

## ABSTRACT

Title of dissertation: NOVEL HEROES: DOMESTICATING THE  
BRITISH, EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MALE  
ADVENTURER

Mariah Mitchell Lynch Bauer, Doctor of Philosophy,  
2011

Dissertation directed by: Professor Laura Rosenthal  
Department of English

In the “General Introduction” of his *Account of the Voyages and Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere* (1773), John Hawkesworth writes that Captain James Cook’s portion of the *Account* is written up from logs kept by the Captain, Sir Joseph Banks, and from “other papers equally authentic.” Hawkesworth makes a more surprising admission in revealing that his relation of Cook’s *Account* was influenced, specifically, by Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740), and so Richardson’s domestic heroine becomes a model for the greatest male adventurer of the age. Hawkesworth’s inclination to lean upon a literary model in his effort to textually “domesticate” his rendition of Captain Cook is not as unusual as the editor’s open admission of intent and his candid citing of the *Pamela* source. This project rests upon the assertion that there is far less division between the travel log and the novel than previously argued, and that the writers of period travel narratives drew upon the same themes and used the same aesthetic strategies that novelists deployed. Further, it is my contention that

this aesthetic formulation—this peculiar brand of domestic heroism borrowed from period novels and their heroines that is appropriated by the constructed male adventurer and enables him to separate and preserve himself from all external savagery—is a formulation that appears repeatedly in eighteenth-century travel literature.

First, I will define “domestic” and describe the masculine variety of “domestic heroism” or “oeconomy” that is being appropriated by male adventurers. In the first two chapters, I will trace the dichotomy of the successful “domestic housewife” or “oeconomic” hero versus the undomesticated anti-hero through a set of examples: Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe (versus Swift’s Gulliver) and Hawkesworth’s Richardsonian Captain Cook (versus Bligh). In the third chapter, I will demonstrate that Mungo Park constructs himself as a deeply vulnerable, gothic, Ann Radcliffe heroine in his *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa*. In the final chapter, looking primarily at Dibdin’s fictional *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe*, I will argue that since the successful male adventurer must possess both female and male attributes, no room is left for the adventuring woman.

**NOVEL HEROES: DOMESTICATING THE BRITISH,  
EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MALE ADVENTURER**

by

Mariah Mitchell Lynch Bauer

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
2011

Advisory Committee:

Professor Laura Rosenthal, Chair  
Professor Tita Chico  
Professor Ralph Bauer  
Professor Orrin Wang  
Professor Amy Weinberg

© Copyright by  
Mariah Mitchell Lynch Bauer  
2011

## Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to Matthew, Eden, and Gideon,  
who are the source of all of my great adventures.

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
Timeline of Relevant Voyages, Travels, Events and Publications.....	iv
Introduction: Romancing the Empire.....	1
Chapter 1: Domesticating Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe; Dissolving Swift’s Lemuel Gulliver .....	27
Chapter 2: Hawkesworth’s Richardsonian Captain Cook versus Mr B.(ligh).....	72
Chapter 3: The Attempted Seduction of Mungo Park: Mr B.(anks), Moorish Banditti, and the Mysteries of Africa .....	123
Chapter 4: Strange “Fac Simile”: Addressing Dibdin’s <i>Hannah Hewit</i> and Representations of the Eighteenth-Century Female Adventurer .....	163
Conclusion: Vulnerable at the Peripheries.....	206
Bibliography .....	215

## Timeline of Relevant Voyages, Travels, Events and Publications

- 1668: Publication date of Henry Neville's *Isle of Pines*
- 1682: First edition of Mary Rowlandson's account of her captivity, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, published in Massachusetts and in London. More editions would follow in 1720, 1770, 1771, and 1773.
- 1697/1699: William Dampier, *A New Voyage Round the World; Voyage to New Holland*
- 1704: Alexander Selkirk abandoned on Juan Fernandez Island by Captain Stradling of the *Cinque Ports* galley
- 1709: Selkirk rescued by William Dampier and the *Duke* and *Duchess* privateering expedition. Woodes Rogers and Edward Cooke were also on the vessels and wrote accounts of Selkirk's discovery that were widely read and were said to influence Defoe.
- 1719: Publication date of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*
- 1726: Publication date of Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*
- 1740: Publication date of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*
- 1740-1744: Dates of Captain George Anson's *Voyage Round the World*
- 1751: Publication date of *The Oeconomy of Human Life*
- 1757?: *The History of Miss Katy N---*
- 1769-1771: Dates of Captain James Cook's *Endeavour* Voyage
- 1773: Publication date of John Hawkesworth's *Account of the Voyages and Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere* (which includes a relation of Cook's *Endeavour* voyage)
- 1775-1783: American Revolutionary War
- 1782: The wreck of the *Grosvenor* off of the coast of Africa
- 1789-1799: French Revolution
- 1789: The Mutiny on the *Bounty*; Captain Bligh is put into a launch in the Pacific

1791-1795: Captain George Vancouver's expedition in the Pacific

1791-1804: Haitian Revolution

1792: Three of the *Bounty* mutineers hanged with "high priority"

1794: Publication date of Ann Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho*

1795-1797: Mungo Park's first travels in Africa

1796: Publication date of Diddin's *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe*<sup>1</sup>

1799: Publication date of Mungo Park's *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa*

---

<sup>1</sup> The publication date of the novel is often listed as being 1792, but this is incorrect. Per Carl Thompson in "The *Grosvenor* Shipwreck and the Figure of the Female Crusoe: *Hannah Hewit*, *Mary Jane Meadows*, and Romantic-Era Feminist and Anti-Feminist Debate," note 7: "Advertising notices in the press in 1796 make it clear that this is the correct publication date." Interestingly, the date of the wreck of the *Grosvenor*, of which Hannah was supposedly a survivor, was 1792, and so that fact alone would suggest that the 1796 publication date was more likely.



## Introduction: Romancing the Empire

In his February 23, 1760, article on the “Narratives of Travellers Considered”

(*Idler* No. 97), Samuel Johnson wrote:

Every writer of travels should consider that, like all other Authors, he undertakes either to instruct or please, or to mingle pleasure with instruction. He that instructs must offer to the mind something to be imitated or something to be avoided; he that pleases must offer new images to his reader, and enable him to form a tacit comparison of his own state with that of others.

In his statement, Johnson is exposing the task that the British eighteenth-century writer of travel narratives<sup>2</sup>—real, imagined, or heavily altered—was faced with.

Relations of travel could not merely involve an empirical, value-neutral litany of data points involving latitude and longitude or bland batteries of Linnaean terminology.

“This is the common style of those sons of enterprize,” Johnson noted, “who visit savage countries, and range through solitude and desolation; who pass a desert, and tell that it is sandy; who cross a valley, and find that it is green.” Yet a writer of travel can not be engaged only with the vapid aesthetic, either. Those travel writers “of more delicate sensibility” who “visit only the Realms of Elegance and Softness; that wander through *Italian* Palaces, and amuse the gentle reader with catalogues of Pictures; that hear Masses in magnificent Churches, and recount the number of the Pillars or Variegations of the Pavement” leave the reader with “nothing on which Attention can fix, or which Memory can retain.” Instead, the “useful Traveller” or

---

<sup>2</sup> In this project, to narrow scope, I will only be working with British travelers and authors, travel narratives and novels.

developer of travel narratives is expected—by working within a hybrid process that will both satisfy the demands of science and harness the power of novelistic strategies—to develop works that are compelling, educational, and impart “something by which his country may be benefited.” The correctly constructed travel narrative will “enable...readers to compare their condition with that of others, to improve it whenever it is worse, and whenever it is better to enjoy it.”

Johnson’s 1760 statement about the complicated project of the effective travel writer underscores an observation that lies at the heart of this project: “*all...Authors,*” whether writers of accounts of travel or the type of writing that would come to be known as the novel, must measure their projects against a common standard—to please and to instruct— if they were to garner positive critical attention. In line with Johnson’s assertion, Percy Adams argued—most extensively in *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel* (1983)—that “prose fiction and the travel account have evolved together, are heavily indebted to each other, and are often similar in both content and technique” (279). Rather than focusing upon a process of true cross-fertilization between eighteenth-century travel narratives and novels, however, Adams hones in on the ways in which period novelists (Defoe, Radcliffe, Swift, and others) were indebted to travel writers for elements such as structure, narrative design, motifs, and character types. Adams’ discussion of early novelists’ reliance upon the travel writers’ use of verisimilitude is useful; and, as will be discussed, the careful detailing of “particulars” certainly made its way into Richardson’s *Pamela*, Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*, and other early novels that signaled the arrival and development of a new kind of literary realism that was expected to impart valuable

lessons upon its readership. In *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*, Philip Edwards asserts that he is focusing upon *actual* travel logs—narratives of sea voyages to be precise—and “the movement from experience into the written word, and on the mutations of the written word as it moves into print.” Though Edwards tries to draw a neat division between “real” sea-narratives, “this large and diversified branch of literature,” and “the travel fiction of the century” which he deems to be less “important” and about which he has “little to say,” there is no neat barrier between the clean, empirical travel log and the aesthetic travel narrative. Edwards, himself, admits that “resemblances and links between the real and the imagined come to the surface on a number of occasions” (6) but still tries to maintain the division.<sup>3</sup> The travel narrative clearly shaped the development of the novel. In turn, however, tales of travel were becoming increasingly “novelistic” in very particular ways. The lines between fiction and non-fiction were extremely blurry in the early eighteenth century—indeed, they did not yet exist—and so it was difficult for period readers to distinguish between the tales of genuine “travelers” and those of “travel liars,” as evidenced by the fact that *Robinson Crusoe* was read as an authentic text. Additionally, it is important not to discount the power that period editors had over the “real” logs that they were tasked with reworking and, point blank, rendering legitimate, and the degree to which the aesthetic trumped the authentic. It is difficult for us to imagine that the British Admiralty left the task of

---

<sup>3</sup> In his chapter on “Dr. Hawkesworth at sea,” Edwards acknowledges: “This vagueness about the aims and purposes of an official publication and in particular the balance between the entertainment and edification of the general reader on the one hand, and the provision of scientific and technical information on the other, was part of an extraordinary lack of clarity in all major voyage accounts. Schizophrenic dithering between the demands of science and the claims of the general reader was never resolved...” (7).

generating its authorized record of the epic, geographically and scientifically critical *Endeavour* voyages to John Hawkesworth, a romance writer, or that Joseph Banks carefully funneled Mungo Park's Africa journals through Bryan Edwards, politician, historian and secretary of the Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa. The modern reader tries to exact a clear and rigid distinction between an evidence-based, emotionally-detached, empirical perspective (typically associated with a tale of masculine adventure and discovery) and a more sensitive, perceptual aesthetic (typically associated with a novel that concerns itself with more feminine or domestic topics). This distinction, however, did not exist in the early eighteenth century. The concept of something that was empirical, stripped of the aesthetic and "value neutral" was new, and the conversation about what the discourse for the Age of Enlightenment should look like was still fluid and evolving. This study seeks to call attention to the fact that there is far less division between the travel log and the novel than previously argued and that the two genres cannot, as Edwards suggests or hopes, be easily disentangled and separated out. Percy Adams argues that eighteenth-century novelists borrowed a number of strategies and elements from period travel writers. My contention is that—in turn—as period appetite for travel narratives continued to explode and the expectations placed upon the competent travel writer (as articulated by Samuel Johnson) increased, developers of travel logs began to lean heavily upon the power of novelistic techniques and aesthetics. If successful, the result was a relation of travel that managed to marry the demands of the scientific community (staking claim in authenticity and veracity and endowed with enough of a rational, empirical tone that it could be taken seriously and instruct) with the demands

of a readership who had to be engaged, entertained and educated (and would only be drawn in by the pleasure-inducing, emotional, aesthetic powers of the novel).

This project stems from my striking upon a concrete example of this new mode or strategy for writing up a tale of travel. In reading the “General Introduction” of John Hawkesworth’s 1773 rendition of Captain James Cook (on dusty microfilm deep in the library), I was stunned to find that Hawkesworth flatly cites Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* as a key model in relating the British Admiralty’s official account of the most famous voyage of a man who has come to be remembered as the greatest British nautical hero of the eighteenth century. In his own language, Hawkesworth acknowledges indebtedness to Samuel Richardson’s “Pamela, the imaginary heroine of a novel that is remarkable for the enumeration of particulars in themselves so trifling, that we almost wonder how they could occur to the author’s mind.” A handful of scholars have taken note of Hawkesworth’s curious decision to use Richardson’s domestic novel and his virtuous, middle-class heroine as a model for Captain Cook and his wholly masculine enterprise. These scholars have asserted that the Richardson model was merely used to support a stylistic decision—a decision to offer up “minute particulars” to cast an atmosphere of modernistic realism. A close reading of Hawkesworth’s rendition of Cook makes it clear, however, that Richardson’s impact goes beyond this tendency toward cataloging minutia. The “I” of the *Voyages* quintessentially male quest may actually be read as a fusion of the journals of Captain Cook, Sir Joseph Banks, Hawkesworth, and Richardson’s “perfect nun” (Pamela 116) and her “very pretty romantic turn for virtue” (101). Though the real Captain Cook was furious at the liberties that John

Hawkesworth took in editing his *Endeavour* voyage chronicles, one must not underestimate the role that Hawkesworth played in the Captain's apotheosis. William Dampier, whom Edwards describes as being "the 'founder'" of the modern sea-voyage (5) and who is acknowledged as being the greatest nautical explorer-adventurer since the Elizabethans Drake and Raleigh, still does not command historical memory as completely as James Cook. It is possible that this is the result of an incident on the *Roebuck* expedition that led to Dampier being court-martialed for cruelty, and despite Dampier's furious attempt to defend his conduct, he was found guilty, denied pay for the voyage, and dismissed from the Royal Navy. Thus deemed unfit to serve on one of the King's ships, Dampier returned to privateering, sailed with Woodes Rogers, rescued Alexander Selkirk from Juan Fernandez island in 1709, and the rest—as they say—became history (or story) in Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. The point is that the utterly unblemished, Richardsonian rendition of Captain Cook that we have been handed down for hundreds of years is due to John Hawkesworth's strategy of developing a supremely virtuous, bourgeois, "novel hero" who during his trial in isolation on board the *Endeavour* managed to separate himself from all external savagery by exerting control over his space (to the degree that he was able) and (most importantly) his self using strategies like the power of writing. Dampier did not have the benefit of an editor who was so talented in the art of character preservation; and, indeed, few did. In line with Johnson's instruction on worthy travel writing and Richardson's *Pamela* project, Hawkesworth was deeply conscious of his task: the construction of a heroic traveler. Using a careful blend of the empirical and the aesthetic, Hawkesworth sought to both amuse and educate the

reader by providing them with ample details about a virtuous protagonist. Thus, a Richardsonian “novel hero(ine)” was born in the form of Captain James Cook.

Hawkesworth’s decision to turn to novelistic devices and aesthetic strategies is not as surprising as his citing specific use of Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* and the servant girl’s prolonged defense of her virtue against the rakish aristocrat, Mr B., as a model for shaping the archetypal male nautical hero of the great age of scientific travel. Though perhaps offering the most pointed and precise example, Hawkesworth’s “novel hero” is one of number of male adventurers who are granted attributes that we might more typically associate with female protagonists in domestic and closely related types of period novels, such as the gothic novel. This project does not simply seek to highlight the aesthetic exchange between tales of travel and what would come to be known as novels: the success of the male adventurers that we encounter in this study is articulated in terms of their ability to domesticate their surroundings and, most importantly, their selves, using the power of virtuous, chaste, self-control so that they may emerge from their difficult missions intact.

