--woman--passed from maker to man is determined by two speeches... constructed as a verbal exchange that is basically contractual. In Genesis 2:18 Adam's maker promises him that he will assuage his loneliness and provide him with a meet help; in 2:23 and 24, Adam accepts this gift by acknowledging it was exactly what was promised him, and then promises to honour it on these very grounds.²⁶

The Genesis dialogue highlights the contractual nature of the marriage of Adam and Eve in Paradise Lost which, Nyquist claims, is produced by "a Protestantism pressed into the service of an historically specific form of individualism... paradigmatically masculine, autonomous, articulate, and preternaturally awake to the implications of entering into relations with others" (115). Turning to the dialogue

between Adam and God just prior to Eve's creation, Nyquist also notes that the corresponding dialogue in Paradise Lost, as it is told by Adam to Raphael in Book 8, has structural parallels to the contract passages in Genesis. In response to Adam's need to "beget / Like of his like, his Image multipli'd" (8.423-24), God first responds with a promise: "What next I bring shall please thee, be assur'd, / Thy likeness, thy fit help, thy other self, / Thy wish, exactly to thy heart's desire" (8.449-51) and rapidly follows with the creation of Eve from Adam's rib. It is to God's fulfillment of the promise that Adam responds with uplifted voice and in the language of obligation:

This turn hath made amends; thou hast fulfill'd
 Thy words, Creator bounteous and benign,
 Giver of all things fair, but fairest this
 Of all thy gifts, nor enviest. I now see
 Bone of my Bone, Flesh of my Flesh, my Self
 Before me; Woman is her Name, of Man
 Extracted; for this cause he shall forego
 Father and Mother, and to his Wife adhere...
(8.491-98)

The above dialogue between God and Adam is clearly based on paternal indulgence and filial indebtedness. The depth of understanding between God and Adam is underscored when one recalls the manner in which Adam and Eve's nuptial has been framed earlier, for, if "wedded Love" is to be hailed as the true source of human reproductivity and productivity, it is also the means by which "all the Charities / Of Father, Son, and Brother first were known"

(4.756-57). Where Adam's speech in Book 8 expresses a commitment to honor the gift giver, his honoring of that giver within the established contractual matrix of male relationships associated with 'wedded love,' implicitly depends upon three things. First, that the woman given is given in good faith; she must have value to render the receiver indebted. Second, that the transaction of a daughter enables her transfiguration; when the daughter functions as the mother's replacement, she must be interchangeable with the mother, and be, like the mother, a means of generating the father's bloodline. Finally, the daughter must not resist being given, she must comply with the terms on which she is given.

Because the divine voice responds to Adam's desire by making him a gift of Eve, the voice must also construct Eve's desire as responsive to Adam's desire. Consequently, when Eve seems to enact desire she is actually precluded from doing so by the system of indebtedness into which she is born. Flesh of Adam's flesh, 'creation' to his 'creator,' and expressly designed to sate Adam's desire, Eve cannot but respond. Thus Adam's contract with his creator propels Eve into a situation of indebtedness to her creator.²⁷ Eve's birth is represented in material terms in the well-known passage of the rib taken from Adam's left side (8.465-67). But Eve more properly comes into being at the point at which her earthly father imagines his desire and precipitates God's fashioning of his daughter: "Mine eyes [the Almighty]

clos'd, but op'n left the Cell / Of Fancy my internal sight,
 by which / Abstract as in a trance methought I saw [a
 manlike creature]" (8.460-62). While she is displaced from
 Adam by God's intervention in her fashioning, Eve is
 conceiveable only as a figment of Adam's dormant desire;
 echoing Sin's relation to Satan, Eve owes her being to Adam.

The implications of such a debt emerge more clearly in
 'Eve's' narrative of her creation. In Eve's account she is
 first warned against herself (4.468) and then prescribed by
 the voice that names her desire, states her indebtedness to
 her original, and thereby identifies her future functions:

... hee
 Whose image thou art, him thou shalt enjoy
 Inseparably thine, to him shalt bear
 Multitudes like thyself, and thence be call'd
 Mother of human Race: what could I do,
 But follow straight, invisibly thus led?²⁸
 (4.469-76)

Eve's question at the end of this passage suggests that the
 representation of Eve as archetypal mother should not place
 aside what the originary myth commonly fails to address--
 that mother Eve is also a child. It is abundantly clear
 later in her account that Eve is daughter as well as mother,
 for when Eve turns away from the sight of Adam, his voice
 commands her to return and claims her on the basis of his
 authorship, his blood relation, and her indebtedness to him
 on both counts:

Return fair Eve,
 Whom fli'st thou? whom thou fli'st, of him thou
 art,
 His flesh, his bone; to give thee being I lent
 Out of my side to thee, nearest my heart
 Substantial Life, to have thee by my side

 Part of my Soul I seek thee, and Thee claim
 My other half: with that thy gentle hand
 Seiz'd mine, I yielded, and from that time see
 How beauty is excell'd by manly grace
 And wisdom.... (4.481-91)

Because Eve initially turns away from Adam, who seems less attractive than the image of herself that she sees reflected in a pool (4.478-80), her return and yielding in response to the voices that direct her motions suggest that her desire for Adam is constructed by those voices. Thus if the union of Adam and Eve is to be cast in terms of the mutuality or reciprocity of a 'right' marital sexuality, it can only be so in a context in which consent is not a real possibility; and consent is not a real possibility in a context girt about by the relations of indebtedness in which the daughter, Eve, is engendered. As a result of these relations between Adam and Eve as begetter to begotten, it is implausible for the daughter to be seductress or initiator because each of these roles presupposes volition. Eve's position as daughter within the scheme of the father-son family on the other hand disallows volition when it invalidates all grounds for refusal.²⁹

Eve yields to one voice, and then succumbs to a second, each of which suggestively prefigures a third authoritative voice that speaks her desire for the forbidden fruit. The

cumulative effect of the first two voices problematizes both the third voice which encodes Eve as an obedient daughter and the concept of volition in Milton's larger argument. The voice that draws Eve toward the forbidden fruit in the dream that she relates to Adam unmistakably echoes the disembodied voice of one Father who has led her to another soon after her birth: "Close at mine ear one call'd me forth to walk / With gentle voice, I thought it thine; it said, / Why sleep'st thou Eve...?/ / I rose as at thy call, but found thee not" (5.36-8, 48). As Eve's actions in the ambiguously named seduction are prescribed by the third fatherly voice, this draws attention to how Eve's so-called choice is also encoded by the biblical source that, by writing her as already and inevitably the transgressor, has religious authority underwrite paternal autocracy.³⁰

Echoing the persuasive mode of the previous two voices, Satan's voice also echoes the second mythical account of origin in Genesis--the 'word' which consigns Eve to a doubly-binding debt as daughter/wife and constructs her as a voracious woman who tempts the father of mankind.³¹ Milton takes up the terms of this account in his description of Eve's eating of forbidden fruit that emphasizes Eve's appetite for godhead. But the description of Eve's voracity contrasts strongly with her early ministry to others' appetites. In Book 5, for example, when Eve gathers fruit to provide a bountiful feast for Adam and Raphael, she does not partake of the fruit herself, just as she does not partake

of the knowledge transmitted from God through Raphael to Adam that the feast serves to celebrate (5.33-36).³²

Eve's abstinence from eating in one context in which eating is linked to the successful transference of God's higher wisdom must affect our reading of her subsequent, 'transgressive' eating, particularly as the proscription against eating builds on the belief that there are some forms of knowledge to which humans should not have access. The contrast between the two scenes of feasting is heightened by Eve's nice attention to others' tastes in garnering the feast in Book 5 versus her gorging on the forbidden fruit in greedy self-absorption:

[Eve] Intent now wholly on her taste, naught else
 Regarded, such delight till then as seem'd
 In Fruit she never tasted, whether true
 Or fancied so, through expectation high
 Of knowledge, nor was God-head from her thought,
 Greedily she ingorg'd without restraint,
 And knew not eating Death: Sate at length
 (9.786-92)

This representation of Eve's eating implies that satisfaction of her appetite inevitably results in a failure to minister to others' appetites; Eve regards naught but her own desire, fails to succour others, and so brings about the deathliness and destruction for which Satan hungers.

The grief of the earth--that other archetypal mother and source of succour--in response to the plucking of the fruit is entirely appropriate: "Earth felt the wound, and Nature from her seat / Sighing through all her Works, gave

out signs of woe / That all was lost" (9.782-84). Taken together with the tenor of God's injunction not to eat of the knowledge-giving, but deathly, fruit (8.321-30), the manner of Eve's eating, understood within the frame provided by incest, is crucial to a myth which constructs male and female appetite and knowledge differentially. Eve's self-absorbed gorging identifies woman's hungry access to knowledge as that which creates dearth and depletes generative potential. Eating the Father's fruit signals Eve's possible absence as a bountiful mother and her presence as a hungering daughter, and so presages the deathliness of the eating-related blights which Michael foresees will afflict the human race:

Some by violent stroke shall die,
 ...by Intemperence more
 In Meats and Drinks, which on the Earth shall
 bring
 Diseases dire...
 What misery th' inabstinence of Eve
 Shall bring on men...
 ...ghastly Spasm...
 Convulsions, Epilepsies, fierce Catarrhs,
 Intestine Stone and Ulcer, Colic pangs....
(11.471-84)

The daughter's inability to curb her appetite is thus identified as the root of human misery expressed in terms of the intestinal corruption accompanying alimentary excess. The unchecked appetite of the daughter portends that she will become a mother who endangers, rather than nurtures, the race created in the Father's likeness. Eve's appetite is

therefore held responsible for the mortality of future generations who consequently become fit food for the maw of Death (10.597-609).

The encoding of the daughter by the voices which speak and sanction a particular form of desire and the creation of her body to satisfy others' appetites, draw together two injunctions against orality in Paradise Lost. Together these show that 'pre-speaking' the daughter's desire actually refuses her the power of speech. Speechlessness both denies the articulation of desire and underlines the more explicit injunction against orality implied in the forbidding of the fruit which yields the father's knowledge.³³ As each of the injunctions is aimed at the willingness of children to hear and to obey the Father's word, the oral/aural method of Satan's seduction of Eve, (first entering the serpent through the mouth to give it voice, and then crouching at Eve's ear), becomes powerfully charged. If it is the father's higher discourse that has by-passed Eve in the confabulation between God and Adam prior to her creation, and between Raphael and Adam in Book 5, it is access to orality that Satan's "persuasive words" at first seem to promise Eve as she reiterates his words:

Great are thy Virtues, doubtless, best of Fruits,
Though kept from Man, and worthy to be admir'd,
Whose taste, too long forborne, at first assay
Gave elocution to the mute, and taught
The Tongue not made for Speech to speak thy
praise. (9.745-49)

On one level Satan does give Eve the elocution that her position as daughter has hitherto denied and Eve briefly becomes instructor to her author, Adam. However, reading Satan as a liberator who gives Eve access to knowledge and speech ignores the incestuous underpinnings of Satan's relation to his own daughter to whom he has offered similar promises of exaltation through alimentation (2.871-41). To cast Satan as a liberating rebel is to locate him entirely outside the dominant structure of power and to identify him as inciting others to uprise from this position of weakness; thus rendered, Satan is entirely an heroic victim of an oppressive power structure. It is important to acknowledge that Satan's relation to this daughter duplicates both his relation to his daughter and Heaven's demand of an indebted obedience.³⁴ Because Satan's relation to Eve duplicates both his relation to his own daughter, Sin, and Heaven's demand of an indebted obedience, his seduction of Eve should be seen as another use of the daughter to depose the father. As Satan draws on the father's exclusive privilege with regard to the daughter, his use of Eve to the end of usurpation discloses that the prohibition against eating itself occurs in a context in which the 'seduction' of the daughter is bound to succeed.³⁵

Eve's seduction also, if indirectly, initiates a hitherto obedient son into disobedience. Eve's offer of the fruit to Adam, "This Tree is not as we are told, a Tree / Of danger tasted... / ... but of Divine effect / To open Eyes,

and make them Gods who taste" (9.863-66), reiterates Satan's words to her: "Ye Eat thereof, your Eyes... / ...shall perfectly be then / Op'n'd and clear'd, and ye shall be as Gods (9.706-8). Just as the orally-penetrated serpent becomes a vehicle for Satan's voice, the orally- and aurally-penetrated Eve becomes a vehicle for conveying the promise of godhead through disobedience. Because the daughter's appetite is already contained by her father's appetite for her, Eve's eating can be a threat only if her voracity is a form of displaced consumption: only if Eve's eating is usurpatory, only if it threatens the demise of the father, does it become a cause for concern. As such a threat cannot come from the daughter, though she is traditionally represented as seeking godhead, and it can only come via the daughter, the first woman's voracity is actually a mechanism which covertly force feeds her a definition of herself as voracious.

Moreover, as Satan's powerlust is enacted through Eve, her transgressive eating emblemizes cannibalization of the father; it discloses that at the heart of the myth of the daughter's appetite for the Father's forbidden fruit, lurks a power-hungry, ungrateful and quinessentially incestuous son. The rebellious son, Satan, exercises a father's privilege when he compels Eve to an experience beyond that into which the God-Adam transaction has given her. Eve's seduction threatens to disrupt the very foundation of the God-Adam transaction, namely, the Father's sole authority to

confer privilege. Clearly it is this authority that Satan challenges when he rebels in response to God's preference of the Son of God ("My only Son" [5.604]) and his appointment of the favored son over all others. Satan's ingratitude is further characterized by his marked ambivalence about being indebted to the father:

The debt immense of endless gratitude,
 So burdensome, still paying, still to owe;
 Forgetful what from him I still receiv'd,
 And understood not that a grateful mind
 By owing owes not, but still pays, at once
 Indebted and discharg'd; what burden then?
 (4.52-57)

Satan's ingratitude in this passage is diametrically opposed both to the Son of God's obedience to paternal authority (3.266-71) and to Adam's humble indebtedness. Against the backdrop of Adam's willingness to honor the Father and the importance of such willingness to harmonious generational relations, Satan's reluctance to acknowledge his debt to God establishes a point of rupture in father-son relations. Repeatedly associated with direct and displaced consumption of prohibited women (the libidinally consumed daughter, the mother 'mined' for gold, the mother raped by Death and devoured by his hell-hound offspring), Satan's enticement of the daughter to eat the Father's fruit both underlines the gravity of such a rupture and maps the trajectory of the son's insubordination. Due to the cumulative effect of the metaphor of incest as it is

associated with alimentation and filial rebellion, eating is unquestionably an act of usurpation.

Paradise Lost thus tells a story of insubordination that begins with a son's failure to honor his father's authority by leading a third of his sons to rebellion, and culminates in the consumption of fruit that traditionally symbolizes generative capability and continued potency.³⁶ The son, who at one level attests to the potential immortality of the father by perpetuating his name and his bloodline, at another level precipitates the father's demise by questioning paternal omnipotence and seeking political power beyond what is allowed. The paradoxical location of the son is strikingly figured in the images of bodily diminution and encroachment that abound in those moments of the narrative most directly concerned with father-son conflict, and nowhere more so than at the Gates of Hell during Satan's encounter with his son, Death.³⁷

Satan is first consigned to a vacuous realm which threatens to engulf him: "Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell; / And in the lowest deep a lower deep / Still threat'ning to devour me opens wide" (4.75-77). But as the danger from which the rebellious Satan shrinks is bodily annihilation through being devoured, his power to withstand annihilation is fittingly expressed in his conversion of himself into the vacuous space ("myself am Hell") that engulfs all else. In a similar vein in book 2, when Satan solicits Sin's and Death's aid to gain passage to the Garden

in which the forbidden fruit grows, he secures their cooperation with a promise to liberate them from the realm of their confinement. He promises to release Sin and Death to unrestrained oral indulgence once his own mission in Eden has been accomplished:

[I shall] bring ye to the place where Thou and
 Death
 Shall dwell at ease...

 ...there ye shall be fed and fill'd
 Immeasurably, all things shall be your prey.
 He ceas'd, for both seem'd highly pleas'd, and
 Death
 Grinn'd horrible a ghastly smile to hear
 His famine should be fill'd, and blest his maw
 Destin'd to that good hour: no less rejoic'd
 His mother bad.... (2.840-49)³⁸

Satan here aligns himself with Sin and Death on the grounds that he is constrained like them. In so doing Satan establishes the forbidding Father as the one who threatens starvation through the restrictions He poses upon consumption. The tale of the Father's withholding of sustenance simultaneously sows the seeds of the argument Satan will use to seduce Eve. Because Eve's seduction recalls the rationale for earlier acts of disobedience, incestuous desire and consumption become irrevocably intertwined with the son's ambition for power of a domestic character. The oral/aural seduction of Eve and her 'transgressive' eating therefore emphasize the points of contact between those fatherly voices that frame a

daughter's desire, the satiation of a father's libidinous appetite through consuming a daughter, and the implicit, deferred promise of alimentary gratification made to a power-hungry, and therefore potentially incestuous, son. Each of these becomes crucial to a familial economy which is founded upon the daughter's compliance, upon her consumability, and upon her inability to articulate the word that constructs her desire in relation to her father's.

Notes

1. For details of these strands of criticism, see William Schullenger, "Wrestling with the Angel: Paradise Lost and Feminist Criticism," Milton Quarterly, 20, no. 3 (1986): 69-85; Joseph Wittreich, "'John, John, I Blush for Thee!': Mapping Gender Discourses in Paradise Lost," in Out of Bounds: Male Writers and Gender(ed) Criticism, ed. Laura Claridge and Elizabeth Langland (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990), 22-54. Each side holds to an individualized view of the author so that the discussion becomes bounded by notions of Milton as a forbidding patriarchal literary father, or an embryonic womanist and champion of companionate marriage. Mary Nyquist ("Fallen Differences, Phallogocentric Discourses: Losing Paradise Lost to History," in Post Structuralism and the Question of History, ed. Derek Attridge, Geoff Bennington and Robert Young, [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 212-43) consciously avoids the limitations of the feminist/opposition divide. See also Janet E. Halley, "Female Autonomy in Milton's Sexual Poetics," in Milton and the Idea of Woman, ed. Julia M. Walker (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 230-53; Stephanie

Demetrakopoulos, "Eve as a Circean and Courtly Fatal Woman," Milton Quarterly 9, no. 4 (1975): 99-107.

2. Edward Le Comte, Milton and Sex (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 68; Jean Hagstrum, Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), chap. 2. See also Diane K. McColley, Milton's Eve (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1983), chap. 3.

3. Noam Flinker, "Father-Daughter Incest in Paradise Lost," Milton Quarterly, 14, no. 4 (1980): 116-22.

4. William Kerrigan, The Sacred Complex: On the Psychogenesis of "Paradise Lost". (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983), 123.

5. Bruce Thomas Boehrer, (Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England: Literature, Culture, Kinship, and Kingship [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992], 132-37) is a notable exception. He treats incest as a central issue in his brief discussion of Paradise Lost.

6. Sigmund Freud, Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics, trans. James Strachey (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989), 6-13. Eugenic theories of incest are often discredited because incest prohibitions do not focus in all cultures solely upon preventing consanguinity; in many cultures prohibitions include affinal relations to whom there is no direct blood tie. On this point see Emile Durkheim (Incest: The Nature and Origin of the Taboo, trans.

Edward Sagarin [New York: Lyle and Stuart Inc., 1963], 68-9, 82-96) who first suggested that incest prohibition is part of a larger avoidance of contact with bodily emissions, including blood; Edmund Leach, Culture and Communication: The Logic By Which Symbols Are Connected (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 65-68.

7. Claude Lévi-Strauss, The Elementary Structures of Kinship, trans. James Harle Bell and John Richard von Sturmer (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), chap. 2.

8. Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 121. Roy Wagner ("Incest and Identity: A Critique and Theory on the Subject of Exogamy and Incest Prohibition," Man: The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 7, no. 4 [1972]: 601-13) usefully elaborates Douglas' point when he demonstrates that a false problem is created by separating relationship from genealogical denotation and then inquiring about the relationship between the two. He argues that the artificial distinction between action and meaning can be overcome if incest laws can be shown to "exist as a function of the meaning system of a culture and to derive their force from meaning" (606).

9. John Milton, Complete Poems and Major Prose, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York: Macmillan, 1957), 2.749-51, 2.758. All subsequent references will appear parenthetically in my text.

10. Peggy Reeves Sanday (Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986]) argues that in an exogamic society in which trade and marriage each emphasize the forging of 'outward facing' ties to create an expanding network, "cannibalism stands for an unacceptable 'turning back,' and is thus sybolically equated with incest" (24). I shall return to a fuller discussion of cannibalism, domestic and material economies, and modes of production, in subsequent chapters.

11. Sin's reference to herself as a bitter morsel may be an allusion to a belief (common in the folk wisdom of many cultures) that a nursing woman ought to abstain from sexual activity. Although Sin cannot be said to be nursing in the conventional sense, she is certainly a source of nourishment for the hell-hound offspring. Consistent with the belief that a sexually-active nursing woman cannot sustain her progeny because her milk is rendered unnourishing or even curdled by her sexual activity, the hell hounds remain unsated and so perpetuate the rapacious cycle of the forced re-entry of the mother. For a discussion of contemporary views of the sexuality of nursing mothers, see Linda Pollock, A Lasting Relationship: Parents and Children Over Three Centuries (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1987), 53-55, cited in Ruth Perry, "Colonizing the Breast: Sexuality and Maternity in Eighteenth-Century England," in Forbidden History: The State, Society, and the Regulation of Sexuality in Modern Europe, ed. John C. Fout

(Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 120-21, n. 71. See also Franciose Heritier, "The Symbols of Incest and its Prohibitions," in Structuralist Essays in Religion, History and Myth, ed. Michel Izard and Pierre Smith (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 171-76. An interesting variation on this theme, the 'milk-tie,' is briefly discussed by Peter Farb and G. Armelagos (Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Food [Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980], 78-79). The term milk-tie refers to a sex prohibition imposed upon male and female children unrelated by blood but nursed by the same woman. In some societies such children are forbidden to marry as though they were linked consanguineously.

12. That a woman's tongue, like her body, must be governed is certainly not a new idea in this period, as evidenced by the loquacity of Chaucer's Wife of Bath and the misogynist authors cited by her last husband in his attempts to silence her. For a useful recent discussion of Renaissance responses to legendary women who displayed a "mannish independence and sexual depravity" and the climate that these established for the early modern period, see Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, "Fetishizing Gender: Constructing the Hermaphrodite in Renaissance Europe," in Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity, ed. Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub (New York and London: Routledge, 1991), 80-111.

13. G. R. Quaiffe (Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives: Peasants and Illicit Sex in Seventeenth Century England [London: Croom Helm, 1979], 31-37) cites evidence given in an examination of witchcraft conducted by Glastonbury justice Robert Morgan in 1653. Much of the so-called evidence supporting accusations of witchcraft focused on the power of witches to cause monstrous birth or untoward behavior in those who crossed them.

14. For Sara Van den Berg ("Eve, Sin and Witchcraft in Paradise Lost," Milton Quarterly 47, no. 4 [1986]: 347-65), Sin and Eve are represented as diametrical opposites and Eve is ultimately redeemed as a 'good' woman. While I agree that Paradise Lost does establish Sin and Eve as figures of contrast, I believe that because the appetite of each figure makes her appear culpable, it does not allow the two figures to be read as opposites. Similarly, the Adam-Eve and Satan-Sin opposition is disallowed by acknowledging the incestuous underpinnings of each union. For a fuller debunking of the stereotype of the daughter's culpability in incestuous relations with her father, see Judith Lewis Herman, Father-Daughter Incest (London and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981), chaps. 2 and 3.

15. In considering the persistence of the vagina dentata figure over several centuries, Margaret R. Miles (Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West [London: Beacon Press, 1989], 159, 223, n. 49) argues that while female reproductive functions were

"the quintessential terror" during the Middle Ages and were seen as needing restraint, they nevertheless provided a macabre form of voyeuristic pleasure. This point is evidenced by the frequent appearance of female genitalia and the simultaneously frightening and titilating manner of their depiction in the art of the period. Anna K. Juhnke ("Remnants of Misogyny in Paradise Lost," Milton Quarterly 22, no. 2 [1988]: 50-58) carefully traces the sources, including Spenser's *Errour*, that were available to Milton for his depiction of Eve and monstrous rendering of Sin.

16. This sense of Satan as a predator is heightened by his likeness to the vulture of Mont Imaus who gorges upon "the flesh of Lambs or yeanling Kids" (3.434). It is interesting to note that as Satan paces, awaiting his prey, he overlooks the realm that is to be peopled by the progeny of the "ill-join'd Sons and Daughters" made vain by Sin. For an elaboration of the role of actual and symbolic food in rituals marking changes in state and status, see Leach, 60-62. For a more detailed discussion of how women's erotic and maternal functions become constituted as mutually exclusive, and the connection of these functions to diet, see Perry, 120-21.

17. On the subject of absent and present women, especially mothers in Paradise Lost, cf. Richard Corum, "In White Ink: Paradise Lost and Milton's Ideas of Women," in Milton and the Idea of Woman, ed. Julia M. Walker (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 120-47.

Viewing woman in terms of the earth as a colonial territory, Corum sees heaven as a mother and an "ideal home country" from which God's progeny is born. Asserting that "this home country, as maternal matrix, has no sexual or genetic relationship to the father's generation of sons" (122), Corum argues that Milton's God is "not sexual." He does concede, however, that while heaven's gate "Pour[s] out by the million her victorious bands" (2.996-97), there are no daughters, only "Spirits masculine" among them; Lynda E. Boose, "The Father's House and the Daughter in It: The Structures of Western Culture's Daughter-Father Relationship," in Daughters and Fathers, ed. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 19-74. Noting the dearth of female figures in Western originary myth, Boose reads the absence women as explicitly an absence of daughters (44-48); Marcia Landry, "Kinship and the Role of Women in Paradise Lost" Milton Studies 4 (1972): 3-18. Landry, though she errs in locating the Satan-Sin incest in Hell, partly explains the difficulty of identifying who is a mother by showing the complexity of blood ties in the poem: "In Hell, both son and father rape the mother who is also daughter and sister, confusing the roles of father, son, brother, and husband as Sin confuses her roles of mother, sister, daughter, and wife" (10).

18. Perry, 124, n.53. That Culpeper's manual was modified and republished in 1684, 1716, 1737, 1777, and

again as recently as 1985, attests to the dissemination--and perhaps the popular appeal--of the idea that fetuses are temperamentally affected by the diet of the woman bearing them. Farb and Armelagous consider the role of the sacred cow in India in a way that is broadly analogous to the way that Perry believes mothers were perceived in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They claim that the cow holds a revered position among certain groups in India mainly because it is "the factory" from which key elements of agricultural production (oxen for tilling and transport, dung for fuel and fertilization) are derived. Farb and Armelagous further suggest that prohibitions regarding consumption that become woven into the psychic and cultural fabric often have their raison d'être in economic forces (120).

19. Boose, 49.

20. Boehrer makes a similar point when he argues that in creating a distinction between the holy trinity ("heavenly rectitude") and the Satanic trio ("infernal depravity") Milton "create[s] a distinction without concrete difference" (135).

21. Christine Froula, "Pechter's Spectre: Milton's Bogey Writ Small; or Why is He Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" Critical Inquiry 11, no. 1 (1984): 171-78; cf. Boehrer, 132-37.

22. On the transmission of power, see Froula's earlier and better-known article, "When Eve Reads Milton: Undoing

the Canonical Economy" Critical Inquiry 10, no. 2 (1983): 321-48. In it Froula argues that Milton "'transexualize[s]'" the female Muse "not just into a Creator figure but into that powerful, self-sufficient male Creator so central to Adam in his relations with Eve" (338). I agree with Froula that the very "invisibility" of cultural authority underwrites silencing and exclusion of woman and that the poem creates an explicitly male originary myth. I differ from Froula where she frames female identity as though it were a pre-existing entity that is only subsequently repressed by the effects of a patriarchal structure. Halley, who uses Froula, likewise assumes a certain fixity of male and female essence. She argues that in the invocation to Book 1, "[e]xactly when maternal brooding becomes paternal impregnation, the female figure of the 'heav'ly Muse' is displaced by a male spirit" (249).

23. Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in Toward an Anthropology of Women, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 159; Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), chap. 1.

24. Rubin is clearly conscious of the need to contextualize the exchange system as she conceives of it when she asks: "Is the woman traded for a woman, or is there an equivalent? Is this equivalent only for women, or can it be turned into something else.... is it turned into

political power or wealth?" (207). She further observes the importance of the evolution of commodity forms in women, systems of land tenure, political arrangements and technological developments to any full-bodied analysis of women in a given society, culture and time.

25. For a thoroughgoing critique of Rubin which tackles Rubin's implicit acceptance of a 'natural' sexuality into which women can be liberated, see Judith Butler, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (New York and London: Routledge, 1990), 72-75.

26. Mary Nyquist, "The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in Paradise Lost," in Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions, ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson (New York and London: Methuen, 1987), 111, 114.

27. Referring to the biblical myth, Boose argues that as Eve is given to Adam, the brother-sister union is implicitly authorized (49). While this may also be said of Paradise Lost, the sibling relationship and fraternal authority resulting from receiving Eve is made subordinate to paternal authority by Milton's luxuriant description of Eve's birth which establishes the importance of the father-daughter relationship. On the question of sibling incest and mutuality, see Diana E. H. Russell, Incest in the Lives of Girls and Women (New York: Basic Books, 1986), chap. 18. The power differential in sibling relationships is an issue I

shall take up again in my chapters on Clarissa and Tom Jones.

28. More than one critic has noted that Eve's account echoes Sin's words to Satan at the Gates of Hell: "Thou art my Father, thou my author, thou / My being gav'st me; whom should I obey / But thee, whom follow?" (2.864-66).

29. When Kerrigan suggests that the Death-Sin incest warns against the appetites of the usurpatory son, he also claims the son's appetites are made possible by the "incestuous mother." In blaming the incestuous mother, Kerrigan overlooks the important fact that Sin is first the incestuous daughter. Even as a mother, moreover, her son's rape of her makes Sin's appetite less the point than Death's appetite, and both of these secondary to the conditions which enable the rape; Philip J. Gallagher (Milton, the Bible, and Misogyny, ed. Eugene R. Cunnar and Gail L. Mortimer [Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1990]) also views Sin as culpable for winning attention with her graces; he claims that Sin gives way to "consensual perversion" with Satan and his followers (93).

30. Froula suggests that Milton uses the Genesis myth in a way that "preenact[s] the silencing of Eve" and that this is integral to Milton's authority in a patriarchal culture ("When Eve Reads Milton," 338); Boehrer makes the important point that language is necessary to prohibition when he argues, with Derrida, that incest presupposes and comprises the extension of popular language between kinship

groups: "without popular language there is no practical apparatus for prohibition... before the prohibition, it is not incest; forbidden, it cannot become incest except through the recognition of the prohibition" (136-37).

31. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar treat the theme of Satan's rebellion in their landmark study The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985). They suggest that Satan provides implicitly feminist women readers with a hero, a model for rebellion, or a revolutionary figure with whom they might identify. But this argument presumes that Satan functions on the edge of, or outside, an established order. In casting Satan as a victim of sorts, they inadvertently imply that his incestuous use of his daughter ought to be overlooked because his rebellion is a bid for freedom from the larger power structure (188-212). I believe that Satan's exercise of power over Sin presumes her fulfillment of a duty to him in a manner analogous to the filial obedience that God demands of his sons, and, more specifically, analogous to that obedience to which Adam's voice commands his daughter, Eve. This makes Satan an inappropriate, or at least unsatisfactory, model for 'feminist rebellion' or literary women's subversiveness.

32. Cf. Louise Schleiner ("Pastoral Male Friendship and Miltonic Marriage: Textual Systems Transposed" Literature, Interpretation, Theory 2 [1990]: 41-58) who argues that

Milton creates space for the emergence of a new and distinctly Protestant bourgeois form of marriage in which the wife is a fit helpmeet. She suggests that Adam asks for a companion in the spirit of the pastoral tradition of male friendship, but that, as Eve does not fulfill this role, Adam continues to need homosocial male friendship which he then finds in Raphael. That Eve continues to minister to the garden during Raphael's visit, Schleiner argues, signals a marital ideal in which woman can affiliately join in with male intimacy and "clai[m] her own education and biblical spirituality... largely through ...[her] insistence on working alone" (154).

33. Raphael tells Adam that when he was given the gift of life, he was also given the gift of speech: "Nor are thy lips ungraceful, Sire of men, / Nor tongue ineloquent..." (8.218-19). Adam thus possesses the capacity to name and so to construct meaning: "to speak I tri'd, and forthwith spake / My Tongue obey'd and readily could name / Whate'er I saw" (8.271-73). Eve does not have this access to articulation: she is, as I have argued, articulated.

34. Herman, 4.

35. Boose, 56.

36. Eli Sagan (At The Dawn of Tyranny: The Origins of Individualism, Political Oppression and the State [New York: Knopf, 1985], 296) believes that when a son is born, an extreme emotional conflict is engendered in the father, for the birth presages the political, if not the physical,

decline of the father. See also Otto Rank (Doubles: A Psychoanalytic Study, trans., ed. and intro. Harry Tucker Jr., [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971], 153) who suggests that the father's ambivalence is associated with the rebirth of the father in the son. He claims that in some cultures it is believed that a child with a strong resemblance to the father has appropriated a part of the father's personality and so the father must soon die.

37. Many critics have also interpreted Satan's Leviathan proportions following the failed 'coup' (1.192-241) as an indicator of filial strength that is to be overcome by the greater paternal might.

38. While Sin responds as warmly as Death to Satan's promise of sustenance (2.848-49), the fact that her appetite is conditioned by her father's aligns Death's appetite more closely with Satan's lust for power.

Chapter 2: Robinson Crusoe Inc(orporates).

"Come boldly, every one of you, and assemble together to dine off me, for you shall at the same time eat your fathers and grandfathers, whose flesh has served to feed and nourish this body. These muscles, this flesh and these veins are yours, poor fools that you are! can you not see that they still contain the substance of your ancestors' limbs? Relish them well, you will find that they have the flavour of your own flesh." A fiction that by no means savours of barbarity.

--Michel Eyquem de Montaigne, "Of Cannibals."

Whence comes all the indecent lawful Things we have been talking of, but from this Sin of Sodom, (viz.) Fulness of Bread? while the Stomach is gorged with animal Food, of which no Nation in the World feeds like us; while the Blood is filled with these pungent Particles, and the Veins swelled with animal Spirits, no wonder the seminal Vessels are over full, and summon the Man to a Dismission or Evacuation, even at the Price of his Virtue, of his Conscience, and of his Reason.

--Daniel Defoe, Conjugal Lewdness.

By Modesty in Discourse I think it must of Necessity be understood, a Decency of Expression; particularly as our Discourse relates to Actions or Things (whether necessary or accidental) that are and ought to be Matters of Secresy [sic], Things which are to be spoken of with reserve, and in Terms that may give no offence to the chaste Ears and Minds of others, and yet perhaps are of Necessity to be spoken to. Indeed such Things, with respect to Decency, ought never to be spoken of at all, but when Necessity urges; and it were

to be wished, that in a Christian and Modest Nation, where the Laws of Decency are expressly admitted as Rules of Life, all immodest Discourses were decry'd by universal Custom; and especially that Printing and Publishing such Things as are not to be read with the like Decency, were effectually suppress'd. But as I have made that Subject a Part of this Work, I say no more of it here.

