

"A Full and Exact Relation": Sodomy, Authenticity, and  
Publication in the Narrative of the Marooned Dutchman

Evan Davis. The Eighteenth Century. Lubbock: Summer  
2003. Vol. 44, Iss. 2/3; pg. 257, 23 pgs

People: Svilt, Jan

Author(s): Evan Davis

Document types: Commentary

Publication title: The Eighteenth Century. Lubbock: Summer  
2003. Vol. 44, Iss. 2/3; pg. 257, 23 pgs  
Source type: Periodical

Text Word Count 10420

Abstract (Document Summary)

In May 1725, a Dutch sailor named Jan Svilt, having been caught kissing a cabin boy, was subjected to the water torture until he confessed to sodomitical acts. After his captain, Dirk van Kloop, along with a council of the ship's officers, condemned him to be marooned on Ascension Island, Svilt began to compose a journal in which he described his diet of birds and turtles, his search for water, his regret for his lustful desires, and the hellish apparitions that appeared to him during the night. Because much of the current knowledge about eighteenth-century homosexuality is derived from court transcripts or hearsay about scandals, if the journal is factual, it would be a valuable eighteenth-century artifact, a rare record of the dying months of a man convicted of sodomy.

Full Text (10420 words)

Copyright Texas Tech University Press Summer 2003

In May 1725, a Dutch sailor named Jan Svilt, having been caught kissing a cabin boy, was subjected to the water torture until he confessed to sodomitical acts. After his captain, Dirk van Kloop, along with a council of the ship's officers, condemned him to be marooned on Ascension Island, Svilt began to compose a journal in which he described his diet of birds and turtles, his search for water, his regret for his lustful desires, and the hellish apparitions that appeared to him during the night. Five months later, he died of thirst, and his body and journal were discovered by Captain Mawson of the British ship The Champion. His journal

was taken to England and printed in 1730 as a twenty-page pamphlet, *The Just Vengeance of Heaven Exemplify'd* }

Such at least is the account offered by Lennard Davis in an article entitled "Criminal Statements: Homosexuality and Textuality in the Account of Jan Svilt." Davis, though skeptical about the authenticity of Svilt's journal, recognizes that the text is potentially an important document in the history of queer subjectivity, one that may preserve "the constitutive experience of queerness."<sup>2</sup> Because much of our current knowledge about eighteenth-century homosexuality is derived from court transcripts or hearsay about scandals, if the journal is factual it would be a valuable eighteenth-century artifact, a rare record of the dying months of a man convicted of sodomy.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, the Dutchman would provide a compelling counterpart to Alexander Selkirk, two genuine island solitaires separated by a decade from the 1719 publication of Robinson Crusoe.

In its broadest sketches, the narrative is plausible. Eighteenth-century readers, especially those well versed in travel literature, would not have been surprised that a sailor had scribbled a journal on Ascension Island. They would have recognized the name of the island. They might have been struck by the captain's decision to punish sodomy with solitude. And they probably would have found plausible the Dutchman's hope "that some Ship or other would speedily come to my Deliverance," since French, English, and Dutch ships returning from the East Indies often stopped at Ascension in search of turtle meat to combat scurvy.<sup>4</sup> The most assiduous readers, moreover, might have known about an established tradition of depositing written testimony on the island. Landing there in 1673, the Dominican missionary Friar Domingo Navarette observed, "Those that sail this way are so curious, as to write Letters, put them into Bottles of thick Glass, and leave them in a safe place but visible, by which the next Comers have intelligence who is gone by, and what Voyage, Whether and Delays they had."<sup>5</sup> Navarette was echoed by Robert Everard, who wrote in 1693, "When we anchored, our captain went ashore in the pinnace to see if there was a letter left in a bottle in a hole in a rock near the landing-place, which every ship that comes to that place leaves there, the island being uninhabited: We took the bottle out of the hole and found thereby that the Kemthorne was the last ship that was there."<sup>6</sup> Similar

comments were to appear throughout the eighteenth century, as Ascension became a more and more common stopping place.

On the other hand, the Dutchman's story might well be a hoax. As Duff Hart-Davis observes in his history of Ascension Island, there are only a few months during the year when turtles arrive at Ascension in great quantity, typically from December to June, so it is unlikely that the Dutchman would have found an abundance of them in late summer, as the pamphlet claims. Furthermore, given the frequency with which ships stopped on Ascension, the Dutchman must have been "exceedingly unlucky" that none stopped there during his five months.<sup>7</sup> And even if such details can be explained, there remain other unanswered questions. If there really was a journal, how do we know that it was written by a marooned sailor and not by earlier voyagers to be found by later ones? Where did the Dutchman get his pen and paper? How likely would it be that a stranded sailor would have the literacy skills to write such a journal? And perhaps above all, how do we know that the pamphlet is not the production of a Grub Street hack capitalizing on the success of Robinson Crusoe, published just a decade earlier?<sup>8</sup>

For Davis, the attempt to establish the authenticity of the narrative potentially renders the critic complicit in the potential silencing of a queer voice. "Which is more or less transgressive," he asks, "to think of the text as fictive, and by so doing deny the constitutive experience of queerness that is preserved there for us, or to think of the text as factual and in so doing cover up the problems of provenance?"<sup>9</sup> For while the narrative would seem to offer a valuable glimpse into queer subjectivity, there are enough anomalies that it seems hasty to take at face value. Davis resists the temptation to try to fix the text as either fictive or factual; instead, he labels its instability an essential function of the queerness of the narrative: "An object like this one is itself unstable and unreachable by historical inquiry, part of a deeply political and psychological repression."<sup>10</sup>

While Davis approaches the narrative through the lens of queer studies, the Dutchman's journal, like its predecessor narrative Robinson Crusoe, lends itself readily to other forms of cultural inquiry. Drawing on Davis's article, Jonathan Lamb in his important book *Preserving the Self in the South Seas* reads Ascension Island also as a site of

preservation; but rather than preserving constitutive queerness, as it does for Davis, the island for Lamb presents the solitary individual with the possibility of preserving the self. An island, he argues, removes the self from society and from the pretenses that arise as the self negotiates between public duty and self-preservation. At the same time, the island enables the "regeneration" of the self by presenting the solitaire with a double-Crusoe with Friday, Selkirk with the goat, the Dutchman with an apparition of his lover-who creates the illusion of community without the conflict that usually accompanies it. Pretense does not cease on an island, but it is managed and even made pleasurable, for there is no one there to call attention to it: "On an island ... there is nothing to contradict pretense except the evidence of the senses, and if they report nothing but delight, then the self can expand amidst its own fantasy."<sup>11</sup>

Within Lamb's schema, the Dutchman is significant for his failure: "It is clear from the Dutchman's journal that a failure to match and conquer the spectral threat will be fatal."<sup>12</sup> Like other castaways, the Dutchman confronts a double, here in the apparition of his lover who taunts him fiendishly during the night. But whereas Crusoe's success lies in what Michael McKeon terms his "capacity to justify each station to which he attains as the way of nature and the will of God," the Dutchman's failed encounter with his lover's apparition signals the degree to which his self is irreparably torn between private desire and public duty.<sup>13</sup>

