

UCLA

Departmental Honors Theses

Title

Island Narrative Pedagogy: Instructing Autodidacticism to Encourage Social Critique

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/44g0f1jg>

Author

Reyes, Michael

Publication Date

2014-03-04

Undergraduate

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

ISLAND NARRATIVE PEDAGOGY: INSTRUCTING AUTODIDACTICISM TO
ENCOURAGE SOCIAL CRITIQUE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

BY

MICHAEL REYES

ADVISOR: CHRISTINE CHISM

LOS ANGELES, CA

03 / 04 / 2014

ABSTRACT

Island Narrative Pedagogy: Instructing Autodidacticism to Encourage Social Critique

by Michael Reyes

This thesis compares the pedagogical methods used in the two didactic island narratives *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān* and *Robinson Crusoe*. Although these narratives were produced in distinct historical moments they share commonalities in their design that provokes readerly investigation of contradictions. Through an allegorical interpretation of each narrative I examine the procedure each character undergoes as he becomes self-aware of his relationship to other humans, divine craftsmanship, and the metaphysical world. How do deserted island settings in these narratives become locations of autodidacticism, or self-learning, that consequently encourage social critique? I claim that these narratives generate models of critical and independent thought for contemporary readers. To buttress my claim I identify the points of institutional critique and anti-binary thinking exhibited in each narrative. I apply theories of the novel, self-reflection, conquest, learning and teaching to my close readings to illustrate how the process of dialectical reasoning is active. The final analysis finds that these texts use self-critique, exemplified by both characters and narrators, to help us readers continually re-envision effective methods of practicing pedagogy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While writing this thesis I have benefited from the support of people, institutions, and on-campus resources. I thank the staff, administrators and graduate mentors at the Undergraduate Research Center who organized conferences and secured funding to grant me the opportunity to travel and share my research. Generous funding from the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Research Fellowship has allowed me to devote much time to this scholarly endeavor. Furthermore, I am indebted to Professor Christine Chism, with whom I shared ideas and confusing papers, and who patiently pointed out gaps in my arguments and writing style. Ever since the inception of this project, which was inspired by one of her thought provoking courses, she has given it her much appreciated attention. In addition, I thank Professor Michael Cooperson for a careful revision of the wording of an early draft. I also thank Professor Muriel McClendon, who helped me think about how to present my work orally, and Professor Robin Kelley who provided me with references and encouragement in the early stages. I thank all of the UCLA librarians who are always ready and willing to help me navigate the overwhelming amount of research materials available to students on and off campus. Lastly, I appreciate the support of all my relations who contributed to my personal well-being during the process of completing this project.

CONTENTS

1. Islands and Self-Learning	1
2. The Literal and Allegorical Meaning of Clothing: A Conduit to the Extra-Literal	3
3. Island Meditations and Shifting Views: Anti-Imperialism and Self-Questioning	10
4. From Autodidactic to Didactic	19
5. The Pedagogy of Fiction Island Narratives: Inviting the Reader to Think	27

1. Islands and Self-Learning

This study compares two island narratives of autodidacticism: Ibn Tufayl's *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān* and Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. I examine the pedagogical application of allegory, a literary device that uses symbolic imagery to represent abstract concepts, as well as its trans-historical capacity. My line of inquiry explores the distinct styles of pedagogy each text uses on the similar island scenarios. I identify various points of social critique within each narrative, such as Ibn Tufayl's overt critique of institutional religion and Daniel Defoe's implicit critique of imperialism. My allegorical interpretation of these narratives presents a model for critical and independent thought to contemporary readers.

The story of *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān* (c. 1169) focuses on an infant, Ḥayy, who grows up on an uninhabited island raised by a gazelle. After learning basic survival skills, he discovers natural laws and through empirical exploration has direct experience of the divine while realizing his inseparability from it. He makes contact with civilization by means of another spiritual hermit, Absāl, who visits the island one day and becomes his apprentice. After failing to teach his fellow man the secrets of divine wisdom, he grows to pity humanity. Ḥayy and Absāl return to the deserted island to pursue the mystical state until their deaths.

Robinson Crusoe (1719) is a tale of an adolescent who flees his home to become a merchant seaman only to end up a castaway on a deserted island for twenty-eight years. His faith in Biblical teachings increases as he finds analogies with what he learns in scripture in the moral lessons provided to him by the island environment. After enslaving a local islander, he develops a proto-colony with the help of other castaways he eventually meets from surrounding islands. He returns to England only to long for his island that he left behind.

Each of these island narratives contains instructions on how to self-instruct. By using frame

narrative or multi-layered narration, a literary technique that serves to present an emphasized second narrative within a main narrative, each text represents the self-reflective practices it advocates. The island, a piece of land surrounded by water, is a prime location to demonstrate self-instruction since it is a place of both isolation and environmental intensity. Historically, the island in literature has been represented as a site of anomalies and natural phenomena that guarantee a range of empirical studies to engage in. Also, as island-based theory has shown us: “The island metaphor [can lend itself] to self-reflexive references: islands can potentially mirror the modes of discourse and textuality in which they are embedded” (Edmond & Smith 4). To apply this theoretical lens to these texts we must consider how the island metaphor mirrors the discourse of autodidacticism. The island setting provides the ideal conditions for self-education by separating the autodidact from the conventional principles of his society and by promoting a dialectical relationship between private learning and instructing the public. The social reassessments that these texts offer are metaphysical understandings developed in solitude by observing the environment. These understandings are of interest to me partly because of the literary techniques used to present them (such as frame-narration, and allegory), but more importantly because the degree to which they are explicitly imposed upon readers varies from text to text.

Vocal literary critics before me have debated whether Defoe's narrative was influenced by Ibn Tufayl's. But, the attempts to trace this line of literary influence often digress from comparing the textual aspects and assume a required historical investigation into the possibility of Defoe having encountered the Arabic text. I find such discussions of influence, which constitute a bulk of the comparative scholarship produced with these two texts, polarizing and (although sometimes intriguing) for the purposes of this study unnecessary. In the most recent book dedicated to the

topic, *Ibn Tufayl and His Influence on European Writers*, Palestinian critic Mahmoud Baroud remarks how: “the whole question of Defoe's indebtedness may never be settled...[but] the fact that we find diverse dissenting... views [concerning] the question of influence...is a driving motivation behind [the] study” (74). Baroud's study heavily considers external evidence regarding Defoe's acquaintance with the Arabic text and also includes close readings that analyze both texts against a varied social and cultural context. But, moving away from the question of influence I contribute instead to the discussion of *Hayy* and *Crusoe* by emphasizing their socially transformative use-value as literary artifacts that challenge readers to question the relationship between pedagogy and resistance.