Alternatively, failure in a journey or voyage is expressed in terms of an inability to domesticate or tame the surroundings and, most critically, the self, that leads to catastrophic results. In essence, in crafting their male adventurers or in representing their adventuring selves, the writers of these travel stories cast “novel heroes” as domestic heroines during their trials in varying degrees of isolation. To be successful, male travelers must be both masculine and feminine; masculine enough to survive the trying journey or perilous period of confinement or captivity, and feminine enough to be able to domesticate self and surroundings and emerge in one piece. Some scholars,

most notably Mary Louise Pratt, have pointed out that some historical male adventurers, particularly in the late eighteenth century, were appropriating “feminine” attributes. In *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Pratt argues that Mungo Park represents the “sentimental, experimental subject” who “inhabits the self-defined ‘other’ sector of the bourgeois world, the private sphere” (78). In this way, Park is recognized by Pratt as being a different kind of hero, a rather romantic hero whose feminine or passive posture during his *Travels* results in an “anti-conquest” (82) and undercuts the seriousness of the imperial process of which he was part. In Chapter 3, I will address Pratt’s analysis of Park more completely, but I raise the point here to draw an early distinction between her presentation of the late, eighteenth-century male “sentimental hero” and the type of adventuring, domesticated “novel hero” that I am identifying across the texts presented in this study. Rather than being action-oriented, the types of sentimental heroes that are depicted in mid to late eighteenth-century novels are characterized as being excessively feminine: passive, weak, ill-prepared for the journey or trial, and tending to survive solely on luck.<sup>4</sup> These features do not translate easily into accounts that involve discovery and adventure in foreign space and in which survival is the most crucial task. Further, if they were to be taken seriously and remembered, the constructed, male adventure heroes of the Enlightenment could not be depicted as being irrational, feeble, and flaccid. Ultimately, the excessively emotional “sentimental heroes” became sufficiently unpalatable to eighteenth-century readers that they fell out of favor. In *The Columbia History of the British Novel*, John Richetti writes that the tendency,

---

<sup>4</sup> See Sarah Fielding’s novel, *David Simple* (1744), Richardson’s *Sir Charles Grandison* (1754), Sterne’s *Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy* (1768), Mackenzie’s *Man of Feeling* (1771), etc.



certainly for the modern reader, is to “laugh uneasily at so-called heroes who cry so easily and copiously” and find “ludicrous and embarrassing their tendency to exaggerate” (187). Further, Richetti argues that the exertion of any form of “control,” any “way of ordering, judging, and mastering one’s world...would run contrary to the passive, victimized posture of most sentimental heroes” (183). If the deeply feminine “sentimental hero” is marked by unchecked emotion that makes it difficult for him to navigate his journey, the certainly masculine though “domestic” adventuring hero that I am identifying and addressing in this study possesses enough “feminine susceptibility”<sup>5</sup> to underscore the inherent risk of the empire-building project but demonstrates the ability to survive his journey into the chaotic unfamiliar by actively imposing control over space (when possible) and, most critically, self.

First, the way in which I am using the term “domestic” must be defined. In Samuel Johnson’s *Dictionary of the English Language*, published in 1755-1756, “‘Domestical’” or “‘Domestick’” is defined as: “‘Belonging to the house; not relating to things publick,’ ‘Private, done at home; not open’, ‘Inhabiting the house; not wild’, and ‘Not Foreign.’” The division between private and public, Britishness and otherness, is drawn onto the concept of “domestic” fairly early on and so, on the most basic level and painted most broadly, “domestic” speaks to “domestic space”: Britain, home, the wooden ship that begins to function as a floating pod of Britishness in a sea of otherness. In terms of the personal characteristics of “domesticity”—as garnered from early representations in literature—the domestic hero(ine) grants special attention to functions conducted in private, home space: cooking, cleaning, sewing,

---

<sup>5</sup> Description taken from Charles Dibdin’s *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe*, which will be addressed in this study.

caring for the people, tending to the animals and the like. The most essential component of the domestic heroine, however, is simply this: self-control or the ability to self-domesticate, to self-tame. She is marked by two key attributes; chastity and virtue. The domestic hero(ine), as she evolved (or at least as she has been remembered by most historians and literary theorists), was gendered female and aligned with private space, the home, domestic functions, and virtuous self-control. Rather than further eroding women's social status, Nancy Armstrong argues in her influential *Desire and Domestic Fiction* (1987) that during the eighteenth century women acquired new power through control over home space. Literary domestic heroines were granted "exclusive authority over domestic life, emotions, taste" and, most importantly, "morality" (41). The importance of aristocratic birth and title were now being textually trumped by middle-class chastity and virtue, and "self-regulation now became a form of labor that was superior to labor" (81). Armstrong asserts that this privileging of morality over social status was applicable only to women, though others have argued that chastity and virtue ultimately evolved into universally desirable attributes. It was through a supremely chaste rendition of domesticity that women, often regardless of social status, gained power (see, for example, the case of *Pamela*). In sum, there is clout in a domestic approach because domesticating space and self is ultimately about agency and exerting control. In *Adventures in Domesticity: Gender and Colonial Adulteration in Eighteenth-Century British Literature* (2004), Sharon Harrow cites Armstrong's work as being groundbreaking but problematic, "[p]rimarily [because her analysis] posits too narrow a view of domestic ideology" and bolsters the binaries that Harrow argues against (home/away;

female/male; domestic/foreign; private/public). Harrow asserts that “eighteenth-century British literature responded to concerns about a changing English identity during a time of great international, colonial expansion by turning to domestic narratives.” Harrow broadens the domestic to mean “both home and nation” and notes that “England’s literary imagination and national identity, increasingly built upon an economy of cultural difference, turned to the domestic as a sustained but shifting trope that promised but often failed to resolve anxiety about the contaminating vices of cultural others” (6), increasingly by “equating fears of cultural adulteration with the loss of female virtue” (11).

The difficult piece—as reflected by the dearth of scholarship on the topic—is figuring out what domesticity has to do with masculinity. Michael McKeon’s *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge* (2005) painstakingly historicizes the separation of the public from the private during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In her 2009 article, “Men Making Home: Masculinity and Domesticity in Eighteenth-century Britain,” Karen Harvey “take[s] a significant lead” from McKeon’s work, underscoring that “while in this modern world things are explicitly separated into ‘public’ and ‘private,’ they are ultimately conflated.” Both McKeon and Harvey argue that “[i]t is within domesticity...that the conflation of ‘public’ and ‘private’ takes place” (524). In her analysis, Harvey goes on to expose the century-wide gap in masculinity studies between the seventeenth-century patriarchal household model and the nineteenth-century compassionate, protective and providing father model. Harvey argues that scholarship that “chronicles the birth of domesticity” has “obscured men’s engagements with the

eighteenth-century home,” focusing upon a “an ideology of female domesticity” which “is seen as central to the construction of a middle-class identity” and thus granting “the home in studies of the British long eighteenth century a rather feminine feel.” This, Harvey points out, “raises at least one significant question: what happened to the domestic patriarch, and to men’s engagements with home more generally during the eighteenth century?” (523). Barring Harvey, no one has tried to reconstruct eighteenth-century male domesticity, and men have largely been missing even in the well-tread Victorian “cult of the home” scholarship. Harvey references John Tosh who, in “New Men? The Bourgeois Cult of Home”<sup>6</sup> asserts that “domesticity worked symbolically, acquiring ‘psychological and emotional dimensions’” in the nineteenth century, and that an “emerging middle-class domesticity of such emotional and psychological depth did not exclude men; they were a (literally) central part of its constitution” since domesticity extended beyond mother/wife to include “the family circle” (527). Harvey argues that the concept of a domesticity that included the entire family, male and female, developed in the eighteenth century and focuses on blurring between public and private, masculine and feminine, in common household terminology, noting (for example) that “[t]he terms

---

<sup>6</sup> In his article, Tosh analyzes the tensions between masculinity and domesticity in nineteenth-century Britain, noting that “[t]he Victorian cult of home tends to evoke largely female associations” and that “[r]ecent historical scholarship has been largely concerned with whether domesticity should be interpreted as empowering or repressive to women” (9). Tosh reclaims space at the hearthside for the Victorian male, arguing that “[a]t the root of the new evaluation of domesticity was the separation from home from work,” the post-Industrial Revolution shift that pushed the middle class man into factories and offices and “elevat[ed] the home to be not only the hallowed sphere of wife and children, but the refuge of the breadwinner as well” who were charged with functioning as “upholders of fireside virtues” when at home (10). It is interesting to think about application of this model to the traveling, male body. What happens when work space is the only space for such long periods of time (as during a journey on a ship)? Does the work space evolve into the home space—is there a drive to attempt to recreate this “hallowed sphere” within the bounds of the wooden world? If they remain psychologically separate, does the home space achieve “elevated” status or is there the looming threat of inability to re-engage with home space (as in the cases of Selkirk and Gulliver)?

‘housewife’ and ‘housekeeper’ were not reserved solely for women” and that, indeed, there was a “‘common culture’ of home shared by the middling-sort men and women” (531). “Housekeeping,” Harvey explains, when undertaken by men, was understood by contemporaries as “OECONOMY, a certain order in Management of a Family and domestick Affairs: Hence the Word Oeconomist, for a good Manager.” Further, and most interestingly, “oeconomy may be taken in a more extensive Sense, for a just, prudent, and regular conduct in all the Parts of Life, and relative Capacities” (532-533).<sup>7</sup> Ultimately, Harvey argues, “Oeconomy rendered the home a training ground for skills that were at the heart of all manly behaviour”: “Oeconomy earned men ‘Honor and Reputation’ and taught them self-governance, an important virtue for any man seeking masculine status” (533).

The eighteenth-century concept of “oeconomy” gives us the language to talk about the intersection between masculinity and domesticity. Per the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “oeconomy,” stemming from the Latin *oeconomia* and the Greek *oikonomos* means “household management”—and the term “oeconomy” was used in reference to managing private, domestic space from the mid sixteenth century on. The wildly popular *The Oeconomy of Human Life* (1751), which went through roughly two hundred editions over a half-century, was purported to be “Translated from an *Indian* Manuscript written by an ancient BRAMIN” which was “discovered” by “an *English* Gentleman, now residing in *China*.” In the long opening letter which details the way in which the “small system of morality, written in the language and character of the ancient Gymnosophists or Bramins,” was “discovered,” it is stated that “[t]hose

---

<sup>7</sup> Harvey takes this definition of “Oeconomy” from Richard Bradley’s 1725 translation and revision of Noel Chomel’s *Dictionnaire Oeconomique: or, The Family Dictionary*.

who admire it the most highly, are very fond of attributing it to Confucius...supposing [the Bramin's version] to be only a translation." (xv-xvi). Part of the point being underscored in the front materials of *The Oeconomy* is that the core tenants being presented—the value of domesticity and self-domesticiation—are not new, but ancient and very much worth revisiting. Interestingly, in *The Oeconomy*, the connection between masculinity and domesticity is made clear and the document is attached to foreign space and presented to the West by a traveling Englishman. From the beginning, *The Oeconomy* offers much more than a prescription for maintaining order in the household. In the "Advertisement to the Public," it is written that "The spirit of virtue and morality" is infused into a manual that serves as a general guide to living. Part I expounds upon "Duties" of the "Individual" such as "Consideration," "Modesty," and "Temperance." Part II is entitled "Of the PASSIONS." Parts III, IV and V speak first about domesticity in terms of the "Natural Relations" between family members and then move into public space, speaking about "Differences of Men" ("Masters and Servants," "Magistrates and Subjects"). "Social Duties"—"Benevolence," "Justice," "Charity," "Gratitude," "Sincerity"—are discussed in Part VI and "Religion" in Part VII. The lesson presented in *The Oeconomy of Human Life*, in sum, is that a man who understands "oeconomy," "who can manage his household" and manage his self, "can command kingdoms" (Harvey 533) or, in the case of this particular study, can (at minimum) command and control his ship. In *Mr. Bligh's Bad Language: Power, Passion and Theatre on the Bounty*, Greg Denning notes that "'Oeconomy' was William Bligh's own approving word for managing resources":

'His damned oeconomy' was the phrase that a weak and dying David Nelson used to describe the cause of their sufferings. Much of the ease

of mind that Bligh felt at the beginning of this terrible voyage came from the ‘oeconomy’ he planned for it and engaged his men to follow. His ‘sad passions’ came mostly from the breaches and suspicions he detected in the working on his ‘oeconomy.’ (100)

James Cook and Bligh were both captains and pursers of their ships and so were responsible for brokering every transaction and tracking every provision in their “wooden worlds.” While Hawkesworth’s Captain Cook seemed to understand the dual nature of good “oeconomy” (self-governance as well as management of domestic space), Bligh clearly did not. Bligh’s brand of domesticity, then, was particularly dangerous. It did not involve the virtuous, almost maternal role of the caretaker that Hawkesworth’s Cook assumed. Rather, Bligh’s cruel and pathological need to maintain control over his ship – his “‘damned oeconomy’”— was the source of his anger management issue and landed him in a launch in the Pacific after being ousted from the *Bounty* by a mutinous crew. This will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 2, but it is illustrative of a larger trend that will be explored in this study. In terms of travel literature (real, heavily altered, and imagined), the protagonists have long been read as quintessential, male heroes, and eighteenth-century scholarship has not yet taken into account the importance of the writers’ thematic and aesthetic application of this evolving notion of domesticity. Framing the eighteenth-century version of male domesticity, “oeconomy,” as not just management of home space but, perhaps most critically, as *self*-management, grants us a new way of looking at these complex male adventurers. Reading these travel narratives through this unusual pairing, though this version of domestic masculinity, will offer the opportunity to re-characterize these period travel logs and their “novel heroes” and re-examine their immense popularity. It will also give us room to explore the following

question: Why, in constructing the eighteenth-century male adventurer/discoverer—one of the most critical cogs in the empire building machine—were period writers drawing upon the trope of domesticity and characteristics more typically associated with vulnerable, female protagonists in period novels?

In the first two chapters, and using the idea of male domesticity or “oeconomy,” I will read two epic, male adventure heroes, one imagined and one real—Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* and Hawkesworth’s Richardsonian Captain Cook—against two failed foils or anti-heroes, imagined and real—Swift’s Lemuel Gulliver and William Bligh (the Mr B. of the *Bounty* mutiny). In any study that involves travel literature one must include the examples of *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver’s Travels* or provide a rigorous explanation as to why they were not included. In the case of this particular study, *Robinson Crusoe* offers a concrete example of interpenetration between the travel log and what will come to be known as the novel: *Robinson Crusoe* is an example of the novel before it was recognized as being such. In 1719, Defoe likely leant upon accounts of Alexander Selkirk’s trial in isolation (via writings by Edward Cooke, Woodes Rogers, and Richard Steele) to create a character that was a very different kind of hero. In *The Secret History of Domesticity*, Michael McKeon notes that though *Robinson Crusoe* is most often “cited as an exemplar” of the adventure novel, it is “the domestication of the island—its familiarization, Anglicanization, and domicilization—[that] lies at the heart of what most fascinates us in Defoe’s novel” (623). The reality is that Robinson Crusoe, who has come to represent the epic, male adventurer in our cultural imagination—“...the true prototype of the British colonist” as James Joyce put it—truly behaves more like a



“domestic housewife” (626) in Defoe’s novel. In this respect, and for the purposes of this study, Robinson Crusoe offers us a clear example of a male body domesticating foreign space. In the first chapter, I will argue that Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe, a “domestic housewife” type of hero or “oeconomic man,” is ultimately successful because he is able to tame his surroundings and, most importantly, his self; to control his situation and emerge intact. As a counter point, I will read Jonathan Swift’s anti-hero, Lemuel Gulliver, as another example of a popular period piece that was born of travel logs.<sup>8</sup> Repeatedly during his *Travels*, and with increasingly destabilizing effect, Gulliver fails to “go domestic” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse 201) and as he disintegrates over the course of Swift’s parody, his inability to hold himself together is articulated in terms of failed domesticity and the inability to re-engage with the “family circle.”