This curious narrative, then, offers considerable interpretive flexibility, lending support on the one hand to a history of queer subjectivity and on the other to an analysis of the constitution of the modern self. But before the narrative gains greater currency, it is necessary to clarify the foggy provenance of the pamphlet, beginning with the version that initially caught Davis's eye. Curiously, it was published not in the early eighteenth century but in the late twentieth. As Davis playfully explains, while sitting at home drinking bourbon, he was interrupted by a large envelope falling through his mail slot, "addressed to Lennard Davis, Book Review Editor, Radical Teacher magazine."<sup>14</sup> In it, he found a short book called *The Queer Dutchman*, a 1978 publication that purports to contain a translation of the Dutchman's journal, a transcription of Dutch East India Company (VOC) trial documents, contextualizing information about life on an

eighteenth-century ship, and a list of Biblical references to homosexuality. Though *The Queer Dutchman* claims to offer a new translation from the Dutch journal, it also, without explanation, refers to a 1747 printing of *The Just Vengeance of Heaven*, itself a New York reprinting of the 1730 London pamphlet.

What we begin to see taking shape is a variation of the communication circuit described by Robert Darnton, which "runs from the author to the publisher (if the bookseller does not assume that role), the printer, the shipper, the bookseller, and the reader."<sup>15</sup> In this case, it runs from the Dutchman (himself perhaps a reader of the 1721 Dutch translation of *Robinson Crusoe*) to his journal to the London printer to the New York publisher to a bookseller and, after numerous detours, to Lennard Davis and then Jonathan Lamb. Though vastly oversimplified, that description raises the important question of where the critic's focus should be. Despite his skepticism about *The Queer Dutchman* and his interest in its provenance, Davis is explicit about the element of the communications circuit that most interests him: "The figment of Jan Svilt, a corpse, a corpus, a body of knowledge or misinformation lies still at the center of the story."<sup>16</sup> The writer, no matter how fictive or factual, contains the heart of the mystery. Lamb, though putting the narrative to a very different use, similarly locates the core of the text in the Dutchman's articulation of his experience. Because the Dutchman's solitary experience figures as a failed example of *Crusoe's* success, Lamb stresses the description of his island life, putting aside the complex ways in which that life might have been represented and distributed to eighteenth-century readers.

Particularly within the context of queer studies that Davis pursues, there is good reason to privilege a text's composition over other moments in the communications circuit. It is, after all, the voices of such authors that have historically been silenced or misrepresented. Nonetheless, it is striking that by emphasizing the writer at the expense of reader, printer, or bookseller, Davis and Lamb reproduce a model of authorship articulated by the text itself: the narrative of the Dutchman, like other first-person narratives of solitude, locates value and appeal in the solitary nature of textual production. Its implicit promise, like *Robinson Crusoe's*, is that the knowledge it presents is valuable precisely because it is

divorced from the social contexts that color other journals. In this sense, early eighteenth-century narratives of castaways and marooned sailors embody a model of authorship that establishes the author as the sole and original proprietor of a text.<sup>17</sup> In Martha Woodmansee's terms, the author during the eighteenth century becomes "a special participant in the production process—the only one worthy of attention."<sup>18</sup> But particularly with an author like the Dutchman, about whom we know little, we miss an important cultural trove if we fail to explore the dissemination of his story.

I am not suggesting that we ignore questions about the truthfulness of the Dutchman's account. To the contrary, I think we can and should carefully examine the plausibility of the narrative. But I want to insist that by focusing exclusively on such questions we limit the text's cultural significance. My purpose, then, is to redirect our critical gaze from the question about the castaway's existence toward the communications circuit in which his existence has reached readers. While it would be enormously useful to possess a demonstrably genuine castaway's journal, we should recognize as well that even potentially fictitious accounts, when considered in light of their full communications circuit, offer considerable insight into the attitudes of eighteenth-century readers toward sodomy and into the cultural contexts in which they read.

In his description of the Dutch sailor, Lamb relies on Davis's article, asserting that the narrative describes "the lurid story of a Dutchman, subjected to the water torture then marooned by his shipmates in 1725 as punishment for homosexual acts. His journal was allegedly found next to his skeleton, giving an account of slow death from starvation and thirst. 'It may perhaps by some be deemed fabulous/ says the editor, On account of the frequent Apparitions mentioned' (The Just Vengeance [1730], ii), but his claim for its authenticity seems justifiable to the extent that the story originates in a real Dutch voyage (Davis 1999, 81-90)" (citations in the original).<sup>19</sup> Though Lamb acknowledges that the journal might be "fabulous" and notes that it was only "allegedly found next to his skeleton," he thus accepts as factual both the claim that the Dutchman suffered water torture, and, more importantly, the existence of the Dutch voyage.

When we turn to Davis's article, however, we find that far from supporting Lamb's assertions, it explicitly contradicts them. Davis makes no claim whatsoever for the authenticity of the Dutch voyage, and of the English captain who allegedly found the skeleton and journal, he inquires, "Was there a captain Mawson? We do not have more than his last name. Did someone invent this work or did they take Mawson's find and interpolate material to strengthen the notion of a 'just vengeance'?" Indeed, about the facts behind *The Just Vengeance*, Davis hedges: "When I have presented this paper at various academically oriented venues, the universal response from my colleagues has been that I should engage in further research. People have suggested that I go to Holland and track down shipping records, or others have suggested I go to England and find out if there was a Captain Mawson. Such helpful suggestions come from a profound feeling that history can be recovered if we try hard and are scholarly enough. . . . But what I want to suggest in this paper is that there are limits to our abilities to recover the past—particularly when we are dealing with marginal groups like homosexuals, criminals, whores, people with disabilities, and so on. It may be that even those remaining documents, like *The Just Vengeance* [,] are so imbricated in an ideology of repression and concealment that the notion of a clear reality that can be recovered has to be rethought and re-theorized."<sup>20</sup> But *The Queer Dutchman*—that curious book slipped through Davis's mail slot—differs enough from *The Just Vengeance of Heaven* that it matters a great deal whether it is an expanded, authentic variation or merely a twentieth-century fabrication. In *The Queer Dutchman*, the narrator receives a name: Jan Svilt. We learn about his stay in Batavia, about his relationship with the cabin boy, Bandino Franz, and about the water torture inflicted upon him ("After hours of drowning and gasping for breath in his hellish contraption, I would have confessed to bugging not only his darling cabin boy, but the whole Dutch navy"<sup>21</sup>). We learn the name of his ship (the *Geertruid*) and his captain (Dirk van Kloop). We even get a translation of Svilt's trial transcript. All these things would broaden our understanding of the narrative and of eighteenth-century queer identity. But on what grounds do we accept them as factual?