The moment *Hayy* and *Crusoe* each turn from autodidactic to didactic marks the practice of teaching based on different methodological premises. The different forms of didacticism I examine are straight forward teaching, which is more explicit and direct, and subversive invitations to dialectically rethink contradictions. I argue that the analytical behavior which the island environment fosters for *Hayy* and *Crusoe* mirrors the behavior that the authors are challenging the reader to assume in the textual environment. With this in mind, my close readings are less concerned with how these texts reflect cultural values implicit in them and more concerned with how they articulate and reproduce alternative modes of thought and behavior.

2. The Literal and Allegorical Meaning of Clothing: A Conduit to the Extra-Literal

As long prose fiction narratives both *Hayy* and *Crusoe* exhibit characteristics of novels. With regards to their novelistic subgenre, I consider *Hayy* a philosophical tale and *Crusoe* an allegorical spiritual autobiography. I am as interested in *what* gets narrated as I am in *how* it gets narrated. In particular, I observe how instances of self-conscious narration represent the act of reaching one's limit of knowledge, a risky activity the authors actively provoke. To illustrate how

novelistic form in both *Hayy* and *Crusoe* accentuates the self-conscious essence of each text I will first borrow Mikhail Bakhtin's description:

'Novel' is whatever force is at work within a given literary system to reveal the limits, the artificial constraints of that system... The novel parodies other genres...exposes the conventionality of their forms and language... [It] is the only developing genre and therefore it reflects more deeply, more essentially, more sensitively and rapidly, reality itself in the process of its unfolding. Only that which is itself developing can comprehend the development process. (v-7)

In both Ibn Tufayl and Daniel Defoe's works the autodidactic process develops through individual study of the world; and since, as Bakhtin says, the novel is a genre that is developing self-learning is a suitable topic for the genre. Each story reveals the artificial constraints of its literary system through self-conscious narration and inquisitive reasoning. The narrator in each text reaches the boundary of his knowledge and consequently begins to probe the limits of textuality. The narrator's awareness of textual boundaries, which is fostered by the isolated island metaphor, is a reflection of how metaphysical understanding can be impeded by social boundaries. In this way, the allegorical didactic mode of each narrative instructs through fiction in order to raise readerly consciousness about the text's capacity to meditate upon its own form of novelistic cloaking to communicate pedagogy.

This emerges most powerfully in the allegorical imagery of nudity found in each text which challenges readers to evaluate the symbolic "clothing" of a particular object of study. The allegorical technique these texts use to accomplish this veiling may be conceived of in terms of the *mise-en-abyme*,ⁱⁱ a literary device that refers to the representation of an entity inside of an identical entity. In this case, the representation of an allegory inside of another allegory serves

the purposes of self-examination. Through the process of clothing and eventually uncloaking the narrative depicts a transformation from culture to nature while exemplifying their inseparability. Moreover, the allegory of nudity and clothing mirror the explicit and the indirect methods of instruction that these authors use to teach. Nudity in these texts is incompatible both with the spiritual intentions of the characters as well as the pedagogical intentions of the authors; as we will see, sometimes instruction must be veiled to be well received.

During the first seven years of Ḥayy's life he learns how to create garments to properly clothe his body. After an unsuccessful attempt at creating a garment out of sticks and leaves, he tries out animal parts: "Boldly taking hold of the eagle, Ḥayy cut off the wings and tail just as they were, all in one piece...Thus he got a fine covering that not only kept him warm but also terrified the animals that not one of them would fight with him" (111). At age seven, Ḥayy discovers a means to produce clothing that both keeps him warm and scares off animals that menace him. On a practical level, Ḥayy's experimental risk-taking results in him acquiring survival wisdom. The artificial surface he produces for himself effectively wards off undesirable attention.

Allegorically, however, this "clothing" alludes to the act of veiling the story in allegory—a veiling that, like Ḥayy's, endures scrutiny—that Ibn Tufayl commits through frame narration. What we see in Ibn Tufayl's case is that he devalues literalism, which is the exposition of an argument in literal terms, ironically, in a very explicit way. At the end of his text, Ibn Tufayl plainly says: "I have not left the secrets laid down in these few pages entirely without veil – a sheer one, easily pierced by those fit to do so, but capable of growing thick to those unworthy of passing beyond that they will never breach it" (166). According to these words, the fact that a veil can potentially "grow thick" for those unequipped to pierce it alludes to the potential that we possess as readers to misinterpret an allegorical text. While demonstrating that all of us, with

exception of “those who are fit to do so,” are susceptible to this potential pitfall, the text raises the question of how we interpret the spiritual that is coded in the sensible.

For readers this act of interpretation shares a semblance with, what we commonly refer to as, the culture/nature binary, which these texts portray as artificial. Each autodidact begins his learning process on the island at a different point in their life. Hayy starts his edification on the island from scratch whereas Defoe arrives to the island with his cultural upbringing as a reference point from which to reconstruct. Crusoe is shown as an adult with a predefined culture while Hayy is an infant and begins only with his wits and senses. Despite these discrepancies in cultural exposure each narrative similarly renders its cultural productions as disposable. As Mahmoud Baroud notes: “Crusoe survives by his wits and the qualities of his cultural upbringing...[while] Hayy survives by his native wits, acute observations, and contemplations depending only on his own efforts and the innate power of reason” (92). On one hand we get invention/exploration in *Hayy* and on the other hand we get *reinvention/self-questioning* in *Crusoe*. This contrast energizes each narrative's capacity for social critique by demonstrating to us different methods of producing and adjusting to cultural change.

For the shipwrecked castaway Crusoe clothing is more of a practical object required to survive the island's hot climate than a symbolically loaded one. The surplus of clothing inherited from his shipwreck becomes worthless as he observes its impracticality: “I had among all the Men's clothes of the Ship almost three dozen of Shirts...but they were too hot to wear...the Weather was so violent hot...yet I could not go Quite naked...tho' I was all alone” (114). The dramatic irony of Crusoe's situation is that he has an abundance of clothing which he has no use for. This is just one way the island reverses Crusoe's value system by rendering a significant amount of his material objects useless. Yet, Crusoe takes on the challenge of survival by

attempting to create clothes, as we see in this account: “I saved the Skins of the Creatures that I kill'd...I made me a Suit of Cloaths...I must omit to knowledge that they were wretchedly made; for if I was a bad *Carpenter*, I was a worse *Taylor*” (114). As illustrated here, Crusoe creates his own garments despite a lack of experience in “taylery.” In this way, Crusoe's adaptability is put to the test as he is required to produce clothing out of raw materials, a “wretched” task that he is unfamiliar with since he comes from a merchant background. His initial inefficiency is only a minor setback and soon after he overcomes it. Progressive instances such as these form Crusoe's autodidactic development which, unlike Ḥayy, involves re-inventing the way of life as he knows it from scratch. The necessity to create clothing out of raw materials draws Crusoe closer to nature than he is used to being.

