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Abstract

The aim of this study is to contribute to the debate about the position of utopia in the eighteenth-century literary domain, through a discussion of the utopian elements in some of the most illustrious works that the century produced, such as Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, as well as Delarivier Manley’s *New Atalantis*, and in some less known works such as Spence’s *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe*, and the anonymous *The Modern Atalantis*, seeking to show how these works embodied new meanings and uses of utopia, both as a term and idea, as perceived by eighteenth-century readers.

It argues that two trends of utopian writing emerged in the seventeenth century. The first, which corresponded to Robinson’s translation of More’s *Utopia*, regarded utopia as a serious vision for a better society. This interpretation was adopted by Francis Bacon in the *New Atlantis* and James Harrington in *The Commonwealth of Oceana*. These two works were direct responses to More in the sense that Bacon and Harrington refer explicitly to aspects of *Utopia* in their narratives respectively. The second, which was based on Burnet’s translation of the text, often emphasised the playfulness of *Utopia* and associated it with romance and entertainment. This understanding of the utopia was particularly illustrated in Henry Neville’s *The Isle of Pines* in the second part of the seventeenth century and continued into the early part of the eighteenth century in Defoe’s and Manley’s utopian-influenced works. The works of Manley and Defoe maintained this tradition of writing as their many imitations, responses, and continuations, which appeared in the latter part of the century, show. The most important of these are *The Modern Atalantis* and Thomas Spence’s *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe*. The former reflected on Manley’s and Bacon’s work in its motifs, structure, and purposes. The latter was a response to Defoe’s utopian vision in *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. The significance of these works is that they put together elements from earlier utopian and utopian-related works to construct new utopian tropes.

The overall aim of this study is to discuss a set of works that are often thought not to have any utopian bearings. It seeks to offer new understandings of utopian or utopian-influenced eighteenth-century texts that were often understudied by modern critics of utopia, reflecting on previously uninspected aspects of the writings of Defoe and Manley. It also seeks to bring to light significant works that have been given little or no critical attention before, in connection to the understanding of utopia in the second part of the eighteenth century.
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1. Introduction

In his introduction to *Utopias of the British Enlightenment*, Gregory Claeys describes the utopia of the eighteenth century as ‘terra incognita’, critically speaking. Until recently, the eighteenth-century utopia has been overlooked or, at best, understudied. The fact that there are only a few books and a dozen articles on a number of utopias testifies to the neglect of eighteenth-century utopias. Most critics of utopian literature have looked upon the eighteenth century as a lacuna in the history of utopian traditions. Some of them have marginalised these utopias, whereas others omitted them altogether.

In 1922, Lewis Mumford claimed that ‘there is a gap in the Utopian tradition between the seventeenth century and the nineteenth’. Three decades later, A.L. Morton proclaimed that ‘utopian literature reached its lowest level in England during the eighteenth century’, a stance repeated in 1971 by J. Max Patrick and Glenn Negley who stated that ‘for the most part, though rich in Rousseauistic and utopian socialist theories, the eighteenth century produced few utopias’. Moreover, the Manuels, though they noted that ‘the eighteenth century probably produced as many utopian texts as the sixteenth and seventeenth put together’, overlooked the majority of eighteenth-century English utopias, and focussed instead on French works of philosophy that have utopian implications, in their 1979 work on utopias. They cited the unpopularity of utopias among eighteenth-century readers, who preferred works of entertainment to those of serious content, as the reason for overlooking these utopias. For them, the age was characterised by ‘writers of popular novels, who catered to a wide-spread taste for the exotic and incorporated pornographic elements in their tales’. In 1984, J.C. Davis offered a radical stance on the position of utopia in the eighteenth century stating that ‘the Enlightenment cannot, even partially, be interpreted in terms of utopia’. Krishan Kumar, a few years later, claimed that the English utopia declined in the eighteenth

---

6 Ibid, pp. 430-32.
century, arguing that the century ‘did not produce a single major work in the traditional utopian form, no one document that would be for the Enlightenment what More’s golden *libellus* was for the sixteenth century and the books of Andrea, Bacon, Campanella, and Comenius were for the seventeenth’.²⁸ For him, the eighteenth century was not a golden age of utopian writing in terms of quality.⁹ Even Christine Rees, who, in 1996, wrote one of the few books that focussed on the eighteenth-century utopian domain, claimed that utopias in the eighteenth century appear, not as complete compositions, but only as passages in other literary publications.¹⁰

This study aims to contribute to the debate about the position of utopia in the eighteenth century. It seeks to demonstrate the reformulations and continuities of utopian traditions in the eighteenth century by focussing on a group of works that are different in form and content from the utopias produced in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Because these works abandoned some aspects of the model of utopia as set by More’s *Utopia* (1516), the majority of modern critics and historians of utopian thought marginalised or dismissed them. This disagreement about the position of utopia in the literary domain can further be attributed to the change in the meaning or associations of utopia in the eighteenth century. Throughout the eighteenth century, *Utopia*, as a text, and consequently as a concept, was often used in newspapers and periodicals to signify not a serious vision of an ideal society, but a fantasy or work of entertainment.

Eighteenth-century utopian works, nonetheless, are as significant as those of the previous two centuries in the sense that they established new traditions of utopian writing. They do not have the same structures or content as earlier utopias in that they often are not descriptions of ideal societies set in unknown places or on distant islands, but they, for the most part, still embody prominent features of earlier utopias. They are, as Fatima Vieira states, ‘utopian in perspective but do not rigorously comply with the narrative model established by More’.¹¹ Vieira’s reference is not to specific eighteenth-century utopias. It is part of her account of the ways in which utopia as a concept has been defined historically. She considers defining utopia as a ‘literary form into which utopian imagination has been crystallized’ to be ‘very limiting’ because it ignores a

---

‘considerable number of texts’ that have utopian dimensions but are different in forms from the original model. The works I am discussing in this thesis fall into this category.

Even though these utopian works were not masterpieces as some of those of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, they still contributed significantly to the development of the genre and continuity of utopian traditions. In this thesis, I focus on three works produced in the seventeenth century, namely Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* (1627), James Harrington’s *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656), and Henry Neville’s *The Isle of Pines* (1668), and on two groups of eighteenth-century utopian-related works; the first includes Delarivier Manley’s *New Atalantis* (1709), the anonymous *The Northern Atalantis* (1713), and *The Modern Atalantis* (1784); the second consists of Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), and the less known *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe* (1782) by Thomas Spence. The choice of these works is to illustrate that the eighteenth century offered new understandings of the meaning and uses of utopia, different from those associated with some of the utopias of the previous two centuries. These works also demonstrate the continuities towards the end of the eighteenth century of utopian traditions initiated by More’s *Utopia*. The selection of Bacon’s, Harrington’s and Neville’s works is partly because they offer different models of utopias, and partly because of their influences on Defoe’s and Manley’s works. Defoe’s and Manley’s works, in turn, influenced Spence’s utopias and the anonymous *The Modern Atalantis* respectively.

One way to look at the continuity of utopian traditions into the eighteenth century is to distinguish the characteristics that had been preserved in the literary utopias since the time of More. My research applies aspects of Lyman Tower Sargent’s definition and categorisation of utopian traditions to the works under discussion. Sargent identifies three levels of utopian traditions. For him, ‘a tradition comes about because thinkers react to one another… Thomas More was reacting to Plato… and to the social problems of his time. Many later writers were reacting to More’. The works of Bacon and Harrington fit this category as they respond to More’s *Utopia*. Also, Spence’s *A*

---

Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe, though a continuation of Defoe’s The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, can be read as a response to some of the utopian aspects of Defoe’s works. ‘At another level a tradition develops simply because authors choose a form through which to present their ideas’ (684). This applies to the integration of utopia and travel narrative after More’s example, in Bacon’s, Neville’s, Defoe’s and Spence’s work. It is also manifested in the addition of a utopian dimension to secret history in Manley’s work and its imitations. Moreover, ‘on a more important level, there are traditions of thought formed by people taking similar positions at different times and places’ (684). For instance, More’s, Harrington’s, Defoe’s, and Spence’s works share an interest in a set of ideas related to such issues as private property and its relation to political power, as well as the best form of government. Though writing at different times, the issue of property is very significant for these authors. Despite their disagreement on the limits of property redistribution and its links to the issue of political authority, the theme occupies a central position in their works. Moreover, the issues of isolating the utopian community and focussing on the themes of secrecy and security extends from More’s and Bacon’s utopias to the works of Manley and Defoe. Secrecy, for example, is a major theme in Manley’s New Atalantis as it is in Bacon’s, though it is treated differently. Secrecy in Manley is associated with corruption, sexual and political scandals. In Bacon, it is linked to the security and preservation of the people of Atlantis. The choice of Manley’s work does not comply with Sargent’s third category because Manley does not take a similar position in relation to some of the issues that Bacon’s work reflects on, even though she tackles some of the themes discussed in his work. Her work does not portray an ideal community as does Bacon’s. The choice of Manley’s work could, however, be used to challenge and even supplement Sargent’s categorisation by adding a fourth level to utopian traditions based on utopian allusion. This is exemplified in Manley’s choice of title which alludes to Bacon’s New Atlantis, and in the imitations of the New Atalantis whose titles allude to Manley’s work. Manley is not directly responding to Bacon’s work. She, however, is using the idealism associated with its title to intensify the satirical effect of her work.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, the utopian traditions to which Defoe’s and Manley’s works belonged were maintained by the many imitations, continuations and responses which recognised the utopian elements in these works. The Modern Atalantis, for instance, is a representative of a group of texts that imitated Manley’s work in terms
of themes and satirical strategies. At the same time, Spence’s *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe* is a response to and continuation of Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequel. It reads Defoe’s work as one that has a significant utopian dimension. The significance of these two works is that they allow us to explore the ways in which the earlier utopias of More, Bacon, and Harrington, as well as the texts of Defoe and Manley were received at the end of the eighteenth century, by reflecting directly on issues discussed in these works.

In Chapter One, I analyse three seventeenth-century works in connection with More’s *Utopia*. These are Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, Harrington’s *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, and Henry Neville’s *The Isle of Pines*. I seek to demonstrate that the meaning of utopia, both as a work and as concept, had changed throughout the seventeenth and into the eighteen century, by focussing on the translations and publication circumstances of More’s work. I argue that Ralph Robinson’s and Gilbert Burnet’s translations of *Utopia* respectively contributed to establishing different meanings of the concept for seventeenth and eighteenth-century readers. While utopia was associated with serious, though fictional, visions for better societies in first part of the seventeenth century, it was often regarded as a playful fantasy in late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. The associations of utopia with serious visions as illustrated in the works of Bacon, Harrington, and with playful entertainment as manifested in that of Neville are discussed in this chapter. These works can still be seen to belong to the utopian traditions initiated by More’s work, though they departed from its model in terms of form and content. This chapter further reflects on the influences of these works on eighteenth-century utopias in terms of form, content, and objectives, focussing on dominant themes in these works which often recur in the utopias of the following century.

Chapter Two is a discussion of the utopian elements of *Robinson Crusoe* and particularly its sequel *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. I attempt to demonstrate that Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequel *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, when considered as a single work of two parts, can be read as a work with a utopian dimension. This reading challenges many critics’ rejection of the utopian potential of Defoe’s work, which was based on their focus on the first part only. It also reflects on the influences of earlier utopias on Defoe’s work in the process of creating a
society. This process starts with an isolated man in the natural state and develops into the establishment of a commonwealth ruled by the majority on Crusoe’s island.

Chapter Three analyses Manley’s *New Atalantis* as an example of the way in which aspects of utopian writing were combined with secret history. While Manley’s *New Atalantis* appeared before Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* chronologically, this chapter moves back to the first decade of the eighteenth century to discuss different strand of writing related to earlier utopias. It seeks to demonstrate that Manley’s *New Atalantis*, primarily a work of amatory fiction, could be seen as a replacement for Bacon’s utopia as the new Atlantis of the early eighteenth century, and that Manley’s text initiated a tradition of writing in which the term ‘Atlantis’ that was used to refer to an ideal society in Bacon’s work, was replaced by ‘Atalantis’ which was associated with corruption and intrigues. Manley’s text illustrates the use of utopian elements in unprecedented manner, adding a utopian dimension to a work of amatory fiction, initiating in its own right a form of writing which was adopted by many authors throughout the eighteenth century.

This study concludes with a discussion of two works that put together utopian elements that the authors retrospectively identified in Defoe’s and Manley’s texts respectively. These are Spence’s *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe* and the anonymous *The Modern Atalantis*. Spence’s work, which regards Defoe’s work as utopian, links it back to earlier utopias of More and Harrington. *The Modern Atalantis*, which imitates Manley’s work in terms of structure and themes, puts together elements from utopian and non-utopian works such as Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* and Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, in addition to Manley’s *New Atalantis*. These two works offer new insights into the way in which the works of Manley and Defoe, which appeared at the start of the century, were interpreted at the end of the eighteenth century in relation to utopia.

The overall aim of this study is to discuss a set of works that are often thought not to have any utopian bearings. It seeks to offer a new understanding of utopian or utopian-influenced eighteenth-century texts that were often ignored by modern critics of utopia, reflecting on previously uninspected or understudied aspects of the writings of Defoe and Manley. It also seeks to bring to light significant works that have been given little or no critical attention before, in connection to the understanding of utopia in the second
part of the eighteenth century, namely *The Modern Atalantis* and Spence’s *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe*. 
2. Utopia in the Seventeenth Century

The seventeenth century was so rich with utopian works that it is still regarded to this day as the most significant period in the long history of utopian thought for two reasons: the variety of utopias produced at that time, and their influence on the utopian and revolutionary thoughts and actions in the seventeenth and eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{14} Some of these seventeenth-century utopias went on to become prominent examples to be followed and imitated by utopian authors of the following centuries. The focus of discussion in this chapter is on Bacon’s \textit{New Atlantis} (1627), Harrington’s \textit{Oceana} (1656), and Neville’s \textit{The Isle of Pines} (1668). The selection of these works as case studies is based primarily on the belief that each of them offers a different perspective on utopian thought, through focusing on specific aspects of the societies they portray, and on their crucial influences on the utopias produced in the eighteenth century. While Bacon’s \textit{New Atlantis} is concerned with the scientific or technological dimension of the utopian community, and Harrington’s with the form of government and constitution, Neville’s work is recognised for its playfulness as well as its focus on such matters as organisation, commerce, and maritime rivalry. I will look at the ways in which these works, along with More’s \textit{Utopia}, were received by the seventeenth and eighteenth-century reading public. Also, I will investigate their impact on the understanding of utopia in the eighteenth century, taking into account the publishing circumstances of these works, and how the understanding of these works changed from seriously intended utopian projects in the early seventeenth century often to works of entertainment in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Because More’s \textit{Utopia} is the reference point against which these utopias are going to be discussed, it is imperative to discuss its reception, and the changes that the text underwent in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

\textit{Utopia} was first published in Latin in 1516, and translated into English in 1551 by Ralph Robinson. The second English translation of the text appeared in 1684. It was done by Gilbert Burnet. This translation was published anonymously. In the preface to this translation, Burnet in addition to his praise of Thomas More, reflects on Robinson’s

translation suggesting that Thomas More might have a hand in it. He states that Utopia ‘was once translated into English not long after it was written; and I was once apt to think it might have been done by Sir Thomas More himself’. His justification for such a suggestion is that ‘it is in the English of his Age, and not unlike his Style’. This, however, is unlikely as the first English translation of the text appeared sixteen years after More’s death. While the title of Robinson’s translation, Thomas Moore’s Vtopia: Containing, an Excellent, Learned, Wittie, and Pleasant Discourse of the Best State of a Publike Weale, indicates that the work, though ‘wittie and pleasant’, describes the best state of the commonwealth focusing on the laws that govern such commonwealth, Burnet’s title, Utopia: Written in Latin by Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England: translated into English, only indicates that the work was written in Latin by Thomas More. The differences between the two translations go beyond the titles and extend into the contents. For instance, while Robinson describes Utopus as ‘kinge and conqueror’ of Utopia, Burnet correctly refers to him only as Utopus. The incident at Cardinal Morton’s house, where Hythloday reflects on the problems of English society, metaphorically describing the transformation of sheep into devourers of men and cities, can also serve to illustrate differences between the two translations. Robinson translates the incident as follows: ‘your shepe that were wont to be so meke and tame, and so small eaters, now, as I hear say, be bec
ome deuowerers and so wylde, that they eate vp, and swallow downe the very men themselves. They consume, destroy, and deuoure whole fields, howses, and cities’. The same anecdote is translated by Burnet as follows: ‘your sheep, that are naturally mild, and easily kept in order, may be said now to devour men, and unpeopled, not only villages, but towns’. The translations of this extract show that the narrative is more concise in Burnet’s than in Robinson’s translation. We can, in fact, attribute the popularity of Burnet’s translation among readers in the late seventeenth and eighteenth century to its succinctness, clarity, and the straightforwardness of the language used. This is evidently illustrated in the number of editions of both translations that appeared in the following two centuries.

---

15 Thomas More, Utopia: Or the Happy Republic; A Philosophical Romance, trans. Gilbert Burnet (Glasgow: Printed by Robert Foulis, 1743), p. vi.
17 Thomas More, Utopia: Or the Happy Republic; A Philosophical Romance, p.120.
18 Sir Thomas More’s Utopia, Translated into English by Ralph Robinson, pp. 40–41.
19 Thomas More, Utopia: Or the Happy Republic; A Philosophical Romance, p.18.
Two English editions of Robinson’s translation of *Utopia* appeared in the first half of the seventeenth century, the first in 1624 under the title *Thomas Moore’s Utopia: Containing, an Excellent, Learned, Wittie, and Pleasant Discourse of the Best State of a Publike Weale, as it is Found in the Gouernment of the New Ile Called Vtopia*, and the second in 1639 under the same title with the name of the translator omitted. In comparison, two editions and a reprint of Burnet’s translation appeared in the late seventeenth century under the title *Utopia: Written in Latin by Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England: translated into English*. The first two of these which appeared in 1684, were editions of the text, and the third was a reissue published in 1685. The publication of two editions and a reissue of the work in less than two years suggest Burnet’s popularity. This popularity of Burnet’s translation of the text continued in the eighteenth century as suggested by its extensive circulation. Most of the editions and reprints of *Utopia* which appeared in the eighteenth century were based on his translation. The first of these appeared in Dublin in 1737, with a short account of the life and trial of Thomas More. This edition was followed by another one in 1743, but with an interestingly different title: *Utopia: or the Happy Republic; a Philosophical Romance. In Two Books*... This edition offered an unprecedented description of *Utopia* as a philosophical romance, thus reflecting on the fantastic and entertaining character of the work. This conforms to Burnet’s classification of the work as a ‘fable’ in *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1681). One more edition which labelled *Utopia* as a ‘philosophical romance’ and described it as ‘the happy republic’ was published in Glasgow in 1762.

One more edition based on Burnet’s translation was published in 1751 under the title *Utopia: Containing an Impartial History of the Manners, Customs, Polity, Government, &c. of that Island. Written in Latin by Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England. And Interspersed with Many Important Articles of Secret History, Relating to the State of the British Nation*. In this title, the association of utopia with secret history, which will be discussed in chapter three, reflects partly on the popularity of secret history in the

---

20 All editions and reprints of the utopias under discussion here are based on the bibliographical details provided by EBBO and ESTC listings of these works.
21 *Utopia: or the Happy Republic; a Philosophical Romance* (Glasgow: Printed for Robert Foulis, 1743), T85446.
23 *Utopia: or the Happy Republic; a Philosophical Romance* (Glasgow: Printed for Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1762), T50639.
eighteenth century and partly on the political character of the text. It also conforms to the understanding of utopia as a political romance in the eighteenth century. The same reference to articles of secret history also appears in another edition of the text that was published in 1795.24 These references recall Manley’s New Atalantis (1709) and Eliza Haywood’s Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia (1725) which associate utopia and secret history in order to voice their concerns about the corrupt state of their society.

The change in the understanding of Utopia from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century may significantly well be due to the different translations of the text by Robinson and Burnet. The reason for this transformation could be the clarity, availability, and circulation of one translation of the text, that is Burnet’s. A number of eighteenth-century periodicals and newspapers, which were widely circulated, often associated utopia with imaginary states, fancies, or works of political romance. Some described the work as a jest intended for entertainment; others referred to it as a political romance. For instance, an article in The Weekly Journal or the British Gazetteer (1718) refers to the imaginary place called Utopia as a ‘grand fantastic lie’;25 an article entitled ‘To Britannicus’ in The London Journal (1724) describes Utopia as fantastic and impractical;26 an article in The London Journal (1734) refers to More’s Utopia and Plato’s Republic as ‘wild fancies’;27 The Gazetteer and the Daily Advertiser (1765) also describes Utopia as an imaginary place; the Public Advertiser of 1765 and 1766 refer to Utopia as an imaginary state and a chimera of the brain;28 and the Public Advertiser (1776) describes it as a political romance.29 Most of these articles grouped More’s work with Plato’s vision of the commonwealth and regarded them as fantasies or works of entertainment rather than serious plans for ideal societies. Further, Utopia was referred to as a political romance in a number of works that appeared in the second half of the century. For instance, in the dedication of Memoirs of the Life of Sir Thomas More... to which is Added, His History of Utopia, Ferdinando Warner refers to Utopia as a

'political romance’ that ‘has stood the test of several ages as a master-piece of wit and fancy’. 30 James Granger describes Utopia as a ‘kind of political romance which gained [Thomas More] the highest reputation as an author’.31 Utopia was also referred to as ‘a kind of political romance’ in A Description of England and Wales.32 At the end of the century, further, Isaac Disraeli remarked that ‘when the Utopia of Sir Thomas More was first published, it occasioned a pleasant mistake. This political romance represents a perfect, but visionary republic’.33

The status of Utopia as a work of political romance or a fanciful work of entertainment as illustrated in these examples could be linked back to the influence of Lucian’s satirical writings on More’s work. This is evident in the way the text was comprehended as a work of entertainment throughout the eighteenth century. The influence of Lucian can be primarily felt in the satirical tone of the text, and in the dialogue technique. More and his fellow humanist Erasmus translated some of Lucian’s writings in 1505 and 1506. C.R. Thompson explains the influences that these translations might have had on the composition of Utopia, as he notes that More’s ‘familiarity with Lucian which the translations compelled and which they attest… contributed something to the verisimilitude of the wonderful Utopia’. 34 In a letter to Ruthall, More praises the virtues of Lucian’s writing and expresses his admiration for Lucian:

If, most learned Sir, there was ever anyone who fulfilled the Horatian maxim and combined delight with instruction, I think Lucian certainly ranked among the foremost in this respect. Refraining from the arrogant pronouncements of the philosophers as well as from the wanton wiles of the poets, he everywhere reprimands and censures, with very honest and at the same time very entertaining wit, our human frailties. And this he does so cleverly and effectively that although no one

34 C.R. Thompson, The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1940), p. 44.
pricks more deeply, nobody resents his stinging words. He is always first-rate at this.\textsuperscript{35}

More, further, remarks that the dialogues he chose to translate ‘have particularly struck [his] fancy’.\textsuperscript{36} Lucian’s dialogues are imitated by More because of their satirical as well as moral value. In short, More’s \textit{Utopia} draws upon a tradition initiated by Lucian in his \textit{A True History} that exposes human weaknesses in a light and funny manner. \textit{A True History} is an account of imaginary voyages to a multitude of strange worlds. Carlo Ginzburg notes that because Utopia is located outside the limits of the known world, it could be considered as one of the Fortunate Islands which Lucian depicts, taking into consideration that More states that Hythloday has not specified its position.\textsuperscript{37} Alistair Fox also emphasises the relationship between More’s \textit{Utopia} and Lucian’s \textit{A True History}, observing that More’s work should be regarded as a work of Lucianic irony, particularly in the way it uses the dialogue technique, arguing that More’s translations of Lucian’s works had a big impact on his career as a writer. For Fox, More’s ‘encounter with Lucian was absolutely crucial to the development of his mature vision and its literary philosophical consequences were long lasting’.\textsuperscript{38} Lucian’s \textit{A True History}, Stephen W. Smith indicates, starts with the narrator declaring that ‘everything we are about to read is… a patent lie’.\textsuperscript{39} Lucian then admiringly declares that Iambulus ‘made up a falsehood that is patent to everybody, but wrote a story that is not uninteresting for all that’.\textsuperscript{40} In More’s judgement, Lucian is a moral writer and his satirical dialogue in \textit{A True History} is both instructive and amusing as it is intended to expose the illnesses of men and how they influence the society of man.\textsuperscript{41} He uses lies as a way to reveal the truth. In similar terms, More is a moral writer whose main concern is to expose the shortcomings of his society.

As a work influenced by the writings of Lucian, \textit{Utopia} is intensively satirical. The first book of \textit{Utopia}, which takes the form of a dialogue, is a satire on the ills of More’s

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Ibid, p. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Carol Ginzburg, \textit{No Island is an Island} (New York, Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 15.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Alistair Fox, \textit{Thomas More: History and Providence} (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), p. 35.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Lucian, tr. A.M. Harman (London, 1913), p.251.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} Stephen W. Smith, p. 40.
\end{itemize}
society, particularly the policies of land enclosure that aimed at driving people out of their homes and lands. In his discussion of the issue of poverty, Hythloday attributes the abject levels of poverty to the noble landowners who, in search of material gain, drove farmers out of their lands, ceased the cultivation of these lands, and closed them to agriculture. More, through Hythloday, criticizes the landowners for their role in the land enclosure movement, turning people out of their homes and forcing them to wander aimlessly. He likens the landowners to the tame sheep that turned monstrous and devoured people and towns. The change in the condition of the sheep indicates the movement from agriculture to commerce. The landowners stopped the cultivation of their own lands and turned them into pastures to breed more sheep and consequently increase their profit through wool trade. The satirical dimension here contributes to the critical character of the dialogue. At the same time, Book II of the text, which is mainly a description of the customs, laws, and habits of the citizens of Utopia, could be seen to contribute to the satirical dimension of the work through its description of an impractical or fantastical vision.