One reason that the provenance of *The Queer Dutchman* (about which Davis confesses to be "a little dubious") is difficult to ascertain is that its paratext calls to mind

Gulliver's Travels, if not Pale Fire, In the preface to the reader, signed by "Peter Agnos" in Sonora, Mexico, May 1977, Agnos claims to have found a book written in Dutch, to which he was drawn by the "illustrations of old sailing ships, of shipwrecks and of men and cargo floundering in the sea."<sup>22</sup> He says that he bought the book, "a copy of sea adventures published in Amsterdam in 1762," and gave it to a friend, Michael Jelstra, who "translated the original journal into English for me."<sup>23</sup> Agnos then added explanatory notes and comments. Despite Agnos's claim that Jelstra translated the work, the only name on the copyright page is C Adler, and though the copyright date is 1978, the book doesn't seem to have been printed until 1993 by Green Eagle Press. Complicating matters, the promotional matter on the book's back cover ignores the assertion that this is supposed to be a new translation and notes that "a mutilated copy (1748) is in the Rare Book Room of the New York Public Library."

Further incongruities cast doubt on the book's claims: a bibliography that omits the Dutch trial records and the book of Dutch sea adventures; phrasing that is identical to that in the 1730 pamphlet despite Agnos's assertion that Jelstra has newly translated the work; a preponderance of rough nineteenth-century illustrations rather than the ones that ostensibly caught Agnos's eye in the eighteenth-century book; and interpolated passages that are either grossly awkward translations or twentieth-century creations. But the most significant evidence that *The Queer Dutchman* is a fictional expansion of *The Just Vengeance* comes from the Dutch shipping records that Davis has declined to consult. According to J. R. Bruijn's immensely useful *Dutch-Asiatic Shipping in the 17th and 18th Centuries*, there was in fact a 600-ton fluit named the *Geertruid*, but neither the name of its captain nor the dates of any of its voyages coincide with the details in *The Queer Dutchman*.<sup>24</sup> Apparently, the author of *The Queer Dutchman* (perhaps Adler himself), simply transcribed large portions of *The Just Vengeance* and then extended the narrative using the name of a real ship and a few historical accounts of Dutch shipping.

But the inauthenticity of *The Queer Dutchman* does not mean that *The Just Vengeance* is equally fictional, and though Davis declines to speculate about the historical existence of Mawson or the Dutch expedition, the historical record is again fairly clear. The title page of the pamphlet claims



that the journal was discovered by Captain Mawson in January 1725/26, as he returned from India on board the Compton. According to the records of the East India Company, the Compton, a 440-ton ship carrying thirty guns and about ninety men, made three voyages between England and Bombay. Its second voyage, led by William Mawson, left Falmouth on April 1, 1722 and returned on April 5, 1726. In January, when the pamphlets claim Mawson stopped at Ascension Island, the ship would have been, appropriately, in the middle of the Atlantic, probably near the Equator. If the original writer of the pamphlet invented the story, he was therefore at the very least working with known facts, ones that British readers could readily enough confirm.

Though the pamphlet does not identify either the Dutchman's ship or his captain, it is possible to speculate as well about the Dutch expedition. We can assume that if the marooned sailor really existed he was left on Ascension on a return voyage, not a departing one. Because of the pattern of trade winds, ships almost never stopped at Ascension on their way toward the East Indies, but they used the island as a common reference point on the way home.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, though ships tended to sail toward Asia in small groups, they almost always returned home in large convoys. The Dutchman's reference to the "Commadore and Captains of the Dutch Fleet" who abandoned him would thus make sense only regarding a return voyage. The question, then, is whether a fleet of ships would have passed the island at the appropriate time. Since the Dutchman's journal begins on May 5, 1725, he must have left the Cape of Good Hope a few weeks earlier. And indeed, on April 11, 1725, a fleet of twenty-three Dutch ships departed from the Cape, led by Admiral Pieter Scherf (master of the Berkenrode), Commadore, Vice-commadore Kornelius Fret (master of the Barbestein), and Rear Admiral Jakob ven der Swet (master of the Langerode). Their voyage from the Cape to the Netherlands took three and a half months; they would have passed Ascension in the beginning of May 1725.

What then can we say with confidence about the Dutchman, his voyage, and the recovery of his journal? Despite the title of Davis's article—"Criminal Statements: Homosexuality and Textuality in the account of Jan Svilt"—we do not know the name of either the marooned Dutchman or his ship, but we do know that Captain William Mawson, the Compton, and a plausible squadron of twenty-three Dutch

ships all existed. If indeed the Dutchman was put ashore by the Commadore of that fleet, then we know as well that the name of that Commadore was Ewout van Dieshoek. Such details, however, do not guarantee the accuracy of the journal, for even if it seems probable that the work is not a complete hoax, there remains the likelihood that the journal underwent transformative revision in the process of its publication. It is that process that therefore needs to be considered.

Overlooked in Davis's and Lamb's accounts of the story is the critical fact that the Dutchman had already made an appearance before 1730 in a publication that was to have its own descendants. In 1728, a pamphlet entitled *An Authentick Relation of the Sufferings and Hardships of a Dutch Sailor* had been printed for J. Roberts; by the end of that year, the eighth edition was being printed in Dublin by George Faulkner;<sup>26</sup> and in 1741, eleven years after the initial publication of *The Just Vengeance of Heaven*, William Oldys and, perhaps, Samuel Johnson selected it to be included in *The Harleian Miscellany*. *An Authentick Relation* recounts nearly the same events on the same days, but its text differs significantly. After their publication, the pamphlets seem to have been read, distributed, and reprinted within mutually exclusive communications circuits. Not only does the later pamphlet make no allusion to the earlier one, but no critic has explored the link between the two. Davis's and Lamb's works treat only *The Just Vengeance of Heaven*; Hans Turley's *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash*, Percy Adams's *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*, and Richard Nash's *Wild Enlightenment* discuss only *An Authentick Relation*.<sup>27</sup> In that exclusiveness, what is lost is the opportunity to see what happens in the process of transmitting this narrative of the sodomitical solitaire.

The title page of *An Authentick Relation* indicates that it was "Printed for J. Roberts, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick Lane" in 1728 and sold for sixpence. Such an imprint is purposely vague; while it is possible that Roberts owned the copyright, it is much more likely that, as one of a small handful of trade publishers, he was paid to put his imprint on a work actually published by someone else.<sup>28</sup> Roberts's name, after all, was used frequently as a screen. In the case of Swift's *Life and Genuine Character of Or. Swift*, for instance, Roberts's imprint disguised the participation of Benjamin Motte;<sup>29</sup> in the case of Pope's

Key to the Lock, it shielded Bernard Lintot, who wanted to disavow his connection with both work and author.<sup>30</sup> Given the nature of the pamphlet, however, it is more likely that Roberts's imprint was designed to fulfill the requirement that a stationer's name be on each work sold. The pamphlet may have been sold either by hawkers or by booksellers other than Roberts.