In both texts, the tension between clothing and nakedness leads to a reversal where clothing becomes the “natural skin” of humans. This is exemplified in the scene where Absāl and Ḥayy first meet. At first sight, Ḥayy is drawn to Absāl and notices that, “[Absāl] was wearing a long black coat of wool and goat hair, which Ḥayy took to be his natural coat” but upon closer inspection he, “realized that the long coat was not a natural skin, but simply a garment intended for use like his own” (158). Ḥayy revises his false initial impression of Absāl's clothing from a distance to an accurate one from a closer vantage point. This two-part act of interpretation is a performance which is analogous to the fruitful interpretive techniques Ibn Tufayl urges the reader to practice. This paradox demonstrates the artificiality of separating cultural productions, such as clothing, and ideas of human “nature” into a binary by emphasizing how they intertwine to form collective attitudes and social norms.

As the primary characters within the novels empirically explore their environment they become amateur students of their islands. In the contemporary English sense of the word an

amateur is one who cultivates an activity as a pastime, as distinguished from one who does it professionally (OED). In this sense of the word, amateurism is relevant in Ḥayy's situation as he grows from infancy to adulthood studying the island environment. While Crusoe's amateurism reveals itself when his island environment forces him to perform menial labor that he never had to do before. However, knowing the Old French etymology of the word amateur, we know that it also means: someone who loves (Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française). With this connotation of the word in mind we may also observe how the love of a higher power becomes the driving force of exploration in these texts. Each character learns by trial and error, risk taking and sensory perception. What we receive as readers is a view into the paradox of the autodidact: that he is learning how to learn. At the end of the autodidact's educational journey are the required skills to perform independent critical thought.

To better demonstrate how the authors of each text are imposing analytical behavior upon the reader we must take a look at their biographical background. Unfortunately, there is a disparity in the amount we know about each author; more is known about Daniel Defoe's life than is known about Ibn Tufayl's. Nevertheless, what we are able to recollect helps us situate each text in the geopolitical context in which it was generated. It is my aim to demonstrate how biographical accounts of these authors, who were each critical about different institutional aspects of the societies they lived in, helps us better understand their introduction of critical thinking as a valuable skill to readers.

Born a Muslim in the small Spanish village of Gaudix, about 50 miles northeast of Granada (c.1116), Ibn Tufayl lived during a time of political instability. His experience as a philosopher, physician and mystic was a result of the era he lived in, which avoided compartmentalization of insulated specialized fields (Conrad 83). Eleventh-century Al-Andalus experienced a

disintegration of political unity resulting in a large number of petty states, or Taifa kingdoms (Wasserstein 82).ⁱⁱⁱ Factional parties divided the Andalusian landscape leaving each state remote and isolated. With this context in mind, the island allegory in *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqẓān* can be read as a rendering of the geographical shift towards isolation of formerly unified territories. This insular strategy enables Ibn Tufayl to make a narrative virtue out of a cultural necessity.

In addition to this geopolitical reason for the usage of islands, within the introduction of *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqẓān*, Ibn Tufayl describes his intellectual pursuit of philosophical and religious knowledge. As he shares his studies of Sufi thinkers such as Ghazālī and Ibn Bājjā with the reader his comparative approach outlines a model for critical engagement. He says: “I myself would not have garnered...the culmination of my intellectual efforts, without pursuing the arguments of Ghazālī and Avicenna, checking them one against the other, and comparing the result with the views that have sprung up in our era...until finally I [saw] the truth for myself” (102). It is apparent here that the intellectual environment of Ibn Tufayl nurtures critical thought. As he weighs the utility and shortcomings of Ghazālī, Ibn Bājjā and Avicenna (who was not a Sufi), he emphasizes the need to surpass the logical mode of thinking and recognize the futility of searching for “specialized terminology” to express the ineffable mystical experience, that is: ecstasy through divine union (96).^{iv} This comparative setup that Ibn Tufayl establishes prepares readers for the dialectic mode of reasoning that *Ḥayy* uses throughout the rest of the story.

Daniel Defoe, who was probably born in London or just outside the city in 1660, was educated at a dissenting academy. He lived shortly before a Civil War that intensified a climate of religious intolerance. Draconian legislation such as the Test Act of 1673 denied civil and religious rights to dissenting denominations (Owens I). Defoe's freedom as a Presbyterian was infringed upon. He wound up in debt after failed business pursuits resulting in his imprisonment.

In his introduction to *Robinson Crusoe*, editor Thomas Keymer notes that by the time that *Crusoe* was published he had been a lifetime campaigner against the claims of divine-right absolutism in church and state. The life Defoe lived earned him a plot in Bunyan Hill Fields, a seventeenth century burial site for people who refused the governance of the Church of England. Despite this passionate anti-monarchism, Defoe idealized many nationalist values resulting in a highly complex range of questions to place at issue in his novel concerning colonial violence, indigenous autonomy and religious proselytism.

3. Island Meditations and Shifting Views: Anti-imperialism and Self-Questioning

What makes Daniel Defoe's text so complex is his simultaneous depiction of Crusoe establishing ideals of European dominance while critiquing imperialism and colonial violence. This conflicting mode of representation has been articulated by postcolonial critic Mary Louise Pratt in her book *Imperial Eyes*. In it she coins the term "anti-conquest," a strategy in which European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence at the same time that they assert European hegemony (8-9). This term most accurately describes how to reconcile the imperial actions with the anti-imperial thought we find in *Crusoe*. If we think of Crusoe as an anti-conquistador we recognize that his moral reflections in the text, which boldly challenge conventional thought, are always underscored with a legitimization of the social arrangements. And although one may argue that such rhetoric is equivalent to a flagrant justification of imperialism, I argue that the ambivalent nuance is noteworthy since it relates to Crusoe's auto-didactic process by granting him dialectical reasoning which is crucial to anti-imperial critique by enabling him to consider a problem's contradictions and determine a conclusion by reconciling them. Ultimately, my readings aim to investigate the fissures within the imperial culture represented in *Crusoe*.

Instances of violence committed by Crusoe against Amerindian natives and the contemplation of violent acts are always accompanied by a conscious moral dilemma. Considering the concept of anti-conquest such moral dilemmas become superficial and deceptive, particularly because they do not supersede the more prominent discourse which asserts British superiority. However, it is during the ambivalent moments that Crusoe's conflicted interiority and his auto-didactic capacities are best demonstrated. As an illustration, Crusoe is initially filled with fearful thoughts after realizing the possibility of cannibalistic savages being on the island. In the name of self-preservation Crusoe begins to think of all the ways he could defend himself from a potential attack. But afterwards his violent reflections are soothed as he recounts:

I began with cooler and calmer thoughts to consider what it was I was going to engage in. What Authority, or Call I had, to pretend to be Judge and Executioner upon these Men as Criminals, whom Heaven had thought fit for so many Ages to suffer unpunish'd, to go on, and to be as it were, the Executioners of his Judgments on upon another. How far these people were Offenders against me, and what Right I had to engage in the Quarrel of that Blood, which they shed promiscuously one upon another. I debated this very often with my self. (144)