--Daniel Defoe, Conjugal Lewdness.

As my discussion of Paradise Lost has shown, consumption must be understood as far more than merely a means of supporting life because eating has cultural significance beyond simple gustatory functions. When examining consumption in Robinson Crusoe, which for many readers is made particularly memorable by the incidence of cannibalism, it is crucial to dispel the materialist myth that Crusoe superficially subscribes to--that anthropophagy serves primarily to create a supply of food in a 'savage' culture.

The myth is not one that is to be dispensed with solely in the light of modern thinking or since the rise of the discipline of anthropology. As E. Pearlman has pointed out in his excellent discussion of cannibalism in Robinson Crusoe, several writers available to Defoe were fully aware that the consumption of human flesh by other humans was more than simply a food preference aberrant by European standards in a given period of history. Montaigne, whose Essais was first translated into English in 1603 by John Florio, is probably the writer on cannibalism best known to modern

readers. He was clearly sensible of the symbolic and ceremonial functions of anthropophagy in his essay, "Of Cannibals":

[the] captor convokes a great gathering of his acquaintance.... [He and] his best friend... in presence of the whole assembly, dispatch [the prisoner] with their swords. This done, they roast and eat him in common, and send bits of him to their absent friends. Not, as one might suppose, for nourishment... but to signify an extreme revenge.

And when he used cannibalism to attack the cruelties that his own culture perpetrated in the name of the Church, Montaigne, though himself a Catholic, certainly understood and exploited the symbolic potential of cannibalism to refer to religious extremism: "there is more barbarity in eating a live than a dead man, in tearing on the rack and torturing the body of a man still full of feeling, in roasting him piecemeal and giving him to be bitten and mangled by dogs and swine... under the cloak of piety and religion... than in roasting him and eating him after he is dead."¹

Modern anthropologists have, likewise, gone some way toward exploring the figurative possibilities and the symbolic functions of cannibalism. Anthropologist Peggy Reeves Sanday, whose data demonstrate that more than fifty-six percent of simple societies do not practice cannibalism, claims that for a society to sustain itself primarily through cannibalism would require that its production of offspring far exceed what is practicable. The idea that

cannibalism merely supplies a community with a source of protein and provides food for common, everyday consumption is as untenable for Sanday as it is for Pearlman--who considers the notion an ecological absurdity.² While Sanday acknowledges that cannibalism can sometimes be a reaction to external conditions such as famine which give rise to food stress, she also observes that in societies where there is hunger, cannibalism is frequently not practised.

Instead of seeing cannibalism in terms of food supply, Sanday conceives cannibalism, as Mary Douglas conceives incest, within a larger framework of the rituals and prohibitions which function as cultural signifiers. For Sanday, the ritual nature of cannibalism suggests that, like sacrifice and indeed incest, cannibalism is a primordial metaphor for relations of domination and submission and for formulating self- and social-consciousness. Concerned with the foundation, maintenance and regeneration of the cultural order, cannibalism is an ontological system consisting of "the myths, symbols and rituals by which people explore their relationship to the world, to other beings, and to being itself."³

The importance of Sanday's formulation to my discussion of Robinson Crusoe can be clarified through a brief return to Mary Douglas' view of the psychic importance of maintaining symbolic distinctions and boundaries. Douglas asserts that religious and other rituals constitute an effort to create unity in, and to impose system on,

experience which is otherwise inherently untidy: "It is only by exaggerating the difference between within and without, above and below, male and female, with and against, that a semblance of order is created."⁴ All that cannot be clearly identified as belonging to a distinct category becomes a locus of tension. Because of the body's central role in fundamental experiences, Douglas sees body symbolism as a highly emotive part of the common stock of symbols. Both matter which straddles the inside/outside bodily distinction, and the sites at which the inside/outside division is breached, especially bodily orifices, have a tremendous power to pollute and therefore to generate fear. Although Douglas refers explicitly to substances which traverse the inside/outside divide by emanating from the body at especially vulnerable points (she names spittle, blood, milk, urine, faeces, tears), a parallel argument can be made with regard to matter which enters and becomes part of the body. As such substances--especially foods--also blur lines of demarcation, they ought to represent a similar threat to order. Precisely because ritual cannibalism is centrally concerned with the orderly crossing of bodily boundaries, Sanday argues, it constitutes a conceptual framework that provides "models of and for behavior.... [and] a system of processing culturally encoded information" (31).

While my analysis of Robinson Crusoe will occasionally touch upon actual anthropophagy, Sanday's understanding of

cannibalism as an ontological system is valuable for enlarging our understanding of the use that Defoe make of figures of eating in this work. Making use of Sanday's insight, I argue that, as cannibalism is used to figure relations of power, it serves to disclose several highly eroticized domestic economies in Robinson Crusoe. There is in my discussion one small but important departure from Sanday. Sanday identifies the reproductive female body as the key ontological symbol in cannibalistic cultures which are typically dominated by competitive male individualism and stresses that cannibalism is a form of social aggression associated with the oral phase of psychosexual development and directed at the mother.⁵ She argues that cannibalism plays a primary role in the social construction of gender identity because in the psychological basis of patriarchal social structures there is an on-going and violent repudiation of oral dependency on the mother. Although I do return to the important issue of oral violence toward females and especially toward mother figures, the first part of my discussion tries to show the larger structure wherein men exhibit a predatory and, I contend, fundamentally incestuous, violence toward other men. Because I believe that oral aggression against females arises out of the context established by relations between men, I place greater emphasis in this chapter on the nature of the intense competition between men. Such competition is repeatedly expressed through references to bodily control,

orality and consumption, all of which are linked by the trope of cannibalism in Robinson Crusoe.

My discussion of Robinson Crusoe begins with a close look at the strained relations between eater and eaten in the work. Even though instances of actual cannibalism on 'Crusoe's' island late in the narrative are memorable because of Crusoe's alarm and his fear of being destroyed, literal anthropophagy does not establish eater and eaten as metaphors for human relations. Instead, anthropophagy makes visible and clarifies mechanisms of power discernible in several domestic economies in Robinson Crusoe including those that undergird extant domestic relations, and especially those between fathers and sons, in Robinson Crusoe. An important aspect of such relations as I have identified them previously is the fact that father and child--frequently represented as respectively predator and prey--are differentially empowered. An examination of the predatory quality of father-son relations in Robinson Crusoe shows how these enable and support the consumerism that emerges with colonialism in the period of mercantile expansion in which the work is set. Familial power dynamics emerge with what I refer to as the novel's 'politics of food' or its 'politics of consumption,' and this is first seen in Crusoe's father's house.

The father, Kreutznaer, recommends the "middle state" as one that will allow Crusoe to be appropriately nourished without exposure to "vicious living, luxury, and

extravagancies on one hand, or by hard labour, want of necessities, and mean diet on the other."⁶ According to Kreutznaer, those who live the extremes suffer distemper and discomfort. It follows that Crusoe's acceptance of Kreutznaer's middle state would mean that he would not have to be "sold to the life of slavery for daily bread... but [live] in easy circumstances... sensibly tasting the sweets of living without the bitter" (28-9). But just as Kreutznaer's gout-riddled condition undercuts his sermon on the virtues of temperance, so the ease with which Kreutznaer may withhold sustenance undercuts his apparent willingness to sustain Crusoe.⁷ Kreutznaer's offer to place Crusoe under "no necessity to seek [his] bread" (29) is subject to certain conditions, for Kreutznaer, who has the means to maintain Crusoe, also claims the power to withhold that other paternal blessing which would allow Crusoe to maintain himself outside his father's house:

having thus discharged his duty in warning me against measures which he knew would be to my hurt... he would do very kind things for me if I would stay and settle at home as he directed... he would not have so much hand in my misfortunes as to give me any encouragement to go away [and]... if I did take this foolish step, God would not bless me, and I would have leisure hereafter to reflect upon having neglected his counsel when there might be none to assist in my recovery.
(emphasis added, 29)

Given the fact that a retraction of paternal support and sustenance is threatened, the early exchanges between

Crusoe and Kreutznaer strike at the very core of what it means to remain in the father's condition-bound house. If the son should disobey, as his errant brothers have before him, he will be doomed to a languishing state from which, starved of paternal approval in both senses, he might never recover. The significance of the father's withdrawal of approval is encapsulated in two biblical sons whose fates are mapped out, like Crusoe's, through the metaphor of consumption. The sea captain on Crusoe's first nautical venture observes Crusoe's likeness to Jonah whose filial disobedience results in his being swallowed by a whale, and Crusoe fantasizes his own ultimate obedience to Kreutznaer and its reward of being fêted and feasted like the returned Prodigal. The parables of the Prodigal and Jonah would seem to offer the choices of obedience or disobedience, of reward or punishment, of being fed or food. And clearly Jonah's fate of being entombed in the belly of the whale, though temporarily, fits this model.

But the Prodigal's father's slaughter of the fatted calf conceals a sinister twist which lies embedded in this form of paternal power. Having wasted his substance--having figuratively consumed himself--the starving Prodigal is placed more thoroughly at his father's mercy. In receiving the Prodigal son and feeding him, the parabolic father (of whom Crusoe believes his own father to be an emblem [37]) would effectively renew the capacity to dictate terms: he would renew the power to prey upon his charge's dependence

upon him. While departure from the father's house at one level suggests a movement beyond the realm of paternal power, Kreutznaer's evocation of the omnipresent heavenly father suggests that such a removal creates at best an illusion of escape. The inevitability of the Prodigal's return and his ensuing obedience gives his father license to extact what price he might in the face of the child's involuntary dependency. By becoming his son's host--that is, in receiving him--Kreutznaer in a sense offers himself to the son for communion. Yet while the concept of communion contains the promise of the reciprocity of host and guest, reciprocity is not offered here. In the son's communion with his father, as in the ritualized communion with the Ur-father host of the religious ritual, the son accepts the kind of food that promises eventually to convert the feeder into the form of 'host' upon which the father might live.⁸ The son's return therefore enables a more thorough incorporation into the father's domestic economy and signals the father's authority over those who are of his house; the Prodigal's parabolically-prescribed return and the father's role as one who is disposed to receive the son each underscore the father's power. Defoe's use of the Prodigal parable highlights the obligation which accompanies the son's acceptance of paternal sustenance; it shows that although filial obedience offers the promise of being fed, it also necessarily writes the child as potential food--as a body available for the father's use. The kind of paternalism

that characterizes Kreutznaer's house clearly relies upon a debt nexus between the male parent who makes provision for the members of his household and those members. This aspect of the father-son relationship forces a recognition of the invasive quality of paternal demands and obligations.⁹

Because domestic relations in Robinson Crusoe are repeatedly concerned with the violation of bodily and psychic boundaries, the text's use of eating, purging and being eaten become highly charged. Common to all three activities is the mouth, the site at which substances in the external world become incorporated into, or, if necessary, ejected from, the corporeal being. As Paul Rozin explains in his study of food preferences, the mouth is "the last site at which reversible decisions about acceptance or rejection can be made. Once swallowing has occurred, the ingested substance is difficult to reject voluntarily." Given the importance of the mouth and the functions associated with this portal between the inside and outside, the mouth plays a key role in both accepting the matter of one's being into the body and in rejecting or regurgitating what is deemed noxious. The father's peculiarly oral violence toward the son (in the form of the blessing given or withheld and the injunction to live in the middle state) is thus oddly similar to the father's bread; it must be expelled before it is assimilated and before it possibly contaminates. At the most literal, as well as the highly figurative level, Kreutznaer's invasiveness must be purged

before the son can begin to become his own master. It is entirely fitting, therefore, that Crusoe's disobedience in going to sea awakens alternating fears of being "swallowed," and so losing being, and that it is accompanied by perpetual vomiting, swooning and calentures which likewise signal a loss of self.¹⁰ Because the father-son relationship here is one in which the father seeks to assimilate the son, it is cannibalistic; as this relation exists between two immediate members of a household that functions as a domestic familial unit, as well as a family in the sense of close blood relatives, it is also profoundly incestuous.

The power dynamic in Kreutznaer's house and the implications of its operation are taken up in Crusoe's enslavement by the captain of the Turkish rover. When Crusoe is captured, persistent images of bodily invasion and penetration indicate that the basic fear that attends living in the new master's house arises from the threat of being physically possessed. The Turkish captain's wholesale claiming of Crusoe and the latter's enforced servility amplify this threat. Crusoe is on a slave ship for the purpose of increasing his own material possessions when the Turkish ship attacks. He is alarmed by his transformation "from a merchant to a miserable slave" (41), from purchaser to purchase, and from master to minion. And Crusoe has, perhaps, good reason to be alarmed by the transformation, when one considers the assumptions that he himself brings to the role of the master.

Crusoe the plantation owner sees slave ownership as a means to future prosperity: he understands proprietorship explicitly in terms of stock increase. Later in the narrative, when Crusoe laments the decisions that have led to his island sojourn, he discloses in a rhetorical question that it was specifically to expedite such "encrease" that he first undertook the slaving mission:

What business had I to leave a settled fortune, a well stocked plantation, improving and encreasing, to turn supra-cargo to Guinea, to fetch negroes, when patience and time would have so encreased our stock at home, that we could have bought them at our own door, from those whose business it was to fetch them? (199)

Although it is the plantation, identified as stock, that is destined to increase, the notion of fetching human cargo which might at some future date be 'purchased' at one's own door through patience and time expended at home is rather suggestive given Crusoe's understanding of mastery elsewhere. For example, when Crusoe describes mastery on the island as a state of having everything that he desires ("I had nothing to covet; for I had all that I was capable of enjoying; I was lord of the whole mannor" [139]), he attaches the perquisite of pleasure to the power and privileges of ownership. This draws attention to another benefit that may be reaped by he who plants and invites a rather different reading of Crusoe's role as a 'planter.' In the light of Crusoe's definition of mastery, the plantation

first identified as stock in the above passage gives way to the human stock--African slaves--which might be also propitiously "encreased" with time and patience expended at home. Precisely because the plantation passage fails to identify the most certain and direct method of of increasing one's stock of slaves--sexual contact with slaves--it gestures toward, without having to name, the tacitly-accepted sexual privileges of mastery.¹¹ Against the backdrop of Crusoe's definition of mastery, his recollection of the invasive Kreutznaer's "prophetick discourse" en route to the house of his captor and new master, the Turk, establishes a point of contact between the Turk's and Kreutznaer's houses.

The similarity between Kreutznaer's domestic arrangements and those of the Turkish captain is heightened when one considers the popular view of Turks in early eighteenth-century England. Turks were commonly associated with contemporary beliefs--and growing fears in the wake of a number of well-publicized prosecutions--about sodomitical practices.¹² Looking at homosexual behaviors and the evolution of sodomitical subcultures in Western culture during the early modern period, Randolph Trumbach distinguishes between continental European and English, and Islamic and Christian attitudes toward sodomy. He notes that the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, influenced by the religious revival of the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-centuries, were particularly active between 1690

and 1730. Trumbach suggests that the 'reforms' that these societies supported (and sometimes facilitated through the persecution of 'mollies,') contributed to the stigmatization of sodomy and sodomites in Europe.¹³ Because he finds that in some Islamic cultures sodomy was not stigmatized if the 'passive' role was taken by an adolescent, while in Europe both passive and active sodomitical roles were stigmatized, Trumbach helps to partially explain why Islamic Turkey was strongly identified with 'exotic' sexuality and why it came to be seen as one of the "home[s] of sodomy." G. S. Rousseau's slightly more recent examination of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century sexual mores also indicates that there were certain popular myths about Turkish sexual behaviors in the period. He suggests that these myths gave rise to tales of Ottoman homosexuality. While Rousseau concedes that it is difficult to assess to what degree such tales fed into pre-existing British myths about Turkish sodomy, he nevertheless demonstrates that Turkey was clearly identified by the English as one of three supposed origins of sodomy.¹⁴

The popular conception of Turks and the sodomitical practices with which Turks were synonymous in this period unmistakably, if subtly, sexualizes Crusoe's situation as the slave to a Turk. The pointed separation of Crusoe from the other members of the crew who are taken to the emperor's court, and the Turkish captain's deliberate selection of Crusoe for his domestic and personal uses are described in

terms which connote their invasiveness. Because he is "perfectly overwhelmed" by the change of circumstances, Crusoe is "obliged to yield" as the crew of the slaver has previously had to yield to the greater might of the attacking rover.

Crusoe's sudden shift in circumstance from merchant to chattel is indicated most strongly in the functions he must perform: he is "kept by the captain of the rover as his proper prize, and made his slave, being young and nimble and fit for his business" (41). Retained as the Turk's property, Crusoe is both a domestic menial "left on shoar to look after his little garden, and to do the common drudgery of slaves about his house" (41) and a sort of 'cabin boy.' Lying first in the cabin of the master's larger vessel while it is docked, Crusoe subsequently composes a third of the crew that staffs the pinnace that serves as the Turk's vessel of pleasure. The pinnace--which in contemporary usage was another name for a prostitute or a mistress--is equipped with the accoutrements of fishing and merry-making. The pleasure vessel also has within it a "cabbin, which l[ies] very snug and low, and ha[s] in it room for [the Turk] to lye, with a slave or two, and... some small lockers to put in some bottles of such liquor as he thought fit to drink...." (42-3); it is in this cabin that Crusoe is "ordered... to lye" (41).

It is not Crusoe's availability for domestic consumption which is the only significant point here.

Equally important is the text's rejection of males as items for consumption and its reluctance to represent--to name--the availability of men as objects of male sexual pleasure except in the most oblique fashion.¹⁵ Such obliquity has created a lacuna around certain aspects of male sexuality in Robinson Crusoe and has caused more than one critic to speak of the text as being devoid of sexual desire.

The alleged absence of desire in Robinson Crusoe becomes conspicuous precisely because so much of Defoe's writing--prose, poetry and prose fiction--is concerned, at some level, with the theme of sexual desire. Certainly, it might be argued that Defoe does not deal with the theme in Robinson Crusoe in the same way as he does in Moll Flanders or Roxana in which female sexual desire is located centrally and situated largely in relation to heterosexual marital arrangements. Indispensable to the claim that sexual desire is absent in Robinson Crusoe is the assumption that by sexual desire one means heterosexual desire. And indeed where this claim is made the dearth of women in the work is often used as supporting evidence while the proliferation of men and groups of cohabiting men goes largely uncommented upon in terms of the sexual theme.¹⁶

Closing down all erotic possibilities other than heterosexual requires the virtual divorce of Robinson Crusoe from the contemporary climate of sodomy trials, the activities of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, criticism of homosexuality in courtly circles, raids on

mollie houses, and documented concerns about sodomy in the Navy. Furthermore, as much of Defoe's own work both before and after Robinson Crusoe--including his gleeful satire of the conquests, rapes and resulting miscegenation that had made the Englishman trueborn--demonstrates, Defoe was at least mindful of the quiet concealment of vices that social mores render unmentionable.¹⁷

In his later treatise Conjugal Lewdness (1727), furthermore, Defoe makes much of the association between Turks and sodomy. In order to do so he relies upon a tacit understanding among his readers of mythical Turkish sexual practices. Defoe then uses this understanding to criticize the 'unspeakable' practice of conjugal sodomy. Making it quite clear that he disapproves of this practice and others that he makes an elaborate feint of not naming ("God forbid we should by Silence seem to approve that Wickedness"), Defoe asserts "that silence is occasioned only because the Wickedness is too gross to be reprov'd." Defoe "compliments" the Turks for their resourcefulness and for their

fruitful Inventions... some Signals, some Figures, to serve instead of Speech...[.] I have observed the Turks... turning up the Slipper by which Signals or Figures the filthy Part might be expressed, without fouling the Mouth, or affronting the Ears of others.¹⁸

Although the context of this passage is heterosexual marital practice, the point that it makes relies upon what is

strenuously rejected; and what is rejected is the practice of sodomy which is associated, via the reference to Turks, with male homosexuality. The "compliment" to the Turks, if it can be so called, is therefore undoubtedly backhanded. As the compliment assumes that the reader shares the writer's understanding of the nature of the absence to which such figures allude, it also presumes the reader's concurrence that what is made absent by the Turkish custom is unspeakable because it is abhorrent.

Michel Foucault construes such lacunae around the subject of male homosexual desire as a form of denial. He suggests that because male power as it is constituted through heterosexual relations is always constructed in terms of polarities such as active command and passive compliance, dominator and dominated, penetrator and penetrated, one role is understood as intrinsically honorable and the other its converse. If this model is transferred to a situation of same-sex male partners, a conflict develops between an ethos which associates men with the active pole and the conception of all sexual intercourse in terms of penetration and male domination. To be an object of pleasure without giving up forever the high status accorded to men in the heterosexual matrix, the passive partner or 'boy' must represent himself as capable of prevailing over others. He must also either deny the passive role itself or deny the possibility that the passive role might afford pleasure. Denial affirms that such pleasure

could not exist, and prescribes that it ought not to be experienced. Where such is the case, desire becomes enshrouded by a tacit code of silence--an absence of what is socially and culturally awkward to name--and therefore surrounded by taboo.¹⁹

In Robinson Crusoe the silence that envelopes master-slave sexual relations is particularly sonorous when one acknowledges the common understanding, contemporary and modern, of the sexual offices demanded of slaves. Orlando Patterson's extraordinarily detailed study, Slavery and Social Death, indicates that in many parts of the Islamic world, and notably among Ottoman Turks in this period, European slaves were especially prized. Pointing out that homosexuality was common in the Jebala area of Morocco where 'boy-markets' were to be found, Patterson also claims that the homosexual use of slaves both remained an important aspect of Islamic slavery into the twentieth century, and that it was "almost the norm" among the mamluks. Paul Rycaut's The Present State of the Ottoman Empire (1688) confirms that the homosexual use of servants and slaves was, if not de rigeur, at least common enough to draw commentary from travelers who wrote about Turkish customs. Rycaut's prominence as secretary to Heneage Finch, the second Earl of Winchilsea, who was Ambassador to Turkey between 1661 and 1669, as well as his own five-year residence in Constantinople that Rycaut deemed his "qualification" to write on Turkish customs, lent his treatise a certain

legitimacy. The impressive publication history of Rycaut's work and the attention that it continued to receive into the early-eighteenth century suggest that Defoe's mention of Turks in the context of slavery would have been a subtle cue that contemporary readers would have been unlikely to have missed.²⁰

Although I am not claiming that sodomitical acts actually take place either in the Turkish captain's house or aboard his pleasure vessel, I am suggesting two things. First, that the sexual consumption of domestic minions is established as considerably more than a possibility in the text. More importantly, the pattern of male power relations in Robinson Crusoe (and especially the relation of the master-proprietor to the slave-property which parallels the father-son relationship of Kreutznaer and Crusoe), creates a predatory environment which requires that domestics at all levels and of both sexes are cast in terms of their obedience to the master. This situation generates a domestic milieu that is at least partially homoerotic and intensely homosocial. Just as Crusoe exists as potential prey in his father's house, so he occupies a similar space within the Turk's domestic realm. The latter household replicates the conditions of the former in that its boundaries include all that the master unequivocally possesses and what he might consume by virtue of ownership. It is therefore apt that, as Crusoe makes his escape, he robs the Turkish master of his pinnace and that he only does so after he has first thrown

the Turk's "manservant" overboard by "supriz[ing] him with my arm under his twist" (44). When he steals the pinnace Crusoe also appropriates the Turk's "boy" as "[his] boy Xury"--his, that is, to consume or dispense with (54).

Because Crusoe reproduces similar relations in the way that he orders his own domestic estates and dictates the relations of consumption on the island, the relationship of consumers to consumables from the point of his arrival on the island underlines the interrelations between eating, power, and incestuous desire. Yet as it does so, it signals an important shift in the relations of eater and eaten that I have hitherto identified in Robinson Crusoe. Crusoe at first experiences the island and its waters as invasive, as evidenced by the proliferation of metaphors of ingestion, of being overwhelmed, engulfed, incorporated and swallowed by the sea or by wild beasts noted by many readers (64, 66, 74-6). However, if Crusoe quails at the thought of bodily annihilation through incorporation, then his power to resist annihilation is aptly expressed in his impulse to devour rather than be devoured.

Such an impulse is amply displayed during Crusoe's lengthy island sojourn, and it is significant that the impulse is first enabled by oral violence toward consumable objects which are clearly identified as female. The shift from Crusoe as potential prey to Crusoe as predator is first discernible in Crusoe's laborious process of removing goods and foodstuffs from the stranded ship. Crusoe's use of the

ship establishes the tone and the significance of consumption on the island, and as the salvaging process elaborates and extends the metaphor of anthropophagy, it establishes Crusoe's role as a consumer rather than a consumable in the newly-established domestic economy of the island.

When Crusoe is washed ashore with neither clothes nor food in a birth-like "dreadful deliverance," the ship provides him with the means to assuage his immediate bodily needs. Because the ship holds food "she" becomes, as Robert Erickson has astutely observed, rather like a nurturing mother to Crusoe, who, "very well disposed to eat," fills his pockets with biscuit from her untouched and copious supply (57). Although the ship, with her bulbous upper foreward deck providing sustenance, is like a nursing mother in one sense, her hold is also laden with consumables. Because of this, as Erickson also points out, the ship simultaneously resembles a pregnant woman:

I found that the ship was bulged, and had a great deal of water in her hold... that she lay so on the side of a bank... that her stern lay lifted upon the bank... all her quarter was free and all that part was dry... you may be sure my first work was to search and to see what was spoiled and what was free. (68)

But while Erickson notes that the laden ship resembles a pregnant woman, he stops short of the implications of Crusoe feeding on her. If the ship is like a pregnant woman,

then does it not follow that feeding on the contents of her hold constitutes cannibalism? Indeed Crusoe's repeated entries into the bowels of the ship conjure an image of mother violation which recall nothing so strongly as the three episodes of cannibalistic mother ravishment in Paradise Lost; namely, Death's rape of his mother, the Hellhounds' multiple forced re-entries of their mother to gnaw her innards and the womb that bred them, and Mammon's voracious plundering of the earth to establish the kingdom of Pandemonium.²¹ In Robinson Crusoe, as in Milton's epic, a son's libidinous violence toward a body which is clearly identified as maternal heralds his attempt at founding a domestic economy beyond the reach of his father's power but based, nevertheless, upon the relations of consumption established in the father's realm. Not only does Crusoe effect his labored 'boarding' of the ship in a naked state and with acknowledged physical difficulty (67), but his subsequent mutilation of the vessel repeats the language of an earlier boarding of a similarly laden vessel by the Turkish captain. Just as the Turkish rover's crew falls to "cutting and hacking the decks and rigging" (41) to overwhelm the trader and to force it to yield up its load, so Crusoe forces the stranded vessel to yield her load. Whereas Crusoe is the plunder in the case of the Turkish rover, in the case of the stranded vessel he becomes the plunderer.

es

f.

h

h

C

h

o.

t

t.

i

d

s

o

(

C

u

a

d

s

t

e.

t)

up

wt

fa

Crusoe first rummages the ship for supplies to establish himself in his new realm ("everything I could get from her would be some use or other to me" [100]) and then he tears the very body of the ship limb from limb to provide himself with the building materials for his 'kingdom.' Crusoe's violence as a plunderer is most graphically shown, however, in his later journal account of a disconcertingly obstetric operation in which he hacks at the ship's 'ribs' to gain access to what lies within: "the beams being cut... the in-side of the hold lay so open that I could see into it... " (100). Crusoe's faintly erotic and decidedly violent domination of the laden body of the ship underlines the sense of the ship as a female nurturer in an echo of those other "digg'd out ribs of Gold" encountered in Paradise Lost (1.689-90).²² Even as the ship is cast as a nurturer, Crusoe's violence enacts a brutal repudiation of dependence upon the sustenance offered by the ship and replaces it with a physical command of "her" body. And it is the disembowelment of this body that helps to ensure the survival of Crusoe's corporeal frame during his long life on the island.

The violence of the assault upon the "bulged" body to extract valuables for use in his future kingdom underlines the fact that Crusoe can only found his kingdom and estates upon the dismembered and cannibalized body of the 'mother' whereof he feeds. So if the politics governing eating in his father's house render Crusoe prey to his father's voracity

it is through a displacement of those relations that Crusoe's domestic realm is established on the island. Crusoe shifts his own subject position as prey onto those he consumes and so builds what will become his colony on the basis of either the ready or the enforced consumability of others. The methodical, almost ritualistic, cannibalization of the mother ship signals, just as the consumability and saleability of lesser species and 'savages' elsewhere signals, one aspect of Crusoe's gustatory rite de passage into the ranks of those who eat rather than those who are eaten, of those who take possession, rather than wait to receive.

Another aspect of this transition is Crusoe's relation to the island, and more properly, the land itself. Crusoe's series of encounters with the land offers strong parallels to the episode of the ship and underlines the symbolic weight of his particular use of each of these as resources. The idea of land as a female would have been a familiar one in the early eighteenth century because of its currency in the burgeoning writings about settlement in the New World since the 1500s. The centuries-old linguistic habit of referring to land as a woman, a habit which had fallen into disuse by the sixteenth century was, according to Annette Kolodny, vigorously revived by the 'discovery' of America which gave the idea of land as mother an everyday reality and immediacy. Because so many of the writings about discovery and settlement emphasized the new lands' bounty

and
or
th
tr
ce
th
o
(
f
s

and the ease with which such lands might be profitably mined or worked, they would have offered a particular appeal to the mood of overseas investment in plantations and foreign trading ventures in the first two decades of the eighteenth century.²³ Defoe has Crusoe, who is, after all, stranded on the island during a period of intensive emigration and overseas settlement during the years of the Stuart monarchy (1659-1688), follow in one part of this tradition when he figures the island as a mother who nurtures in the immediate sense of providing a new haven from the tempestuous element after his vessel founders.

Like the wrecked ship, however, the island is rapidly translated into a nurturer of a slightly different order, that is, into its capacity to provide Crusoe with food. While the roles of nurturer and nourisher are not discordant in the cultural discourse of motherhood, what is interesting is the way that these functions join to enable the emergence of an elaborate pattern of womb-like enclosures which both feed and protect Crusoe.²⁴ Very soon after his arrival on the island, Crusoe builds an enclosure of a double row of stakes suggestive of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century obstetrical and anatomical notions of the womb being surrounded by protective bones. Crusoe further excavates a large hollow with means of egress and regress into which he introduces the goods and foodstuffs that will enable his survival.

But the fact that the land nourishes from its own store also allows it to develop rapidly into something beyond this kind of mother figure. The land acquires erotic appeal through a fecundity which invites intemperate and connotatively incestuous indulgence of the appetites: "I found mellons upon the ground in great abundance, and grapes upon the trees; the vines had spread indeed over the trees, and the clusters of grapes were... very ripe and rich" (113). Faintly dangerous because indulgence in her fruits can bring on flux and fevers, the land nevertheless affords "a secret kind of pleasure" and as Crusoe contemplates possession of her, he constructs himself as licensed to proceed by an age-old privilege: "to think that this was all my own, that I was king and lord of all this country indefeasibly, and had a right of possession; and if I could convey it, I might have it in inheritance as compleatly as any lord of a manor in England" (114). In addition to this claiming of privilege, the 'fruits' that Crusoe elsewhere wrests from the land as mother-mistress through his plantation-style seeding of tracts for maximum yield (118), enable the leisure which is necessary for the enjoyment of his country-house and sea-coast estates.

Because the estates, each supported by its own plantation and cattle enclosures, rely upon the deliberate and purposeful exploitation of the mother-mistress island, another womb-like enclosure that Crusoe appropriates--the cave that he finds concealed in the interior of the island--

becomes laden with meaning. Erickson alludes to the sexually-suggestive nature of this cave when he remarks that Crusoe's discovery of the "virginal cave made by no hands 'but those of meer Nature' marks Crusoe's farthest penetration into, or 'possession' of his kingdom" (68). Erickson's suggestion that the cave is virgin land is, however, belied by the fact that the entrance to the cave is blocked by its previous occupant. With his "broad shining eyes," and his "very loud sigh like that of an old man in pain," the "monstrous frightful old he-goat, just making his will... and gasping for life, and dying indeed of meer old age" (183), resembles no-one more closely than Crusoe's gouty, chamber-ridden father. The death of the goat releases to Crusoe, not a barren or unseeded tract, but a cave pregnant with treasure. Nearly two-hundred feet high and studded with what Crusoe believes to be diamonds, precious stones or gold (184), the womb-like enclosure left to Crusoe by the goat becomes the "vault" to which Crusoe will take his valuables--his munitions, his ammunition, his money, and Friday--for safekeeping as he elsewhere entrusts his valuables to that other isolated and vacated goldmine, the frugal "good ancient widdow."

Crusoe's occasional, but financially strategic, recourse to the widow initially mark her value as just another female item available for his consumption, for the self-sacrificing woman invests wisely for him despite her own wasted substance and straitened circumstances. However,

closer examination discloses that the widow is the enabling force in Crusoe's success because it is she who initiates the profitable triangulated commerce--the trading of purchased 'servants,' tobacco, and English goods sold at four times their value--which yields stock valued in excess of the original capital investment. The widow thus becomes a shadow of Crusoe's biological mother in the sense that the money first given to the widow is the money that Crusoe makes on what he describes as "the only voyage which I may say was successful in all my adventures" (40). Although Crusoe attributes his success on this voyage to the ship's captain who teaches him the principles of navigation, the success that Crusoe seeks--success as a trader--is only possible because of the initial forty pounds that his mother raises on his behalf. Crusoe's use of his mother is therefore analagous to his commandeering of the ship and the island. The mother's summoning of material resources enables his success in terms of the world beyond the island just as the island and the ship provide Crusoe with the means to establish a polity after the fashion of his father, and each enables Crusoe to establish ascendancy over other men. Like the mother-mistress island, the mother-as-resource acknowledges what Swift's Spanish name for another island, La Puta, would make abundantly clear; that 'she' is the whore (as well as the trade) on which one doats.²⁵

It might still be argued that Crusoe's cannibalization of the ship and his plundering of the island's bounty are

j

t

f

s

s

C

w

c

P

t

m

f

N

f

h

t

C

r

le

ac

justifiable necessities. Indeed one might ask whether, given the dismal prospects that the island at first seems to offer for Crusoe's survival, Crusoe has any choice but to use the ship, and contend that there is no good reason for him to shun the wealth that the land affords. However, because Crusoe elsewhere demonstrates a thorough understanding of what--besides basic subsistence--is at stake in the politics of consumption, it is not possible to dismiss Crusoe's particular use of the stranded vessel nor his luxuriation in the riches of the earth quite so easily. The stakes become more clearly defined in Crusoe's deliberate pursuit of female flesh on the island to satisfy his carnal desires. Not only does Crusoe mine another female 'treasure' in the form of a turtle filled with eggs (101) immediately after his plunder of the wrecked ship, but he also comes to see that she-goats and their young, despite their resistance and Crusoe's own momentary pangs of remorse, may be had with relative ease:

I killed a she-goat which had a little kid by her which she gave suck to, which grieved me heartily... I laid down the dam, and took the kid up in my arms... in hopes to have it bred up tame, but it would not eat, so I was forced to kill it and eat it myself. (79)²⁶

More interesting still--indeed a fascinating object lesson in the politics of eating--is Crusoe's mode of acquiring and taming goats for purposes of domestic use.