By the year's end, *An Authentick Relation* had been reprinted in ChristChurch Yard by George Faulkner, the owner of *The Dublin Post Boy* and *The Dublin Journal* whom Swift had famously labeled "the prince of Dublin printers." Though the edition is a completely new typesetting, it nonetheless follows the first edition very closely, with little more than an occasional change of capitalization or, more rarely, spelling. (The title of the Dublin printing, for instance, drops the *fc* from *Authentick*.) We can gauge Faulkner's other pursuits at the time from an advertisement appended to the end of *An Authentic Relation*, where he lists among his publications Pope's *Dunciad*, Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, Fielding's *Love in Several Masques*, Vanbrugh and Gibber's *Provok'd Husband*, Theobald's *Double Falsehood*, or the *Distrest Lovers*—all of which had appeared in London in the same year. Around the same time, Faulkner was becoming more acquainted with Swift. In 1725 he had published *Fraud Detected*, the first collected edition of the *Drapier's Letters*,<sup>31</sup> and by the end of the decade Swift relied upon Faulkner fairly extensively.

In contrast to *An Authentick Relation*—published with the imprints of reputable London and Dublin figures and then included in the *Harleian Miscellany*—*The Just Vengeance of Heaven* has a more shadowy publication history. Its original British appearance listed it simply as "Printed and sold by the Booksellers and at the Pamphlet Shops of London and Westminster," a designation that seems designed to diffuse responsibility for the work. It appears never to have been reprinted in England, though it was reprinted across the Atlantic several times in the mid-1740s, once sold by William Bradford in Philadelphia (1748) and once by James Parker at the New Printing Office in New York (1747), where copyright laws were unlikely to be enforced.

Not surprisingly, both the 1728 and the 1730 pamphlet directly confront the problem of authenticity, albeit with different levels of success. In its prefatory material, for instance, *An Authentick Relation* claims that "[t]he

Original Manuscript from whence this Journal was printed may be seen at the Publishers" (in Roberts's edition) or "at the Printer's hereof" (in Faulkner's edition).<sup>32</sup> The *Just Vengeance* promises similarly that the Dutchman's orthography can be viewed by "any one who has Curiosity enough to see the Original," though because it is printed and sold only "by the Booksellers and Pamphlet Shops of London and Westminster," it is unclear where such a curious reader would go. This attention to authenticity is hardly surprising: given the publication dates and the story's position as journal, travel tale, and narrative of solitude, it would be remarkable if they were not so attentive. As Davis comments in his *Factual Fictions*, English culture at this precise juncture was consumed with questions of facticity, especially as the novel took over ground formerly ceded to history: "something profoundly wrong has happened within the news/novels discourse by the first quarter of the eighteenth century—a breakdown, as it were, in signification has occurred.... While not all language was disintegrating, clearly the language of the news/novels discourse had to undergo so many transformations, reverse interpretations, allegorizations, and so on that it might be difficult to assign it a clear and unambiguous capability for signification."<sup>33</sup> In part, doubts about authenticity arose because of the methods of eighteenth-century print production; as Adrian Johns has demonstrated (and as *Gulliver's Travels* famously exemplifies), print did not by itself guarantee even that the author's copy had been faithfully reproduced, much less that textual assertions were credible: "In the realm of print, truths became falsehoods with dazzling rapidity, while ridiculous errors were the next day proclaimed as neglected profundities."<sup>34</sup> But of course not all texts made equal sorts of truth claims, and travel writing developed its own distinct methods to convince its readers that the story it told was true.

If there really did exist a Dutchman's journal, it would not have been atypical to find it substantially altered in print. Many works, if not carefully overseen, went through significant revision once out of the author's hands, but of all forms of publication, perhaps none was so open to revision as sea journals. The journal of Basil Ringrose, for instance, in which he describes a 1680 expedition into the South Sea, demonstrates the possibility that holograph journal, manuscript copy, and printed book could all vary from one another. Ringrose's journal, which was copied by

William Hack and then printed in the second volume of the second edition of A. O. Exquemelin's *Bucaniers of America*, increasingly validates the questionable leadership skills of Bartholomew Sharp, with the manuscript copy and book containing entire passages that do not appear in the journal. As Glyndwr Williams points out, it is unclear whether Ringrose, Hack, or Sharp himself was responsible for the changes.<sup>35</sup>

The journal form was not just a convenient way to tell a story; it carried with it its own promise of authenticity, grounded in the notion that to write at the time of an experience would guarantee a more faithful account than to write in retrospect. In his account of the wreck of *The Wager* in 1741 off the coast of Chile, for instance, the midshipman Isaac Morris laments his lack of a journal:

If I had been so fortunate as not to have been deprived of proper Materials for keeping a Journal, a Multitude of Incidents would have been recorded which have now slipt the Memory, and a more particular Account preserved of the Manners and Customs of the Native Indians where we resided, which is now forgot. . . . I mention this, that the Reader may not expect, in the following Accounts, any thing like the Regularity of a Journal.<sup>36</sup>

Morris's account was one of five, so even if he had had a journal, readers would have compared his account of events with others that they had read. But confronted with the journal of a solitary castaway such as *Crusoe* or the *Dutchman*, readers could not make such a comparison. On the one hand, the journal of a *solitaire* promises an authentic experience of solitude-solitude as it is experienced before it can be contaminated by exposure to others. On the other hand, its solitary production renders it inherently unverifiable. Most journals, after all, refer to other people, whose own testimony confirms or refutes the claims that a journal makes. But the journal of a *solitaire* by definition must authorize itself. The writing that validates the castaway leaves him potentially unbelievable.

To see why this is so, it is useful to compare the *Dutchman* with Alexander Selkirk, the most famous solitary castaway not to keep a journal. Each of the accounts of Selkirk-by Woodes Rogers, Edward Cooke, and Richard Steele takes pains to establish its own authenticity as a ground for popular acceptance. Woodes Rogers, the first to publish an extended

account of Selkirk, recognizes the paradox that though his story will be valued because of Selkirk's unique solitude, it will also be judged by its resemblance to previously printed castaway narratives, especially those by Basil Ringrose and William Dampier, who had also described castaways on Juan Fernandez. A reader might, after all, suspect him of fabricating a fictional narrative from the same cloth. After referring explicitly to the earlier narratives, he asserts, "whatever there is in these Stories [by Ringrose and Dampier], this of Mr. Selkirk I know to be true; and his Behaviour afterwards gives me reason to believe the account he gave me how he spent his time."<sup>37</sup>

Steele, whether or not he actually met Selkirk, faces a slightly different problem, though he solves it in a similar manner: not only does his narrative invite comparison with Rogers's, but as well, he has allegedly met Selkirk "in the year 1711," two years after Selkirk's rescue.<sup>38</sup> As Steele himself acknowledges, a castaway does not retain his solitary mindset indefinitely: upon meeting Selkirk for a second time in London, Steele reflects, "I could not recollect that I had seen him; familiar Converse in this town had taken off the Loneliness of his Aspect, and quite altered the Air of his Face."<sup>39</sup> But if a short stay in London has changed Selkirk so substantially, what is to guarantee that two years aboard the Duke have not also changed him? To assure the reader that the Selkirk he interviews is essentially the same Selkirk of Juan Fernandez, he claims to be able to read the castaway's solitude in his appearance: "When I first saw him, I thought, if I had not been let into his Character and Story, I could have discerned that he had been much separated from Company, from his Aspect and Gesture; there was a strong but cheerful Seriousness in his Look, and a certain Disregard to the ordinary things about him, as if he had been sunk in Thought."<sup>40</sup> Like Rogers, rather than simply accepting Selkirk's story as the truth, Steele has checked it against the "aspect and gesture," which provide the guarantee that he can pass along to his readers. What sets Steele's account apart from Rogers's is Steele's desire to discern moral instruction in the description of the castaway. But the more Selkirk echoes Steele's own beliefs—"I am now worth 800 pounds, but shall never be so happy as when I was not worth a Farthing"—the more doubtful it becomes that it is actually Selkirk speaking. Authenticity exacts a price, and the more the narrative admonishes, the less authentic it appears.