Here, Crusoe thinks about the complexities of his encounter with the Caribbean Amerindians. The appearance of such thoughts is indicative of the anxiety Defoe has in regards to the conquest of the Other. This is apparent as Defoe denies his protagonist of a justification to conquer. For Crusoe, religiosity and self-reflection go hand and hand. In this way, he faces the question of authority and the right to judge. Crusoe not only designates "Heaven" as the appropriate entity to deal with judgment of the Amerindians, but recognizes the right for the Amerindians to judge themselves. On the other hand, this excerpt also shows us that Crusoe has little concern for the

violence which happens amongst the natives. In lieu of intervention Crusoe's emphasizes why he should avoid violence. Afterwards he identifies the greater injustice regarding his intentions to colonize: "The People had done me no Injury...therefore it could not be just for me to fall upon them... rooting them out of the Country is... unjustifiable... I began... to conclude, I had taken wrong Measures in my Resolutions to attack the Savages" (145). His violent imagination, which is triggered after finding the leftovers of a cannibal feast held by the Amerindians, begins to quail after reasoning that they have not committed violence against him. Crusoe's initial defensiveness collapses and he is forced to admit that his hostile position is "unjustifiable." Yet, in accordance with the anti-conquest mindset, his good intentions are undermined by an inherent privileged possessiveness of land which is apparent in Crusoe's lexicon as he condemns rooting the natives out of "*the* Country" instead of a more accurate "*their* Country."^v This is a symptom of the denial Crusoe faces as a conflicted pseudo-colonialist. He experiences tension between his love for an idealized sense of English nationality and non-violent means of resistance. Since *Robinson Crusoe*, unlike *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān*, is written in a time of colonial expansion the postcolonial lens, in addition to allegorical interpretation, becomes a useful hermeneutic for this narrative.

The oceanic environment provides a dangerous element of island imagery that Defoe employs due to its association with contrariety. After deciding to tour the circumference of the island by boat Crusoe goes upon a hill to survey the surrounding coastline and chart his path. It is here that he sees an eddy in the water near the shore of the island. An eddy is water that by some interruption in its course runs contrary to the direction of the tide or current (OED). The appearance of this imagery during a time that Crusoe's attitude regarding his castaway status is shifting serves to indicate the change in his mode of thinking.

I perceiv'd a strong...furious Current...I took the more Notice of it, because I saw

there might be some Danger; that when I came into it, I might be carry'd out to Sea by the strength of it, and not able to make the Island again...there was a same Current on the other Side of the Island, only, that is set off at a farther Distance; and I saw there was a strong Eddy under the Shore; so I had nothing to do but to get in out of the first Current, and I should presently be in an Eddy. (117)

The observations Crusoe makes on the hill help him determine the risk factor of his venture out to sea. Around the perimeter of the island is a strong current that is capable of carrying him out to sea, but there is also an eddy that can bring him back to the island. Through reason he predicts a favorable outcome; he determines that as long as he can enter the counter-current he will avoid straying too far away from the island. Convinced of this sound plan Crusoe takes his boat out to circumnavigate the island. Only then Crusoe realizes that his observation was unable to determine the strength of the “furious Current.” Shortly after going off shore with his boat he is dragged off to sea to the point where he sees “no main Land, or Island” (118). This scene demonstrates a case where Crusoe's hypothetical conclusion, reached through reason, is disproved when applying it to practical use. This is a humbling experience for Crusoe as he is challenged by unpredictable forces of nature. After being cast out at sea for a while he begins to think that he may never make it back to the island. In this desolate condition Crusoe reaches this conclusion: “Thus we never see the true State of our condition, till it is illustrated to us by its Contraries; nor know how to value what we enjoy, but by want of it” (118). This statement expresses how Crusoe does not value his prior condition, as a castaway on the island, until he is exposed to an even worse condition, as a castaway at open sea. On one level Crusoe's experience almost being drawn out to sea heightens his appreciation for the island environment, but allegorically, it also makes him grateful for being able to experiencing contraries. Crusoe's

experience with the eddy demonstrates the risk of independent thinking. He is, literally, drawn too far by the premises he clings to and eventually considers an alternative way of thinking. In this way, the imagery of the eddy is used to portray the dialectic experience as both a valuable and sometimes dangerous one.

Each of the previous scenes, both Crusoe's reflections on colonial violence and his experience with the eddy, respectively exhibits traits of direct and indirect didacticism. In the first case Crusoe explicitly articulates his dialectic train of thought as he contemplates non-violence. In the second case the eddy is literally a stream of water that runs contrary to another, but allegorically it comes to represent independent thinking. Indirect didacticism uses allegoric imagery to refer to another meaning, while direct didacticism lays out an argument in plain language. With these distinct approaches to pedagogy in mind we can further consider the techniques used in each narrative to allegorically veil and unveil.

Ibn Tufayl is not concerned with explicitly establishing the dominance of any particular ideological framework upon any other characters in his narrative. He does, however, demonstrate the transformative potential of Ḥayy's reasoning, thereby tempting readers to accept its preeminence. The development of Ḥayy's life is presented to us as phases divided into seven year increments. As he reaches a new phase, he rethinks what he has learned in the previous phase. Such a mode of representation that involves perpetual changes in scientific and philosophic understandings of the world may be considered through the theoretical lens of "epistemological paradigm shift" as thought of by Thomas Kuhn in his influential book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). According to Kuhn:

Discovery commences with...the recognition that nature has somehow violated the paradigm induced expectations that govern normal science. It...continues with

[an]...exploration of the area of anomaly. And it closes only when the paradigm theory has been adjusted so that the anomalous has become the expected. (53)

This passage describes the moment a paradigm shift occurs, which is when scientists encounter anomalies that cannot be explained by current science and consequently must readjust their theories. Ḥayy's scientific approach is particularly active during the first couple of seven year life-phases as he empirically explores his environment. This theory of revolution provides us with a lens to examine the phases of Ḥayy's life as shifts of consciousness. As an illustration of this theory in action, Ḥayy encounters his own anomaly when his mother dies; his view of the physical world is impacted. Afterwards, as Ḥayy explores the concept of death he reaches a metaphysical understanding; this is how he undergoes his own paradigm shift. His autodidactic capabilities leave readers astonished with the extent to which Ḥayy is willing to reject conventional thinking. In this way, Ibn Tufayl invites us to admire the autodidact in Ḥayy and perhaps join Absāl in treading an inquisitive path that challenges the expectations of our own conventional thinking.

Among the most memorable scenes in *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān* is when Ḥayy dissects his mother, the gazelle,^{vi} after her death in search of a way to awaken her from her permanent slumber. As he realizes that she will not awaken again he becomes intrigued by the mystery of her vanishing, "The body now seemed something low and worthless compared to the being he was convinced had lived in it for a time and then departed. Ḥayy turned the focus of his thoughts on that being. What was it?" (114). Ḥayy determines that the body of his mother is not equivalent to the being he knew as his mother. His quest to describe this evasive idea eventually leads him to the ineffable experience of mysticism. Moreover, by displacing this maternal figure to a spiritual essence, something he later concludes that him and every being share, this dissection scene opens

up the possibility for defining a relationship outside of the binary of mastery and dominance and towards one of open-ended educational journey. With the death of his beloved mother in mind, we may even say that the catalyst for his educational journey is love. The narrator explains: “His affection was transferred now from the body to the being that was its master and mover” (115). The being that the narrator refers to, to which Ḥayy transfers his affection, is the soul. His displaced affection triggers him to think about what else there is to love beyond the corporeal. As we will come to see, this philosophical inquiry motivated by love serves to unite the sensible world and the non-sensible world.