Having tethered a beast and left it without any means of feeding for several days, Crusoe makes the fullest use of his advantage:

I began to think of the poor kid, which I had penned within my little circle, and resolved to go and fetch it home, or give it some food; accordingly I went, and found it where I left it, for indeed it could not get out, but almost starved for want of food.... having fed it, I ty'd it as I did before, to lead it away; but it was so tame with being hungry, that I had no need to have ty'd it, for it followed me like a dog; as I continually fed it, the creature became so loving, so gentle, and so fond, that it became from that time one of my domesticks also, and would never leave me afterwards. (124)

Able, simply by virtue of greater might, to incorporate kids in the fleshly sense of eating them, Crusoe first effects a figurative incorporation which is here painted as a benevolent attempt at domestication. Crusoe's feeding of the goat to make it tractable in this passage, as he elsewhere selectively feeds the cats he retains for companionship and destroys all others, serves a function: it brings the beasts into the enclosure which marks off Crusoe's domestic sphere from all that lies beyond his pales. In feeding the goats, Crusoe makes the desired objects an integral part of his domestic "little circle." As the flock from which Crusoe selects the animals that he is going to devour is ultimately spoken of as his "little family," the feeding of one's "domesticks" becomes collapsed into feeding on one's "domesticks" which is, as a modest proposer has elsewhere

established, the age-old privilege of the "lord of the whole manor." Here, the majestic, paternalistic privilege of absolute command ("I could hang, draw, give liberty, and take it away, and no rebels among all my subjects" [157]) becomes the privilege of the butcher. It is therefore only with the driest humor or the most gruesome irony that one can enjoy Crusoe's idyll and "smile to [see him] and [his] little family sit down to dinner" (157).

As his methods of husbandry show, Crusoe, like Kreutznaer before him, maximizes his capacity to give or to withhold food in order to maintain about him a "family" upon which he can feed.²⁷ Furthermore, although Crusoe supposedly shudders at the mere thought of exocannibalism as it is practiced by the Amerindians, he himself institutes a form of endocannibalism when he gathers goats for his household's deferred consumption. Just as the cannibals use anthropophagy ritually as a means of dealing with competitively invasive enemies and to differentiate between the prowess of competing groups, so Crusoe's cannibalistic husbandry proclaims who is licensed to eat whom; Crusoe's domestic husbandry institutes a system which allows its head unrestricted access to the members.²⁸ This system is both conducive to capitalism in that it enables the accumulation of a deliberately-amassed surplus enabling selective and strategic future consumption, and emblematic of the system that underwrites Crusoe's project of colonizing the island.

When Friday is brought within the circle prescribed by Crusoe's pales he is claimed in much the same way as the goats have been claimed--and he is husbanded in more than one sense of the word. In a repetition of Crusoe's taming of the goat, Crusoe initially makes Friday tractable by withholding the type of food that Friday is wont to consume and replacing that food with matter of Crusoe's own creation. As Pearlman has observed, Defoe's representation of Crusoe's elaborate weaning of Friday from a "cannibal diet" with bread and milk is rather absurd in view of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century travellers' reports that the the Caribs did not live solely on human flesh and that anthropophagy was a religious and ceremonial practice for them. Pearlman further asserts that the weaning episode works to create a dutiful son bound to glorify Crusoe and to do his bidding:

It should come as no surprise when he tells us of Friday, that "his very affections were tied to me, like those of a child to a father".... Friday is dealt with not as a child, but as an infant. Crusoe strips him of all personality; he is a zero, a cipher, and the characteristics attributed to him merely projections of Crusoe's own needs.²⁹

Pearlman is right to underscore the egocentrism that is implied this treatment of Friday and the way that Crusoe thereby diminishes Friday. But in one crucial respect Pearlman does not go far enough. More disturbing than the actual fact of Crusoe's egocentricity is the total obedience

req

Cru

a r

to

fin

vi

wi

de

u

t

w

s

c

f.

se

th

En

ey

required of Friday at the most fundamental level at which Crusoe's egocentrism is effective. In what must be seen as a rather bizarre repetition of Adam's conjuring of Eve prior to her actually coming into being in Paradise Lost, Crusoe first conceives Friday in a dream immediately after he is violently agitated by his desire for a meet companion who will let him learn about his own condition on, and means of deliverance from, his paradisaal island:

When this had agitated my thoughts for two hours or more with such violence, that it set my blood into a ferment, and my pulse beat as high as if I had been in a fever, meerly with the extraordinary fervour of my mind about it; nature, as if I had been fatigued and exhausted with the very thought of it, threw me into a sound sleep... [and] I dreamed.... (202)

Even though Crusoe describes the dream as being unrelated to his mental activity prior to sleep, the fact that he conjures a companion for himself and that he does so when he is in an unmistakeably excited, even frenzied, state, heightens the erotic suggestiveness of Friday's conception.³⁰ Moreover, when Friday is encountered in the flesh in a meeting which virtually reenacts the dream sequence, he is described in terms that set him apart from the other Amerindians, the cannibals who seek to devour. Enticing and desirable when given through Crusoe's waking eyes, Friday is

a comely handsome fellow, perfectly well made; with straight strong limbs, not too large; tall

and well shaped... a very good countenance... something very manly in his face... yet he had all the sweetness and softness of an European in his countenance too, especially when he smiled. His hair was long and black, not curled like wool; his forehead very high and large, and a great vivacity and sparkling sharpness in his eyes.... His face was round and plump; his nose small, not flat like the negroes, a very good mouth, thin lips, and his fine teeth well set, and white as ivory. (208)

Because the description of Friday is given with all the cloying detail of a Romantic love object, it acquires a homoerotic quality which points up Friday's fitness for consumption. Not only is sweet, plump Friday appealingly sensual, but the fact that he is rendered as an assemblage of body parts underscores the similarity of the cannibals' and the father-like Crusoe's potential uses for him.³¹ The cannibals intend to use Friday both for ceremonial purposes and to assuage certain appetites, or, as Friday explains and Crusoe translates, "'They no eat mans but when makes the war fight'; that is to say, they never eat any men but such as come to fight with them, and are taken in battle" (224). While Crusoe's consumption of Friday is not literal, it is nevertheless a figurative incorporation designed to sate a form of power lust.

Following the successful defeat of the cannibals at the time of Friday's so-called rescue,³² Crusoe also enacts the ritual of a victory feast and it is fitting that his ritual differs from that of the cannibals only in so far as Crusoe substitutes the flesh of young goats for that of Friday (213). Just as the reprieve from the cannibals causes Friday

to
his
eve
cre
com
"[I
my
th
ru
of
ar
Cr
pe
f
t
c
f
m
f
e
b
i
a
t)
In
es

to kneel down, kiss the ground, and lay Crusoe's foot upon his head "in token of swearing to be [Crusoe's] slave for ever" (207), so the killing of a kid to celebrate victory creates in Friday an abject submission similar to the complete bodily possession celebrated in the cannibal feast: "[Friday] came and kneeled down to me, and embraceing [sic] my knees, said a great many things... I could easily see that the meaning was to pray me not to kill him" (213). The rules governing conquest, capture and the consumption or use of prisoners of war, as they are explained by Friday (and are here tacitly adhered to by both the cannibals and Crusoe), dictate that he who spares life, in essence possesses the power to take life. By an extension of this formulation, he who spares life has, figuratively, the means to give life.

Yet if the fact of Crusoe's ritual places physical control of the body at the center of the master-servant and father-son relationship, it also strongly suggests that mastery is intimately bound up with the designation of functions and the names given to certain functionaries. For example, the fact that Crusoe's sovereignty of the island is based first and foremost upon his verbal claim to the island--upon his naming of the island and everything in it as his own and himself as its "lord" and master--suggests that the act of naming is, at bottom, an act of creation. Indeed as a skillful propagandist, pamphleteer and especially as a promoter of colonization and trade in the

colonies, Defoe's awareness of the power of discursive practices, his 'linguistic colonialism' in laying claim to human and other resources, ought not to be overlooked.

Examining Defoe's copious writings promoting colonization against the backdrop of his many money-making schemes in the New World, Fakrul Alam observes that both in Defoe's narratives and in his essays, particularly those in Serious Reflections, linguistic conversion follows rapidly on the heels of physical domination and religious (Christian) invasion. Writing in a similar vein about more recent colonialist literature, Abdul R. JanMohamed holds that the most powerful means by which colonization is effected is not through materialist practices, the efficacy of which ultimately depends upon the technological superiority of the colonizing force. Control is most effectively exercised through the acceptance by colonized peoples of the colonizers' system of values, attitudes, discursive practices and mode of production. JanMohamed distinguishes between material and discursive practices to expose the contradictions between the stated purposes of colonization, to 'civilize' and 'Christianize,' and its covert aim, to exploit the colony's resources thoroughly and ruthlessly. JanMohamed shows that, at the same time as the materialist and discursive practices seem contradictory, there is a profoundly symbiotic relationship between them because "the discursive practices do to the symbolic presence of the native what the material practices do to his

physical presence; the writer commodifies him so that he can be exploited more efficiently by the administrator."³³

The considerable material benefits which accrue from Crusoe's naming of the island as his realm attest to the efficacy of linguistic practices and to the power of naming in particular, for, as Patterson has observed, one's name is the "verbal signal" of one's identity and the use of a different name is universally recognized as a sign of altered status. Patterson notes that a name change is often associated with the stripping of a former identity, an increase or denudation of privileges, or a change in social or legal standing, as Daniel Foe, son of a tallow chandler, was undoubtedly aware. In master-slave relations, Patterson identifies re-naming as a feature of enslavement secondary only to the usually ritualized consumption of a slave's first meal in the master's house. Such a meal, consisting of the type of food that the master customarily eats, symbolizes the cutting of ties with the slave's kinsmen; the ingestion of the master's food and renaming together signal the creation of a future kin tie or allegiance to the master.³⁴

Nowhere is the significance of a change in name and the power implicitly vested in the name-giver more strikingly exhibited than in what transpires during the naming of Friday. Crusoe presumes that the Carib has no name and no comprehensible language but dumb show in the same way that he presumes that the island is previously 'undiscovered'

land. In giving the young man who escapes from the cannibal feast a name, Crusoe both claims the power to designate functions and underscores the fact that proprietorship commonly attends naming. In a ritual which carries the symbolic weight of a communion, Crusoe actually brings Friday, the reforming cannibal and his soon-to-be Christianized servant, into being, for none such exists prior to the naming.³⁵ In the act of linguistic creation which is virtually simultaneous with Crusoe's first 'gift' of food to the Carib, Crusoe speaks Friday's servitude and the ease with which he will be assimilated to his master's ways:

[Friday] made all the signs to me of subjection, servitude, and submission imaginable.... I began to speak to him, and teach him to speak to me; and first, I made him know his name should be Friday... taught him to say Master, and then let him know, that was to be my name; I likewise taught him to say yes and no, and to know the meaning of them; I gave him some milk in an earthen pot... [and] a cake of bread... [and he] made signs that it was very good for him. (209)

A condition which in slave-master relations Patterson calls "human parasitism" reinforces Crusoe's first human subject's obedience and his supposed dependence on Crusoe as sovereign master. Referring to an aspect of European Americans' relationships with their African slaves, Patterson describes human parasitism as a phenomenon in which "one party produces nothing and consumes part of the other's product." Patterson sees this as an initially

unstable situation which can be stabilized only through the slave's alienation from all other attachments. With Patterson's example of African slaves in North America, as with other situations of enslavement, alienation takes the form of the genealogical isolation and detachment of the slave. Such casting adrift of the slave from all points of reference to social and cultural systems other than those of the master causes the social death of the slave who, as a result of his/her alienation, has no existence or social legitimacy except through the parasitic master:³⁶

[o]n this intersubjective level the slaveholder fe[e]d[s] on the slave to gain the very direct satisfaction of power over another, honor, enhancement, and authority. The slave, losing in the process all claim to autonomous power, [is] degraded and reduced to a state of liminality.
(337)

The situation that Patterson describes is one in which the master's parasitic dependence on the minion, subject or slave is transformed by paradoxically defining the minion as dependent. At the same time that the condition of parasitism obscures the master's satisfaction with the position of authority, it renders the minion as a pitiful creature who cannot survive without the master. That the term human parasitism accurately depicts the relationship between Crusoe and a number of those whom he subjects is amply demonstrated when Crusoe later requires the marooned ship's captain and the men put ashore by mutineers to live by his

ru

I

gi

th

(2

Cl

de

ge

c:

ha

de

w

s

o

o

c

r

X

'

F

i

c

h

te

th

rules: "'you will not pretend to any authority here; and if I put any arms into your hands, you will upon all occasions give them up to me, and do no prejudice to me or mine upon this island, and in the mean time be governed by my orders'" (254). In the sublimation of Europeans, as with the Carib, Crusoe justifies his actions by casting them as parasitic dependents who can only survive under the superior governance of a master who directs their labor and who creates stringent laws to enable their survival and happiness; although it is Crusoe who actually seeks to be delivered from isolation by his subjects, he credits himself with their deliverance.³⁷

The declarative act of naming others as subjects and servants is therefore by no means removed from other more overt forms of oral violence in Robinson Crusoe. In the case of Friday, Crusoe both authors a persona for later narrative consumption and creates a being whose existence as servant, reformed 'savage' and as "my man, Friday" (like "[his] boy Xury") is entirely incorporated into the existence of the 'civilized' master. Crusoe's linguistic assimilation of Friday is therefore every bit as powerful as any material incorporation that anthropophagy can achieve. In constructing Friday verbally as a minion in relation to himself as master, and by additionally showing his capacity to follow this through with physical force, Crusoe precludes the possibility of Friday's resistance.

In the light of Crusoe's propensity to assimilate others as a means of appropriating their value, Crusoe's own fear of being literally consumed on the island can be viewed in two distinct ways, each associated with being penetrated, invaded or colonized. At one level the possibility of the existence of another person constitutes a threat to the self; the very sight of the footprint destroys security and signals destruction rather than deliverance. The cannibals do not, however, threaten mere destruction; they threaten "the worst kind of destruction" (200). Not only do signs of the cannibals' presence herald complete annihilation in the literal act of incorporation, but the sheer physicality of the act of cannibalism makes undeniable the fact that the most extreme form of subjection to another's will and system of values has taken place. In fact Crusoe's explanation for the killing of cannibals on the occasion of the Spaniard's rescue shows that the murders have very little to do with the immediate physical threat that the cannibals pose either to the Spaniard or to Crusoe himself. Crusoe's attack is triggered, despite his sometime resolution not to "meddle" or presume himself the executioner of God's justice, by the sight of the Spanish captive who is "an European, and ha[s] cloaths on" and whose first word upon rescue, though it is the Latin form, is nevertheless, "'Christianus'" (233-5). It is entirely fitting that once Crusoe vomits the "disorder" occasioned by his first sight of a cannibal feast, he thanks God--not for not being the cannibals' next meal--but for his

ontological separateness from the cannibals: "[I] gave God thanks that had cast my first lot in a part of the world where I was distinguished from such dreadful creatures as these" (172).³⁸

In this sequence, as Crusoe later observes, cannibalism represents the complete loss of ontological being: "what would become of me, if I fell into the hands of the savages; or how should I escape from them, if they attempted me..." (emphases added, 201). Cannibalism is here the quintessential expression of what it is to be 'mastered'--to be assimilated into an alien body without trace. And this form of violent assimilation, as the text amply demonstrates through its choice of would-be cannibal victims, comes closest to being realized through the incorporation of certain forms of otherness; of youth that has suffered itself to be conquered (Friday and Xury), of the aged and infirm (Friday's father), and of those, like the Catholic Spaniard, who in their alienness are too weak to defend themselves. Masterful like the cannibals in that he gains custody of the same would-be cannibal victims--as well as his own addition of the 'savages' themselves and of those female bodies which might be easily laid waste--Crusoe is more cannibalistic than the cannibals themselves. Through his acts of sublimation, Crusoe does not have to actually consume those he captures, he merely incorporates them and so compels them to do as he desires.

Notes

Maggie Kilgour (From Communion to Cannibalism: An Anatomy of Metaphors of Incorporation [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990], 250, n.11) points out that 'incorporation' in its rarer forms can mean both to furnish with a body and to copulate. More usual significances are: to unite into one body or uniform substance; to put something else into or include it in the body or substance; to put one thing into another so as to form a body or integral whole; to take in or include as part of something; to join or form into a society or organization; to constitute as a legal constitution. The three basic forms that Kilgour draws from these definitions are 'incarceration' (to give something formless a body), 'consubstantiation' (the joining of two bodies), and 'sublimation' or 'cannibalism' (the subsumption of one body by another). It is the interplay between these significances that I wish to evoke in my title and so to highlight in this chapter.

1. E. Pearlman, "Robinson Crusoe and the Cannibals," Mosaic 10 (1976): 50. Contemporary writers on cannibalism include Peter Martyr, De nouo Orbe, or The History of the West Indies (1612); Richard Hakluyt, Hakluyt's Voyages

(1600); Charles de Rochefort, History of the Caribby-Islands, (1665). Michel Eyquem de Montaigne, "Of Cannibals," in The Essays of Montaigne, trans. E. J. Trenchmann, vol. 1 (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), 209.

2. Peggy Reeves Sanday, Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 11; Pearlman, 51.

3. Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 21, xii, 31.

4. Douglas, 4.

5. Sanday, 13, 37.

6. Daniel Defoe, The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, ed. Angus Ross (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1965), 28. All subsequent references will be to this edition and page numbers will be given parenthetically in my text.

7. Ian Bell (Defoe's Fiction [Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1985], 83) notes that Kreutznaer's affliction, gout, is traditionally (if inaccurately) associated with gluttony and venery. He links Kreutznaer's name with Defoe's identification of drunkenness as a trait of the Germans in The True Born Englishman and so with intemperance.

8. Kilgour, 15.

9. Florence Rush's study of the sexual abuse of children in the Judeo-Christian West (The Best Kept Secret: Sexual Abuse of Children [New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980])

explores the culture of indebtedness between parents and children. While Rush stresses the way that deeply-embedded notions of duty to parents enables the abuse of girls--including the incestuous abuse of daughters by fathers--she also suggests that societies which normalize such abuse of girls thereby enable the sexual abuse of boys. Rush's discussion of emotional coercion and the physical access of fathers to their children is particularly valuable for the insights it gives as to why and how such abuse is experienced and silenced. On the abuse of boys in particular, see pp. 176-82.

10. Paul Rozin, "Psychobiological Perspectives on Food Preferences and Avoidances," in Food and Evolution: Toward a Theory of Human Food Habits, ed. Marvin Harris and Eric B. Ross (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987), 182-83; Kilgour describes verbal communication in the frame of cannibalism and communion as, an "oral activity that is similar to eating but [which] offers a less physical model for exchange.... Food is the matter that goes into the mouth, words the more refined substance that afterward comes out: the two are differentiated, and yet somehow analogous, media exchanged among men" (8).

11. Defoe's verse satire, The True Born Englishman, first published in 1700, emphasizes miscegenation in a way that makes it clear that Defoe is no stranger to the frequent, though unspoken and usually undocumented, sexual abuses that attend mastery:

That Het'rogeneous Thing, an Englishman:
 In eager Rapes, and furious Lust begot,
 Betwixt a Painted Britain and a Scot:
 Whose gend'ring Offspring quickly learn'd to Bow,
 And yoke their Heifers to the Roman plough:
 From whence a Mongrel half-Bred Race there came,
 With neither Name, nor Nation, Speech or Fame.
 In whose hot Veins new Mixtures quickly ran....
 (1.280-87)

12. On this point see Dennis Rubini, "Sexuality and Augustan England: Sodomy, Politics, Elite Circles, and Society," Journal of Homosexuality 16, nos. 1-2 (1988): 355-60. For a discussion of charges of sodomy and navy prosecutions extending into the latter part of the century, see Arthur N. Gilbert "Buggery and the British Navy," Journal of Social History 10, no. 1 (1976): 72-98.

13. To imply that the Societies for the Reformation of Manners singlemindedly pursued sodomites is perhaps misleading, for the Societies were almost certainly summoned to partisan and personal political uses. On the ways in which the Societies were used in the pursuit of individual interests of members of the Country party such as the Reverend Thomas Bray, see Rubini, 352-358. Rubini's discussion is also useful for the distinctions that it makes within Christianity and its consideration of the political value of linking a Catholic monarch, via the association of Catholicism and Rome, with sodomy. On Defoe's involvement in the Societies, see Paula Backscheider's, Daniel Defoe: His Life (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press,

15

th

Be

J

i

R

C

R

D

Y

t

o

v

c

R

m

o

o

s

p

u

b

p

w

th

1989), 235-40. Backscheider makes no explicit mention that the Societies were active against sodomites.

14. Randolph Trumbach, "London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century," Journal of Social History 11, no. 1 (1977): 6. Trumbach identifies Italy as the other "home" of sodomy; G. S. Rousseau, "The Pursuit of Homosexuality in the Eighteenth Century: 'Utterly Confused Category' and/or Rich Repository?" in 'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality During the Enlightenment, ed. Robert Purks Maccubbin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 132-68. According to Rousseau, the supposed origin of sodomy depended greatly on England's political relations of the moment and so it was variously identified as Italy, France and Turkey.

15. Gilbert discerns such a reluctance in his study of court martials records in the British Navy from 1700-1861. Records show that buggery was treated as seriously as murder, mutiny and desertion in that it was a capital offence. Gilbert has found that during the most active years of the war of the Spanish Succession (1703-1710), death sentences for buggery in the navy made up twenty-seven percent of the total number of death sentences. Observing an unwillingness to convict on the part of some court martial boards, Gilbert convincingly argues that to acknowledge participation in sodomy--even as a non-consenting partner--was to expose oneself to the stigma of the sodomite and to the possibility of being sentenced to death for buggery. The

reluctance to name buggery led to confusion about defining the act and this later resulted in many cases where alleged rapes were recounted in great detail.

16. James Joyce noted the sexual apathy of Crusoe in a lecture on Defoe delivered in Trieste in 1912. An English translation is available in "Daniel Defoe" Buffalo Studies 1, no. 1 (1964): 5-25. Eric Berne's brief discussion of Robinson Crusoe in "The Psychological Structure of Space With Some Remarks on Robinson Crusoe," The Psychoanalytic Quarterly 25 (1956): 549-67, offers some valuable insights on the links between sexuality and oral incorporative urges but he does not connect these with homosexual desire. In Love and Death in the American Novel (New York: Anchor Books, 1966), Leslie Fiedler mentions Robinson Crusoe in terms of a tradition of the "pseudo-marriage of males" (366) but dismisses homoeroticism because he sees Friday as a stock comic figure for the racial and social inferior. Sexuality is seen as an important issue by Aydon Charlton ("The Appeal of Robinson Crusoe," Sphinx 2 [1974]: 21-37), but his essay does little more than trace evidence of the oral, anal and sexual phases of psychosexual development in Robinson Crusoe. Robert A. Erickson ("Starting Over with Robinson Crusoe," Studies in the Literary Imagination 15, no. 2 [1982]: 51-73) notes the frequent claim of an "absence of sex in the novel" and remarks on Crusoe's "literally 'womanless' condition on the island" (52). Seeing the island and wrecked ship as mother figures, Erickson claims that

each is highly sexualized but he confines his discussion solely to the heterosexual matrix. Martin Gliserman ("Robinson Crusoe: The Vicisstudes of Greed--Cannibalism and Capitalism. Displaced Desire: Money, Mother, Eating, and Encirclements," American Imago 47, nos. 3-4 [1990]: 177-231), arguing that Crusoe's desire for the mother is displaced into a desire for money, also focuses entirely on female figures as objects of male desire. In his article, "Orphaning the Family: The Role of Kinship in Robinson Crusoe," ELH 55, no. 2 (1988): 381-419, Christopher Flint makes the provocative claim that "Friday seems to answer almost all of [Crusoe's] desires" (394), but his discussion remains within the main critical corpus which frames desire as male heterosexual desire. One notable exception to this trend is Humphrey Richardson's novella, The Sexual Life of Robinson Crusoe (Paris: Olympia Press, 1955). This work, which invites analysis in its own right because of its disturbing and pornographic luxuriation in sexual violence, also deserves attention for the way that it exploits the 'absence' of sexuality to disclose the potential for rather different sexual arrangements than those identified in the studies mentioned above. Richardson's work has been given scant scholarly notice. For example, John A. Stoler's bibliography (Daniel Defoe, An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1900-1980 [New York: Garland, 1984]) claims that a copy of Richardson's text could not be found even after an intensive interlibrary loan search. I myself

had no difficulty in locating the work in an ordinary interlibrary search. In William L. Payne's bibliography ("An Annotated Bibliography of Works about Daniel Defoe, 1719-1974: Part II," Bulletin of Bibliography 32, no. 2 [1975]: 71) in which the novella is listed under "Studies, Reviews, Criticism," does not annotate the novella. Helen H. Palmer and Anne Jane Dyson's English Novel Explication: Criticisms to 1972 (Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1973) does not list Richardson's work at all.

17. "Satyr be kind and draw a silent Veil, / Thy Native England's Vices to conceal..." The True Born Englishman (1.145-6).

18. Daniel Defoe, Conjugal Lewdness; or, Matrimonial Whoredom. A Treatise Concerning the Use and Abuse of the Marriage Bed (1727; reprint, Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1967), 16, 385.

19. Michel Foucault, The Use of Pleasure, vol. 2 of The History of Sexuality, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 215, 220-23.

20. Orlando Patterson, Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), 421, n.18. Paul Rycaut's The History of the Ottoman Empire was first published in 1668; by 1670 it was in its third edition, and by 1670, its sixth. An abridged form was appended to Savage's "History of the Turks in 1701" and the work was translated into French (1670 and 1677), Polish (1678) and German (1694).

21. On this point see Homer Obed Brown, "The Displaced Self in the Novels of Daniel Defoe," ELH 38, no. 4 (1971): 567.

22. As Michael Seidel ("Robinson Crusoe" Island Myths and the Novel [Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991], 42) has observed, the area of Crusoe's settlement is located in the mouth of the Orinoco. Because Walter Raleigh had hoped to discover El Dorado, the city of gold, in the same river basin, the location of Crusoe's island and the fact that the vessel becomes stranded here gives the island a legendary association with gold.

23. Annette Kolodny, The Lay of the Land: Metaphors as Experience and History in American Life and Letters (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), 8-9. The image of land in the New World as a fertile and bountiful woman is available, for example, in the writings of Richard Hakluyt (1584), Robert Johnson (1609), John Smith (1616), John Hammond (1656), Robert Beverley (1705), and Robert Mountgomry (1717). For a fascinating discussion of how this series of images is taken up in erotica of the period, see Paul Gabriel Boucé, "Chtonic and Pelagic Metaphorization in Eighteenth-Century English Erotica," Eighteenth-Century Life 9, no. 3 (1985): 202-17. Defoe himself represents land as a woman in The True Born Englishman: "England, unknown as yet, unpeopled lay; / Happy, had she remain'd so to this Day, / And not to ev'ry Nation been a Prey. / Her open Harbours, and her Fertile Plains, / The Merchants Glory these, and

those the Swains / To ev'ry Barbarous Nation have betray'd
her, / Who Conquer her as oft as they Invade her" (1.95-
101).

24. Gliserman, 202-3.

25. Kolodny shows that land subject to excessive demands was conceived as a generous mother raped and violated by her own children. Embedded in the image of land as bountiful mother, Kolodny claims, is a confusion of filial and erotic responses which result in the horrors of incest (12-22). See also Dorothy Dinnerstein, The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 104-5, 109. On the longstanding association of the uterus with money, with a purse, and with the idea of productivity in these senses, see Thomas Laqueur, Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990), 64, 263, n.4.

26. Crusoe repeatedly seeks out female flesh, for example: "I could have shot as many [fowl] as I pleased, but... had more mind to kill a she-goat... which I could better feed on" (123). When Crusoe's ammunition dwindles, he considers another pregnant goat the source of a ready supply of food (154). By contrast, male creatures such as the "great lyon" shot by Crusoe and Xury are "game indeed... but... no food" (49). The lion, like the ravenous leopard that Crusoe later gives to his "friendly negroes" (52), has trophy value. Keeping the leopard's pelt distinguishes

Crusoe as one who is able to overcome a 'maneater' and so lends him a certain status.

27. Flint suggests that Crusoe duplicates his father's economic order and then replaces him; a similar duplication and replacement pattern is at work in the relations of predation (388).

28. Diane Armstrong ("The Myth of Cronus: Cannibal and Sign in Robinson Crusoe," Eighteenth-Century Fiction 4, no. 3 [1992]: 218) elaborates this through the figure of the cannibal king. Patterson groups the twenty-nine meanings of the word 'master' given in the Oxford English Dictionary under four basic headings: a man with authority as the captain of a sailing vessel; one qualified to teach; a title or complimentary rank; an indication of superiority (eg. mastermind). These four categories succinctly demonstrate the ease with which brutal domination and pastoral edification can be conflated (334-35). Cf. Richard Braverman, "Crusoe's Legacy," Studies in the Novel 18, no. 1 (1985): 1-26.

29. Pearlman, 43.

30. In Conjugal Lewdness Defoe links sodomy with gluttony when he suggests that the inhabitants of Sodom enjoyed "diverse other Excesses, besides that one delectable Crime, which bears the Name and Reproach of the Place to *this* Day. Their gorged Stomachs discovered themselves, no *doubt*, in all the Excesses of a provoked Appetite, and an *inflamed* Blood..." (320-21). In suggesting that food and sex

have similar and interrelated effects, Defoe might simply have been making reference to common, if outmoded, notions about bodily humors; nevertheless the two forms of appetite coalesce in Conjugal Lewdness, as in Robinson Crusoe, about the "Sins of Sodom."

31. Edward D. Seeber ("Oroonoko and Crusoe's Man Friday," Modern Language Quarterly 12 [1951]: 286-91), notes the similarity of this passage to a description of the enslaved African nobleman of Aphra Behn's Oroonoko, or, The Royal Slave (1688). The two descriptions function in similar ways in that each renders its subject for the reader's sensory delectation. Whereas Friday is represented as a collage of body parts, however, Oroonoko is physically dismembered so that the two descriptions occupy different positions along a continuum of erotized violence. Richardson exploits the full erotic potential and the latent violence of the description in Robinson Crusoe (140-55). For a fuller discussion of the interconnectedness of eroticism and violence in slave-master relationships, see Jessica Benjamin, "The Bonds of Love: Rational Violence and Erotic Domination," in The Future of Difference, ed. Hester Einstein and Alice Jardine (Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1980), 41-70.

32. Pearlman astutely observes that by the time that Crusoe steps into the chase (ostensibly to rescue Friday from the cannibals) Friday has already outpaced his pursuers. Crusoe's later confession that Friday would

probably would have very quickly escaped his pursuers altogether, places a question over the issue of whether the violence perpetrated on the cannibals can be explained as necessary (defensive) violence (53).

33. Fakrul Alam also notes that colonized people who are to become usable as servants in Defoe's narratives are often tractable. They are very willing to learn to speak English and it is implied that to speak is to speak English. "Religious and Linguistic Colonialism in Defoe's Fiction," North Dakota Quarterly 55, no. 3 (1987): 118, 120-21. Abdul JanMohamed, "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature," Critical Inquiry 12 (1985): 64.

34. Patterson, 54.

35. Naming declares integrity by establishing that a collection of ideas is distinguishable as an entity. Naming enables concepts to be framed as discoveries and points of origin to be constructed much as Lennard J. Davis argues that the 'New' World had to be imagined as new or novel before it could be discovered. "The Facts of Events and the Event of Fact: New World Explorers and the Early Novel," The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation 32, no. 3 (1991): 241-43, 246.

36. Patterson, 337, 334-9.

37. Similarly, although Crusoe is proud of the fact that he allows liberty of conscience, he presumes that making allowances is his prerogative. As each subject

remains beholden to Crusoe, Crusoe claims the right to give freedom when, freedom, by its very definition, cannot be given: "First of all, the whole country was my own meer property... I had undoubted right of dominion. 2ndly, my people were perfectly subjected: I was absolute lord and lawgiver; they all owed their lives to me, and were ready to lay down their lives... for me.... we had but three subjects, and they were of three different religions... however, I allowed liberty of conscience throughout my dominions" (241). In spite of its air of affectation, Crusoe's speech actually describes with great accuracy the code by which Crusoe lives; liberty of conscience is exactly what his regime does not permit.

38. On the way that the presence of another being on the island destroys security, see Brown, 571-72, 576. David Dabydeen ("Eighteenth-century English Literature on Commerce and Slavery," in The Black Presence in English Literature, ed. David Dabydeen [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985], 28, 45) demonstrates that moral justification for the slave trade by a number of prominent men including John Dunton, James Boswell, Edward Long and James Grainger was offered on the grounds that slavery saved Africans. Slavery, Dabydeen suggests, was also justified as an evil 'necessary' to England's economic survival among the rival trading nations of Europe. Charles Davenant's argument in An Essay Upon the Probable Methods of Making a People Gainers in the Ballance of Trade (1699), echoed by Defoe in The Review of

February 3rd 1713 and in his writings on commerce, was that England needed to participate in trade to survive as a European and world power. On this point see also Carol Houlihan Flynn, The Body in Swift and Defoe (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 149-52. Cf. Daniel Statt, "Daniel Defoe and Immigration," Eighteenth-Century Studies 24, no. 3 (1991): 293-314.

Chapter 3: Bringing Up a Chicken for the Father's Table.

nothing but the last extremity shall make me abandon my father's house... if I can by any means, by any honest pretences, but keep off my evil destiny in it.... Whatever my motives, the world would not know them: to complain of a brother's unkindness, that one might do. It is too common a case where interests clash. But where the unkind father cannot be separated from the faulty brother, who could bear to lighten herself by loading a father?

A strutting rascal of a cock have I beheld... chucking his mistress to him, when he has found a single barley-corn... and when she has got the dirty pearl, he struts over her with an erected crest... sweeping the dust in humble courtship: while the obliged she... by her cowering tail, half-stretched wings, yet seemingly affrighted eyes... lets one see that she knows the barley-corn was not all he called her for.

the lady... thinks there can be no danger out of this house equal to what she apprehends from me in it.... The pretty simpleton knows nothing of the world....