In terms of themes, More’s *Utopia* tackles the issues of poverty, warfare, crime, religion, as well as those of the isolation of its island setting, the island’s security, and secrecy to a certain extent. Some of these recur extensively in the utopias of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Utopia*, for instance, was set on an island in the New World. It, however, was not originally an island; it was a peninsula. Unlike the islands portrayed in other utopias of the early modern period, the island in *Utopia* was cut off from the mainland by man’s physical labour: ‘Utopus, my ruler, converted me, formerly not an island, into an island’. The act of cutting Utopia from mainland signifies the birth of a nation. Not only did Utopus cut Utopia off from the world, but he also gave the island its new name, an act that features in most of the utopias discussed in this study: ‘But Utopus, who as conqueror gave the island its name (up to then it had been called Abraxa), and who brought the rude and rustic people to such a perfection of culture and
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42 This specific example was of interest for seventeenth and eighteenth-century commentators who used it on a number of occasions to satirise the shortcomings of society. For example, an article in *Collection for Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* (1692) uses the sentence, ‘sheep eat up towns’, and refers to *Utopia* as a work of political satire; also an article in *London Evening Post* (1771) reflects on the changes in the political, economic and social systems in England by stating that ‘flocks of sheep had devoured not only men, but whole houses and towns’, in an allusion to *Utopia*.

humanity, as makes them now superior to almost all other mortals, gained victory at his very first landing’ (113). Before the arrival of Utopus, Abraxa was an uncivilised country with rude inhabitants. Utopus not only changed the physical shape of the land and gave it his name, but also turned it into an example of perfection and civilisation. Moreover, transforming the peninsula into an island enhanced its defensive strategies and reduced the threats of the outside world against it. The peninsula was naturally well-fortified, but after separating it from the mainland, it becomes virtually impregnable because its geography makes it easier to defend against any outer dangers, and therefore it is well protected in the sense that ‘the landing is so well defended by nature or by engineering that a few defenders can prevent strong forces from coming ashore’ (111). Furthermore, the island of Utopia, though not completely isolated from the rest of the world, maintains a set of regulations to protect itself from inside as well as from outside threats. These laws govern travel and foreign policy, for example. The Utopians are very careful about the security of their borders and ‘very secretive in their dealings with the outside world’. For instance, their regulations in regard to travel from and to Utopia, as well as within the island itself, are strict. In Utopia, travel without permission inside or outside the island is strictly prohibited: ‘If any person gives himself leave to stray out of his territorial limits and is caught without the governor’s certificate, he is treated with contempt, brought back as a runaway, and severely punished. A rash repetition of the offence entails the sentence of slavery’ (147). Moreover, the inhabitants of More’s Utopia are very cautious in their dealings with their neighbours. Their priority is to protect their state against any threats, whether they are military, intellectual or cultural. Because Utopia is a self-sufficient island that produces what its citizens need, it could choose to keep its interactions with the outside world minimal. This, however, is not the case. Even though Utopia is isolated, its citizens are not isolationists as indicated by Hythloday’s insistence that the Utopians maintain strong relationships with their neighbours, and these extend beyond trade and strategies of defence.

Like some English utopias that followed its example, the island in *Utopia* is intended as a model to criticize the social and political patterns in contemporary England. In addition to the links between the geographies of England and Utopia, there are other
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implicit and explicit references that show More to have had England in mind when composing *Utopia*. The text, like most utopian works, presents a social system which is designed to maintain the continuity and stability of the community. This order, which is meant to be the alternative that *Utopia* proposes to correct the problems of More’s society, is based on attaining and maintaining social justice. It is noticeable that what More presents in the dialogue through Hythloday has its counterpart in Book II. He, for example, indicates in Book I that private property prevents the attainment of a just social order. In Book II, private property is banished in favour of a communal way of living. In *Utopia*, justice is achieved through equality. Hythloday indicates that to maintain their social order against any internal and external threats, the utopians deploy secrecy in their dealings with their neighbours and in their military affairs. They have spies and agents. They hire mercenaries to fight on their behalf. They do not have a standing army. As we will see, this theme recurs in Harrington and later in Spence. The Utopians justify their secret dealings as far as war is concerned by stating that they detest war as an abhorrent thing fit for beasts only. For them, the glory gained from war means nothing. They would rather use secret means such as bribes than get involved in wars directly. The same themes of secrecy and isolation are given central position in Bacon’s utopia.

**Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis***

Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* testifies to the seriousness attached to utopia in the seventeenth century. It reflects on a number of motifs discussed in More’s text. It, however, presents a social system different to the one that More’s work proposes. *New Atlantis* was a response to, and departure from More’s *Utopia*, which is referred to explicitly in Bacon’s work as ‘a Feigned Commonwealth’. Bacon seems not to agree with More on specific aspects of the ‘best state of commonwealth’, such as its social and political orders, the subject of marriage, and the relationship between man and nature. While More believed in justice as the sole force that can bring the society together and maintain a just social order, and in man’s ability to sustain a harmonious relationship with nature, Bacon insisted on a social order protected by regulations,
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particularly secrecy, and on the elite’s subjugation and control of nature. In the *New Atlantis*, Bacon delineates a scientific utopia demonstrating that the improvement of mankind can only be carried out through the pursuit of scientific knowledge. For him, scientific progress is not an end in itself, but a means to transform humanity into a better state. Rossi notes that ‘for Bacon the purpose of scientific research was neither to acquire fame nor to produce miracles, but to improve the conditions of human existence, and this could only be achieved by collaboration, the founding of adequate institutions, and the publication of results in plain exact terms’.  

Unlike More the humanist philosopher, Bacon rejected the classical philosophical teachings of Plato and Aristotle in favour of scientific observation and experimentation as the means for advancing scientific knowledge.

The *New Atlantis* was published by Bacon’s chaplain William Rawley in 1627 at the end of the volume that contained *Sylva Sylvarum*. In his note to the reader, Rawley notes that Bacon designed this work to be appended to that specific volume: ‘This work of the *New Atlantis*...his Lordship designed for this place’ because ‘it hath so near affinity (in one part of it) with the preceding Natural History’. During the seventeenth century, the *New Atlantis* was published separately on two occasions. One was in London in 1635 under the title *New Atlantis, A Work Unfinished. Written by the Right Honourable, Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban*. The other was in London in 1658 under the same title, but with a note indicating that this work was issued as part of *Sylva Sylvarum*, and that it was also issued separately. Apart from these two editions, the work was published as an appendix to *Sylva Sylvarum: or A Natural Historie* on fourteen occasions between 1626 and 1683. Most of these editions have ‘New Atlantis, A Work Unfinished’ on an additional title page and a separate pagination as Bacon intended it to be in his original design. This format indicates that the work was not a continuation of *Sylva Sylvarum* as a separate title page and different pagination suggests a break between the two works. However, the number of editions in which the work was published as part of *Sylva Sylvarum* testifies to its popularity in that form and not as an independent work. In the eighteenth century, not a single publication of the *New Atlantis* as a separate work can be found. It does however appear in five collections of Bacon’s works. On two occasions, in 1733 and 1737, it appears in *The Philosophical*.
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Works of Francis Bacon, ... Methodiz’d and Made English from the Originals, with Occasional Notes, to Explain what is Obscure, and Shew how far the Several Plans of the Authors for the Advancement of all the Parts of Knowledge Have Been Executed to the Present Time. It also appears in The Works of Francis Bacon... With Several Additional Pieces Never Before Printed in any Edition of his Works. To which is Prefixed, a New Life of the Author by Mr. Mallet in 1740, 1753, 1760, 1765, and 1778. This suggests that the New Atlantis was not popular among eighteenth-century readers as a separate work.

Though influenced by More’s Utopia, the New Atlantis in turn influenced and inspired a variety of utopian works in the seventeenth century in terms of imitations, continuations, and techniques. For instance, influenced by Bacon, Margret Cavendish positioned her utopia, The Description of a New World Called the Blazing World (1666) at the end of her more serious work, Observations Upon Experimental Philosophy (1665). In her preface to the reader, she justifies her practice by stating that ‘if you wonder that I join a work of fancy to my serious philosophical contemplations, think not that it is out of a disparagement to philosophy’. Responding to Bacon’s work which delineates a patriarchal society, she creates a vision of society ruled by an Empress whom Cavendish’s spirit joins in the Blazing World. In this world, a scientific vision is presented and carried out not by human beings, but by beast-like creatures. Bacon’s work also inspired Gabriel Plattes’ totalitarian utopian vision in Macaria (1641). Plattes’ work, which draws on More’s Utopia in its use of the name Macaria, introduces an institution called the ‘College of Experience’. It recalls Bacon’s Salomon’s House in terms of its workings and aims. The work was intended to persuade the parliament to help the poor and engage in reviving the economy. Its aim was to make England like Macaria, a reference to the happy island neighbouring More’s Utopia.

Just as Burnet would characterise More’s Utopia as a ‘fable’, this was the word chosen decades earlier by Rawley to describe Bacon’s New Atlantis: ‘This fable my Lord devised, to the end that he might exhibit therein a model or description of a college instituted to the interpreting of nature and the producing of great and marvellous works for the benefits of men, under the name of Salomon’s House, or the College of the Six

Days’ Works’. Even though the part of the work about Salomon’s House was completed, Bacon’s intention, Rawley continues, was ‘to have composed a frame of Laws, or of the best state or mould of a commonwealth’ (712). Bacon, however, ‘foreseeing it would be a long work, his desire of collecting the Natural History diverted him, which he preferred many degrees before it’ (712). The ‘fable’ of the *New Atlantis* was Bacon’s first and last attempt at writing fiction. Drawing on *Utopia*, which has its sources in Plato’s *Republic*, Lucian’s writings, and the travel accounts of Amerigo Vespucci among others, the *New Atlantis* belongs to a hybrid genre. It draws on a combination of modes of writing, including utopian fantasy and travel literature. It starts with an account of the adventures of a group of sailors that leads them to discovering the utopian island of Bensalem or New Atlantis. This is followed by the sailors being admitted to the island after a series of religious oaths, cautious security and health checks, and a period of quarantine. Through a series of conversations with Bensalemite officials, readers are informed about the history and making of New Atlantis, before we are told about the workings, experiments and laws of Salomon’s House through an account given by one of its Fathers to the narrators.

The *New Atlantis* differs from More’s *Utopia* both thematically and structurally. Thematically, the difference is between the two authors’ concepts and attitudes towards man’s nature and his relationship with nature at large, and in their visions of the best way to establish and sustain a permanent social order. Structurally, the dialogue technique, the satirical dimension, and the paratexts that support the narrative in More’s *Utopia* such as poems, letters, maps, are all absent from the *New Atlantis*, except for a short preface written by Rawley explaining the circumstances of the work’s composition and publication. However, like *Utopia*, the *New Atlantis* was set on an island located in the South Sea. There is no real description of the island itself. We, as readers know a little about its size, shape, population, geographical divisions or number of cities. Also, we are not told how the island was defended, nor what its military organization, if it has any, was like. This suggests that, though a work of fiction, the *New Atlantis* reflects Bacon’s character as a man interested in scientific observation as illustrated in the limited use of fiction in the text.
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The island of Bensalem is hard to find unless by a fortunate coincidence. It is naturally isolated and it maintains an isolationist policy through a set of rules that were first enacted by King Solamona, the founder and lawgiver of the state of Bensalem. Chloe Houston rightly refers to the *New Atlantis* as a classic example of the ‘isolationist utopia’, whose officials are deeply concerned about the security of its border and anxious about its relationship with the outside world. She views the island of New Atlantis as ‘the home of an older and wiser culture absolutely in command of its dealings with the outside world. Bacon’s utopia is difficult to find about, difficult to reach and difficult to enter; in possession of the globe’s secrets, it keeps the rest of the world at arm’s length’.

However, it is the elite scientists of Salomon’s House who are in control, not Bensalem’s public. The isolationist position of New Atlantis and its social order are maintained through the constant effecting of secrecy in all aspects of life on the island, and in its dealings with the world beyond its borders as well. Variations of the theme of secrecy as represented in Bacon’s text recur in the works of Defoe and Manley though for different purposes as we will see.

Secrecy in the *New Atlantis* is represented in conjunction with the author’s attitude towards the notion of man’s nature. Bacon places his trust in the elite scientists represented in the text by the Fathers of Solomon’s House, not in the common man. This is manifested very early in the text in the scene of encounter that brings the sailors to their first contact with the officials of Bensalem. In contrast to the scene of encounter which shows the friendliness of Utopians towards strangers, the Bensalemites approach the sailors with reluctance and caution. The sailors were left perplexed by the cautious response of the Bensalemites. Like the sailors, the seventeenth-century reader of the book might be puzzled by the unwelcoming attitude of the islanders, given that they are Christians, and willing to help the distressed sailors. The reader, however, is informed later in the text that the officials were acting according to the rules of secrecy that govern their dealings with strangers: ‘we of this island of Bensalem (for so they called it in their language) have this: that by means of our solitary situation, and of the laws of secrecy, which we have for our travellers, and our rare admission of strangers, we know well most part of the habitable world, and are ourselves unknown’.
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passage also indicates that because ‘the admission of strangers to this society is so rare, the narrator and his company are the first to have landed [there] in thirty-seven years, despite the increased levels of international travel in the early seventeenth century’. Even though it is hospitable, Bensalem is an extremely secretive society. Its officials repeatedly remind the narrator and his company that they are only permitted to reveal to foreigners some aspects of Bensalemite society, and that others must remain undisclosed. In the words of A.L. Morton, ‘Chance voyagers, like the narrator of the story, were welcomed in Bensalem and received hospitably, but intercourse with foreign lands was discouraged. This is because King Solamona,

recalling into his memory the happy and flourishing estate wherein his land then was, so as it might be a thousand ways altered to the worse, but scarce any one way to the better; thought nothing wanted to his noble and heroic intentions, but only as far as human foresight might reach, to give perpetuity to that which was in his time so happily established; therefore… he did ordain the interdicts and prohibitions which we have touching the entrance of strangers.

Further, the distrust of man’s nature could be discerned in the regulations that govern travel within Bensalem, into and out of it. Like More’s Utopians, the people of Bensalem and its visitors as well, are not allowed to travel without official permission. Only the members of the elite science institution are permitted to travel: ‘Now for our travelling from hence into parts abroad, our Lawgiver thought fit altogether to restrain it… But this restraint of ours hath only one exception, which is admirable; preserving the good which cometh by communicating with strangers and avoiding the hurt’ (721). Despite the fact that New Atlantis is isolated from the world, its officials know everything about the rest of the world. They have knowledge of the affairs, learning, and nature of the rest of the world, while the rest of the world remains in ignorance of them. This is achieved by sending out secret missions at regular intervals whose targets were to import all that was known in other lands:
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When the king had forbidden to all his people navigation into any part that was not under his crown, he made nevertheless this ordinance; that every twelve years there should be set forth, out of this kingdom two ships, appointed to several voyages; That in either of these ships there should be admission of three of the Fellows or Brethren of Salomon's House; whose errand was only to give us knowledge of the affairs and state of those countries to which they were designed, and especially of the sciences, arts, manufactures, and inventions of all the world. 

The aim of sending these secret envoys to Europe is to gain knowledge in arts, sciences and other fields of learning. These errands, however, can be interpreted in a different way: they might be looked upon as means for the Fathers of Salomon’s House to maintain contact with the outside world, while the vast majority of the Bensalemites remain in total ignorance. The reason for keeping the citizens’ contact with the outside world minimal is maintaining the social order established within the community. Salomona demanded that secrecy should be implemented in all aspects of life in Bensalem, so as to avoid threats from outside the island and from inside as well. Secrecy within the community of New Atlantis can be explained through inspecting the relationship between Solomon’s House and the rest of the community. This institute of science is the most striking example of the implementation of secrecy in the text. The *New Atlantis* advocates an elitist strategy that attributes ignorance to the masses represented by the general population of Bensalem, and perfection to the scientists represented by the Fathers of Salomon’s House. First, the scene of encounter generates a sense of superiority of the officials of Bensalem to the sailors. Then, a sense of elitism is manifested through the secret dealings of the Solomon’s House. The masses of Bensalem know almost nothing about it and about its experiments. They only know what the Fathers of the science institute want them to know. So, while the masses of Bensalem are superior to the sailors, they are inferior to the members of the science institute. The sailors are admittedly overwhelmed by the superiority of the Bensalemites to them, and this feeling goes on to the end of the narrative. The people of Bensalem,
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however, are inferior to the members of Salomon’s House. They are completely isolated from the Fathers. The science institute, then, is a symbol of elitism in the text. The inner isolation of the public from the Fathers of Solomon’s House could be read as an act that generates a sense of distrust on the part of the Fathers towards the general population of Bensalem. The visit of one of the Fathers to Bensalem could be used to support this claim. For the masses of Bensalem, the reason of his visit remains a secret. At this point in the text, much attention is given to the lavishness and superior appearance of the visiting Father, not to the reasons behind his visit: ‘Behind his chariot went all the officers and principals of the Companies of the City. He sat alone, upon cushions, of a kind of excellent plush, blue: and under his foot curious carpets of silk of divers colors, like the Persian, but far finer’ (726). This passage is but one example of the several passages devoted here to the description of the grace, glory, and superiority of the Father. These passages emphasise the luxury being enjoyed by the elite of Bensalem and indicate that they hold most of the privilege and authority in Bensalem. Bacon’s celebration of luxury here is in contrast to More’s treatment of luxury. For Bacon, it is a sign of power and authority; for the Utopians, it is one of the reasons of poverty and consequent injustice.

Structurally, Bacon’s New Atlantis demonstrates significant alterations to the form of utopia as shaped by More’s work. The most striking of these alterations is the absence of dialogue from the New Atlantis. The work initially takes the form of a report that includes a series of conversations that lead to the eventual description of the scientific utopia of New Atlantis. In More’s work, the dialogue is used to prepare the reader for the vision of the ideal society that is going to be described in the discourse. More uses the dialogue part of the text to justify Hythloday’s description of the utopian island in the second part of the text. By the time the reader begins to hear about the society of the Utopians that More delineates in Book II of Utopia, the reader is already acquainted with the illnesses that the writer is suggesting remedies for in his ideal society. The dialogue in More’s Utopia involves More himself, his fellow humanist Peter Giles, and his imaginary narrator, Hythloday. Within this main dialogue we have another dialogue that takes place at Cardinal Morton’s house, and involves Hythloday, Cardinal Morton, and the layman. In Bacon’s work, the reader is not provided with any background to the text. The story is told by a group of sailors, but these sailors’ names, identities, and nationalities remain a mystery to the reader. With no context or background information,
the reader is immediately introduced to the story of the ideal community, preceded by a brief scene of encounter between the islanders and the sailors arriving at the island. Another major difference between More’s *Utopia* and Bacon’s *New Atlantis* is the absence of the satirical dimension from the latter. Bacon’s work excludes the satirical element that More’s *Utopia* employs for the interpretation of the social and political culture in which the text originates. What we encounter in Bacon’s text is a serious vision of a scientifically advanced society. This is evident in the Father’s explanation of the workings of Salomon’s House in scientific terms such as ‘the knowledge of causes, the secret motions of things, enlarging the bounds of human empire… etc.’ (727). At the centre of Bacon’s utopia, we have the Solomon House, a symbol of the kind of perfection that Bacon aspires to. According to Suzanne Smith, ‘the entire island is structured around a research institution, which is sometimes called ‘the College of the Six Days’ Works’, a reference to the Hebrew belief that God created the world in six days.60 A.L. Morton argues that Bacon’s utopia is the product of a time when utopian ‘writers were concerned with political questions, with the framing of a model constitution and with its working machinery. In other words, they were concerned with power not justice’.61 Bacon, as the *New Atlantis* illustrates, is one of those figures interested in the political power generated by the scientific advancement of knowledge. Harrington, almost thirty years later, stated in his utopia, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, that political power is originated in the balance of landed property.

**James Harrington’s *The Commonwealth of Oceana***

The changes in the political situation in England in the second part of the seventeenth century, throughout the commonwealth period, contributed to a change in the mode of utopian works produced at the time. According to Morton, ‘There was a close relationship between the Utopian writings and the active framing of constitutions which went on throughout the Commonwealth period’.62 One significant example of this type of utopia was James Harrington’s *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, a work which
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contains explicit allusions to More’s *Utopia*, particularly in its insistence on the citizen militia and in its use of such titles as ‘phylarchs’ which More used for his Utopian officials. The term appears in Harrington’s works on several occasions. The work also refers directly to Francis Bacon and quotes from his essay ‘Of the True Greatness of Kingdoms and Estates’. Harrington’s aim in *Oceana* and some of his other works was to disseminate and defend his republican views. His efforts even extended to establishing a club called the Rota where his fellow republicans met and discussed the political issues of the time. Following the restoration of monarchy in 1660, he was accused of treason and consequently arrested in 1661. He was locked up in the Tower, and was later moved to St. Nicholas’ Island, and from there to Plymouth. After his release from prison, he published several works which, along with the works he wrote before his arrest, were collected in one volume by John Toland in 1700.

In the seventeenth century, *Oceana* was published three times. Two editions appeared in 1656 under the title *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, with a dedication signed by Harrington. A third edition appeared in 1658 also with a dedication to ‘His Highness the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland. By James Harrington’. This was a reissue of the first edition of 1656. *Oceana* provoked negative responses from Harrington’s contemporaries, particularly Henry Stubbs in *The Commonwealth of Oceana Put into the Balance, and Found too Light. Or An Account of the Republick of Sparta, with Occasional Animadversions Upon Mr. James Harrington and the Oceanistical Model* (1660), and Matthew Wren in *Considerations on Mr. Harrington’s Common-wealth of Oceana: Restrained to the first Part of the Preliminaries* (1657). In the eighteenth century, however, *Oceana* appeared six times, appended to *Other Works of James Harrington*. The most important of these editions appeared in 1747. To this edition was added Henry Neville’s *Plato Redivivus: or, a Dialogue Concerning Government*. This edition is significant because it reflects Neville’s interests as a republican writer and his links to Harrington, given that these two works defended similar republican ideals. Neville’s work adopted many of the republican principles that Harrington advocated in *Oceana*. *Plato Redivivus*, like
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Oceana, insisted on the balance of property and political power. This edition was reissued with a Dublin imprint and a new title page in 1758. Oceana provoked contradictory responses from the reading public in the eighteenth century. Some regarded it as a practical plan for establishing the best form of government; others regarded it as a work of fantasy. For example, a piece in the Observator of 1706 states that ‘Harrington’s Oceana, and Bacon’s New Atlantis, may properly be call’d schemes of government’. Further, the philosopher David Hume identified Oceana as the most valuable model of an ideal commonwealth in ‘Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth’ (1754). For him, ‘all plans of government, which suppose great reformation, in the manners of mankind, are plainly imaginary. Of this nature, are the Republic of Plato and the Utopia of Sir Thomas More. The Oceana is the only valuable model of a commonwealth that has yet been offered to the public’. It, however, seems to have some defects for Hume: ‘First, its rotation is inconvenient, by throwing men, of whatever ability, by intervals, out of public employments. Secondly, its Agrarian is impracticable…Thirdly, the Oceana provides not a sufficient security for liberty, or the redress of grievances’. Also, an article in the London Chronicle of 1766 advocates Harrington’s work as the perfect example for an ideal commonwealth: ‘The Oceana of James Harrington for practicableness, equality and completeness, is the most perfect model of Commonwealth, that ever was delineated by antient or modern pen’. In contrast, other writers referred to Oceana as a fantasy in the mould of Plato’s and More’s works. For instance, the Prompter of 1735 describes Oceana as a work of ‘so obscure and intricate speculation’. These examples show that eighteenth-century readers and writers often regarded Oceana more as a serious vision than a fantastic speculation.

Towards the end of the century, Oceana and Harrington’s republican principles became a reference point for political thinkers in the time of the revolutions, particularly Thomas Paine, William Godwin, and Thomas Spence among others. A piece in the Diary of Woodfall’s Register published in 1792 remarks that Harrington’s republican ideas were always present in political debates about the best form of government following the French Revolution. It states that there was a consensus that ‘Monarchy was an evil, and … a Republican form of Government was, as Harrington in his Oceana
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calls it, the ancient prudence of the world’. This view was further emphasised by the *Morning Post* which lists Harrington’s work alongside ‘Algernon Sydney’s *Discourses on Government*’, ‘Milton’s prose work’, ‘[James] Burgh’s *disquisitions*’ and Locke’s theories on government as works ‘which till lately were accounted by the booksellers merely waste paper books’, but ‘have so much risen in value, that they sell for double their original prices. Such a rage for Political Reasoning has of late gone forth among the public. In fact, every person who pretends to a library, thinks it a disgrace to be without these books’. James Burgh was known for his radical criticism of government policies and defence of parliamentary reform as illustrated in his *Political Disquisitions: or, An Enquiry into Public Errors, Defects, and Abuses* (1775). This work, which was popular in the last two decades of the eighteenth century, influenced the radical thought of Thomas Paine and possibly Thomas Spence, particularly in the use of the parish system and insistence of agrarian law. Burgh himself wrote a utopian work under the title *Account of the First Settlement, Laws, Form of Government, and Police of the Cessares* (1764).

Despite its popularity and significant influence on political thought throughout eighteenth century as illustrated in these examples, *Oceana* has always proved to be hard to read, digest, and interpret. Like More’s and Bacon’s utopias, it is a hybrid text; it combines the fictional, the polemical, and the philosophical. The fictional dimension of the work has often been disregarded by the scholars of Harrington, who choose to focus instead on its value as a constitutional and political work. The reason for neglecting the fictional aspects of the text was because the ideal commonwealth that Harrington described in his work referred to England directly. *Oceana* was inspired by the military and political unrest in England in the 1640s and early 1650s. In 1649, the monarch was tried and executed. This was followed by the abolition of the House of Lords and the declaration of England as a free state. This victory, that culminated in the elimination of the monarchy and the House of Lords, however, failed to bring about peace and stability to the war-torn country. In the seven years that followed the execution of the king, five parliaments were assembled, and by the time *Oceana* was in print, five parliamentary systems had been installed and proved unsuccessful in bringing
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stability and peace. The intervention of military officers and army generals in civil politics increased the tension and brought about more chaos. In 1653, the army imposed the Instrument of Government which brought Oliver Cromwell to power. The Instrument proposed a coordinate government with a Lord Protector, a Council of State, and a single chamber elected parliament. Harrington, like many others, believed that a better alternative was needed, and he tried to provide one in his *Oceana*. The work appeared in 1656 alongside Henry Vane’s *A Healing Question* and Marchmont Needham’s *The Excellency of a Free State*. Like *Oceana*, these works, Pocock argues, offered ‘programmatic statement[s] of English classical republicanism’. Harrington, however, recognised that a better strategy was needed, and this strategy consisted in the use of narrative to convey his vision.

