

Why does this story not include any women (besides the widow and Crusoe's mother)?

This is puzzling as there were more women alive in eighteenth-century England than men and Defoe wrote many other works that had women as the protagonist. Defoe actually wrote many works about women, so it is puzzling why he didn't do this here. But like I said in class, towards the end of the book it seems that Defoe was trying to quickly wrap up the story and might have planned to introduce more women into the story.

What happens to Friday? Is he mentioned in the next book?

Friday is mentioned in the sequel and he spends driven years with Crusoe in England. However, later on in the book while trying to leave Brazil Friday is shot by arrows and dies shortly after.

I wonder what become of his kids? He seems to not care about his wife, like at all.

The children are mentioned in the beginning of the next book, but we do not see much more of them. Crusoe's wife has a larger role in the beginning of the sequel, but she quickly dies.

Why does a deeply flawed character as RC seem so fake?

There are some aspects of human behavior that are universal throughout time, but there are many things that change through time. I think to the 18th century reader, Crusoe might not seem so fake, but to us he seems different.

Is Robinson Crusoe still widely studied?

Defoe was one of the most important writers of the 18th century and Crusoe is the most accessible and easiest to read of all Defoe's work. It is also one of the stories that continue to be told and it is helpful to study it in order to better understand why this happens.

Would it be worth it to read the second novel?

It is more of the same, so I don't think it is worth it. But if you really want to see "the end" of the story, it might be worth your time.

Do the 2nd and 3rd books improve upon the first or no?

The third book is much different than the first two and some people think it is just too weird to read. I don't think the 2nd book is as complex as the first one. You will find it hard to track down copies of these two books because they just aren't that good.

Is the next book going in more detail about the same voyages?

Nope. New voyages!

Does Crusoe get the names of some of the animals in the book wrong?

I don't think so. Which animals do you think he got wrong?

Why does Crusoe go back to the island? He has had bad luck with sailing.

Crusoe seems to romanticize the freedom he experiences on the island, which he looks back fondly on. He most likely thought that since he was rich, God had forgiven him and he could now sail freely.

Would Crusoe change anything about the life he lived?

He seems to acknowledge many of his mistakes, but I am not sure if he would say that he would do anything different. In the last book, he talks a lot about the problems of the world and seems to really enjoy thinking about his time on the island alone.

Why is Robinson Crusoe island in Chile? It seems like the journey does not match the reality.

This is a complex issue. First, the island is the actual Island that Alexander Selkirk (the "Real" Crusoe) shipwrecked on and became the basis for the Crusoe's island in the book. So why not just name it Selkirk island? Well the island was named Robinson Crusoe island in 1966 after the stories of Crusoe and Selkirk became confused with one another.

Was it reflective of the time to have so many shipwrecks?

We were not great sailors back then, many ships were lost at sea too. The sea has always proven to be unpredictable and deadly even now crab fishing is extremely dangerous.

Why didn't Crusoe and Friday unite at the end of the book?

Defoe was probably just trying to end the book and thought he would get to Friday in the next book.

Why is this such a popular adaptation?

I do not know! That is why I study this text, to try to understand the lasting appeal of the story.

How would the story have ended if Defoe had more time/space to elaborate on the ending?

The sequel ends with Crusoe's comfortable retirement, so I guess that would be what Defoe wanted.

Is Robinson Crusoe's legacy defined by it being the first novel and how exactly do other texts form from it?

Most of Crusoe's notoriety comes from the fact that it is considered the first novel. Much like we continue to read *Beowulf* since it is an early English poetical form, we continue to study the "first" of many things. The focus on the individual and the internal processes of thoughts become the base for many other 18th century novels.

Why does having to become a Catholic keep Crusoe from moving to Brazil?

First off, Defoe was anti-Catholic. Brazil was/is very Catholic. In the book, Crusoe does not want to become a Catholic because he would be "a Martyr for Religion, and die in the [Catholic] Inquisition." Crusoe would consider himself a protestant and unwelcome in Brazil.

Do I think Crusoe would be more relatable if his story was less ironic?

That would help, but one of the most enjoyable aspects of the book is its weird humor.

What happened to Friday's dad?

He eventually meets back up with Friday and Crusoe in the sequel.

If the book is so controversial, why is it still taught? What makes it so incredible that it is a universal staple in literature classes?

I think it is important to contextualize pieces of literature like this and not just remove it from the canon completely. Like I said in class, the story of Crusoe is already being retold and through that retelling it brings all the baggage of the original. I think it is important to understand the original and understand what exactly we are retelling when a new "robinsoniade" emerges. Because Crusoe is considered the first novel, it usually becomes a starting text to talk about the development of the novel.

Does Crusoe's character actually evolve or grow during the story?

This is an interpretive question, but I am doubtful that Crusoe actually learned any lessons throughout his journey.

What is my opinion on whether we should read Robinson Crusoe and other works that may be considered problematic by some people?

Well I assigned this book, so I think it should be read. For me, it is important to acknowledge some of the issues with the text and place them in context. This story is retold all the time and I think it is important to understand where it comes from and what historical baggage comes with it.

Why is this taught in English classes?

It is the first novel, many other books reference it, Defoe was one of the key authors of the 18th century, and it gives us insight into the early forms of fiction. It is often considered a "canonical" work, one that was popular at the time and helps us understand 18th century British culture.

What does Defoe believe about slavery personally? I know RC reflects parts of his opinion, but I feel like there may be more to it.

Defoe seems to both defend and oppose slavery. He was an outspoken critic of the conditions of slavery, but also defended slavery from some of the early abolitionists.

How long did it take for people to realize that the story was fiction? Misleading view of religion because Crusoe gives credit to God for many miraculous events.

By the publication of the sequel many people knew this story was not real, but I am not sure how many people actually believed it. Many of the intellectuals in London thought it was fiction, but we don't have good records as to what other people thought.

How old is Crusoe and does he ever die in the books?

At the end of the sequel he is 72 years old. He does not die in the book.

Why would anyone agree to colonize on the island at the time when it was extremely underdeveloped?

Transporting plants and materials was pretty sophisticated at this point in history, so one could somewhat change the plant and animal life on an island to their choosing.