In the second chapter, I address the eighteenth-century nautical voyagers beginning with Hawkesworth’s Cook, whom I have already explained was the source of this project and who has been widely acknowledged as being the most solidly deified British sea captain of the great age of scientific travel. As previously discussed, when tasked with writing the British Admiralty’s “official” account of the *Endeavour Voyages*, John Hawkesworth—who had earlier published an edition of Jonathan Swift’s works, adapted Southerne’s *Oroonoko*, and produced a handful of moral-laden “Oriental Tales”—turned to Richardson’s *Pamela* as a model. I will look closely at Hawkesworth’s manipulations of the logs and “authentic” papers that

---

<sup>8</sup> It is clear that Swift “expected his readers to have read enough travel literature, then a popular genre, to catch the echoes of words like ‘remote’ then descriptive of countries, and of ‘fable’ and ‘fabulous accounts’ as that which most travel writers professed to eschew—usually in the inevitable prefatory matter addressed to ‘the reader’ in which, while the style of the narrative is ‘plain,’ the writer is a man of parts and learning” (Sherbo 126).

he received from Cook, Banks and the other travelers and his use of Richardson's *Pamela* in producing a rendition of a Captain Cook who, for better or worse, would be the only Captain Cook that the public would know for hundreds of years. Hawkesworth's virtuous captain, I will argue, is ultimately a successful traveler because he successfully—*Pamela*-like—staves off the onslaughts of debauched external forces and stabilize his self by focusing on domestic life and morality. Interestingly, the protracted detailing of fending off seduction that both Richardson and Hawkesworth employ in standing up their virtuous hero and heroine ended up earning them both the same result: immensely popular texts and accusations of pornography. In the case of Hawkesworth's telling of the *Endeavour* voyage, it was likely the journals of Sir Joseph Banks (the rakish, aristocratic "Mr B." of the voyage to Tahiti) that added the largest dose of sordid color to the *Account*. Sir Joseph Banks played a critical role in eighteenth-century global expansion circles: he personally voyaged on some of the most major discovery missions of the century; funded and engineered many others; controlled the ways in which the stories of the voyages were told by supplying and personally monitoring editors; and lorded over a museum of imperialist maps, logs, and artifacts at his home at 32 Soho Square. The reach that Sir Joseph Banks had over the eighteenth-century empire-building machine and the process by which missions of discovery, adventure, and expansion were being "romanced" requires that Banks be granted a place in this study, if only to acknowledge the power that he did, in fact, wield. Like so many other voyages, Captain William Bligh's two missions to transplant breadfruit from Tahiti to the West Indies to provide a new source of cheap food for slaves was motivated by one of

Joseph Banks' schemes. The mutiny on the *Bounty* secured Bligh's place in history as one of the most unsuccessful travelers and in the second half of Chapter 2 I will provide a close reading of Bligh (the *Bounty's* Mr B.) as a foil to Cook. There were certainly a number of other sea captains who commanded a fair amount of fame (or infamy) and attention. To explain why I chose to engage Cook and Bligh and to illustrate how central the project of crafting a "novel hero" was in determining whether or not history would remember any given adventurer or discoverer, I will briefly touch upon some of the bigger names in eighteenth-century navigation here. William Dampier (*A New Voyage Round the World*, 1697; *A Voyage to New Holland* aboard the *Roebuck* in 1699) has already been addressed, as has the episode of "bad oeconomy" that rendered him incapable of checking his temper and being convicted of a charge of cruelty. Captain George Anson earned recognition for capturing a Spanish galleon and for completing a circumnavigation with his squadron from 1740-1744, but suffered horrific losses due to scurvy (only 188 of the original 1,854 of the crew survived), a condition which surely could have been mitigated with better "oeconomy." Yet, despite the fact that Captain George Vancouver did not lose a single man to scurvy during a 1791-1795 trek through uncharted sections of the Pacific that rivaled Cook's for long-term impact, the voyage is largely forgotten because Vancouver was placed at the center of a London smear campaign after having punished or mismanaged some of the wealthier members of his crew. Vancouver's fatal mistake was alienating Sir Joseph Banks, who had supported the voyage and the participation of the wealthy travelers who felt that they had been mistreated by Vancouver as he strove to ensure that a repeat of Bligh's recent mutiny

did not occur. In terms of the aforementioned voyages, Dampier and Anson precede the example offered by Hawkesworth's Cook and both involve captains who suffered from "bad oeconomy" and did not have the benefit of an editor like Hawkesworth who could masterfully smooth and obscure from public view their domestic failings. In the case of Vancouver, who came after our Richardsonian Cook, we see an example of the dangers of crossing the formidable Sir Joseph Banks: the man who controlled which voyages and missions of discovery were being funded and the story that the empire was telling itself about the process of empire-building could very quickly place an adventurer on the wrong side of the spin. Vancouver, though he should be remembered as being among the greats, was pushed into silent obscurity by what had become the eighteenth-century travel narrative industry.

In Chapter 3, I will focus upon a "novel hero" who made an inland trek of discovery. It was through the enthusiastic support of Sir Joseph Banks that Mungo Park, Banks' young, Scottish protégé, was selected to travel on behalf of the African Association into the interior of the continent. In *Slavery and the Romantic Imagination*, Debbie Lee notes that in an era of extreme interest in travel and travel logs, "Africa was pursued with more attention than the rest of the world put together." When Park emerged from the interior and returned to England in 1797 (via America on a slave ship after having been thought dead):

Banks and the African Association immediately set about shaping his experiences into a publication designed to open the continent to the eyes of European readers. Banks recruited Bryan Edwards, who had already written the influential *History, Civil and Commercial, of the British West Indies*, as a ghostwriter. Edwards made sure Park's narrative was "interesting and entertaining" and then had Banks "cast [his] eye" over each chapter for final approval. The narrative

certainly has dramatic elements with the requisite amount of humor, sex, danger, and violence. (23)

Upon Park's return, Edwards (former leading member of the Colonial Assembly of Jamaica and then secretary of the Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa), drew up an account of Park's travels which was published by the Association in their Proceedings. When Park wrote his own account of the journeys, he availed himself of Edward's assistance and published *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* in 1799. The text was tremendously popular and became an instant literary classic, inspiring (among other things) Georgiana Cavendish, Duchess of Devonshire's poem, "A Negro Song" (1799) in which Park, the "White Man" is urged to bear witness and "Remembrance of the Negro's care," and—more importantly—the inclination of period literary figures and others to depict "Africa as a place through which the hidden depths of self could be imagined" (Lee 23), which ultimately supplied the political momentum necessary to launch a British initiative to push deeper into the continent (a consequence that was likely unintended by Parks but championed by Banks). Following the model of male domesticity that we have been exploring, Park's success is measured in terms of his ability to preserve his self intact while traveling through dark and disorienting Africa in the aesthetically rich *Travels*. Given his situation, walking almost entirely alone across an expanse of uncharted wilderness through unknown groups of people with foreign languages and cultures, Mungo Park had very limited control over his physical space. There are no textual moments during which he may exert power over an isolated island, or even a hut that has been granted him by the person or entity in charge, as in the case of Gulliver in Houyhnhnm land. Park has no "wooden world" which he may order and no crew

which he may discipline. In this type of environment, Park can only manage to stay whole by controlling his self with complete and total focus. In this respect, since he wields so little agency in the world around him, Mungo Park is the most authentically “feminine” traveler that is encountered in this study. The Africa that Mungo Park describes is mysterious—simultaneously haunted and haunting—and is depicted as being deeply gothic. More specifically, Mungo Park casts himself as an Ann Radcliffe heroine; a sensitive, utterly defenseless and vulnerable “stranger in a strange land” who must desperately work at holding the core self together amidst marauding, Moorish banditti, sexually-aggressive gazes, and disturbing periods of captivity. Published just five years after the tremendously popular *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, Park leverages a gothic aesthetic in his Africa and models his adventuring self after the 1790’s vision of female vulnerability. What is perhaps most interesting about Mungo Park’s *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* is that the adventurer textually positions himself as the object of the gaze of sexually assertive, African female voyeurs, thus rendering his white, male character susceptible in an unusual way and placing sharp focus on his own chastity and virtue, the two hallmark attributes of the successful period her(oine).<sup>9</sup> I address the gothic most directly in the

---

<sup>9</sup> As previously noted, the observations detailed by Mungo Park in his *Travels* significantly impacted the period literary landscape, and were (as cited by Debbie Lee) “the subject of a play called ‘Mungo’s Address.’” In fact, this “Mungo’s Address” was actually a poem that prefaced a popular period play—a poem that was also published in *THE BEE, or Literary Weekly Intelligencer* in 1793 Edinburgh, which predates, of course, Mungo Park’s return from Africa. Interestingly, “Mungo” was a period “stock symbol of the suffering, abused African” (Sandiford 70), a trope that stemmed from a stage character named “Mungo,” “the ‘cheeky’ black servant in Isaac Bickerstaff’s hugely popular comic opera *The Padlock* (Drury Lane, 1768)...the ‘first blackface comic figure on the London stage’” (Carlson 139). Though the aligning of Mungo Park’s unusual first name with the tragicomic, exceedingly popular black-faced “Mungo” of the eighteenth-century stage—similar characters appear in *Inkle and Yarico*, Southerne’s and Hawkesworth’s *Oroonoko*, Matthew Lewis’s *The Castle Specter*—is a mistaken correlation, the representations staged in these plays could speak to the aesthetics presented in Park’s *Travels*. Dramatic representations of hypersexual blackness (though attached to black, *male* bodies—the love interest is inevitably white, female and vulnerable to this

third chapter, but “gothic moments” are encountered in almost all of the tales of travel addressed in this study, even those that pre-date the “birth” of the gothic genre. My assertion is that it is understandable that in looking for aesthetic angles and literary strategies with which to articulate encounters with what Jonathan Lamb calls mental and terra incognita writers of tales of adventure and discovery press the gothic into service. As our “novel heroes” face off with punishing hardship, death and near-death experiences, utterly foreign spaces and people, and butt up against physical and mental limits to which they have never been pushed, the result is often articulated in terms of fear and confusion, “terror” and “horror.”

In Chapter 4, I will address the following question: if, indeed, the traditional understanding of eighteenth-century male adventure heroes may be enriched and complicated by reading them through the lens of a new brand of appropriated domestic masculinity or “oeconomy,” where does that leave the adventurer who is actually gendered female? Exposed and helpless as he is in the *Interior Districts of Africa*, Mungo Park is placed in the most authentically “feminine” position of any of the travelers that we encounter in this project. To expand briefly upon this point, Defoe’s *Moll Flanders* and his *Robinson Crusoe* are both tales of survival. In Moll’s case, the London environment into which she is born and through which she must chart a course as a disenfranchised woman is far more brutal and unforgiving than Crusoe’s island. To be a dispossessed woman was to be defenseless and at the mercy of circumstance and of others; to be utterly vulnerable. *The History of Miss Katty N—* (1757?), which relates “*Her Amours, Adventures, and various Turns of Fortune, in*

---

magnetism), do appear in Park’s *Travels*. They are, however, attached to the black, *female* body, and so the standard dynamic is flipped upside down as Mungo becomes the feminized, white figure, whose boundaries are preserved intact and whose virtue is rewarded.

*Scotland, Ireland, Jamaica, and in England*” and is said to be “*Written by Herself*,” provides another example of this reality. It is probable that the strong support that Mungo Park received from his English, female readership was inspired by the women’s recognition that Park had been rendered “feminine” and powerless in Africa in a way that resonated with them. Of course, there are only a handful of examples of females who are able to function as foils to the male adventure hero since, in reality, there were no female Captain Cooks, William Blighs, or Mungo Parks. Recently, attention has been drawn to the French adventuress, Jeanne Baré (sometimes spelled Barrett or Baret), who disguised herself as a man and enlisted as valet and assistant botanist on a Bougainville expedition (1766-69)—but Baré left no personal account of her adventure; and the male accounts that do survive detail what a shocking intrusion a female presence was on an all-male enterprise.<sup>10</sup> In tales of adventure or discovery, European, female protagonists—as a rule—are absent. Women are present—a central feature, in fact—in Neville’s utopian (though ultimately dystopian) fiction, *Isle of Pines* (1668), which details George Pines’ ability to populate a desert island after a shipwreck by procreating with astonishing efficiency and success with the four female survivors. *Isle of Pines* has long been seen as another potential source for *Robinson Crusoe*, but if Defoe indeed leant upon Neville in crafting his story, he certainly did not retain the women, and so the canonical castaway of the eighteenth century becomes a solitary male figure. More precisely, Defoe did not retain the actual women, but his *Robinson Crusoe* did absorb feminine attributes. Thus, *actual* women were forced out of tales of travel altogether: there was

---

<sup>10</sup> See the recently published *The Discovery of Jeanne Baret: A Story of Science, the High Seas, and the First Woman to Circumnavigate the Globe*.



no space for white women in the voyage of adventure and discovery and the literary tale of travel was developed and recognized as being a masculine genre. It is interesting to note that the two early travel tales that we will encounter in this study that do feature a strong female presence—*Isle of Pines* and *Gulliver's Travels*—are dystopias, which suggests that the presence of real women can have a corrosive or distorting effect on the male enterprise. Though female characters disappeared from the standard travel narrative, feminine attributes were appropriated by successful male adventure heroes. In *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s—Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen* (1995), Claudia Johnson argues (in terms of sensibility) that as female emotion was usurped by male authors to ground normative masculinity in the novel, two consequences resulted: all women risked becoming “equivocal beings” who were either too masculine or too feminine, and women lost narrative terms for describing their own subjectivity (left only with the ability to issue a hyper-emotional, hysterical response). Though the comparison with Johnson’s analysis is limited because there are typically no women present in travel logs, when a woman inserts herself or is inserted into the genre, as in the case of Charles Dibdin’s *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe* (1796), Johnson’s analysis proves useful. Though it is desirable—even critical—for a male adventurer to have both male and female characteristics to survive their journey and preserve their boundaries intact, it does not seem that the female adventurer is granted the same allowances. There is nothing helpless or vulnerable about Dibdin’s Hannah Hewit: the “Female Crusoe” is unfailingly bright, industrious, and resourceful. As Dibdin writes in his advertisement “TO THE PUBLIC”: “Added to the exquisite

feminine susceptibility [Hannah Hewit] had a male mind” (vi); she is quite literally figured as an “equivocal being.” Like the other traveling bodies that have been addressed, Hannah is both masculine (“male mind”) and feminine (“feminine susceptibility”)—but the application of the male attributes to the female body generates a cartoonish result; a thoroughly over-the-top “Female Crusoe” who burlesques her more realistic and believable male predecessor. As I will demonstrate in this project, though there is certainly room for female attributes in the quintessentially male quest for adventure and discovery since a successful male hero must engage in the “novel” process of domesticating space and self, there is no room for adventurers who are actually gendered female, whether real or fabricated.

## Chapter 1: Domesticating Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*; Dissolving Swift's Lemuel Gulliver

Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* has become so firmly entrenched in our popular consciousness that it is difficult to imagine the text as a new work in the bustling 1719 travel literature market. On the title page of the first edition, there is no mention of Defoe.<sup>11</sup> "The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe...Who lived Eight and Twenty Years, all alone in an un-inhabited Island on the Coast of America" is said to be "Written by Himself" (2). Of course, *Robinson Crusoe* was quickly attributed to Defoe and became wildly popular, running through four editions of the first volume by the end of the year. The text was also, however, subjected to as much criticism as praise since *Robinson Crusoe* was an example of the novel before there was "fiction" and because its readership did not know how to be novel readers.<sup>12</sup> Though there has been a fair amount of speculation about where the inspiration for the famous castaway came from—Neville's *Isle of Pines*; Dampier's account of "Will," a Moskito Indian who spent five years alone on Juan Fernandez island; an English translation of Ibn Tufail's *Hayy ibn Yaqdhan*, an earlier novel set

---

<sup>11</sup> In *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature* (2008), John Mullan reminds his readers that some of the greatest works in English literature were first published without their authors' names. Mullan asserts over 70% of English novels were published without attribution by the end of the eighteenth century, including *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver's Travels*.

<sup>12</sup> In commenting upon the success of the text, Theophilus Cibber wrote that Defoe's: "...imagination was fertile, strong, and lively, as may be collected from his works of fancy, particularly his *Robinson Crusoe*, which was written in so natural a manner, and with so many probable incidents, that, for some time after its publication, it was judged by most people to be a true story. It was indeed written upon a model entirely new, and the success and esteem it met with, may be ascertained by the many editions it has sold, and the sums of money which have been gained by it." (Shinagel 261-262)

on a desert island; or Robert Knox's account of his abduction by the King of Ceylon in 1659—the grand share of credit is most often given to accounts of Alexander Selkirk, a Scottish sailor who, after “having some Difference with the Captain” opted to be castaway on Juan Fernandez Island for “four Years and four Months.” When Selkirk was finally discovered, he was “cloath'd in a Goat's Skin Jacket, Breeches, and Cap” and had created a domestically functional space for himself, having “tam'd some wild Goats and Cats” (Cooke's Account, *RC* 230). In 1719, Defoe likely leant upon contemporary accounts of Alexander Selkirk's “trial in isolation,” adding to the bland and factual narrative a set of themes and aesthetic devices—the building blocks of what would come to be known as fiction—to create his “novel hero.” What emerges is a text that has far more emotional consciousness and depth than the naked accounts upon which it was based. Though a more thorough treatment of *Isle of Pines* as a potential source for *Robinson Crusoe* will appear in Chapter 4, it is worth noting that if Defoe was, in fact, influenced by Neville's utopian text about the shipwrecked George Pines' epic effort to populate a desert island by consorting with four female survivors, the presence of physical women was lost in the journey from Neville's 1668 *Isle of Pines* to Defoe's 1719 island. Traces of women, however, remain in the presence of feminine attributes that make Robinson Crusoe an unusual model for the all-male, nation-building enterprise. As Michael McKeon points out, Robinson Crusoe is curiously feminine, really: a “domestic housewife kind of hero” (*Secret History* 626). For the purposes of this study, *Robinson Crusoe* provides a concrete, early example of a British male adventure hero behaving in a markedly feminine way in foreign space; domesticating his exotic surroundings and taming his self. A

prevalent Marxist interpretation of Crusoe is as an “economic man” in the modern sense, and he has been aligned with Capitalism, individualism, and expansive commercialism. Other critics, such as Diana Spearman, have argued that it’s impossible to read Crusoe as an economic hero because he is alone on an island and an economy—the existence of which depends upon the open exchange of goods and services—can not exist if there is no society. An “*oeconomy*,” however, can and certainly does exist on Crusoe’s isolated island. My assertion is that Defoe’s iconic adventure novel is really a depiction of a domestic “*oeconomy*” in which a bourgeois male body survives his trial in isolation by exerting control over and domesticating his island space and, most importantly, his self. Further, the model provided by Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* suggests that, in order to be successful, future “novel heroes” must be both masculine and feminine; masculine enough to survive the traumatic trial and feminine enough to, literally, “hold it together” by controlling space and self. Jonathan Swift’s anti-hero, Lemuel Gulliver, provides a fictional counter to Defoe’s successful “novel hero.” *Gulliver’s Travels*, of course, parodies *Robinson Crusoe* and the new breed of aestheticized travel log – a generic strategy that the acerbic Swift might have simply called “lying”— that it represents. In launching his attack, Swift takes up the same set of novelistic concerns and tools and articulates Gulliver’s failed heroism in terms of failed domesticity. Repeatedly over the course of his *Travels*, Gulliver’s inability to hold himself together is expressed in terms of bad “*oeconomy*” and his ultimate incapability to re-engage with the “family circle” back at home in London.