According to Davis, Harrington was aware that the technical details of his thirty orders were going to prove difficult for his readers to digest. But he was also worried they would ‘foolishly’ reject them because they were hard to understand. So, he used the narrative format to make understanding his orders easier for his readers. Davis further claims, that Harrington used fictional narrative because he wanted to ‘engage his readers’ imaginative participation’ (55). He used the narrative form because he was aware that it is more flexible and could provide him with more space to convey his vision of things as he wanted them to be, not what they were. But the shift from the ‘old dysfunctional narratives … to the new narrative of a perfect and immortal commonwealth which *Oceana* offered’, Davis argues, ‘would require access to power and this meant recourse to Oliver Cromwell, and *Oceana* was accordingly dedicated to him’ (56). Because Harrington uses a fictional or narrative form in *Oceana* to describe his ideal commonwealth, the work exhibits features that might define the work as a utopia. Like Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, Harrington’s *Oceana* marks a shift in the form and content of utopia as shaped or defined by More’s model. Unlike Bacon’s work, however, it does not describe an ideal scientific institute or an imaginary community of a remote island. It rather presents a vision of ideal community created out of balancing the powers of the society in which it is originated. *Oceana* is often associated with More’s *Utopia* and Bacon’s *New Atlantis* as one of the masterpieces of the utopian genre in Britain. It is, however, ‘not a utopia in More’s, Bacon’s, and Campanella’s sense’,
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according to Pocock. For Pocock, *Oceana* does not ‘portray a no-place or utopia, an imaginary island in unknown seas, but a fictionalised yet instantly recognised England’ (xvii).

In terms of structure, *Oceana* is divided into four parts: the Preliminaries, which is mainly an analysis and historical account of the principles of government; the Council of Legislators, which describes the fictional setting up of the best way for devising an ideal state; the Model of the Commonwealth of Oceana, which is a description of the constitution and institutions of this commonwealth; the Corollary, which is a reflection on the history and consequences of the first fifty years of the commonwealth of Oceana (7). Prior to the description of the ideal commonwealth of Oceana, the text reflects on a variety of constitutional forms of government in ancient civilisations in order to emphasise the validity of the republican form of government that the author devises. Harrington delineates in his work a vision of a utopian state, based on his belief that he knew why all previous constitutional experiments failed. Following his commentary on the reasons for the failure of each of the previous constitutional schemes, he presents his constitution as a model that has eliminated all these causes of failure. This is represented by two master narratives that run throughout the text. The first, according to Davis, ‘delineated the vulnerability of all past governments to the unregulated flow of history around two principles of analysis, Empire and Authority. The second showed how the flow of history could be brought under regulation by the erection of an entirely new polity, an Equal Commonwealth, which would be perfect and immortal’. These two lines of narrative are the closest Harrington’s work comes to More’s *Utopia* as far as structure is concerned. As the first book of *Utopia* is a dialogue in which the social problems of More’s society are reflected on, the first line of narrative in *Oceana* is also a reflection on ancient governments and the reasons of their failure. Similarly, like Book II of *Utopia*, the second line of narrative in *Oceana* presents an answer to what has been critiqued earlier. Harrington is not reflecting on the problems of England as such, but inviting English people to adopt his plan for reform. The reader is not asked to compare the ideal and the corrupt, and judge the validity of the latter to solve the problems of the former; rather he is invited to compare the form of government proposed in the text with

---
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examples of previous governments that failed, and to be encouraged to adopt the ideal programme at hand.

Further, the element of satire which was missing from Bacon’s *New Atlantis* is present in *Oceana*. The first example of satire appears on the book’s title page. Here Harrington supplies an epigraph from Horace’s first Book of *Satires*, which reads: Tantalus a labris sitiens fuginetia captat/ Flumina: quid rides? Mutate nomine, de te/ Fabula narratur.\(^80\) This epigraph translates to ‘Thirsty Tantalus grasps at streams escaping from his lips. What are you laughing at? With the name changed, the story is told about you’.\(^81\) The reference is clearly to England only ‘with the name changed’. The critical character of the text, according to Nelson, is then highlighted from the outset. It is true that the book does not explicitly list any social problems or illnesses of society that needs to be addressed, but what this quotation indicates is that for England to avoid the destiny of Tantalus, it has to follow the program described in *Oceana*. People should abandon greed and hunger for wealth in favour of the ‘equal agrarian’ that is the equal redistribution of land’, which stands as the central foundational element of his system.\(^82\)

The element of satire can be also discerned in the character of Lord Archon (Oliver Cromwell), the Legislator and founder of Oceana. Harrington dedicated his work to Cromwell and modelled his Lord Archon after him. However, the ending that Harrington delineated for his Lord Archon, as the founder of Oceana who establishes the Commonwealth and then gives up power as ‘the Greatest of Captains/ the Best of Princes/ The Happiest of Legislators/ The Most Sincere of Christians’\(^83\), is perhaps the course that he wished Cromwell to take, but was certain that Cromwell was not going to.\(^84\) The end that Harrington draws for the character of Lord Archon in the text is a representation of what he wished Cromwell would do in reality. In fact, Cromwell responded to Harrington’s call for him to give up power by stating that ‘the Gentleman had like to trepan him out of his power, but what he got by the sword he would not quit for a little paper shot’.\(^84\) The ‘little paper shot’ is a direct reference to the irrelevance and impracticality of Harrington’s work. Though it presented a profound vision for
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reform, the example set by *Oceana* was deemed irrelevant at the time due to the continuous conflicts among several political and religious warring factions.

Further, *Oceana*, like *Utopia*, employs paratexts to give the reader an idea of what he is going to read by the time he gets to the description of the ideal commonwealth. The fictional paratexts here are as extensive as in More’s text. In addition to the epigraph from Horace’s *Satires* and the dedication of the book to Cromwell, the reader encounters an ‘Epistle to the Reader’ and ‘the Introduction or Order of the Work’ before reaching the first part of the book, ‘The Preliminaries’. In the Epistle to the Reader, Harrington notes that he started writing this work two years prior to its publication, and in ‘the Introduction’, he explains the structural division of the text. *Oceana*, thus, still maintains some of the features of the original model represented by More’s *Utopia*, despite the alterations that the text undergoes.

Thematically, Harrington also makes certain changes in his discussion of issues tackled in the original model. Such themes as religious tolerance, warfare and support of the citizen militia at the expense of the standing armies, and election recur in both works. However, the defining theme of each of the two works is different. While More is concerned with justice as the main aspect of his ideal community, Harrington’s vision is more constitutional. His commonwealth has the equal distribution of landed property as its main foundation. What he intended to do was to transform England from a country torn by violence and chaos into a stable, well-organised nation governed by laws, not by corrupt politicians. Every man in his commonwealth is under the rule of the law. No man possesses the power to alter the state. The corner stone of his commonwealth is an Agrarian Law for redistributing lands equally. To this is added voting by secret ballot, both for electing the people’s representatives and also the members of Parliament, and the rotation of offices, where one third of the members of Parliament and other elected bodies are replaced every year, and the whole set up is changed every three years. The agrarian he calls the ‘foundation’, and the others (ballot and rotation of office) he describes as ‘superstructures’. It is the balance between these divisions that gradually contributes to the making and sustenance of the ideal commonwealth:

An equal commonwealth is such a one as is equal both in the balance or foundation, and in the superstructure; that is to say, in her agrarian
law and in her rotation. As the agrarian answers to the foundation, so does rotation to the superstructures. Equal rotation is equal vicissitude in government, or succession to magistracy conferred for such convenient terms, enjoying equal vacations, as take in the whole body by parts, succeeding others, through the free election or suffrage of the people.  

He believes that a swift and accurate application of his republican system would lead to stability and permanent peace. Harrington’s republican principles as illustrated in this system played a significant role in shaping the political thought during the time of the French Revolution. Many of its principles such as the balance of power and property, voting by ballot, and rotation of office recurred in the utopias of the time. In addition, the work also influenced the works of Harrington’s contemporaries, particularly his fellow republican Henry Neville as is evident in *Plato Redivivus* and *The Isle of Pines*.

**Henry Neville’s *The Isle of Pines***

Henry Neville was an associate of the republican Harrington, and a member of his Rota Club. He was known as an astute defender of Harrington’s theories and sought to implement part of Harrington’s political schemes during the 1659 Parliament in which he was a leader of the Harringtonian group. Thomas Hobbes believed that Neville might have had a hand in Harrington’s *Oceana*: ‘Mr. T. Hobbes was wont to say that Henry Nevill had a finger in that pye; and ’tis like enough. That ingeniose Tractat, together with his and H. Nevill’s smart discourses and inculcations, dayly at Coffee-houses, made many Proselytes’.  

Neville contributed to the political debates of his time through a series of pamphlets and satirical libels such as *The Parliament of Ladies* (1647), *News from the New Exchange, or the Commonwealth of Ladies* (1650), *Shuffling, Cutting and Dealing in a Game of Piquet* (1659), a work entitled *The Isle of Pines* (1668), and a profound republican treatise entitled *Plato Redivivus* (1681).
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My focus in this section is on *The Isle of Pines*. This work’s playful dimension corresponds to the fantastic character associated with More’s *Utopia* and represents a trend in utopian writing that continued into the eighteenth century. Like More’s work, *The Isle of Pines* could be interpreted as a jest meant to entertain the readers. The work, though it claimed to be a ‘True Relation’ of the experience of George Pine and his female companions on an uninhabited island, as suggested by its subtitle, was regarded as a joke or ‘sham’, according to Anthony Wood. Wood wrote on his copy that ‘when first published, ’twas look’d upon as a mere sham or piece of drollery’. This work, unlike the utopias of Bacon, and Harrington does not make explicit references to More’s *Utopia*. We do not have any evidence that Neville read More’s work or had it in mind while writing *The Isle of Pines*. There are conjectural links between Neville’s and More’s works, however. In addition to some thematic parallels, Neville’s work recalls More’s *Utopia* in terms of techniques. He uses certain devices used by More to attach a sense of reality to his fictional work. More, for example, uses letters written by real people such as Peter Giles for that purpose. Neville uses the same technique by introducing Van Sloetten’s narrative through two letters written by a historically real figure, the Dutch merchant Abraham Keek, attempting to present the text as a real travel narrative. He, further, attempts to add a sense of reality to the text by giving the exact location and latitude of his island. However, this is followed by an attempt to undermine the reality of the exact location of the island by suggesting that there might be a mistake in the number of the leagues. This qualifies *The Isle of Pines* as utopia because it describes ‘a no-place’ which, however, is used to reflect on the problems of England at the time, according to Mahlberg. Nonetheless, unlike the utopias of More, Bacon, and Harrington, *The Isle of Pines* does not present any vision of an ideal society.

Neville’s work was written in the period that followed the English Revolution and the Restoration of the Stuart Monarchy. Its publishing circumstances are complex, to say the least. It appeared in three distinct parts. The first part, which constitutes the main body of the text and narrates the story of the shipwreck of George Pine and his four women companions on an uninhabited island, appeared in June 1668. The second part, a


letter supposedly written by the Dutch sailor Henry Cornelius Van Sloetten that relates the circumstances of the discovery of the island of the English Pines and narrates the history of the island as given by its latest ruler, William Pine, appeared on July 22, 1668. Five days later, a third piece, which comprises the first two pieces with additional linking material, appeared.90

The utopian dimension of the text is manifested in the island setting, the act of naming, and the attempt of George Pine and his ancestors to establish a particular social order on the uninhabited island by attempting to lay the foundation for a good government that protects this order, trying to transform the island from a state of war to a state of society through the introduction of laws. *The Isle of Pines* is set on an island located in unknown waters and isolated by its geographical location. The island in Neville’s work being a large Island, and disjoyned, and out of sight of any other Land, was wholly uninhabited by any people, neither was there any hurtful beast to annoy us. But on the contrary, the Countrey so very pleasant being always clothed with green, and full of pleasant fruits, and variety of Birds, ever warm, and never colder then in *England* in *September*: so that this place (had it the culture that skilful people might bestow on it) would prove a *Paradise*.91

This description of the island gives the text an ‘Arcadian’ rather than utopian character represented by the serenity of the scene and the harmony between man and nature, where any act or desire for domination is absent. Mahlberg argues that the experience of George Pine and his female companions is a manifestation of a group of people living in a state of nature.92 The state of idleness and abundance in which Pine and the four female survivors find themselves leads to a state of lust, and turns the work into a narrative of sexual liberty, with Pine taking possession of the four women:

Idleness and fullness of everything begot in me a desire of enjoying the women, beginning now to grow more familiar; I had persuaded the two Maids to let me lie with them, which I did at first in private, but

---

after, custome taking away shame (there being none but us) we did it more openly, as our lust gave us liberty; afterwards my Masters Daughter was content also to do as we did.\textsuperscript{93}

Pine and the four women lived on the island choosing not to have any restrictions or obligations to conventional morality concerning sex prior to the birth of their children. They lived according to their natural tendencies and were satisfied with their conditions.

On the surface, the text might be read as a sexual fantasy or a work of ‘Rabelaisian humour’ which Neville wrote ‘to amuse himself’ as Caroline Robbins notes.\textsuperscript{94} Beneath the veil of sexual indulgence, however, lies a discourse of the dominant philosophical trends of the period that were concerned with the origin of society and the best form of government, particularly those of Harrington and Hobbes. Following this period of sexual liberty, and the birth of the first generation of their children, George Pine realised the need for some sort of social order. He, therefore, divided his children into four groups according to their mothers. He also divided the island into four parts and allocated one for each of these groups. The themes of land division, and organising people in social and political groups feature prominently in the utopias of More, Bacon and Harrington. It is an important part of the overall setup of these utopias since each of the utopias in question offers a plan or a model for a better society. In More’s and Harrington’s utopias, people are organised in groups according to their roles. In Bacon’s, scientists are organised in groups according to their specialisations. In Neville’s work, however, this process is executed on familial basis. At this point in the narrative, the character of the text shifts from the Arcadian to the utopian; this is marked by insistence on organising the community and on the need for laws and consequent social order that can maintain the model of coexistence as proposed by the founder. Simply put, the text’s utopian character is represented in the need for order and organisation. The state of ease that George Pine and the four women have enjoyed prior to the birth of their children is now replaced by the need for an order to rule the island.

This system, however, fails to maintain the condition of coexistence that George Pine hoped for. This is evident in the consequences of his earlier misdeeds, particularly the acts of fornication, whose effects have become more visible in the third generation of
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his descendants. Necessity, which he used as a justification for marrying his sons and daughters of the first generation, is now replaced by lust. The moral deterioration of society at this stage is attributed to ‘a neglect of hearing the Bible read’, and is manifested in the acts of whoredom, incest, and adultery.\textsuperscript{95} The punishment for these acts, issued by Henry, the Pines’ new prince, proved ineffective to stop the degeneration of society. Neville, like More, Bacon, and Harrington, acknowledged the need for law to maintain order. He believed in the need for a form of government to impose authority and manage the affairs of the community. Yet, when compared to the utopias of More, Bacon, and Harrington, Mahlberg argues, Neville’s utopia never reached the levels of order and organisation that characterise those utopias.\textsuperscript{96} As far as the founders of utopias in these works are concerned, ‘George Pine is no great legislator like King Utopus or Olphaus Megaletor, and certainly no early modern Lycurgus’.\textsuperscript{97} Order is established on the island through ‘piecemeal reform’, and because of the absence of the ‘the right foundations, the ideal society could not be achieved’.\textsuperscript{98} George Pine’s failure to establish a solid foundation for his community leads to a state of anarchy instigated by some of its members following his death. In other words, the absence of laws and the death of the figure of authority on the island leave the community in a state of chaos. The portrayal of George Pine as a patriarchal ruler who prioritised sexual indulgence over looking after the state of affairs on the island can be viewed as an implicit attack on Charles II who was known for his sexual adventures and negligence of the political affairs of England.

At the same time, the work could be read as a criticism of the deterioration of the English military and commercial powers, and the decline of the English maritime authority in comparison with that of their Dutch rivals. The first scene of encounter between the naked English Pines and the superior Dutch sailors is a symbolic manifestation of the widening gap between the two nations in terms of commerce, maritime, military, and political influence. The Dutch sailors’ status as being superior to the natives is emphasised from the start. The natives, in comparison, are depicted as
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naked and uncivilised.\textsuperscript{99} According to Mahlberg, the arrival of the Dutch sailors during the rule of William Pine brings the text back to the context of seventeenth-century maritime and military rivalry by pitching representatives of two great sea powers against each other.\textsuperscript{100} The encounter between the English islanders and the visiting Dutch sailors in an illustration, or, as Adam Beach puts it, a case study of ‘English degeneracy and Dutch supremacy’.\textsuperscript{101} The encounter is meant to criticise the deteriorating condition of English politics and influence under monarchical rule.\textsuperscript{102} The English islanders are depicted as people living in primitive conditions in comparison to the Dutch sailors. This, for instance, is manifested in the Dutch sailor’s description of the Prince’s palace and the houses of the majority of the islanders:

Having refreshed ourselves, they invited us to the Pallace of their Price or chief Ruler, some two miles distant off from the place where we landed; which we found to be about the bigness of one of our ordinary village houses, it was supported with rough unhewn pieces of Timber, and covered very artificially with boughs, so that it would keep out the greatest showers of Rain.\textsuperscript{103}

Further, the sense of inferiority of the islanders to the visiting sailors is emphasised in the scene of the first encounter between the two parties. Unlike the Utopians and Bensalemites in More’s and Bacon’s utopias respectively, it is the islanders in Neville’s work that have to identify themselves to the Dutch sailors, not the other way round. Also, the contrast between the clothes of the islanders and those of the Dutch sailors, and the poor quality of food are all examples of their inferiority. In addition, Neville’s delineation of the islanders as unarmed people in comparison with the superior military power of the Dutch sailors could be read as a reflection on the state of the military capacity of England after the second Anglo-Dutch War of 1665-1667. The effect of that war on the English military power was disastrous because the navy of the United Provinces destroyed the majority of the English fleet at Chatham.\textsuperscript{104} It is significant to mention that Neville never attacks the Dutch in his work. His critique appears to be
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aimed at the English monarchy under the Stuarts. As a republican, Neville continued to see the Dutch as natural allies over the French. The Dutch sailors never attempt to colonise the island or contest the right of the Pines to it. Rather, they provide the Pines with useful tools and help their king quell the civil unrest on the island. The Pines were in possession of the land but not of the techniques to make the most of it. Neville, like his friend Harrington, acknowledged the importance of people for the establishment of the commonwealth. For Harrington, people were ‘the materials of a commonwealth’. For Neville, people are the main component for the achievement of national prosperity. The Isle of Pines does not lack labourers; it is well populated. What the Pines lack, however, is a sense of direction and purpose, Mahlberg claims. For Neville, colonisation does not only mean the ownership of land. It is a combination of the possession of land, the efficiency of its cultivation, the use of labour and the trade of its products. However, the way the Pines are depicted in the text indicates that the English nation is not ready to adopt this formula. Neville portrays the English as idle and lazy people who enjoy lying idly on ‘Mossey Banks’. In contrast, the Dutch are associated with authority. This is exemplified in the manner they restored order to the isle following an incident of unrest. Unable to put down the unrest instigated by one of the descendants of the Phills, William Pine resorts to the Dutch sailors for help. The state of anarchy on the island is triggered by sexual desire. It is not the desire for power, but the power of desire that causes unrest on the island. Henry Pine had enacted a set of laws to maintain the unity and continuity of the island community. These laws which impose severe punishments on those who commit any acts of blasphemy, rape, adultery and defamation of the Governor, seem to have worked during the reign of Henry. However, before the Dutch sailors’ departure, a rebellion breaks out, demonstrating the failure of Henry’s penal legal system. It is not these laws, but the arms of the Dutch that are used to put down the unrest. The ineffectiveness of the laws imposed by the monarchy could, thus, be read as a call for a new form of government, a constitutional setup that can end the state of war on the island. This form of government is outlined by Neville in *Plato Redivivus*, where he calls for adopting a form of government based on the consent of the majority and abandoning the rule of the one. For him, a form of
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constitutional government founded on consent is intended for the ‘preservation of the governed; and not for the exaltation and greatness of the person or persons appointed to govern’.\textsuperscript{110}

The \textit{Isle of Pines} is thus a work that has much political and historical significance. It has a Harringtonian or republican dimension, though it does not describe an ideal society. The model that Neville presents in \textit{The Isle of Pines} is not meant to be imitated by the English people and lawmakers to improve the conditions of England. Instead, the United Provinces stands as an alternative model to be emulated in England.\textsuperscript{111} The work could hence be read as a criticism of the corrupt and declining England under the reign of the monarchy, describing the state of deterioration, both moral and political, into which English society has descended. Like earlier utopias, however, \textit{The Isle of Pines} reflects on themes such as colonialism, patriarchal authority, and social hierarchy. It also stresses the theme of order and organisation. For Neville, the failure of the laws imposed by the monarch to maintain peace and stability in the community necessitates the introduction of a constitutional government based on the theory of consent, and on the republican ideals expressed by Harrington in \textit{Oceana} and defended by Neville in \textit{Plato Redivivus}.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Throughout the seventeenth century, there were two broad ways in which people approached utopia. In the first half of the century, utopia was often regarded as a serious social or political vision for a better society. In the second half, it was associated with playfulness, satire, and even frivolity. These two understandings of utopia, however, are not mutually exclusive. In fact, what makes the responses of readers and writers more complex is that they often responded to both ways of understanding utopia. Some of the utopian authors who consciously followed More’s model as set in \textit{Utopia} chose to emphasise one strand or the other. On the one hand, Bacon’s \textit{New Atlantis} and Harrington’s \textit{The Commonwealth of Oceana}, for example, correspond to the association
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of *Utopia* with serious social and political commentary. These two texts were clear responses to More’s work as they referred to More’s text or some of its aspects explicitly. However, the social and political orders presented in these two works were different from the one advocated by More in *Utopia*. For More, the elements of justice and equality are the backbone for a successful social order. Bacon however, advocates scientific advancement as the key for establishing an ideal society. Harrington, in turn, focuses on the importance of constitutional laws for achieving the ideal commonwealth. Though different in terms of the social and political orders they propose, these works still discuss a number of themes that More’s *Utopia* tackles. Among these, organisation, secrecy, private property, and citizen militia are the most prominent.

On the other hand, Neville’s *The Isle of Pines* drew on the playfulness associated with *Utopia*. Neville’s work was looked upon by some seventeenth-century readers as a playful literary hoax, not as a serious political discourse. This playful treatment of *Utopia* as a work intended for entertainment continued into the eighteenth century. This is illustrated in some eighteenth-century works such as Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson*, Manley’s *New Atalantis*, and the anonymously published *The Modern Atalantis*. Some of these works treated utopia light heartedly. While Bacon’s *New Atlantis* and Harrington’s *Oceana* followed More’s example in presenting utopian visions for ideal societies, Neville’s *Isle of Pines* and these eighteenth-century works were different from More’s *Utopia* in terms of form and content. They, however, could still be viewed as significant parts of utopian traditions established by *Utopia*. They drew on it in certain aspects, particularly its playful dimension, the island setting, themes of secrecy, religion, warfare, and the need for social order. Manley, for instance, draws on Bacon’s work in her treatment of the issue of secrecy. Further, her work recalls Neville’s in its use of sexual affairs as a means for a deeper criticism of political corruption. Defoe’s work draws on More’s work in the island setting and such themes as religious tolerance and the need for laws. It also reflects on Bacon’s text in Crusoe’s employment of an experimental approach to his daily life on the island. In its treatment of the relationship between property and power, it draws on Harrington’s and Neville’s works. And finally like *The Isle of Pines*, Defoe’s work insists on the need for laws in the process of constructing society from the state of nature into that of a commonwealth.
The significance of the works discussed in this chapter is that they drew responses from eighteenth-century utopian authors. They also considerably influenced the utopias produced throughout the eighteenth century. The fantastic or satirical aspects of these works continued to feature in works such as *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequels, Manley’s *New Atalantis*, Haywood’s *Memoirs of Certain Island* and many more. Moreover, such themes as Bacon’s isolationist policies, secrecy and experimental empiricism influenced Defoe’s and Manley’s works respectively. Among the works discussed here, *The Commonwealth of Oceana* and More’s *Utopia* have been the most influential. Their impact, particularly in practical aspects such as the citizen militia, rotation of office, secret ballot, and parish system respectively, appeared in several utopian works produced in the second part of the eighteenth century, particularly Thomas Spence’s utopias in the last two decades of the century.
3. Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe and the Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe: A Utopian Experiment?*

In this chapter, I argue that *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequel *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* present a utopian vision that is initiated in the former and accomplished in the latter. This vision can be best discerned through an analysis of the two books as a single unit. It starts with the reform of man through a series of stern tests undertaken by Crusoe while in solitude on the island, and concludes with the establishment of a collective system on the island. Despite the extensive critical attention that Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* has received since its publication, there is still room for further exploration of the utopian aspects of the text. A survey of the critical studies on its utopian potential shows disagreement as to whether the text belongs to a utopian tradition of writing or not. For Harry Ross, who believes that a utopia should be concerned with the welfare and happiness of the whole community, not of the individual, *Robinson Crusoe* is not a utopia because ‘you cannot have a utopia of one’.\(^\text{112}\) What Defoe is concerned with in this work, he argues, is the condition of man in a state of nature, rather than the construction of a specific social or political order. James Holstun, moreover, believes that *Robinson Crusoe* belongs to a trend of writing at the start of the eighteenth century that was intended for the glorification of nature and the relationship between man and nature. He refers to that trend as the ‘robinsonade’. Though it presents a cultural alternative, *Robinson Crusoe* is not a utopia in the mould of the texts he discusses in his work, and to which he refers as Puritan utopias, for two reasons: ‘First, while it does portray an alternative cultural totality, it is a quasi-journalistic fiction written for the literary marketplace rather than a political fiction written as part of a political debate. Second, while its plot is not completely secular, it is thoroughly demillennialised’.\(^\text{113}\) Holstun’s argument seems to be based on his focus only on the first part of the Crusoe story without giving any attention to *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. This reading seems to miss the point that the two parts, considered as a single unit, portray a shift in the political constitution of the island from absolute monarchy in *Robinson Crusoe* to a form of commonwealth in *The Farther


Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. In this commonwealth, shared opinions and consent of the inhabitants are the measures of rule. The work, moreover, mirrors the political changes in England in the late seventeenth century. It tackles some of the most debated issues of the time such as colonisation, monarchism, the commonwealth, and the best form of government. Further, that the fiction used in the text is quasi-journalistic as Holstun calls it, and that the work was intended for the marketplace, are not sufficient objections to the work’s utopian potential, given that Neville used the same type of fiction in The Isle of Pines so as to facilitate the transmission of his work. The type of fiction that Defoe used in the Crusoe story conforms to his style of writing as a journalist or reporter who made his living from writing pamphlets and editing journals. Crusoe, for example, keeps a journal of his activities recording his day-to-day life. We should also remember that Defoe’s work does not delineate an ideal utopia in the manner of More’s and Bacon’s; it describes in detail the process through which society is constructed starting with one man and developing into a community of men. The text also has a religious dimension that extends over the two parts of the story and contributes to the arguably utopian experiment in question. The majority of the first part focuses mainly on the relationship between man and Providence, and man’s endeavour to find God in difficult times of trouble and solitude, manifested in the moral transformation of Robinson Crusoe to a better man. The second part emphasises religious tolerance and that the coexistence of different religious faiths in the same community is feasible. Like Holstun, David Fausett remarks that Defoe ‘makes no attempt to present a utopia’ in Robinson Crusoe. His work, however, initiated a new form of ideal writing that replaced ‘older styles of utopianism’ in the eighteenth century. He believes that Robinson Crusoe is ‘devoid of strictly utopian content’, despite its use of the device of ‘imaginary voyage’. Even though Defoe’s work is utopian-influenced, the use of the ‘imaginary voyage’, however, is not its only link to earlier utopias. It is not devoid of utopian content because it tackles such themes as the island setting, property, isolation, secrecy, oaths, and the need for social and political orders, which occupy central positions in older utopias.