As an illustration we can turn to a scene where Ḥayy’s discovery of fire leads him to theorize about the essence of the soul. During his youth, he witnesses a fire break out. The occurrence terrifies him, but shortly after his terror turns into intrigue when he acquaints himself with the substance.

Carried away by his amazement, and by the courage, not to say audacity, God had compounded with his nature, Ḥayy reached out and tried to grasp a piece of it...But...it burned him... [He] took it home—for he had moved into a cave...He kept the fire up...tending to it day and night. (115-116)

This scene of Ḥayy playing with fire is exemplary of his courage to discover in the face of harm. It also captures the quickness of his adaptability, as he is terrified by the substance at first but soon after comes to care for it. This instance of independent thinking is similar to Crusoe's frightful experience with the eddy, but in this case Ḥayy masters his fear. His respect for the fire is representative of the respect he shows for the resources the island provides for him as they each contribute to his spiritual development. He becomes a fire-keeper not only because of the practical uses of fire but also because of the way it fuels his inquiry into the spiritual. The

narrator describes: “his new infatuation with fire, based on its power and its beneficial effects, gave him the notion that what had abandoned his doe-mother's heart was of the same or similar substance” (116). Seeing here how Ḥayy interconnects the power of fire with the life force of the soul is exemplary of the way in which he reads or interprets his environment allegorically.

However, he does not base his association of this visible, incandescent and hot substance with the soul based off of a purely logical premise. He bases his theory in empirical evidence by vivisectioning an animal to inspect whether the ventricle possessed the same substance as fire.

“Cutting open the heart, he saw the chamber, filled with a steamy gas, like white mist. He poked in his finger—it was so hot it nearly burnt him, and the animal died instantly. This satisfied him that the hot vapor was what imparted animation to the animal” (117). Almost getting burnt as he plays with fire, Ḥayy’s risky experiment tests his theory of the relation fire has to the soul by verifying it through his senses. The satisfaction he gains from this experiment intensifies his intellectual inquiry into his surroundings.

At the age of twenty-eight, after having spent much time observing the laws of physics in his environment, Ḥayy turns his focus to the heavens. His astronomical observations impact his theological ideology as he asks himself: Who or what is the creator of existence? After determining that the heavens and the stars in the skies were extended in three dimensions, therefore making them bodies, he uses reason to determine the finitude of the universe. He then studies the orbits of celestial bodies until he gains a thorough understanding of their movement. Eventually he reaches an understanding that, “the heavens and all that is in them are...one being whose parts are interconnected” (130). However, this macrocosmic understanding of his relation to the universe, as a part to the whole, did not satisfy him. Instead: “Ḥayy wondered whether all this had come to be from nothing, or in no respect emerged from nothingness but always existed”

(130). Hayy grapples with this fundamental “what came first?” question for years until he agrees that:

Perhaps the implications were the same! For..if..the universe had come to be in time, *ex nihilo*,^{vii} then the necessary consequence would be that it could not have come into existence by itself, but must have had a Maker to give it being. This Maker could not be perceptible to the sense; for if it [was], then it would be a material body...part of the world, itself in time and in need of a cause. (131)

Ultimately, this psuedo-astrotheological line of inquiry complicates Hayy’s outlook on his environment, but it also triggers him to recognize the importance of the unseen. As this passage outlines, the conclusion Hayy reaches, that the implications for both arguments are the same, leads him to attribute the “cause” of all existence to the effect of the Maker. Moreover, he addresses the contradiction of the Maker being perceptible to the senses, which would necessitate an act of creation. As he becomes self-conscious of having reached such an abstract level of thinking, he realizes that his awareness of this “Necessarily Existent” entity is proof that he too possesses a self that is non-physical. “Hayy...knew that what in him had allowed him to apprehend this Being was unlike bodies and would not decay as they did” (137). Upon distinguishing himself in this way he is faced with a dilemma concerning his existence. If he possesses a non-decaying self which is separate from his physical self, to which does he devote his energy and attention? For a short period of time Hayy gives precedence to the former, but the extremity of his focus gives rise to practical problems.

Hayy considered how he...would concentrate on that Being for a time, but [then] some sensory thing would present itself, some animal cry would split his ears, some image would dart across his mind, he would feel a pain somewhere, or get

hungry or thirsty or hot or cold, or have to get up and relieve himself. (138)

Such conflicts arise because Ḥayy seeks to transcend from the corporeal into the spiritual while remaining bound to his physical body. His senses, through which he has learned everything he knows about the world, eventually become a deterrent to what he seeks to accomplish spiritually, ecstatic unity with divine truth. After reaching an understanding that the soul is eternal Ḥayy stops tending to his physical well-being. This change in his behavior is indicative of Ḥayy's paradigm shift, where his basic assumptions regarding his theory of science have changed and thus he cannot reject what he now knows. After this shift Ḥayy is able to break from a purely binary mode of thinking and de-dichotomize his theological views of corporeal and spirit. Instead Ḥayy conceives of the Maker as: “a Being neither in contact with matter nor cut off from it... 'contact' and 'discontinuity', 'inside' and 'outside' are merely predicates of the very physical things which He transcends” (133). This type of thinking reminds Ḥayy that not only is his body of value, but also that the visible world is evidence of God's power. After this paradigm shift Ḥayy becomes determined to discover the signs of divine craftsmanship and cosmic order.

4. From Autodidactic to Didactic

The interconnectedness of a part with the whole is central to the tale of *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān*; to a lesser extent a similar line of reasoning appears in *Robinson Crusoe* as Crusoe realizes relations beyond boundaries of class and nation. Although Defoe's protagonist ultimately maintains that as a civilized Englishman he is superior to other beings, the island teaches him otherwise. From being a master reliant on workers, he transitions into becoming completely self-reliant. He learns about the existence of valuable specialized wisdom which is found beyond class boundaries.