As might be expected in a novel that appeared in the market before the genre was recognized, the tension between Defoe's desire to stake claim in authenticity and truth and his desire to deploy the highly effective tactics of fiction to capture and educate his readers is immediately visible in *Robinson Crusoe*. In the Preface, the editor writes that he "believes the [account] to be a just History of Fact" with no "Appearance of Fiction in it," but quickly adds that whether or not it is an authentic text, he "does...a great Service in the Publication" of a work that will bestow "Improvement...Diversion..." and "Instruction [on] the Reader" (3). Whether or not Defoe's work was directly based upon the accounts of Selkirk (and there are enough similarities that it's difficult to argue that it wasn't), it is still interesting to look at the contemporary accounts that Defoe would have, at minimum, encountered, and likely have drawn directly from in crafting his converted castaway. Edward Cooke and Woodes Rogers were both on the *Duke* and *Duchess* privateering expedition that stopped at Juan Fernandez Island in 1709 and discovered Alexander Selkirk. Cooke's account was the first to appear in print and detail the "Rescue" of "one Alexander Selkirk" who, having argued with "Capt. Stradling" about the poor conditions aboard the "leaky" *Cinque Ports* galley, had gone "ashore on this Island, where he continu'd four Years and four Months, living on Goats and Cabbages that grow on Trees, Turnips, Parsnips, &c" and had once avoided being taken prisoner by a "*Spanish* ship" (Cooke, *RC* 230). Woodes Rogers' detailed, firsthand account of Selkirk's rescue was included in *A Cruising Voyage round the World* (1712). Per Rogers' account, when Selkirk first arrived at the island:

He had with him his Cloathes and Bedding, with a Firelock, some Powder, Bullets, and Tobacco, a Hatchet, a Knife, a Kettle, a Bible,

some Practical Pieces, and his Mathematical Instruments and Books. He diverted and provided for himself as well as he could; but for the first eight months had much ado to bear up against Melancholy, and the Terror of being left alone in such a desolate place. He built two Huttts with Piemento Trees, cover'd them with long Grass, and lin'd them with the Skins of Goats, which he kill'd with his Gun as he wanted, so long as his Powder lasted, which was but a pound; and that being near spent, he got fire by rubbing two sticks of Piemento wood together upon his knee. In the lesser Hutt, some distance from the other, he dress'd his Victuals, and in the larger he slept, and employ'd himself in reading, singing Psalms, and praying; so that he said he was a better Christian while in this Solitude than ever he was before, or than, he was afraid, he should ever be again. (Rogers, *RC* 232)

Rogers' account provides a litany of copious, domestic details about "Selkirk's Solitary Life." He includes what Selkirk's diet consisted of—"Fish" (which he could only eat in limited quantity because "they occasion'd a Looseness"); "Crawfish" and "Goats Flesh" ("boil'd and...broil'd"); "Turnips, which had been sow'd there by Capt. *Dampier's* Men...Cabbage...Fruit of the Piemento Trees... black Pepper call'd *Malagita*, which was very good to expel Wind and against Griping of the Guts" (233). When "offer'd...a Dram...[Selkirk] would not touch it, having drank nothing but Water since his being there, and 'twas some time before he could relish [his rescuer's] Victuals" (234). Rogers also documents the ways in which Selkirk's "way of living and continual Exercise of walking and running, clear'd him of all gross Humours, so that he ran with wonderful swiftness thro the Woods and up the Rocks and Hills," impressing his rescuers with his "Agility": "he distanc'd and tir'd both the Dog and the Men" (233). To fend off the rats, Selkirk domesticated the island's cats, which became "so tame, that they would lie about him in hundreds." He also "tam'd some [goat] Kids, and to divert himself would now and then sing and dance with them and his Cats so that by the Care of Providence and the Vigour of his Youth,

being now but about 30 years old, he came at last to conquer all the Inconveniences of his Solitude, and to be very easy.” After his clothing wore out, Selkirk “made himself a Coat and Cap of Goat-Skins” (234).

None of the individuals who wrote about Alexander Selkirk could pass up the opportunity to issue a dictum on the potential benefits of a contained life. At the end of his account, Woodes Rogers pens a statement about the power of “Divine Providence” which could have “supported any man”: “By this one may see that Solitude and Retirement from the World is not such an unsufferable State of Life as most Men imagine, especially when People are fairly call’d or thrown into it unavoidably.” Most importantly, the tale of Selkirk:

...may...instruct us, how much a plain and temperate way of living conduces to the Health of the Body and the Vigour of the Mind, both which we are apt to destroy by Excess and Plenty, especially of strong Liquor, and the Variety as well as the Nature of our Meat and Drink: for this Man, when he came to our ordinary method of Diet and Life, tho he was sober enough, lost much of his Strength and Agility. But I must quit these Reflections, which are more proper for a Philosopher and Divine than a Mariner, and return to my own subject.” (Rogers, *RC* 235)

Richard Steele ends his article on Selkirk in *The Englishman* (December 1713) on a similar note:

When the Ship which brought him off the Island came in, he received them with the greatest Indifference...The Man frequently bewailed his Return to the World, which could not, he said, with all its Enjoyments, restore him to the Tranquility of his Solitude...This plain Man’s Story is a memorable Example, that he is happiest who confines his Wants to natural Necessities; and he that goes further in his Desires increases his Wants in Proportion to his Acquisitions; or to use his own Expression, *I am now worth 800 Pounds, but I shall never be so happy, as when I was not worth a Farthing.* (Steele, *RC* 238)



The story of the man professed to be the template for the iconic castaway is really a tragedy. Selkirk is only successful at managing his “oeconomy” —managing his domestic space and his self—when he is a marooned, male, English body on his own, private island, so utterly cut off from human interaction that he “forgot his language” (Rogers 233). The converted castaway that emerges does not translate back to a public life in England. He implodes. In “The Real Robinson Crusoe” Bruce Selcraig (a distant relation of Selkirk) goes in search of his relative and discovers that Selkirk, “pirate, lout, and hero” was a ““a bit of a bastard, more respected in his absence than in his presence””:

When [Selkirk] finally returned to Lower Largo, he wanted little to do with his relatives. Some biographers say (though others doubt) that he began to replicate the best of his life on Juan Fernandez, down to a cave-like shelter that he built behind his father’s house, from which he would gaze upon the Largo harbor. He evidently became something of a loner and resumed his drinking and fighting...in November 1720, at age 44, he returned to the only life that ever meant anything to him, signing on as the first mate of a naval warship, the HMS *Weymouth*, bound for Guinea and the Gold Coast of Africa in search of pirates...In all his travels, Selkirk had never seen ‘the fever’ destroy as many men as this...On December 13, 1721, it recorded another...‘at 8pm. Alexander Selkirk...died.’ As with the others, they threw his body overboard” (9)

The ending of the real life story of Defoe’s prototype, Alexander Selkirk (drunk and angry in a man-made cave), reads more like Lemuel Gulliver (mad in a horse stable) than Robinson Crusoe. *Robinson Crusoe* ends with the protagonist being returned to England (via Portugal) after spending twenty eight years on the island. Defoe’s Crusoe quickly glosses over the next stage of his life in England, carefully avoiding any potential Swiftian/Selkirkian scenes of dissipation, only very briefly and tangentially mentioning marriage, the birth of three children, and the death of his

wife, before returning to the only topic he is comfortable with; speaking about adventures in foreign lands. In the sequel, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719), and a third volume, *Serious Reflections During the Life and Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1720), the protagonist relates yet more tales of adventure abroad. It is utterly impossible for Defoe's "novel hero" to return to or meaningfully engage with England, his true "home space." This seems to be a common thread among Selkirk, Gulliver, and Crusoe: there is palpable danger in returning to a real (as opposed to self-constructed) domestic space that demands the ability to participate in human relationships. The difference is that Defoe's character does not engage with the true "home space" for long enough to dissolve in public view. The "oeconomy" depicted in Defoe's epic adventure is the "oeconomy of the individual" and it seems that the success of the Robinsonade "individual oeconomy" model hinges upon the "novel hero" exerting control and domesticating his space and self in near-complete isolation.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> In *Robinson Crusoe*—for the grand majority of the novel, there is no "family circle" (barring the dancing cats and goat kids), and, really, (barring the late appearance of Friday and brief run-ins with cannibals and Spaniards) no other humans at all. For much of the text, there is no sense of "family": Crusoe calls his parrot, "*Poll*," his "Favourite" and "the only Person permitted to talk to [him]," his "Dog" and "two Cats" (who all sit around his Crusoe's table with him in the tent) are called "Servants," while Crusoe himself is the human "King" (RC 108). When other humans do appear in the narrative, Crusoe tends to diminish their humanity so, for example, though Crusoe does come "to really love the Creature" (154), Friday is repeatedly described in non-human terms nevertheless. In "Robinson Crusoe's 'Tent upon the Earth,'" Julia Prewitt Brown argues that "[t]he first bourgeois interior in English fiction is located in a cave or 'Tent upon the Earth'" and that "Crusoe's inventory of domestic objects is the first in a line of such inventories." Brown offers a nice synopsis of the "[m]any other aspects of Crusoe's domestic fortress [that] set the stage for later images of the bourgeois home": "...the home as fortress, first of all; the strong association between the home and private property; the role of the domestic arts in the home, which Virginia Woolf may have been the first to observe; the place of the servant who lives within but sleeps apart from the family (Friday's bed is made up outside Crusoe's cave) ...the problematic role of the family in the individualist psychology of the capitalist (Crusoe keeps pets, but could you ever imagine him with a family?)" (365) Indeed, you can't imagine Crusoe with an actual family, and Defoe ensures that you don't have to by only fleetingly mentioning that he has one at all. Apparently, the "Real Life Robinson Crusoe" was incapable of reintegrating himself into a "family circle" back at home in England as well.

For two hundred pages, Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* expounds upon the kernel of the lesson that both Rogers and Steele identify in their accounts of Selkirk: the importance of temperance and the dangers of excess. It is interesting to think that twenty one years before Pamela artfully blocks Mr B.'s lustful onslaughts in an English manor house, a marooned, male, English body is behaving in a very "domestic" way. Perhaps Richardson's "new species of writing" was not so new after all—and was not so firmly fixed to the female body as we might have imagined. Richardson's *Pamela* has long been hailed as a critical moment in the development of the novel, in general, and of the domestic novel, in particular. When Richardson's tome about a servant girl defending her virtue against the rakish aristocrat "Mr B." appeared in two volumes in November of 1740, it soon turned into what we now call a "best-seller" and images of Pamela appeared on fans and teacups throughout England. In the argument that Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse present in *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life*, the conceptualization of a developing middle class in eighteenth-century England is played out in novels that are about virtuous, writing, captive bodies. These bodies are usually female bodies, but Armstrong and Tennenhouse identify *Robinson Crusoe* as being an important exception and provide a very interesting close reading that correlates Defoe's marooned male with Richardson's captive Pamela. Armstrong and Tennenhouse note that "*Crusoe* was Defoe's only novel to be listed among books appropriate for nineteenth-century women and children to read, no doubt because *Crusoe* was the only one of Defoe's protagonists to conduct himself in the manner of a Richardsonian heroine." Using the power of "intellectual labor"

(188), “Crusoe single-mindedly preserves the magical boundary defined by his skin from any and all invaders...he goes domestic” (201). Armstrong and Tennenhouse point out that, arguably, “Richardson...simply replaces Crusoe’s island in the New World with the interior spaces of the household, the female body and the private world of the emotions as revealed in Pamela’s letters to her parents” (200). A close reading of Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* along these lines reveals that, indeed, as Armstrong and Tennenhouse suggest, “there are important similarities” between *Robinson Crusoe* and *Pamela*, and it seems that Defoe’s novel about a castaway, male adventurer anticipates Richardson’s isolated, female paragon of virtue in myriad ways. Both Crusoe and Pamela are depicted as isolated, bourgeois bodies who, leaning upon the power of “intellectual labor” in the form of writing, meticulously document their own trials (epistolary/journalistic examples of formal realism) and actively frame them as religious or moral quests. There are also differences—Richardson’s Pamela exerts a large amount of energy textually separating herself from all others (the rakish Mr B. and the barbaric servants in the manor house in which she is imprisoned) and, of course, there are so few interactions with other humans (barring the discovery of Friday and fleeting glimpses of and interaction with Spaniards and cannibals) on Crusoe’s island that there is little opportunity to develop a robust “virtuous I” versus “corrupted other” dynamic. Also, Pamela must spend several hundred pages actively defending her virtue against the advances of the hyper-sexual Mr B., and Crusoe (again because of the extreme nature of his isolation) doesn’t have to fend off any active aggression or temptation (even in the form of alcohol, which dries up quickly). Finally—as I will later describe at greater length—

the truth is that Crusoe is far more “domestic” than Pamela. Pamela has shockingly limited domestic skills for a servant girl who is in such demand and seems to do very little around the house whereas Crusoe functions with great success as salvager, excavator, builder, hunter, tanner, tailor, gardener, cooker and preserver, potter, and general, all-round super-domesticator.

What I am proposing is the existence of a conceptual timeline that extends from *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), which anticipates *Pamela* (1740) by supplying a representation of the bourgeois body managing a trial in isolation in a very “domestic” way, to Hawkesworth’s *Account of the Voyages of Captain Cook* (1773) in which Hawkesworth grants credit to Richardson for having provided a model for his virtuous captain. Later in this study, I will trace this trend through Mungo Park who casts himself as the more vulnerable female representation of the 1790s— a Radcliffean, gothic heroine— but the core thematics apply. The influence is also structural. The Preface of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), which promises to provide “Improvement...Diversion...” and “Instruction [to] the Reader” (3), will be echoed in the Preface of Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740), in the Preface of Hawkesworth’s rendition of Captain Cook (1773), and in other texts that provide meticulous descriptions (all in first person, epistolary or journal form) of trials suffered by bourgeois bodies in isolation (on islands, in ships, in captivity)—male or female— that are intended to generate an emotional response and to convey a moral lesson. In all cases, the authors utilize what will come to be called novelistic devices—aesthetic organization and shape; internal dialogue and reflection; a personal sense of the protagonists’ ability to interpret the world around them—to capture the attention of

the reader and (hopefully) impart some valuable lesson. All of the aforementioned texts are also “remarkable for the enumeration of particulars in themselves so trifling, that we almost wonder how they could occur to the author’s mind” (to quote Hawkesworth on the wonders of Richardson’s *Pamela* in his Preface to Cook’s *Voyages*). In his hugely influential *The Rise of the Novel*, Ian Watt asserts that *Robinson Crusoe* was a critical text in the structural and thematic development of the novel as an early example of this type of “formal realism,” because it depicts how an atmosphere of modernistic realism is generated when “all these Particulars” (*RC* 52) are laid out. I would argue that in all of the texts being addressed in this project—whether real, imagined, or heavily altered—the cataloguing of minutia shows how “little circumstances, properly arranged, could be experimentally accurate, interesting enough to arouse curiosity, and morally significant” (Lamb, *Preserving the Self* 101); thus satisfying Samuel Johnson’s suggestion that “all...Authors” should strive to “mingle pleasure with instruction” (*Idler* No. 97). This point is made in the “Preface” of Richardson’s *Pamela* and in Hawkesworth’s “General Introduction” to his *Voyages*: the detailing of particulars should support the central, moral lesson—govern private space; govern the self. This same theme is offered up in *The Oeconomy of Human Life* (1751), a guide to living that the “Advertisement to the Public” claims is infused with “The spirit of virtue and morality”: the “Duties” of the “Individual,” first and foremost, are “Consideration,” “Modesty,” and “Temperance.” *The Oeconomy of Human Life* was, of course, a conduct book. When Richardson was writing *Pamela*, he first conceived of what would come to be recognized as the first domestic novel as a conduct book. This observation adds another interesting layer to the chain of

influence as the trope of domesticity and an unwavering focus on the importance of personal conduct appear in exotic locales in which we might least expect them; such as on-board the all-male *Endeavour*. In terms of the timeline, however, it seems that the trend of the success of the adventurer being associated with the ability to domesticate foreign space and self began with Crusoe, male representative of the British imperial project.