--Samuel Richardson, Clarissa

In the previous chapter I considered ways in which the figure of cannibalism in Robinson Crusoe is linked with a particular kind of domestic economy reliant upon and

maintained by a power differential between father figures and the members of their households. I suggested that competition between men for resources and for political control is powerfully figured through the trope of cannibalism which works as a symbolic system to represent sometimes conflicting, but more frequently interlocking, hierarchies of power. In Clarissa, cannibalism is also summoned to use to represent power and the mechanisms through which it operates, as Raymond F. Hilliard has ably demonstrated in his article, "Clarissa and Ritual Cannibalism." Hilliard sees cannibalism as one of several kinds of oral violence in the work and links it to cultures preoccupied with orality and the mother imago.¹

Clarissa is, to be sure, replete with images of aggressive orality as successive attempts to coerce the exemplary daughter--into marriage with Solmes, into yielding to Lovelace--are expressed through various men's threats to devour her. Even though the son, James Harlowe, represents daughters as "chickens brought up [by their fathers] for the tables of other men" he assures Clarissa that the suitor, Roger Solmes "will neither eat [her], or drink [her]."² Solmes' convulsive gnawing at his cane, which belies James' assurance, gives way to a ravishment of Clarissa's hand with his "odious mouth" (319) in a menacing form of courtship. Lovelace describes himself as a ravening hound with "froth hanging about his vermillion jaws" and a "woman eater" (440, 720) as he anticipates his rape of Clarissa who is elsewhere

described as a "sweet lamb" singled out for the slaughter (559). Drawing on the wealth of just such metaphors in Clarissa, Hilliard argues that Clarissa becomes a scapegoat for collective psychic aggression and that "Lovelace shares with the other tyrannical misogynists in the novel--James and Mr. Harlowe, Uncle Antony, Solmes--a murderous, infantile rage at all signs of female intentionality, impulsivity, or independence" (1090). According to Hilliard, Clarissa's ritual cannibalization expresses a peculiarly male drive for autonomy and cannibalism is for Richardson the nexus between personal and social aggression directed primarily against women.³

Because Hilliard gives considerable attention to the implied oral violence of the mother-son relation in Clarissa and sees cannibalism in terms of the redirection of oral aggressive tendencies away from the mother, his discussion raises the question of how the other principal dynamic of the family romance--that of father and daughter--might be viewed through the frame of orality; if cannibalistic violence represents a striking and predominantly male penchant to devour and for power in Clarissa, the emaciation of Hilliard's female 'cannibal victim,' Clarissa, following her contracted oral activity--her virtual abstention from food--surely offers itself as an equally powerful, if inverted, image of orality. I suggest that whereas orally aggressive acts in Clarissa assert autonomy on the part of males, the act of not eating presents itself as the

asymmetrical counterpart that Western culture dominated by the heterosexual matrix offers to females. I further suggest that if the son's oral aggressiveness is associated with the process of individuation from the mother, then perhaps the daughter's emaciation may be linked to the father's capacity to effect her diminution. Placing my emphasis in this chapter on the rejection of food by a woman, rather than its consumption by a man, I will argue that Clarissa's alarmingly frequent food refusal, the circumstances under which it is inaugurated, and its result--her bodily emaciation--are in Clarissa powerful symbols of what it is to be feminine in a cultural milieu that identifies the propensity to consume as masculine--a milieu that measures men's successes over other men through each man's bodily mastery of the woman most completely in his power, his daughter. Exercised by more than one orally-aggressive father figure in Clarissa and underwritten by interrelated features of the patriarchal code, this mastery constructs the severely diminished body of the work's exemplary daughter, Clarissa.

* * *

Samuel Richardson's Clarissa leaves an after impression--a haunting specter of a young woman who, after elaborate preparation and several months of slow wasting, dies. Why should a heroine who is robust for the first eighteen years of her life undergo, during the course of the narrative, such a process of emaciation as a result of not

eating? Some readers of Clarissa have suggested that, in representing Clarissa's failure to eat in the novel, Richardson renders her a Christian saint or martyr whose worldly defeat is also her spiritual victory. Carol Houlihan Flynn observes that, in keeping with Christian tradition, Clarissa's self-denial enables her to nurture the poor through the fund that she establishes. At the same time, Clarissa's asceticism allows her to assume the "Christ-like mask of forgiveness" to turn mealtimes--times when her family was wont to punish her for her lack of compliance--into "nightmares for her family." Margaret Doody, though she rather peremptorily dismisses Clarissa's death by wasting as "(probably galloping consumption)... [and] certainly a trifle mysterious" nevertheless locates Clarissa within a tradition of Christian asceticism in the West. Arguing that Clarissa's meditations upon and desire for death are not strictly Puritan (they follow a Catholic tradition well documented in devout literature of the seventeenth century), Doody claims that Clarissa undergoes a form of Christian martyrdom emblemized by the figure of St. Cecilia. Cynthia Griffin Wolff sees Clarissa's not eating as a form of bodily mortification practiced when Clarissa discovers sinful pride in herself; when she separates this pride from just pride in her virtue Clarissa becomes like a Puritan Elect saint, and so her death is a spiritual triumph.⁴

Clarissa's failure to eat as she moves rapidly toward death after the rape also bears resemblance to "holy

anorexia," a behavior that Rudolph Bell has identified as characteristic of numerous female Italian saints in the Middle Ages whose vitae he examines in detail. Like many of the women of Bell's study, Clarissa is, for her first eighteen years at least, an obedient, favored daughter prized by her patriarchal family. Bell interprets the asceticism of the 'holy anorectic' as a form of worldly rebellion against bourgeois patriarchy. He argues that when the women of his study abstained from food, they deliberately chose their appetites and bodies as areas of their experience through which they could exert a modicum of social control.⁵ Even though the secular element of Bell's understanding of women's food abstinence in this earlier period counters the basis of Flynn, Doody, and Wolff's readings of wasting as a purely spiritual triumph through martyrdom and death, Bell's observation about the paradoxical nature of any triumph that uses self-starvation as its means suggests that readings of wasting as worldly acquiescence, and wasting as worldly rebellion have much in common. A woman's abstention from food, Bell points out, will be ultimately "hailed as heroically virtuous by the very patriarchy she is rebelling against"; she will be seen as adopting an extreme version of the self-sacrifice that Western culture deems appropriate to female behavior. Bell shows that while self-starvation may constitute rebellion against a particular power structure it nevertheless exists within that structure and is inevitably created by and

through it, for, as Hilliard asks when he cites Bell to argue that Clarissa's wasting is a form of collusion with her oppressors, "what is Clarissa doing if not carrying through the ritual cannibalism inaugurated by her persecutors, achieving their ends for them, devouring herself?".⁶

To read Clarissa's death by wasting as an outright triumph, then, is clearly to apportion to the daughter an inordinate degree of control. Although Clarissa's frequent meditations and the constant references to her "fasts" as she nears death may lend a voluntary and Christian religious aspect to her abstinence, it should be remembered that these references occur late in the work and toward the end of Clarissa's life, and that they are found mainly in Belford's letters to Lovelace about Clarissa's decline which are colored by the bantering rivalry between the two friends. Prior to the rape, Belford has sought to bring Lovelace to repentance and to place himself, the reformed libertine, morally above Lovelace. Even though Lovelace resolves to deny Belford this victory (970), Belford's letters about Clarissa during the period of her incarceration are replete with details calculated to inspire pity and to assert Belford's ascendancy over Lovelace. Belford's letters, which finally seek to create an "honour to [Clarissa's] memory" (1176), linger over every morsel that Clarissa eats to create a composite picture of a martyr's pious fast. When the prostitute Sally Martin orders Clarissa's jailers to

press her to eat and greets their failure with the mocking retort, "She must be fasting: nothing but her prayers and tears, poor thing!" (1053-4) and the observation that death by willfull starvation is unchristian, Belford curses Sally. When Clarissa tries to eat, Belford represents peristalsis as a feat performable only with the utmost difficulty: "her tongue was ready to cleave to the roof of her mouth.... She tried to taste [bread and butter]; but could not swallow it: but eagerly drank the water; lifting up her eyes in thankfulness for that!!!" (1054).

When Clarissa finally concedes to eat two days later, Belford represents this as largely an attempt to mollify the prostitutes (1058). He offers an explanation, on Clarissa's behalf, for every concession to eating; Clarissa is "prevailed [upon] to drink a dish of tea, and taste some bread and butter... probably... to have an excuse not to dine with the women when they returned" (1059). As Clarissa draws closer to death, Belford augments the catalogue of abstinence by reporting to Lovelace her physical weakness (1276, 1308), the pathos of her barren cell, and even her attitude "clasping her fingers and lifting up her eyes" in prayer (1341). By representing attempts to make Clarissa eat as virtual assaults instigated by the prostitutes and Clarissa's refusal of food as her stamina in withstanding their encroachments, and by framing each of these with Clarissa's attitudes of submission, the woman who abstains from food is gradually wrought into a piously fasting saint

rejecting worldly corruption after Lovelace's sexual attack.⁷

To cast Clarissa's abstinence as a virtue and to attach value to it as a model, if extreme, response to persecution, is to place great stock in Belford's letters which are designed to exonerate their writer, to chastise his friend, and to make the history of Clarissa palatable and honorable; it is also to place aside the familial, social and cultural factors discernible in earlier epistles that contextualize the pattern of Clarissa's food refusal. The importance of such factors in Clarissa's food-related behavior is recognized by Paula Marantz Cohen who sees Clarissa as an anorectic daughter whose anorexia is brought on by multiple covert tensions within her family. Drawing on family systems theory, Cohen suggests that Clarissa's emaciated body is an exaggerated version of her role among the Harlowes; she feeds the family members with power and self-definition through her own lack of status and both mediates and provides a target for tensions between the members of her unharmonious family. I hesitate over Cohen's description of Clarissa as the "original anorectic daughter" (31) because of Cohen's anachronistic application of the term anorexia as it is today used to describe a specific and modern disease. However, Cohen's larger point, that food abstinence does not arise ex nihilo, but that it is intimately bound up with social, cultural, familial and institutional imperatives, is

an important one, and one that students of eating practices insist should not be ignored.⁸

For example, Caroline Walker Bynum's study of women's eating practices and abstention from food in the Christian West during the later Middle Ages confirms Cohen's point by demonstrating that women have not historically merely abstained from eating, they have been in charge of food preparation and distribution, and concerned with the ritual uses of food and its consumption. Although food abstinence could certainly be one way in which women could exert control over their bodies, the implications of such behavior has always been intensely political; the communal nature of food consumption and the distinctly ritual functions of eating in the religious underpinnings of social life suggest to Bynum that food-related behaviors ought not to be viewed linearly as though they were divorcible from the wider contexts of food consumption and distribution, collective health and social malaise.⁹

Moreover, there is good reason to believe that Richardson perceived food-related behaviors in a manner akin to Bynum's at the time that Clarissa was written. Richardson was a friend and patient of George Cheyne, a physician who believed that poor diet and excessive eating each effect ill health and nervous disorders. Richardson edited and printed Cheyne's three main works, The English Malady (1733), An Essay on Regimen (1740), and The Natural Method of Cureing (1742). In the preface to The English Malady Cheyne

attributes the ill health and nervous disorders of the English to their wealth and high living. Elaborating on diet, Cheyne writes: "the Manner of Dressing or Cooking [the materials of luxury], is carried on to an exalted Height. The ingenious mixing and compounding of Sauces with foreign Spices and Provocatives, are contriv'd... to rouze a sickly Appetite to receive the unnatural Load... [and] to render a natural good one incapable of knowing when it has enough". The treatise that follows regards self-denial as a means of obtaining greater bodily and national health.¹⁰

Cheyne's letters to Richardson from 1734 until Cheyne's death in 1743 detail, in addition to matters of editing and printing, the regimen of plain diet and purging that Richardson followed from late 1741 until 1748. Cheyne's letters accord to food abstinence the status of a restorative; a way of managing disorder and reinstituting order. The letters and Richardson's adoption of Cheyne's regimen suggest that Richardson could not fail to be aware of the symbolic importance of food avoidance as a means to contain the excessive sensual indulgence that gives rise to corruption in the body politic.¹¹ Placed against this background, Clarissa's failure to eat acquires a rather different dimension than that of a purely religious fast or even a willful rebellion against authority; eating and not eating, gathering flesh and wasting, become ways of articulating the orderliness or disorderliness of collective life.

Clarissa's account of her not eating, as it appears in her letters to Anna Howe, does indeed plot the harmonies and disharmonies of collective life; her letters tell a distinctly different story than the virtual saint's vita of Belford's letters. Clarissa indicates that her failure to eat occurs, not first in concert with Lovelace's persecutions or following the rape as several commentators have claimed, but at a much earlier phase of the events that culminate in her death.¹² Clarissa's food abstinence coincides with, and emerges out of, the exacting demands of influential members of her family but principally those of her father. Clarissa's failure to eat at Harlowe Place is set in motion by her father during the period when three very secular domestic crises--all deeply bound up with male competition over resources and status--arise in quick succession: the reading of her grandfather's will in her favor, the duel between her brother and Lovelace and the question of whom Clarissa should marry. During the period directly following her refusal of Solmes, and prior to the first record of Clarissa's failure to eat, mealtimes are established as an indicator of domestic disequilibrium.

In Clarissa's last letter of 25 February her state of disgrace is signalled in the way that she is shunned at tea: "My mamma's eyes were fixed on the teacups.... My papa sat... [with] his head... turned from me.... My brother looked at me with scorn, having measured me... with his eyes" (63). Clarissa's customary office of making tea is

removed to her mother and brother exposing her as a palpable absence--a non-entity, "not know[ing] what to do with [her]self" (63)--in the familiar family ritual. Mr. Harlowe soon threatens Clarissa's complete exclusion from the circle when, the other members of the family having departed on one clumsy pretext or another, he utters in silencing terms the only basis on which he will acknowledge his daughter's existence: "No protestations girl!--No words--I will not be prated to!--I will be obeyed--I have no child--I will have no child, but an obedient one.... I ask nothing of you but what is in your power... and your duty to comply with.... I will be obeyed, I tell you!--and cheerfully too!--or you are no child of mine!--" (64-6). Mr. Harlowe's oral violence here precludes Clarissa's verbal participation in establishing the terms to which he insists she adhere silently and completely.

When Mr. Harlowe's brutality achieves Clarissa's silence but not her compliance, he resorts to another strategy. On March 3 Clarissa records the less overtly-threatening, but nevertheless coercive withdrawal of her father's favor when he denies her communally shared food. Recalling the gouty father of Robinson Crusoe whose affliction he shares, and identifying a domestic economy that is established along similarly invasive lines, Mr. Harlowe makes absolute obedience a condition of commensality when he interrupts his wife's assignment to bring Clarissa to accept Solmes. Addressing Mrs. Harlowe in Clarissa's

presence, Mr. Harlowe announces dinner, and, observing that the daughter's obedience ought to follow a simple assertion of parental will, he adds: "Let us have you soon down--your daughter in your hand, if worthy of the name" (93). In other words, Clarissa may be nourished in the bosom of her family only if her silent and cheerful compliance with her father's unwanted solicitation marks her as dutifully filial. A full week later Mrs. Harlowe is still attending meals without Clarissa whose opposition to her father has confirmed her to be "[un]worthy of the name of daughter" (103). At this point Clarissa records a loss of appetite and a refusal of food: "I thought I should have been commanded down; but [my mother] sent me up a plate from her table. I wrote on. I could not touch a morsel. I ordered Hannah... to eat of it, that I might not not be thought sullen" (106). Clarissa's failure to eat occurs, then, not first as an act of volition, but as a result of the distasteful conditions that are attached to the function of eating at Harlowe Place. Thereafter, the daughter's failure to comply with her father's demands results in an increasing exclusion from the commensal circle as Clarissa is removed from the numerous confabulations that take place at breakfasts and dinners to determine her fate.

As commensality is widely, and cross culturally, considered an affirmation of community, trust, familial affection and favor, the refusal of Clarissa's presence at mealtimes signals distrust and rejection.¹³ First

articulated in Mr. Harlowe's refusal to own Clarissa, his distrust appears again in his declaration of her unworthiness as a member of the Harlowe clan. Again like Robinson Crusoe's father, Mr. Harlowe figuratively offers with one hand the sustaining paternal acknowledgement and the mark of identity--the name--that he threatens to remove with the other; Clarissa may continue to be a Harlowe and a daughter only if she gives in and yields up her body to her father's purposes. The father's dismissal of Clarissa here--to be later reiterated in the vehemence of his withering curse--withdraws the validation and sustenance that is necessary to the daughter's psychic well-being. When Mr. Harlowe casts Clarissa as "no child of [his]" he consigns her to the unstable position of a nobody, a redundant being, a being with neither name nor identity.¹⁴ Mr. Harlowe's refusal to acknowledge Clarissa as a daughter is tantamount to an erasure of her very existence as her futile plea to her father after the rape makes clear: "I don't even know what my name is!-- I never dare to wish to come into your family again!... I will call you... for you are my own dear papa, whether you will or not--And though I am an unworthy child--yet I am your child" (890). Coinciding with Clarissa's declaration that she will never eat or drink again (895), and pointing up the erasure of Clarissa's person effected by her father's determination to own her in only the specified way, the plea underlines the 'no-body'

status that is to become starkly literalized in the chronic emaciation of Clarissa's frame.

The father's severity that repeatedly finds its center in the refusal of commensality invites a scrutiny of the alleged source of his displeasure, Clarissa's refusal of Solmes' suit. Clarissa has of course turned down a number of suitors favored by her father before without having incurred Mr. Harlowe's wrath. We may presume that Clarissa has suffered no chastisement for these earlier refusals because Clarissa acknowledges that her trials are recently begun. Furthermore, because Solmes is initially dismissed as an unlikely choice of husband (he is entertained only after the bloody confrontation between Lovelace and the younger James Harlowe) it seems improbable that Clarissa's refusal of Solmes would alone incur displeasure to such an extreme that it would cause her to be disowned.

Although Clarissa's failure to eat follows her refusal of Solmes, and his suit appears as a virtual side effect of the interfamilial rivalry of Lovelace and Harlowe, there is a form of rivalry closer to home that emerges as a contributor to Mr. Harlowe's anger when it surfaces after Clarissa's grandfather's death. Almost palpably entering the narrative in the interval between Clarissa's refusal of earlier suitors (Symmes, Mullins and Weyerley) and her refusal of Solmes, and shortly before Mr. Harlowe imposes his condition of obedience and Clarissa fails to eat, is the

grandfather's will in Clarissa's favor. Clarissa sums up the Harlowe response to the will in this way:

Nobody indeed was pleased: for although everyone loved me, yet being the youngest child, father, uncles, brother, sister, all thought themselves postponed as to matter of right and power (who loves not power?); and my father himself could not bear that I should be made sole... and independent, for such the will as to that estate and the powers it gave me... made me. (77-78)

Especially ill-received by the son, James Harlowe, who aspires to the peerage and sees his grandfather's wealth as a means to fulfill personal ambitions, the will and its reception uncover a widespread desire for power in the nominally harmonious Harlowe household.

The contents of the grandfather's will link the internal competition for power among the Harlowe men (which is in place before the opening letter's narrative of Lovelace's and James' interfamilial rivalry) to the competition over Clarissa herself. Forced to the surface by the will, the intrafamilial rivalry over Clarissa renders her position as the hitherto dutiful Harlowe daughter a highly problematic one at more than merely the level of her refusal of Solmes. It is clear that even before the question of whom Clarissa should marry has arisen, Clarissa's presence has been eagerly sought by her kinsmen. Late in the novel Clarissa describes her life prior to the family "disturbances" of the opening epistle in the following way:

I was the joy of [my uncles'] hearts; and, with theirs and my father's, I had three houses to call my own; for they used to have me with them by turns, and almost kindly to quarrel for me: so that I was two months in the year at one's house; two months at the other's: six months at my father's; and two at the houses of others of my dear friends, who thought themselves happy in me: and whenever I was any one's, I was crowded upon with letters by all the rest, who longed for my return to them. (1105-6)

Clarissa's presence has been very much "longed for" by her various kinsmen, each of whom attempts to claim her for his solitary joy and pleasure by having her board with him in his own house. It is this vying for Clarissa's presence that the grandfather's will brings to the fore; in short, the will dramatizes the unspoken question about which Harlowe man gets to enjoy the daughter's bodily presence. When the will lays claim to Clarissa by naming her as the grandfather's "own peculiar child" (53) and reinforces its claim through the weight of inheritance, it cuts to the heart of Clarissa's kinsmen's struggles over her and calls attention to the erotic interest embedded in their struggles to possess her. As Janice Haney-Peritz has astutely observed, the preamble to the will--sent by Clarissa to Anna Howe for her friend's perusal--is steeped in highly eroticized language which signals the presence of desire within the family:

the grandfather emphasizes the 'delight of [his] old age' (I:21)... [which] he not only attributes to his relationship with Clarissa but also attempts to prolong by means of his will.... Refusing to observe the 'forms' of law, the

grandfather couches his will in terms of need and desire.... The emphasis on delight, the interest in prolonging pleasure, and the references to need and desire, all mark the emergence of a new kind of will, a sexualized will that is intent on privileging the feminine--the 'amiable,' 'kind,' and 'tender' Clarissa.¹⁵

Whether the will is intended to privilege Clarissa or not, what it actually does is to thrust Clarissa into the midst of the crisis over possession. Because the "sexualized" will identifies a Clarissa who may 'delight' and 'pleasure' as part of the family's common stock of erotic property, it marks Clarissa's status as a sexual object within the family and therefore as a woman over whom multiple and conflicting claims of possession may arise--and have arisen. When the grandfather claims Clarissa as his own in the will, he advertises the nature of Clarissa's problematic status in the Harlowe kinship group; Clarissa's status is problematic because her erotic appeal threatens to unhinge a basic tenet of the patriarchal code, the code which comprises the incest prohibition, and which marks a daughter as the property of her father.

Explicitly addressed to men, the rules prohibiting incest and implicitly enjoining exogamy seek to maintain internal lines of order and purity within kinship groups by dividing women into discrete categories according to male rights of ownership and exchange. The incest rules, as they are given in Leviticus 18.6-16, presume that while men initiate sexual relations, and all women are available for

sexual consumption, women must be selectively consumed.

Women are categorized according to which man within a kinship group has the prerogative to have intercourse with a given woman and the incest rules prohibit the sexual use of any woman who already belongs to a male relative:

6 None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness: I am the LORD.

7 The nakedness of thy father, or the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she is thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.

8 The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: it is thy father's nakedness.

9 The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or daughter of thy mother, whether she be born at home, or born abroad, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover.

10 The nakedness of thy son's daughter, or of thy daughter's daughter, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover: for theirs is thine own nakedness.

11 The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, she is thy sister, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.

12 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister: she is thy father's near kinswoman.

13 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister: for she is thy mother's nearest kinswoman.

14 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife: she is thine aunt.

15 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter-in-law: she is thy son's wife: thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.

16 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness.

While the laws are reinforcible by the prior claim of a kinsman in all other cases, this is not so in the case of a father and his daughter; because the only prior claim to the

daughter is the father's own claim, the prohibition of the daughter is only implied. As Judith Lewis Herman observes, "[although] the incest taboo forbids [the father] to make sexual use of his daughter, no particular man's rights are offended, should the father choose to disregard this rule. As long as he ultimately gives his daughter in marriage, he has fulfilled the social purpose of the rule of the gift." Even though father-daughter incest may be technically illicit, Herman suggests, it is socially explicable because it conforms to overarching expectations about the nature of male authority over women.¹⁶ In Clarissa, the right to possess the daughter--that ought to be the father's right to bestow upon her future husband--is both underlined and problematized by the desires of her male kin for her bodily presence. By virtue of the multiple claims that threaten to infringe the code prohibiting the internal consumption of women, Clarissa becomes an anomaly at Harlowe Place.¹⁷ When the will shows the extent to which the interior space of the family is sexualized, Clarissa is identifiable as a danger to lines of order within the family; she is a potential source of intrafamilial conflict because she heightens the nexus of conflicting desires among the Harlowe men.

Seen against the backdrop of her kinsmen's desire for Clarissa, the proposed marriage to Solmes would seem to offer one way in which tensions arising from the daughter's eroticized presence at Harlowe Place might be diffused. Yet Clarissa's proposed marriage to Solmes itself generates

difficulties due to another irregular feature of the grandfather's will. In leaving his wealth to Clarissa, the grandfather has transgressed the law of primogeniture that ought to ensure the easy transference of property (his sons' and grandson's inheritance) along blood and kinship lines--he has "lopped off one branch of [the grandson's] expectations" (77). As the primary beneficiary of the grandfather's will Clarissa becomes doubly a source of tension; she is at once part of the store of wealth of the father in whose house she is brought up, and physically part of the father in that she carries his bloodline, and yet she threatens to deplete the family's 'wealth' in both respects.

Because the rule of exogamy dictates that the daughter must be given out of the kinship group in marriage, and because giving her in marriage would deplete the family's store of material wealth as well as its bloodstock, the tension inherent in Clarissa's impending marriage, as it intersects with the issue of the grandfather's inheritance, uncovers the central conflict in the two main systems defining value in Western culture. These two systems--the idealized blood relationship connecting father and son, and the system of property inheritance--are encapsulated in the code of primogeniture that the grandfather puts aside in his will. The heiress Clarissa's marriage would deny the Harlowe family the material wealth that might enrich its stock and it would deprive the family of her body. Clarissa is therefore perched at the intersection of the two conflicting

codes of Western culture--the code that demands exchange, and the impulse to amass and pass on wealth that favors her retention.¹⁸

Recognizing these conflicting impulses in Clarissa, John Allen Stevenson has argued that the proposed marriage to Solmes marks a movement to retain Clarissa for the exclusive use of the Harlowes. As a result of the terms to which Solmes will agree (terms that will return much of Clarissa's wealth to her natal family), marriage to Solmes would satisfy both the need to give the daughter exogamously in marriage and effect her retention. Rejecting the popular argument that the Harlowe greed accounts for their treatment of Clarissa, Stevenson sees the retention of Clarissa's grandfather's estate as less directly the point than the retention of the daughter herself; he sees the Harlowes' relentless attacks on Clarissa as part of an attempt to retain their skillfull housekeeper and admirable daughter. Bitter about the idea of losing Clarissa, he suggests, the Harlowes seek a literal form of endogamy when they try to marry Clarissa to a man of a similar social rank to themselves. Stevenson argues that while the Harlowes recruit Solmes to their cause, he is largely a puppet for the Harlowe machine: "they abuse him and exploit him... they do not intend to give him Clarissa at all. He is only the conduit by which they hope to reincorporate her" (765). In marriage to Solmes, Clarissa would neither have to leave Harlowe Place nor enter into sexual relations with any man

from another group so that her marriage would be like a marriage into the Harlowe clan. For this reason, Stevenson argues, the Harlowes' attempt to bring about the marriage bears "strongly incestuous overtones."¹⁹

Stevenson's discussion of the "incestuous" element of the Harlowes' behavior, however, underplays Clarissa's erotic appeal when it sees Clarissa's "excellence as a Harlowe" and the family's wish to keep her as "one of them" as primary motivations for retaining Clarissa.²⁰ The exogamic code is, after all, explicitly concerned with sexual availability and unavailability; the rule of exogamy seeks not simply to prevent the retention of the daughter, but to prevent her sexual consumption by the kinship group itself. As a nubile daughter Clarissa's erotic value as an object of titillation is at least as important as her "excellence as a Harlowe," and her appeal as a fruit that may be tasted only vicariously is unmistakable in the manner of her various kinsmen as they attempt to persuade her to marry Solmes.

Clarissa's uncle, John Harlowe, takes an approach that plays up and plays upon the eroticism of his paternalistic claim to his niece. In her letter of April 2nd to Anna Howe, Clarissa describes her uncle Harlowe's appeal for her acceptance of Solmes: "Half-distant, half affectionate, was the air he put to his daughter-niece, as he used to call me.... and [he] kissed me, and called me, charming creature!" (294). Brushing aside Clarissa's attempt to

discuss the disgrace of her confinement, John Harlowe repeatedly kisses Clarissa's glowing cheek and her hand in a form of courtship marked by solicitation and denial that Clarissa indignantly acknowledges: "I was vexed to be thus... played upon: and how could I be grateful for a visit that it was now evident was only a too humble artifice to draw me in" (294). Because John Harlowe is Clarissa's "papa-uncle," she his "daughter-niece," his attempt to 'seduce' her into compliance strongly suggests an actively incestuous desire. John Harlowe's courtship, moreover, seeks to persuade Clarissa to yield herself to Solmes, a man very much like her uncles and her father in age and in temperament as well as in social status, out of a carefully-coerced sense of filial duty and love.²¹ The erotic quality of this exchange is heightened by the fact that Clarissa's brother and sister linger in the vicinity "hand in hand, lover-like" to exemplify the rewards of compliance, or, as uncle John pointedly explains to Clarissa, "love me, as you used to love me--Your grandfather did not do so much for you, as I will do for you" (295).

The erotic play of Clarissa's uncle is predicated upon the assumption that Clarissa's sexual compliance is her kinsmen's to construct and direct. This assumption also informs Clarissa's brother's assault. James Harlowe, named for his father and a third older than his sister, early adopts a strategy of verbal assault by assuming the paternal voice: "you observe, miss... that it is not I, but your

papa, that tells you that you are not to receive the visits of that Lovelace" (57). When Clarissa later persists in refusing Solmes, James recommends that Solmes use violence to make Clarissa wish that she had given consent, "I know no other method of being even with her, than, after she is yours, to make her as sensible of your power as she now makes you of her insolence" (317). He himself, moreover, treats Clarissa roughly: "Here, sir, said he, take the rebel daughter's hand; I give it you now; she shall confirm the gift in a week's time, or will have neither father, mother, nor uncles to boast of" (306). In the brutal bodily handling that accompanies these words and wrenches Clarissa's shoulder, James takes upon himself the father's prerogative. He claims the daughter in order to give her while at the same time surveying Clarissa with an eye to the marital pleasure that she offers: "Look at her person! Think of her fine qualities!... we all gloried in her till now... and after two or three more struggles, she will be yours and, take my word for it, will reward your patience!... depend upon it, you will be as happy a man in a fortnight, as a married man can be" (first emphasis added, 306). Standing in for Clarissa's father while employing a violence that pre-enacts the struggles of James' own rival, Lovelace, to rape Clarissa, James provides Solmes with an "unbrotherly" model of how to force the unwilling sister-cum-daughter to yield.²²

As brother and uncle each identifies himself as having authority because of his proximity to Clarissa's father, each confirms that it is the father who is accorded primary control over Clarissa's sexuality. For this reason it would be a mistake to assume that internal rivalries function as a predominantly divisive force among the Harlowe men. Indeed, because the successive solicitations of uncle and brother are united by the tacit understanding that the father has ultimate power with regard to his daughter, it is curious to see just how low-key the father's very effective control of his daughter actually is after the early confrontations staged around commensality. In fact, the question that is most properly the father's to ask after the rape according to the code of paternal authority is only asked in the epistles by those who ought to have less reason than the father to expect an answer.²³ While John Harlowe's crude question about Clarissa's intactness is notable for its stinging insensitivity to Clarissa's plight (1192), the letter from her uncle Antony that follows is positively voyeuristic. Antony's letter lingers on Clarissa's sexual contact with Lovelace as he has imagined it in its quotidian detail: "You lived several guilty weeks with one of the vilest fellows that ever drew breath, at bed as well as board no doubt... pray don't be ashamed to be asked after what may naturally come of such free living..." (1195). Antony's letter juxtaposes this concern with Lovelace's provision of Clarissa's board with passages from

Ecclesiasticus 42 pertaining to the rights of the father whose daughter boards in his house.

According to Antony, a father's concern for his daughter's well-being is first and foremost a jealous watchfulness over who gains sexual access to her:

A father waketh for his daughter when no man knoweth--When she is young, lest she pass away in the flower of her age (and you know what proposals were made to you at different times): and being married, lest she be hated: in her virginity, lest she be defiled, and gotten with child in her father's house (I don't make the words, mind that).... Keep a sure watch over a shameless daughter... lest she make thee a laughing-stock to thine enemies (as you have made us all to this cursed Lovelace)... and make thee ashamed before the multitude. (1196)

While this passage asserts the father's intense concern about his daughter's sexual state--his culturally-sanctioned watchfulness over her--it also marks the father's house itself as not entirely a safe space for the daughter to inhabit precisely because the daughter's virginity is the father's province. When taken together with Antony's coarse enquiry about the conditions attached to Lovelace's provision of board, Antony's representation of the father's house as a place where the daughter boards inadvertently suggests that the daughter may be as readily defiled within the father's house as outside it. If the father's domain is a place where his daughter may be made pregnant, it does not stand outside the common understanding that any man who provides accommodations and food (board) for a woman

customarily exacts payment of a sexual nature (bed) in kind. This subtle linking of paternal shelter with filial indebtedness not only raises the question of how such a debt might be discharged, it also points to virtually the only asset in the maintained woman's possession--her sexual value.

The easy transition between the sexual and non-sexual functions of women whom one keeps in one's house as dependents, a woman who keeps (maintains) one's house and a woman that is 'kept' as a mistress in one's house, is brought to light in the recurring figure of the housekeeper in Clarissa. The most notorious keeper of a house is, of course, Sinclair. But Sinclair is not representative of women who keep house in Clarissa because, even though she earns money from the male clients who frequent her establishment, she is the primary manager of her own house; she is able to bring charges against and have Clarissa incarcerated for her unpaid board. Women who keep house for male owners in return for bed and board are more usual in Clarissa. Clarissa herself is the most memorable housekeeper. Her grandfather "delight[s] to call [her] his housekeeper" (1414) even when she attends to what he has declared her "dairy house." Clarissa is also an excellent manager of her father's house and takes charge of most domestic affairs that a wife would customarily oversee. When James plans to have Clarissa as his housekeeper if the designs to marry her should fail, Clarissa acknowledges the

lowly status and limited powers of a woman who keeps house when she remarks to Anna Howe, "I have no mind to be his housekeeper; and I am sure, were I to go with him, I should be treated rather as a servant than as a sister--perhaps not the better because I am his sister" (56).

The keeping of one's daughter and the keeping of one's sister are each girt about by a culture of indebtedness that establishes ideal conditions for her internal use. But because Clarissa's kept status in her father's house has more bearing on Clarissa's food abstinence than her potential to become her brother's housekeeper, and because the plight of the kept sister emerges with greater clarity in Tom Jones and serves a more critical narrative function in that work, I confine my present discussion to the significance of Clarissa's kept status as it effects the father-daughter relationship.²⁴ If one accepts that the debt incurred by the acceptance of board in the father's house may be dangerous to the daughter and to the maintenance of order, then Clarissa's movement beyond the debt-bound and sexualized interior of Harlowe Place ought to offer the reinstitution of the exogamic code even at the price of an order fraught with the tension between Lovelace and the younger James Harlowe. Yet Clarissa's departure with Lovelace never suggests the restoration of even this precarious form of order; her departure marks a further "disturbance" when it is characterized as the daughter's extreme disobedience--the high point of her failure to honor

the debt she has incurred by living in the father's house. Clarissa herself acknowledges before her meeting with Lovelace that to leave willingly with Lovelace would flout the accustomed order embedded in the "Old Law" that precludes the daughter from making a promise and frees her from having to stand by any promise that she has presumptuously made. Given by Richardson in a footnote, the patriarchal code from Numbers 30. 3, 4, and 5 (which Clarissa plans to use to break her agreement to leave with Lovelace) pertains to the ineffectiveness of the daughter's word while she is in her father's house:

3. If a woman vow a vow unto the Lord, and bind herself by a bond, being in her father's house in her youth;
4. And her father hear her vow, and her bond wherewith she hath bound her soul, and her father shall hold his peace at her; then all her vows shall stand....
5. But if her father disallow her in the day that he heareth; not any of her vows or of her bonds wherewith she hath bound her soul shall stand: and the Lord shall forgive her, because her father disallowed her. (361)

According to the code, the daughter's subjection to the authority of God is mediated by her father to whom she owes complete obedience. In other words, she ought not--and cannot--legitimately oppose her earthly father; and any attempt to do so will amass the symbolic weight of a disobedience of the heavenly Father himself. Although the edge of the garden at Harlowe Place with its ruined chapel and overgrown oaks falls short of Paradisal verdure (352),

it is nevertheless the site of what Clarissa identifies as her Fall when she likens herself and Lovelace at St. Albans to "the first pair, I at least driven out of my paradise" (393). Clarissa's analogy for her disobedience in leaving her father's garden does indeed lend her departure the mythic dimension of the temptation of Eve rather than the mere flight of an undutiful girl. Lovelace, however, appears not, as Clarissa seems to suggest, as a traditional Adam led astray by woman, but as a disruptive force--a rebel son--who, Satan-like, coerces her with whispered promises of something denied by her father.²⁵ Clarissa's likeness to the tempted Eve is strongest when Lovelace offers to remove the constraints of the patriarchal code from Clarissa. When he offers to take Clarissa 'at her word' and to thereby free her from what he calls her "disgraceful oppression" (375), Lovelace offers Clarissa freedom from constraint in the manner that Satan has offered it to Eve. And, like Eve, Clarissa is offered an empty promise as becomes clear in Lovelace's power over her following the flight and culminating in her rape.