In contrast to Ross, Holstun, and Fausett, critics such as Gregory Claeys, A.L. Morton and Christine Rees are convinced that *Robinson Crusoe* is a utopian work intended for the expression of a utopian vision. Claeys describes *Robinson Crusoe* as ‘individualist utopia’ where ‘the ideal of the well-ordered society is lived out mostly in solitude, partly taking the form of a fantasy of power (Crusoe becomes governor of his island), and a rumination on the development of conscience and the idea of returning to a state of nature’. 116 A.L. Morton claims that ‘Daniel Defoe is the characteristic writer and *Robinson Crusoe* is the characteristic utopia of the early eighteenth century’. 117 He, as a Marxist, analyses the text, alongside Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, in terms of its hero’s dominant political and economic endeavours, and claims that the success of the bourgeois hero has changed the mode of utopian writing at the time:

The individual hero, the full-scale bourgeois man, having transformed England, has now reached the shores of Utopia… It is not only what Crusoe and Gulliver see which is important, but what they do, and their Utopias are presented not in the abstract but very much through the eyes of the visitors… they are not mere observers but actors and their actions change and modify the Utopias which they describe. 118

He, implicitly, but rightly, suggests that Defoe’s work, at least, presents a different type of utopia where the focus is not on the description of an already established ideal society, but on the making of one. His analysis, however, seems to neglect the value of hard work and the efforts that the bourgeois man puts into the making of the new utopia, focussing instead on the titles of Defoe’s and Swift’s works to argue for the advent of a new type of utopian writing. The Manuels adopt Morton’s stance on the significance of the bourgeois hero in the new type of utopia. They argue that *Robinson Crusoe* represents a new form of utopia, where ‘many elements are preserved from the classical Morean utopia’. 119 Like Morton, they categorise Crusoe as ‘a kind of aggressive bourgeois Prometheus’ (433). For them, the new form of utopia is ‘wedded to the utopian mode’, represented by earlier utopias, ‘and helps transform it from a mere hope or wish with no great prospect of fulfilment into an assertive proclamation that man can do anything fresh if he has the will and the wit’ (433). Christine Rees follows Morton’s
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and the Manuel’s lead, identifying Robinson Crusoe with a new type of utopia. Her Utopian Imagination and Eighteenth-Century Fiction offers the most comprehensive analysis of Defoe’s work in a utopian context to date. She cites Robinson Crusoe as a prime example of eighteenth-century utopias, arguing that ‘eighteenth-century utopian fiction might be said to begin with that most unlikely protagonist for a utopian narrative, the man cut off from society altogether’. She refers to Crusoe as the discoverer and founder of utopia, ‘man as island’, and describes his dinner with his animals as ‘the classic utopian ritual of a communal meal’ (76, 86). Defoe’s work, she claims, ‘conforms to the [utopian] type’ because it gives extra significance to the ‘subject of food’ which ‘occupies an important place in the utopian tradition’ (79). In fact, it is not the subject of food but the rituals of eating that are central to utopia, as the abundance of food is not an issue in the utopian communities of More, Bacon, and Neville. She, moreover, places Crusoe in line with the founders of earlier utopias, claiming that ‘like other utopian founders, having ensured the means of survival, [Crusoe] pays close attention to topography’ (80). Rees, however, seems to overlook the fact that the existence of utopian founders in earlier utopias of More and Bacon is intentional, while that of Crusoe is coincidental, having been shipwrecked on the uninhabited island. Defoe, nonetheless, follows Neville’s lead by using the same device of marooning his utopian founder on a deserted island in The Isle of Pines, the only text that approximates Defoe’s work in terms of structure and sequence of events. Further, Rees, whose critical analysis of the utopian dimension of the Crusoe story extends to The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, seems to choose less significant points to support her argument, relying instead on the rhetorical device of repeating the term ‘utopian’ almost every time she mentions Defoe’s work in order to establish her point.

Placing Robinson Crusoe and its sequel, The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, in a utopian context is a task most critics have failed to fulfil. Except for Rees, who makes a passing reference to the existence of Robinson’s translation of More’s Utopia in Defoe’s and Farewell’s libraries, critics have not presented any substantial proof that Defoe was aware of earlier utopian works. Rees’s remark itself is problematic because whether this copy of Utopia belonged to Defoe or Farewell is not established. If
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this copy belonged to Defoe, it is interesting that it was Robinson’s not Burnet’s translation of *Utopia* because during the years of Defoe’s education, it was Burnet’s and not Robinson’s translation that was in circulation, and we might therefore expect that he would be more likely to have read or known Burnet’s version of *Utopia*. Further, the task is made even more difficult by the publication circumstances of the earlier utopias of More, Bacon, Harrington, and Neville. Defoe was 24 when Burnet’s translation of More’s *Utopia* first appeared in print. However, no editions of More’s work were published in the three decades preceding the composition of Defoe’s work. Also, the last edition of Bacon’s *New Atlantis* to be published before the appearance of *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequel was reprinted as an appendix to *Sylva Sylvarum* in 1683, and the last version of *Oceana* that was in the press before the appearance of *Robinson Crusoe* appeared in 1700.

The purpose of citing these critical studies is to show that, with the exception of Rees, they have based their judgments of the utopian potential of Defoe’s work exclusively on the first part of what became the Crusoe trilogy, and ignored the critical value that examining *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* as one work of two parts could have contributed to their assessments. My focus will be on the process through which the island community is transformed from the state of nature into that of society throughout the two parts of Defoe’s work. In fact, the publication history of *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* suggests that the two works were often read as one, given the numerous editions and reissues in which the two works were published together rather than separately. This was often done by the booksellers, but whether Defoe had a hand in it is not known. The two works appeared together on eight occasions during Defoe’s life and on many more after his death. Further, the subtitle of *The Farther Adventures* describing it as ‘the second and last part’ of Crusoe’s life deems it necessary to read it as a continuation of his story in part one, and not as a separate work. Nonetheless, critics of Defoe’s novel have often ignored *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. Published in 1719, it represents the second volume of what became the Crusoe trilogy, the third part being *Serious Reflections During the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, a six-essay volume comprising philosophical reflections on the fictional adventures of Robinson Crusoe, published in 1720.
The publication history of *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* indicates that the text was published with *Robinson Crusoe* more often than the latter was published on its own during the eighteenth century. Melissa Free notes that the 'English-language publications of *Crusoe* in the eighteenth century generally included either all three volumes (nearly 50 percent) or the first two volumes (just under 47 percent); less than 4 percent were made up of *RCI* alone'. While the first edition of 1719 and 'the second issue' of the first edition were published separately, other editions were often printed with the first volume. For example, the ESTC indicates that the 1722 edition of *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* was probably appended to the sixth edition of *Robinson Crusoe*; the 1726 edition was published with the seventh edition of the first part; the 1733 edition indicates that volumes two and three share a special title page: "The farther adventures of Robinson Crusoe. Vol. II and III, printed in the year 1733", and the 1736 edition was published with the eighth edition of volume one. *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* was also printed with editions of *Robinson Crusoe* that appeared in 1753, 1755, 1761, 1766, 1772 and 1778 to mention just a few. In most of these editions, there were few hints of a break between the two texts, where *The Farther Adventures* has a separate title page. For example, one of the 1722 editions of *The Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* indicates that parts 2 and 3 have separate title pages, ‘but pagination and register are continuous’. This was abridged by Thomas Gent. The subtitle of the 1726 edition also states that ‘the whole three volumes [were] faithfully abridg’d and set forth with cuts’. This reading the two parts of Crusoe’s story as one unit is important for analysing the utopian project that Defoe presents in his work.

Throughout *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, Defoe depicts a utopian experiment which starts as an individualistic utopia in the former and develops to a collective utopia in the latter. The individualistic utopia is achieved through the moral reform of the protagonist, whereas the collective utopia is fulfilled
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through transforming the state of nature into a collective state of society based on the Lockean model presented in the *Two Treatises of Government* (1689). In the course of the chapter, I will investigate the contextual and textual connections between Defoe’s work and the earlier utopias of More, Bacon, Harrington, and Neville. I will do that by focussing on Defoe’s education, his utopian tendencies, and on certain themes that take a central position in Defoe’s work, their connective value and centrality in the utopias of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The most important of these themes are the function of the island as a site for the utopian experiment, its links with the themes of secrecy and isolation, the transition from secrecy to social contract, the relationship between property possession and power, and the transformation of the political and social orders of the island. For instance, the island setting which is a common feature of the utopias of More, Bacon, and Neville occupies a central position in Defoe’s work; the relationship between property ownership and power features prominently in Harrington’s *Oceana*; and the necessity for laws to establish a utopian community from the basic state of nature is a central theme in Neville’s *Isle of Pines*. This will offer a new insight into Defoe’s work, and highlight its utopian dimension.

First, Defoe’s utopian interests could be linked back to his education at the Dissenting Academy in Newington Green. There, he was educated by Charles Morton whose speculative tendencies might have influenced Defoe. Both Christine Rees and Ilse Vickers discuss the influences of Charles Morton and his teachings on shaping Defoe’s utopian ideas. Rees focuses on the links between Morton’s philosophy and the utopias of More and Bacon. Morton, she stresses, was an acquaintance of Bishop John Wilkins who speculated about travel to the moon, and whom Defoe acknowledges as a pioneer in lunar travel in both *An Essay Upon Projects* (1697) and *The Consolidator* (1705).\(^{127}\) Morton was also the author of *Eutaxia*, a treatise on politics, assumed to be an imitation of More’s *Utopia*. The treatise itself, Rees says, is no longer extant, though Morton probably used it as a text book for his students at the Academy (73). Its title, however, seems to recall that of More’s work.
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Ilse Vickers’s focus is on the importance to Defoe of Charles Morton’s role in the ‘Philosophical Clubb’, which was modelled on Bacon’s Solomon House. Its members were specialists in such sciences as geography, philosophy, medicine, and anatomy. More importantly, one of the members of the Clubb, John Wilkins, was a dedicated follower of Bacon. Through Morton, Defoe learned about Bacon’s experimental philosophy and was introduced to what was called natural sciences. In his depiction of the character of Robinson Crusoe, Vickers claims, Defoe put into practice all experimental theories he learned about in the Academy, endowing his man with such skills as observation and experimentation. This is manifested in ‘Crusoe’s meticulous study of the world of things, [which] is in part a fictional rendering of the experimental scientists’ habit of mind’. Further, Vickers rightly notes that Defoe does not instil in his protagonists all aspects of Bacon’s complex experimental science: ‘Looking at Bacon’s whole scientific programme, it is clear that Defoe is not interested in induction and aphorisms, nor in Bacon’s method as a totality. The aspects of Bacon’s philosophy in which he is interested are those which an ordinary man can do and use’. In the text, Crusoe is depicted as an ordinary man separated from the rest of humanity and forced by his circumstances to struggle for survival in a primitive natural environment. His circumstances force him to depend on his own resources to survive. His successful handling of the state of nature on the island corresponds to Bacon’s experimental and empirical philosophy. Crusoe is not concerned with establishing a state of harmony with his natural environment. He manipulates nature to protect himself, and uses it resources to create the means for his survival. For instance, he adopts Bacon’s experimental philosophy in the incident where he attempts to make pots and jars for his own use. Like a scientist, Crusoe reflects on the process of making pots from earth by using fire, stating that he ‘let them stand in that heat about 5 or 6 hours , till [he] found one of them, tho’ it did not crack, did melt or run, for the sand which was mixed with clay melted by the violence of the heat’. He repeats the experiment many times till it is successful. His approach to the experiment is empirical. He also learns from his mistakes when it comes to choosing the right seasons for planting and harvesting his crops, in a direct
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128 The Philosophical Clubb (an early version of the Royal Society of London) met weekly at Wadham College in Oxford to discuss natural and experimental philosophical issues related to topics such as physics, medicine, and husbandry.


reference to Bacon’s philosophy which relies on observation and learning step-by-step from mistakes in experiments. Vickers, further, remarks that Charles Morton’s collected lectures, also called *The Compendium Physicae*, reflect ‘the way in which Bacon’s disciples adopted the principles of experimental science’, and ‘shows how these ideas were taught by Morton and came to influence Defoe’—indeed, Defoe’s approach to reality cannot be grasped apart from *The Compendium*. It was at the academy that he first learnt that the careful study of the world... is the best education’.  

It is this knowledge of the world that helps Crusoe not only to survive his ordeal on the island, but to turn the island into ‘a planted garden’, through a combination of hard work and instinct for planning and organisation.

Second, Defoe’s utopian predispositions are manifested in his instinct for planning. This is expressed in works that both preceded and followed *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequel. It commenced in his non-fictional work, *Essay Upon Projects* (1697) and continued in the works he wrote after the Crusoe trilogy, particularly in his *A Plan of the English Commerce* (1728). Rees believes that Defoe’s mind had a ‘naturally utopian bent’ represented by his ‘instinct for planning and problem solving’.  

This is combined with an ‘impulse to make things vivid to produce schemes that transcend the merely feasible’ (74). She however chooses not to elaborate on this statement, and moves instead to liken Defoe’s moral endeavours to those of Thomas More. She claims that because Defoe is concerned with such issues as beggary, poverty, unemployment and crime, he is similar to More who addresses the same topics in his work. For her, Defoe is utopian because he proposes solutions for the problems of his society (74). To demonstrate Defoe’s utopian tendency, it would be more convincing to reflect in more detail on Defoe’s instinct for planning in *An Essay Upon Projects*, a text Rees refers to in her study, and in *A Plan of the English Commerce*, a text she overlooks, and then show how the desire for planning was manifested in the utopian experiment in *Robinson Crusoe* and *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*.

In *An Essay Upon Projects*, Defoe introduces a set of projects or proposals intended for rebuilding and protecting the fragile economy of England in the wake of the war with France. He claims that solving England’s economic dilemma lies in ‘contrivance and
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In the introduction to his work, he refers to the instinct for planning as ‘the faculty of projecting’, which is essential for achieving his targets. In the body of the work, he outlines the means for expanding the English economy particularly in relation to commerce, slavery and colonisation, themes that take centre stage in the Crusoe story. He claims that

Projects of the nature I Treat about, are doubtless in general of publick Advantage, as they tend to Improvement of Trade, and Employment of the Poor, and the Circulation and Increase of the publick Stock of the Kingdom; but this is suppos'd of such as are built on the honest Basis of Ingenuity and Improvement; in which, tho' I'le allow the Author to aim primarily at his own Advantage, yet with the circumstances of Publick Benefit added.

The aim of his proposed projects is to improve the condition of the English economy which, in turn, would lead to the betterment of the conditions of people. Among these, he proposes to increase the potential involvement of banks in supporting commercial dealings. In his maritime project, he suggests employing sailors at fixed wages, since seafaring plays a significant role in England’s commercial exchanges with other nations. As far as slavery is concerned, he recommends importing slaves from Africa to increase the labour power needed for the execution of his projects. His projects are not only designed for England, but for its colonies as well. He saw in the colonies unlimited but neglected resources that England could exploit to expand its economy. As in An Essay upon Projects, Defoe’s fascination with planning, his projecting faculty, is reiterated in his A Plan of the English Commerce. In this work, Defoe presents his observations about the condition of the British economy as he experienced it through his tour through Britain which he narrates in Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain. By the end of A Plan of the English Commerce, he puts forward plans for the development of English economy through the promotion of commerce both at home and in the colonies. These projects are very similar to those he presented in An Essay Upon Projects. Some of these plans are illustrated in Crusoe’s experiences on the island, and manifested in his capacity for problem solving as well as the need for planning to maintain and sustain

himself. Through planning, contrivance, and invention, Crusoe manages to survive. When Crusoe first arrives on the island, he finds it uninhabited and in a state of wilderness. By the time he leaves for the second and last time, the island is transformed into a site for a collective utopia that has all means of survival and progress.

Unlike the utopias of More, Bacon, Harrington, Defoe’s experiment starts as a one-man adventure in *Robinson Crusoe* and only develops into a collective utopia in *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. What we see in *Robinson Crusoe* and its sequel is a utopian experiment which begins with the marooning of the protagonist in solitude on the island and ends with the establishment of a commonwealth governed by civil laws. As *Robinson Crusoe* is concerned with the experiences of Crusoe while isolated on the island, it delineates an individualist utopia as Claeys terms it. Utopia is achieved through the moral fulfilment of Robinson Crusoe who refuses to regress to the state of bestiality, and works hard instead to turn the state of nature into a state of civilisation. He refuses to be naked even though he is alone on the island, unlike the Pines in Neville’s utopia. He instead makes clothes from goatskins to protect himself from the sun and the rain. This act of wearing clothes, no matter how rough and ugly they might be, is also a conscious link to the state of civilisation to which he belongs.

While on the island, Crusoe is restricted to few tools he salvages from the shipwreck; with these tools he proceeds to improve his solitary condition. Hence, he becomes fully adapted to the kind of environment in which he is destined to live, that is quite alien to his basic nature, a kind of environment that later appeals to his outward senses and his inner senses or convictions. He creates civilization by transforming the state of nature in a sort of cultural and political evolution. Because the wilderness of the island mirrors the internal wilderness within Crusoe, his triumph over the wild environment on the island parallels his control of his desires and fears, and his triumph over his inner despair through a combination of hard work and religious meditations. As he transforms the island into a civilised place, he himself undergoes a process of transformation in which he reassesses his relationship with Providence and reflects on his past mistakes. This combination, John Richetti argues, ‘enables Crusoe to leave his paranoid seclusion
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and to convert his island from Hell to Heaven’. In the first few years of his stay on
the island, Crusoe views isolation as a punishment and exile from society, but he
gradually comes to the realisation that his isolation might be a blessing rather than a
curse. He frequently dwells on the ramifications of his isolation, describing himself as a
captive and the island as a Prison to him. After two years on the island, Crusoe gives
‘humble and hearty thanks that God had been pleas’d to discover to me, even that it was
possible I might be more happy in this solitariy condition, than I should have been in a
Liberty of Society, and in all the pleasures of the world’ (90). He gradually starts to see
the bright side of his solitary condition. When he realizes the meaning of his escape
from the shipwreck as the only survivor, his feelings towards his solitude on the island
change markedly. He starts looking at the merits of his situation. He reflects on that by
saying that ‘In the first place, I was removed from all the wickedness of the World here.
I had neither the Lust of Flesh, the Lust of the Eye, or the Pride of Life, I had nothing to
covet; for I had all that I was now capable of enjoying’ (102). The reference to pride
recalls More’s treatment of this theme in Utopia. In Book II, Hythloday remarks that
pride is the cause of human misery and the source of greed. The Utopians are happy
because they succeeded in removing the roots of pride from their society. At the same
time, he criticises the fact that pride persists in other countries where it is deeply rooted
in men’s hearts. Robinson Crusoe’s moral transformation reaches its peak at this
moment in the narrative. Having overcome his desires and pride, he is now a different
man. He is no longer concerned with personal gain, but with gaining spiritual insights
into his relationship with God. With the passage of time, he comes to describe the island
as ‘the most pleasant Place in the World’ (111).

By the end of this process of moral transformation, he becomes a reformed man, man as
utopia. The individualism of the protagonist is at the centre of Robinson Crusoe because
part of Defoe’s utopian vision as presented in the text is based on making Crusoe a
better man. Rees, in her analysis of the text as a utopia, highlights the significance of
individualism in the book and its relationship to the way in which utopia is perceived,
and stresses the point that

139 John Richetti, Defoe’s Narratives: Situations and Structures (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975),
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The only way to experience utopia as an individual is through the consciousness of the traveller narrator, who functions as alien commentator. However, Crusoe combines both roles, as discoverer and creator, man as island... he becomes the founder of a utopia and the individual who registers the kind of experience he creates, first for himself then for others.\footnote{Rees, p. 75.}

Like A.L. Morton, she attributes to Crusoe the role of the maker of utopia. We can distinguish the narrator in Defoe’s utopia from the narrators of earlier utopias in terms of function. In More’s and Bacon’s works, the traveller arrives in utopia to find an organized world in which everything has its own place. At the centre of each of these utopias is an organized city, set as the capital of utopia. Unlike the narrators in More’s and Bacon’s works, the voyager in the case of Crusoe is forced by his circumstances to be confined on an uninhabited island, where he comes to deal with the primitive state of nature and starts organizing things around him in his own way for his own use. In Crusoe’s case, there is no society and no civilization; nothing to describe as narrators in traditional utopias usually do. Rather, it is Crusoe himself who builds the community by conquering nature, and this reflects Defoe’s optimism that man can survive in the state of nature and can turn this state into a state of society using his knowledge and skills. As A. L. Morton notes, Crusoe is not a ‘mere observer, but the maker of utopia’.\footnote{Morton, p. 123.} It is what Crusoe does, not what he sees, that matters.

As in the utopias of More, Bacon, and Neville, the setting for Defoe’s utopian experiment is an island. However, the island in Defoe’s work is different from any of the island settings in earlier utopias because it refers to a real place. Defoe locates his utopia in a more precisely mapped place off the coast of South America near the mouth of the Orinoco River within sight of the island of Trinidad.\footnote{Robinson Crusoe, p. 170.} The island is also different from those in More’s and Bacon’s utopias in terms of function, as it is not a setting for an already established ideal society. Like the island in Neville’s work, however, the island in Defoe’s work is uninhabited. It is a blank canvas on which the author draws his vision, with no rules or laws. At the same time, it is not only a setting for the utopian experiment that Defoe projects in Robinson Crusoe and its sequel, it is...
also part of the experiment itself because it undergoes a process of change marked by a shift from a state of chaos into one of organisation that mirrors the change within Crusoe himself. In terms of topography, the island in Robinson Crusoe could have been inspired by the island of Neville’s The Isle of Pines. Like the Isle of Pines, Crusoe’s island is not naturally protected; it is flat and easy to enter. It is, therefore, Crusoe’s responsibility to contrive the means necessary to fortify his island so as he can protect himself against any threats, whether these are internal or external.

As a man in a state of nature, Crusoe is justified in his efforts to protect himself in an act of self-defence because man in a state of nature is always haunted by fear. He is in a state of war because he is not aware of the fact that his island does not offer any threats to his safety. Before the appearance of the savages on the island, Crusoe enjoyed a period of peace in which he was in full control of the island. However, the discovery of the footprint on the island brings him into a state in which he lives ‘in the constant snare of the fear of man’ (129). In order to protect himself in such a state, Crusoe follows a series of procedures, such as secrecy, building shelters, and insisting on oaths of allegiance from the new comers to the island. Secrecy, for instance, is adopted by Crusoe to preserve himself against exterior threats; it is necessitated by his solitude. In More’s and Bacon’s works, the insistence on the elements of secrecy and isolation is justified by their strict foreign policies. Secrecy in Robinson Crusoe is emphasized in the way Crusoe tries to keep his existence on the island as a secret, and in the way he builds his shelters. It is not surprising that secrecy is given a great deal of attention in the novel, given the political background of its author. Defoe’s name did not appear on any of the early editions of Robinson Crusoe or The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. There is nothing surprising in that, given the fact that Defoe was raised in the world of controversial pamphleteering, where anonymity was more or less ubiquitous. In fact, only few of his works carried his name as their author, and these include: Daniel Defoe’s Hymn for the Thanksgiving (1706), and De Foe’s Answer to Dyer’s Scandalous News Letter (1707). After the accession of King George to the throne, Pat Rogers argues, Defoe grew more prone to concealment. In this period, he became obsessed with the use of pseudonyms so as to conceal his real identity.145 His inclination to secrecy could also be justified on the grounds of his job as a secret agent for many years. After his release from Newgate Prison in 1703 with the intervention of the Tory minister,
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Robert Harley, Defoe worked under disguise for many years as a government spy and was involved heavily in the Anglo-Scottish conflict. He acted as a promoter and publicist for the Union between Scotland and England, and at the same time he travelled around the country to test the political temperature, spying and writing on behalf of Harley under such names as Alexander Goldsmith and Claude Gilot.\textsuperscript{146} Hence, Defoe’s fondness for false names or anonymity parallels Crusoe’s fear of exposure. Crusoe’s attempts at keeping his existence on the island a secret recalls Defoe’s concerns with the issue of secrecy and his job as a secret agent. While his hero experiences solitude on a remote island, Defoe himself experiences solitude in the midst of society. He reflects on this type of solitariness at length in \textit{Serious Reflections During the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe}. Crusoe starts \textit{The Serious Reflections} with meditation on solitude: ‘I have frequently look’d back, you may be sure, and that with different thoughts, upon the notions of a long tedious life of solitude, which I have represented to the world, and of which you must have formed some ideas, from the life of a man in an island’,\textsuperscript{147} and later comes to the conclusion that ‘all the parts of a compleat solitude are to be as effectually enjoy’d, if we please, and sufficient grace assisting, even in the most populous cities, among the hurries of conversation, and gallantry of a court, as in the deserts of \textit{Arabia} and \textit{Libya}, or in the desolate life of an uninhabited island’.\textsuperscript{148} What Defoe means is that man can be in total solitude even in the midst of society and this is the sort of solitude Crusoe experienced while in Brazil.

In addition to keeping his existence on the island a secret, Crusoe also follows a series of steps to secure himself against any possible threats. At the beginning, he makes use of the hill where he builds his shelter and the trees close to it to protect himself. He uses the hill as a watching point, so that he can always be ready to defend himself against any possible danger:

\begin{quote}
My thoughts were now wholly employ’d about securing myself against either savages, if any should appear, or wild beasts, if any were in the island, and I had many thoughts of the method
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{146} Ibid, p.5.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid, p.16.
how to do this, and what kind of dwelling to make, whether I should make me a cave in the earth or a tent upon the earth.\textsuperscript{149}

Then he starts planting trees and building walls around his abodes. He does his best not to be exposed to danger from outside. All Crusoe’s attempts at securing himself before the footprint incident are precautionary, in the sense that he is not sure about the existence of any danger that might threaten his life, be it internal or external to the island as the above extract shows. The language of conditionality marked by ‘ifs’ in the above passage demonstrates uncertainty on Crusoe’s part. When Crusoe finds out that the island does not present any internal threats to his safety, he concentrates his efforts on protecting himself against external dangers. He also discovers a cave in the woods where he stores all his food and ammunition. The cave which he describes as ‘a meer natural cave in the earth’ proves to be an ideal hiding place for Crusoe who then decides to turn this cave into a fortress by constructing a wall around it (140). The fortress becomes a symbol of authority in \textit{The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe}. It is inhabited by the Spanish Captain whom Crusoe made governor and his Spanish and Portuguese companions. It is to the castle that the settlers resort to seek justice when wronged by the three English rogues.