It is because of the staying power of *Pamela* and its tenacious mapping of the emerging bourgeois figure to a writing, isolated, virtuous and *female* body—and a slew of scholarship that has reinforced this perspective—that the marooned, “oeconomic” male body has gone missing. Though Armstrong and Tennenhouse and McKeon note Robinson Crusoe’s domestic tendencies, they stop short of recognizing that Defoe’s “novel hero” might be just one interesting and clearly influential example of a larger pattern of marooned or mobile domesticity that is attached to a male adventurer’s body. The concept of “oeconomy”— as management of domestic space and management of self—gives us the language to start exploring the possibility that these “novel heroes” have their own brand of “masculine domesticity.” Following from Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s line of argument, Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe is not just able to “single-mindedly preserve the magical boundary defined by his skin from any and all invaders...” because of his use of “intellectual power.” Crusoe is able to “go domestic” (rather than savage) because he is an “oeconomic” man, and is able to save his self and soul by exerting control over his private island and, most critically, his self. In the next section—“Robinson Crusoe: An ‘Oeconomic’ Man”—I will provide a close reading of Robinson Crusoe as

a bourgeois “novel hero” who documents his own religious trial in isolation and manages to save his self and soul through the power of “oeconomy.” In the following section, “Lemuel Gulliver: Perverse ‘Oeconomies’” I will provide a close reading of how Swift's Lemuel Gulliver's arrival at anti-hero status is signaled by cues that involve the failure to achieve a strong, domestic “oeconomy” and inability to engage with the “family circle.”

*Robinson Crusoe: An “Oeconomic” Man*

Defoe's Robinson Crusoe is damned because he turns his back on his father and the sound “oeconomy” that his middle class father represents. As has been much discussed, Robinson Crusoe is immediately figured as a bourgeois, “true repenting Prodigal” (8) type of figure. “[M]ine was the middle State,” explains the narrator in the beginning of the novel, a state which his father:

...had found by long Experience was the best State in the World, the most suited to human Happiness, not exposed to the Miseries and Hardships, the Labour and Sufferings of the mechanick Part of Mankind, and not embarrass'd with the Pride, Luxury, Ambition and Envy of the upper Part of Mankind...in the Middle of the two Extremes, between the Mean and the Great.

“Peace and Plenty” are figured as the “Handmaids of the middle fortune” and “Temperance, Moderation, Quietness, Health, Society, all agreeable Diversions, and all desirable Pleasures [are] the Blessings attending the middle Station of Life.” In essence, the middling life is a space of sound “oeconomy”; and the language used to describe that space anticipates the key foci of *The Oeconomy of Human Life*:

“Consideration,” “Modesty,” and “Temperance.” Fired by a “secret burning Lust of



Ambition for great things” (5), however, the narrator turns his back on the rational “middle state,” and ignores his father’s “truly Prophetic” statement that “God would not bless [him], and [he] would have leisure hereafter to reflect upon having neglected his [father’s] Counsel when there might be none to assist in [him in his] recovery” (6). From the very beginning, a tangible sense of divine anger pervades the story as the narrator describes how he boards a ship against his father’s will, how the “Winds begin to blow,” and “how justly [he] was overtaken for [his] wicked leaving of his father’s house” (7), damned to be plagued by “ill Fate” (12) and the palpable feeling that the “Hand of Heaven” would overtake him and that he would be “undone without Redemption” (15). The “wild and indigested”—undomesticated, if you will— “Notion of raising [one’s] Fortune” (13) is the flip-side of the rational, measured, controlled and “oeconomically”-sound, “middle State.” It is because the narrator “obey’d blindly the Dictates of [his] Fancy rather than [his] Reason” (31), because he opted to “pursue a rash and immoderate Desire of rising faster than the Nature of Things admitted” (29), because he ultimately fails to control his self, that he ends up subjected to a “dreadful Deliverance” (36) on a deserted island. It is the same impulsive, unchecked appetite that “drove [fortune-seeking sailors] so out of the Way of all humane Commerce, that had all [their] Lives been saved, as to the Sea, [they] were rather in Danger of being devoured by Savages than ever returning to [their] own Country” (32). I want to pause here for a moment to consider two words that are presented with great frequency from the very beginning of *Robinson Crusoe*: Fortune and Providence. As carefully detailed by J.G.A. Pocock, *Fortune/Fortuna* is seen as a pervasive, amorphous factor (with pagan roots) that often wreaks havoc with the

notion of (Divine) Providence, which stems from the Latin *providentia*, “foresight, prudence.” Historically, the capriciousness of chance (*Fortuna/Fortuna*) was seen as being an affront to order, destiny, and “Providence,” and in classical thought, the human condition was read as being a battle between human will (informed by virtu(e)) and *Fortuna* (the powerful vagaries of chance). Of course, Fortune “came to bear the predominantly monetary meanings of inheritance, acquisition, or dowry” (Pocock 405) and so “the antithesis of virtue ceased to be *fortuna*, but corruption instead” (402). The “wild and indigested Notion of ...Fortune” (13) presented in *Robinson Crusoe* projects uncontrolled savagery onto the idea of Fortune itself (defined as corrupting wealth and the potentially frightening cost of the chances one takes to secure wealth). Thus, the idea of “Fortune” is “othered” in Defoe’s novel and struck against a certainly more familiar (but not necessarily kinder), Puritan form of “Providence.” The term “Providence” is repeated with incredible frequency over the course of *Robinson Crusoe*: “the Wisdom of Providence” (3); “tempt Providence to my Ruine (13); “Why Providence should thus completely ruine its Creatures” (47); “pure Productions of Providence” (58); “I rejected the voice of Providence” (67); “Dispositions of Providence” (80); “afflicting Providences” (83); “The Hand of God’s Providence...if Providence had thought fit” (95); “Providence of God” (101); “a special Providence” (119); “a secret Hand of Providence governing the World” (197); etc. A Puritanical god looms large over Crusoe’s island. Directly after his “dreadful Deliverance” (36), the narrator (who didn’t seem concerned about honoring the divine earlier in the text) worries that he might “lose [his] Reckonings of Time... even forget the Sabbath Days from the working Days” and delights in having “found three very

good Bibles” (51). A “very ill, frightened almost to Death” (64) Crusoe has a “dreadful” vision of a “Man descended from a great back Cloud, in a bright Flame of Fire” that “move[s] towards [him] with a long Spear or weapon in his hand to kill [him]” (64-64), and makes the “first Prayer...that [he] had made for many Years” (67): ““*Jesus...give me Repentance!*”” (71). The narrator offers “Thanks to God for opening my Eyes, by whatever afflicting Providences, to see the former Condition of My Life, and to mourn for my Wickedness and repent” (83). Crusoe’s mistake was failing to conduct himself as an “oeconomic man,” rejecting a more tempered and modest “Middle” life and rolling the dice to seek his Fortune.

I call attention to the fact that Crusoe’s god is a Puritan god because the “virtuous I” versus “corrupted other” dynamic – a dynamic which will later be a central feature in Richardson’s *Pamela* and in Hawkesworth’s rendition of Cook—comes most alive in anti-Catholic rhetoric, directed primarily at the Spaniards, who are “without Principles of Tenderness” (124), and also directed against the idolatrous (apparently cannibalistic) natives.<sup>14</sup> The narrator finds “two or three Popish Prayer-Books” (48) in the wreckage and spends a fair amount of time throughout the book detailing that due to their brutal brand of conquest and colonialism, “the very name of *Spaniard* is reckon’d to be frightful and terrible to all People of Humanity or of Christian Compassion” (124). When Crusoe first sees “the Print of a Man’s naked Foot on the Shore” he immediately processes the situation in religious (or anti-religious) terms: “I stood like one Thunderstruck, or as if I had seen an Apparition...I

---

<sup>14</sup> Other moments at which Crusoe distances from others include his interactions with “this *Moor*...the Boy, who they call’d *Xury*” who Crusoe forces to “*swear by Mahomet and his Father’s Beard*” to be “true” to him. This is in Crusoe’s time on “the truly *Barbarian Coast*, where whole Nations of Negroes were sure to surround us with their Canoes, and destroy us: where we should ne’er once go on shoar but we should be devour’d by savage Beasts, or more merciless Savages of humane kind” (19).

fancy'd it must be the Devil...*Satan* should take human shape" (112). When the narrator sees evidence of "*Canibals*"—"a horrid spectacle;" "the Shore spread with Skulls, Hands, Feet, and other Bones of humane Bodies"— he is overwhelmed by dark "Thoughts...of inhuman *hellish* Brutality, and the Horror of the Degeneracy of Humane Nature" (119-20). And yet, the narrator checks his "Horror...at the unnatural Custom of that People" by ruminating on the thought that they "do not know [cannibalism] to be an Offense" and so do not deserve the treatment that they have received at the hands of the Spaniards:

That this would justify the Conduct of the *Spaniards* in all their Barbarities practis'd in *America*, where they destroy'd Millions of these People, who however they were Idolators and Barbarians, and had several bloody and barbarous Rites in their Customs, such as sacrificing human Bodies to their Idols, were yet, as to the *Spaniards*, very innocent People; and that the rooting of them out of the Country, is spoken of with the utmost Abhorrence and Detestation, by even the *Spaniards* themselves, at this Time; and by all other Christian Nations of *Europe*, as meer Butchery, a bloody and unnatural Piece of Cruelty, unjustifiable either to God or Man. (124-5)

The natives are identified as being "Idolators and Barbarians" in *Robinson Crusoe*, and the Spaniards are only deemed slightly less offensive.<sup>15</sup> In studying the demographics of his domestic space, the narrator notes:

My island was now peopled, and I thought myself very rich in Subjects; and it was a merry Reflection which I frequently made, How like a King I look'd. First of all, the whole Country was my own meer Property so that I had an undoubted Right of Dominion. 2dly, My People were perfectly subjected: I was absolute Lord and Lawgiver, they all owed their Lives to me, and were ready to lay down their Lives, *if there had been Occasion of it*, for me, It was remarkable, too,

---

<sup>15</sup> One of the core components of Catholicism that separates it from the Protestant factions in Christianity is the idea of transubstantiation—the Catholic belief that when one "eat[s] this bread and drink[s] this cup" they are actually eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ. Arguably, this moment in the Catholic Mass can, and has been, read as staged, ritualized cannibalism. Further, the Catholic tradition of honoring a multitude of saints has been historically dismissed by some Protestant factions as being idol worship.

we had but three Subjects, and they were of three different Religions. My Man *Friday* was a Protestant, his father was a *Pagan* and a *Cannibal*, and the Spaniard was a Papist: However, I allow'd Liberty of Conscience throughout my Dominions. (174)

As stated, there is so little community on Crusoe's island that there isn't much opportunity for the narrator to textually separate himself from other people. When the opportunity does arise, however, Crusoe is made Protestant "King" over a set of more savage subjects. Even the souvenir trappings of his time on the island become infused with this sense of pagan savagery: "When I took leave of this Island, I carry'd on board for *Reliques*, the Goat's-Skin Cap I had made, my Umbrella, and my Parrot...also the Money I found in the Wreck of the *Spanish Ship*" (200).

Having angered his Protestant God into exacting providential discipline by failing to behave as an "oeconomic" man at home, Crusoe must learn to practice good "oecomony" on the island on which he was marooned if he hopes to survive intact. After offering himself up in "Resignation to the Will of God" (96), Robinson Crusoe relishes his isolation on the island as it enables him to more fully control his domestic space and his self.

...I was remov'd from all the Wickedness of the World here. I had neither the *Lust of the Flesh*, the *Lust of the Eye*, or the *Pride of Life*. I had nothing to covet; for I had all that I was now capable of enjoying: I was Lord of the whole Manor; or it I pleas'd, I might call myself King, or Emperor over the whole Country which I had Possession of. There were no Rivals, I had no Competitor, non to dispute Sovereignty or Command with me. (94).

It is certainly easier to exact control over the self when there is no temptation in the form of sex, alcohol, or luxury items, and so two key features of future domestic hero/ines—chastity and virtue—are more easily achieved by Crusoe during his trial in almost complete isolation. I am not trying to posit too narrow a vision of sexuality.

There are a number of scholars who have looked at sexuality and, more specifically, homosexuality on Defoe's island.<sup>16</sup> It is clear, however, that temptations of the flesh, according to the narrator himself, do not exist to the degree that they did on Neville's polygamous *Isle of Pines*, for example, or in Tahiti. There are also no sexually aggressive figures like *Pamela's* Mr B., the series of threatening men depicted in *Hannah Hewit*, the disgusting and assertive female Yahoos, or the voyeuristic women who appear in Park's *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa*. Crusoe is virtually alone. Upon first arriving on the island, Crusoe immediately begins to map a familiar language of domestic space onto the wild land, which he determines to be "barren...un-inhabited, except by wild Beasts" (40). He spends his first night on the island in what he calls his "Apartment in the Tree" (36) after the initial panic of finding himself marooned subsides. The realization that his "Provision" was so limited had thrown Crusoe into "terrible Agonies of the Mind" and he behaved "like a Mad-man" (36) until determining that the proper course of action—his "first work" (37) in this new space—must be to go to the Ship that "seem[ed] to stand upright still" (36) to "see what was spoil'd and what was free" (37). Crusoe's "next Work" was to the "view the Country" that he will claim ownership over "and seek a proper Place for [his] Habitation, and where to stow my Goods to secure them from (39) whatever might happen" (40). And so Crusoe "went to work to make... a little Tent with the Sail and some Poles...cut for that Purpose, and into this Tent [he] brought

---

<sup>16</sup> See, for example, *Queer People: negotiations and expressions of homosexuality, 1700-1800* (Mounsey and Gonda, eds., 2007). In her article, "Robinson Crusoe, Virginal Hero of the Commercial North," Dee Ann DeLuna argues that "Defoe presents a hero who primes his body and mind into a finely tuned mercantile instrument that, in its intense engagement with living improvements, is invulnerable to sexual stirrings" (78). DeLuna is arguing against "recent perspectives on Crusoe opened by queer studies" which read Crusoe's textual asexuality as "inexplicit representation of transgressive and repressed sexuality—hence Crusoe queered" (70).

every Thing that I knew would spoil, either with Rain or Sun, and... piled all the empty Chests and Casks up in a Circle round the Tent, to fortify it from any sudden Attempt, either from Man or Beast” (43). A great amount of time is spent detailing the creation of Crusoe’s private space:

I had many Thoughts of the Method how to do this, and what kind of Dwelling to make, whether I should make me a Cave in the Earth or a Tent upon the Earth: And, in short, I resolv’d upon both, the Manner and Description of which, it may not be improper to give an Account of...I consulted several Things in my Situation which I found would be proper for me, 1<sup>st</sup>. Health, and fresh Water...2dly. Shelter from the Heat of the Sun, 3dly. Security from ravenous Creatures, whether Man or Beasts. 4thly. A View to the Sea, that if God sent any Ship in Sight, I might not lose any Advantage for my Deliverance, of which I was not willing to banish all of my expectation yet. (44)

The process of “set[ting] up the Tent” is meticulously described, as is the “Entrance” which is not a “Door, but... a short Ladder to go over the Top, which Ladder, when [he] was in, [he] lifted over after [himself], and so was completely fenc’d in, and fortify’d, as [he] thought, from all the World.” Into “this Fence or Fortress, with infinite Labour,” Crusoe “carry’d all [his] Riches, all [his] Provisions, Ammunition and Stores.” When the tent is complete, Crusoe “began to work [his] Way into the Rock” to create “a Cave just behind my Tent, which serv’d me like a Cellar to my House” (45).