This tension between authenticity and moral instruction informs as well the shift from *An Authentick Relation* to *The Just Vengeance*, for there is a sustained and predictable pattern of revision from the 1728 pamphlet to the 1730 one: authenticity gives way to moral admonishment. Both pamphlets present themselves as truthful and both try to present moral imperatives about the sins of sodomy, but at every turn, from the title pages to the descriptions of the Dutchman's final days, the earlier pamphlet stresses that its story is true; the later pamphlet, that the story is exhortative.

The full titles of the two pamphlets indicate these differences broadly. The full title of the first pamphlet is *An Authentick Relation of the many Hardships and Sufferings of a Dutch Sailor, Who was put on Shore on the uninhabited Isle of Ascension, by Order of the Commadore of a Squadron of Dutch Ships. With a Remarkable Account of his Converse with Apparitions and Evil Spirits, during his Residence on the Island. And a particular Diary of his Transactions from the Fifth of May to the Fourteenth of October, on which Day he perished in a miserable Condition. Taken from the Original Journal found in his Tent by some Sailors, who landed from on Board the Compton, Captain Morson Commander, in January 1725/26.* The largest type is devoted to the words "Authentick Relation," and the theme of authenticity is then reflected in the "particular diary," in the exact dates that are provided, and the "original journal." The full title of the second pamphlet is *The Just Vengeance of Heaven Exemplify'd. In a Journal Lately found by Captain Mawson, (Commander of the Ship Compton) on the Island of Ascension. As he was Homewardbound from India. In which a full and exact Relation of the Author's being set on Shore there (by Order of the Commodore and Captains of the Dutch Fleet) for a most Enormous Crime he had been guilty of, and the extreme and unparallel'd Hardships, Suffering, and Misery he endur'd, from the Time of his being left there, to that of his Death. All Wrote with his own Hand, and found lying near the Skeleton. While making similar claims for authenticity-an "exact relation"-the thrust has shifted here to the Dutchman's "Enormous Crime" and to the "Just Vengeance" that is enacted upon him. Even the authenticating final phrase-"All wrote with his own Hand, and found lying near the Skeleton"-provides moral instruction by linking the confession with a grisly death,*

a metonymic association reinforced by the frontispiece engraving (Figure 1).

In the pamphlets' handling of the journal, *The Just Vengeance* replaces a fragmented journal with a more continuous narrative. The journal in *An Authentick Relation* comprises short fragmented sentences, ones lacking the benefit of hindsight:

The 14th Ditto, took my Tea Kettle with some Rice, and went into the Country where the Water was. Afterwards returned again to my Tent, and mended my Clothes, and past away the rest of the Day in reading.

The 15th Ditto, all the Day employed in getting of Sea-Fowls Eggs and Birch.<sup>41</sup>

By contrast, *The Just Vengeance* completes the sentences and provides contextualizing detail:

On the 14th and 15th I took my Tea-kettle and some Rice to the place above-mentioned, and after having refreshed myself return'd to my tent, mended my Clothes, and spent the Remainder of the Day in reading. (8)

Often, the later text adds metadiscursive tags that imply the text was actually composed later and with an eye toward an audience: "Yesterday" becomes "The day before." The Dutchman hides clothes, "that I might the better know where to find them again" (1). When he looks for ships, he adds, "it was my usual custom to walk out every Day, in hopes of a distant View of Ships upon the Ocean, forced by Stress of Weather to make towards this desolate Island to repair the Damages" (4).

Besides directing the journal more explicitly to an audience, such changes consistently amplify the Dutchman's contrition. For example, when he fails to catch a fish, the Dutchman of *An Authentick Relation* responds simply with a "melancholy Walk" (7); his counterpart in *The Just Vengeance* instead reads in nature a sign of divine judgment: "Judge then what Anxiety of Mind, what Midnight Horrors I must undergo, whilst the Night is an Emblem of my crimes, and each clear Day renews my Punishment" (5). Similarly, after leaving his tinder-box on his bed and burning the quilt, the Dutchman of *An Authentick Relation* observes simply, "The 23d Ditto, all this Day was remaking



what was burnt yesterday" (7). In *The Just Vengeance*, his response is notably more penitent: "The 23d I spent the whole Day in admiring the infinite Goodness of Almighty God, who had so miraculously preserved the small Remainder of my worldly treasure; and sometimes tortured myself with the melancholy Reflection of the inexpressible Punishments my crimes deserved, well knowing the Wages of Sin was inevitable Death, and that my crime was of the blackest Dye; nor could I possibly form an idea in my Mind of a Punishment that could make the least Atonement for so great an Offence" (5-6).

Davis correctly points out that *The Just Vengeance* was "not reprinted with the intention that contemporaneous readers might sympathize with [the Dutchman], but rather with purpose that his life might serve as a moral warning to others."<sup>42</sup> Certainly that observation obtains in regards to a text whose narrator laments, "Alas! how wretched is that Man whose Bestial Pleasures have render'd him odious to the rest of his Fellow-Creatures, and turned him loose on a barren island, Nebuchadnezzar like, to herd and graze with Beasts, till loathsome to himself and spurn'd by Man, he prays to end his wretched Days! His guilty Conscience checks him, his Crimes stare him full in the Face, and his misspent Life calls aloud for Vengeance from on high. Such was the case of me unhappy Wretch, which proves the Justice of All-gracious Heaven" (10-11).<sup>43</sup> But the observation is less applicable to the earlier pamphlet, which interweaves condemnations of the sodomite with an explicit encouragement of compassion. Though the preface alerts the reader that "The detestable Crime for which the Dutch Commadore thought fit to abandon and leave this Sailor on a desert Island, is pretty plainly pointed out, p. 15. of the Journal," rather than castigating the Dutchman, the text immediately evokes the reader's sympathy: "The Miseries and Hardships he lingered under for more than five Months, were so unusually terrible, that the bare Reading of his Account of 'em must make the hardest Heart melt with Compassion." The subsequent enumeration of his suffering makes physical hardships grammatically parallel with a suffering conscience and harassing demons: "Tormented with excessive thirst; in want of almost every Thing necessary to defend him from the Inclemencies of Weather; left to the severe Upbraidings and Reflections of a guilty Conscience; harass'd by the blasphemous Conversations of evil Spirits, haunted by Apparitions, even tumbled up and down in his tent by Demons; and at the same time not one Person upon

the Island from whom to seek Consolation or Advice: These are such Calamities, as no Mortal could ever long support himself under." Strikingly, the "guilty Conscience," "blasphemous Conversations," and "Apparitions" all here become external forces, enabling readers to imaginatively align themselves with the Dutchman while distancing themselves from his actions.