The act of building the wall, according to Scott Nowka, reflects Crusoe’s attempt to isolate himself from the outside world both physically and psychologically.\textsuperscript{150} Isolation, at this point is self-contrived and used to protect the individual. It becomes part of Crusoe’s mentality. It is imposed by internal fear. So, isolation in \textit{Robinson Crusoe} operates in two ways. First, Crusoe isolates himself from his environment in order to protect himself from any threats it throws at him. Then, we have Crusoe isolated from the world after surviving the shipwreck. As far as the latter interpretation is concerned, isolation in Defoe’s work, signifies something different to what it represents in the utopias of More and Bacon. While isolation in More’s and Bacon’s utopias is emphasised as one of the means for protecting these utopia, isolation in \textit{Robinson Crusoe} is imposed on the narrator and maker of utopia by his circumstances. As Utopia and Bensalem are self-sufficient and superior to all other nations, laws were enacted to keep their contact with the outside world to the minimum.

\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Robinson Crusoe}, pp.47-8.

By the end of *Robinson Crusoe*, with the moral fulfilment of Crusoe which parallels the structural transformation of the island, his relationship with the island develops remarkably, to the extent that the island becomes a part of his mental makeup and this extends to *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. At the beginning of *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe elaborates on this point by expressing his desire to go back to the island:

> The desire of seeing my new plantation in the island, and the colony I left there, run in my head continually. I dreamed of it all night, and my imagination run upon it all day; it was uppermost in all my thoughts, and my fancy worked so steadily and strongly upon it, that I talked of it out of sleep; in short, nothing could remove it out of my mind; it even broke so violently into all my discourses, that it made my conversation tiresome; for I could talk of nothing else. All my discourses run into it, even to impertinence, and I saw it my self.\(^{151}\)

He becomes obsessed with the island. He comes to realise that on the island he was not restrained by society and its norms. In the absence of society, he underwent a process of spiritual regeneration through which he got transformed from a man who is not happy with his middle-class position in society into a man who comes to develop a sense of self-reliance by the end of his adventures. What happens on the island is a reflection of the change within Crusoe himself. He proves his domination over his environment and develops into a morally reformed man. He transforms his island to whatever he wants it to be using his skills and tools. Because of the tools he brings from the ship, Crusoe goes beyond the stage of survival to that of construction. He starts using the resources of the island and his own tools to construct his own society. More important than the tools he salvages from the ship is the knowledge and intellectual ability with which Defoe equipped him.

Unlike George Pine who spent much of his time on the island in a natural state characterised by idleness and sexual indulgence, Crusoe had to work hard to survive. He had to contrive the means of his survival, in terms of food, shelter, and safety. His successful conquest of the state of nature on the island and his creation of a modified

mode of European civilisation, of which he is part and parcel, parallels Utopus’s conquest of Abraxa in More’s *Utopia*. Like Utopus who colonises the peninsula, turns it into an island and names it Utopia after himself, Crusoe, utilising his experience, skills, and tools, transforms the island from a state of wilderness into a state of civilisation. He then declares himself as the sole king and sole owner of the island. He reflects on this thought, stating that ‘I was Lord of the whole Manor; or if I pleas’d, I might call my self King or Emperor over the whole Country which I had Possession of’.

At this point in the narrative, Crusoe was the only man on the island. As a King, his subjects consisted merely of his animals, his parrot, dog, cat, and goats. He imagines himself as an absolute monarch who ‘had the lives of all [his] subjects at [his] absolute command’. Being an absolute king, he ‘could hang, draw, give liberty, and take it away, and no rebels among all [his] subjects’ (118). He further dwells on the self-amusing thought that he is the king of the island in his description of his majestic meal that is attended by his subjects: ‘Then to see how like a King, I din’d too all alone, attended by my servants, *Poll*, as if he had been my favourite, was the only person permitted to talk to me’ (118). His other attendants are his dog and cats. This, however, changes with the arrival of humans on the island where Crusoe continues to assert his status as the king and owner of the island.

Crusoe’s declaration of his possession of the island and his absolute authority over it at this point is, nonetheless, very significant as it defines his relationship with the island, his eventual relationship with his human subjects, and the form of government on the island. This oral declaration of authority only complements the act of actual ownership of the island which he had already effected through the acts of building shelters, fortifying his abodes and cultivating the land. In other words, he implements possession through cultivation, a principle that Locke advocates in the second of his *Two Treatises of Government* when he declares that ‘as much Land as a Man Tills, Plants, Improves, Cultivates, and can use the Product of, so much is his Property. He by his Labour does, as it were, inclose it from the Common’.

To describe himself as ‘lord of the whole manor’ means that Crusoe has full possession of the island. Then, to declare himself as the absolute king of the island indicates that his authority is not limited to landed property but also extends to humans. Crusoe repeatedly reminds us of his status as the
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‘King and Lord of all this Country indefeasibly’, of his ‘Right of Possession’, and that he ‘might have it in Inheritance, as completely as any Lord of a Manor in England’, and asserts his ownership of the island throughout the text. He extracts his authority as a king, lord or emperor from the possession of property. Therefore, Crusoe, being the sole owner of the land, is the only figure of power on the island. As he remarks, he has ‘no rivals’ at this stage of the novel (102).

Further, Crusoe maintains his right to possession and authority through exercising the act of naming. He first names his island as ‘the island of despair’. Then, he gives the name ‘Friday’ to the man he saves from the cannibals. The act of naming is a unifying theme in all previous utopias, and can be used to argue that Defoe’s work belongs to the same utopian traditions. Utopus conquers Abraxa, turns it into an island, and gives it a name and identity. Salomona, similarly, names the scientific institute at the heart of Bensalem as Salomon’s House, a religious reference to the Hebrew prophet, Solomon. George Pine also names his island after himself and his companions, calling it the island of Pines. The act of naming in each of these works reflects the significance attached to giving each of these utopias its name and identity. The same act operates in Robinson Crusoe. Crusoe colonises the island by giving names to places and subjects, and by building shelters and abodes. In ‘Friday: or, the Power of Naming’, Novak remarks that ‘Crusoe transforms his island… through a creative process of naming’. In giving names to places and creatures on the island, he claims his possession of the island. For instance, by renaming Friday, Novak argues, ‘Crusoe assumes possession of him in the same way that Columbus assumed possession of the land by his namings’. The act of naming on the part of Crusoe is to assert his control over his subjects and his right to the possession of the island. For Novak, the act of naming is one of the means Crusoe uses to colonise the island and enslave Friday.

Crusoe continues to assume the status of King or Emperor even after the arrivals of people on the island. His status as the only figure of authority on the island does not change with arrival of Friday, Friday’s father, and the Spaniard. After he has saved them from the cannibals, the three men swear obedience to him. He never considers
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them as rivals. Towards the end of Robinson Crusoe, he again stresses his status as the king and owner of the island, iterates that the other settlers are his subjects:

My Island was now peopled, as I thought myself very rich in Subjects; and it was a merry Reflection which I frequently made, How like a King I look’d. First of all, the whole Country was my own meer Property; so that I had an undoubted Right of dominion. Secondly, My People were perfectly subjected: I was absolute Lord and Law-giver, they all owned their lives to me, and were ready to lay down their lives, if there had been Occasion of it.157

Crusoe here seems to be jokingly fantasizing about his status as a king. The use of the phrase ‘merry reflection’ whenever he refers to himself as a king implies a sense of playfulness. This links back to the wittiness and playfulness associated the utopian fantasies of More’s Utopia and Neville’s Isle of Pines in the eighteenth century. Crusoe’s reflections, however, appear to be serious when he asserts his possessive nature referring to the island as his property and to people as his subjects. With the arrival of people on the island, Crusoe’s adds to his statuses as king and lord those of a lawgiver and governor. He still however emphasises the absolutism of his rule. He is the sole source of power and authority on the island. The titles ‘ruler’, ‘governor, ‘king’ and ‘lawgiver’ are reminders of the titles More, Bacon, and Neville bestowed on the founders of their utopias respectively. In his translation of Utopia, Robinson refers to Utopus, the founder of utopia, as king, ruler and lawgiver.158 Similarly, Salomona of the New Atlantis is also Bensalem’s king and lawgiver.159 Neville also uses the title ‘chief governor’ to refer to the rulers of the Pines. By declaring himself as the king of the island and the representative of civilization, Crusoe assumes a similar status to those of Utopus of Utopia and Salomona of Bensalem. But while Utopus and Salomona are removed from the picture in that they are mentioned only as founders of their respective utopias, Crusoe maintains his title as ‘king’ for most of the narrative.

In order to maintain his authority on the island and his right to possession of the land, Crusoe, like the officials of Bensalem in Bacon’s New Atlantis, requests that the comers
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to the island swear allegiance to him, and not to undertake any actions that threaten his rule, so as to have his permission to settle there. His request is partially based on his distrust of his fellow men in a state of nature. Only through a series of oaths of allegiance or contracts, oral or written, that Crusoe seeks to avoid the chaos that characterises the arrival of new comers in the state of nature. In each of the scenes of encounter on the island, Crusoe requests a series of procedures to be followed so as to assert his position on the island. As the island is now peopled, Crusoe is under the threat of being deposed as ruler of the island. He, therefore, believes that oaths of allegiance are the way to establish his authority. He is content that his ‘people were perfectly subjected’ and that he was the ‘absolute Lord and Lawgiver’. ‘They all owed their lives to [him], and were ready to lay down their lives, if there had been an occasion of it.’

This however, applies to those who are indebted to him, having saved them from the cannibals. In the case of Friday, for instance, the contract takes the form of signs of servitude and subjection: ‘he came close to me, and then he kneel’d down again, kiss’d the ground, and laid his head upon the ground, and taking me by the foot, set my foot upon his head; this, it seems, was in token of swearing to be my slave for ever’ (161).

The signs that Friday makes could be interpreted as an act of voluntary servitude. A similar oath was made by Friday’s father and the Spanish Captain whom he saves from cannibals too. These two people, like Friday, were ready to die for him. With the Spanish and Portuguese sailors that the Spanish Captain was going to bring from the mainland, Crusoe is not satisfied with oral oaths only. He instructs the Spanish Captain

Not to bring any man with him, who would not first swear in the presence of himself and the old savage, that he would no way injure, fight with, or attack the person he should find in the island, who was so kind to send for them in order to their deliverance; but that they would stand by and defend him against all such attempts, and where-ever they went, would be entirely under and subjected to his command; and that this should be put in writing and sign’d with their hands (195).

He ironically seeks that the oath takes the form of a written contract, though he is aware of the unavailability of writing materials: ‘How we were to have this done, when I knew they had neither pen or ink; that indeed was a question which we never asked’ (195).
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Similarly, he makes the English men swear to obey him as well. He asks them to take an oath that, while they are on the island with him, they ‘will not pretend to any authority’ there, and that if he ‘put arms to [their] hands, they will ‘upon all occasions give them up’ to him. They are also asked not to do ‘any prejudice’ to him or his other subjects on the island, and to be ‘govern’d by [his orders]’ (201). These requests on Crusoe’s part are instigated by fear of rivalry. At the end of *Robinson Crusoe*, the society on the island is governed by a set of oaths, not by laws. These oaths or contracts, however, are not enough to maintain the stability and continuity of society after Robinson Crusoe leaves the island and returns to England. In the absence of the figure of authority, the absolute monarch, these oaths are deemed invalid as illustrated in the violent acts of the English mutineers and their desire for power in *The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, particularly in the first part of the island episode prior to Crusoe’s arrival back on the island.

In *The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, the island community is transformed from a state of nature into a commonwealth based on the Lockean theory of consent and property rights. The settlers adopt the Lockean principle that ‘every Man, by consenting with others to make one Body Politick under one Government, puts himself under an Obligation to every one of that Society, to submit to the determination of the majority and to be concluded by it’.¹⁶¹ The political constitution of the island is thus transformed from absolute monarchy, with Crusoe as the sole ruler of the island, to that of a commonwealth based on collective consent. The process of transforming the island into a commonwealth takes place in *The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* in the absence of Robinson Crusoe. Following Crusoe’s departure to England, the island descends into a state of anarchy triggered by the provocative actions of Will Atkins and his gang. These actions are motivated by the desire for power. The state of anarchy here recalls the state of war which was instigated by the power of lust or desire in Neville’s *The Isle of Pines*. As in Neville’s work, a form of authority is needed to maintain the continuity and stability of the community in Defoe’s work. Out of necessity, certain measures were employed on the island to counter any attempts at threatening its stability and continuity in the absence of Crusoe. Upon his arrival back on the island, Crusoe as the island’s king receives a report from the Spanish Captain whom he left in charge about the reasons that prompted them to establish certain laws in
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the community, mainly the troubles caused by the English mutineers following his departure to England. These three claimed that ‘the island was theirs, that the Governor, meaning me, had given them possession of it, and nobody else had any right to it’. The behaviour of the three mutineers puts the community on the verge of war, being unhappy with their situation on the island. The violation of the state of peace by the three English rogues and their threat to the lives of the other subjects, necessitate the introduction of penal procedures, the first of these is related to the right of self-defence. This procedure is based on Locke’s right to self-defence where he states that ‘it being reasonable and just I should have a Right to destroy that which threatens me with Destruction’. Accordingly, the Spaniards had to react to protect themselves and the two good English men from the villainy of Will Atkins and his two friends: ‘I hope you will not be despleas’d when I shall tell you how forc’d by Necessity we were oblig’d, for our own preservation, to disarm them’. In order to protect themselves from the English mutineers, the Spanish settlers ‘dismissed them from the society and turned them out to shift for themselves’, with their Captain indicating that ‘for all the laws and all Governours were to preserve society; and those who were dangerous to the society ought to be expelled out of it’ (69, 67). Of course, the society would not tolerate the individual when the individual acts against the collective interest of the whole and would be looked upon as a threat to the continuity of life in the community. Because greed and desire for power are human instincts that cannot be overcome at certain points as in the case of Will Atkins and his fellows, laws in the utopian community are necessary. At the time of Crusoe’s departure from the island for the second time laws were in place to maintain the survival and continuity of his utopia. These are civil laws related to land division, issues of property, management of the plantations, and Crusoe’s right to the ownership of the island. They are intended for establishing justice and equality.

The sense of equality on the island develops dramatically across the two parts of the Crusoe story. In part one, Crusoe himself, after he rescues Friday, acknowledges that God made all humans the same, and Friday has the same rights and faculties he himself has. However, one of the first things Crusoe does is to teach Friday to call him ‘Master’, asserting his supremacy over him. Further, Crusoe declares himself the king of the
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island, and all others are his subjects. So, equality is emphasized by its absence. This situation changes in *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, where the concepts of equality and fair opportunity are immensely emphasized. This recalls Locke’s insistence on equality ‘wherein all the Power and Jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another: there being nothing more evident, than that Creatures of the same species and rank promiscuously born to all the same advantages of Nature…should be equal one amongst another without Subordination or Subjection’. \(^\text{165}\) One important example of fairness on the island is that when the Spanish sailors arrive on the island, they are allowed equal share of provisions and habitations like the inhabitants who have already been there: ‘They gave them an equal admission into the house and or cave; and they began to live very sociably, and the head Spaniard, who had seen pretty much of my methods, and Friday’s father together, managed all their affairs’. \(^\text{166}\) Equality is also maintained by Crusoe himself when he distributes the goods he brought to the island equally among the inhabitants: ‘I brought out my cargo of goods, wherein that there might be no dispute about dividing, I shew’d them that there was sufficient for them all; and desired that they might all take an equal quantity of the goods that were for wearing’ (121).

Thus, Crusoe does his best in order to sustain the community he has created materially by providing the inhabitants with their needs. Having experienced life on the island, on his journey back to the island, Crusoe makes sure he takes with him all the supplies, equipment and artisans that can guarantee the continuity and development of his colony:

> Particularly, I carried two carpenters, a smith, and a very handy ingenious fellow, who was a cooper by trade, but was also a general mechanic; for he was dexterous at making wheels, and hand-mills to grind corn, was a good turner, and a good pot-maker; he also made any thing that was proper to make the earth, or of wood; in a word, we called him our Jack of all trades (13).

Crusoe’s main concern throughout both books remains the development and improvement of his island community. In *Robinson Crusoe*, he is concerned with what is good for himself; in *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, he is concerned
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with what is good for the community. He even promises to send more supplies to the island from Brazil after his departure. However, what is more important about the process of perfecting society on the island than the material satisfaction of the inhabitants is the spiritual and religious stability among them. This is provided in the shape of the French priest whom Crusoe brought to the island:

It is true, this man was a Roman, and .... I must (to set him out in just colours) represent in terms very much to his disadvantage, in the account of Protestants; as first, that he was a papist; secondly, a popish priest; and thirdly, a French popish priest. But justice demands of me to give him a due character; and I must say, he was a grave, sober, pious, and most religious person (125-6).

In *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe himself is the priest and the preacher. He goes through a process of spiritual and religious awakening which culminates in his re-evaluation of his relation to Providence, and in his conversion of the pagan Friday to Christianity. Like that of the Pines, Crusoe’s Christianity in his solitude on the island is derived directly from the Bible; it is not influenced by the teachings and interpretations of the Church. Defoe, however, goes a step further than Neville by introducing a religious figure in the shape of the French priest to the island. Even though the Christianity he converted Friday to is based on his interpretation of the Bible, after his discourses with the French Popish priest, he realises that he is too far from the true meaning of Christianity. The introduction of this priest to the community, and the way he teaches the inhabitants the essence of Christianity, indicate a kind of religious tolerance that Defoe wanted to observe in England. This idea of religious tolerance can be traced back to *Robinson Crusoe* when he talks about the freedom of religious beliefs on the island:

It was remarkable too, we had but three Subjects, and they were all of different Religions. My Man Friday was a Protestant, his Father was a Pagan and a Cannibal, and the Spaniard was a Papist: However, I allow’d liberty of Conscience throughout my Dominions.167

Being a tolerant king, Crusoe allows his subjects religious freedom and liberty of conscience. Defoe’s hopes, as far as the freedom of faith is concerned, are summed up by Crusoe in *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* when he expresses his
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admiration for the French priest: ‘I was astonished at the sincerity and temper of this truly pious papist, as much as I was oppressed by the power of his reasoning’. He calls for a religion that is not concerned with ‘whatever Church or particular profession we joined to, or joined in’. The attitude of the French priest exemplifies the dominant call on man to critique religion and embrace it depending on his understanding and interpretations. This extract could be interpreted as a call on Defoe’s part for establishing a universal religion and abolishing the restrictions that Churches impose on religious faith. Like More’s Utopus, and Bacon who calls for a form of faith realised partly through the study of nature and partly through revealed religion, Defoe believes that different faiths can co-exist. On his return to the island, Crusoe discovers that the desire for power has ruined the society he built. The cure for these diseases, Defoe believes, is to promote the vision of a new world founded on moral values. Rees argues that Defoe in his work ‘has constructed his island on the paradigm of European Christianity’. This is not quite precise because the form of Christianity that Crusoe adopted is not Christianity in its European sense, but one he shaped according to his own beliefs. For Rees, what we encounter in Robinson Crusoe and its sequel is an ‘assertion of cultural identity, a means of giving the spiritual structure, first to the individual’s experience and then to the colony’s way of life’. The ‘seeds of faith’ which he brought from England to the island, along with other aspects of civilisation, are ‘ready to germinate under the right conditions just as the seeds of corn providentially germinate’. This process culminates in the conversion of Friday in part one at the hands of Crusoe, and that of the savages at the hands of the French priest in the second part. Crusoe’s spiritual journey is, therefore, a significant component of Defoe’s utopian project. Through this journey, Crusoe comes to realise the real values of things, consequently becoming a better man morally and socially. He becomes a morally reformed man, the foundation that Defoe proposes for the establishment of a better community. The transformation in Crusoe’s character and perceptions is paralleled by the transformation of the island from a state of wilderness to a state of organisation.

By the end of his time on the island, Crusoe describes the island as a commonwealth. Addressing his subjects, who are ‘now settled in a kind of Commonwealth among
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themselves’, even though he did all he could to supply the community with all resources needed to maintain it, Crusoe remarks that he ‘was not capable of giving them better rules, than they were able to give themselves, only made them promise me to live in love and good neighbourhood with one another; and so I prepared to leave them’ (171). This marks a significant shift in the island’s system of government. It is no longer the authority of the one but of the many that rules the island. Crusoe admits that the people on his island are capable of self-governance and that he has ‘no authority or power, to act or command one way or other, farther than voluntary consent mov’d them to comply’ (194). This is also a direct reference to Locke’s statement that ‘Men being, as has been said, by Nature, all free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this Estate, and subjected to the Political power of another, without his own Consent’. Crusoe’s declaration signifies a shift from the state of nature into that of commonwealth. As the authority of the community increases, the power of Crusoe as a sovereign decreases. He, however, still supports the form of government set up on the island and thereby conforms to the laws of civilisation. At this point, Crusoe’s role and influence on his subjects is transformed to one of ‘father and benefactor’. The transformation is completed with Crusoe declaring in The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe that the colony he established is now a commonwealth ruled by the consent of its inhabitants. What started as an amusingly imaginary monarchy is now a collective commonwealth that has its laws and government. The commonwealth is achieved through an official division of the island into equal plantations. The act is documented by a written contract. This act conforms with the Lockean theory that the stability of society is based on the individuals’ right to property. To manage an equal distribution of property, a form of contract is needed. Hence, Crusoe divides the plantations on the island among the settlers through a written contract:

Having divided things justly, and so much to everyone’s satisfaction, that they only desired one general writing under my hand for the whole, which I caused to be drawn up and sign’d and seal’d to them, setting out the bounds and situation of every man’s plantation, and testifying that I gave them thereby severally a right to the whole possession and inheritance of the respective plantations or farms, with
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their improvements of them and their heirs, reserving all the rest of the island as my own property, and a certain rent for every particular plantation after eleven years, if I, or any one from me, or in my name, came to demand it, producing the attested copy of the same writing (171).

The division of land equally, along with the establishment of the commonwealth, recall Harrington’s republican ideas about the relationship between property division and political power as expressed in Oceana. Dividing the landed property on the island has given people the right to property, and accordingly to having their say in the political ruling of the island. Crusoe, consequently, is not the sole king of the island because he is not its sole owner. The written contract stands as an agrarian law that governs the distribution of property and the stability of the community.

**Conclusion**

Even though Defoe’s utopian experiment drew on some aspects of the works of More, Bacon, Neville, and Harrington, his vision of society as presented in Robinson Crusoe and The Farther Adventures conformed to the way in which utopia was received in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Utopia was no longer viewed as a description of an already established ideal model. Instead of describing an ideal society that the narrator discovers by chance, Defoe depicts in details the stages through which such society is constructed, focussing particularly on the significance of the individual in this process. For Defoe, reforming the individual spiritually, as the first step towards the construction of the desired society, comes before setting up laws to govern it. Nonetheless, Defoe’s work still offers clear thematic and structural links to earlier utopias. For instance, it appears to draw on More, Bacon, and particularly on Neville in terms of its island setting, though the function of the island in the novel is different from its function in these works, as its transformation from a chaotic wilderness into an organised habitable place, represents a significant part of Defoe’s utopian experiment, and not a mere setting for a ready-made utopian model. Defoe’s work is not meant to present an ideal alternative for Defoe’s society. Rather, it is intended to describe the
process through which a modified version of European society can be constructed by using the standards of European civilisation in a state of nature.

Defoe’s vision of a commonwealth as presented in the work is a two-phase experiment. The first phase, which lasts for the majority of the first part of the two-part work, is concerned with the moral fulfilment of Robinson Crusoe. This phase describes the spiritual journey that Crusoe undertakes on his way to redemption. This journey recalls the journey that Christian undertakes in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*. However, while Crusoe’s redemption is achieved through religious meditation, Christian has to go on a physical journey to the celestial city to be redeemed. By the end of his meditations and reflection on his sins, the individualistic utopia is achieved as Crusoe emerges from the island as a reformed man.  

At the same time, Crusoe’s moral development parallels the physical development he executes on the island, turning it into a garden. The second phase is concerned with the establishment of a collective utopia in *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. The transformation recalls the failure of the settlement in Neville’s *Isle of Pines*. Neville’s work attributes the state of anarchy on the isle to the founder’s failure to set up a form of order or political structure. Defoe goes a step further by establishing a rights-based society, signifying a rejection of the state of chaos and instability that comes along with the monarchical form of government. In Neville’s work, penal procedures prove insufficient to protect the community under the rule of monarchy. In Defoe’s, the author advocates a collective system or constitution at the expense of a monarchical sovereignty. Accordingly, every individual on the island has a natural right to property, but a set of regulations are needed to protect these rights. As the final step in turning the island into a commonwealth, Crusoe divides the land formally through a written contract. It now comprises three colonies: ‘The Spaniards possess’d my original habitation, which was the capital city, and extended their plantations all along the side of the brook… The English liv’d in the north-east part… and came on southward’, and the third colony belonged to the savages (172-3). In *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe’s authority is derived from his complete possession of the island. Since the political structure of the community is dependent on the balance of property ownership, the change in the form of government on Crusoe’s island is, therefore, inevitable. Because of the change in property possession, the power dynamic
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on the island has shifted from absolute monarchy to one based on people’s consent. With the development of the community from a state of nature to a state of society, the laws of nature are replaced by those of society. The absolute monarchy which ruled in the state of nature is abandoned in favour of a collective democracy in a state of society.