In this process of achieving self-reliance Crusoe experiences all sides of the labor/administration spectrum including that of enslavement in North Africa. Examining

Crusoe's enslavement, which is experienced before becoming castaway on the island, helps illustrate the diverse range of positions Crusoe has held, and more importantly helps us determine whether his exposure to slave labor affects his attitudes towards the slave. As a Merchant headed towards the African shore his crew encounters a "Turkish Rover" which successfully captures him and the men on his ship. He, "was kept by the Captain of the Rover, as his proper Prize, and made his Slave, being young and nimble, and fit for his Business. At this surprising Change of Circumstances from Merchant to a miserable Slave, [he] was perfectly overwhelmed" (18). His misery captures the sense of violation produced by subjugation, while privileging his own perspective. Although his *entire* crew is captured by the rovers, the only experience we hear about is *his*. This is a common gesture found in Defoe's text, and of the novelistic genre he contributes to, where the individual is prioritized over the communal. Consequently, representations of most tasks that require communal effort—such as participating in a ship's crew and liberating oneself from bondage—are reduced to feasible obstacles for Crusoe to overcome on his own, which belittles their difficulty and systemic structure. This emphasis on the individual also impedes the possibility of recognizing the oppression of other laborers, mainly Friday, whom Crusoe encounters later in the story.

Upon his enslavement Crusoe becomes conscious of the unjustness of his situation which in turn, prompts him to plan his escape, but his reaction sharply contrasts with the later voluntary subjugation of the Amerindian he encounters, Friday. Although Crusoe manages to escape from captivity through his own risk-taking, during his later attempts to escape from the island he recognizes that he needs assistance. In fact, before they meet each other Crusoe dreams about meeting a savage that serves him as a pilot to help him escape the island. As Crusoe and Friday's actual meeting takes place Crusoe considers it as the realization of his dream which frames the

encounter as an instance of providential care. Friday and Crusoe's first moment of contact occurs after Crusoe successfully shoots and kills Friday's would-be captors, other cannibal Amerindians. After that moment, "[Friday] came nearer, kneeling down...in acknowledgement for my saving his life" this gesture culminates in Friday placing Crusoe's foot over his head, which Crusoe interprets as "a token of swearing to be my Slave for ever" (172). This narrative focus on Crusoe's interpretation of Friday's humble action denies readers of any access to Friday's intentions or the precise tactics of his submission.

On the other hand, later in the story, during the process of indoctrinating Friday, Crusoe comes to learn more about his own weaknesses. After teaching Friday how to speak English Crusoe dismisses Friday's religious ideologies and explains to him the notion of Jesus Christ and the Devil, to which Friday responds, "if God much strong, much might as the Devil, why God no kill the Devil, so make him no more do Wicked?" (184). Crusoe is unprepared to address this question satisfactorily, instead he "was strangely surprized at this question," this results in Crusoe thinking that: "[although] meer Notions of Nature...will guide reasonable Creatures to the Knowledge of God...nothing but divine Revelation can form the Knowledge of Jesus Christ...the Word of God...[is] absolutely necessary [for] instructing...the Souls of Men...and the Means of Salvation" (184). This exemplifies how Crusoe's solution to a didactic roadblock is attributing his inability to instruct on the pupil's incapacity to learn. Crusoe uses inductive reasoning as he interprets the particular instance of Friday's lack of receptivity to Christian theology as indicative of the general condition of "reasonable Creatures." Instead of providing Friday with an explanation as to why his hypothetical situation, of God killing the Devil, cannot happen he abandons the attempt at conversion and dismisses the topic of conversation. With this question, Friday's lesson of the day comes to an abrupt end as Crusoe returns to ponder in solitude. He

concludes that the only way non-believers of his overtly Christian outlook will come to accept the truth of God is through divine revelation. As he switches from an autodidact to a didactic mode Crusoe's responds to Friday's challenge by reflecting on Friday's objection in solitude. He resorts to self-learning, a reflex of his insular existence, in order to enhance his teaching skills. This episode of resistance demonstrates that self-knowledge and the ability to instruct are mutually constituent skills.

Crusoe reflects on his exchange with Friday and admits that, “in laying Things open to him, I really inform'd and instructed my self in many Things, that either I did not know, or had not fully consider'd before; but which occur'd naturally to my Mind, upon my searching into them” (185). This acceptance of “Things [he] did not know,” is an unmistakable instance of Crusoe reaching the boundaries of his knowledge, due to his amateur practice of proselytizing. He further admits that he “has...more Sincerity than Knowledge, in all the methods of [the] poor creature's Instruction” (185). This portrayal of a subordinate character as the provocateur of critical thought disrupts the conventional “banking method” of instruction, an oppressive model of pedagogy in which the pupil is seen as a container that must be filled with the content of the teacher's narration.^x This educational model, on which Crusoe's pedagogic approach was premised, overlooks and devalues the active intellect. When Crusoe views Friday as someone who must receive a “foundation of religious knowledge” (182) and attempts to lay it on him, his reliance on Friday's acceptance of religious knowledge overlooks the power of dissent. Such exchanges of opposing viewpoints are at the crux of the dialectical reasoning found in *Robinson Crusoe*.

For Crusoe it is difficult to reach any notion of equality with Friday due to the submissive manner in which he first presented himself to him. The gesture of eternal service Friday commits reaffirms notions of superiority that Crusoe already exhibits. Moreover, Crusoe's experience

having dabbled in the slave trade has made it easy for him to think of humans in unequal terms. The only moments where Crusoe becomes capable of thinking outside the binary of superior/inferior is when he asks himself what the Lord would do faced with a similar problem. For example, after first meeting Friday Crusoe has his guard up and is prepared for any potential attack Friday may commit if he decided to turn on him. But soon after observing Friday's nonthreatening demeanor he observes:

It has pleas'd God, in his providence, and in the Government of the Works of his Hands, to take from so great a Part of the World of his Creatures, the best uses to which their faculties, and the Powers of their Souls are adapted...the same Powers, the same reason, the same sentiments of Kindness and Obligation...and all the Capacities of doing...and receiving Good, that he has given to us; and that when he pleases to offer to them Occasions of exerting these, are...more ready to apply them to the right Uses for which they were bestow'd, that we are. (176-177)

Although the binary mode of thinking is clearly portrayed here, this is as close as Crusoe gets to synthesizing the “us/them” split. He is in astonishment as he considers how Friday (and by implication his race) is capable of “the same reason...that [God] has given us,” and that “[they are] more ready to apply [it] to the right uses...that we are.” It is within these lines that Crusoe places Friday's entire race on a pedestal for Friday's own individual actions. This backhanded compliment appears to speak highly of Amerindians at first, by praising their ability to use the power of reason better than Englishmen, but on second thought is loaded with the racist inductive misconception that a tokenized individual can redeem an entire racial group. This moment causes Crusoe to compare his observations of Friday's behavior with that of his own European background: “in reflecting as the several Occasions presented, how mean a Use we

make of all these, even though we have these Powers enlighten'd by...the Spirit of God, and by the Knowledge of his Word, added to our Understanding” (177). It is here that Crusoe identifies a contradiction in his understanding of moral behavior. Despite the alleged advantage that Crusoe claims he has as an individual “enlighten'd” by the word of God, he is upset by what he perceives to be a misuse of such an advantage. How can those closest to God's word be so far from his ways? It is implied in Crusoe's usage of the plural personal pronoun “we” that the reader is included in his identification grouping. By strategically including the reader into this ironic realization, he not only challenges the reader to live up to a moral standard but to actively seek out contradictions in what is commonly taken for granted as truth. In this case, the presumption that those who know the word of God should know how to better employ reason and kindness than those who do not is disproved. Through his confrontation with an Amerindian that breaks the stereotype of a murderous hungry cannibal and whose manners supersede and put to shame his own, Crusoe is forced to re-think the binary.