The particular mode of power that Lovelace acquires through the forbidden liaison is in itself rather singular for it offers a form of domestic salvation, to use Nancy Miller's phrase, that is problematic to say the least. Partly as a result of Mr. Harlowe's early promise to disown his daughter in her disobedience, and partly through Lovelace's management of the situation at the garden gate,

Lovelace gains in Clarissa not so much a lover and potential wife, as a fatherless daughter.²⁶ Lovelace represents himself, moreover, not first as husband material, but as a kinsman: "Remember only that I come at your appointment, to redeem you at the hazard of my life from your gaolers and persecutors, with a resolution... to be a father, uncle, brother, and as I humbly hoped, in your good time, a husband to you, all in one" (377). When it conflates the title of husband with other relationships that identify blood linkage, Lovelace's declaration suggests that these roles--and by implication the functions associated with each, including the power to control what and when the kinswoman may eat--might have a significant degree of overlap.

While Lovelace's identification of himself as Clarissa's kinsman first hints that there may be more than merely superficial similarities between Mr. Harlowe's prior and Lovelace's subsequent treatment of Clarissa, Lovelace's isolation of Clarissa, the limits he imposes upon her movement and actions, and his mediation of her transactions with the world beyond her lodgings at St. Albans and at Dover Street, gradually heighten and confirm these similarities. Far from freeing Clarissa from her oppression, far from rescuing her from her jailers and persecutors, Lovelace comes increasingly to replace them and to duplicate the tenor of her principal jailer's demands as he progressively reintroduces the indignities that Clarissa suffered in the father's house.²⁷ As Lovelace's insistence

on Clarissa's complete compliance and blind trust are almost identical to the demands made by her father, it is as though the rivalry among the Harlowe men for control of Clarissa extends beyond that family to encompass Lovelace. Once Lovelace has Clarissa in his custody, the opening epistle's narrative of interfamilial rivalry seems at one level to become secondary to the rape narrative dealing with Lovelace's abuse of power over the woman under his protection.

On another level, however, Lovelace's desire for Clarissa is quite clearly inflamed by a desire for mastery over her brother; when Lovelace outlines his motives for pursuing Clarissa in his first letter, his intention to "brin[g] that sordidly-imperious brother to kneel at the foot-stool of my throne" (145) precedes his litany of Clarissa's perfections. As Lovelace reconstructs the conditions of Harlowe Place and especially the terms of Mr. Harlowe's authority over his daughter, his appropriation of Clarissa gathers meaning as a usurpatory act--the act of a son clamouring for the power of a father, and, in the process vying with another son who might also aspire to the father's power. As in the case of those earlier power-hungry sons, Satan and Robinson Crusoe, bodily possession of a woman that properly belongs to the father signals an attempt to establish the son and his own authority and becomes a consummate passion and a passion to consum(mat)e.

Almost as soon as Clarissa is removed from the garden of Harlowe Place, Lovelace begins what is to become his relentless testing of her--supposedly to ascertain her virtue, obedience and loyalty. In this he repeats the test of duty set by Mr. Harlowe. Lovelace's first trial for Clarissa is based on the premise that because Clarissa has entertained Lovelace's letters against her father's wishes and has been disloyal where she owes the greatest duty, Lovelace cannot be sure of her loyalty to himself. Lovelace figures Clarissa's regrets about having disobeyed her father as signs of her knowing disobedience and of her unreliability:²⁸

She blames herself for having corresponded with me....

Has she been capable of error?--Of persisting in that error?.... What must be those inducements... that were too strong for duty, in a daughter so dutiful?.... Was a person of virtue to be prevailed upon to break through her apparent, her acknowledged duty upon any consideration?.... Can she suffer herself to be provoked to promise to abandon her father's house, and go off [with a lover], knowing his character?.... May there not be... other Lovelaces; other like intrepid persevering enterprisers...? (427-28)

According to Lovelace, Clarissa's error is not in actually leaving Harlowe Place, but in entertaining and articulating the notion of doing so. As such a notion both signals a lack of trust in her father and casts aspersions on his house by implying that all was not as it should have been therein, Lovelace argues Clarissa's potential to similarly dishonor

him were she to become his wife (429). Even though Lovelace has offered to take Clarissa at her word from her father's house, he further insinuates himself into a position of authority like that of her father when he engineers the frightful situation at the garden gate that brings about her bodily compliance in spite of her verbal negative:

"terrified, I was got out of sight of the door... he put my arm under his, his drawn sword in the other hand, and hurried me on still faster: my voice, however, contradicting my action; crying, No, no, no, all the while" (380). Like the father whose "terrible voice" has sought to silence his daughter's refusal to yield up her virginity upon demand, Lovelace's machinations force his charge into a consenting negative that anticipates the drugged conditions under which she will be raped.

Subsequently, and in keeping with the code that marks the endorsement of his daughter's word as a father's prerogative, Lovelace begins to speak for Clarissa and to expect her silence. His assumption that Clarissa will maintain silence and the fact that in several instances she does, signal the power that Lovelace gains through his self-assigned guardianship--through his pledge to be "father, uncle, brother... husband... all in one." Maneuvering Clarissa into silence in the matter of their actual circumstances by means of a lie that she is unable to contradict with credibility, Lovelace has Clarissa endorse by default the lie that they are brother and sister.

Representing himself as the brother of an unruly sister and manipulating Clarissa into silence, Lovelace implicates her in the lie in a way that makes Clarissa's later objections to his freedoms less effective. Moreover, Clarissa's silence gives her adoptive kinsman license to act as he might under the pretense of offering her protection because it places her in a "state of obligation... to her new protector" (398). It is because he assumes the role of her brother, for example, that Lovelace gains free access to Clarissa's bedchamber at St. Albans (388). And it is in the same letter in which he boasts to Belford of "topp[ing] the brother's part before the landlady" (414) that he describes the first kiss given to Clarissa as a moment of heightened sexual pleasure: kissing Clarissa as a brother pleases Lovelace as much as "the ultimatum with any other woman" (413).

While playing the brother's part affords greater sexual access to Clarissa than the lover's part, it must be remembered that the brother's power is effective because it is endorsed by his father; it is therefore fitting that Lovelace's greatest 'triumphs' over Clarissa are to be achieved once he assumes the paternal role more fully. When Clarissa's status as a fatherless daughter is confirmed in her father's curse relayed in Arabella Harlowe's letter of April 15th, Lovelace condemns Mr. Harlowe's renouncement of Clarissa as extreme and unpaternal. Lovelace then responds with his own form of murderous oral violence and an

impassioned reiteration of his undertaking to be Clarissa's father:

I found her recovering from fits, again to fall into stronger fits; and nobody expect[ed] her life.... Nor wonder at her being so affected; she whose filial piety gave her dreadful faith in a father's curses; and the curse of this gloomy tyrant extending...to both worlds--Oh that it had turned in the moment of its utterance to a mortal quinsy, and sticking in his gullet had choked the old execrator, as a warning to all such unnatural fathers. (518)

Imaginatively killing Mr. Harlowe by making him eat his own words, Lovelace establishes himself as Clarissa's author and lays claim to the author's sweetest privilege: "I [brought] her back. More than a father to her; for I have given her a life her unnatural father had well-nigh taken away; shall I not cherish the fruits of my own benefaction?" (emphases added, 518). The self-proclaimed father's idea of what it means to cherish becomes abundantly clear when, merely two days later, he reports to Belford that the remainder of his family, "our mother and her daughters" are in preparation to receive him, the "name-father," and his latest 'daughter,' Clarissa (569). Lovelace's family consists of 'mother' Sinclair; the confraternity of rakes are her sons, and the prostitutes her deflowered daughter-nieces.²⁹ In what is at once a parody and a duplication of her position in the Harlowe family, Clarissa is inserted into Lovelace's family bearing exactly the status, virgin daughter under seige, that she bore when she left Harlowe

Place. Clarissa's position in Lovelace's household--where lines of incest are hopelessly tangled by brethern/sons who initiate daughters into sex and by the sexually-available mother, herself a sometime 'niece'--further mirrors Clarissa's position in her father's household; she is again subject to the demands of a 'kinsman' (a "father, uncle, brother... all") who insists that she yield her virginity to his purposes. It should come as no surprise that, in the midst of these new but oddly familiar circumstances of coercive solicitation, the pattern of absence from commensality is reinaugurated.

Clarissa's absence from meals at Sinclair's identifies a slightly different configuration of power than that of her absence from the table at Harlowe Place. At home Clarissa has been forbidden to eat with the family by her father to make her comply with certain demands. At Dover Street she initially appropriates her father's tactic of withdrawal from commensality to establish terms when, "not choosing either tea or supper" she informs Lovelace of her choice to be sequestered (525). Lovelace, likening her behavior to the futile protest of a caged bird, believes he understands her tactic (557) and gloats over his power to create strategems to manage her: "I am a great name father.... Preferments I bestow.... I degrade by virtue of my own imperial will, without any act of forfeiture.... What a poor thing is a monarch to me!" (569).

When Clarissa's retirement takes up a period of three weeks, spent in illicit correspondence with Anna Howe, Lovelace takes it upon himself to punish the women for both their defiance of parental authority and their writing of "treasonable" letters (573). Yet rather than acting with the absolute authority of the sovereign he professes to be, Lovelace becomes as jealous as a father--as jealous, in fact, as Mr. Harlowe whose attitude and actions he begins to mimic: "He went out this morning; intending not to return to dinner, unless (he sent me word) I would admit him to dine with me. I excused myself. The man whose anger is now to be of such importance to me was, it seems, displeased" (emphasis added, 590). Lovelace's displeasure is heightened considerably at a solus breakfast four days later when a copy of one of Anna Howe's disparaging letters confirms that Clarissa's distance is deliberately instituted (634). While Lovelace names the correspondents as "[u]ndutiful wretches" and imagines himself as the parent whose authority has been flouted, his fantasy of raping the "sister-beauties" and becoming their master suggests the sexual expediency of such authority (635, 637).³⁰ As Lovelace increasingly aligns himself with the disobeyed father, the tensions around mealtimes intensify and commensality--or its refusal--becomes once again an elaborate dance of solicitation and denial.

Lovelace's letters from Sinclair's at this time represent Clarissa's absence from meals as a tendency to

disobedience and as her contempt for the man with whom she ought to be compelled to share them. Barely tolerating Clarissa's absence at other times, Lovelace takes umbrage at her retirement at mealtimes when her presence might be expected to maintain his facade of domestic harmony. In a curious inversion of the father who banished Clarissa from the tea and supper table until she would agree to his terms, Lovelace sues for Clarissa's presence at every meal. Despite this inversion, however, the underlying significance of shared meals remains largely unchanged.³¹ Viewing Lovelace's wish to eat with her as dangerous lest it increase her contact with him and make way for his greater familiarity, Clarissa understands the refusal of commensality as also a way of signifying her disapproval of other demands of the man who provides the repast. Because Clarissa approaches shared meals with caution, her choice to avoid them signals her distrust of Lovelace's motives from the beginning of her stay at Sinclair's: "We had some talk about meals....I told [Sinclair]... I chose to dine by myself.... They thought me very singular; and with reason.... I was less concerned for what they thought.... as Mr. Lovelace had put me very much out of humor with him" (532).

But the very fact that Lovelace is implicated in Clarissa's choice to dine alone allows him to implement an inverted system of compliance and reward which, though it seems to demand compliance on Lovelace's part, ultimately works in his favor. In her letter of May 21st Clarissa

explains the workings of this system to Anna Howe:

"[Lovelace] demanded... to be admitted to afternoon tea with me: and appealed by Dorcas to his [appropriate] behavior to me last night; as if... he thought he had a merit in being unexceptionable" (641). When Clarissa responds to this solicitation by repeating an earlier agreement to breakfast with Lovelace, his raving response shows that her power to refuse a favor is largely an illusion. As Clarissa is compelled to give into one demand if she is to avoid worse, her concession to a supper meeting is coerced out of a fear of Lovelace's anger ("[a]s we had been in a good train for several days past, I thought it not prudent to break with him for little matters" [641]), so that she is, as she puts it, "threatened into his will" (641).

Lovelace's reception of Clarissa at supper not only replays the fierce physical struggle that has been part of her experience at Harlowe Place, but concludes with Clarissa begging Lovelace's permission to withdraw. This meeting lays the ground for the promised breakfast meeting which confirms that even when it is Clarissa who refuses commensality, it is Lovelace who dictates terms. When Clarissa appears for breakfast dressed for church and clearly with no intention of partaking of the repast except in the most cursory way, the dining room becomes an arena for intimidation and an angry struggle across the rattling teacups ensues. The struggle forces Clarissa into a solitary confinement from

which she emerges, upon Lovelace's insistence, at teatime with this illuminating observation:

I was guilty, it seems, of going to church.... of desiring to have the whole Sunday to myself....for these [faults] I was to be punished: I was to be compelled to see you, and to be terrified when I did see you by the most shocking ill-humor that was ever shown to a creature in my circumstances.... You have pretended to find free fault with my father's temper, Mr Lovelace: but the worst that he ever showed after marriage, was not in the least to be compared to what you have shown twenty times beforehand.... Oh my dear papa, said the inimitable creature, you might be spared your heavy curse, had you known how I have been punished ever since my swerving feet led me out of your garden doors to meet this man! (650)

His anger likened to Mr. Harlowe's tyranny, and his manner of punishing Clarissa's lack of compliance linked to her father's attempt to terrify his daughter into obedience, Lovelace stands as a horribly exaggerated caricature of Clarissa's father.

Like Mr. Harlowe, then, Lovelace surrounds eating with distasteful conditions which coalesce about his insistence that Clarissa fulfill his demands. Rather than nurturing Clarissa as he has earlier promised to do, Lovelace wants Clarissa to pacify and nurture him. Because Lovelace renders Clarissa in terms of how she can fulfill his needs, because he establishes her availability to feed his self-image and to thus perpetuate himself, it should come as no surprise that another long-awaited meeting in the dining room gives

rise first to an oral ravishment of Clarissa's bosom, and then to an erotic fantasy of literally dining on her:

I would not forgo the brightest diadem in the world for the pleasure of seeing a twin Lovelace at each charming breast, drawing from it his first sustenance....

I now, methinks, behold this most charming of women in this sweet office, pressing with her fine fingers the generous flood into the purple mouths of each eager hunter by turns: her conscious eye now dropped on one, now on the other, with maternal tenderness; and then raised up to my delighted eye, full of wishes, for the sake of the pretty varlets, and for her own sake, that I would deign to legitimate; that I would condescend to put on the nuptial fetters. (706)

Where James has characterized daughters as "'encumbrances and drawbacks upon a family'" and claimed that "'a man who has sons brings up chickens for his own table... whereas daughters are chickens brought up for the tables of other men'" (77), Lovelace's fantasy of feeding on Clarissa alters the function of the daughter to make of her a 'chicken' that Lovelace--her "name- father"--can consume. By imagining Clarissa as a mother, the daughter's meeting with her name-father is translated into the duty of the daughter/mother to nourish her father, the father of her children and the male children who will--if Lovelace condescends--bear his name. While Lovelace's fantasy marks his desire as simultaneously that of a father, sexual partner and son, his power derives, the fantasy suggests, from his own transformation into a father, and his pleasure from the very vulnerability of the woman over whom absolute power is wielded. When Clarissa

uses her by now customary abstention from commensality to create the ruse that allows her to escape to Hampstead, Lovelace is determined to regain her on his own terms and to turn Clarissa's "crushed rebellio[n]" to his own advantage in his self-assigned role of "sovereign in possession" (761).

It is entirely fitting then that when Lovelace finds Clarissa at Hampstead whither she has flown after his attempt on the night of the fire, he enters the house in the guise of a gouty old man who recalls the unspoken physical threat posed by the similarly-afflicted Mr. Harlowe. The sexual suggestiveness of Lovelace's transformation from an old man reminiscent of Clarissa's father to the would-be rapist are difficult to miss in light of Lovelace's flamboyant self-exposure ("I unbuttoned... my cape... pulled off my hat... threw open my great coat" [772]), and his gleeful corruption of Milton's lines to displace the potency of Ithuriel's weapon onto his own body: "I started up in my own form divine, / Touched by the beam of her celestial eye, / More potent than Ithuriel's spear!" (772). As Erickson has so evocatively expressed it, rather like the "gout-ridden father stumping up to her room and killing her in his rage" that Clarissa has feared at home, Lovelace administers "another shock in the guise of a hobbling old man, whose sudden appearance in his true colors also reenacts that earlier surprise in the garden of her father's house when 'he threw open a horseman's coat' and confronted

her" (158). Clarissa claims she "cannot eat" after the confrontation at Hampstead. She avoids the dining room that Lovelace engages and marks as his own territory, she eats only sparingly, and she insists upon paying her own 'bed and board' for the remainder of her time at Hampstead.

The next (indeed final) refreshment that Clarissa accepts from Lovelace proves to be the tea laced with a sedative that dulls her senses prior to the rape. It is particularly significant that the rape is enabled by Clarissa's momentary lapse in her guarded refusal to countenance the terms that Lovelace has set. When Clarissa accepts the supposedly restorative dish of tea, Lovelace takes advantage of her lapse to reinstitute (through his use of the drug) the terms adumbrated by Mr. Harlowe; Clarissa's acceptance of Lovelace's condition-bound sustenance is turned into his license to dispense with her virginity in the manner of his choosing. Clarissa's taking in of Lovelace's hitherto rejected sustenance at this crucial moment turns out to be the key to his success in translating her refusal of his sexual advances into a drug-induced and enforced acceptance. Through the orally-administered drug that deprives Clarissa of her senses during the rape, Lovelace exactly reproduces the power relation between father and daughter. By allaying Clarissa's apprehensions with the assurance that it is only the milk--that most nurturing of all foods--that she is unaccustomed to, Lovelace equips himself to override any objection that

Clarissa might make. He doubly guarantees his success by actually incapacitating her from articulating the negative--her non-consent--during the rape; in so doing he implicitly calls upon the code that decrees that a daughter's word requires endorsement by the man who has her under his protection and who is therefore at liberty to coopt her agency.³²

Shortly after the rape, Clarissa takes up the theme of annihilation by oral means in one of the accusatory fragments that uses the metaphor of parasiticism: "Thou pernicious caterpillar, that preyest upon the fair leaf of virgin fame, and poisonest those leaves which thou canst not devour! Thou fell blight, thou eastern blast, thou overspreading mildew, that destroyest the earliest promises of the shining year!... Thou eating canker-worm that preyest upon the opening bud..." (892). Apparently directed at Lovelace, the accusation might just as easily be levelled against Clarissa's father given the withering effect of his curse and the conditions with which he has blasted his daughter's existence.

After the rape, of course, Clarissa's wasting reaches chronic proportions. Rejecting the terms that Lovelace forces upon her through the violence perpetrated on her non-consenting body, Clarissa's failure to eat after the rape--accompanied by violent stomach aches and other disorders (932)--accelerates the pattern of food abstinence first seen at Harlowe Place where the daughter's trust was initially

eroded by terms she could not stomach and by an incapacitating oral violence. In the rape, moreover, Lovelace has enacted almost exactly the violence that the Harlowe men have threatened. Not only has Lovelace taken James' advice to Solmes, to make Clarissa as sensible of his power as she once made him of her insolence (317), but Clarissa is gained by Lovelace after two or three struggles just as James has promised Solmes she would be (306). Echoing the Harlowe intention to deliver her up to Solmes under any circumstances, furthermore, Clarissa's incapacity is to prove no obstacle to Lovelace, as, "ill or well" his 'ceremony' too is to be forcefully conducted and legitimated by the retroactive consent that Lovelace hopes to secure by taking Clarissa to wife. Rather than being simply a rake and a rival, an outsider against whom the Harlowe daughter must be protected, Lovelace--the paternalistic protector turned rapist--dramatizes the latent threat of the work's other terrifying protector, that preternatural insider, the father.

Clarissa's failure to eat and her resulting emaciation speak the violation of filial trust by the father; his is a violence that is literalized in the bodily violation of the daughter by the other man who undertook, father-like, to nurture and to love her. Given the incestuous nature of paternal-filial love in Clarissa, the daughter's return to her father's house in death can hardly be conceived as a triumph for her at any level. Rather, her return speaks the

daughter's eternal bondage to the terms of daughterhood within her earthly father's house; constructed through her father's almost endlessly displaced desire, the daughter can have no existence beyond that desire, as the curse, an intensely overdetermined expression of the father's wish to retain power over his daughter, shows. Even when Mr. Harlowe relents sufficiently, though belatedly and without forgiveness, to withdraw the curse, his terms are sustained by the other 'word'--the biblical codes--that preclude the daughter's agency. The otherworldly Father's house, accessible through a demise of corporeal substance that results in death, offers neither respite nor a mitigation of terms; it offers a redoubling of the conditions that wring the daughter's body into a no-body. The crises of Clarissa's marriageability and her potential to evade the father's wishes conclude with her marriage to a heavenly Father ("never was a bride so ready as I" [1339])--a marriage that brings the emaciated and violated daughter's body back to its final residence in the father's house.

Notes

1. Raymond F. Hilliard, "Clarissa and Ritual Cannibalism," PMLA 105, no. 5 (1990): 1083-1097.
2. Samuel Richardson, Clarissa, or The History of a Young Lady, ed. Angus Ross (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1985), 77, 267. All subsequent references will be to this edition and page numbers will appear parenthetically in my text.
3. Hilliard, 1090, 1084.
4. Carol Houlihan Flynn, Samuel Richardson: A Man of Letters (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 45; Margaret A. Doody, A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), 171; Cynthia Griffin Wolff, Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth-Century Puritan Character (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1972), 83-4, 162, 158-9. See also Katherine Cummings (Telling Tales: The Hysteric's Seduction in Fiction and Theory [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991], who claims that 'Sinclair' is a homophone that "casts Clarissa in(to) the French figure of 'St. Claire'" who founded an order devoted to the sick poor and was celebrated for chastity (123). Cummings further suggests that Clarissa

identifies with Sinclair and that the antiphysical saint is Richardson's antitype for the monstrosity in women represented by Sinclair or sans Clair. Even Terry Eagleton's Marxist reading, The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), entertains the idea of Clarissa's death as a potential, if highly-ambivalent, spiritual submission (90).

5. Rudolph Bell, Holy Anorexia (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 18-19, 115. Bell makes it clear that his term, "holy anorexia" is not the modern illness anorexia nervosa, but that it shares many of the physical and psychological characteristics of the modern disease. Bell uses 'holy anorexia' as a shorthand term to describe behaviors of food abstinence and/or appetite loss among women and to consider factors that contributed to such behavior. His term holy anorexia approximates to Hilde Bruch's idea of an 'anorectic stance,' a resistance against feeling exploited and controlled, in The Golden Cage: The Enigma of Anorexia Nervosa (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976), and in Eating Disorders: Obesity, Anorexia Nervosa and the Person Within (New York: Basic Books, 1973). Bruch's interactive (rather than intrapsychic) approach to anorexia, which emphasized the importance of agency and identity to the potential anorectic, laid the groundwork for numerous recent studies of the illness. The idea that food abstinence is utilized by some women to rebel against

oppressive patriarchal ideology and practices in modern Western culture has appeared in a variety of forms in self-consciously feminist studies of anorexia nervosa in recent years. See, for example, Susie Orbach, Hunger Strike: The Anorectic's Struggle as a Metaphor for our Age, (London: Faber and Faber, 1986); Noelle Caskey, "Interpreting Anorexia Nervosa," in The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986), 175-189; Susan R. Bordo, "The Body and the Reproduction of Femininity: A Feminist Appropriation of Foucault," in Gender / Body / Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing, ed. Alison M. Jaggar and Susan R. Bordo (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989), 13-33; Matra Robertson, Starving in the Silences: An Exploration of Anorexia Nervosa, (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 12-21 .

6. Bell, 116, 185; Hilliard, 1092.

7. For a detailed discussion of Belford's motives for writing Clarissa into "Saint Clarissa," see Donnalee Frega, "Pedagogy of the Perfect: Consumption and Identity in Richardson's Clarissa" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1989), 234-46.

8. Paula Marantz Cohen, The Daughter's Dilemma: Family Process and the Nineteenth-Century Domestic Novel (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991), 24, 30-31, 52-3. My own disinclination to use the term 'anorexia' in

connection with the case of Clarissa stems from the fact that the term was not identified with the behaviors that Cohen describes until comparatively recently. According to Petr Skrabanek ("Notes Toward the History of Anorexia Nervosa," Janus: Revue Internationale de l'histoire de la pharmacie et de la technique 70 [1983]: 117), the first English fasting girl on record was Martha Taylor from Richardson's native Derbyshire. She became of public interest from 1668-69 due to a report on her fast by one J. Reynolds. The earliest recorded case in medical literature approximating to the modern condition anorexia nervosa which usually involves considerable bodily emaciation among its other symptoms, is found in Richard Morton's Phthisiologia: or a Treastise of Consumptions (London, 1689). Although this treatise details the case of Mary Axe who is described as having a nervous consumption and whose symptoms closely resemble those of the modern disease anorexia nervosa, there is nothing that shows that Richardson was aware of either her case or that of Martha Taylor. Several eighteenth-century physicians associated anorexia (which was understood as a lack or loss of appetite) with a broad range of nervous disorders including hysteria and hypochondria giving rise to works such as Giorgio Baglivi's The Practice of Physick, (London, 1723), George Cheyne's The Natural Method of Cureing the Diseases of the Body and the Disorders of the Mind (London, 1742), Robert Whytt's Observations on the Nature, Causes, and Cure of those Disorders which have been

commonly called Nervous, Hypochondriac, or Hysterical (Edinburgh, 1767), and William Cullen's First Lines of the Practice of Physic (Edinburgh, 1791). It was not until the nineteenth century that the term came to signify anything resembling the modern concept of the illness anorexia nervosa. In the nineteenth century, bodily emaciation and abstention from food became the subject of independent reports by William Gull ("The Address in Medicine Delivered Before the Annual Meeting of the B.M.A. at Oxford," Lancet 2 [1868]: 171-76; idem "Apepsia hysterica. Anorexia Nervosa," Transactions of the Clinical Society 7 [1874]: 22-28) and Charles Lesègue ("De l'anorexie hystérique," Archives générales de médecine 21 [1873]: 385-403). Confused in 1914 with Simmonds disease, a condition arising from damage to the pituitary gland, it was only during the 1930s that anorexia nervosa was established as a disease of psychic origin and taken up by Sigmund Freud and others who continued to associate it with hysteria. For a fuller history of the disease, see Hilda Bruch, Eating Disorders, chap. 12; Helmut Thomä, Anorexia Nervosa, trans. Gillian Brydone (New York: International Universities Press Inc., 1967), chap. 1; Ilza Veith, Hysteria: The History of a Disease (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); Mara Selvini Palazzoli, Self Starvation: From Individual to Family Therapy in the Treatment of Anorexia Nervosa, trans. Arnold Pomerans (New York: John Aronson, 1978), 3-25; Skrabanek, 109-128; Rudolph Bell, Holy Anorexia, chap. 1.

For an overview of the most recent medical, psychoanalytical and feminist work on the subject, see Robertson, 22-35, 40-45.

9. Caroline Walker Bynum, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkley: University of California Press, 1987), 207.

10. T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben D. Kimpel, Samuel Richardson: A Biography (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 42-44, 154-6; George Cheyne, The English Malady: or a Treatise of Nervous Diseases of all Kinds as Spleen, Vapours, Lowness of Spirits, Hypochondriacal, and Hysterical Distempers, &c. (London, 1733), i-iii, 35.

11. Charles F. Mullett, ed. The Letters of Doctor George Cheyne to Samuel Richardson (1733-1743), University of Missouri Studies, vol. 18 (Columbia: University of Missouri, 1943). Although Cheyne does associate self-denial and abstention from food with religious virtue, he emphasizes the value of temperance for restoring bodily and social equilibrium in a culture given to the corruptions of a disorderly sensual excess. In a letter of June 30 1742, Cheyne writes: "I have often thought Low-living and its Attendants to mend a weakened Constitution of Body, has a great Analogy and Resemblance to the Meanest Purification and Regeneration preserved in holy Writ. The Method of Cure.... is called by [the ancient physicians] Cyclus Metasyncriticus...viz't by Evacuation... Bleedings now and then, Thumb or other Vomits... these will answer all the

Designs of Evacuation to throw off the old corrupted Mass, representing Repentance, Self-Denial, avoiding the Occasions of Sensuality and Sin, and throwing off the old Man with all his Works of Darkness" (101).

12. See, for example, Terry Castle, Clarissa's Ciphers: Meaning and Disruption in Richardson's 'Clarissa' (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982), 106, 119, 124-26. Hilliard attributes Clarissa's food abstinence to her being "'swallowed up' by her grief after the rape" (1091), and John A. Dussinger ("Love and Consanguinity in Richardson's Novels," Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 24, no. 3 [1984]) claims that Clarissa's refusal to eat and undress follows "the trauma of sexual violence" and represents a withdrawal from the world (n.18, 519). In The British Novel, Defoe to Austen: A Critical History (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990), John Allen Stevenson links the rape with the onset of bodily denudation: it is "the fulcrum between blooming good health and rapid [corporeal] decay" (39). Frega's doctoral dissertation is a notable exception for she considers the significance of mealtimes at Harlowe Place (111-17).

13. Peter Farb and George Armelagos, Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Eating (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1980), 4-6; Bynum refers to a family as "a group of people who reside--and especially eat--together" and suggests that "[t]o refuse commensality is both to refuse the meal as a symbol of familial bond and to refuse

the most basic support that a father's money and mother's household skill can provide: food" (223).

14. Clarissa's lack of identity is underlined when Mr. Harlowe more emphatically severs Clarissa from the Harlowe name and from the affective tie: "when Mr. Solmes can introduce you to us, in the temper we wish to behold you in, we may perhaps forgive his wife, although we never can in any other character, our perverse daughter" (190).

15. Janice Haney-Peritz, "Engendering the Exemplary Daughter: The Deployment of Sexuality in Richardson's Clarissa," in Daughters and Fathers, ed. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers. (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 189.

16. Judith Lewis Herman, Father-Daughter Incest (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), 60. On this point see also W. Arens, The Original Sin; Incest and Its Meaning (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 140-150.

17. I use the term 'anomaly' here as Mary Douglas uses it in Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 53, 113, to describe something or someone that breaches lines of demarcation between different culturally-sanctioned categories. Such a person (or such an object) is considered polluted and polluting and so frequently inspires fear, contempt, anger, hatred, or some combination of these. It is worth noting with Douglas that the incest prohibitions are informed by the operational logic of the dietary laws that

precede them in Leviticus 11.2-41, and that Leviticus as a whole is devoted to the priestly principles of order and wholeness. Both the incest and dietary prohibitions stand as an elaboration of the injunction to be 'holy' (to be whole, separate or complete) and any thing or person that cannot be identified as clearly belonging to one category is considered anomalous. The multiple and overlapping claims to Clarissa render her such an anomaly. On the concept of anomaly, see also Patricia Klindienst Joplin's "The Voice of the Shuttle is Ours," Stanford Literature Review 1 (1984): 41-43.

18. Lynda E. Boose, "The Father's House and the Daughter in It: The Structures of Western Culture's Daughter-Father Relationship," in Fathers and Daughters, ed. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 28. Douglas usefully elaborates other threats posed by the daughter's marriage in an exogamic social system. Because a wife usually comes from a kinship group with which her husband's group ordinarily competes for resources and for status, marriage harbors the germ of conflicting material interests. The potential for procreation within marriage further identifies the daughter as potentially traitorous; at the same time that her community of origin cannot consume her because of the law prohibiting incest, the daughter may increase the human resources of her marital kin through childbirth. The daughter's ability to reproduce alarmingly

brings together the crossing of community/kinship lines in marriage with the crossing of blood lines and bodily bounds (147).

19. John Allen Stevenson, "The Courtship of the Family: Clarissa and the Harlowes Once More," ELH 48 (1981): 757, n. 18, 760. For an elaboration of the greed argument see Christopher Hill, "Clarissa Harlowe and Her Times," in his Puritanism and Revolution Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century (London: Secker and Warburg, 1958), 370-71, 374, 383; Mark Kinkead-Weekes, Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist (London: Methuen, 1973), 131ff. For a discussion of women and property in the period that also deals with Clarissa, see Austin W. Flanders, Structures of Experience: History, Society, and Personal Life in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel (Columbia, S. Carolina: University of S. Carolina Press, 1984), chap. 4.

20. Stevenson, "The Courtship of the Family," 765, 766.

21. Solmes is introduced as a friend of Clarissa's uncles and several descriptions demonstrate his likeness to them and to Mr. Harlowe. See especially Anna Howe's letter of Thursday March 9 (letter 27) which describes Solmes, Uncle Antony and Mr. Harlowe all as encroaching, dreary, spendthrift suitors.

22. This point is not lost on Frederick R. Karl (The Adversary Literature. The English Novel in the Eighteenth Century: A Study in Genre [New York: Farrar, Straus and

Giroux, 1974]) who notes that "[i]n addition to the obvious sadistic overtones of Clarissa's relations with James, Arabella, and Mr. Harlowe are the lines of incest. We could argue that James's insistence that Clarissa marry Solmes is more than family-oriented.... Clarissa is surrounded by father figures who loom as sexual threats" (133). Lynda Zwinger (Daughters, Fathers, and the Novel: The Sentimental Romance of Heterosexuality [Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991]), who offers a parallel reading of this episode to mine, observes that James' violent behavior and language begin "with [Clarissa's] father's blessing"; she refers to James' suit for his sister as "a courtship by proxy" (20)--a courtship that is ultimately on behalf of Clarissa's father. On the power differential between male and female siblings in modern Western culture, see Diana E. H. Russell, Incest in the Lives of Girls and Women (New York: Basic Books, 1986), chap. 18.