Literary critics who have analysed Robinson Crusoe in a utopian context failed to reach a consensus as to whether this work has the characteristics of a utopia because they have neglected the significance of The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe as a work that offers the narrative frame for the second part of the experiment. Critics have also failed to reach an agreement about the potential of the text as a work that belongs to a utopian tradition because it presented a new type or style of utopian writing different from earlier utopias. Defoe’s utopian experiment, however, is but one of many experiments with new forms of utopian writing that appeared in the eighteenth century. Other styles involved merging aspects of utopia and amatory fiction in the early eighteenth century, or utopia and revolutionary writings in the utopian works produced at the end of century. Some of these combined utopian elements within political writings, proposing political, economic and social reform plans. Among these Spence is the most prominent. Others were explicit satires of the shortcomings of society. These were presented within erotic frames. The most important of these were Manley’s The New Atalantis and its imitations.
4. From the Ideal to the Scandalous: Representations of Secrecy in Manley’s *New Atalantis*

Utopia as a concept was eroticised and used for satirical purposes in the eighteenth century. Manley’s use of a utopian concept in *The New Atalantis* continued a tradition of writing in which utopia was associated with criticism of corruption. It was presented in an erotic framework, not through a description of a perfect society similar to the ideal communities depicted in the earlier utopias of More and Bacon. In this tradition, utopia is not celebrated for its advocacy of justice, equality, and prosperity, but rather for its exposure of corruption, self-interest, and scandal. Manley’s *New Atalantis* does not present a utopian vision of ideal society. It rather exposes the corruption of English society at the start of the eighteenth century. Until recently, the utopian dimension of Manley’s text has consistently been overlooked by critics. Only few scholars investigated the text in a utopian context. Most literary critics of Manley judged the text according to its scandalous and political bearings. Some referred to it as an imitation of the *chroniques scandaleuses* of Marie D’Aulnoy that trade in scandal and immorality; others discussed it in connection with the amorous intrigues of Aphra Behn. Over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, few critical studies of Manley’s fiction have tackled the *New Atalantis* in a utopian context. Most of these have indicated that Manley’s work is an imitation of Bacon’s *New Atlantis* in some respects. These studies, particularly Janet Todd’s *Sign of Angellica*, Christine Rees’s *Utopian Imagination and the Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, Nicole Pohl’s *Women, Space, and Utopia, 1600-1800*, and Nicola Parsons’ *Reading Gossip in Early Eighteenth-Century England*, have rightly focused on the work’s title and its allusions to Bacon’s *New Atlantis* as well as the episode that involves a description of the all-female community

that Manley calls the ‘New Cabal’, an episode discussed by many critics examining not the utopian, but the satirical and political nature of the text. Few critics, particularly Nicole Pohl and Christine Rees, have looked upon the all-female community that Manley presents in the New Atalantis as her counterpart to Bacon’s utopia in particular. While it is evident that the title of Manley’s text as well as the New Cabal are possible links between Manley’s and Bacon’s texts, they are certainly not the only ones. This chapter argues that a most significant connection between the two texts is the element of secrecy and its representations. It seeks to build on the links offered by the above-mentioned critics and extend the discussion to include the manifestations of secrecy in the title, use of aliases, allegorical names and places, the new Cabal episode, as well as the process of unmasking hypocrisy throughout Manley’s text. The significance of this discussion lies in its attempt to emphasise critically understudied sides of Manley’s work. In this manner, it tries to define the position of Manley’s work in relation to utopian writing in the early eighteenth century. It also seeks to offer an understanding of the connections between two literary forms, namely utopia and secret history.

Manley’s work, Secret Memoirs and Manners of Several Persons of Quality, of both Sexes. From the New Atalantis, an Island in the Mediterranean. Written Originally in Italian, was often cited as New Atalantis in the eighteenth century. It is best known as a work of amatory fiction that belongs to the secret history genre. However, the reference to Bacon’s New Atlantis in its title, the focus on the representations of secrecy, and the new cabal episode, significantly complicate associating the work only with secret history. Manley’s allusion to Bacon’s work and her choice of title is not insignificant as it established a tradition of allusion to Bacon’s and More’s imagined societies in the titles of secret histories that was followed by many writers throughout the century, most significantly Eliza Haywood in her work, Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia (1725). Manley’s objectives in making allusions to the classically acknowledged utopia of Francis Bacon are strategic and satirical. Her aim is to use the work of a famous writer to enhance the satirical effects of her own work. A discussion of Manley’s New Atalantis in relation to Bacon’s utopia might well evoke a juxtaposition of the ideal with the corrupt, for while Bacon portrays an arguably ideal community in New Atlantis, the community that Manley presents in her work is characterised by greed, corruption and hypocrisy, themes reflected on by More in Book I of Utopia. However, such juxtaposition does not diminish the links among these works.
These links include common themes such as the island setting, the treatment of marriage and sexuality, gambling, and, most significantly, the issue of secrecy and its representations.

**Political and Literary Contexts of Manley’s Works of Secret History**

The *New Atalantis*, like Manley’s other works of secret history, was motivated by party politics. The work attracted a great deal of attention from Manley’s contemporaries, who often referred to her as ‘the author of Atalantis’. For instance, Joseph Addison, in the *Tatler* (no. 42), describes Manley as his ‘loving friend, the author of the Atalantis’; Jonathan Swift, in his letters, refers to Manley as the author of Atalantis: ‘I have bespoken the spectacles; got a set of Examiners, and five pamphlets, which I have either written or contributed to, except the best, which is ‘The Vindication of the Duke of Marlborough’, and is entirely of the author of Atalantis’; and Richard Steele refers to Manley as the author of Atalantis in a letter he wrote to her, where he tells her that he was not ‘the Bickerstaff who animadverted so severely on the Author of the Atalantis’. Manley herself used the title in some works she wrote after 1709. For example, she refers to herself, through her narrator, as the famous author of Atalantis on more than one occasion in *The Adventures of Rivella*. She is also referred to as the author of Atalantis in an advertisement attached to *The Memoirs of Europe* (1710): ‘There is in the press, and will speedily be published, the second volume of *Memoirs of Europe, Towards the Close of the Eighth Century, Written by Eginardus, Secretary and Favourite to Charlemagne, and Done into English by the Author of the New Atalantis*. In addition, works, such as *Court-Intrigues* and *The Court Legacy*, were attributed to the author of Atalantis. Manley was sometimes grouped with Eliza
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180 Delarivier Manley, *Memoirs of Europe, Towards the Close of the Eighth Century. Written by Eginardus, Secretary and Favourite to Charlemagne; and Done into English by the Translator of The New Atalantis* (London : printed for John Morphew, 1710), Image no. 15.
Haywood as the authors of Atalantis and New Utopia as illustrated in *A Collection of Novels Selected and Revised by Mrs Griffith* (1733). The editor of this collection indicates that ‘the celebrated *Atalantis* of Mrs Manley served [Haywood] for a model’ in the Court of Carimania and the *New Utopia*.\(^1\) This implies that a new style of utopian writing was emerging at the time, and into that trend Manley’s *New Atalantis* and Haywood’s ‘New Utopia’ belonged. It also points out that Haywood’s ‘new utopia’ was an imitation of Manley’s work. While she influenced Haywood’s work, Manley, in turn, was influenced by the writings of Aphra Behn. Alongside Aphra Behn and Haywood, Manley formed what the poet-critic James Sterling in 1732 called ‘the fair Triumvirate of wit’.\(^2\)

The *New Atalantis* was not Manley’s only work of secret history. To this tradition belonged *Queen Zarah and the Zarazians*, which appeared in print in 1705 and *Memoirs of Europe*, which was published in 1710. These works were mainly propagandistic attacks on Whig politicians, particularly the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. *Queen Zarah and the Zarazians*, Manley’s first fiction of scandal, was an allegory of the control of the court of Queen Anne in the early years of her reign by Whigs, especially Sarah and John Churchill. As its title, *The Secret History of Queen Zara and the Zarazians. Being a Looking-Glass for ------ ---------------- in the Kingdom of Albigion Faithfully Translated from the Italian Copy Now Lodg’d in the Vatican at Rome and Never before Printed in any Language* suggests, the work is a secret history that deals with political intrigues and scandalous sexual affairs. *Queen Zarah and the Zarazians* was published anonymously, stressing the secrecy surrounding the identity of its author. The title page of the 1711 edition which was appended to the *New Atalantis* reads as follows: *The Secret History of Queen Zarah and the Zarazians. Containing the True Reasons of the Necessity of Revolution that Lately Happen’d in the Kingdom of Albigion.* The changes in the text’s subtitles significantly allude to different stages in Manley’s attack on Whigs. The subtitle of the first edition (1705) positions the text as an attack on the Whig ministry and its ill use of authority in Albigion (England); the subtitle of the second edition (1711) refers to the revolution that led to the collapse of the Whig ministry. The subtitles of the 1743 and 1745 editions indicate that in Manley’s
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\(^2\) ‘The fair Triumvirate of wit’ is a phrase derived from James Sterling’s 1732 poem ‘To Mrs Eliza Haywood on her Writings’, quoted in George F. Whicher, *The Life and Romances of Mrs Eliza Haywood* (New York: 1915), p.27.
satire, the corruption and hypocrisy of the Whigs are ‘Pleasantly Expos’d’ and that the work is ‘Design’d as Looking Glass for an Illustrious Lady’. ‘Looking glass’ which appears in the subtitles of the 1705, 1743, and 1745 editions, was a common metaphor often used by satirists. Manley used this metaphor to intensify the severity of her satire of the vanity of prominent Whigs, particularly Sarah Churchill, ‘the illustrious lady’ in the subtitle of her own work. It is worth mentioning that the authorship of the text was debatable because the 1743 and 1745 editions were attributed to Joseph Browne (1646-1678), while the title page attributed it to Manley.\textsuperscript{183} The significance of \textit{Queen Zarah and the Zarazians} is that it is essential for the discussion of the development in Manley’s style, and her association of secret history and utopianism in the \textit{New Atalantis}.

Like \textit{Queen Zarah and the Zarazians}, the \textit{New Atalantis}, in terms of content, reflects on the state of English politics in the early years of the eighteenth century. The text consists of a series of anecdotes told by Lady Intelligence to her companions, the divine goddesses Astrea and Virtue. Astrea returns to the island of Atalantis ‘to see if humankind were still as defective, as when she in disgust forsook it’.\textsuperscript{184} The book features the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough as well as their Whig associates as its main satirical targets. From all the politicians she attacks in the book, the Churchills suffer the most. Manley’s attack provoked Sarah Churchill to question Manley’s source of inside information, which she suspected to be prominent Tories, alluding to Lady Masham, Robert Harley, and Lord Peterborough. In a letter to Queen Anne, after the arrest of Manley, Sarah Churchill wrote: ‘It has appeared that she kept correspondence with two of the favourite persons in the book, my Lord Peterborough and Mr. Harley, and I think it is to be suspected that she may have had some dealing with Mrs. Masham who is called Hilaria’.\textsuperscript{185} In her version of the story regarding the mystery surrounding her sources of information, Manley claims in \textit{Rivella} (1714) that during her trial, the prosecutors us’d several arguments to make her discover who were the Persons concerned with her in writing her Books; or at least from whom she

\textsuperscript{183} Joseph Brown, \textit{The Secret History of Queen Zarah, and the Zarazians. Wherein the Amours, Intrigues, and Gallantries of the Court of Albignon (During her Reign) are Pleasantly Exposed} (London: Printed for J. Huggonson, 1743), N22291.


had reciev’d Information of some special Facts, which they thought were above her Intelligence. Her Defence was … that she [was] writing for her Amusement and Diversion in the Country; without intending particular Reflections on Characters.  

She insisted on the playfulness of her text, denying any political motives behind it. Her statement here corresponds to her declaration that love is the only subject that women should write about: ‘Politicks is not the business of a woman, especially of one that can so well delight and entertain her Readers with more gentle pleasing Theams’ (117). This statement is quite ironic because there was no woman writer in the early years of the eighteenth century who had made politics her business more than Manley. In all her works of fiction, the themes of sex and politics are complexly intertwined. Her works are packed with sexual and political scandals as Ballaster suggests when she notes that in Manley’s works of scandal, ‘sexual plotting and political intrigues are parallel activities, the one calling up the other in the reader’s consciousness’.  

The movement from Queen Zarah to New Atalantis marked a development in Manley’s literary techniques, illustrated in her use of allegorical narrators represented by Astrea, Virtue, and Lady Intelligence in the latter. Except for the use of allegorical figures in New Atalantis, the two works are similar in many aspects. For example, they were published anonymously to emphasise the secrecy surrounding their authorship, and were claimed to have been translated from Italian originals as their subtitles indicate. Also, in both works Manley uses aliases as a means to hide the real identities of her characters. In terms of content, Queen Zarah aligns with Manley’s political views as a Tory writer, particularly in its attacks on the Whigs and their political motivations, an attack she continued in New Atalantis. According to Ballaster, the New Atalantis ‘presents Whig (anti-Catholic pro-Parliament) politicians as sycophants and parasites manipulating a vulnerable monarchy, whose activities as dangerous seducers plotting to destroy female sexual innocence, are equivalent to their designs upon the English state’.  

The success of Manley’s New Atalantis, which coincided with the collapse of the Whig ministry in 1710, promoted critics and historians to link the two events. Nicola Parsons, for instance, claimed that ‘the book has been credited with this dramatic
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turn in the political fortunes of the nation by both eighteenth-century observers and modern-day historians’. 189 Parson’s statement is based on George Macaulay Trevelyan’s claim that New Atalantis was ‘the publication that did most harm to the Ministry’.190 This is likely if we take into account the enthusiasm with which the book was received at the time of its publication. The success of New Atalantis encouraged Manley to compose and publish her third work of secret history, Memoirs of Europe in 1710. This work was often referred to as a sequel to New Atalantis or the third and fourth volumes of New Atalantis. This work represented the last stage of her propagandistic assault on Whigs. Like its predecessors, Queen Zarah and the Zarazians and New Atalantis, it traded in gossip and scandal to criticise the Whigs’ influence in the court of Queen Anne. At the same time, it also responded to the change in political situation by revelling in the rise of the Tory party to power and the liberation of the Queen from Whig control. It particularly celebrated the Queen’s new favourites, Abigail Masham and Robert Harley.

Of Manley’s three works of secret history, the New Atalantis represents a distinct contribution to the genre. Rebecca Bullard, in The Politics of Disclosure, distinguishes Manley’s New Atalantis from other secret histories on the grounds of Manley’s Tory inclinations, and the place of the reader in relation to the text. She first argues that Manley’s criticism of Whig politicians, courtiers and writers is due to the fact that their increasing impact has undermined the authority of the Queen: ‘Queen Anne has been enslaved by a Cabal of tyrannical Whigs’.191 She cites Henry St John’s A Letter to the Examiner to support her claim. In his Letter, St John condemns Britain’s ‘subjection to the Will of an Arbitrary Junto’, the ‘Tyranny exercised by the 1708-1710 Whig ministry in general and the Duchess of Marlborough in particular, and the “slavery” into which Queen Anne was forced during this ministry’.192 Bullard’s argument is a response to Annabel Patterson’s claim in Early Modern Liberalism that secret history is an essentially Whig literary tradition, and that Tory writers of secret histories have

borrowed the name ‘secret history’ for their works but not the ‘ethical rationale’. Bullard then distinguishes Manley’s secret history from earlier secret histories by the unique place Manley assigns for her reader in the implied author-reader relationship. Bullard identifies a gap between the Whig secret historians and their readers. She claims that Manley ‘reworks the rhetoric of disclosure which characterises secret history in order to cultivate a shared understanding and complicity between the author and the reader’. While I strongly agree with Bullard’s argument, I believe, in addition, that Manley’s contribution to the secret history tradition lies in the way she associates aspects of secret history and utopian writing, thus adding new dimensions to the two traditions at the same time. This association of utopia and secret history recurs in the titles of two eighteenth-century editions of Burnet’s translation of Utopia in 1751 and 1795. These read as Utopia: Containing an Impartial History of the Manners, Customs, Polity, Government, &c. of that Island. Written in Latin by Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England. And Interspersed with Many Important Articles of Secret History, Relating to the State of the British Nation. The subtitles of these editions are clear evidences of an association between secret history and utopia. Manley’s association of the two trends of writing in her New Atalantis could have influenced these connections. The several imitations of her work testify to its influence throughout the century.

The utopian dimension of the New Atalantis is manifested in the island setting, the satirical depiction of the new cabal as a commonwealth, and in the representations of secrecy. According to Temple, the text ‘makes claims to secrecy, foreign origins, and exotic utopian locale’. Though it draws on Bacon’s work in terms of title and focus on secrecy, Manley’s work, unlike Bacon’s text, does not present any visions for reform. It does not offer an ideal alternative to corrupt English society, but rather opts to expose its vices on a distant island, using allegorical figures and aliases for its characters. Despite a lack of direct proof that Manley read Bacon’s utopia, there are, nonetheless, some clues that hint at Manley’s familiarity with Bacon’s work. The first clue is related to the availability of Bacon’s work during prior to the publication of the New Atalantis. Bacon’s text was printed in 1664, 1670, 1676, 1677, and 1683. In most of these, it was
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appended to *Sylva Sylvarum*. The second clue is that Manley perhaps knew of Bacon through the political journals that were in print at the start of eighteenth century. She was involved in political pamphlet wars at the time. Through writing political pamphlets in response to Whig pamphleteers, she perhaps had the chance to read Bacon in their works. As a writer of pamphlets for *The Examiner*, she attacked Whig politics and exchanged gibes with Whig writers such as Richard Steele and Joseph Addison. Bacon was mentioned and quoted on several occasions in the journal to which these writers contributed, particularly in *The Tatler* No. 17, No. 108, and No. 133. For instance, in the ‘Essay on Silence’ (*The Tatler*, No.133), Bacon is referred to as ‘one of the greatest geniuses that our own or any county has produced; after having bequeathed his soul, body, and estate, in the usual form, adds, ‘My name and memory I leave to foreign nations, and to my countrymen, after some time be passed over’. Bickerstaff, moreover, cites three of Bacon’s essays in his own papers on Husbands, Impudence, and Dissimulation; and in his ‘Essay on Poetry’ in *The Tatler* No. 108, he quotes from the *Advancement of Learning* the passage on poetry, ‘which gives a truer and better Account of this Art than all the Volumes that were ever written upon it’. In his ‘Essay on Religion’ in *The Tatler* No.267, Bickerstaff describes Bacon as ‘Man who for the Greatness of Genius, and Compass of Knowledge, did Honour to his Age and Country’, and who had ‘the sound, distinct, comprehensive Knowledge, of *Aristotle*, with all the beautiful Lights, Graces and Embellishments, of *Cicero*’. Manley refers directly to *The Tatler* in her dedication of *Memoirs of Europe* to Richard Steele. The third and strongest clue to Manley’s familiarity with Bacon’s work is her association with Jonathan Swift. Swift was an admirer of Bacon and, according to John Shanahan, he ‘owned several editions of Bacon’s works, including the multivolume *Opera Omnia* of 1730, and his engagement with the lord Chancellor’s ideas was lifelong. Swift annotated his copy of Bacon’s *History of Henry VII*, and often cited and alluded to the *Essays, or Counsels*. One reference to Bacon that could serve as evidence that Manley knew about Bacon’s work, appeared in *The Examiner* No. 46 for the year 1712. An article in criticism of, and attack on Whigs, read:
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How blest is the Queen in such subjects, who declare to the world, that they have no Prospect of Happiness, but what must begin with her Death? If they are out of Power, let Heaven and Earth be confounded: These are such, who, as my Lord Bacon expresses it, would set a House on fire, to roast their own egg by it.\textsuperscript{200}

The article uses this metaphor as expressed by Francis Bacon in his essay ‘Of Wisdom for a Man’s Self’ to attack the self-interest of Whig politicians.\textsuperscript{201} It is possible that Manley wrote this article because it appeared during the period when she was the editor of the journal. Her editorship of \textit{The Examiner} ended with the publication of No. 52. Though these clues do not offer direct evidence of Manley’s knowledge of Bacon’s work, they hint at specific occasions where Manley may have come across some of Bacon’s writings. In addition to these clues there are textual evidences that I am going to explore so as to establish links between Manley’s \textit{New Atalantis} and Bacon’s \textit{New Atlantis}. The most important of these is the representations of secrecy in both works.

**Representations of Secrecy in Manley’s \textit{New Atalantis}**

Nicola Parsons remarks that the society that Manley depicts in her work is ‘a far cry from Francis Bacon’s utopian civilisation of the same name. Here, secrecy is a stratagem used by courtiers to screen their profligate behaviour and conceal their accretion of political power’.\textsuperscript{202} The corrupt community that Manley depicts in the \textit{New Atalantis} is in a remarkably polar contrast to the utopian community that Bacon envisions in \textit{The New Atlantis}. However, Manley’s reference to this arguably ideal community as a counterpart to her corrupt society is interesting for both strategic and satirical purposes. Parsons argues that shortening the title of the book to \textit{New Atalantis} is strategically important in the sense that it foregrounded the vision of the text by placing it alongside Bacon’ renowned utopia, the \textit{New Atlantis}.\textsuperscript{203} Manley may have

\textsuperscript{202} Parsons, p. 56.
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hoped that this association would aid her commercial success. It may indeed have contributed, at least initially, to catching readers’ eyes. Success did follow as the work was a bestseller, and was printed in six editions by 1720. From a satirical point of view, Manley’s placing of her work in the same frame alongside Bacon’s scientific utopia would no doubt intensify the satirical effect of her work. By presenting her work in the same bracket with Bacon’s utopia, Manley sought to highlight the corruption, hypocrisy, and vices that plagued the community on the island of Atalantis. Her aim was to focus her readers’ critical gaze back on their own corrupt society, rather than dream about the merits of an ideal one. She, as Herman argues, ‘deliberately provided the negative alternative to Bacon’s great allegory’. Unlike Bacon’s advanced society in *New Atlantis*, where law rules over men, the community in Manley’s *New Atalantis* is ruled by the authority of individuals, not of laws.

A preliminary reading of Manley’s *New Atalantis* alongside Bacon’s *New Atlantis* places before the reader two contradictory works in terms of themes and forms of writing. A close reading of these texts, however, indicates that there is much in common between these two works. I do not mean to say that Manley’s work falls into the same form of writing as Bacon’s. Manley is not interested in the ideal but in the real as her work demonstrates; her concern is with the corruption of the English society of her time, not with presenting an ideal alternative to it. Yet, in both texts, secrecy is a power that is used for different purposes. In Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, secrecy is a positive power, a law deployed for sustaining the order and unity of the utopian community. In Manley’s *New Atalantis*, secrecy, which Parsons refers to as ‘stratagem’ used by politicians to conceal their corruption and misuse of authority, is a negative power. It is a veil for vice and a means of protection for corrupt men of power, whose authority is maintained as long as their secrets are undisclosed. Evelyn Fox Keller, explaining the power of secrets in general, states that ‘secrets function to articulate a boundary: an interior not visible to outsiders, the demarcation of a separate domain, a sphere of autonomous power’. In *New Atalantis*, secrecy operates on the borders of the private sphere represented by the Queen’s bedchambers and the courtiers’ private lives, and the public sphere represented by the general public. The narrative moves on both sides of the boundary making public
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what is meant to be concealed. That movement between the inside and the outside, between the private and public spheres is at the centre of the narrative. Manley’s focus is on the private lives of these corrupt Whig politicians and aristocrats. By exposing their secret affairs in the private sphere, she attempts to show how their greed, hypocrisy, and corruption damagingly affect the public sphere. For instance, at one point in the narrative Lady Intelligence criticises the corruption of the Queen’s favourites and condemns the entire court, arguing that though the heart of the ‘graceful Empress . . . is entirely upright’, her trust in hypocritical ministers and favourites has contributed to widespread corruption.\textsuperscript{206} The main concern of these ministers and favourites is to prevent any communication between the public and private spheres. In this way, they control the flow of information between the two spheres. The Queen is not allowed to see into the public sphere, and the public are not allowed to see into the private sphere. Their motivations for doing that are usually personal gain and self-interest, not the social, economic, and political prosperity of the nation. Addressing Astrea, Intelligence remarks:

\begin{quote}
Were she [Queen Anne] but to judge all things by her own eyes and ears, all things would be administered with the same impartiality and justice as if your self had held the balance, but alas! What defence is there against the corruption of the favourites and the by-interests of ministers? 'tis impossible a prince can come to the knowledge of things but by representation, and they are always represented according to the sense of the representator. Either avarice, revenge, or favour, are their motive, and yet how is it possible to prevent it? A prince knows not how to distinguish by the outside, and are seldom let into the inside (110).
\end{quote}

The type of secrecy that these corrupt politicians seek to maintain is different from the secrecy that the members of the Salomon’s House have imposed on the community of Bensalem in Bacon’s work. In Bacon’s community, Salomon’s House parallels the private sphere in Manley’s work; the rest of society represents the public sphere. The
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people of Bensalem are in the dark about anything related to the dealings and experiments of Salomon’s House. However, the Fathers of Salomon’s House are fully aware of everything happening in the public sphere. The people of Bensalem only know what the Fathers of Salomon’s House want them to know. Further, the objects of secrecy in both texts are different. In Bacon’s work, secrecy is attached to significant scientific experiments and discoveries that are meant to improve society. In Manley’s society, secrecy is utilised to keep scandals and sexual affairs under wraps. The secrets that Manley’s characters endeavour to keep are often related to concealing identities and sexual affairs. As Manley was fully aware that a ‘scandal occurs when hidden motives in conflict with public objectives are exposed to public scrutiny’, she, therefore, made it her business to reveal to public scrutiny what was meant to be kept secret, and in this way achieved success and popularity. She took advantage of people’s curiosity and of the destabilizing influence of gossip to achieve her aims, using the character of Intelligence that stands for gossip, to disclose the secrets of her corrupt targets.

In New Atalantis, secrecy works on two levels, authorial and textual. On the authorial level, Manley deployed many disguises to distance herself from the authorship of the text. First, the book was published anonymously. The only individuals named on the title page were the publishers, John Morphew and J. Woodward. Second, the title page and dedication of the book indicate that the text was translated from Italian into English, and was preserved by a French man. In her dedication of the first volume to Henry, Duke of Beaufort, Manley writes:

The following adventures first spoke their own mixed Italian, a speech corrupted, and now much in use through all the island of the Mediterranean; from whence some industrious Frenchman soon transported it into his own country… a friend of mine, made that campaign, met with it last year at Brussels; and thus, a la Francoise, put it into my hands, with a desire it might visit the court of Great Britain.208

208 New Atalantis, p.3.
In her dedication of the second volume, she refers to herself as ‘Unknown! unfriended! An obscure original, a nameless translator, no party interested in its favour or ready to prepossess others’ (131). This tactic of pretending to be a translator was used by Manley in *Memoirs of Europe*, a sequel to the *New Atalantis*, which ‘was done into English by the Translator of the Atalantis’, \(^ {209}\) and in *Queen Zarah and the Zarazians*, which was also translated from Italian.