Crusoe's dualistic conception of humans being divided into categories such as “those who will experience divine revelation” and “those who will not” forms the basis to his ambivalent attitudes of human equality. Within the world of the novel this humanistic divide is superimposed upon an artificial, yet dogmatically accepted, model of superiority and inferiority which manifests itself as the civilized and the primitive. In addition, his faith in divine providence generates undertones of determinism. This moderate predestinarian mode of thought together with a superiority complex makes for a typical “manifest destiny” destiny imperialist prototype. But as the previous excerpts have illustrated, Crusoe is able to perceive the artifice of cultural productions due to the liminal position he holds on the thresholds of socio-economic divisions. As he is relocated to the island environment, peripheral to the English metropole, his isolation

becomes a vantage point from which to critically gauge the limitations of his dualistic thinking, the indispensable remnants of his cultural upbringing. It is only through dialectic logic, the juxtaposing of two contradictory views on a single issue, such as his wish to be delivered of his “miserable condition on the island” and his recognition of the island as “the most pleasant place in the world,” (118), that Crusoe attempts to reconcile his ambivalent attitudes without reaching definitive answers. Defoe presents to us the consideration of these irreconcilable binaries of salvation/damnation and homesickness/wanderlust in a didactic narrative form in order to invite the reader to the task of reconciling them. As Defoe scholar, Maximillian E. Novak once observed: “Defoe will occasionally stop the action of his stories to hold a debate between his hero...and another character on a social issue, but more often than not, he allows the events to carry their own significance and expects the reader to make his own judgments” (666). The dual function that Defoe's dramatization of such dilemmas serves is to present his complex world view and simultaneously instruct readers on how to read his text. As we have observed in the cases where Crusoe's intellect is challenged, the debates that Defoe includes within the narrative which dispute social, moral and spiritual topics are often left without a definite conclusion. Instead, his reflections on religious conversion, violence and indigenous sovereignty underhandedly provoke the reader's interpretation.

Ḥayy leaves his island to visit Absāl's with the intention to transmit his privately gained experience as an autodidact into pedagogic instruction for the public. It is during this episode that Ibn Tufayl completes his critique of religion as a symbolic institution by highlighting the contradictions exhibited by the so-called wise men of Absāl's island. Due to the close-mindedness of these men, Ḥayy's visit to the other island is short lived. Although Absāl gathered a group which “approached nearest to intelligence and understanding” even these individuals are

unwilling to deviate from their established way of thinking as Absāl did (162). Ḥayy began to instruct the group, “But the moment he rose the slightest bit above the literal or began to portray things against which they were prejudiced, they recoiled in horror from his ideas and closed their minds” (163). This learned group does not open up their minds to Ḥayy’s alternative perspective. Ibn Tufayl, however, characterizes this decision made by the group of pupils as a defect they have as beings that refuse to receive truth. For example, he says claims that: “their inborn infirmity simply would not allow them to seek Him as Hayy did...Wisdom, they have no means of reaching; they were allotted no share of it” (163). This stance articulates an exclusive vision of truth as being reached by only a select few and that the rest will not reach it due to an inherent incapability to do so, reminiscent of Crusoe's conclusion on the same topic.

A major divergence between these two texts is in their transition from autodidactic to didactic. On one hand, both Crusoe and Ḥayy are driven to instruct by their own choice, but as soon as they realize that their ideas are not well received they respond differently. Each of them attribute God's guidance as the deciding factor that determines whether people will or will not understand divine knowledge, but Crusoe is more insistent on teaching than Ḥayy is. Crusoe responds to Friday's challenge by continuing to teach him tenets of Christianity, while Ḥayy responds to the unreceptive crowd of students by returning to his island. These different responses indicate the varying degrees to which each character seeks to impose their world view on other characters. However indirect or explicit each character asserts his narrative onto the pupil, each author, by virtue of narrating through allegory, is saying one thing while meaning another. The main difference between the pedagogical methods each narrative advocates is the degree of subtly or forcefulness applied. On one hand we have the straightforward method of teaching, or the banking method of instructing where knowledge flows from instructor to pupil in the fashion of a

one way street. While on the other hand we have an approach that provokes dialectical thinking and invites intellectual exchange in the fashion of a two way street. Readers are likely to be more resistant to the insistence of the straightforward mode since it forcefully posits its values as facts, whereas the dialectical mode offers readers an opportunity to develop their own understandings. However, the reception of a certain mode of pedagogy is contingent on the pupil's mode of learning which is susceptible to shifting. Previous scenes, such as Crusoe's eddy and Ḥayy's fire, show us how independent thinking involves risk taking and every student has a different comfort level. Some pupils may rely on authoritative figures to directly inform them about the “facts” of a given topic. Ultimately these narratives challenge readers to think about how they learn.

5. The Pedagogy of Fiction Island Narratives: Inviting the Reader to Think

Both texts use contradiction to instigate active reading. One example is how the reader is offered two different creation stories in *Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān*. The first story claims that Ḥayy was spontaneously created from a mass of clay on the island that worked “until hot and cold, damp and dry were blended in just the proper way” (106). The other story claims that Ḥayy’s biological mother was royalty and that her brother, who was king, forbid her to marry until he found her a partner. Since she conceived Ḥayy out of wedlock she feared the exposure of her secret and put Ḥayy in an arc and cast him into sea, eventually he reached the coast of the island. In each possible story Ḥayy's existence is nothing short of miraculous. Moreover, the juxtaposition of these two alternative creation stories suggests that they are both equally unbelievable. Although the abandoned baby story, which alludes to the story of Moses in the Qur’an and the Old Testament,^{xi} is more plausible than spontaneous creation, the fact that we are unable to distinguish which one is “true” reinforces Ibn Tufayl’s usage of fiction. The opposing accounts provide us with the opportunity to use dialectical reasoning for ourselves. What we discover is

that in the end determining which story is true is beside the point.

Both of these authors successfully create multiple levels of narration to complicate their outlook on society. In this way, these texts challenge readers to question the reliability of the text itself. For example, Ibn Tufayl's self-conscious narrator employs a frame narrative to explicitly warn readers to avoid interpreting his text literally. This is accomplished through clear transitions between first-person and third-person narration, in addition to the narrator commenting on the story being told. Daniel Defoe, on the other hand, uses anonymity to make his readers believe that his story is an autobiographical account instead of a fiction. The multileveled perspective these texts embody in their narrative form mimics the content within the stories of multilayered understandings of the physical and social world.