It costs our “novel hero” “much Labour, and many Days, before all these Things were brought to Perfection” (45), and it is this almost obsessive control over securing and defending his provisions and person (against what seem to be completely fabricated threats, since Crusoe’s immediate assessment is that the island is uninhabited) that enables Crusoe to manage the risk of his coming undone when faced with disorder. Though this particular scene of potential disorientation and

dissipation in the face of radical wildness does not take place in the South Pacific, it is reminiscent of the analysis provided by Jonathan Lamb in his *Preserving the Self in the South Seas 1680-1840*. Faced with vast, baffling otherness, the “self” is threatened with a spiral into madness—and so, I would argue, the “Enemies that [Crusoe] apprehended Danger from” (45) are not embodied adversaries at all, but the recognized, potential perils of disintegrating disorder. All of this angling for control on Crusoe’s “horrid Island” (47) and the fear inspired by loss of control and the process of facing off with the disorienting unfamiliar results in the use of language that will come to be known as gothic, but was not yet recognized as such; terms to describe fear, “terror” and “horror.” During the first “terrible Storm” that Crusoe encounters as a young adventurer, he sees “Terror and Amazement in the Faces even of the Seaman themselves” (9) and is “so surprised that [he] fell down in a Swoon.” (11); a rather unstable and feminine way for the model of male, British imperialism to respond. When Crusoe is shipwrecked on his island, he notes that: “It is impossible to express to the Life what the Extasies and Transports of the Soul are, when it is so sav’d... out of the very Grave” (35). But, immediately thereafter, realizing that he has “nothing about [him] but a Knife, a Tobacco-pipe, and a little Tobacco in a Box,” that “this was all [his] Provision,” Crusoe is plagued by “terrible Agonies of the Mind, that for a while [he] runs about like a Mad-man” (36). After the “terrible Earthquake,” the narrator is “so amaz’d with the Thing it self, having never felt the like, or discours’d with any one that had, that [he] was like one dead or stupify’d” (59). Crusoe is later haunted by a “terrible Dream” (64) and begins to “be sick,” which offers him “a leisurely View of the Miseries of Death” (66). Continually, in



concretizing his relationship with God, Crusoe must face off with the perverse “oeconomies” of his “past Life with such Horrour” (71); “terrible Reflections upon my Mind...of my wicked and hardned Life past” (96). At another moment, after having their supper interrupted by Crusoe and Friday, the cannibals believed the island to be an “enchanted Island” (175), inhabited by “Devils and Spirits” (191). And when what “appear’d plainly to be an *English* Long-Boat” arrives, “Joy” quickly gives way to “Confusion...secret Doubts...the secret Hints and Notices of Danger...that are certain Discoveries of an invisible World, and a Converse of Spirits” (180). The moment of Crusoe’s rescue ends up being the most “gothic” moment of the text, perhaps because the narrative of order and control that Crusoe has worked so hard to establish on his island is interrupted once again, and the “*Spectre-like* Figure” that half-appears in the rupture is misinterpreted: “*Am I talking to God, or Man! Is it a real Man, or an Angel!*” (183). The other-worldly element is driven out of the text when Crusoe assists the Captain in quelling the mutinous uprising and order is restored in the “wooden world” of the ship, reflecting back onto the island itself and rendering it less “enchanted.” Obviously, the gothic genre will not be identified for another half-century, but the suggestion is that the language of fear, disorientation and disorder emerges in these spaces of confused contact from the beginning. Further, unfamiliar chaos (which is articulated in “gothic” terms) may only be managed or domesticated by the imposition of rational order.

A true “oeconomic man” while on his island, Crusoe staves off destabilizing disorder and the threat of madness by wielding as much control over his domestic space—“having settled my household Stuff and Habitation” (52)—and self as he can

muster. Crusoe is deeply bothered by there being “no Order” in the Cave that he had constructed— that it was just a “confus’d Heap of Goods” (50). Crusoe sets himself to ordering the Cave so that “it look’d like a general Magazine of all Necessary things, and [he] had every thing so ready at [his] Hand, that it was a great Pleasure to see all [his] Goods in such Order, and especially to find [his] Stock of all Necessaries so great” (51). Crusoe will continue to appropriate familiar language about domestic space and apply it to the wild landscape. Throughout his time on the island, Crusoe will work “to make this Room or Cave spacious enough to accommodate me as a Warehouse or Magazin, a Kitchen, a Dining-room, and a Cellar” and his Tent will be his “Lodging” space” (55). Later, in conducting a “more perfect Discovery” (72) of his island, Crusoe will find a place “so fresh, so green, so flourishing...that it looked like a planted Garden” and begins conceiving of himself as “Lord of a Mannor” as “in *England*” (73). When he returns to his “Tent and...Cave” after “three Days in this Journey,” Crusoe calls that space “Home” and is conscious of the weight of the word: “I came Home; so I must now call my Tent and my Cave” (74). Our “novel hero” will come to have two homes: “my Castle” (112, 115), “my Country-House, and my Sea-Coast House” (75), but finds himself always “impatient to be at Home”—in the simple, stable, “middling” tent and cave by the sea:

I cannot express what a Satisfaction it was to me, to come into my old Hutch, and lye down in my Hammock-Bed: This little wandring Journey, without settled Place of Abide, had been so unpleasant to me, that my own House, as I call’d it to my self, was a perfect Settlement to me, compar’d to that; and it rendred every Things about me so comfortable, that I resolv’d I would never go a great Way from it again, while it should be my Lot to stay on the Island. (82)

The more effective his “oeconomy”—the more successful Crusoe is at controlling his private space and self, preserving his boundaries, and “going domestic”—the more he is able to live “mighty comfortably” (99) and “at home” on what he increasingly sees as being his “beloved island” (102). Disruptions, such as Crusoe’s discovery that his island is not, in fact, uninhabited (the footprint and evidence of cannibals) are registered in Crusoe’s relationship with his carefully constructed domestic space. After having seen evidence of cannibal’s “cruel bloody Entertainment” (122), Crusoe’s description of his home space shifts from positive (“Home,” “my Castle”) to negative: “I kept my self...more retir’d than ever, and seldom went from my Cell, other than my constant Employment” (126). The shift is permanent: when the narrator returns to his old “Home”—the tent and cave—to try to “live after [his] old Fashion, and take care of [his] Family Affairs,” it has become only his “old Habitation” (140), its emotional value deflated by the rupture created by the discovery of the footprint and the fact that the “beloved island” is not only Crusoe’s.

Defoe’s Crusoe exerts a vast amount of energy “managing [his] household Affairs” (57), and is actively far more domestic than the Pamela, the domestic heroine that Richardson will create twenty-one years later. The range of domestic skills that Crusoe develops during his time on the island is impressive. Having “entertain’d a Thought of breeding up some tame creatures, that [he] might have Food when [his] Powder and Shot was all spent” (56) the castaway raises a “Breed of tame Goats” (81)—his “Domesticks” (82)— and attempts to domesticate “a Kind of wild Pidgeons” (57). Crusoe is so effective at domesticating cats that he becomes “much surpriz’d with the Increase in [his] family” and “afterwards came to be so pester’d

with Cats, that [he] was forced to kill them like Vermine... to drive them from [his] House as much as possible” (75). Of course, Crusoe’s most disturbing domestication project stems from his plan “to get a Savage into [his] Possession” (144) in the form of Friday: “my Savage, for so I call him now” (147); “this Creature” (165). Less complicated examples of Crusoe’s domestic endeavors include his creation of a “Bower,” where he grows grapes and makes “excellent good Raisins in the Sun” (75). The crafty castaway teaches himself to make “strong deep Baskets to place...corn in” (79) and “earthen Pot[s],” “flat Dishes, Pitchers, and Pipkins” (88). Crusoe carves “an exact Boat...a very handsome Periagua, and big enough to have carry’d six and twenty Men, and consequently big enough to have carry’d [Crusoe] and all [his precious] Cargo” (93). Having “saved the Skins of all the Creatures that [he] kill’d...[Crusoe] made me a Suit of Cloaths wholly of these Skins, that is to say, a Wastcoat, and Breeches open at Knees, and both loose, for they were rather wanting to keep [him] cool than to keep [him] warm” (98). Crusoe “set up” a “Dairy” and manages to procure milk “Butter and Cheese” from his “Flock” of goats (107). He makes “a great clumsy ugly Goat-Skin Umbrella” (109) from their hide. Perhaps in a desperate attempt to deal with having witnessed evidence of cannibalistic activity on the beach, Crusoe immediately after decides to “try to brew my self some Beer” (122). By painstakingly depicting the ways in which Crusoe, who “had never handled a Tool in [his] life” finds “in time by Labour, Application, and Contrivance” that “at last...[he] wanted nothing but [he] could have made it,” Defoe’s adventure novel produces the following lesson: “...by stating and squaring everything by Reason, and by making the most rational Judgment of things, every Man may be in time Master of

every mechanick Art” (51). “Time and Necessity” make Robinson Crusoe “a compleat natural Mechinick” and, the narrator asserts, placed in similar circumstances, he “believe[s] it would [have to same effect on] any one else” (53). At this and many other textual moments, Robinson Crusoe feels more like a conduct book (like *The Oeconomy of Human Life*, for example) than an adventure novel: faced with extraordinary circumstances, a “trial in isolation,” you must behave in the following ways or face likely dissipation. Or, to put it in Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s language: like Richardson’s Pamela, “Crusoe singly-mindedly preserves intact the magical boundary defined by his skin from any and all invaders...he goes domestic” (201).

Defoe’s “novel hero” also seems to be exceptionally conscious of the power of writing (a characteristic which will be repeated in Richardson’s *Pamela* and in the accounts of other “novel heroes” that will be encountered throughout this study), and of the written word. When documenting his arrival on the island and his salvaging of provisions from the ship, Crusoe notes, specifically, that he “...found Pen, Ink and Paper, and...husbanded them to the utmost, and [that he] shall shew, that while [his] Ink lasted, [he] kept things very exact, and after that was gone [he] could not, for [he] could not make any Ink by any Means that [he] could devise” (48). Shortly thereafter, in outfitting his domestic space, Crusoe “began to apply [him]self to make such necessary things as [he] found [he] most wanted, as particularly a Chair and a Table, for without these [he] was not able to enjoy the few Comforts [he] had in the World, [he] could not write, or eat, or do several things with so much Pleasure without a Table” (50). Writing is as necessary as eating in the sustainment of self on Crusoe’s

island. In a strange moment in the text, after “having settled [his] household Stuff and Habitation, made a table and Chair,” Crusoe officially “began to keep [his] Journal” and so the reader is subjected to a recap of the story back to the beginning and “...told all these Particulars over again” (52). In effect, the reader witnesses Crusoe starting the process of “writing to the moment”—scribing the notes taken while journeying or adventuring or writing a journal— which both harkens back to the origin of all travel logs and anticipates Richardson’s “writing to the moment” in *Pamela*.<sup>17</sup> This is another shared discursive element between travel writing and novels that take an epistolary or journal form. Defoe’s Crusoe also writes his way through his editing of the Journal, providing a “*N.B.*,” for example, that explains that: “This Wall being describ’d before, I purposely omit what was said in the Journal; it is sufficient to observe, that I was no less Time than from the 3d of *January* to the 14<sup>th</sup> of *April*, working, finishing, and perfecting his Wall” (56). Later, plagued with illness and fear, Crusoe, “directed by Heaven, no doubt,” finds “a Cure, both for Soul and Body” in “Tobacco” and “the few Books, [he] had sav’d” which includes a “Bible”:

...I took up the Bible and began to read, but my Head was too much disturb’d with the Tobacco to bear reading, at least that Time; only having opened the Book casually, the first Words that occur’d to me were these, *Call on me in the Day of Trouble, and I will deliver, and your shalt glorify me*. The Words were very apt to my Case and made some Impression upon my Thoughts at the Time of reading them, tho’ not so much as they did afterwards; for as for being deliver’d, the Word had no Sound, *as I may say*, to me; the Thing was so remote, so impossible in my Apprehension of Things...(66).

---

<sup>17</sup> This aspect of Richardson’s “domestic novel” was mocked by Fielding in *Shamela*, which ruthlessly targets the awkwardness of the epistolary form in dealing with ongoing events, and the triviality of the detail which the form necessitates.

From this point forward, Crusoe "...daily read the Word of God, and apply'd all the Comforts of it to my present state" (83). Another concrete component of Crusoe's ability to preserve his self is his engagement with the curative Bible, which provides a steady dose of the "Encouragement of the Word of God" and fosters the development of a "true Scripture View of Hope." Stopping at various points in the text to wade more deeply into this and other religious and philosophical issues, Crusoe always announces his re-entry into the more mundane, daily account of his life as "oeconomic" castaway: "But leaving this Part, I return to my Journal" (71). As his "Ink began to fail [him]," the narrator "contented [him]self to use it more sparingly, and to write down only the most remarkable Events of [his] Life, without continuing a daily *Memorandum* of other Things" (76). Crusoe's allegation that his journal, his "Story[,] is a whole Collection of Wonders" (186) is really a vast overstatement. Crusoe's meticulous detailing of the time spent on his island tends toward the banal in its cataloging of domestic minutia. Our narrator consciously writes himself as "oeconomic man" and is able to manage the potentially disastrous, self-dissolving consequences of interacting with the chaotic unfamiliar by exerting control over not just private space but also private self.

*Lemuel Gulliver: Perverse Oeconomies*

*Travels Into Several Remote Nations of the World In Four Parts*, written by "Lemuel Gulliver, First a Surgeon, and then a Captain of Several Ships" appeared into the same bustling travel literature market seven years after Defoe's *Robinson*

*Crusoe* in 1726. As Arthur Sherbo points out in his sweeping article, “Swift and Travel Literature,” Swift traditionally “employs recognizable literary genres as vehicles for his satires and adopts the language and conventions of those genres” (115) and, in the case of what would come to be known as *Gulliver’s Travels* and later be attributed to Swift, the literary genre being burlesqued is the exceedingly popular, now aestheticized, travel log. It is clear that “[m]ost of the time Swift assumes his reader’s familiarity with travel literature” (125), and *Gulliver’s Travels* feels well-worn and seeped in a larger tradition of travel literature because it is constructed to feel this way. In the opening “LETTER FROM CAPT. GULLIVER TO HIS COUSIN SYMPSON,” Gulliver delivers a sound, textual thrashing to Sympson:

I hope that you will be ready to own publickly, whenever you shall be called to it, that by your great and frequent Urgency you prevailed on me to publish a very loose and uncorrect Account of my Travels with Direction to hire some young Gentleman of either University to put them in Order, and correct the Style, as my Cousin *Dampier* did by my Advice, in his Book called, *A Voyage round the World*.

Thus, the book opens with Captain Gulliver situating himself within a long tradition of sea captains who, as victims of overzealous editing and aesthetic addition that allowed information to be “omitted” and “inserted” without “consent,” could scarcely recognize their “own Work” (28) once it reached the marketplace. Urged on by Sympson who “insisted on the Motive of *publick Good*,” Gulliver “suffer[ed] [his] Travels to be published” by a “Printer” who “hath been so careless as to confound the Times, and mistake the Dates” and then allow the “original Manuscript” to be “destroyed since the Publication” (29). The tale of woe could have been issued by Dampier or Cook or any number of non-fictional eighteenth-century sea captains whose travel logs were suddenly made to straddle the near-invisible line between fact



and fiction to satisfy the insatiable market. As Christopher Fox points out in his introduction to *Gulliver's Travels*, travel literature is not the only genre that is manipulated in Swift's parody. One of Swift's key foci in the book is "[h]ow meaning itself can be distorted and reshaped" and "the theme of corruption, especially corruption of the primary meaning of the word": *Gulliver's Travels* involves a careful and willful "scrambling of fact and fiction" and "the parody of various kinds of writing... including spiritual autobiography, conversion narrative, travel tale, imaginary voyage, scientific report, and features of what would come to be called the novel" (14-15). What Swift is skillfully exposing is the troublingly porous boundary between all of these genres. He is attacking the corrupting convergence of fact and fiction, male adventure narrative and female or domestic novel, empirical "value neutral" truth and a more subjective aesthetic, that he sees in contemporary travel narratives. In *Gulliver's Travels*, the misadventures of a bourgeois body are carefully documented, and the narrator is conscious of harnessing the power of writing to mimic and lampoon a larger literary tradition that was also conscious of the power of writing. The reader is directly addressed at various points in the text. In Lilliput: "But I shall not anticipate the Reader with farther Descriptions of this Kind, because I reserve them for a greater Work, which is now almost ready for the Press; containing a general Description of this Empire..." (63). At different intervals, in "writing to the moment," the narrator inserts statements like: "wherewith I shall not trouble the Reader;" "shall not interrupt the Reader with the Particulars" (68); "shall not trouble the Reader with a particular Account of this Voyage" (88). There is also a nod to the emergent style of formal realism: "I hope, the gentle Reader will excuse me for

dwelling on these and the like Particulars; which however insignificant they may appear to groveling vulgar Minds, yet will certainly help a Philosopher to enlarge his Thoughts and Imagination, and apply them to the Benefit of publick as well as private Life” (100).