On the textual level, the title of the book implies secrecy. Manley’s choice of title and its allusions to Bacon’s Atlantis is enhanced by her choice of the setting of her work. By setting the work on a distant island in the Mediterranean, the anonymous writer of the book distances the events of the book and its characters from England and the English court. Utopian writers often used a distant island to represent an ideal society. Their aim, however, was often to offer through those utopias a commentary on and criticism of their own contemporary societies. From the start of the book, the world of the island is set in contrast with the world of Great Britain and France, ‘places renowned in the court of Jupiter, for hypocrisy, politics, politeness, and vanity’. \(^ {210}\) Manley had used the same tactic in *Queen Zarah and the Zarazians* when she set the action in the Kingdom of Albignon, a thinly veiled representation of Britain. This tactic parallels the same technique devised by More and Bacon who surrounded the locations of their utopias with secrecy in their utopian works respectively. Astrea chooses this island because of ‘the European world being the most famed above for sciences’, a reminiscence of the land of sciences which evokes Bacon’s scientific vision in the *New Atlantis* (4).

Secrecy is also manifested in the use of aliases and allegorical figures. At one point in the narrative, Astrea asks Lady Intelligence, ‘Can your poets here below speak truth?’, and Intelligence subsequently replies ‘metaphorically, or by way of allegory’ (60). In hiding the truth behind allegories, aliases and metaphors, Manley found a secure way to represent truth without being censored. Not once in the book does Manley refer to the real names of her characters. Rather, she uses aliases such as Count Fortunatus to refer to John Churchill (14), Sigismund II to refer to King Charles II (14), Monsieur l'Ingrate as an alias for Steele (101), and Daphne as an alias for Catherine Cockburn (158). In


\(^ {210}\) *New Atalantis*, p. 4.
addition, Manley’s use of a group of allegorical figures, the goddesses Astrea and Virtue, as well as Lady Intelligence, enhances the secrecy surrounding the text, in the sense that through these figures, she communicates her thoughts to her readers indirectly. While Intelligence plays the role of a gossip who exposes the secrets of Manley’s targets, Astrea, and to a lesser degree Virtue, provide the moral commentary that Manley intends.

The three figures move unseen while touring the island of Atalantis. Astrea and Virtue decide that they ‘will make [themselves] garments of the ambient air, and be invisible, or other ways, as [they] shall see convenient’ (9). They, then, impose invisibility on Lady Intelligence as the words of Virtue show: ‘you shall walk invisible with us; in the name of Jupiter we arrest you, to attend upon Justice and Virtue’ (13). The invisibility of the narrators in Manley’s work reflects her invisibility as far as the authorship of the book is concerned. She surrounds her text with secrecy, seeking to remain invisible in the literary arena. In order to avoid any charges of libel, Manley published her work anonymously. As noted earlier, on the only occasion she was charged, she claimed that she was writing amorous trifles for her own amusement. Most of her poems, fictional works, and her pamphlets for The Examiner were published anonymously, even though she confessed to the authorship of the New Atalantis. Despite the fact that Manley was arrested nine days after the publication of the book and was released on bail in 1710, she was not convicted of seditious libel, having not used any real names of politicians or places, but rather aliases and allegorical references. In The Adventures of Rivella, she states that she admitted to the authorship of the New Atalantis so that her publishers Morphew and Woodward, and her printer John Barber who were also arrested with her, would be discharged:

In conclusion she told me that herself was the Author of Atalantis, for which three innocent persons were taken up and would be ruined with their families, that she was resolved to surrender herself into the Messenger’s Hands, who she heard had the Secretary of State’s warrant against her, to discharge those honest people from their imprisonment (109).

211 The Adventures of Rivella, p.111.
And later in the same text, she reflects on her use of aliases and allegorical references by wondering whether

the Persons in Power were ashamed to bring a Woman to her Trial for writing a few amorous Trifles purely for her own Amusement, or that our Laws are defective, as most persons conceiv’d, because she had serv’d her self with Romantick Names, and feign’d Scene of Action? (111).

Manley was not arrested for the lewdness and scandalous nature of her narrative, but for its political implications: ‘people are offended at the liberty she uses in her memoirs, and she is taken to custody. Miserable is the fate of writers: if they are agreeable, they are offensive; and if dull, they starve… after this who will dare to give the history of Angela?’, writes Lady Mary Wortley Montagu in a letter to Frances Hewet, asking ‘what has happened to the unfortunate authoress’.212 Angela is a reference to London. It is referred to in the text as the capital of the New Atalantis.213 The use of romantic names and imagined settings, a feature of earlier utopias, particularly More’s Utopia, as well as writing for amusement, conform to the playfulness attached to utopia in the eighteenth century. Manley claims that the text was written for its author’s amusement, and not intended to be taken seriously. While she uses allegorical names for places and individuals, the publication of a key to the text contradicts her claim. The key, which was circulated separately from the text, was intended to help the readers decipher the text and construct their own version of the narrative by replacing the representative allegorical characters with the actual figures who were the intended targets of her criticism. Whether the key was written by Manley or her publishers remains a mystery.

Secrecy on the textual level is further displayed in the character of Intelligence, Manley’s principal narrator of the New Atalantis, and the means through which all secrets are revealed. Her character implies secrecy and interest in gossip. According to Samuel Johnson’s Dictionary, the term ‘intelligence’ primarily means ‘Commerce of information; notice; mutual communication’, and the term ‘Intelligencer’ stands for ‘one who sends or convey news’.214 Further, the newspapers of the early eighteenth

---

213 New Atalantis, p. 9.
century associated the term ‘intelligence’ with secrecy and information gathering. The term was often used to refer to conveying secret information in military and political contexts. For example, an article published in the *Observatory* in 1705 claimed that ‘Intelligence and secrecy of councils are the life and soul of government. This was the Maxim Oliver Cromwell made his own, ’twas this made him successful against the Royal-Party at Home, and made him Dreaded by foreign Princes Abroad’. In *New Atalantis*, Intelligence is an inside source of information. She revels in exposing corruption, and in revealing the secrets of the corrupt. She is identified with secrecy as far as the dissemination of news is concerned. Her role in the text is to report her findings to Princess Fame and to Astrea and Virtue as the narrative progresses. When she first meets the two deities, she asks to be excused for six moments, so she can disclose their secret to the Princess: ‘I would in a moment have dispatched your affair, by a short whisper in the ears of Fame’. Like the ‘merchants of light’ in Bacon’s utopia, Intelligence is an information bearer. However, the essence of the material reported by the two parties is very different. The brothers of Salomon’s House travel abroad under certain rules, and hand in reports about advances in all fields of knowledge to the Fathers. Intelligence, in contrast, reports on trivial affairs, scandals, and intrigues. While Intelligence does not keep a secret, the brothers of Salomon’s House, who are ironically labelled the ‘merchants of light’, and whose commitment is to enlighten the citizenry of Atlantis, keep their findings concealed from the citizens of Bensalem. The strength of Intelligence lies in secret-revealing gossip. She tells of everything she knows. In contrast, the power of the merchants of lights lies in silence.

Via Intelligence, Manley launches her attacks against her targets and exposes their corruption. The first time Intelligence is introduced in the text, she was described by Virtue as ‘busy… like a courtier new in office. She is the first lady of the bed-chamber to the Princess Fame’, and a little bit later she declares that she is ‘the groom of the stole to the omnipotent Princess Fame’ (13). Nicola Parsons claims that these roles were assigned to Intelligence in the book deliberately, since they were the same positions occupied by Sarah Churchill in Queen Anne’s court. As Intelligence can be a
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personification of Manley in the text, assigning these roles to Intelligence reveals a ‘fundamental affinity’ between the Manley and Churchill (62). Following the work of McDowell, Parson argues that ‘both Manley and Churchill are female intelligencers; women who sought political involvement through the newly available medium of print’.  

Sarah held the key to the Queen’s bedchambers and was in control of the flux of information between the public and the private spheres, and this is what infuriated Manley and caused her to accuse Sarah of the ill use of office. Even though Manley assigns Intelligence the same positions held by Sarah Churchill, the role she plays in the text is different to the one played by Churchill. Because she reveals everything she knows, Intelligence is the opposite of Sarah Churchill who used all her influence to keep the public in the dark regarding the affairs of the courtiers. Intelligence, moreover, claims that her job is to entertain strangers: ‘You have hit, ladies, upon my very business; I entertain strangers with vast respect, they give me the greatest attention; for all I say is generally new to foreigners’ (13). Intelligence says all that is new but whether what she says is true or not does not matter. She is interested in gossip not in truth. She is rarely concerned with truth as Virtue declares (13). In this regard, Intelligence contradicts Manley’s self-representation as a truth-teller whose only mission is to unmask the hypocrites and to reveal the truth hidden under their masks.

Secrecy on the textual level is further manifested in the episode that describes the New Cabal. While Parsons views secrecy to be operating on a number of levels in the *New Atalantis*, particularly in the character of Intelligence, I think that the cumulative effect of secrecy is perhaps best demonstrated by the narration of the activities of the new Cabal. This anecdote brings Manley’s work close to earlier utopias. Of the literary critics who discussed the New Cabal anecdote, Christine Rees, and particularly, Nicole Pohl have considered the utopian dimension of this all-female commonwealth. In *Women, Space, and Utopia, 1600-1800*, Pohl analyses the new Cabal in terms of gender and feminine pleasures, and remarks that what Manley portrays in the *New Atalantis* is a group of aristocratic women whose relationships and dealings are based on companionship and shared property. She refers to this group of women as ‘separatist and quasi-communist community’, and describes the new Cabal as Manley’s ‘utopian
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The women who form this community share not only property, but pleasures as well. Similarly, Christine Rees argues that Manley creates an all-female utopia within the New Atalantian framework. This utopia is governed by the rules of sorority, secrecy and communality. It is not the structure of the New Cabal that parallels the utopias of More and Bacon, but rather the rules that govern its affairs. The new Cabal, in other words, is not equivalent to More’s Utopia or Bacon’s Atlantis as a community, as the term cabal itself signifies only a ‘small body of persons engaged in secret or private machination or intrigue’, as the Oxford English Dictionary defines it. It, however, is similar to Bacon’s ideal society to some extent in terms of laws, for both communities operate under the laws of common property, comradeship and secrecy, though for different purposes. The new Cabal, Intelligence tells us, is ruled not by money, property, or interest. As in earlier utopias,

in this little commonwealth is no property; whatever a lady possesses is, sans ceremonie, at the service and for the use of her fair friend, without the vain nice scruple of being obliged. ’Tis her right; the other disputes it not, no, not so much as in thought. They have no reserve; mutual love bestows all things in common, ‘twould be against the dignity of the passion and unworthy such exalted, abstracted notions as theirs.

Manley’s description of the new Cabal as a commonwealth ruled by a set of laws hints at linking the text to earlier utopias. More’s Utopia and Harrington’s Oceana both describe commonwealths. Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe also describes the process of constructing a commonwealth. As in those utopias, there is no private property in the new Cabal. The members of the cabal also shared duties and rights like the utopians of More, Bacon, Harrington and Defoe. The new Cabal, like Harrington’s utopia, is ruled by laws not individuals as is the case in the rest of Atalantis.
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In principle, Manley’s Cabal implies secrecy. It is an enclosed all-female community that excludes men and rejects the traditional norms governing the relationship between men and women. The female members of this community ‘momently exclude the men: fortify themselves in the precepts of virtue and chastity against all their detestable undermining arts: arraign without pity or compassion those who have been unfortunate as to fall into their snare’ (155). The new Cabal comprises women from Queen Anne’s court as well as women writers. In this female community, ‘secrecy is a material article’, that maintains the unity of the community (156). As in Bacon’s work which emphasises its power, the law of secrecy governs the new Cabal in Manley’s work. Thus, secrecy could be argued to represent the strongest link between the two works. But at the same time, through the lesbian community embodied in the new Cabal, Manley depicts a satirical counterpart to Bacon’s all-male ideal community, presenting a negation of it, represented by a community of women whose mysterious dealings and exclusion of men are rejected by the early eighteenth century traditional ideals of the relationship between men and women. Manley’s all-female community contrasts Bacon’s all-male one, for the focus in Bacon’s community is on the scientific advancement and empirical experiments carried out by male scientists, whereas the female members of Manley’s new Cabal are mainly interested in female affairs. Astrea, the goddess of justice, questions the motives of the new Cabal stating that,

If only tender friendship, inviolable and sincere, be the regard, what can be more meritorious or a truer emblem of their happiness above? ’tis by imitation, the nearest approach they can make, a feint, a distant landscape of immortal joys. But if they carry it a length beyond what nature designed and fortify themselves by these new-formed amities against the hymenial union, or give their husbands but a second place in their affections and cares, ’tis wrong and to be blamed (161).

Astrea points out the difficulty that such a community would face in order to be socially accepted, given the strict social norms that govern society, and this is stressed by Lady Intelligence’s definition of the new Cabal as ‘a sect (however innocent in itself) that does not fail from meeting its share of censure from the world’ (154). Even though the
new Cabal is depicted as a sort of micro-utopia in principle, such utopia is not accepted by society. The society’s censorship of the New Cabal is grounded on its rejection of the sexual politics of this community which focuses only on the pleasure of members. This depiction of the new Cabal hints at Manley’s ambivalence regarding the motives of this community. Astrea’s commentary suggests that she is not sure that members of the new Cabal have got the right principles for an ideal community. At the same time, the description of their dealings suggests that these principles are not ideal in practice either.

Manley’s conception of secrecy is also largely embodied in the process of unmasking the corruption and hypocrisy of Whig politicians and writers throughout the text. Secrecy, in this sense, is regarded as a negative power that shields the hypocrisy of the corrupt politicians and courtiers. Manley’s focus is on the process of revealing secrets by unmasking hypocrisy. There are many textual examples of unmasking hypocrisy in the book, such as the accounts related to the Churchills, and the story of the Duke and his ward Charlot in the political domain, and the anecdotes involving Steele and her fellow women writers in the literary one. For instance, Manley attacks the deceptive methods that the Churchills use to hide their wastefulness, deceitfulness, and greed. Via Intelligence, she accuses them of encouraging vice and corruption. Their only interest is financial gain as the alias Fortunatus which she uses for John Churchill implies. By exposing the vices of the Churchills, Manley purports to unveil the secrets of the favourites’ circles and their scandals to the public. This makes the public sphere aware of the degree of corruption of the favourites, and the impact of their self-interests and greed on the future of the island. Unlike Bacon who insisted on the use of secrecy to protect the political secrets of the state, Manley’s characters use it to hide their sexual desires and protect the secrets of their bedrooms.

In the literary arena, Manley’s attack on Steele and women writers focuses on their undeserved success and ingratitude to her. Her feud with Steele, for instance, featured in the pages of The Examiner, The Guardian, The Tatler, as well as Manley’s New Atalantis and Adventures of Rivella.224 Steele appears in the New Atalantis as Monsieur l’Ingrate. She describes him as a man with ‘an inexhaustible fund of dissimulation’.225
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She mockingly depicts him as a ‘black beau’, with ‘his eyes lost in his head, hanging eyebrows, broad face and tallow complex’ (101). Manley herself appears in the story of Steele as the mocking airy wife. She does not give herself an alias or allegorical name. In fact, Manley’s appearance in the story with a slightly modified name recalls More’s role in his *Utopia*, where he puts himself into the text as the character Morus. This act could have been inspired by Lucian who also put himself into his satires. In this story, Manley depicts herself as the kind-hearted and good-natured woman who has been wronged by Steele. According to Manley, Steele’s standards ‘were loose, his principles were nothing but pretence and a firm resolution of making his fortune at what rate soever… he covered all by a most profound dissimulation, not in his practice, but in his words: not in his actions, but in his pens’ (102). Nonetheless, Manley’s focus in her criticism of Steele emphasises his hypocrisy as a writer. She claims that he has ambitions, but he lacks skills: ‘He’s a poet too… he exhausted most of his stock, for what he has since produced seem but faint copies of that agreeable original, though he’s a most incorrect writer’ (101,102). Manley’s attack on Steele could have been inspired partly by her envy of his success in the literary market as her representation of him as undeserving but happy producer of mercenary writing indicates, and partly by their political differences as Manley was a Tory and Steele was a Whig.

In addition to Steele, her targets of satire in the literary arena also included women writers and rivals like Catherine Trotter, Mary Pix, and Sarah Fyge Egerton. Manley used attacks on these women as a means to defend her status as a writer, often citing their hypocrisy as the reason for her fall out with them. These writers feature in the *New Atalantis, Memoirs of Europe*, and *The Adventures of Rivella*. In her attacks on these women, Manley employed the same tactics she used when criticizing Steele. Her attacks on Steele and her fellow women writers was an attempt on her part to construct and control her image through creating self-representations of herself and her literary rivals in her fiction. Her self-representations are manifested in the characters of the airy wife and Delia in the *New Atalantis* as well as the character of Rivella in *The Adventures of Rivella*. She always portrayed herself as the victim who had been wronged by those she was attacking. Her secret weapon in these experiments was her awareness of the fact that secrets have complex influences as they circulate through society. She was aware of the appeal of gossip to the general public, and thus traded in gossip, trifles, and ‘old Stories that all the World has long since reported’ to achieve success and establish her
Manley’s *Atalantis*: the New *Atlantis* of the Eighteenth Century

The popularity of Manley’s work is evident in the number of works that imitated it and used the term ‘Atalantis’ not in the Baconian context, but rather in the scandalous and political contexts that Manley’s work associated with the term. In this sense, Manley’s text established a tradition of utopian allusion in a framework that is totally different from the frameworks of More and Bacon. Manley’s *New Atalantis* could be seen to have eclipsed Bacon’s scientific utopia, *New Atlantis*, in terms of popularity and appeal to the reading public and in the marketplace. Manley’s work replaces the ideal values and aspirations for scientific and technological advancement that Bacon’s work envisions by corruption, self-interests, and hypocrisy. It questions the validity of the values that works such as Bacon’s utopia advocate when compared with the prevalent values of self-interest, corruption, and lewdness in the early eighteenth century. The text itself works by indirection in the sense that it highlights the significance of virtue by emphasising its absence.

Manley’s allusion to Bacon’s *New Atlantis* and her use of a slightly different version of the title of Bacon’s utopia gave the term ‘Atalantis’ a new meaning. After the publication of Manley’s work, the term ‘Atalantis’ was often associated with sexual intimacies and political intrigues in courts, and with secret histories. The *Oxford English Dictionary* states that the term ‘atalantis’ implicates ‘secret or scandalous history’, and it cites Manley’s work as an example for the use of the term in this sense: ‘atalantis: (n) Brief title of romance satirising those who had effected the Revolution of
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1688; hence generally a secret or scandalous history’. Since its publication, Manley’s New Atalantis was confused with Bacon’s New Atlantis on numerous occasions. There are many examples of eighteenth-century catalogues where Manley’s work was cited as New Atlantis and Bacon’s work as New Atalantis. Some examples from these catalogues include entries in which Bacon’s New Atlantis was accidentally misspelt as New Atalantis. For instance, entry number 1141 in Bibliotheca Antonii Collins, arm. or, A Complete Catalogue of the Library of Anthony Collins (1731), cites Bacon’s work as ‘Nova Atalantis’. Also, entry number 472 in Bibliotheca Grangeriana: or a Complete Catalogue of the Library of Thomas Granger (1732), cites the work of Francis Bacon as ‘Bushell’s Abridgment of Lord Bacon’s Theory in Mineral Prosecutions... And Lord Bacon’s New Atalantis’. Entry number 237 in Wagstaff’s Catalogue of Choice Books for 1771, cites Bacon’s work as Lord Bacon’s Natural History, Containing 1000 Curious Experiments, Including his New Atalantis, Which History Gave to the Royal Society in England; Finally, Entry number 40 in A Catalogue of Books, Exhibiting a Valuable and Curious Collection (1794) lists the work of Bacon as: Bacon (Lord Verulam), Sylva Sylvarum, Nat. Hist. in X Centuries, Portrait, 5th edit, 1639, New Atalantis Unfinished. The citations of Bacon’s work in these entries are clear misspellings as each of these entries refers to Bacon and cites the work in scientific and experimental contexts. Further, Bacon’s text has been misspelt as the New Atalantis in other works. For instance, in The Harleian Miscellany (1753), the writer says ‘I have read over Sir Thomas More’s Utopia, and my Lord Bacon’s New Atalantis, which he called so in imitation of Plato’s old one.’ Samuel Johnson, in A Dictionary of the English Language (1755), quotes from Bacon’s work and cites it as the New Atalantis. Another example that shows a misspelling of Bacon’s title is entry number 5 in The Elements of Universal Erudition, Containing an Analytical Abridgment of the
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Sciences, Polite Arts, and Belles Lettres (1771), which cites the work of Bacon as The Atalantis of Lord Bacon and groups it with Sir Thomas More’s Utopia, The Poetical City of the Sun by Campanella, and some other works as political fables. While Manley’s New Atalantis, like More’s Utopia, Campanella’s City of the Sun, and Bacon’s New Atlantis, is a political fable, the belle letters in the title is a reference to an elegant or polite type of literature, not love letters and sexual intrigues, which excludes the possibility of the reference being to Manley’s work.

In the same way, Manley’s New Atalantis was cited as New Atlantis on several occasions. For example, entry number 122 in A Catalogue of Books (1755) cites Manley’s work as Memoirs from the New Atlantis (London, 1709). Also, entry number 1847 in First Part: A Catalogue of Books, Being the Shop-stock of the Late William Ross, Bookseller (1766) cites Manley’s work as New Atlantis. Entry number 1285 in A Catalogue of the Library of the Late Learned Antiquarian, Walter Macfarlane (1768) cites Manley’s memoirs as New Atlantis. Finally, the title page of the 1711 edition of The Secret History of Queen Zara and the Zarazians states that this work was appended to the New Atlantis. These entries are obvious misspellings of the term Atalantis as they cite a work in two volumes, which is a clear reference to Manley’s text. All these examples show that Bacon’s New Atlantis was more likely to have been misspelled as Manley’s than vice versa. Overall, confusing Manley’s secret history with Bacon’s utopian work is strategically significant as it implies that Manley’s work could be said to have displaced Bacon’s utopia in certain respects. That is to say, the new Atlantis of the eighteenth century was Manley’s.

Manley’s work enjoyed unrivalled popularity throughout the eighteenth century. The literary success of the New Atalantis and the context in which Manley used the term

‘Atalantis’ to indicate sexual and political intrigues, elicited many imitations that had used the term in the same context. Some of these imitations shared the same commitment of Manley’s work, which is to satirise the corruption of society and expose its vices. Others ironically depended on the term ‘Atalantis’ to achieve commercial success in the same way Manley used a slightly deformed version of Bacon’s eye-catching title. These imitations varied between fictional accounts, works of poetry, articles and comments in magazines and newspapers. For example, *The History of the Yorkshire Gentry, Particularly the Amours of Melissa* (1713), which was published under the title *The Northern Atlantis*, draws on Manley’s *New Atalantis* in its title, form and content. As in Manley’s work, this text is written in a mixture of prose and verse: the work is a fictional narrative into which was inserted some poems in the same way poems were inserted into the fictional narrative in the *New Atalantis*. As the title suggests, *The Northern Atalantis* is a criticism of the corruption of the local community in the city of York, the northern Atalantis. Its concern is with the local community of York, not the whole island of Great Britain. It seeks to expose the greed and hypocrisy of people, the corruption in the domains of religion, law, and education. Unlike Manley’s text, it does not place much focus on politics. As far as the narrative form is concerned, the work comprises a series of short accounts of, and commentaries on, the vices of society and the corruption of a group of people the narrator comes across during his time in York. The narrator, joined later by a companion, move from one scene to another describing and commenting on what they see. This narrative technique emulates the same technique Manley deploys in *New Atalantis* through her narrator Intelligence and her companions Astrea and Virtue, and it even draws on the apple pie metaphor that Manley uses in her work. Manley uses this metaphor in her work to satirise Egerton and her priest husband.\(^{239}\) In terms of themes, the narrator first criticises the naivety of a group of people who were deceived by a quack whose ‘preposterous lies, jumbled into a cant, so tickled the Ears of the Thoughtless Multitude’ that they were convinced to buy his medications, and ‘began to be as free of their pence, as a Prostitute is of her flesh, or a Canting Spintext of his Sighs and Groans’.\(^{240}\) Then the narrator moves to criticise the corruption of nunneries and the hypocrisy of priests. He describes a nunnery he comes across as the ‘seminary of all Debaucheries’ where girls
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are exposed to the ‘Temptations of the Lustful Priests’ (9). The narrator also attacks the system of education in York. He adopts satirical strategies similar to the ones Manley used in her work, such as satirising the physical defects of her targets as a means to reflect on their moral flaws. For instance, Manley depicts Steele as a clownish figure, and Egerton as a ‘blackmoor, flat-nosed, blobber-lipped’ woman who has no ‘sign of life in her complexion’. The narrator of the *Northern Atalantis* mockingly describes a pedagogue as

a perfect skeleton, a mere Shotten-Herring, or like a long slender Cane with a Head upon it, and short Red Hair under his cap; so that there needs no more to be said to such as known the Proverb, *that neither cat nor dog of that Colour are good*: His Eyes almost sunk into his pole, as if he had look’d through a prospective Glass, or the deep Windows of a Linen-Draper’s Shop; his Nose turning up, and somewhat Flat; his Neck as long as a Crane… his Voice was weak and hollow; his hands full of freckles and each Shoe might have serv’d for an ordinary coffin: In short, he was a person of few words; he was the Superlative Degree of Ignorance, and the very neplus of Ingenuity and Sense.242

This description of the pedagogue recalls Manley’s description of the moral and, more importantly, the physical deformities of Steele.243

*The Northern Atalantis* also draws on Manley’s *New Atalantis* in its depiction of hypocrisy, infidelity, gallantry and political intrigue. The book is a criticism of the ‘frisking Age of Mistaken Gallantry’ (56). It relates a series of tales of gallantry where money and self-interest rule. For example, the description of the cunning of Melissa of the book’s title resembles Manley’s description of women whose lives and marriages are based on self-interest as in the cases of Daphne and Berintha. Of all the ladies who ‘sighed to be Mistresses of that fine Equipage [of Squire Witless Clodpates], and practise’d the little Arts of the sex, to engage the Squire’s Eyes and Notice’, Melissa is the one who makes the successful conquest (61). The language of this extract is similar to Manley’s language in the *New Atalantis* when she describes the tricks of Berintha:
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Berintha, being coquet in perfection, whenever she spoke to the Baron, she softened the tone of her voice, called smiles to her mouth and dimples to her cheeks, assumed a dying sweetness in her eyes, threw out the bait with all the artifice of a skilful hand. Not that she loved him, any other man would have served her business as well.  