23. Mr. Harlowe's absence from much of the action of Clarissa has caused more than one commentator to regard him as an enfeebled patriarch yielding to the power of his young, vigorous son. Florian Stuber ("On Fathers and Authority in Clarissa," Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 25, no. 3 [1985]: 537-575), goes so far as to suggest that Clarissa is attracted to Lovelace because he has the makings of a strong father and because Lovelace is unlike her own weak father. More recently Haney-Peritz, whose position is in other ways far removed from Stuber's, sees

Mr. Harlowe as an "unwitting accomplice" in James' struggles with Lovelace and with Clarissa, and as a father "usurped and sexualized without his knowing or wanting it" (192). I maintain with Zwinger that Mr. Harlowe's power is critical: his power is acknowledged by the Harlowe men and sustains their frightening encroachments on Clarissa. As Zwinger observes when she refers to James' use of the father's voice as a form of ventriloquy (21), James' and Mr. Harlowe's interests are, for the most part, closely aligned.

24. There are of course other kept women in Clarissa. For example, Lovelace mocks Clarissa's uncle, John Harlowe, as "an old sinner" for collapsing the distinctions between housekeeper and kept woman (696). John Harlowe uses his housekeeper as a mistress while at the same time criticizing libertinage. But the case of Belton's housekeeper best illustrates the problems that arise when one does not maintain one's housekeeper at a proper reserve. Belton's error, according to Belford and Lovelace, is not in having a kept woman as such, it is in allowing one's kept woman, particularly if she is a "consuming mistress," to deplete one's house and attain control of one's estate (1088). Having entrusted the keeping of his house to an arguably unfaithful mistress, Thomasine, who is generally supposed to be his wife, Belford jeopardizes his estate (612), and Thomasine's sons "riot on the remnant of his broken fortunes" (1089). Once Thomasine and her illegitimate children have been ejected, a more fitting choice of

housekeeper for the purposes of consolidating Belford's dwindled estate is found in Belton's despised, lowly and impoverished sister who is ingrafted to the place vacated by the mistress (1224).

25. On Clarissa and Lovelace as Edenic figures, see Tom Keymer, Richardson's 'Clarissa' and the Eighteenth-Century Reader (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 106-14. Anna Howe's later description of Lovelace's voice and his behavior at Colonel Ambrose's assembly also conjures an image of Lovelace as a temptor of this ilk: "I heard [Lovelace's] odious voice, whispering behind my chair... One request--I started up from my seat, but could hardly stand neither, for very indignation--Oh this sweet, but becoming disdain, whispered on that insufferable creature!... but... let me entreat from you one quarter of an hour's audience" (1135).

26. Nancy K. Miller, The Heroine's Text: Readings in the French and English Novel, 1722-1782 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 188. For a discussion of Lovelace's legal claim to Clarissa, see John P. Zomchick, "Tame Spirits, Brave Fellows and the Web of Law," ELH 53, no. 1 (1986): 199-120. Zomchick suggests that Lovelace is able to claim Clarissa as his property because she is abandoned by her family. Flanders believes that Clarissa "repeated[ly] attempts to create a family with which to replace her original one. She continually asserts that she is in effect an orphan... (154).

27. On this point see Linda S. Kauffman, Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre, and Epistolary Fictions (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), 130, 132.

28. There are strong parallels between Lovelace's reasoning here and the reasoning that Iago uses to persuade Othello of Desdemona's infidelity in the third act of Othello (3.3.155-61, 206-8). In letters 97, 245, 246 and 252, as in letter 31 where Lovelace recites a line that captures Othello's anguish over Desdemona's supposed infidelity, Lovelace frequently asserts that a daughter who has betrayed her father's trust has the makings of an unfaithful and deceitful wife and that she is deserving of punishment.

29. 'Mother' Sinclair's daughters are also referred to as her husband's "nieces." As Robert A. Erickson (Mother Midnight: Birth, Sex, and Fate in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Defoe, Richardson, and Sterne [New York: AMS, 1986], 140, 278, n.37) points out, 'niece' was a common slang term in the eighteenth century for a prostitute.

30. Lovelace's incestuous desire for the "sister beauties" in this instance in which he specifically identifies himself as a disobeyed father, reemerges in a more complicated form in one of Lovelace's dreams. In the dream Clarissa is living upon her inheritance and is visited by Anna Howe: "Miss Howe... [is] enabled to compare notes with [Clarissa]; a charming girl, by the same father, to her friend's charming boy; who, as they grow up, in order to

consolidate their mammas' friendships (for neither have dreams regard to consanguinity), intermarry; change names by Act of Parliament, to enjoy my estate" (922). The children offer proof of Lovelace's sexual conquest of both 'sisters.' Whether or not the children's marriage would consolidate a friendship based upon the sisters' common sexual interest in Lovelace, it would certainly consolidate Lovelace's estate by permitting his daughter's sexual and economic value to be incorporated into, rather than circulated out of, his family.

31. Cf. Frega, 166-167.

32. For the implications of Clarissa's unconsciousness (and her resultant inability to consent to--or to refuse--intercourse) in the context of women's status as legal beings and the period's increasing demand for physical evidence to establish truth, see Frances Ferguson's, "Rape and the Rise of the Novel" Representations 20 (1987): 88-112.

Chapter 4: Bre(a)d, Bed, and Bawd.

[Y]our sister was the mother of that child you found between your sheets.

--Henry Fielding, Tom Jones

The lowing heifer, and the bleating ewe in herds and flocks, may ramble safe and unregarded through the pastures. These are, indeed, hereafter doomed to be the prey of man.... But if a plump doe be discovered to have escaped from the forest, and to repose herself in some field or grove... every man is ready to set his dogs after her; and if she is preserved from the rest by the good squire, it is only that he may secure her for his own eating.

I have often considered a very fine young woman of fortune and fashion, when first found strayed from the pale of her nursery, to be in pretty much the same situation with this doe.... she is hunted from park to play, from court to assembly, from assembly to her own chamber, and rarely escapes a single season from the jaws of some devourer or other: for if her friends protect her from some, it is only to deliver her over to one of their own chusing....

--Henry Fielding, Tom Jones

"Three pounds at least of that flesh which formerly had contributed to the composition of an ox, was now honoured with becoming a part of the individual Mr Jones.... This particular... may account for our hero's temporary neglect of [Mrs. Waters].... [S]he was in love, according to the

present universally received sense of that phrase, by which love is applied indiscriminately to the desirable objects of all our passions, appetites, and senses, and is understood to be that preference we give to one kind of food rather than to another."¹ So begins the famous Upton episode in Tom Jones. In this episode, following his magnificent feat of eating, Tom Jones engages in sexual relations with Mrs. Waters that are later--mistakenly as it turns out--characterized as incestuous. I refer to the Upton episode in which Tom unwittingly has sex with the woman, née Jenny Jones, believed to be his mother, not solely because it marks a moment in Tom Jones where the main concerns of this study--incest and eating--come together. Occurring at almost the exact mid-point of the novel at the end of the ninth book, the Upton episode is also important as the spectacular second in a series of three episodes in which Tom Jones is found in a bed in which, according to prevailing social and cultural codes, he ought not to be.²

During the Upton episode itself, as in all of Tom's sexual encounters except that which produces legitimate issue, Tom is cast as responding to woman's lasciviousness rather than initiating sexual relations himself. Mrs. Waters apparently possesses an overwhelming seductive power. She launches an attack on Tom and he succumbs to the might of that "royal battery," her bosom (456). Yet Tom shows more initiative in the Upton episode than it would seem from Mrs. Waters' campaign to conquer him and her "feast[ing] heartily

at the table of love" (461). Tom is first attracted to Mrs. Waters by her "well formed and extremely white" (441) breasts, whose very whiteness suggests their capacity to nurse as well as to be objects that arouse male heterosexual desire. Mrs. Waters' breasts are appealing precisely because they offer the combined erotic/gustatory appeal of a literal "quantity of delicate white human flesh" (252) which the narrator identifies in the chapter on love in book 6 as necessary to the curbing of both kinds of hunger. Once Tom's appetite for two types of flesh is whetted, he gorges on actual meat as a prelude to sating his sexual appetite. Informed by the narrator's explanation of lust as the propensity to consume a quantity of white human flesh, Tom's lust for Mrs. Waters is a desire to devour her, or, more accurately, to cannibalize her. This association of meat-eating with manly prowess militates against the narrative's persistent representation of women's bodies in general, and maternal bodies in particular, as uncontained, powerful, and dangerously predatory.

First of all, the long-standing link between meat-eating and manliness in Western cultural tradition is evident in several references in Tom Jones itself to the purposeful eating of meat by veteran warrior heroes in classical literature and myth. Probably the most memorable of these references is the narrator's likening of Tom to "Ulysses, who... had the best stomach of all the heroes in that eating poem of the Odyssey" (453), and who, we are to

infer, was therefore among the most courageous of Odyssean heroes. For Fielding, who wrote the popular contemporary English ditty, "The Roast Beef of Old England," which appeared in The Grub Street Opera (1731), and in Don Quixote in England (1734) by the title "The King's Old Courtier," the eating of beef by soldiers in a mythologized past is responsible for their manly vigor and bravery in battle as well as their bellicosity. In the ditty, English manliness compares very favorably with European effeminacy. By means of a simultaneous and parallel comparison, Englishmen's appetites are described as robust and healthy--as everything that European men's appetites are not:

When mighty Rost Beef was the Englishman's Food,
It ennobled our Hearts, and enriched our Blood;
Our soldiers were brave, and our Courtiers were
good.

Oh the Rost Beef of Old England,
And Old England's Rost Beef!

Then Britons, from all nice Dainties refrain,
Which effeminate Italy, France, and Spain;
And mighty Rost Beef shall command on the Main.
Oh the Rost Beef of Old England,
And Old England's Rost Beef!³

Extending the idea that there is a direct correlation between diet and human characteristics, here national character, the narrator of Tom Jones alludes to the capacity of food to foster certain qualities in men when he undertakes first to give human nature in the "plain and simple" style of English cooking, and to "hash and ragoo it

wit

aff

Eu

is

ma

ex

Fi

in

be

a

h

a

e

w

h

T

P

a

t

w

w

i

A

t

with all the high French and Italian seasoning of affectation and Vice thereafter" (53). By indentifying European taste with corruption and effeminacy, English taste is constructed as something that is wholesome; it is overtly masculine and implicitly heterosexual. Against this explanation of what it means to have a hearty appetite, and Fielding's representations elsewhere of Englishmen turned into fops by European diet, and fops made manly by English beef, it is no accident that Tom has considerable prowess as a fighter and that his lust for the hunt is matched only by his lust for women.⁴ When Mrs. Waters launches her mammiform attack on Tom, therefore, the heterosexual matrix subtly established by the narrative's association of good appetite with manliness and flesh-eating rewrites the purported hostility of Mrs. Waters as a relinquishment of the bosom to Tom's masculine faculty--his appetite for meat. Thus the power of Mrs. Water's bosom to conquer Tom is considerably abated by his predisposition to ravage rather than ravish the white meat that Mrs. Waters proffers.⁵

In spite of all indications that Tom is extremely willing to have sex with Mrs. Waters, moreover, and even when we know that Mrs. Waters is Jenny Jones, and that Jenny is not Tom's mother, we are apt to attach to Mrs. Waters Allworthy's misdirected criticism of libidinous drives in the unwed and supposedly besmirched Jenny:

How base and mean must that woman be, how void of that dignity of mind, and decent pride, without

which we are not worthy the name of human creatures, who can bear to level herself with the lowest animal, and to sacrifice all that is great and noble in her, all her heavenly part, to an appetite which she hath in common with the vilest branch of creation! (67)

The Upton episode is helpful in breaking down this erroneous attribution. Because the Upton episode associates male libido explicitly with excessive eating in Tom's pre-coital consumption of three pounds of ox, it draws attention to the way in which sexually-active females across the social spectrum in Tom Jones are depicted as sexual predators, substantial eaters, or, more usually, both. In Mrs. Waters' case, the exposed ample breasts that she is loathe to cover on the road to Upton allude to the uncontainability of her body in line with such well-known, excessive and appetitive female bodies as Milton's Sin, Pope's Dulness, Swift's goddess Criticism, and of course, Richardson's 'Mother' Sinclair.⁶

The conflation of women's appetites for food and their procreative functions is also evident in Tom Jones when the muse is represented as an obese mother who spawns hacks. The "redundant sustenance" from the muse's ample breasts creates sated, but intellectually stunted progeny (608). The muse is depicted elsewhere as being fattened by the ancients upon whom she is permitted to graze (552). Other versions of the devouring female body abound in the novel, as coarse or indiscrete women and sexually incontinent ones are often bad mothers. That such women dine heartily is exemplified by the

gorging of the ironically-named Honour (480-81) who will sell her fidelity to the highest bidder, Mrs. Fitzpatrick, whose elopement and subsequent desertion of her child through the offices of a potential future beau leaves her appetite undiminished (526-27), and Nancy Miller, who, having been "hungry" enough to have "sat down to dinner before grace was said" narrowly averts having an illegitimate child (674). Even Bridget Allworthy, cast as the lean figure that might have inspired Hogarth's 'A Winter Morning,' has trailing behind her in Hogarth's print a "starved foot-boy" as she walks through that haven of loose women, Covent Garden (79). The starved foot-boy foreshadows the son that Bridget almost deprives of a fortune by her incontinence: his wasted body emblemizes the mortification of Tom's flesh by Thwackum as a result of Bridget's failure to curb her lover-like longing for Tom over the would-be suitors Square and Thwackum.⁷

Because these hungering women are represented as caricatures of amorous spinsterhood, lower-class womanhood, and of the unruly disobedient heiress, they are given a familiar and easily-accessible (if sometimes grotesque) comedic appeal. However, if one follows the inclination to dismiss these figures of hungry female libido as mere comedic effects, one is also compelled to dismiss their counterpart, male libido represented in terms of the ravening animal image. Such a summary dismissal would obscure the novel's two most disconcerting arenas of male

predation which emerge with great clarity when they facilitate or follow those other crucial instances in Tom Jones where Tom is found--as at Upton--in a bed in which he should not be.

The first episode in which Tom Jones is in the 'wrong' bed opens the novel. He is the unnamed illegitimate infant who, against the backdrop of the narrator's bill of fare to the promised feast, is found in Thomas Allworthy's--his mother's brother's--bed. The third episode is located at the close of the novel. It follows the public supper at Mrs. Miller's celebrating the separate marriages of young Nightingale and his cousin. In this episode Tom clasps Sophia in a well-advertised wedding embrace that anticipates his private, fruitful marital union with Sophia in a bed at Sophia's father's house. In each case, the owner of the bed that Tom occupies undertakes to provide for him and so to maintain him. These two bed episodes do not simply create a thematically coherent frame for the narrative, they also share with each other--and with the Upton episode that lies nestled between them--the novel's pervasive concern about who may have the use of certain types of property. Of course the Upton incident turns out not to be the case of incest it is feared to be. But the peril it embodies--that a man may have use of a woman he would be ordinarily prohibited from enjoying--is the result of the confusion over parentage in the first bed scene in Allworthy's chamber, and in some ways anticipates the submerged irregularities of the closing

conjugal bed episode. Whereas Fielding's narrative sleight of hand on the issue of who Tom's mother is glibly dispenses with the potential for incest at Upton that arises from Tom's illegitimacy and uncertain parentage, it does not remove the tincture of incest from the two relationships in the work marked by the bed episodes by virtue of which Tom becomes a man of property at narrative's end.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will show that although Tom's 'incest' with Mrs. Waters has most commonly been treated as a device employed by Fielding for comedic effect and to bring about Tom's ultimate maturation and repentance, this episode points the way backward and forward to Fielding's unfolding of the issue of property rights and usage in Tom Jones.⁸ At the same time the spectacular manner in which the Upton affair is treated (through its physically and narratively central situation and through the scare that incest has occurred) draws attention away from the novel's other strategically-placed bed episodes, the domestic arrangements that enable these episodes, and the novel's persistent concern with who owns and who may therefore use certain types of property. Even though incest is not specifically named in the opening and closing bed episodes, each episode raises afresh the questions of the kind of ownership that arises from rearing and commensality, and the usage rights that accrue from ownership. The submerged incest theme is crystalized about the economies of food provison, bride and land procurement and familial

regeneration in the first and third bed episodes. These economies link the two bed episodes more closely with the spatially central non-incest episode than has hitherto been imagined, so that the two 'frame' episodes are finally more important than the Upton episode for the novel's discussion of property through its attention to incest and eating.⁹

A look at the ethos of Allworthy's household and the circumstances that surround the discovery of the foundling in Allworthy's bed provides a useful point of entry to this discussion. At first glance, Paradise Hall, with its classical lines, extensive grounds and its meadows "fed with sheep" (58), epitomizes an ideal and bountiful Golden Age of self-sufficiency and open-handed generosity. Its proprietor, "replete" with benevolence, is said not to be "one of those generous persons, who are ready most bountifully to bestow meat, drink, and lodging on men of wit and learning, for which they expect no other return but entertainment, instruction, flattery, and subserviency; in a word, that such persons should be in the number of domestics, without wearing their master's cloaths, or receiving wages" (74-5). On the contrary, the narrator informs us, every person in this house is the "perfect master of his own time... he might at his pleasure satisfy all his appetites within the restrictions only of law, virtue and religion... he might... absent himself from any meals... without even a solicitation to the contrary: for indeed, such solicitations from superiors always savour very strongly of commands" (75). Yet

there are early indications that Allworthy--like Robinson Crusoe's and Clarissa Harlowe's fathers--makes substantial demands of those who live in his self-contained paradise and eat at his table.

George Seagrim's ejection from Paradise Hall following the partridge-shooting incident in book 3 is a case in point, for the rationale that informs his ejection helps to elaborate Fielding's concern with several kinds of property in Tom Jones. George's nickname, Black George, links him directly to the Waltham Black Act which was rapidly enacted in the period from 30th April to 27th May 1723 to safeguard propertied liberties and interests. Legislation had been in existence in the seventeenth century for the protection of landed property. However, the Black Act of 1723 took the protection of individually-owned property further when it created fifty new capital offenses through the generation of fresh descriptions of offenses against property. The Black Act was created to deal with a series of localized disturbances involving illegal night hunting, or poaching, by criminal gangs on private estates with deer parks, enclosed coppices and fisheries. The two most sensational incidents of poaching occurred in 1720 in Windsor Forest, and in 1723 in the counties of Hampshire and Berkshire.¹⁰ Despite the fact that the Black Act sought to deal with very specific incidents, its hasty enactment is seen by modern analysts of game laws as indicative of a prevailing mood of anger and fear about unlicensed encroachment on privately

owned property. The act is generally seen as emblematic of a wider trend of change in legislation pertaining to land use in the early modern period in which substantial tracts were becoming less available to those of the lower social orders as a result of the increasing enclosure of land for more intensive agricultural use.

Enclosure (the conversion of common lands into private property, or the substitution of 'enclosed' fields for the open field system) had been going on since the fourteenth century and had sparked civil unrest in the 1530s, 1570s, and early 1600s. But because the latter half of the seventeenth- and the eighteenth century as a whole brought important new developments in agricultural methods, products and technology, this period saw an escalation and greater codification of the practice of enclosure in parliamentary law. Legislation further eroded the rights of the unpropertied orders, of tenants and small landowners to use common lands to graze livestock and to procure food, building materials and fuel. As enclosure made it more difficult for those without property to eke out a living, it caused John Cowper and others to declare against the practice as damaging to the national interest and to the working poor. The preservation of resources for the use of the relatively affluent propertied orders by successive acts of enclosure and by the Black Act marks a decreased availability of resources to those closest to subsistence levels. That many poaching-related offences were for the

first time legally punishable by death as a result of the Black Act in turn suggests the importance of landed property in distinguishing between social orders in a period of tremendous uncertainty about such distinctions brought about by new methods of acquiring (and measuring) worth.¹¹

While it is true that George's initial infraction of the law concerning game--his part in killing the partridge sprung on Allworthy's land and shot on Western's--is at odds with his job as gamekeeper, George's dismissal has effects which are, in common sense terms, disproportionate to his trespass: "'your poor gamekeeper, with all his large family... have been perishing with all the miseries of cold and hunger'" (143). Influenced by Squire Western's fury over the trespass, and inflamed by George's attempt to evade detection, Allworthy honors the spirit of a law which preserves "property in animals ferae naturae" for the exclusive use of the landowners without regard for the cost of such exclusivity to their minions (47-48).¹² This position closely aligns Allworthy with those like Western who will "preserv[e] and protec[t]... certain animals... [and] unmercifully slaughter whole horse-loads themselves" (124). The juxtaposition of the benevolent ethos that superficially graces Paradise Hall and Allworthy's actions--which demonstrate a marked concern for safeguarding privately-ownable property--embodies a philosophical paradox. But this is a paradox easily resolved if one understands that generosity like Allworthy's can only

function on an extended basis when resources belong to the few who may choose whether or not to dispense largesse to the many. It is therefore to the advantage of a landowner like Allworthy to keep control of resources; preservation is actually necessary if Allworthy's generosity, and in turn his power, are to continue.¹³

The principle of preserving resources for one's own use is everywhere evident in Tom Jones and especially so in the power that Allworthy exercises over those, like Black George, who are paid to serve him. Particularly interesting in this regard is Allworthy's domestic servant and housekeeper, Deborah Wilkins, to whose intimacy with Allworthy the narrator more than once refers. Deborah is thought so intimate with Allworthy that his own sister, Bridget, does not trust Deborah with the secret of her pregnancy. In spite of this level of intimacy between employee and employer, it is somewhat disconcerting to observe Deborah's lack of alarm at Allworthy's nocturnal summoning of her to his bedchamber. The narrator invites the reader to laugh at Deborah's vanity when she pauses to preen herself at the looking-glass as though regardless of the urgency of Allworthy's summons (56). Assuming we have not missed the sexual innuendo in the narrator's speculation that Allworthy might be lying "expiring in an apoplexy, or in some other fit" (emphasis added, 56) while he waits for his housekeeper to come to his bed, the narrator then pokes fun at the prudence and chastity of the old maidenish

Deborah under the guise of staving off any coarse notions the reader might have entertained about her:

Mrs Deborah Wilkins... tho' in the 52nd year of her age, vowed she had never beheld a man without his coat. Sneerers and prophane wits may perhaps laugh at her first fright, yet my graver reader, when he considers the time of night, the summons from her bed, and the situation in which she found her master, will highly justify and applaud her conduct; unless the prudence, which must be supposed to attend maidens at that period of life at which Mrs Deborah had arrived, should a little lessen his admiration. (56)

But if the narrator's feint of defending Deborah's good name emphasizes the superfluity of her prudence because Deborah's age renders her sexually undesirable, this very superfluity intimates what might be expected of a female servant of more tender years were she to be summoned in like fashion.

Clearly the social, economic and sexual vulnerability of the female who is enclosed in the realm of domestic property that I have broached in my discussion of house-kept women and housekeepers in Clarissa is not irrelevant to the case of Deborah Wilkins who has grown elderly in Allworthy's service. And it is certainly not an idea that would have been novel to Fielding who, in November 1747, took his own six-months pregnant housekeeper, Mary Daniel, as his second wife.¹⁴

Because it is foregrounded by the narrator's acknowledgement of a female dependant's sexual availability, Deborah's initial response to the infant in Allworthy's bed gives credence to the idea that he could very well be the

foundling's father. Deborah heaps insults on the unidentified mother yet she does not pursue what ought to be just as pressing a question; the identity of the foundling's father. In this omission Deborah tacitly subscribes to the idea that the identity of the child's father requires no questions. Drawing her conclusions from folk wisdom and from where the infant is found, Deborah retreats to a position that rather falteringly defends Allworthy only when he expresses horror at the insinuation that he may be--or may be thought--the foundling's father:

I don't know what is worse... than for such wicked strumpets to lay their sins at honest men's doors; and though your worship knows your innocence, yet the world is censorious; and it hath been many an honest man's hap to pass for the father of children he never begot; and if your worship should provide for the child, it may make the people the apter to believe: besides, why should your worship provide for what the parish is obliged to maintain? (57)¹⁵

That this speech of Deborah's is the retraction of the comic sychophant becomes clear during the episode of Allworthy's near-death in book 5. When Allworthy is thought to be on his deathbed Deborah repeats her first response to the foundling:

It would have becomed [sic] him better to have repented of his sins on his death-bed, than to glory in them, and give away his estate out of his own family to a mis-begotten child. Found in his bed, forsooth! A pretty story! Ay, those that hide know where to find. Lord forgive him, I warrant he hath many more bastards to answer for, if the truth was known. (230)

Once we learn that Bridget Allworthy is Tom's biological mother, that Tom was conceived in an illicit liaison that took place within the confines of Paradise Hall itself, and the reasons why popular opinion maintains that Allworthy is Tom's father, Deborah's reference to a truth that may not be fully known, hovers darkly. It allows the possibility that Tom is the product of both Allworthy and his sister and gilds with new meaning Mrs. Waters' later revelation about Tom's parentage to Allworthy: "'your sister was the mother of that child you found between your sheets'" (836). As T. G. A. Nelson has rightly observed, the form of this sentence is odd to begin with. It not only identifies Bridget as the mother of the child, but it "calls attention to a gesture on her part that pointedly invited her brother to father it--almost, indeed, accused him of having done so."¹⁶

Futhermore, as Homer Obed Brown has convincingly argued, the very presence of the foundling in Allworthy's bed strongly suggests "that something is wrong in Paradise, that there is something deficient or excessive, something less than all-worthy in the patriarch, something hidden" (224).¹⁷ Given the sexual access of the householder to the women in his household that has surfaced in the narrator's crude joke about Allworthy's nocturnal summons to Deborah, it is significant that Bridget, Allworthy's unmarried sister and mother of the infant ensconced in her brother's bed,

also lives at Paradise Hall as a dependent. Although Deborah is Allworthy's housekeeper in title, Bridget serves as the keeper of Allworthy's domestic enclosure in another respect. Bridget is first introduced as the physical occupant of the place at her brother's table that has been vacated by Allworthy's dead wife five years before:

Miss Bridget rings her bell, and Mr Allworthy is summoned to breakfast.... The usual compliments having past between Mr Allworthy and Miss Bridget, and the tea having been poured out, he summoned Mrs Wilkins and told his sister he had a present for her; for which she thanked him, imagining, I suppose, it had been a gown, or some ornament for her person. Indeed, he very often made her such presents, and she, in complacence to him, spent much time in adorning herself. (59)¹⁸

As a result of Allworthy's oddly-named "present" to his sister and the couple's exaggerated courtesy at the breakfast table, the scene quickly develops an ironic texture of conjugal harmony and domestic felicity. This is heightened when "the little infant" is produced and Allworthy resolves--against the background of Bridget's sotto voce grumbling--to "take care of the child, [and] to breed him up as his own" (59, 60).

When this parody of conjugal completeness and Bridget's complacence to her brother in all matters down to that of personal dress is placed alongside her observation that "all men were headstrong, and must have their own way, and [her] wish that she had been blest with an independant fortune"

(60), it does indeed seem as though something "less than all-worthy" is afoot. Since Bridget's compliance in all matters is born of obligation, it seems as though Allworthy's generosity might not be entirely disinterested. This in turn underscores the possibility that his charity in other instances might likewise yield pleasurable returns--or, equally, that it might be a return for pleasures already enjoyed.¹⁹

When Deborah's outburst at the time that Tom is discovered offers illegitimate paternity as the most feasible explanation for Allworthy's magnanimity in Tom's case, her explanation cannot be as hastily dismissed as the narrator would have us at one level believe. The terms in which Deborah expresses her response create an uneasy sense that there has been something extraordinarily wrong in the foundling's conception. Deborah attributes certain alien characteristics to the foundling that underline "its" anomalous status and non-personhood: "'it goes against me to touch these misbegotten wretches, whom I don't look upon as my fellow creatures. Faugh, how it stinks! It doth not smell like a Christian'" (57). Moreover, Deborah refers to the foundling (already marked as the product of a coupling outside the law by "its" illegitimacy) as a creature that defies classification, and so depicts Tom as what Brown calls a "monster [that] results from an unnatural coupling".²⁰

Deborah's experience of Tom as an anomalous creature is entirely consistent with the age-old belief in English folklore that incestuous conceptions bring forth monsters. Although the degeneration argument proper did not emerge until the late nineteenth century with the rise of biological 'inbreeding' theories, there is evidence to suggest that monstrous births were being linked to incest in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century philosophical discourse. When Deborah responds to Tom as though he were an object of contagion to be reviled and avoided, she marks him as a creature that is beyond the pale of all ordinary human relationships and brings to mind the similarities between the creature that hails from Paradise Hall and the hell-hound creatures of Paradise Lost.²¹ Nothing can be expected from "such creatures" according to Deborah, "than that they will "grow up and imitate their mothers" (57). Certainly, Tom's dalliances might be said to imitate Bridget's pre-marital sexual activity. But then Tom's incontinence is explained rather differently by Western and with a force that is not substantially allayed by the narrator's later assertion to the contrary: "'Allworthy loves a wench himself. Doth not all the country know whose son Tom is?.... many a wench have we two had together. As errant a whoremaster as any within five miles o' un'" (182).

I have said that Allworthy's adoption and rearing of the foundling in itself gives rise to the supposition that he is the father of the illegitimate boy. Indeed, one is

forced to wonder later in the narrative how it is possible for Allworthy to disown Tom if he has never owned him. But Allworthy's decision to give the foundling his own name, fittingly bastardized from 'Thomas' to 'Tom,' does more than Tom's sexual promiscuity or Allworthy's adoption of the infant to support the reading of Tom as Allworthy's natural son. Tom is given not one, but two names. In place of that important indicator of paternity, the surname, Tom is given the name of the woman, Jenny Jones, who is publically named as his biological mother. According to the logic that ascribes Tom his matronym even when circumstantial evidence provides him with a biological father in Partridge, 'Tom Jones' ought to be renamed 'Tom Allworthy' once Bridget is found to be his natural mother.²² Allworthy's lack of attention to the rightful ownership of this name--especially as it is his own name too--highlights the aliases and potential designations (Jones, Partridge, Summer, Allworthy) that compose the mystery of whose son Tom might be. In underscoring the unreliability of proper names as indicators of place and property, or as indicators of genealogy, the retention of the name given by Allworthy allows Tom Jones--more accurately, Tom Allworthy--to receive Thomas Allworthy's property in the form of the Squire's "great liberality" at the end of the novel; Tom gets to own Allworthy's property without having had to adopt that marker of blood relationship, the surname, that most publically acknowledges paternity.²³

Adding to his suspicious lack of attention in the point of Tom's name, Allworthy is inconsistent in dealing with pregnancy in unwed women. As Allworthy has been loquacious and severe in his condemnation of Jenny's bestial qualities, incontinence and immoral conduct when he supposes that her sexual appetites have produced Tom, the paucity of his comments upon the same failings in Bridget is especially noticeable.²⁴ In the case of his sister, Allworthy is more aghast at the fact that she concealed having had a child ("it was the most unjustifiable conduct in my sister to carry this secret with her out of this world" [837]), than the fact that she has had such a child. And he is most disconcerted by the thought that the secret might have prevented him from recognizing and rewarding the presence of his own blood in Tom (848). Christine van Boheemen explains Allworthy's failure to acknowledge Bridget's sexual activity as part of an unwillingness to hold Bridget responsible; to do so would "lend her autonomy and presence... as an independent source of origin." van Boheemen also suggests that Allworthy is culpable in Bridget's pregnancy at the level of his failure to enforce the social code that proscribes women's sexual activity before marriage.²⁵

However, the impossibility of corroborating Jenny's tale about Summer being Tom's father resurrects the specter of the uncontainable, appetitive and duplicitous female body in a way that implies that Allworthy may be more directly culpable. If a woman's appetite makes her incontinent, her

uncontained fecundity makes her liable to conceive illegitimate children. Because a woman may also lie about who is her child's father--and the fact that it is Jenny who has artfully perpetrated the lie about Tom's parentage--an unquestioned acceptance of Jenny's 'revelation' becomes impossible. As a result of the lies that have gone before, one is compelled to question the truth of the deft narrative turn that makes Summer Tom's biological father on the strength of Jenny's word and the word of the once mendacious Bridget. With an ambivalence reminiscent of Jenny's when she allows herself to be believed the foundling's mother while actually confessing only to having "conveyed it [to bed] at the command of its mother" (835), Allworthy finally owns Tom and acknowledges a blood relation to him: "'[Tom] is my own sister's son--as such I shall always own him; nor am I ashamed of owning him[.] I am much more ashamed of my past behaviour to him; but I was as ignorant of his merit as of his birth'" (848). Even here, Allworthy's precise relation to the foundling is muddled by the phrase, "as such." The phrase might simply mean that Allworthy will own Tom because Tom is Allworthy's nephew. Yet it could just as easily mean that, despite a failure to own Tom in some other unspecified capacity--that although Tom is something other than a nephew--Allworthy will publically acknowledge only that Tom is his nephew. Notwithstanding Allworthy's early undertaking to make any child of his sister's his heir (an undertaking

which he rescinds in Blifil's case), he finally accepts Tom when Tom is identified as an Allworthy by blood.

The numerous clues that Allworthy is Tom's father, in so far as they identify Tom as an both an extension and recipient of Allworthy's property, offer a key to the text; they move the narrative toward the resolution, Tom's acquisition of property, that we know we can expect and that makes the marriage between Sophia and Tom (and so the closing bed episode) possible. It is worth noting too that Tom turns out to be largely what Deborah Wilkins has deemed him to be from the outset. Tom is a child of Allworthy parentage who will be provided for after he is laid to the bed of the man who is in most major respects his father. Finally, Tom's generous spiritedness--the feature that he has most in common with Allworthy--comprises so much a foregone conclusion of his worth that we accept without question that his claim to moral authority is ultimately validated by blood and gentle birth on his mother's side while failing to pursue the text's many suggestions that the Allworthy blood could have been passed down by the benevolent patriarch too.²⁶

Just as Allworthy's naming of Tom and acceptance of the illegitimate boy into Paradise Hall through his bed is remarkable for its failure to observe proper place, property and the trespass of social boundary lines, so the final bed episode beginning with Tom's embrace of Sophia marks a confusion of these features. It is to the series of events

that conclude with Tom firmly established at Western's that I now turn. In order to understand the extent of confusion signaled by Tom's domicile at Squire Western's, it is helpful to consider how carefully the Squire, like his neighbor, endeavors to observe boundaries of property and social status elsewhere. Western gives a great deal of attention to such boundaries and to the "difference of meum and tuum," for example, when he represents Sophia's departure for London as Tom's 'theft' of her. At the most basic level, Sophia's departure from Western's household does mark a loss of property for him as he thereby loses physical possession of Sophia without having given consent to her departure. Because Sophia's departure results from her refusal to marry where Western would have her marry, it also has the potential to thwart Western's wish to decide to whom property settled on Sophia would belong. In this sense, as Western vehemently acknowledges, Sophia's flight does constitute a kind of theft by her future husband, and Western is determined to limit the amount by which his individually-owned property will add to the personal enrichment of another: "'if [Tom] will ha un, one smock shall be her portion. I'll sooner ge my estate [sic] to the zinking fund.... Not one hapenny... shall she ever hae o' mine'" (282-83).²⁷

But there is a great deal more at stake in Western's identification of Sophia as a possession that may be stolen than the physical custody of his daughter and his money.