Reading *Robinson Crusoe* and *Gulliver’s Travels* back-to-back results in a curious echo. *Gulliver’s Travels* opens with a parodied description of Defoe’s “middle state”: “My Father had a small estate...But the Charge of maintaining me...being too great for a narrow Fortune; I was bound Apprentice to Mr. *James Bates*, an eminent Surgeon.” Young Lemuel Gulliver develops his skills as a surgeon and sets his sights upon “learning Navigation” to support his future plans to “travel, as [he] always believed it would be some time or other [his] Fortune to do” (39). Gulliver becomes “Surgeon to the *Swallow*,” marries (little detail is provided), and then quickly opts to “go again to Sea” to gain “some Addition to [his] Fortune” (40). At the beginning of the account of his “Voyage to *Brobdingnag*,” it is because Gulliver has been “condemned by Nature and Fortune to an active and restless life” that “two Months after [his] Return, [he] again left [his] native Country” (91) and set out on a quest for adventure. The same constellation of themes offered up in the beginning pages of *Robinson Crusoe* are offered up in *Gulliver’s Travels*—the Middle State, Fortune, marriage and family as emotionless venture—but there is no “prodigal son” meta-narrative mapped onto Lemuel Gulliver; the delivery is unapologetically frank and secular. There is no Protestant God looming over the text and the idea of Providence is only mentioned once: for the Lilliputians, “the Disbelief of a Divine Providence renders a Man incapable of holding any publick Station”

(73). Mercurial, corrupting Fortune certainly does exist and haphazardly guides Lemuel Gulliver's *Travels*. Ultimately, after four, punishing but entirely self-imposed voyages, Gulliver notes "[t]hat if good Fortune ever restored me to my native Country" he would make it known "that a *Houyhnhnm* should be the presiding Creature of a Nation, and a *Yahoo* the Brute" (219). By this point, Gulliver had developed "such a Love and Veneration for the [*Houyhnhnms*], that [he] entered on a firm Resolution never to return to human Kind, but to pass the rest of [his] Life among these admirable *Houyhnhnms* in the Contemplation and Practice of every Virtue; where [he] could have no Example or Incitement to Vice." Alas, "it was decreed by Fortune, [Gulliver's] perpetual Enemy, that so great a Felicity should not fall to [his] Share" (235), so he is damned "to pass his Days among *Yahoos*" and face the possibility of "relapsing into [his] old Corruptions, for want of Examples to lead and keep me within the Paths of Virtue" (253).<sup>18</sup>

The lessons of good "oeconomy"—the importance of temperance and the dangers of excess—certainly do run through *Gulliver's Travels*, but, in typical Swiftian style, they are confounded and distorted. Gulliver's ability to preserve his boundaries intact hinges upon access to "Examples" that will "lead and keep [him] within the Paths of Virtue." It is not a matter of reaching "in" while in a state of isolation and solitude and controlling the self, it is a matter of reaching "out" and hanging ones' hope for self-preservation on a local example. The extraordinarily

---

<sup>18</sup> As previously stated, the tragedy of the Selkirk story is that the model castaway is only successful at managing his "oeconomy" —managing his domestic space and his self—when he is a marooned, male, English body on his own, private island, so utterly cut off from human interaction that he "forgot his language" (Rogers 233). Defoe avoids detailing these uncomfortable moments of failed contact with actual home (England) versus his "oeconomically"-sound, constructed home (his "Tent upon the Earth"), only very fleetingly mentioning Crusoe's family.

rational and virtuous *Houyhnhnms*, among whom “Unchastity, was never heard of” and who educate the “young ones of both Sexes” in “*Temperance, Industry, Exercise, and Cleanliness*” (244), provide that example. In the first three voyages, Gulliver is really a kept man (as—at least initially—a prisoner in Lilliput, a pet in Brobdingnag; and essentially an escorted guest on his third voyage). In the Country of the Houyhnhnms, Gulliver is finally managing his own “little Oeconomy to [his] own Heart’s Content” (249), but he is not, like Crusoe (or even Selkirk) able to figure himself as master of his own domestic space. Even worse, he recognizes himself as being a brutish and disgusting *Yahoo*, who is (rightfully) lorded over by virtuous horses. Bad “fortune” dictates that Gulliver will be “a poor *Yahoo*, banished from the Houyhnhnms” and their civilizing powers. Returning home from England, having (like Selkirk) lost recognizable human language, Gulliver will be laughed at for his “strange Tone in speaking, which resembled the Neighing of a Horse” and left to the morally corrosive elements of eighteenth-century London society. As stated in the introductory LETTER, Gulliver is very conscious of the “corruptions of his *Yahoo* nature”—the “infernal Habit[s] of lying, Shuffling, Deceiving, and Equivocating, so deeply rooted in the very Souls of all my Species, especially the *Europeans*—and fears that these corruptions will be “revived in [him] by Conversing with a few of your Species, and particularly those of [his] own Family, an unavoidable Necessity” (30-31). Simply put, the Houyhnhnms are the model of virtuous “oeconomy”; the Yahoo-like European humans are marred by perverse “oeconomy”; and the horror is Gulliver’s recognition of the “yahoo within.”

The word “oeconomy,” specifically, is used twice in *Gulliver’s Travels*—first in Lilliput in reference to the “prudent and exact Oeconomy” of the prince and later in reference to Gulliver’s aforementioned “little Oeconomy” in Houhyhnhnm land. The novel is bookended by the most interesting examples of Gulliver’s failed, perverse “oeconomies,” and emphasis will be placed upon Lilliput and Houhyhnhnm land. Throughout the text, however, very careful attention is paid to topics related to domesticity, writ large (food, housing, clothing, child-rearing, etc.). In Lilliput, Gulliver considers himself “as bound by the Laws of Hospitality to a People who had treated [him] with such Expence and Magnificence” (44), which anticipates part VI of *The Oeconomy of Human Life*, which asserts that “Gratitude” is key amongst “Social Duties.” Initially filled with amused “Wonder and Astonishment at [Gulliver’s] Bulk and Appetite” (43), “the Court” of Lilliput was ultimately “under many Difficulties concerning” the maintenance of their giant guest: “my Diet would be very expensive, and might cause a Famine” (50). Ultimately, the Emperor of Lilliput “stipulates to allow [Gulliver] a Quantity of Meat and Drink, sufficient for the Support of 1728 *Lilliputians*”:

Some time after that, asking a Friend at Court how they came to fix on that determinate Number; he told me, that his Majesty’s Mathematicians, having taken the Height of my Body by the Help of a Quadrant, and finding it to exceed theirs in the Proportion of Twelve to One, they concluded from the Similarity of their Bodies, that mine must contain at least 1728 of theirs, and consequently would require as much Food as was necessary to support that Number of Lilliputians. By which, the Reader may conceive an Idea of the Ingenuity of that People, as well as the prudent and exact Oeconomy of so great a Prince. (61)

Though Gulliver deems the Emperor’s “Oeconomy” to be prudent, it is not clear that the rest of the Lilliputians agree. From the beginning, in an offhand and gruesome

remark, Gulliver notes that “Sometimes [the Lilliputians] determined to starve me...But again they considered, that the Stench of so large a Carcase might produce a Plague in the Metropolis, and probably spread through the whole Kingdom” (50). And the cost doesn’t stop with food: “Six Hundred Persons” are hired to be Gulliver’s “Domesticks...three hundred Taylors” are called to make Gulliver a “Suit of Cloaths” and “six of his Majesty’s greatest Scholars [are] employed to instruct [Gulliver] in their Language” (51). Gulliver is put up in “an ancient Temple, esteemed to be the largest in the whole Kingdom; which,” interestingly, “having been polluted some Years before by an unnatural Murder, was, according to the Zeal of those People, looked upon as Prophane” (47). The detailing of the excess and expense of keeping such an enormous guest continues:

And here it may perhaps divert the curious Reader, to give some Account of my Domestick, and my Manner of living in this Country during a Residence of nine Months and thirteen Days. Having a Head mechanically turned, and being likewise forced by Necessity, I had made for myself a Table and chair convenient enough, out of the largest Trees in the Royal Park. Two Sempstresses were employed to make me Shirts, and Linnen for my Bed and Table...I had three hundred Cooks to dress my Victuals...I took up twenty Waiters in my Hand and placed them on the Table; an hundred more attended below on the Ground... A Dish of their Meat was a good Mouthful, and a Barrel of Liquour a reasonable Draught... (75-76)

Though Gulliver slips in a Robinsonade reference to his “mechanically turned” head and his hand-crafted table and chair, the truth is that he is largely waited upon by a fleet of “domesticks” armed with vast amounts of food and drink. Witnessing the drain, “*Flimnap* the Lord High Treasurer” looked upon Gulliver “with a sour Countenance” and “represented to the Emperor the low Condition of his Treasury,” pointing out that the large, kept man with excessive appetites “had cost his Majesty

above a Million and a half of *Sprugs*” (77). As Gulliver’s “good Star would have it,” he makes it home from Lilliput and quickly signs up for another voyage, whereupon he ends up a “Curiosity” (95), a “publick Spectacle” (102), or “*Lusus Naturae*” (*freak of nature* 108), among the giants of Brobdingnag. There, Gulliver is again a kept man, though his comparative diminutiveness renders him far less expensive and more amusing to keep.<sup>19</sup> Finally, by his fourth misadventure in Houyhnhnm land, Gulliver “had settled [his] little Oeconomy to [his] own Heart’s Content”— and he is less “kept” (as prisoner or pet or carefully tended-to guest) and more actively domestic than in the other journeys. The truth is, though, that the household that Gulliver manages is bestowed upon him by his “Master” who “had ordered a Room to be made for [him] after [the Houyhnhnm] Manner, about six Yards from the House.” Gulliver details making “Rush-mats,” how he “had worked two Chairs with my knife... made [him]self [clothes] with the Skins of Rabbets...soaled [his] Shoes with Wood...” (249) and even (rather grotesquely) managed to make “Leather...supplied it with the Skins of *Yahoos*, dried in the Sun.” Gulliver “would contrive to make...a Kind of Bread” and “sometimes made a shift to catch a Rabbet, or Bird, by Springes made of *Yahoos* Hairs” (214). The narrator stops himself from writing too much on

---

<sup>19</sup> Again, domestic spaces and topics are thoroughly detailed. When Gulliver first arrives, the lady of the house “minced a bit of Meat...and placed it before [Gulliver]” who “made her a low Bow, took out [his] Knife and Fork, and fell to eat; which gave them exceeding Delight” (97). Initially, small Gulliver’s “Bed” is a “Cradle” that is “put into a small Drawer of a Cabinet, and the Drawer...placed upon a hanging Shelf for fear of the *Rats*” (101). Later the “Queen commanded her own Cabinet-maker to contrive a Box that might serve [Gulliver] for a Bed-chamber,” a “Nice Workman, who was famous for little Curiosities, undertook to make [him] two Chairs...and two Tables, with a Cabinet to put [his] Things in,” and he is given “an entire set of Silver Dishes and Plates” (110). Small Gulliver is treated like a domesticated pet in Brobdingnag, and the King “was strongly bent to get [Gulliver] a Woman of [his] own Size, by whom [he] might propagate the Breed”— “But I think I should rather have died than undergone the Disgrace of leaving a Posterity to be kept in Cages like tame Canary Birds; and perhaps in time sold about the Kingdom to Persons of Quality for Curiosities” (138).<sup>19</sup> The houses of Laputa are “very ill built” (157) and their clothing ill made and the houses of Balnibarri “are very strangely built” (167).

the topic of food, however: “This is enough to say upon the Subject of my Dyet, wherewith other Travellers fill their Books, as if the Readers were personally concerned, whether we fare well or ill” (215). Gulliver even pauses to issue a very Selkirkian, Robinsonade statement, asserting that in Houyhnhnm land, he “enjoyed perfect Health of Body” and “Tranquility of Mind” and affirming “the Truth of these two Maxims”: “*That, Nature is very easily satisfied; and That, Necessity is the Mother of Invention*” (250). In reality, there is no real agency or autonomy in Gulliver’s “little Oeconomy”; he is not the solitary, self-created king of empty space but the extraordinary, industrious pet to a “Master” who grants him a small space to tend in his kingdom of noble horses.

In Lilliput, Lemuel Gulliver is “bad oeconomy” personified in that his sheer size necessitates an appetite and existence that is immoderate and creates a tremendous pull on the society into which he has appeared. Gulliver in Lilliput is actually reminiscent of the reading of Captain Cook’s murder as presented in *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific*, where Obeyesekere argues that Cook was killed not because of his having been aligned with Hawai‘ian mythological system but because of “Hawai‘ian food anxiety” and a population “concerned over the demands made by chiefs to provide as many provisions as possible for the foreigners” (240). Further, there is concern in Lilliput about Gulliver’s ability to manage his own physical self— one of the two key aspects of successful personal “oeconomy.” The first time that Gulliver “disburthened [him]self,” he expresses that “was ever so guilty of so uncleanly an Action”: “I would not have dwelt so long upon a Circumstance, that perhaps at first Sight may appear



not very momentous; if I had not thought it necessary to justify my Character in Point of Cleanliness to the World; which I am told, some of my Maligners have been pleased, upon this and other Occasions, to call in Question” (48). When there is loss of control—and in Swift’s scatological book, loss of physical control results in uncleanness, filth or desecration— textual anxiety results. Again, the language that emerges (as in *Robinson Crusoe*) is language that we have come to associate with the gothic genre— “terror,” “horror,” and language that signals fear and alarm—but before the genre existed. It bears pausing to consider whether the gothic can exist and be effectively deployed in a satirical parody like *Gulliver’s Travels*. As Avril Horner and Sue Zlosnik convincingly argue in *Gothic and the Comic Turn*, however, a comic doppelganger has always inhabited the gothic style and appears more vividly in some texts than others. Perhaps because the environment that Swift develops is so disordered and topsy-turvy, resulting anxiety produces a palpable sense of the comic gothic. “[A]larmed at Midnight with the Cries of many Hundreds of People at [his] Door; by which being suddenly awaked, [he] was in some Kind of Terror,” Gulliver is told that “her Imperial Majesty’s Apartment was on fire, by the Carelessness of a Maid of Honour, who fell asleep while she was reading a Romance” (69). Giant Gulliver runs to the Palace and opts to extinguish the fire with “Urine.” The “Empress[,] conceiving the greatest Abhorrence if what [he] had done, removed to the most distant Side of the Court, firmly resolved that those Buildings should never be repaired for her Use; and, in the Presence of her chief Confidants, could not forbear vowing Revenge” (70). Indeed, the Queen gets her revenge and giant Gulliver faces “Impeachment” since a dictate is written that specifies: “That whoever shall

make water within the Precincts of the Royal Palace, shall be liable to the Pains and Penalties of High Treason” (79). The crime is punishable by “the most painful and ignominious Death, by setting Fire to your House at Night” (81). Interestingly, both the crime and the punishment involve desecration or destruction of home space and that the incident—“the discharge of Urine in her majesty’s Apartment”—is “mentioned with Horror.” The detailing of the other proposed punishment for Gulliver’s failure to manage and control his self—starvation— gets increasingly dark: “for want of sufficient Food, you would grow weak and faint, and lose your Appetite, and consequently decay and consume in a few Months” at which point, the Lilliputians plan to “cut your Flesh from your Bones, take it away by Cart-loads...leaving the Skeleton as a Monument of Admiration to Posterity” (82). Gulliver’s crime and the punishment in Lilliput are aligned with topics of domesticity: home and food. Gulliver considers that he “might easily with Stones pelt the Metropolis to Pieces: But... soon rejected that Project with Horror, by remembering the Oath I had made to the Emperor, the Favours I received from him, and the high Title of *Nardac* he conferred upon me” (83). The Laws of Hospitality and Gulliver’s awareness that he had pulled too hard on the Lilliputian Economy and failed to control his own “oeconomy,” render him incapable of defending himself.<sup>20</sup> Textual anxiety appears again when now comparatively diminutive Gulliver ends up on the opposite end of the physical size spectrum and expresses “Fear and

---

<sup>20</sup> Another gothic moment in Glubbdubdrib: “The Governor and his Family are served and attended by Domesticks of a Kind somewhat unusual. By his skill in Necromancy, he hath the power of calling whom he pleaseth from the Dead.” Gulliver is greeted by “Rows of Guards, armed and dressed after a very antick Manner, and something in their Countenances that made [his] Flesh creep with a Horror that [he] cannot express.” To his “great Astonishment they vanished in an Instant, like Visions in a Dream” and were replaced by “a new Set of Ghosts,” leaving Gulliver “terrified” (183).

Astonishment” when he encounters the “enormous Barbarians” of Brobdingnag. “The Maids of Honour” inspire the most “Horror and Disgust”: “Their Skins appeared so coarse and uneven” and they had no qualms with “dischang[ing] that they had drink” in front of their small pet, Gulliver. But the gothic element really reaches a hysterical pitch in the fourth account of Gulliver’s *Travels*. Gulliver’s “Horror and Astonishment are not to be described, when [he] observed in this abominable [Yahoo], a perfect human Figure” (213) and Gulliver registers that he “must be a perfect *Yahoo*,” perhaps a “wonderful *Yahoo*,” but an “odious Animal, for which [he] had so utter an Hatred and Contempt” (218) nevertheless. At this moment, Gulliver “turned away [his] Face in Horror and detestation of [his] self” (251). In Lilliput, gothic horror stems from isolated moments of loss of self control (failed “oeconomy”), but in Houhyhnhnm land, the horror infiltrates the text as Gulliver realizes that he is wholly Yahoo and, thus, wholly savage, filthy, brute, and vile. When he first encounters the Yahoo, it is stated that “Upon the whole, [Gulliver] never beheld in [his] Travels so disagreeable an Animal, or one against which [he] naturally conceived so strong an Antipathy” and throughout the fourth account, Gulliver is “full of Contempt and Aversion” (207) for these “detestable Creatures” (212) that the “orderly and rational...acute and judicious” (209) Houhyhnhnms kept “in a Kennel” to train them to a “degree of Tameness” (246) and use as beasts of burden. Gulliver exerts tremendous energy trying to “distinguish [him]self from as much as possible, from that cursed Race of *Yahoos*” (217), trying to prove to his virtuous equine master that his “Teachableness, Civility, and Cleanliness” (215) make him an exceptional Yahoo, but his efforts are futile: Gulliver can’t camouflage his

abhorrent inner-Yahoo, and this inspires a gothic type of horror. When Gulliver returns home to England after his stay in Houyhnhnm land in a grim “Sort of *Indian Canoo*...cover[ed]...with the Skins of *Yahoos*” (254), he is filled with “Hatred, Disgust and Contempt” when he processes that “by copulating with one of the *Yahoo*-species, [he] had become a Parent of more; it struck [him] with utmost Shame, Confusion, and Horror.” When Gulliver’s “Wife took [him] in her Arms and kissed [him],” the “Touch of that odious Animal” sends Gulliver into a disordered “Swoon for almost an hour” (261).