Moreover, the description of Melissa’s features as a lady who, ‘tho’ no great Beauty, had a certain Liveliness and agreeable turn of Features, which made her appear very engaging, and a smartness and female vivacity in conversation, that those of no nice Judgment esteem’d her as a wit’, is similar to Manley’s description of some of her characters, particularly that of Charlot: ‘Charlot was no great beauty, her shape was the best, but youth and dress make all things agreeable’. The two authors satirically criticise this type of women who wear the mask of beauty and use their bodies to attract men, achieve financial gain, or higher rank in society. The significance of *The Northern Atalantis* lies in the way in which a title that has utopian connotations was used to indicate corruption and scandal in the early years of the eighteenth century. The work does not link back to earlier utopias of More and Bacon per se. It, however, adopts the Manley way of using a utopian term to reflect on non-utopian society. The text is not concerned with depicting ideal values to be adopted. Its focus is rather on exposing the corruption and decay in the local community of York. The work is but one example of the several imitations of Manley’s work throughout the eighteenth century. It represents a template of a number of works that drew on Manley’s work in their contents and satirical strategies.

**Conclusion**

Manley’s work is a representative of a tradition of writing in which utopia as a concept has been associated with secret history. It links back to the playfulness associated with utopia in the previous two centuries. The work alludes to Bacon’s *New Atlantis* in its title, but its content is different and almost in polar contrast to Bacon’s work. The publication of Manley’s *New Atalantis* marked the emergence of a new meaning of the
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244 *New Atalantis*, p. 65.
245 *Northern Atalantis*, p.61.
utopian term ‘Atlantis’. The term is used in a work that does not present a vision of an ideal community similar to Bacon’s, but a community characterised by greed, hypocrisy, exploitation, and secrecy. In this community, with the exception of the new Cabal, it is the power of politicians, not the power of law that rules. As a political romance, the work reflects on such themes as injustice, poverty, and corruption which More reflects on in Book I of his *Utopia*. Despite the hostility with which Manley’s work was received, particularly by her fellow writers and contemporaries as well as the politicians and courtiers she targeted, the work enjoyed a great deal of popularity and appeal to the general reading public. It was published in several editions through the course of the eighteenth century and was imitated on numerous occasions, and even eclipsed Bacon’s *New Atlantis* upon which Manley drew while composing her work.

Manley used an allusion to Bacon’s work to maximise the satirical effect of her text. Through the issue of secrecy, she shifted the focus from exploring the hidden secrets of nature to exploring the hidden secrets of the bedchambers. In other words, unlike Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, Manley’s *New Atalantis* is interested in the secrets of the private sphere, represented by the bedroom. Though we do not have evidences for direct engagement, one way to read Manley’s text in relation to Bacon’s is to view it as mockingly replacing the scientific advancement that forms the basis of Bacon’s work with gossip. As a response to Bacon’s emphasis on scientific inquiry as a male domain, Manley presented interest in gossip as a female power. She was aware of the human sense of curiosity as much as Bacon. However, the subjects of curiosity in these two cases were different. Further, both works emphasised secrecy; but while Bacon’s brothers of Salomon’s House used secrecy in relation to their discoveries and scientific experiments, secrecy in Manley’s work is emphasised in relation to concealing sexual affairs. Secrecy is represented in Manley’s work in the title, the location and significance of the island of Atalantis, in the figure and role of the main narrator, Intelligence, and in the narrative techniques used by Manley, especially that of unmasking the hypocrisy of her targets through revealing their secrets. At the same time, secrecy was deployed by Manley as an author to avoid any charges of seditious libel. She used many devices to distance herself from the text, relying significantly on the destabilizing effect of gossip to achieve her goals. Her work was centred on the equation of using the power of desire to fulfil the desire for power, and the impact of the secret affairs of the private sphere on the public one.
As an epitome of sexual intrigues and corruption of politicians, Manley’s ‘Atalantis’ could be seen as a replacement for Bacon’s ‘Atlantis’ which was associated with scientific progress and utopian ideals, as the new Atlantis of the eighteenth century. This is verified by the number of works that used the term in the same context as Manley’s work did. Some of these works had the term ‘atalantis’ in their titles such as *The Northern Atalantis, The Modern Atalantis, The New Atalantis for the Year 1713* (1714), *The German Atalantis* (1715), and *The Atalantis Reviv’d* (1745). There are also some works that did not have the term 'Atalantis in their titles, but still however, used the term in contexts similar to the ones in which Manley used it. For instance, the term ‘Atalantis’ is identified with gallantry and gossip in ‘Country Characters’ by Mr Cumberland, Author of the Observer &c. In his account of the life of Billy Bachelor, he remarks that ‘Billy Bachelor… has a court-Atalantis of his own, from which he can favour you with some hints of sly doings amongst maids of honour, particularly of a certain duchess now deceased’.247 Also, *Court-Tales; or, a History of the Amours of the Present Nobility* (1717) imitates Manley’s text in that it gives a series of accounts of the sexual affairs and political intrigues of politicians and rich courtiers.248 These examples embody significant satirical attacks on rotten societies where corruption and vices reign. They offer various accounts of trickery, political corruption and sexual scandals in the form of secret histories and commentaries. They also present overlapping sexual and political affairs that condemn society to decay. For my argument in tracing developments in the association of secret history and utopian elements, the most significant imitation of Manley’s work, however, is the anonymous *The Modern Atalantis* (1784), a work that maintained the trend of writing represented by Manley’s work towards the end of the eighteenth century.
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248 *Court-Tales: or, a History of the Amours of the Present Nobility. To which is Added a Complete Key* (London, Printed for J. Roberts, 1717).
5. Conclusion

Eighteenth-century utopias were not as insignificant as many literary critics argued. The works of Defoe and Manley, which were discussed in the previous two chapters, maintained and reformulated some of the earlier traditions found in seventeenth-century utopian writings, by drawing on specific features of the utopias of More, Bacon, Harrington, and Neville. This reformulation process is manifested in the focus of Manley’s and Defoe’s works not on describing ideal societies, but on the criticism of the shortcomings of the author’s society in the former and on the evolution of society from the state of nature in the latter. In Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe and its sequel, two works I read as one, Defoe depicts a shift from an individual utopia exemplified in the moral evolution of the protagonist to a collective utopia realised by the political evolution of the island community from the state of nature to that of a commonwealth.

In Manley’s New Atalantis, ‘Atalantis’ is used to indicate political and sexual intrigues, not to refer to an ideal island as in Bacon’s New Atlantis. The works of Defoe and Manley were different in form from earlier utopias in the sense that they were as Christine Rees rightly notes, parts of larger narrative schemes, secret history in Manley’s case and travel narrative in Defoe’s.

The new modes of utopian-related writing, as expressed by Defoe’s and Manley’s texts in the early years of the eighteenth century, continued to the end of the century. These texts evoked a variety of associations which were embodied particularly in two works that picked on these works’ utopian potential, namely the anonymous The Modern Atalantis (1874), and Thomas Spence’s A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe (1782). The significance of these two works lies in the way they link together different utopian traditions. The Modern Atalantis is partly an imitation of Manley’s New Atalantis dealing with such themes as the corruption of politicians, sexual scandals, and the manipulation of secrets to achieve financial gain and sexual satisfaction, and employing some of the satirical devices that she employed in her work. At the same time, the work partly alludes to Bacon’s experimental philosophy as illustrated in the New Atlantis. The text presents a perfect example of the confusion between Bacon’s New Atlantis and Manley’s New Atalantis in the way it shifts the scene from one island to another, from perfection in Urgando’s island, which symbolises Bacon’s Atlantis, to corruption in the island of Libertusia, which symbolises Manley’s Atalantis. The work
is an instance of the way Bacon’s and Manley’s works were associated. Similar example of such connections appeared in an article in *Fog’s Weekly Journal* of 1733, where it satirically refers to the fantastical character of Bacon’s work by grouping it with More’s work, describing ‘an island call’d Utopia, which, with another adjacent one, the new Atlantis, forms a powerful kingdom’. When Utopia was first discovered, ‘Gold was held in such Contempt’ and there was no use for it, but now ‘no people on Earth excels them in paying Veneration, nay, Adoration to that divine Mettal’. However, the term ‘adjacent’ hints at Eliza Haywood’s *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia*, suggesting that the reference here is to Manley’s and Haywood’s works, not to Bacon’s and More’s.

The narrative in *The Modern Atalantis* commences on an island in the Atlantic Ocean, ruled by Urgando, where the focus is on revealing ‘the most hidden secrets of nature’. The secrets of nature are disclosed by ‘those powerful arts’ of magic (iv). The work at this point also draws on Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, particularly in its use of magic and supernatural spirits. Uriel, the name of the demon, itself recalls that of Ariel in Shakespeare’s work. The work could also be said to recall Bacon’s utopia where the island of Bensalem is referred to as ‘the land of magicians’. Like the island of Bensalem in Bacon’s work, Urgando’s island is naturally fortified where, ‘a mist impenetrable to mortal sight surrounded these blissful shores’. The only thing missing from this island is human existence: ‘the joys of human society alone were absent’ (v). However, Urgando was aware of the existence of humankind on an island in the Western Ocean, and he was impressed by ‘the restless ingenuity of man [who] had contrived a vast machine, by which the daring artist had soared above the clouds of heaven, and visited the great aetherial expanse…’ (3). The vast machine is a reference to the air balloon.

Air travel itself links the work back to Bacon’s experimental philosophy which forms the foundation of his scientific utopia. In the *New Atlantis*, Bacon, through the Father of Salomon’s House, expresses his interest in air flying. The Father states that the scientists of Salomon’s House ‘imitate also flights of birds’, and they ‘have some
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251 *New Atlantis*, in *The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon*, p. 718.
252 *The Modern Atalantis*, p. v.
degrees of flying in the air. Air travel is perhaps one of those inventions that Bacon anticipated in the early years of the seventeenth century. Almost a hundred and fifty years later, Balloon travel caused frenzy among Europeans throughout the 1780s. One year before the appearance of the *Modern Atalantis*, the first balloon flight was launched in France in June 1783. In December of the same year, two experimental balloons were launched in London by Count Francesco Zambeccari. These experimental balloon launches recall Bacon’s experimental philosophy that insisted on the empirical approach to scientific knowledge and disregarded the contemplative one. This event increased the English people’s interest in ballooning. It created a sense of excitement as an unprecedented spectacle for them. The subject widely featured in works across the literary arena from poems, penny ballads, to jest books. In *The Modern Atalantis*, balloon travel was used as a means of satire.

Through the use of the air balloon, the scene shifts to the Island of Libertusia. Like the island of Atalantis in Manley’s text, Libertusia stands for the Island of Great Britain even though it is set in the Western Ocean. The name Libertusia itself has utopian tone. It is reminiscent of Harrington’s Oceana and Spence’s Crusonia and Spensonia. The shift between the two islands in the *Modern Atalantis* shows the contrast between the islands in Bacon’s and Manley’s works. While the former is associated with scientific organisation and order, the latter stands for corruption and scandal. Urgando and his assistant arrive on the island invisible and secure to ‘the intrusion of the mortals eye’. The narrative at this point becomes more like that of Manley’s *New Atalantis*, where Astrea and Virtue are invisible to the human eye while they are touring the island of Atalantis. The Demon in this work parallels Lady Intelligence in Manley’s work. Like Intelligence, Uriel operates as the gossip who reveals the secrets of corrupt politicians to his companion.

The *Modern Atalantis*, moreover, is a political allegory that draws on Manley’s work in terms of content. For example, the Circus, where ‘the rich, the beautiful, and voluptuous at this moment vie with each other in the pompous display of dress and equipage’, parallels Hyde Park in Manley’s text. It is at the centre of the narrative. The Demon
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255 Ibid, pp. 46-47.
256 *The Modern Atalantis*, p. 4.
then moves from one person to another, describing them and relating their stories in response to Urgando’s inquiries, in the same manner Intelligence answers the questions of Astrea in *New Atalantis*. Further, the themes that the work tackles are almost the same ones discussed in Manley’s text. These include secrecy, greed, hypocrisy, gaming, and sexual intrigues. Gaming, for instance is depicted as a vice. While telling the story of a young man referred to earlier, the Demon states that the man had developed ‘an invincible attachment with the dice-box’ that had ‘diminished his princely fortune’ (11). Similarly, Manley in the *New Atalantis* criticises ‘the prevailing force of gaming’ as ‘witchcraft’.\(^{257}\) For her, gambling is not a form of diversion any longer, but rather a form of employment (187). She further attacks gaming as a waste of honour, money and time particularly for women who neglect their houses and mothers’ duties, and spend most of their time playing cards. These women ‘become bold, avaricious, designing, unmerciful, neglectful mothers, insupportable wives, exchanging all their charms for gold to lavish at the basset table’ (187).

In addition, *The Modern Atalantis* has a complex network of political intrigues and sexual relationships at its centre. The text comprises a series of anecdotes that relate the political intrigues and sexual scandals of Tory politicians and favourites in the court of George III.\(^{258}\) The text, as the title indicates, deals with the ‘secret memoirs of the most conspicuous persons of high quality, of both sexes’ as does Manley’s work. Like *New Atalantis*, *The Modern Atalantis* was also provided with a key to reveal the real characters of the author’s satirical targets. This was not necessary, as an article in *The Monthly Review* indicates, because ‘the character here exhibited are well known; and what is related of them needed no devil to reveal’.\(^{259}\) The same article also states that ‘the writer doth not wholly deal in scandal; though there is too large a quantity of it in this little volume’.\(^{260}\) The work, moreover, is described by Amanda Goodrich as an ‘attack on the traditional role of the aristocrats as defenders of the state’ which ‘was held up for ridicule’.\(^{261}\) In the political and utopian contexts in which Manley’s work has been examined, this work contributes remarkably to the discussion of the connections between Manley’s *New Atalantis* and Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, particularly in

\(^{257}\) *New Atalantis*, p.187.
\(^{258}\) Keen, p. 47.
\(^{260}\) Ibid, p. 231.
its focus on revealing secrets and controlling nature. It combines elements from utopian, utopian-influenced, and non-utopian works, namely Bacon’s New Atlantis, Manley’s New Atalantis, and Shakespeare’s The Tempest, indicating that utopia at the end of the century was significantly part of a larger political discourse.

Spence’s A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe also draws on elements from earlier utopian traditions to establish a new tradition. The work is an example of Spence’s eclecticism because it picks up elements from More’s Utopia, Harrington’s Oceana, Neville’s The Isle of Pines, and Defoe’s The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe and puts them together to create a utopia. For instance, the text draws on More’s Utopia and Neville’s Isle of Pines in the use of the dialogue technique. It takes the form of a dialogue in a letter conveyed by a visitor to the island as in Neville’s The Isle of Pines. For instance, the readers of A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe are introduced to the advantages of the system of Crusonia through a dialogue between Mr Mann, a citizen of Crusonia, and Captain Wishit, a visitor to the island. The dialogue relays to readers the recent problems that the Crusonians have faced and the solutions they applied. Captain Wishit, who is initially very sceptical about the Crusonian system, seems to be converted to ‘wishing it’ at the end of his encounter with Mann, as his own name suggests. Wishit, moreover, can be seen as an allusion to the last line of More’s Utopia where More, though sceptical about it, rather wishes than hopes for the utopian system to be followed in Europe: ‘I readily admit that there are many features in the Utopian commonwealth which it is easier for me to wish for in our countries than to have any hope of seeing realised’. Wishit’s role as a visitor to Crusonia also recalls that of Hythloday in More’s Utopia. Further, like Neville’s Isle of Pines where story of the Pines is revealed through a letter by Henry Cornelius Van Sloetten to his friend in London, the story of the Crusonians similarly is told through a letter sent by Captain Wishit to a friend in England. Like Van Sloetten, Wishit arrives on the island of Crusonia after a storm. Nonetheless, the text’s most obvious reference is to Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe and its sequel. A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe is a continuation of, and a response to the social and political order that Crusoe established by the end of The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. In chapbook form, the work offers a re-reading of Crusoe’s establishment and a modification of the political system on the island, proposing a more equal distribution of landed property among its people.

It starts where the island episode ends in *The Further Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*. Spence’s choice of the chapbook format was because the Crusoe story was already established and disseminated in that form in the second part of the century. The opening sentence of the text follows the utopian model and hints at the purpose of the work: ‘After a stale Description of Courses and Storms, manner of landing, &c., I now proceed to tell you something of the Government, Religion, and Customs of this famous Island’.263 At the same time, that the narrative frame is limited to one sentence is a satirical remark on utopian tropes. It indicates that Spence is not really interested in fictional details such as the imaginary voyage and shipwrecks. Instead, he is focused on presenting the practical details of his plan for a better society.

In order to understand this work, we need to understand Spence’s background and ideology as a political writer. Spence was born in Newcastle to religious parents. His political ideologies were shaped by two factors: the poverty in which his family struggled all their lives, and his religious upbringing.264 He was first noticed as a political theorist and writer after introducing his plan for a better and equal community, which was repeated throughout almost all of his works. The plan, which he first read at a meeting of the Philosophical Society of Newcastle in 1775, suggests

that all land belonged to the people; that the land might be divided into parishes, which should receive from each individual a rent for the portion of ground which he occupied, which rent was to be transmitted to government for the purposes of state; that land was not to be sold or alienated by the parishes, or they would be looked upon with as much horror and detestation, and used by the people as if they had sold all their children to be slaves, or massacred them with their own hands.265

The political climate of Newcastle played an important role in shaping Spence’s political perspectives in his early career. *A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe* is therefore a reflection on the image of an idealised Newcastle.266 The island is named Crusonia, after its founder, Crusoe. Its main town is

265 Ibid, p.316.
built on each side of a commodious Harbour, a considerable River falls into it, and at the upper End of the Harbour, there is a most elegant Bridge. The Town extends about a Mile on each side along the Shore, and about half a Mile outward towards the Country, and contains about fifty thousand Inhabitants. Four Parishes meet and have their Churches in it, two on each Side, whose Steeples are very magnificent, and a great Ornament to the Town. It is full of superb and well furnished Shops, and has every Appearance of Grandeur, Opulence, and Convenience, one can conceive to be in a large Place, flourishing with Trade and Manufactures.267

The landscape in the text fuses the rural and the urban in one scene, so as the town is ‘properly a Continuation of Garden and Orchards’ of the countryside (7). Following a short fictional description of Crusonia, we are told that the islanders meet and discuss the Crusanian system. In terms of themes, Spence’s work reflects on the issues of private property, idleness, and warfare which occupy central positions in the utopias of More and Harrington. As in More’s and Harrington’s utopias, voting through the secret ballot is a basic principle in A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe. Lawyers in Crusonia, as in More’s Utopia, are deemed ‘unnecessary’ (14). Also, like More’s Utopia and Defoe’s utopian-influenced work, Crusonia advocates religious toleration (14). Further, strangers are encouraged to settle in Crusonia. When the island is overpopulated, the Crusanions spread to the continent, like the Utopians in who set up colonies on neighbouring island when Utopia is overpopulated. Taxes in Crusonia are estimated according to the parishes’ ability to pay.268 The continent is named Fridinea after Friday in Defoe’s work. In Crusonia, as in Utopia, ‘anarchy, idleness, poverty and meanness’ have no room. These are rather replaced by ‘nothing but order, industry, wealth, and the most pleasing magnificence’.269 This is an indication that the correct application of Spence’s plan would replace idleness and poverty with wealth, order and prosperity. Spence’s faith in the validity of his plan as the means for establishing a utopian society is repeated almost in all his works, and this one is no exception. The same themes Spence discusses in A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe recur in his other utopias. The most significant of these is the issue of private property and its

267 A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe, p.7.
268 Rudkin, p.47.
269 A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe, p.7.
influence on the landlord-tenant relationship. Mr Mann tells Wishit that the Crusonian system, since its establishment, banished landlords and adopted the parish system:

We intend to have no Landlords but the Parishes and to make every parish a corporation and every man a parishioner and member of that Parish, and that only he last dwelt a full year in, notwithstanding what other parish, County or Nation he might come from prior to such settlement. A small rent or rate shall, according to the determination of the parishioners, be paid by every Person, suitable to the valuation of the Houses and Land he possesses, to the Parish Treasury to be put to such uses as the majority pleases and each parish shall have all the uncontrollable Power that can possibly be made good use of by a corporation, to be connected only by a Parliament for the common strength and welfare of the whole (6).

This extract indicates that Spence rejects the Lockean model in favour of a Harringtonian one that should be followed to construct an ideal community which can guarantee an equal distribution of land, and thus, equal rights to the inhabitants. For him, the flaw in the Lockean model after which the commonwealth was established in Defoe’s work, is that it installed an individual as landlord and gave him the unjust right to claim the ownership of landed property through a written contract. Spence’s interest in land property, as illustrated in his utopian plan, was heavily influenced by James Harrington’s writings, and his Oceana in particular. His insistence on the importance of landed property as the focal point of his political ideology stems from his belief that it is a crucial component for political power as he states in The Real Rights of Man:

That property in land and liberty among men, in a state of nature, ought to be equal, few, one would fain hope, would be foolish enough to deny. Therefore, taking this to be granted, the country of any people, in their native state, is properly their common, in which each of them has an equal property, with free liberty to sustain himself and family with animals, fruits, and other products thereof.\(^{270}\)

\(^{270}\) The Real Rights of Man, in The Political Works of Thomas Spence, p.1.
The influence of Harrington in the text appears in Spence’s subordination of all political aspects in favour of a system of equal distribution of property. He made several direct references to Harrington in his writing. According to Chase, Spence, in his trial of 1801, chose to read extracts from The Examination of James Harrington, Taken in the Tower of London by the Earl of Lauderdale, and from Prerogatives of Popular Government. Spence also published extracts from Harrington’s works in his Pig’s Meat (1793) on several occasions. From Harrington, Spence derives his ideas of the secret ballot and citizen militia, as well as the significance he attached to the equal distribution of landed property as the major factor for the establishment of an ideal society. Harrington’s influences on Spence, Chase argues, could be ‘observed in his keenness for the ballot, in his belief that voters should have a property-qualification, and that Members of Parliament should be paid. He has, also, adopted Harrington’s critical attitude to the Old Testament. In addition, Harrington and Spence are similar in their convictions that all capable members of the ideal community are to bear arms. For Spence, ‘the general forces of the commonwealth are composed of the whole people…All the Spensonians are soldiers; they are all exercised in the use of arms’. Similarly, Harrington in Oceana emphasises the significance of bearing arms as the means for maintaining political responsibility, a point Spence asserts in his works: ‘it was delightful to behold so many thousand citizen soldiers in arms only of defence; an army of men ‘who their duties know, and know their rights; and, knowing, dare maintain’. In this sense, both Spence and Harrington follow Thomas More’s model which was based on rejecting standing armies in favour of citizen militias.

Spence was convinced that any political reform would not be effective without a law that oversees the just redistribution of landed property. He called for radical abolition of existing systems as the way for establishing better ones. He believed that establishing a just and better system required striking at the root of the existing one, rather than trying to diagnose and remedy its symptoms. He famously elaborated on this point in A Further Account of Spensonia, by stating that
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274 A Further Account of Spensonia, in The Political Works of Thomas Spence (1795), p. 31; A Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe, pp. 9-10; The Real Rights of Man, p. 4.
Thousands of abortive schemes are daily proposed for redressing grievances and mending the constitution, whereas, the shoes were so ill-made at first, and so worn, rotten, and patched already, that they are not worth the trouble or expense, but ought to be thrown to the dunghill; and a new pair should be made, neat, tight, and easy as for the foot of one that loves freedom and ease. Then would your controversies about this and the other way of cobbling, that continually agitate you, be done away, and you would walk along the rugged and dirty path of life easy and dry-shoe.²⁷⁵

He reiterated his discontent with reform plans proposed by his contemporaries in *Restorer of Society*, because, in his opinion, they should abolish any existing system before implementing these plans. He identified the abolition of private property as the starting point for this process because he was convinced that political power comes from landed property. In Spensonia, as in Crusonia and as in Oceana, the common ownership of landed property is necessary for participating in the domain of politics. He indicates that in all previous states, governments were the owners of lands. So for the Spensonians ‘to have the government in their own hands, they must begin first, by taking the land into their own hands’.²⁷⁶ Also, the ideal community presented in this text is not established on the perfectibility of mankind. It is based on a set of rules that keep the community intact.

The significance of Spence’s utopia stems from the fact that it creates a vision of an ideal community by combining specific elements from earlier utopian or utopian-influenced texts. Most of Spence’s works seem to be linked to representatives of other literary forms or traditions. His *Supplement to the History of Robinson Crusoe* and *An History of the Rise and Progress of Learning to Lilliput* can be regarded as sequels to Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* respectively. Also, *The Constitution of Spensonia, a Country in Fairy-Land, Situated between Utopia and Oceana* is a contribution to the utopian tradition because its title refers to two landmarks of that tradition. It can also be read as a punning reference to Edmund Spenser’s ‘The Faerie Queene’ (1590). These references to famous literary works from diverse genres, in the titles and subtitles of Spence’s works demonstrate the eclectic nature of his texts.

²⁷⁵ *A Further Account of Spensonia*, p. 30.
²⁷⁶ *A Description of Spensonia*, p. 32.
They give readers an initial idea about their content and help them determine their approach for decoding these texts. The uniqueness of Spence’s endeavours lies in the process in which he seems to be synthesising a variety of utopian traditions, so as to produce a practical vision for a better world. He picks elements from earlier utopias to construct his own. His importance for this research is that he proves that, by the late eighteenth century, at least one prolific writer was reading Defoe’s work as one that has strong utopian associations. The way Spence tackles utopia as an idea seems to stress the practicality of what he is presenting. Though he is using the islands in Defoe’s and Swift’s fictional works as setting for his utopias, he is more concerned with the practical issues of utopia. Utopia for him is a plan for better society to be realised in reality.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, the way in which utopia was generally received by the reading public changed. Utopian traditions were retrospectively identified as illustrated in *The Modern Atalantis* and more importantly in Spence’s utopias. These works reinvented utopian traditions by combining elements from utopian or utopian-influenced works that appeared in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. The way these traditions were constructed points at the significance of Manley’s and Defoe’s works in eighteenth-century utopian discourses. Drawing on aspects of earlier utopian works became the norm in the latter part of the century in the sense that some of the works produced at the time, made direct references to earlier utopias of More, Bacon and Harrington in particular. These utopias evidently influenced the political ideals presented by such political theorists as Thomas Paine and William Godwin at the end of the eighteenth century. These ideals were translated into fictional and non-fictional accounts in such utopian works as *A Trip to the Island of Equality* (1792), William Hodgson’s *The Commonwealth of Reason* (1795) and Thomas Northmore’s *Memoirs of Planetes, Or, a Sketch of the Laws and Manners of Makar* (1795) among others. These works embodied a tendency for political reform, ‘culminating in a partial fusion of utopianism and constitutionalist political theory’, represented by the revolutionary thought of such writers as Thomas Paine and William Godwin.\(^{277}\)

---

\(^{277}\) Claeys, *Utopias of the British Enlightenment*, pp. xi-xii.
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