Following in the spirit of Fielding's cervine analogy that I use as my second epigraph and which brings does and daughters into close compass, Western links the theft of his daughter overtly to the poaching of game; he categorizes Sophia with items of livestock that are deemed food and which the law permits Western to reserve for his exclusive consumption. As a result of this alignment, Tom is initially characterized by the Squire as an illegitimate upstart and a poacher seeking to 'starve' his social superior by stealing that superior's food:

I always thought what would come o' breeding up a bastard like a gentleman, and letting un come about to volk's houses. It's well vor un I could not get at un, I'd a spoil'd his caterwauling, I'd a taught the son of a whore to meddle with meat for his master. He shan't ever have a morsel of meat of mine, or a farthing to buy it....(282)

Western would rather see this 'meat' "rot in the streets.... [and] be no better than carrion" (283) than that another should eat it without his permission. In this matter Western becomes "very low and despicable" for he exactly fits the narrator's description of the "great personage" who, "by confining [human necessities] to themselves... seems desirous to prevent any others from eating" (453).

Western's continuation of the eating metaphor in his lament on Tom's treachery suggests that his meat--Sophia--is also sexual property. The connection between the procuring of food and its consumption is developed in Western's

summe

West

sugg

the

for

ref

tim

In

in

a:

u

c

t

a

a

r

t

a

f

t

v

summoning of the hunt analogy in speaking of his daughter. Western's inapt use of the hunt analogy elsewhere might suggest that he randomly refers to Sophia as the meat that the underling filches from the Squire's table were it not for his repeated references to Sophia as a 'puss' when referring to Tom's theft of her. The use of 'puss' at this time emphasizes the importance of Sophia as a sexual being:

The son of a bitch was always good at finding a hare sitting; an be rotted to'n, I little thought what puss he was looking after; but it shall be the worst he ever wound in his life.... Little did I think, when I used to love him for a sportsman, that he was all the while a poaching after my daughter. (283)

In the mid eighteenth century, the word 'puss' was used interchangably with 'hare' to refer to smaller game as well as actual hares during the hunt. Both puss and hare were used as slang terms to refer contemptuously to women.²⁸ A coarser aspect of the latter form of puss--its use to refer to the female pudenda--is evoked in Western's earlier application of the term to Molly Seagrim when she and Tom are disturbed in the bushes at the end of book five "[Western] began to beat about, in the same language, and in the same manner, as if he had been beating for a hare, and at last cried out, 'Soho! puss is not far off. Here's her form...' (248). By the time Western uses the term to refer to his daughter as game that is his rightful property (and with which Tom ought to have no business), therefore, 'puss'

has acquired a layer of sexual meaning which in turn colors the Squire's obvious enjoyment of his daughter's sexual presence and his vociferous merchandising of her charms elsewhere.

The identification of Sophia as a source of sensory pleasure, as this intersects with her value as costly game, emerges in a particularly striking manner in Western's display of Sophia to Blifil. Whereas Tom has been permitted to "come about volk's houses" like a gentleman on the tacit understanding that a close but strictly limited admiration of Sophia is the full extent of his privilege, Western treats Blifil as a potential purchaser and consumer. This in turn places Western in the position of a vendor and supplier, one who, as Sophia's resistance to the marriage continues, feels "the same compunction with a bawd when some poor innocent whom she hath ensnared... falls into fits at the first proposal of what is called seeing company" (746). It is in keeping with this role that Western whets the would-be son-in-law's appetite by inviting Blifil to ensnare Sophia--to pursue her as forcefully as he would pursue other edible game:

Follow her, boy, follow her; run in, run in, that's it.... Dead, dead, dead. --Never be bashful.... Women never gi' their consent.... [had I] staid for her mother's consent, I might have been a batchelor.... To her, to her, co [sic] to her, that's it you jolly dog. (315-16)

The father's zeal is matched only by Blifil's measured enjoyment of his quarry's distress, and, not surprizingly, Sophia emerges as a rare culinary delicacy in the clutches of some foul feeder:

not... ready to eat every woman he saw, yet [Blifil] was far from... destitute of that appetite... said to be the common property of all animals.... [He] consider[ed] Sophia as a most delicious morsel... regard[ed] her with the same desires which an ortolan inspires in the soul of an epicure.... nor was his desire... lessened by the aversion which he discovered in her to himself. (316)

Here Western is clearly base in his encouragement of Blifil's perverse appetite against Sophia's will, and all the more so because he incites the would-be son-in-law to take his daughter by violent means. At the same time that Western's enthusiasm over Blifil's anticipated consumption of his daughter constitutes a second-hand enjoyment of the sensual pleasure that Sophia's marriage promises, Blifil's pleasure is heightened by Western's representation of Sophia as a scarce and highly-prized commodity. By representing Sophia in terms of the sport she will provide and her enhanced flavor for being rare game, Western facilitates the translation of Blifil's erotic but passive 'regarding' of Sophia into an act of enforced conquest and possession, and finally into an act of eidetic rape.²⁹

Nevertheless, Western's encouragement of Blifil to take Sophia by force makes perfect sense, rather than appearing

as a father's perverse pleasure in his daughter's distress, when it is remembered that Western is a "preserver of the game" who hires a known poacher to be his gamekeeper. If Western's hiring of Black George presents the illogic of setting the fox to guard the hen house (to borrow James Harlowe's characterization of daughters as chickens) it also offers an analogue to his promotion of Blifil's pursuit of that most highly-prized game, Sophia. In each case, established codes pertaining to ownership and use are eroded in the very action (the hiring of a gamekeeper, the choosing of a son-in-law) that ought to shore them up.

In the same way that Western both preserves game and tacitly endorses the illicit consumption of game by hiring Black George, he endeavors to give his daughter in marriage where he can continue to enclose her to himself--where he can have vicarious access to her person. In Western's own words, "'[He] had rather bate something, than marry [his] daughter among strangers and foreigners'" (257). Because a substantial portion of land is attached to Sophia's person, Western's retention of access to his daughter also means that he will maintain access to the land that, in the ordinary pattern of settlement, the daughter would eventually contribute to her husband's family. Western's promotion of Blifil's suit therefore acknowledges the need to give Sophia in marriage for the sake of forming a strong alliance with the future owner of neighbouring lands ("'nothing can lie so handy together as our two estates...

{wh

alr

inh

str

sin

co

fa

We

ad

be

p

r

b

o

S

r

c

t

s

t

g

m

e

t

T

i

[which] are in a manner joined together in matrimony already'" [257]) even while it seeks to avoid the loss inherent in giving his daughter away.³¹ In short, Western strives for an endogamous arrangement that will simultaneously satisfy his desire to retain power and consolidate property, and the counter imperative for the father to give up his daughter in marriage. Because Western's invitation to Blifil relies very heavily on his advertisement of the sensual pleasure she will yield, it becomes increasingly clear that Sophia has sexual as well as property value for Western in the way that Clarissa represents both forms of value to the Harlowe men.

These interpenetrating values are further complicated by the repeated appearance of Sophia's muff in Tom Jones. At one level, the muff is simply a small accessory or item of Sophia's clothing; Tom's reverence of it alludes to the romance convention of an artifact carried by a lady's champion betokening her fidelity to that champion. However, the muff is also an emblem of Sophia's availability for sexual use in the wider market. The vulgar use of muff since the end of the seventeenth century to denote female genitalia gives sexual meaning to the progress of Sophia's muff inside Western's house and around the country.³⁰ In the eventual contest over the muff between Tom and Western, the tension is almost tangible. The muff's last appearance, in Tom's hand in the kitchen at Upton (after Sophia has placed it in the bed Tom has vacated to go to Mrs. Waters),

generates considerable consternation because it (falsely) signals the daughter's liberation as sexual property from paternal control. There follows a banal exchange between father and would-be husband over the latter's possession of the muff:

"My daughter's muff!" cries the squire, in a rage. "Hath [Tom] got my daughter's muff! Bear witness the goods are found upon him. I'll have him before a justice of the peace this instant. Where is my daughter, villain?" "Sir," said Jones, "I beg you would be pacified. The muff, I acknowledge, is the young lady's; but upon my honour, I have never seen her." (491)

Western wants the same satisfaction over Tom's possession of the muff as the law could give in a case of elopement. His failure to be appeased by Fitzpatrick's treatment of the matter as simply a crime against ordinary property ("the law concerning daughters was out of the present case... stealing a muff was undoubtedly felony, and the goods being found upon the person, were sufficient evidence of the fact'" [492]) and the conflation of property and use value made possible by the vulgar meaning of muff reconfirms this item's importance in representing both types of value. Because it echoes the language and action of the early partridge-shooting episode in which Tom's possession of the partridge is taken as proof of poaching (125), however, Fitzpatrick's treatment of the muff as simply a variety of stolen property points again toward the extensive confusion

of w

syst

muf

mat

the

its

pr:

the

to

We

pa

li

co

re

co

u

w

h

f

c

a

w

i

v

i

i

of women, landholdings and material possessions in the value system of Tom Jones.

Fitzpatrick's pronouncement on Tom's possession of the muff casts Tom as an interloper gaining access to Western's material possessions. Not only does Tom have no right to these possessions, but for Tom to have them on his person in itself constitutes a serious breach of a fundamental principal of the host-guest arrangement. After all, Western, the rightful owner of the muff has opened his house and land to Tom against his more usual tendency toward enclosure. As Western's boon companion, frequent dinner guest, drinking partner and friend, Tom appreciates all along that he has little hope of Sophia. Tom does not expect Western to consent to a marriage between him and Sophia, and he recognizes the impropriety of any attempt to gain such consent. As the recipient of Western's largesse, Tom understands that "to frustrate the great point of Mr Western's life... [would be] to make very ill use of his hospitality, and a very ungrateful return to the many little favors received" (280), in much the same way that Square casts Tom's dalliance with Molly as base because it takes advantage of George's friendship with Tom.³² Tom and Western's longstanding friendship and the confidence implied in Western giving Tom the run of his estate should make a very good case as to why Tom should not be found in this instance with Sophia's muff--and later with Sophia herself--in his possession. During his friend's visits Western has

made

tit

han

as

the

a

to

ac

r

e

o

c

e

A

c

h

r

s

c

w

e

t

b

h

a

made it no secret that he expects to procure property, title, wealth and social status in exchange for Sophia's hand in marriage (208). Tom's inability as a foundling and as a man who cannot inherit property to give Western any of these, and Western's candidness about Tom's ineligibility as a husband for Sophia should make Western's actual opposition to Tom's courtship of Sophia unsurprising and his final acquiescence to the marriage rather remarkable.

Indeed, as Western explicitly offers to reward Tom's rescue of Sophia on one occasion with anything but his estate or Sophia herself, and feeds and houses Tom in excess of all usual forms of hospitality, the Squire might be characterized as a kind of surrogate father to Tom; he extends to Tom both a generosity that echoes that of Allworthy, and provides Tom with a sensual education to complement the rational education that Allworthy seeks to provide. As Western has elsewhere shown that he applauds Tom's sexual pursuits as long as these do not involve Sophia, Tom's desire for Sophia acquires the characteristics of that basest ingratitude of the 'son': the coveting of a woman that is forbidden because she belongs to the father.

Yet at the same time, and largely because Western so emphatically designates Sophia as that part of his property that is out of bounds for Tom, his open invitation to Tom to be in Sophia's company and almost incidentally to witness her charms is odd. It is particularly so when Sophia returns as a nubile young woman from her aunt's house to sit at the

head of her father's table where her presence is likely to enchant Tom (163). This pattern of simultaneous invitation and denial in Western's house is explicable in the way that the terms of Allworthy's house are explicable--by recourse to the rationale for hiring a gamekeeper. Put simply, George's appointment and Tom's commensality each give a titillating theoretical access to what is withheld at the practical level. At the same time, Tom and Black George are in different ways best positioned--as well as most likely--to use Western's property (George his land, Tom his daughter) in a manner that is overtly prohibited. In view of the similarities between Western's approach to land preservation and daughter preservation--where each may be accessed from within by special permission--it is perhaps no coincidence that Black George who also has a nubile daughter has a fundamental philosophical affinity with Western. For both fathers, in spite of their vastly different social and economic positions, the nubile daughter is a means of acquiring property. And in each case, Tom's association with the father results in first social, and then sexual access to his friend's daughter while it materially enriches the friend.³³

The way that Sophia is described when she first enters the narrative suggests a more profound link between the Squire's daughter and his property in the form of land. Sophia's body is shown emerging out of a verdant landscape like the "lovely Flora [to whom] every flower rises to do...

homage" (154) and then as a collection of "perfectly bred" body parts--symmetrical limbs, luxuriant hair, high forehead, regular ivory teeth, lustrous eyes and alabaster bosom (155). When this early itemization of Sophia's body is taken together with Western's later display of Sophia's prospects to Blifil and Tom's inclusion of Sophia in an inventory of Western's wealth that includes his plate and his fortune (168), the sense that Sophia is, like the land, a part of Western's stock and a measure of his worth is compounded.

What is in operation here can be best explained by a phenomenon that Patricia Parker describes in her discussion of land cast as at once fertile woman, private property and as 'landscape' in early modern reports of New World discovery. Parker suggests that the logic of private property embodies a desire to simultaneously display and boast of possessions to others to incite envy and admiration, and to establish "definite boundaries around [property] to make sure it was 'enclosed'" and therefore safe from theft. Parker further suggests that the economic motive for detailing a woman's parts as an inventory of goods is intimately connected with the motive of "shaping, controlling, or limiting [her] fertility in a particular way."³⁴ When Western continues to invite Tom to his house it is as though he deliberately seeks to display to Tom what the younger man cannot have--to establish Tom as a less powerful and economically less well-endowed bidder for land.

Western's determination to give his daughter as a bride only where she will procure further resources or enable him to more clearly delineate and consolidate his existing resources makes Sophia not merely the game, but virtually indistinguishable from the land over which Western maintains so jealous a guard. Especially because Western hoards Sophia's prospects--her person, her attributes and potential fecundity--he would enclose her within the boundaries of the neighboring estate in order to remain privy to the manner in which her properties are utilized. Failing this, Western would enclose Sophia, incarcerate her, and let her fertility go to seed, so to speak, rather than have the unpropertied Tom have access to her.

It is fitting that this stance of Western's should be quickly revised when Tom stands to gain from his reconciliation with Allworthy and from Allworthy's liberality. From the point that Allworthy owns Tom as his blood relative, Tom becomes a man who can fulfill Western's desire for a son-in-law who brings breeding, wealth, property and alliance. Because the land that is to become Tom's and the estate already owned by Western are adjacent to each other, the marriage of Tom and Sophia emblemizes a form of enclosure, a consolidation rather than a division, of landholdings and of neighboring families. Western's sudden resurgence of interest in his daughter's body once Tom becomes a viable choice of husband is unmistakable, and it is nowhere more strongly expressed than in Western's

enthusiasm leading up to, and his vociferous commentary during, the wedding supper and the wedding night.

As Western encourages Tom to procure Sophia's consent to marry, he virtually recreates the episode in which Blifil salivates over Sophia's charms. Western repeats the hunting call with which he has earlier rallied Blifil's perverse appetite for his daughter: "'To her boy, to her, go to her.- -That's it, little honeys.... I thought thou' hadst been a lad of higher mettle, than to give way to a parcel of maidenish tricks'" (867). He then facetiously lingers over Tom's "tousling" of Sophia. The principal difference between Western's encouragement of Blifil to take Sophia and his encouragement of Tom is that in the latter instance Western gloats over the vigorous male offspring that is sure to be born nine months from the wedding night (863, 868). As he bawdily revels in Tom's rifling of his daughter's charms under Mrs. Miller's roof then, Western anticipates the reaping of its rewards under his own roof. In so doing, Western simultaneously completes the voyeuristic possession of his daughter that has been deferred by the failure of Blifil's suit, and takes stock of projected productivity; in taking stock, Western claims his part in the future management of Sophia's fertility and procreativity.

In stark contrast to the unruly bodies of the lascivious Mrs. Waters and the mendacious Bridget Allworthy (who might have thwarted the reconciliation of a son and a father when they concealed the information that would have

prevented Tom's exile from Paradise Hall), the body of Western's daughter is anything but uncontained, excessive or disorderly. Chaste Sophia, who dines daintily and who must sometimes be coaxed to eat (527, 748), is as unlike Bridget and the other sexually-incontinent female figures in Tom Jones as she could be. As the marriage becomes imminent, Sophia's body is no longer conceived of as solely an erotic sexual body; it is explicitly represented as the source of domestic growth and well-being. Sophia's fertility promises to cement the harmony between Tom and Western, and Tom and Allworthy, with all the benefits that Allworthy, as well as his neighbor, expects to arise from "[a]n alliance between two families... between whom there had always existed so mutual an intercourse'" (783). With its moderated fertility, Sophia's body contains the potential for the enclosed genealogical progression of two families become one and so demands that the final bed episode be considered anew. Even though the closing bed episode marks the licit union of a husband and wife, and so contrasts with the opening bed episode and the Upton episode which mark illicit or potentially illicit unions, it simultaneously contains the germ of endogamy--of a hermetic (en)closure that is (re)productive.

By virtue of the common blood that makes Tom able to benefit from Allworthy's liberality, the son-in-law comes to reside in the house of his father-in-law. Western, for his part, averts the painful necessity of dividing up the

property he would retain intact when forced by the social imperative to marry his daughter to another man; by novel's end, "Western hath resigned his family seat, and the greater part of his estate to his son-in-law, and hath retired to a lesser house of his, in another part of the country" (873). Western experiences neither the theft of the daughter's person, nor a loss of the sensual pleasure Sophia has always given him:

[Western] is often a visitant with Mr Jones, who as well as his daughter, hath an infinite delight in doing everything in their power to please him.... he gets drunk with whom he pleases, and his daughter is still as ready as formerly to play to him whenever he desires it; for Jones hath assured her, that as next to pleasing her, one of his highest satisfactions is to contribute to the happiness of the old man; so great the duty which she expresses and performs to her father renders her almost equally dear to him, with the love she bestows on himself. (873)

Sophia simultaneously keeps her father entertained, dutifully complies with her husband's wishes with regard to her treatment of her father, cheerfully tolerates the drunkenness that her dead mother was loathe to countenance and provides Western with a prattling girl-child like her former self on whom to dote. Blending the functions served by Bridget at Paradise Hall and her own mother at Squire Western's, Sophia "d[oes] the honours of the table" in lieu of a dead wife who, like a "faithful upper servant" oversaw the preparation of meals and bore a child that was destined to materially enrich her husband (871, 309). At the same

time, Sophia improves on the performance of the absent dead wives in Tom Jones. She does not deplete her own father's reserves through marriage, and, while she keeps her husband's house, this is a domain into which her father has unrestricted access and which he therefore, in a manner, never gives up. Finally, Sophia bears legitimate issue whose health bodes well for the next generation.

Meanwhile, Tom enjoys Western's house and Allworthy's blessing and liberality upon his marriage to Sophia. The offspring that Sophia bears him, "two fine children, a boy and a girl," recreate a pattern that is familiar from Allworthy's house (873). The children of Tom and Sophia symbolically reproduce the enclosed, self-sufficient, if superficial, harmony of Paradise Hall. And it was out of that self-sufficient domestic enclosure that a pair of siblings, one male, one female, originally--and almost spontaneously--generated Tom Jones.

Notes

1. Henry Fielding, The History of Tom Jones, ed. R. P. C. Mutter (London: Penguin, 1985), 454. All further references to this work will appear parenthetically in my text.

2. Bruce Stovel's article, "Tom Jones and the Odyssey," (Eighteenth-Century Fiction 1, no. 4 [1989]: 263-79) first drew my attention to the fact that a bed appears at the opening, the center, and the conclusion of Tom Jones.

3. Henry Fielding, Don Quixote in England: A Comedy (London, 1734), 1.6. Martin C. Battestin ("Fielding's Contributions to the Universal Spectator [1736-7]," Studies in Philology 83, no. 1 [1986]: 109 n. 22) also notes that "[s]atiric references to 'ragoût' and 'soupes maigre'" occur in The Grub Street Opera, Welsh Opera (1731), True Patriot (1745), Miser (1733) as well as in Tom Jones, and suggests that for Fielding these foods "epitomized the effeminacy of French cuisine" (109 n. 24). J. A. Ward ("Dining with the Novelists," Personalist 45 no. 3 [1946]: 399-411,) also observes that eating and drinking in Tom Jones is a "dominantly masculine activity" (400).

4. Battestin ("Fielding's Contributions," 108, n. 20) gives several examples of Fielding's use of the transformative powers of diet: Don Quixote in England (6.25); The Grub Street Opera (9.259); The Champion of 8th April 1740.

5. Tom's hearty appetite for the hunt, as for heterosexual sex, stands in stark contrast to Blifil's habitual lack of enthusiasm. Blifil's "appetites [are]... so moderate that he [is] able, by philosophy or by study, or by some other method, easily to subdue them" (263). In battle, too, Blifil lacks prowess: Tom easily defeats the larger Blifil in boxing (131-32) and later disposes of both Blifil and the tutor Thwackum when he is caught with Molly Seagrim. For a careful and thought-provoking treatment of how ambiguous sexual identity was linked with the Jacobite cause in anti-Jacobite propaganda pamphlets, and a brief discussion of the homoeroticism of the tutor-pupil bond, see Jill Campbell, "Tom Jones, Jacobitism, and Gender: History and Fiction at the Ghosting Hour," Genre 23, nos. 2-3 (1990): 161-90. Paul Gabriel Boucé ("Sex, amours and love in Tom Jones," in Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century, ed. H. T. Mason [Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1984], 31) also suggests the homoeroticism of the Thwackum-Blifil relationship.

6. Cf. Claude J. Rawson, "Cannibalism and Fiction, Part II: Love and Eating in Fielding, Mailer, Genet, and Wittig," Genre 11 (1978): 233.

7. Local gossips see Bridget's interest in Tom as a sexual interest. On Bridget's sexual appetitiveness, see Patricia Brückman, "An Early Hint of Miss Bridget's Affairs, with a Parallel Note on Mr Allworthy," in Man and Nature: Proceedings of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies vol. 6, ed. Kenneth W. Graham and Neal Johnson (Edmonton: Academic Printing, 1987), 73-79. If Bridget's sexual appetite does not preclude Tom whom she knows to be her son, Bridget's interest in Tom marks her as both unrestrained and unwholesome in her appetites. Robert L. Chibka ("Taking 'The SERIOUS' Seriously: the Introductory Chapters of Tom Jones," The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation 31, no. 1 [1990]: 33-4) sees Bridget's desire for Tom as a potential incidence of incest too lightly dismissed. Molly Seagrim and Lady Bellaston are the novel's other sexually appetitive women, but their more emphatically economic (rather than affective) tie to Tom places them in a slightly different relation to him than Bridget. It should be noted, however, that Lady Bellaston supplies Tom with the means to eat in exchange for sexual favors, and that Tom supplies Molly's family with foodstuffs while she is his sexual partner.

8. There is a long tradition of scholars who see the scare of incest as instrumental to Tom's maturation or repentance. They include, William Empson, "Tom Jones," Kenyon Review 20 (1958): 241; E. Taiwo Palmer, "Fielding's Tom Jones Reconsidered," English 20, no. 107 (1971): 46;

Martin C. Battestin, The Providence of Wit: Aspects of Form in Augustan Literature and the Arts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 152-63; Gene S. Koppel, "Sexual Education and Sexual Values in Tom Jones: Confusion at the Core?" Studies in the Novel 12 (1980): 8; Michael L. Hill, "Incest and Morality in Tom Jones," The South Central Bulletin 41, no. 4 (1981): 102; Boucé, 36; John Zomchick, "'A Penetration which Nothing Can Deceive': Gender and Juridical Discourse in Some Eighteenth-Century Narratives," Studies in English Literature 29, no. 3 (1989): 539.

9. William Park ("Tom and Oedipus," Hartford Studies in Literature 7 [1975]: 207-25) and T. G. A. Nelson ("Incest in the Early Novel and Related Genres," Eighteenth-Century Life 16, no. 1 [1992]: 127-62) are rare exceptions in that they seriously consider other incestuous possibilities in Tom Jones in addition to the Upton episode.

10. For a detailed discussion of the Black Act and the political climate that surrounded its enactment, see E. P. Thompson, Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act (London: Allen Lane, 1975), 27-32, 190-198. Douglas Hay ("Poaching and the Game Laws on Cannock Chase," in Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England, ed. Douglas Hay, Peter Limbaugh and E. P. Thompson [London: Allen Lane, 1975], 189) observes that by an act of 1670 a man had to be a manorial lord or have substantial property to kill even the smallest of game on his own property. On the amount of property that one was required to own to have

hunting privileges in the eighteenth century, see William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1765-69), 4.13.174-75. See also Maaja A. Stewart, "Ingratitude in Tom Jones," Journal of English and Germanic Philology 89, no. 4 (1990): 528; and James Thompson, "Patterns of Property and Possession in Fielding's Fiction," Eighteenth-Century Fiction 3, no. 1 (1990): 21-24. For the difficulties of identifying what I refer to as the 'lower orders' as commoners or peasants, see J. M. Neeson, Commoners, Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 297-304.

11. For the chronology of Enclosure Acts, see Michael E. Turner, English Parliamentary Enclosure. Its Historical Geography and Economic History (Folkestone and Hamden: Archon Books, 1980), chap. 3, 68, table 10. From Turner's data a steady increase in enclosure acts is discernible between 1730 and 1760, and a considerable increase occurs from the 1760s into the 1820s. J. A. Yelling (Common Field and Enclosure in England 1450-1850 [Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1977], 170-213) is particularly useful on the changing technologies and yields of plant and animal husbandry. John Cowper, An Essay Proving that Inclosure of Commons and Common Field Land is Contrary to the Interest of the Nation (London, 1732), 1, 5-7, 22-24, 45-46. Thomas Andrews (An Enquiry into the Encrease and Miseries of the

Poor of England [London, 1738], 38) also protested against enclosure.

12. On the "property in animals ferae naturae" in this period Blackstone observes that a man "may have the privilege of hunting, taking, and killing them, in exclusion of other persons." He defines game animals as "transient property" and adds that as long as they "continue within [a man's] liberty... [he] may restrain any stranger from taking them therein: but the instant they depart into another liberty, this qualified property ceases" (2.25.394-5).

13. Thwackum offers another example of Allworthy's power; when Thawckum criticizes Allworthy for readmitting Tom to his favor and for by-passing himself in the Westerton living, he suffers the consequences (dismissal) of biting the hand that feeds him (825). Thwackum's position is not unlike our own, for if we partake of the feast that Fielding's narrator spreads, we are bound by the terms of the "public ordinary" not the "eleemosynary treat" (51); we allow the narrator to set the terms on which we continue to read. On this point, see Eric Rothstein, "Virtues of Authority in Tom Jones," The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation 28, no. 2 (1987): 107-8; Timothy O'Brien, "The Hungry Author and Narrative Performance in Tom Jones," Studies in English Literature 25 (1985): 618-19. Cf. Michael Bliss, "Fielding's Bill of Fare in Tom Jones," English Literary History 30, no. 3 (1963): 240.

14. Martin Battestin and Ruthe R. Battestin, Henry Fielding: A Life (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), 421-23.

15. It is perhaps useful to provide a context for Deborah's question about why Allworthy would undertake to keep a bastard whose maintenance ought to be the responsibility of the parish. According to Blackstone, "the duty of parents to their bastard children, by our law... is principally that of maintenance. For, though bastards are not looked upon as children to any civil purposes, yet the ties of nature, of which maintenance is one, are not so easily dissolved" (1.16.446). Allworthy's undertaking to bring Tom up at his own expense might therefore be considered an admission of paternity.

16. Nelson, 155.

17. Whereas Homer Obed Brown ("Tom Jones: The 'Bastard of History,'" Boundary 2 7, no. 2 [1979]: 225) goes on to suggest that Tom is a sign "doubly displaced" in Allworthy's bed, I believe that the reader is carefully led to dismiss this significant clue that Allworthy might easily be Tom's father.

18. Clothing more than once transmits information about social, economic and sexual relations in Tom Jones. In Tom's financially propitious affair with Lady Bellaston, the condition of being 'kept' is most obvious in the quality of clothing that Tom wears after he becomes Lady Bellaston's lover. Earlier in the narrative, the assault of Molly

Seagrim is precipitated by her peers' envious rage when Molly appears in a cast-off gown of Sophia's. The gown and Molly's trinkets infuriate the envious 'respectable' women at Molly's church. These items (wrongly) signal Molly's status as a kept woman in her affair with Tom; they affront by brazenly advertising the rewards of unchastity (177-78, 208). The repeated appearance of Sophia's muff--that most suggestive item of female attire--is a subject to which I shall return.

19. Bridget's residence with her widower brother in some ways parallels Fielding's own experience. According to Battestin and Battestin, (Henry Fielding: A Life , 378) Fielding had his sister Sarah live with him and manage his household after the death of his first wife, Charlotte, in 1744. Sarah moved out of her brother's house upon his marriage to Mary Daniel in 1747. There is no known record of anything untoward having taken place in the 1744-47 period during which Sarah lived with Henry. However, there was apparently an episode in Henry's childhood that Martin Battestin ("Henry Fielding, Sarah Fielding, and the Dreadful Sin of Incest," Novel 13, no. 1 [1979]: 6-18) refers to as Henry's "shocking erotic experiment" with his sister Beatrice (23).

20. Brown, 224.

21. W. Daniel Wilson ("Science, Natural Law, and Unwitting Sibling Incest in Eighteenth-Century Literature," Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture 13, no. 19 [1983],

251-52) looks at two related notions, that a monstrous birth is indicative of an incestuous conception, and that the threat of monstrous offspring accounts for the prohibition of incest, as these ideas appear in contemporary philosophical discourse. He claims that these beliefs can be traced back as far as Pope Gregory in the sixth century. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they are found in Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy (1612), Capanella's De Monarchia Hispanica (1640), and Buffon's Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière (1753). The prevalence of these beliefs in folk myth and superstition in the early modern period is touched upon in my treatment of Sin and her incest-bred progeny in Paradise Lost. On contagion resulting from incest, see Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo (New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966), 30, 113.

22. On Tom Jones' name, see Brown, 202; Christine van Boheemen, The Novel as Family Romance: Language, Gender, and Authority from Fielding to Joyce (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987), 45-56; and Douglas Brooks-Davies, Fielding, Dickens, Gosse, Iris Murdoch and Oedipal 'Hamlet' (London: Macmillan, 1989), 7-8. Allworthy foists paternity on Partridge on the basis of flimsy (part inadmissible, part circumstantial) evidence. Jenny's position at the Partridge house and her disappearance on the day she is to face Partridge before Allworthy are circumstances that work against Partridge. Mrs. Partridge's unlikely and obviously

ill-motivated allegation of her husband's infidelity ought to be inadmissible because, in contemporary English law, a wife could not give evidence against her husband.

Allworthy's readiness to accept that Tom is Partridge's child because Jenny has lived in the Partridge household as a servant is perhaps telling with regard to his own position as a household head with female dependents. Finally, in order to conclude that Partridge is Tom's father, Allworthy takes the word of a household member, Mrs. Partridge, against its legal head, Mr. Partridge (106-7).

23. It is unclear whether Tom actually inherits Allworthy's property per se. Most criticism of Tom Jones tacitly assumes that he does. Because he is illegitimate, however, Tom would be ineligible in English law to inherit Allworthy's property. Blackstone describes the bastard's ineligibility to inherit in this way: "The rights are very few, being only such as he can acquire... for he can inherit nothing, being looked upon as the son of nobody... and sometimes called filius nullius, sometimes filius populi.... Yet he may gain a sir-name by reputation... though none by inheritance.... The incapacity of a bastard consists primarily in this, that he cannot be heir to any one, neither can he have heirs, but of his own body... for, being nullius filius, he is therefore kin to nobody, and has no ancestor from whom any inheritable blood can be derived" (1.16.446). On this point see also Martin C. Battestin, ed., The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling, by Henry Fielding. 2

vols. (Oxford and Middletown, Connecticut: Oxford University Press, 1975), 79. Whether Tom actually inherits Allworthy's property as a son or not, he certainly enjoys Allworthy's "liberality" after his marriage to Sophia. For an informative discussion of the legal forms that Allworthy's "liberality" could take in contemporary English law, see Susan Staves, Married Women's Separate Property in England, 1660-1833 (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990), 62-65.

24. Allworthy's severity in his lecture to Jenny pales beside his treatment of Molly Seagrim when she is found to be with child. Molly is immediately sent to a house of correction by Allworthy because she is pregnant with an illegitimate child and because she will not name her child's biological father. Allworthy's actions here are more than simply severe, they are in violation of three explicit laws. According to Blackstone, a woman could not be lawfully compelled to disclose paternity until one month after her delivery in case the strain of interrogation should negatively affect the fetus. For the same reason she could not be committed before she gave birth. Finally, before she could be committed, two justices were required to sign the order to commit her (1.16.446). See also Rothstein, 104.

25. van Boheemen, 80.

26. As Homai J. Shroff (The Eighteenth-Century Novel: the Idea of the Gentleman [London and Baltimore: Edward Arnold, 1978], 19, 25) has pointed out, if Tom had been the

biological son of Jenny Jones or Partridge--if he had not belonged to a 'gens' or stock--his generous instincts and physical beauty would not alone have secured Sophia in marriage for him. Cf. Leopold Damrosch, Studies in the Fictional Imagination from Milton to Fielding (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 286.

27. The Sinking Fund established by Walpole in 1717 sought to reduce national, that is, collective, debt. Western is clearly more concerned with protecting privately-owned assets.

28. A connection between hares and daughters is also suggested by a description of Sophia's distress. When her father incarcerates her, Sophia behaves exactly like a terrified hare: "she began to thunder with her foot and afterwards to scream" (744). On the long tradition of hares as emblems of lechery, see Boucé, 32.

29. The Squire's urging of Blifil's sexual conquest of Sophia is explicit in an earlier conversation between Sophia and her father. Western attributes Sophia's reluctance to marry to her "squeamishness." He reassures Sophia that, as in the case of her mother whose "whimper[ing] and whin[ing]" were overcome in twenty-four hours, Sophia's own squeamishness about marriage will be overcome by Blifil's 'briskness' (272). Even before this conversation, the maid, Honour, couches Western's promise of Sophia to Blifil without Sophia's knowledge in sexual terms: "'More shame for [Western]... you are to go to bed to him, and not master'"

(270). Western's encouragement of Blifil to conquer Sophia is strongly reminiscent of the way in which the younger James Harlowe bolsters Solmes' pursuit of Clarissa. Like James, Western seems to derive pleasure from Sophia's response to a situation that mingles cannibalistic violence with sexual desire. At the same time, the perverse joy that Blifil derives from his anticipated conquest recalls the "odious" Solmes' convulsive gnawing at his cane as he awaits Clarissa's submission. On this last point, see Raymond Hilliard, "Clarissa and Ritual Cannibalism," PMLA 105, no. 5 (1990): 1090, 1084.