To condemn sodomy, *The Just Vengeance* heightens the rhetorical dimensions of the earlier pamphlet, beginning with the graphic display of the skeleton on the first page and continuing into nearly every journal entry. A single long passage from each pamphlet will make the difference clear:

The 16th Ditto, to no Purpose looked out for Ships; and in the Night was surpriz'd by a Noise round my Tent of Cursing, and Swearing, and the most blasphemous Conversations that I ever heard. My Concern was so great, that I thought I should have died with Fright. I did nothing but offer up my Prayers to the Almighty to protect me in this miserable Circumstance; but my Fright rendered me in a very bad Condition of Praying, I trembling to that degree, that I could not compose my thoughts; and any body would have believed that the Devil had moved his Quarters, and was coming to keep Hell on Ascension. I was certain that there was no human Creature on the Island, but my self, having not seen the Foot-steps of any Man but my own. (An Authentick Relation 11-12)

On the 16th I took my Walk on the Beach as usual, and with as little Success as ever, then returned to my tent to repose myself, where in the solemn Gloom and Dead of Night I was surprised by an uncommon Noise that surrounded me, of bitter cursing and Swearing, mix'd with the most blasphemous and libidinous Expressions I ever heard: My Hair stood an End with Horror, and cold Sweats trickled down my pallid Cheeks: Trembling I lay, fearful to speak, least some vile Fiend, more wicked than the rest, should make a Prey of me; Food fit for Devils after my Revolt from the just Laws of Heaven: For no Man living but would have thought the Devil had forsook his dark Abode, and come attended by infernal Spirits to keep his Hell on Earth; being very certain there was not a human Creature on the island except myself, having never observed the Footsteps of a Man since my being there. (*The Just Vengeance* 8-9)

Frontispiece, *The Just Vengeance of Heaven Exemplify'd* (London, 1730). Courtesy The Newberry Library, Chicago.

The "Gloom and Dead of Night," the "libidinous Expressions," the "Hair [that] stood on End with Horror," the devil's "dark Abode" and "infernal Spirits": all point to a gothic sensibility that plays with stock images of spiritual horror to color the island's sparse landscape.

These differences—the metadiscursive flattening of a jagged text, the presentation of the narrator as religious penitent, the heightened rhetoric—which all shift the thematic center of *The Just Vengeance* from authenticity to exhortation, are especially apparent in the description of the Dutchman's last days:

The 4th Ditto, Drank the last of the Blood, which was well settled, and a little sour. The 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th, I lived upon Turtles Blood and Eggs; but my Strength decays so, that it will be impossible I should live long. I resign my self wholly to Providence, being hardly able to kill a Turtle. The 9th, 10th, and 11th, I am so much decay'd, that I am a perfect Skeleton, and can't write the Particulars, my Hand shakes so. The 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th, Lived as before. I'm in a declining Condition. The 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22d, 23d, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th. October the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th, All as before. (An Authentick Relation 28)

From the 5th to the 8th I lived upon Turtles Blood and Eggs, from the 8th to the 14th I linger'd on with no other Food to subsist me. I am become a moving Skeleton, my Strength is intirely decayed, I cannot write much longer: I sincerely repent of the sins I committed and pray, henceforth, no Man may ever merit the Misery which I have undergone. For the Sake of which, leaving this Narrative behind me to deter Mankind from following such Diabolical Inventions. I now resign my Soul to him that gave it, hoping for Mercy in—(The Just Vengeance 20)

In *An Authentick Relation* the sparse series of undifferentiated dates suggests a commitment to authentic representation. By contrast, even in his death, the Dutchman of *The Just Vengeance* is aware of both his own sinfulness and also of the status of the narrative that he will leave behind. His journal contains little empty space:

those days when nothing happens are blended into those around them so that every date has or shares a corresponding event. At the end, his Yorick-like textual flourish dramatizes a soul so sinful that it can scarcely reach the goal toward which it gropes.

To account for the changes between 1728 and 1730, we need to recognize the distinct audiences and the cultural contexts that shaped the texts. In the 1730 pamphlet, numerous signs indicate the shift in audience: the lack of a named publisher, bookseller, or printer; the excision of the Latin epigraph at the end of the preface; the addition of the spectacular engraved frontispiece; the narrative ease; and the subsequent publishing history that takes the pamphlet to the colonies rather than to the Harleian Miscellany. Perhaps most tellingly, in contrast to *An Authentick Relation*, which, as we have seen, encourages a sympathetic bond with the Dutchman, *The Just Vengeance* encourages the reader to sympathize instead with a pair of debtors who allegedly came to possess the journal: "The Copy was left in the Hands of two unhappy Gentlemen confined for Debt, and is now published for their sole Benefit; whoever therefore become Purchasers of this Piece, will not only afford a comfortable Relief to them during their Confinement; but perhaps contribute to their Enlargement."<sup>44</sup> The confinement of the Dutchman is thus reconfigured in the confinement of the debtors, "unhappy Gentlemen" who can be relieved through the purchase of the work. Taken together, these changes point to a different audience, one of different educational and financial status and one that shared the attitudes toward sodomy that the pamphlet expounds or that was accustomed to the moralizing rhetoric it contains.

But the alterations register as well an awareness of changed cultural context. For readers of *An Authentic Relation*, the most salient events would have been recent raids on the molly houses and prosecutions of sodomites. Partly as a response to the efforts of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which had been founded in 1690 in part to close the bawdy houses, Mother Clap's molly house had been raided in 1725/26, leading to the subsequent arrest of over forty men and the execution of three. We might expect the 1728 pamphlet to mirror the heightened rhetoric of the Societies' literature, though as Netta Murray Goldsmith points out, the prosecutions created a backlash as "authorities and the general public reacted

against the Societies."<sup>45</sup> It may be, therefore, that while antisodomitical literature continued to be published extensively, there was also room for a more subdued rhetoric in the aftermath of the raids.

In 1730, however, a new wave of trials grabbed public attention. From June to August, British and Irish newspapers reported widespread prosecution of sodomites in the Netherlands. In its June 13, 1730 edition, *Fog's Weekly Journal* reported, "We hear by the last Mail from Holland, that seven Persons convicted of Sodomy had been executed at the Hague, and that 13 others were to be executed at Amsterdam; and that several Persons of Distinction, accused of the like Crime, absconded, and among them some eminent Merchants." By June 25, a report in the *Grub Street Journal* suggested that the trials had revealed an extensive gay subculture, much as the activities of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners had done in England<sup>46</sup>: "Besides the 7 formerly mentioned, 2 have been burnt, and 2 publicly drowned on a scaffold at Amsterdam. All the towns seem to be infected with this unnatural sin. The prisons are full at Leydon, Delft, Rotterdam, here [The Hague], and at Amsterdam. In short, all ranks are infected to that degree, that the magistrates are almost at a loss, how to extinguish this infernal heat." Similar reports appeared in numerous daily papers, including *The London Gazette*, *The Daily Post Boy*, *St. James's Evening Post*, *The York Courant*, *The Daily Journal*, the *Dublin Weekly Journal*, and *The Old Dublin Intelligence*, prompting the States of Holland to complain that "some of the London News-papers had exaggerated the story of the Sodomites in their country."<sup>47</sup> The reports culminated in August with accounts of a "Placaert against Sodomites" published by the States of Holland and West Friesland, which established the death penalty both for sodomites and for those guilty of "letting their Houses, for the sake of filthy Lucre, for the commission [of sodomy]," dictated that "The Bodies of such as shall be executed, shall immediately after Execution be publickly burnt to Ashes cast into the Sea, or hung upon Gibbets, to be exposed, as unworthy of Burial," and ordered that the names of all those convicted be published.<sup>48</sup>