The various levels of narration represented in these texts probe the limits of textual representation and through dissimilar means establish self-awareness. Self-awareness is established through the interaction of the *diegetic* and *extradiegetic* levels. The *diegetic* level, or diegesis, is composed of the events which constitute the universe of the story; that which tells us about the world created through the act of narration. On the *extradiegetic* level we have events that take place outside the main story and are external to the diegesis, for example when the narrator's first-person voice directly addresses the reader. Since Hayy and Crusoe are also characterized as having self-awareness, the remaining participant in the literary exchange: readers, are indirectly instructed to open their minds. Self-awareness is repeatedly portrayed by different means in the text to emphasize its centrality.

The didactic experience in Ibn Tufayl's narrative is characterized by an explicit method of instruction. The introduction of *Hayy Ibn Yaqzān* assumes the form of a response to a friend where the alleged intention of the narrator is to reveal the secrets of “Oriental” or “Illuminative”

philosophy. As a preface to his story, Ibn Tufayl delves into a discussion of philosophical figures that contributed to early Islamic Sufi thought such as Ghazālī and Ibn Bājjā. The narration then builds up to the moment in which the narrator enters the diegetic world of Ḥayy Ibn Yaqzān with an explicit, “Let me tell you the story of Hayy Ibn Yaqzān, Absāl, and Salaman...For the tale points a moral for all with heart to understand, 'a reminder for anyone with a heart or ears to listen and to hear'” (103). Up to this point in the narrative, the narrator has remained in the extra-diegetic; this moment marks the transition into the diegetic world. By claiming that the story points to a moral the narrator explicitly informs the reader about the intention of the text without saying what the moral actually is in order to encourage critical thought.

Conversely, in Defoe's text, first-person narration is used to assign value to the literal, to his “real” story. In fact, before it was discovered that Defoe had authored *Robinson Crusoe*, readers of the original publication were susceptible to believing that it was indeed someone's autobiography due to its anonymous publication. Defoe provides a “frame” for his text to suggest to readers that his story is non-fiction. He narrates through a fictional “editor” of *Robinson Crusoe* in the preface and claims that the text is a: “History of fact, neither is there any Appearance of Fiction in it.” After this claim to reality enveloped in the preface, the persona of Crusoe then becomes the first-person narrator for the rest of the story. This exemplifies how Defoe manipulates anonymity to expose the unreliability of the written word as truth. In this sense, Defoe can be read as positioning his values against the boundaries of his society by rendering documentary confirmations of truth questionable. Defoe instills within readers an inquisitive self-defense mechanism as his illusory preface claims to be fact but is really fiction.

This essay is as much a literary analysis of autodidacticism on islands as it is a commentary on how literary texts are capable of instructing us on how to read them. The prose fiction

narrative becomes the vehicle for social critique at the moment we are able to see how its artificial qualities can refer to similar social constructs that we obey today. These fictions raise our awareness of how to identify and reevaluate our relation to artificiality. I invite readers to think beyond the dualistic division of instruction from art and instruction from nature as two separate processes and offer a perspective that claims: it is in our nature to learn from art.

For the purposes of this study, I conclude by noting how these novels emphasize the importance of “reading” in both a literal and allegorical sense and the inextricability of the meanings produced. By “reading” their environments, Hāy and Crusoe “unveil” the symbols produced by their culture. The aim of the practice is to go beyond the aesthetic function of language and consider how these narratives, which claim to be true and adopt the conventions of reportage, force the reader to reconsider the allegorical imagery found in them. Students studying the structural conventions employed in these narratives will inevitably realize that they themselves become complicit in the allegorical abyss by becoming readers reading fictional representations of other readers. This mirroring effect exemplifies how the island allegory provides the conceptual separation required to position oneself in a strategic vantage point in order to perform social assessment. The final analysis finds that these texts use self-critique, exemplified by both characters and narrators, to help us readers continually re-envision effective methods of practicing a more reflexive pedagogy.

REFERENCED WORKS

"Amateur." *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*. 1st ed. 1694. 16 February 2014.

"Amateur, n." *OED Online*. September 2013. Oxford University Press. 8 December 2013

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981. Print.

Baroud, Mahmoud. *The Shipwrecked Sailor in Arabic and Western Literature: Ibn Tufayl and His Influence on European Writers*. London: Tauris, 2012. Print.

Conrad, Laurence I. Introduction. *The World of Ibn Tufayl: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Hayy Ibn Yaqzan*. By Conrad. Leiden: Brill, 1996. Print.

Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Ed. Tomas Keymer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

"Eddy." *OED Online*. September 2013. Oxford University Press. 8 December 2013

Edmond, Rod, and Vanessa Smith, eds. Introduction. *Islands in History and Representation*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

"Ghazal." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd Ed. Brill Online. 9 January 2014

Goodman, Lenn E., Trans. *Hayy Ibn Yaqzān: A Philosophical Tale*. By Ibn Tufyal. Chicago: Chicago UP, 2009. Print.

Keymer, Tomas. Introduction. *Robinson Crusoe*. By Keymer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

Kuhn, Thomas S. "Anomaly and the Emergence of Scientific Discoveries." *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1962. Print. 52-65

Leinster-Mackay, D.P. *The Educational World of Daniel Defoe*. B.C., Canada: U of Victoria, 1981. Print. 27.

Novak, Maximillian E. "Defoe's Theory of Fiction." *Studies in Philology*. Vol. 61, No. 4 (1964): 650-668. Web. 16 Feb. 2014.

Pratt, Mary Louise. Introduction. *Imperial eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. By Pratt. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Wasserstein, David. *The Rise and Fall of the Party-kings: Politics and Society in Islamic Spain 1002-1086*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985. Print.

NOTES

ⁱ Arabic for: “Alive son of Awake.”

ⁱⁱ French for: “put into the abyss.”

ⁱⁱⁱ From original Arabic *ṭā'ifa* meaning: party or group.

^{iv} *Sufis* are practitioners of a mystic sect of Islam who seek the love of God without fear of a Hell or the hope of a Paradise (141). For a further discussion of Ghazālī, Ibn Bājjā, and Avicenna please refer to Lenn E. Goodman’s introduction and notes in *Hayy Ibn Yaqzān: A Philosophical Tale* (2009).

^v For this condition the term “seeing-man,” also coined by Mary Louis Pratt in her book *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, may be applied to refer to the “unfriendly label for the white male subject...whose imperial eyes passively look out and possess” (9).

^{vi} The image of the gazelle is used in the ancient Arabic poetic tradition to compare to one's beloved and idealize feminine grace. This tradition was prevalent in the North African environment where Ibn Tufayl lived for a large part of his life, and where Gazelles dwell in the semi-desert steppe and the Savannah. Ibn Tufayl's gazelle is particularly noted for its maternal tenderness.

^{vii} Latin for: “out of nothing.”

^x I draw this concept from Brazilian educator and philosopher Paulo Freire's seminal text *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968). It is suitable for situating the educational model often at play in an asymmetrical power dynamic.

^{xi} The story of the rescue of infant Moses can be found both in the Qur'an 20.36 (*Ta Ha*) and the Bible 2:1 (*Exodus*).