30. Western's sister has earlier acknowledged this function of Sophia in the proposed marriage to Blifil: "'It is the honour of your family which is concerned in this alliance; you are only the instrument. Do you conceive, mistress, that in an intermarriage between kingdoms, as when the daughter of France is married into Spain, the princess herself is alone considered in the match? No, it is a match between two kingdoms, rather than between two persons. The same happens in great families, such as ours. The alliance between the families is the principal matter. You ought to have a greater regard for the honour of your family, than for your own person....'" (306-7).

31. Jones DeRitter, "'How Came This Muff Here?' A Note on Tom Jones" English Language Notes 26, no. 4 (1989): 45. The muff first appears with Honour's warning to Tom that his toying with it and kissing of it will ruin it (197).

Retrieved from Honour by Sophia because of Tom's admiration, the muff subsequently so interferes with Western's sensory pleasure when it interrupts Sophia's amusement of her father at the piano that it is flung by Western into the fire, and has to be hastily rescued from perishing by his daughter. This action foreshadows Western's repeated threat that he will have his daughter perish if he cannot have complete control of her. The muff makes its next appearance at Upton where it is left as both a rebuke and a form of invitation to Tom whose dalliance with Mrs. Waters has become known to Sophia (486).

32. Square is quick to cast Tom's lie to protect George Seagrim and Tom's affair with Molly Seagrim in the most negative light "the sacrifice of truth... imagined to have been made to friendship, was, in reality, a prostitution of it to a depraved debauched appetite.... [Tom] supported the father, in order to corrupt the daughter, and preserved the family from starving, to bring one of them to shame and ruin" (187). In spite of its obvious malice, Square's accusation does have a ring of truth. Tom acknowledges that the misuse of a friend's daughter is a poor return on any father's friendship (169, 208), and Seagrim himself is far from insensible that he is obliged to Tom (817).

33. Black George's activity as a trader marks another intersection of sexual and property interests in Tom Jones. A dealer in flesh of one kind--the game he poaches and sells illegally (291)--George is also nominally that other kind of

dealer in flesh, a keeper or pimp, because he derives benefit from the sexual traffic of his daughter. With both Molly and Sophia, Tom's sexual use of the daughter emerges out of an economy of friendship and exchange--in George's case, the gifts of meat and coin that maintain the Seagrim family and its next illegitimate generation, in Western's case, those of land and legitimate issue that promise to maintain the intactness of property at narrative's end.

34. Patricia Parker, Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property (London and New York: Methuen, 1987), 152-53, 131.

CONCLUSION

Although this essay has considered the incidence of eating and incest and their deployment as metaphors in narrative during the first half of the eighteenth century, these concerns are in evidence in narratives of the latter part of the century. Frances Burney's Evelina (1778) and Matthew Lewis' The Monk (1796) both exploit mistaken identity plots which eventually unfold as potential incest narratives. Not only does each of these narratives consider the ramifications for a daughter of her father's illicit sexual activity and corrupt ambition, but Burney and Lewis each construct graphic tableaux of oral violence as ways of talking about familial relations gone awry. Following in the tradition of brutal sexual aggression, incestuous longings and murderous urges inaugurated by Horace Walpole's The Castle of Otranto (1764), The Monk also provides a taste of the bewildering array of clerical 'brothers' and 'sisters,' 'mothers' and 'fathers' in Gothic narratives whose vows of abstinence from a range of oral and sexual pleasures weaken

under the strain of irresistible attraction to characters to whom they are later found to be connected consanguineously--and whose stories raise the possibility that blood is drawn to blood.

When incest and eating appear in twinned fashion in nineteenth-century prose narrative, the forbidden and potentially scandalous possibilities of family relations have considerably abated. Who can forget, for example, the luxurious abundance of costly fruit, wedding confection, meat distribution, and ritual meals that contextualize Emma's father's declaration to his marriageable daughter that he will put up with no more weddings? Who will not remember sickly Fanny Price and her marriage to her first cousin Edmund after she has been extracted from the poverty and squalor of Portsmouth to be healthily reared in the luxury of her uncle's productive estate at Mansfield, or the plight of Jane Eyre in Charlotte Bronte's novel of 1847 who arrives near-starved at the cottage of the cousin who feeds her but later demands her hand in marriage? In a century during which women's bodies and bodily functions were to be increasingly regulated by conduct books, in which women's ailments were to be newly scruntinized and codified by the revision of terms such as anorexia and hysteria in medical treatises, and in which a vigorous debate on vegetarianism was to link diet and food consumption with relations of power and domination, nineteenth-century English narrative

repeatedly represents intrafamilial attraction within a commensal domestic household as normative.

It is perhaps no accident that the attention to the political significance of women's bodies in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary studies has coincided with the raised profile of incest and child sexual abuse, food refusal and disordered eating in our own age.¹ I attempt no simple extrapolation from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary representations of incest and eating, to eating disorders and allegations of actual incest in the late-twentieth century. However, the upsurge of interest in these issues since the early 1980s does suggest that they have become pressing concerns in our own period, characterized as it has been by changes in the composition of the workforce, shifts in the distribution of wealth and power, and the proliferation of 'alternative' lifestyle choices, each of which has substantially reshaped family composition and structure as well as ideas about what is deemed appropriate as food.

It is interesting, too, that recent popular media attention to incest--especially criticism of the theory that memories of childhood sexual abuse are repressed by the cultural taboo on incest and the latent fear on the part of the abused that disclosure will breach family trust and break up the family--has styled itself as seeking to hold families together or to 'mend' families ruptured by ill-motivated or misguided professionals. Critics of repressed

memory theory have frequently accused psychiatrists and social workers employing memory retrieval techniques of inducing purported victims to manufacture memories where no sexual abuse has occurred. Such professionals have more than once been accused of trying to destroy otherwise harmonious families and of being motivated by feminist, anti-family militance to seek the ruin of successful men through false allegations of incest.²

It is clear that a great deal of the research on incest and on eating behaviors carried out during the last two decades has been undertaken by self-consciously feminist scholars in a variety of disciplines. This attests to the importance with which the issues of incest and eating have been regarded in the re-thinking of gender relations and in the analysis of gender configurations arising from heterosexual nuclear family organization since the early modern period. It is equally clear in literary treatments and in modern studies of incest and eating as distinct entities that incisive questions still need to be asked about what constitutes nurture and rearing, about the kinds of obligations and loyalties that are fostered by children's dependence on their parents, and about the sexual pressures that each of these places on those receiving nurture.

Notes

1. Literary scholars dealing with the political significances of women's bodies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries include Annette Kolodny (The Lay of the Land: Metaphors as Experience and History in American Life and Letters [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975]), Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar (The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985]), Nancy Armstrong (Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel [New York: Oxford University Press, 1987]), Helena Michie (The Flesh Made Word: Female Figures and Women's Bodies [New York: Oxford University Press, 1987]), Frances Ferguson ("Rape and the Rise of the Novel," Representations 20 [1987]: 88-112), Ruth Perry ("Colonizing the Breast: Sexuality and Maternity in Eighteenth-Century England," in Forbidden History: The State, Society, and the Regulation of Sexuality in Modern Europe, ed. John C. Fout [Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992], 107-38), and Charlotte Sussman ("The Other Problem with Women: Reproduction and Slave Culture in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko," in

Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism, ed. Heidi Hutner [Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993], 212-33). Recent research on incest and child abuse in the twentieth century includes scholarship by Florence Rush (The Best-Kept Secret: Sexual Abuse of Children [New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980]), Judith Lewis Herman (Father-Daughter Incest [London and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981]), Jeffrey Masson (The Assault on Truth: Freud and Child Sex Abuse [New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux Inc., 1984]), Diana E. H. Russell (Incest in the Lives of Girls and Women [New York: Basic Books, 1986]), and a second work by Judith Lewis Herman (Trauma and Recovery: From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror [New York: Basic Books, 1992]). On food refusal and disordered eating in the twentieth century, see Hilde Bruch (Eating Disorders: Obesity, Anorexia Nervosa and the Person Within [New York: Basic Books, 1973]), Susie Orbach (Hunger Strike: The Anorectic's Struggle as a Metaphor for our Age [London: Faber and Faber, 1986]), Noelle Caskey ("Interpreting Anorexia Nervosa," in The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman [Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986], 175-89), and Matra Robertson (Starving in the Silences: An Exploration of Anorexia Nervosa [New York: New York University Press, 1992]).

2. Frederick Crews is a particularly virulent critic of memory retrieval. His review of books in what he calls the

repressed memory "movement" ("The Revenge of the Repressed: Part II," New York Review of Books 41, no. 20 [December 1994]: 49-58) represents male relatives identified as child sexual molesters through memory retrieval as the victims of anti-family militance (50, 52). Other articles in a similar vein are Carol Tavris, "Beware the Incest-Survivor Machine," The New York Times, 3 January 1993, Book Review Section; Alasdair Palmer, "Guilty When Proved Innocent," The Spectator, 14 August 1993, 9-11; Frederick Crews, "The Revenge of the Repressed: Part I," The New York Review of Books 41, no. 19 (November 1994): 54-60.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alam, Fakrul. "Religious and Linguistic Colonialism in Defoe's Fiction." North Dakota Quarterly 55, no. 3 (1987): 116-23.
- Andrews, Thomas. An Enquiry into the Encrease and Miseries of the Poor of England. London, 1738.
- Arens, W. The Original Sin: Incest and its Meanings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Armstrong, Diane. "The Myth of Cronus: Cannibalism and Sign in Robinson Crusoe." Eighteenth-Century Fiction 4, no. 3 (1992): 209-220.
- Armstrong, Nancy. Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Backscheider, Paula. Daniel Defoe: His Life. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Baglivi, Giorgio. The Practice of Physick. London, 1723.
- Battestin, Martin C. "Fielding's Contributions to The Universal Spectator (1736-7)." Studies in Philology 83, no. 1 (1986): 88-116.
- . The Providence of Wit: Aspects of Form in Augustan Literature and the Arts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
- ., ed. The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling, by Henry Fielding. 2 vols. Oxford and Middleton, Connecticut: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Battestin, Martin C., and Ruthe R. Battestin. Henry Fielding: A Life. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Bell, Ian. Defoe's Fiction. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1985.
- Bell, Rudolph. Holy Anorexia. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

- Benjamin, Jessica. "The Bonds of Love: Rational Violence and Erotic Domination." In The Future of Difference, ed. Hester Einstein and Alice Jardine, 41-70. Boston: G. K. Hall and Co., 1980.
- Bennett, Joan S. "God, Satan, and King Charles: Milton's Royal Portraits." PMLA 92, no. 3 (1977): 441-57.
- Berne, Eric. "The Psychological Structure of Space With Some Remarks on Robinson Crusoe." The Psychoanalytic Quarterly 25 (1956): 549-67.
- Beuler, Lois. "The Structural Uses of Incest in English Renaissance Drama." Renaissance Drama 15 (1984): 115-45.
- Blackstone, William. Commentaries on the Laws of England. Vols. 1, 2 and 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1765-69.
- Bliss, Michael. "Fielding's Bill of Fare in Tom Jones." English Literary History 30, no. 3 (1963): 236-43.
- Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. Monarchy and Incest in Renaissance England: Literature, Culture, Kinship, and Kingship. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.
- Boose, Lynda E. "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare." PMLA 97, no. 3 (1982): 325-47.
- . "The Father's House and the Daughter in It: The Structures of Western Culture's Daughter-Father Relationship." In Daughters and Fathers, ed. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers, 19-74. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Bordo, Susan R. "The Body and the Reproduction of Femininity: A Feminist Appropriation of Foucault." In Gender / Body / Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing, ed. Alison M. Jaggar and Susan R. Bordo, 13-33. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1989.
- Bouc  , Paul Gabriel. "Chtonic and Pelagic Metaphorization in Eighteenth-Century English Erotica." Eighteenth-Century Life 9, no. 3 (1985): 202-17.
- . "Sex , amours, and love in Tom Jones." In Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth-Century, ed. H. J. Mason, 25-38. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation, 1984.
- Braverman, Richard. "Crusoe's Legacy." Studies in the Novel 18, no. 1 (1985): 1-26.

- Brooks-Davies, Douglas. Fielding, Dickens, Gosse, Iris Murdoch and Oedipal 'Hamlet'. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Brown, Homer Obed. "The Displaced Self in the Novels of Daniel Defoe." ELH 38, no. 4 (1971): 562-90.
- . "Tom Jones: The 'Bastard of History'." Boundary 2 7, no. 2 (1979): 201-33.
- Bruch, Hilde. Eating Disorders: Obesity, Anorexia Nervosa and the Person Within. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- . The Golden Cage: The Enigma of Anorexia Nervosa. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Brückman, Patricia. "An Early Hint of Miss Bridget's Affairs, with a Parallel Note on Mr Allworthy." In Man and Nature: Proceedings of the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, vol. 6, ed. Kenneth W. Graham and Neal Johnson, 73-79. Edmonton: Academic Printing, 1987.
- Butler, Judith. Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. New York and London: Routledge, 1990.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women. Berkley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Campbell, Jill. "Tom Jones, Jacobitism, and Gender: History and Fiction at the Ghosting Hour." Genre 23, nos. 2-3 (1990): 161-90.
- Camporesi, Piero. Exotic Brew: The Art of Living in the Age of Enlightenment. Trans. Christopher Woodall. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.
- Caskey, Noelle. "Interpreting Anorexia Nervosa." In The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman, 175-89. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Castle, Terry. Clarissa's Ciphers: Meaning and Disruption in Richardson's 'Clarissa'. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Charlton, Aydon. "The Appeal of Robinson Crusoe." Sphinx 2 (1974): 21-37.
- Cheyne, George. The English Malady: or a Treatise of Nervous Diseases of all Kinds as Spleens, Vapours, Lowness of Spirits, Hypochondriacal, and Hysterical Distempers, &c. London, 1733.

- . The Natural Method of Cureing the Diseases of the Body and the Disorders of the Mind. London, 1742.
- Chibka, Robert L. "Taking 'The SERIOUS' Seriously: The Introductory Chapters of Tom Jones." The Eighteenth-Century: Theory and Interpretation 31, no. 1 (1990): 23-46.
- Clark, Alice. The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century. 1919. Reprint, New York: A. M. Kelley, 1968.
- Cohen, Paula Marantz. The Daughter's Dilemma: Family Process and the Nineteenth-Century Domestic Novel. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Corum, Richard. "In White Ink: Paradise Lost and Milton's Ideas of Women." In Milton and the Idea of Woman, ed. Julia M. Walker, 120-47. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Cowper, John. An Essay Proving that Inclosure of Commons and Common Field Land is Contrary to the Interest of the Nation. London, 1732.
- Crews, Frederick. "The Revenge of the Repressed: Part I." New York Review of Books 41, no. 19 (1994): 54-60.
- . "The Revenge of the Repressed: Part II." New York Review of Books 41, no. 20 (1994): 49-58.
- Cullen, William. First Lines of the Practice of Physic. Edinburgh, 1791.
- Culpeper, Nicholas. A Directory for Midwives or, A Guide for Women in Their Conception, Bearing and Suckling Their Children. London, 1651.
- Cummings, Katherine. Telling Tales: The Hysteric's Seduction in Fiction and Theory. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Dabydeen, David. "Eighteenth-century English Literature on Commerce and Slavery." In The Black Presence in English Literature, ed. David Dabydeen, 26-49. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.
- Damrosch, Leopold. Studies in the Fictional Imagination from Milton to Fielding. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Davenant, Charles. An Essay Upon the Probable Methods of Making a People Gainers in the Ballance of Trade. London, 1699.

Davis, Lennard J. "The Facts of Events and the Event of Fact: New World Explorers and the Early Novel." "The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation" 32, no. 3 (1991): 240-55.

Dawson, Thomas. The Good Huswife's Jewell. Wherein is to be found most excellend [sic] and rare Deuises for Conceits in Cookery, found out by the practice of Thomas Dawson. Wherevnto is adjoyned sundry approved receits for many souveraine oyles, and the way to distill many precious waters, and diuers approved medicines for many diseases. Also certain approved points of husbandry. London, 1585.

Defoe, Daniel. Conjugal Lewdness, or, Matrimonial Whoredom. A Treatise Concerning the Use and Abuse of the Marriage Bed. 1727. Reprint, Gainesville, Florida: Scholar's Facsimiles and Reprints, 1967.

---. The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. Ed. Angus Ross. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1965.

---. The True Born Englishman. London, 1700.

Demetrakopoulos, Stephanie. "Eve as a Circean and Courtly Fatal Woman." Milton Quarterly 9, no. 4 (1975): 99-107.

de Montaigne, The Essays of Montaigne. Vol. 1. Trans. E. J. Trenchmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927.

DeRitter, Jones. "'How Came This Muff Here?' A Note on Tom Jones." English Language Notes 26, no. 4 (1989): 41-46.

Dinnerstein, Dorothy. The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Doody, Margaret A. A Natural Passion: A Study of the Novels of Samuel Richardson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Douglas, Mary. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Durkheim, Emile. Incest: The Nature and Origin of the Taboo. Trans. Edward Sagarin. New York: Lyle and Stuart Inc., 1963.

Dussinger, John A. "Love and Consanguinity in Richardson's Novels." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 24, no. 3 (1984): 513-26.

- Eagleton, Terry. The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
- Eaves, T. C. Duncan, and Ben Kimpel. Samuel Richardson: A Biography. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Empson, William. "Tom Jones." Kenyon Review 20 (1958): 217-49.
- Erickson, Robert A. Mother Midnight: Birth, Sex, and Fate in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Defoe, Richardson, and Sterne. New York: AMS, 1986.
- . "Starting Over With Robinson Crusoe." Studies in the Literary Imagination 15, no. 2 (1982): 51-73.
- Farb, Peter, and G. Armelagos. Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Food. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980.
- Ferguson, Frances. "Rape and the Rise of the Novel." Representations 20 (1987): 88-112.
- Fiedler, Leslie. Love and Death in the American Novel. New York: Anchor Books, 1966.
- Fielding, Henry. Don Quixote in England. A Comedy. London, 1734.
- . The History of Tom Jones. Ed. R. P. C. Mutter. London: Penguin, 1985.
- Flanders, Austin W. Structures of Experience: History, Society, and Personal Life in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1984.
- Flinker, Noam. "Father-Daughter Incest in Paradise Lost." Milton Quarterly 14, no. 4 (1980): 116-22.
- Flint, Christopher. "Orphaning the Family: The Role of Kinship in Robinson Crusoe." ELH 55, no. 2 (1988): 381-419.
- Flynn, Carol Houlihan. The Body in Swift and Defoe. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- . Samuel Richardson: A Man of Letters. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Foucault, Michel. An Introduction. Vol. 1 of The History of Sexuality. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

- . The Use of Pleasure. Vol. 2 of The History of Sexuality. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Frega, Donnalee. "Pedagogy of the Perfect: Consumption and Identity in Richardson's Clarissa." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1989.
- Freud, Sigmund. "The Ego and the Super-Ego (Ego Ideal)." In The Ego and the Id. Trans. Joan Riviere. Ed. James Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press, 1974.
- . Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement Between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics. Ed. James Strachey. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989.
- Froula, Christine. "Pechter's Spectre: Milton's Bogey Writ Small; or Why is He Afraid of Virginia Woolf?" Critical Inquiry 11, no. 1 (1984): 171-78.
- . "When Eve Reads Milton: Undoing the Canonical Economy." Critical Inquiry 10, no. 2 (1983): 321-48.
- Gallagher, Philip. Milton, the Bible, and Misogyny. ed. Eugene R. Gunnar and Gail L. Mortimer. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1990.
- Gilbert, Arthur N. "Buggery and the British Navy." Journal of Social History 10, no.1 (1976): 72-98.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Gliserman, Martin. "Robinson Crusoe: The Vicissitudes of Greed--Cannibalism and Capitalism. Displaced Desire: Money, Mother, Eating, and Encirclements." American Imago 47, nos. 3-4 (1990): 177-231.
- Goody, Jack. The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Gull, William. "Apepsia hysterica. Anorexia Nervosa." Transactions of the Clinical Society 7 (1974): 22-28.
- . "The Address in Medicine Delivered Before the Annual meeting of the B. M. A. at Oxford." Lancet 2 (1868): 171-76.
- Hagen, Ann. A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Food Processing and Consumption. Middlesex: Anglo-saxon Books, 1992.

- Hagstrum, Jean. Sex and Sensibility: Ideal and Erotic Love from Milton to Mozart. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Hall, Michael L. "Incest and Meaning in Tom Jones. The South Central Bulletin 41, no. 4 (1981): 101-4.
- Halley, Janet E. "Female Autonomy in Milton's Sexual Poetics." In Milton and the Idea of Woman, ed. Julia M. Walker, 230-53. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Haney-Peritz, Janice. "Engendering the Exemplary Daughter: The Deployment of Sexuality in Richardson's Clarissa." In Daughters and Fathers, ed. Lynda E. Boose and Betty S. Flowers, 181-207. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Hay, Douglas. "Poaching and the Game Laws on Cannock Chase." In Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England, ed. Douglas Hay, Peter Limbaugh and E. P. Thompson, 189-254. London: Allen Lane, 1975.
- Henisch, Bridget Ann. Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1976.
- Heritier, Franciose. "The Symbols of Incest and its Prohibitions." In Structuralist Essays in Religion, History and Myth, ed. Michel Izard and Pierre Smith, 171-76. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Herman, Judith Lewis. Father-Daughter Incest. London and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- . Trauma and Recovery: From Domestic Abuse to Political Terror. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Hill, Christopher. Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. London: Secker and Warburg, 1958.
- Hilliard, Raymond F. "Clarissa and Ritual Cannibalism." PMLA 105, no. 5 (1990): 1083-97.
- . "Laughter Echoing From Mouth to Mouth: Symbolic Cannibalism and Gender in Evelina." Eighteenth-Century Life 17 (1993): 46-61.
- Hunter, Diane. "Hysteria, Psychoanalysis, and Feminism: The Case of Anna O." In The (M)Other Tongue: Essays in

- Feminist Psychoanalytic Interpretation, ed. Shirley Nelson Garner, Claire Kahane and Madelon Sprengnether, 89-115. Cornell University Press, 1985.
- JanMohamed, Abdul. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Radical Difference in Colonialist Literature." Critical Inquiry 12 (1985): 59-87.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass. "Fetishizing Gender: Constructing the Hermaphrodite in Renaissance Europe." In Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity, ed. Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub, 80-111. New York and London: Routledge, 1991.
- Joplin, Patricia Klindienst. "The Voice of the Shuttle is Ours." Stanford Literature Review 1 (1984): 25-53.
- Joyce, James. "Daniel Defoe." Buffalo Studies 1, no. 1 (1964): 5-25.
- Juhnke, Anna K. "Remnants of Misogyny in Paradise Lost." Milton Quarterly 22, no. 2 (1988): 50-58.
- Karl, Frederick R. The Adversary Literature. The English Novel in the Eighteenth Century: A Study in Genre. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974.
- Kauffman, Linda S. Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre, and Epistolary Fictions. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Kerrigan, William. The Sacred Complex: On the Psychogenesis of "Paradise Lost". Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Keymer, Tom. Richardson's 'Clarissa' and the Eighteenth-Century Reader. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1992.
- Kilgour, Maggie. From Communion to Cannibalism: An Anatomy of Metaphors of Incorporation. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Kinkead-Weekes, Mark. Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Knachel, Philip A. Introduction to Eikon Basilike, The Portraicture [sic] of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings, by John Gauden. Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization Series. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966.

- Kolodny, Annette. The Lay of the Land: Metaphors as Experience and History in American Life and Letters. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975.
- Koppel, Gene S. "Sexual Education and Sexual Values in Tom Jones: Confusion at the Core?" Studies in the Novel 12 (1980): 1-11.
- Kowaleski-Wallace, Beth, and Patricia Yaeger ed. Re-figuring the Father: New Feminist Readings of Patriarchy. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.
- Landry, Marcia. "Kinship and the Role of Women in Paradise Lost." Milton Studies 4 (1972): 3-18.
- Laqueur, Thomas. Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Le Comte, Edward. Milton and Sex. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.
- Lesègue, Charles. "De l'anorexie hystérique." Archives générales de médecine 21 (1873): 385-403.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. The Elementary Structures of Kinship. Trans. James Harle Bell and John Richard von Sturmer. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- Markham, Gervase. A Way to Get Wealth, Containing fix Principall Vocations, or Callings, in which every good Husband or Hous-wife, may lawfully imploy themselves. London, 1623.
- . The English Hous-Wife, containing the Inward and outward Vertues which ought to be in a compleat Woman. London, 1664.
- Masson, Jeffrey. The Assault on Truth: Freud and Child Sex Abuse. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux Inc., 1984.
- McCabe, Richard. Incest, Drama, and Nature's Law 1550-1700. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- McColley, Diane K. Milton's Eve. Urbana: Univerity of Illinois Press, 1983.
- McKeon, Michael. The Origins of the English Novel, 1660-1740. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

- Mennell, Stephen. All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- Miles, Margaret R. Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christain West. London: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Miller, Nancy K. The Heroine's Text: Readings in the French and English Novel, 1722-1782. New York: Columbia, 1980.
- Milton, John. Complete Poems and Major Prose. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Montanari, Massimo. The Culture of Food. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
- Morton, Richard. Phthisiologia: or a Treatise of Consumptions. London, 1689.
- Mullet, Charles F., ed. The Letters of Doctor George Cheyne to Samuel Richardson (1733-1744). University of Missouri Studies, vol. 18. Columbia, 1943.
- Neeson, J. M. Commoners, Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Nelson, T. G. A. "Incest in the Early Novel and Related Genres." Eighteenth-Century Life 16, no. 1 (1992): 127-62.
- Nyquist, Mary. "Fallen Differences, Phallogocentric Discourses: Losing Paradise Lost to History." In Post Structuralism and the Question of History, ed. Derek Attridge, Geoff Bennington and Robert Young, 212-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . "The Genesis of Gendered Subjectivity in the Divorce Tracts and in Paradise Lost." In Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions, ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson, 99-127. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- O'Brien, Timothy. "The Hungry Author and Narrative Performance in Tom Jones." Studies in English Literature 25 (1985): 599-614.
- Orbach, Susie. Hunger Strike: The Anorectic's Struggle as a Metaphor for Our Age. London: Faber and Faber, 1986.
- Palazzoli, Mara Selvini. Self Starvation: From Individual to Family Therapy in the Treatment of Anorexia Nervosa. Trans. Arnold Pomerans. New York: John Aronson, 1978.

- Palmer, E. Taiwo. "Fielding's Tom Jones Reconsidered." English 20, no. 107 (1971): 45-50.
- Palmer, Alasdair. "Guilty When Proved Innocent." The Spectator, 14 August 1993, 9-11.
- Palmer, Helen H., and Anne Jane Dyson. English Novel Explication: Criticisms to 1972. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1973.
- Park, William. "Tom and Oedipus." Hartford Studies in Literature 7 (1975): 207-25.
- Parker, Patricia. Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property. London and New York: Methuen, 1987.
- Patterson, Orlando. Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Payne, William L. "An Annotated Bibliography of Works About Daniel Defoe, 1719-1974: Parts I-III." Bulletin of Bibliography 32, no. 1 (1975): 3-14, 27, 32; 32, no. 2, (1975): 63-75, 87; 32, no. 3 (1975): 89-100, 132.
- Pearlman, E. "Robinson Crusoe and the Cannibals." Mosaic 10 (1976): 39-55.
- Perry, Ruth. "Colonizing the Breast: Sexuality and Maternity in Eighteenth-Century England." In Forbidden History: The State, Society, and the Regulation of Sexuality in Modern Europe, ed. John C. Fout, 107-38. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Pollak, Ellen. "Beyond Incest: Gender and the Politics of Transgression in Aphra Behn's Love Letters between a Nobleman and His Sister." In Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism, ed. Heidi Hutner, 151-86. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Pollock, Linda. A Lasting Relationship: Parents and Children Over Three Centuries. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1987.
- Pullar, Philippa. Consuming Passions: A History of English Food and Appetite. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1970.
- Quaiffe, G. R. Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives: Peasants and Illicit Sex in Seventeenth Century England. London: Croom Helm, 1979.

- Rank, Otto. Doubles: A Psychoanalytic Study. Trans., ed. and intro. Harry Tucker Jr. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971.
- Rawson, Claude J. "Cannibalism and Fiction, Part II: Love and Eating in Fielding, Mailer, Genet, and Wittig." Genre 11 (1978): 227-313.
- Richardson, Humphrey. The Sexual Life of Robinson Crusoe. Paris: Olympia Press, 1955.
- Richardson, Samuel. Clarissa, or The History of a Young Lady. Ed. Angus Ross. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1985.
- Robertson, Matra. Starving in the Silences: An Exploration of Anorexia Nervosa. New York: New York University Press, 1992.
- Rothstein, Eric. "Virtues of Authority in Tom Jones." The Eighteenth-Century: Theory and Interpretation. 28, no. 2 (1987): 99-126.
- Rousseau, G. S. "The Pursuit of Homosexuality in the Eighteenth Century: 'Utterly Confused Category' and/or Rich Repository?" In 'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality During the Enlightenment, ed. Robert Purks Maccubbin, 132-68. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Rozin, Paul. "Psychobiological Perspectives on Food Preferences and Avoidances." In Food and Evolution: Toward a Theory of Human Food Habits, ed. Marvin Harris and Eric B. Ross, 181-205. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.
- Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." In Toward an Anthropology of Women, ed. Rayna Reiter, 157-210. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.
- Rubini, Dennis. "Sexuality and Augustan England." Journal of Homosexuality 16, nos. 1-2 (1988): 349-81.
- Rush, Florence. The Best Kept Secret: Sexual Abuse of Children. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Russell, Diana E. H. Incest in the Lives of Girls and Women. New York: Basic Books, 1986.
- Rycaut, Paul. The History of the Ottoman Empire. London, 1668.

- Sagan, Eli. At the Dawn of Tyranny: The Origins of Individualism, Political Oppression and the State. New York: Knopf, 1985.
- Sanday, Peggy Reeves. Divine Hunger: Cannibalism as a Cultural System. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Schleiner, Louise. "Pastoral Male Friendship and Miltonic Marriage: Textual Systems Transposed." Literature, Interpretation, Theory 2 (1990): 41-58.
- Schochet, Gordon J. Patriarchalism and Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- Schullenberger, William. "Wrestling with the Angel: Paradise Lost and Feminist Criticism." Milton Quarterly 20, no. 3 (1986): 69-85.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.
- Seeber, Edward D. "Oroonoko and Crusoe's Man Friday." Modern Language Quarterly 12 (1951): 286-91.
- Seidel, Michael. "Robinson Crusoe" Island Myths and the Novel. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.
- Shorter, Edward. The Making of the Modern Family. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
- Shroff, Homai J. The Eighteenth-Century Novel: the Idea of the Gentleman. London and Baltimore: Edward Arnold, 1978.
- Skrabanek, Petr. "Notes Toward the History of Anorexia Nervosa." Janus Revue Internationale de l'histoire de la pharmacie et de la technique. 70 (1983): 109-28.
- Staves, Susan. Married Women's Separate Property in England, 1660-1833. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Stevenson, John Allen. The British Novel, Defoe to Austen: A Critical History. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.
- . "The Courtship of the Family: Clarissa and the Harlowes Once More." ELH 48 (1981): 57-77.
- Statt, Daniel. "Daniel Defoe and Immigration." Eighteenth-Century Studies 24, no. 3 (1991): 293-314.

- Stewart, Maaja A. "Ingratitude in Tom Jones." Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 89, no. 4 (1990): 512-32.
- Stoler, John A. Daniel Defoe: An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism 1900-1980. New York: Garland, 1984.
- Stone, Laurence. The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Stovel, Bruce. "Tom Jones and the Odyssey." Eighteenth-Century Fiction 1, no. 4 (1989): 263-80.
- Stuber, Florian. "On Fathers and Authority in Clarissa." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 25, no. 3 (1985): 537-75.
- Sussman, Charlotte. "The Other Problem with Women: Reproduction and Slave Culture in Aphra Behn's Oroonoko." In Rereading Aphra Behn: History, Theory, and Criticism, ed. Heidi Hutner, 212-33.. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Tavris, Carol. "Beware the Incest-Survivor Machine." New York Times, 3 January 1993, 1, 16-17.
- Thomä, Helmut. Anorexia Nervosa. Trans. Gillian Brydone. New York: International Universities Press Inc., 1967.
- Thompson, E. P. Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act. London: Allen Lane, 1975.
- Thompson, James. "Patterns of Property and Possession in Fielding's Fiction." Eighteenth-Century Fiction 3, no. 1 (1990): 21-42.
- Trumbach, Randolph. "London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century." Journal of Social History 11, no. 1 (1977): 129-40.
- Turner, Michael E. English Parliamentary Enclosure. Its Historical Geography and Economic History. Folkestone and Hamden: Archon Books, 1977.
- van Boheemen, Christine. The Novel as Family Romance: Language, Gender, and Authority from Fielding to Joyce. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press: 1987.
- Van den Berg, Sara. "Eve, Sin and Witchcraft in Paradise Lost." Milton Quarterly 47, no. 4 (1986): 347-65.

- Veith, Ilza. Hysteria: The History of a Disease. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Wagner, Roy. "Incest and Identity: A Critique and Theory on the Subject of Exogamy and Incest Prohibition." Man: The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 7, no. 4 (1972): 601-13.
- Ward, J. A. "Dining With the Novelists." Personalist 45, no. 3 (1946): 399-411.
- Watt, Ian. The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding. Berkley: University of California Press, 1957.
- Wilson, W. Daniel. "Science, Natural Law, and Unwitting Sibling Incest in Eighteenth-Century Literature." Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture 13, no. 19 (1983): 249-70.
- Wittreich, Joseph. "'John, John, I Blush for Thee!': Mapping Gender Discourses in Paradise Lost." In Out of Bounds: Male Writers and Gender(ed) Criticism, ed. Laura Claridge and Elizabeth Langland, 22-54. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.
- Wolfram, Sybil. In-Laws and Out-Laws: Kinship and Marriage in England. London and Sydney: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Wolley, Hannah. The Gentlewoman's Companion; or, a Guide to the Female Sex: containing Directions of [sic] Behaviour, in all Places, Companies, Relations, and Conditions, from their Childhood down to Old Age... With Letters & Discourses upon all Occasions. Whereunto is added, A Guide for Cook-maids, Chamber-maids, Dairy-maids and all others that go to Service. The whole being an exact Rule for the Female Sex in General. London, 1673.
- Woolf, Cynthia Griffin. Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth-Century Puritan Character. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1972.
- Whytt, Robert. Observations on the Nature, Causes, and Cure of those Disorders which have been commonly called Nervous, Hypochondriac, or Hysteric. Edinburgh, 1767.
- Yelling, J. A. Common Field and Enclosure in England 1450-1850. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1977.
- Zomchick, John. "'A Penetration which Nothing Can Deceive': Gender and Juridical Discourse in Some Eighteenth-Century Narratives." Studies in English Literature 29, no. 3 (1989): 535-61.

Zwinger, Lynda. Daughters, Fathers and the Novel: The Sentimental Romance of Heterosexuality. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293014195972