Though in the two decades between 1710 and 1730, there is not a single recorded indictment for sodomy in the Netherlands,<sup>49</sup> between 1730 and 1732, over 350 men were prosecuted and eighty of them executed. Had the Dutch

mariner been caught in 1730 rather than 1725, his fate would likely have resembled the fates of four sodomites who were, at the end of June, "carry'd and thrown into the Zuyder-Zee, where 30 others were drowned in Sacks a few Days before, and Cannon-Bullets at their Feet."<sup>50</sup>

Though *A Just Vengeance* was distributed within a murky and anonymous communication circuit that makes its precise publication date uncertain, these accounts in the popular press may have been the immediate impetus behind a new printing of the Dutchman's journal. With accounts of the Dutch prosecutions fresh in readers' minds, the printer of *A Just Vengeance* could indulge in antihomosexual rhetoric while displacing fears of contamination from Britain to the Netherlands. As Cameron McFarlane notes, "sodomy is repeatedly represented as coining from elsewhere, a kind of foreign infection erupting within the social body, but the source of which is definitely outside the social body."<sup>51</sup> Given the rumors that sodomites had begun to flee the Netherlands for England, *The Just Vengeance* can be read not only as a cautionary tale addressed to individuals but also as a broader cultural narrative that establishes a screen between nations: while admitting the Dutch sodomite into the British public sphere through his journal, it simultaneously excludes the physical body.

As I have suggested, Lamb and Davis follow the castaway's lead by keeping the author at the center of textual meaning. But as soon as we begin to trace the publication history of these pamphlets, the solitary author, far from being the known quantity, becomes relatively unknown: what we have is less a record of authorial intention than a record of the other parts of the communication circuit. The question we can begin to ask is not exclusively Did it occur? or even Did the sailor do what he said he did? but rather What does the publication history of these pamphlets reveal about eighteenth-century readers and their attitudes toward sodomy and the solitary self? It may well be that solitude and sodomy, the one an ostensible "cure" for the other, present readers with similar problems of credibility. Both the solitaire and the sodomite are alienated from the printed artifact that describes them, each locating identity outside the orthodox sociability of the public sphere. And both run risks with publication, rhetorical risks for the former, penal risks for the latter. It is not surprising that the narratives of both would be subject to extensive revision and rewriting.

Insofar as *solitaire* and *sodomite* resist the sociability inherent in textual production, each becomes practically unknowable, forcing us either to celebrate his unknowability or to explore those moments of book publication that an author-centered reading tends to ignore. In a sense, the solitary castaway takes to its limit the logic of possessive and original authorship: insofar as the production of the narrative is utterly divorced from the rest of the communication circuit—the dying Dutchman, like the journal-writing *Crusoe*, has neither publisher, bookseller, wholesaler, or reader—it authorizes itself as an autonomous work.<sup>52</sup> But its very autonomy paradoxically renders the author unknowable and the account unverifiable. One response is to revel in that epistemological uncertainty; another is to turn the critical gaze toward the other forces that brought the narrative to readers, and to discern in the text the creative and meaningful workings of a full circuit of communication.

[Footnote]

#### NOTES

I would like to thank Richard Nash, Mary Saunders, and the anonymous reviewers at *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this essay.

1. The pamphlet's title page does not provide a date, but for reasons that will become clear later in the essay, I am prepared to accept the 1730 designation suggested in the British Library's catalog.

2. Lennard Davis, "Criminal Statements. Homosexuality and Textuality in the Account of Jan Svilt," *Narrating Transgression: Representations of the Criminal in Early Modern England*, ed. Rosamaria Loretelli and Roberta De Romanis (New York, 1999), 85.

3. This reliance on court records is addressed in Rictor Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House: The Gay Subculture in England, 1700-1830* (London, 1992), 13; B. R. Burg, *Sodomy and the Pirate Tradition: English Sea Rovers in the 17th-century Caribbean* (New York, 1984), xxiii; Arend H. Huussen, "Prosecution of Sodomy in Eighteenth Century Frisia, Netherlands," *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York, 1989), 249; J. L. Boon, "Those Damned Sodomites: Public Images of Sodomy in the Eighteenth Century Netherlands," *The Pursuit of Sodomy:*

Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe, ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma (New York, 1989), 239; Netta Murray Goldsmith, *The Worst of Crimes: Homosexuality and the Law in Eighteenth-Century London* (Aldershot, 1998), passim; Arthur N. Gilbert, "Buggery and the British Navy, 1700-1861," *Journal of Social History* 10 (1976), 72-98. Cameron McFarlane's *The Sodomite in Fiction and Satire 1660-1750* (New York, 1997) provides an important reminder of the need to distinguish between "discursive presence and cultural reality" (61).

4. *The Just Vengeance of Heaven Exemplify'd. In a Journal Lately Found by Captain Mawson* (London, 1730), 2.

Subsequent citations noted parenthetically in the text.

5. Quoted in Duff Hart-Davis, *Ascension: The Story of a South Atlantic Island* (New York, 1973), 13.

6 Hart-Davis, 14.

7. Hart-Davis, 22,23.

8. By 1728, when the Dutchman's journal was first printed, the first volume of *Robinson Crusoe* had gone through seven registered London editions (six printed for W. Taylor and one for W Mears and T Woodward), three abridgments, a serialization in *Heathcot's Intelligence*, and multiple piracies, three of which appeared in 1719 alone. Henry Clinton Hutchins, *Robinson Crusoe and Its Printing, 1719-1731* (New York, 1967). See too Martin Green, *The Robinson Crusoe Story* (University Park, 1990), 19-21.

9. Davis, "Criminal," 85.

10. Davis, "Criminal," 89.

11. Jonathan Lamb, *Preserving the Self in the South Seas, 1680-1840* (Chicago, 2001), 179. Despite his emphasis on the doublings in the novel. Lamb curiously omits what is arguably the most important instance: the doubling that occurs between *Crusoe's* journal and his later retelling of his experience. This is the doubling that enables *Crusoe* to be simultaneously solitary and social, ensconced on his island but active in the public sphere. The strategy of denying the public is necessary to the rhetorical stance of the solitaire-"a hermit who takes a newspaper is not a hermit in whom one can have complete confidence," declares Tom Stoppard's *Lady Croon* (*Arcadia* [London, 1993], 86)-but it is nonetheless inevitable that the publication, printing, and reading of the solitaire's words leave their own, possibly recoverable, traces.

12. Lamb, 182.

13. Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740* (Baltimore, 1987), 336.

14. Davis, "Criminal," 81.



15. Robert Darnton, "What is the History of Books?" *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (New York, 2002), 11.
16. Davis, "Criminal," 90.
17. Paradoxically, the cottage industry that attempts to identify the sources of Robinson Crusoe effectively reinscribes the notion of solitary and original authorship. It would seem that such studies would undercut that notion by locating Crusoe's inspiration in other texts, but in practice they tend to resurrect the solitary author in another figure: the original author becomes not Crusoe but Alexander Selkirk, Henry Pitman, Krinke Kesmes, or some other castaway. One often senses that what the critic wants is the real castaway, the real Robinson Crusoe.
18. Martha Woodmansee, "On the Author Effect: Recovering Collectivity," *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*, ed. Martha Woodmansee and Peter Jaszi (Durham, 1994), 16.
19. Lamb, 181.
20. Davis, "Criminal," 84.
21. Peter Agnos [pseud.?], *The Queer Dutchman* (New York, 1978), 52.
22. Agnos, 5.
23. Agnos, 5.
24. As the records of Dutch-Asiatic Shipping in the 17th and 18th Centuries (JR Brujin, FS Gaastra, and I. Schoffer, eds. *The Hague*, 1979) indicate, the Geertruid made five round-trip voyages between Texel and Batavia between 1718 and 1733, but it is clearly not the ship that marooned the Dutchman in May 1725. First, the ship never had a captain named von Kloop. Second, from February 1725, when it lay at the Cape of Good Hope, until May 1726, when it returned to the Cape from Batavia, the Geertruid was east of Africa; thus when the Dutchman began his journal, the fluit would have been somewhere in the Indian Ocean. Third, despite *The Queer Dutchman's* claim that the ship landed at the Cape of Good Hope on June 1, 1724 and remained there twenty-two days, the real Geertruid landed on February 3, 1725 and remained until the 28th. And finally, *The Queer Dutchman* claims that the Geertruid "reached Java in July of 1724," on which date it was actually in port in Texel.
25. Brujin, Gaastra, and Schoffer, 67, 86.
26. All the surviving copies of *An Authentick Relation* that I know of are either first editions printed in London or eighth editions printed in Dublin. It is possible that Faulkner could have advertised his pamphlet as an eighth

edition in order to give the appearance of popularity, though I am not aware of other incidents of that practice.

27. Hans Turley, *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash: Piracy, Sexuality, and Masculine Identity* (New York, 1999); Percy G. Adams, *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel* (Lexington, 1983); Richard Nash, *WiW Enlightenment* (Charlottesville, 2003). Nash mentions both pamphlets (196n), but his discussion relies solely upon *An Authentick Relation*, which he takes to be a genuine account. *A Just Vengeance of Heaven Exemplify'd* has been reprinted in Charles Neider, *Great Shipwrecks and Castaways: Authentic Accounts of Disasters at Sea* (New York, 1980).

28. Michael Treadwell, "On False and Misleading Imprints in the London Book Trade, 1660-1750," *Fakes and Frauds: Varieties of Deception in Print and Manuscript*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester, 1989), 34.

29. Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age. VoI III* (London, 1983), 756.

30. David Foxon, *Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book Trade* (Oxford, 1991), 5.

31. Ehrenpreis, 780.

32. It is interesting to speculate about what a reader would have found upon visiting Roberts or Faulkner. Presumably the journal was written in Dutch. Does "The Original Manuscript" therefore refer to a translation? If so, what is the meaning of "original"?

33. Lennard Davis, *Factual Fictions. The Origins of the English Novel* (New York, 1983), 149,153.

34. Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago, 1998), 171.

35. Glyndwr Williams, *The Great South Sea: English Voyages and Encounters 1570-1750* (New Haven, 1997), 82-93.

36. Isaac Morris, *A Narrative of the Dangers and Distresses which befel Isaac Morris* (London: Printed for S. Birt, at the Bible and Ball, in Ave-Mary-Lane; and sold by A. Tozer, Bookseller, in Exeter), introduction.

37. Woodes Rogers, [Account of Alexander Selkirk's Solitary Life on Juan Fernandez Island for Four Years and Four Months], *Robinson Crusoe*, ed. Michael Shinagel (New York, 1994), 235.

38. As Robert Lovett has pointed out ["Sir Richard Steele's 'Frequent Conversations' with Alexander Selkirk," *English Language Notes* 25 (1987): 46-50], a comparison of Steele's account in *The Englishman* with those of Rogers and Cooke indicates that Steele most likely never conversed with Selkirk at all, but that he rather took the earlier

accounts and embellished them in order to arrive at appropriate moral conclusions.

39. Richard Steele, [On Alexander Selkirk], Robinson Crusoe, ed. Michael Shinagel (New York, 1994), 237-38.

40 Steele, 238.

41. An Authentick Relation of the many Hardships and Sufferings of a Dutch Sailor (London: Printed for J. Roberts, 1728), 11. Subsequent citations noted parenthetically in the text.

42. Davis, "Criminal," 85.

43. Passages like this one illustrate the difficulty of locating in such texts a "constitutive element of queerness." As McFarlane observes, "When we read the documents from this period as indicating the emergence of a 'homosexual' identity what we are often doing is collapsing what is actually an external element (satirical attack) into the internal element that we are hoping to find (the sodomite's 'identity')." (63). As should be clear, I am sympathetic to McFarlane's desire to shift attention from "the 'truth' of these representations" to "the cultural work which these representations performed" (20), though my own approach has been to emphasize textual circulation more than McFarlane tends to do.

44. Vengeance, Preface.

45. Goldsmith, 9. see also Norton 44, 69.

46. Norton, 49, 52.

47. Grub Street journal (July 9, 1730).

48. Dublin Weekly Journal (August 1, 1730).

49. Boon, 240.

50. Old Dublin Intelligence (July 10, 1730).

51. McFarlane, 55.

52. I am drawing a distinction here between Crusoe's self-presentation in his journal and in his later narrativization. The former, he claims, is written only for himself: "I drew up the State of my Affairs in Writing, not so much to leave them to any that were to come after me, for I was like to have but few Heirs, as to deliver my Thoughts from daily poring upon them, and afflicting my Mind" [Robinson Crusoe, ed. Michael Shinagel (New York, 1994), 49], whereas the latter is clearly written with a reading public in mind. As critics from Charles Gildon to Michael McKeon have noted, the distinction between journal and retrospective commentary is never as clear as Crusoe initially promises, but despite that blurring, the journal nonetheless promises a solitude that is unaffected by a public audience.

[Author Affiliation]  
Evan Davis  
Hampden-Sydney College

[Author Affiliation]  
EVAN DAVIS is visiting professor of English at Hampton-Sydney College. Currently he is working on a book about the Scriblerus Club, authorial collaboration, and national identity.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction or distribution is prohibited without permission.

ABELL records are copyright and are reproduced under licence from the Modern Humanities Research Association.

Copyright © 1996-2009 ProQuest LLC. All rights reserved.