The real tragedy of *Gulliver’s Travels* is the protagonist’s complete inability to re-engage with the true domestic; to return to real, home space (England) and join his “family circle.” Many critics have noted Swift’s very complex relationship with women.<sup>21</sup> In the *Travels*, Gulliver notes that “the Caprices of Womankind are not limited by any Climate or nation...they are much more uniform than can be easily imagined” (160). Later the narrator states: “I could not reflect without some Amazement, and much Sorrow, that the *Lewdness, Coquetry, Censure, and Scandal*, should have Place by Instinct in Womankind” (240). In his analyses of the cultures that he bumps up against during the course of his *Travels*, Gulliver details with increasing approval a set of distorted domestic spaces. In Lilliput, “Men and Women are joined together like other Animals, by the Motives of Concupiscence” and “they will never allow, that a Child is under any Obligation to his Father for begetting him,

---

<sup>21</sup> In a November, 1726 letter to Swift, John Gay wrote that: “Among Lady-critics, some have found that Mr. Gulliver had a particular malice to maids of honour.” In “Gulliver’s Malice: Gender and the Satiric Stance,” Felicity Nussbaum notes that “Swift’s satires against women have long marked him as part of the lingering misogynist tradition from Juvenal and Ovid that was revitalized in the seventeenth century by Robert Gould, Richard Ames, Lord Rochester, and Dryden” (319, in Fox, ed., *Gulliver’s Travels*, critical edition). See also Laura Brown, “Reading Race and Gender: Jonathan Swift” and Felicity Nussbaum, *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660-1750*.

or to his Mother for bringing him into the World” (73). In Houyhnhnm land, where “there is a superior Degree of Virtue,” the horses stop procreating when they “have produced one of each Sex.” “In their Marriages they are exactly careful to chuse such Colours as will not make any disagreeable Mixture in the Breed” and “*Strength* is chiefly valued in the Male, and *Comeliness* in the Female” (243). Yet the sterile and highly engineered domestic lives of the Lilliputians and Houyhnhnms seem to be far less dysfunctional than Gulliver’s own domestic life. As a young man, “being advised to alter [his] Condition, [Gulliver] married Mrs. *Mary Burton*...with whom [he] received four Hundred Pounds for a Portion” and then quickly opts to “go again to Sea” to gain “some Addition to [his] Fortune” (40). From this point forward, Gulliver’s family is only mentioned sporadically. After the disaster in Lilliput, Gulliver returns to England and “stayed but two Months with my Wife and Family; for my insatiable Desire of seeing foreign Countries would suffer me to continue no longer.” After having “left fifteen Hundred Pounds with my Wife, and fixed her in a good House a *Redriff*” (89), Gulliver returns to a life of certain misadventure. In Brobdingnag, Gulliver the domesticated pet briefly “bemoaned [his] desolate Widow, and Fatherless Children...lamented [his] own Folly and Willfulness in attempting a second Voyage against the Advice of all [his] Friends and Relations” (94) and even once “...dreamed [he] was at home with [his] Wife and Children” (99). After his miraculous return to England, however, despite the fact that his “Wife protested [he] should never go to Sea any more” Gulliver’s “evil Destiny so ordered, that she had not Power to hinder [him]” (147) and so he returns to the sea. After the third journey, Gulliver pauses to consider that it might be “more consistent with Prudence and

Justice to pass the Remainder of [his] Days with [his] Wife and Family” (193) but, incapable of “learn[ing] the Lesson of knowing when [he] was well,” Gulliver is only able to stay “at home with [his] Wife and Children about five Months” before leaving his “poor Wife big with Child, and accept[ing] an advantageous Offer to be made Captain of the *Adventure*, a stout Merchant-man of 350 Tuns” (205). By the end of his time in Hounyhnhnm land, of course, Gulliver’s perception of his self has been so broken down as he processes his yahoo-ness that he can barely engage with himself let alone his now recognizably yahoo family. Re-engagement with his domestic circle “struck [him] with utmost Shame, Confusion, and Horror.” And so, “the first Money [Gulliver] laid out was to buy two young Stone-Horses, which [he] kept in a good Stable”—and “next to them the Groom is [Gulliver’s self-expressed] greatest Favourite; for [he] feel[s] [his] Spirits revived by the Smell [the Groom] contracts in the Stable.” The tale of Gulliver and his *Travels* concludes with the disconcerting image of a wholly self-loathing Gulliver interacting only with his horses who “understand [him] tolerably well” and “live in great Amity with [Gulliver], and Friendship to each other”(261). The possibility of human relationship has completely disintegrated because Gulliver doesn’t see himself or his family as being intellectually and morally superior “human” anymore; that concept has been gutted by his time spent among the virtuous Hounyhnhnms.

Unlike Robinson Crusoe, Gulliver fails to manage his “oeconomy” and preserve his boundaries intact and so he *becomes* and recognizes himself as *being* the savage. After all, how can you manage your inner self (and, by extension, your domestic space) when you are a naturally filthy, brutish, abhorrent yahoo? The

binaries—self versus other; virtue versus vice; inside versus outside; domestic versus wild; Providence versus Fortune; civilized versus savage—utterly collapse at this moment in *Gulliver's Travels*, and without the tension between those forces (which are manageable when they may be characterized as stable, polar opposites) the critical meta-narrative of the virtuous, enlightened European (versus all others) can not be maintained. The success of this meta-narrative— the romance that the Empire tells itself about itself— hinges upon the maintenance of these boundaries and upon the ability of the “novel hero” to manage his “oeconomy”— to tame his surroundings and, most importantly, his self— to control his situation and emerge intact and on the right side of the binary.

## Chapter 2: Hawkesworth's Richardsonian Captain Cook versus Mr B.(ligh)

John Hawkesworth's much anticipated *Account of the Voyages and Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere* appeared in London in the summer of 1773. The Admiralty-commissioned *Account* was intended to undercut and silence the unauthorized and inaccurate tales of South Sea adventure that were infiltrating the presses of London by supplying a single, official version of the journals kept by Byron, Carteret and Wallis (in Volume One) as well as a more comprehensive, official account of Captain James Cook's recent first voyage aboard the *Endeavour* (in Volumes Two and Three).<sup>22</sup> In his lengthy "General Introduction,"<sup>23</sup> John Hawkesworth writes that his *Account* "is drawn up from the journals that were kept by the Commanders of the several ships, which were put into my hands by the Lord Commissioners of the Admiralty for that purpose: and, with respect to the voyage of the *Endeavour*, from other papers equally authentic; an assistance which I have acknowledged in an introduction to the account of her voyage."<sup>24</sup> Most intriguing is Hawkesworth's admission that his relation of Cook's portion of the *Account* was

---

<sup>22</sup> In *John Hawkesworth: Eighteenth-Century Man of Letters*, Abbott gives a more specific history of the "spurious" tales that were cropping up before the *Account* appeared in the summer of 1773.

<sup>23</sup> The passages from the *Voyages* "General Introduction" are taken from an on-line edition, as I was unable to locate it on microfiche. The "South Seas" website contains a variety of materials that relate to "Voyaging and Cross-Cultural Encounters in the Pacific (1760-1800)" and is supported by the National Library of Australia (NLA). The text of the "General Introduction" was taken from the London 1773 Edition of Hawkesworth's *Account*. It may be located on-line at: <http://southseas.nla.gov.au/>.

<sup>24</sup> In Chapter Four of *Sexual Antipodes*, entitled "The Sexual Nature of South Sea Islands," Cheeks notes that "Hawkesworth had access to fifty-seven logs and journals, though he probably drew on no more than a dozen" (141).



influenced (specifically) by Richardson’s “Pamela, the imaginary heroine of a novel that is remarkable for the enumeration of particulars in themselves so trifling, that we almost wonder how they could occur to the author’s mind.” Despite the immense popularity of the *Account* and the tremendous attention that it received during the period—it “went into eight editions within sixteen years and was the most frequently borrowed title in the Bristol library for over a decade after its initial publication” (Cheek 140) — Hawkesworth’s Richardson-influenced rendition of Captain Cook and his scientifically-critical South Sea voyages has garnered little modern critical attention.<sup>25</sup> How is one to approach a travel log whose author asserts that he is producing “something authentic”<sup>26</sup> while simultaneously acknowledging indebtedness to (of all things) Richardson’s *Pamela*, a revolutionary domestic novel “that set the hymen of a non-aristocratic woman above the wishes of a gentleman” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse 200)? A modern perspective motivates us to try to exact a rigid distinction between the immensely popular travel log (which we align with that which is male and empirical) and the emergent domestic novel (which we

---

<sup>25</sup> The handful of modern critics who have taken note of Hawkesworth’s statement about *Pamela* in the “General Introduction” to the *Voyages* have focused solely upon stylistic connections between Richardson’s novel and Hawkesworth’s highly detailed travel narrative. In Chapter Four of *Sexual Antipodes: Enlightenment Civilization and the Placing of Sex*, Pamela Cheek argues that “Hawkesworth’s introduction to the *Account* displays a strong degree of forethought about how to pitch a national document of scientific achievement to a late eighteenth-century audience,” noting that “Hawkesworth, the professional man of letters, self-consciously embraced two primary rhetorical modes: the ‘naked’ or ‘unornamented’ style associated with the British scientist’s documentation of fact and the stimulation of sympathy associated with the novel” (147). Cheek’s argument about the stylistics of Hawkesworth’s *Account* echoes the more detailed analysis of the Hawkesworth/Richardson connection that Jonathan Lamb presents in *Preserving the Self in the South Seas 1680-1840*. Lamb asserts that Hawkesworth had “hoped that authenticity and interest might coexist” in his *Account* (101). Lamb points out—via the “General Introduction” to the *Voyages*—that Hawkesworth borrows this tactic of insertion of minute particulars from two disparate quarters—Banks and Richardson— and draws stylistic authority from their work.

<sup>26</sup> Beaglehole, *The Life of Captain James Cook* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974), 289.

align with that which is feminine and emotional), but that distinction did not exist in the eighteenth century. The project of “all” successful “Writers,” according to Samuel Johnson, was relatively complex: “he undertakes either to instruct or please, or to mingle pleasure with instruction” (*Idler* No. 97). To satisfy these requirements, period travel writers sought to engage and instruct their readers by deploying novelistic themes and aesthetics. In reality, John Hawkesworth’s inclination to lean upon a “feminine” literary model to textually and editorially “domesticate” the greatest male nautical captain of the age is not as unusual as his open admission of intent and his candid citing of the *Pamela* source. In crafting his Richardsonian rendition of Captain Cook, John Hawkesworth develops a chaste and virtuous, bourgeois, “novel hero” who is able to separate his self from all savage and less domesticated “others” and emerge intact. To be a successful “novel hero,” according to this model of male domesticity or “oeconomy,” the adventurer or discoverer must be both male and female; male enough to manage the trial and female enough to domesticate space and (most critically) self and emerge in one piece. Male travelers who are incapable of controlling their passions and appetites are not granted to same elevated status. As Pamela is constructed in opposition to Mr B., the tyrannical, sexually-aggressive, rakish aristocrat of Richardson’s captivity narrative, Hawkesworth’s Cook is constructed in opposition to the *Endeavour*’s own rakish aristocrat, Mr B.(anks), whose tales of unchecked sexual appetite in the Pacific made their way into the *Account*. At the end of the chapter, I will provide a reading of yet another Mr B., William Bligh, whose “damned oeconomy” resulted in the mutiny on the *Bounty* and

secured Bligh a place in history as the least capable naval commander of the great age of scientific travel.

Conscious, perhaps, of the need to marry the pleasurable with the educational, John Hawkesworth quickly recognized that the sober, rather emotionally detached “naked narrative” of Captain Cook did not provide the level of “entertainment” that he was hoping to incorporate into his rendition of the *Voyages*. In order to “more strongly excite an interest”<sup>27</sup> in his readership Hawkesworth turned to a series of journals—“papers equally authentic”—that belonged to the men who had accompanied Cook, ultimately focusing most heavily upon the papers of the amateur botanist “Joseph Banks Esquire, a Gentleman possessed of considerable landed property in Lincolnshire” who purchased passage on Cook’s voyage and “kept an accurate...circumstantial” and decidedly racy journal of the voyage.<sup>28</sup> In structuring his *Account*, it is clear that Hawkesworth felt compelled to look outside of the logical choices in choosing models of “interest” for a male adventure because the details generated in Banks’ account, at best, provided no moral significance and, at worst, supplied only (to borrow Richardson-esque phraseology) the lusty perspective of a quintessential “rakish aristocrat.” It was Richardson’s novel *Pamela*, a text “remarkable” for its “enumeration of particulars,” that provided for Hawkesworth an example of how “little circumstances, properly arranged, could be experimentally accurate, interesting enough to arouse curiosity, and morally significant” (Lamb,

---

<sup>27</sup> Hawkesworth’s “General Introduction” to the *Voyages*. See footnote 2.

<sup>28</sup> Hawkesworth’s “Introduction” to Volumes Two and Three of the *Voyages*.

*Preserving the Self* 101).<sup>29</sup> Hawkesworth admired Richardson greatly and both writers were deeply invested in drafting new perspectives on eighteenth-century morality.<sup>30</sup> Ultimately, however, this strategic “enumeration of particulars” got both Richardson and Hawkesworth into trouble. Both moralists were accused of being a bit too generous with details concerning the nature and level of vice that consistently threatened their virtuous protagonists; vivid details that were deemed pornographic. “‘Instruction,’” Richardson wrote to Lady Echlin, “‘is the Pill; Amusement is the

---

<sup>29</sup> This is not to suggest that all eighteenth-century readers saw Richardson’s project in *Pamela* as being entirely moral and/or successful. Fielding and Haywood, of course, quite scathingly expressed their discontent with the virtuous mistress. Robert A. Donovan notes that “Richardson’s critics have always tended to divide themselves into the pamelists and the antipamelists.” “Joseph Wood Krutch assails Pamela in a tone that can only be described as savage: ‘The character of Pamela is so devoid of any delicacy of feeling as to be inevitably indecent. She seems to have sense of either her own or any possible human dignity and she can only be admired if a dogged determination to resist violation is considered to be, by itself, enough to make her admirable. Despite the language of pious cant which she speaks with such fluency there is no evidence that she has the faintest conception of that disinterestedness which alone can give piety meaning’” (As quoted in Donovan, “The Problem of Pamela, or, Virtue Unrewarded,” 377).

<sup>30</sup> During his time as editor and principle author of the *Adventurer*, Hawkesworth wrote a series of essays on literary criticism in which he “delineates a view of art that marks all of his writing.” In his biography, *John Hawkesworth: Eighteenth-Century Man of Letters*, John Abbott points that: “While Hawkesworth notes in his fourth *Adventurer* that writers of history, voyages, and biography are confined to facts that require primarily faithful transcription, he observes in his sixteenth paper that the writer of fiction ‘has unbounded liberty to select, to vary and to complicate’ in such a way that he engages not simply the mind but the passions.” “Given this power,” Hawkesworth asserts that the writer of fiction is obligated to “‘principally consider the moral tendency of his work, and...when he relates events he should teach virtue’ (*Adventurer* 1:108)” (32). The literary issues of genre, and genre-associated responsibility are, of course, the same issues that Hawkesworth would later address in the “General Introduction” of his *Voyages*. The choices that Hawkesworth makes in terms of his earlier fiction are also applicable. In his oriental fables and domestic fiction, Hawkesworth “like Richardson...writes of people who are, or aspire to be, members of a moneyed middle class, and the values of this class are constantly extolled.” Hawkesworth’s story in *Adventurer* no. 7, “Distress encourages to hope; the history of Melissa” is strikingly reminiscent of *Pamela*. Hawkesworth’s characters and the readers learn together that “one gains earthly happiness (and prospect of eternal bliss) through money, good marriage, piety, and caution in conduct, especially that involving the sexes” and loses happiness “through imprudence, recklessness, high living, and defiance of revealed religion” (36). Hawkesworth “continue[d] his attempts to appeal to the moral spirit of his times” through theatrical adaptations for David Garrick that rendered Dryden’s *Amphitryon*—minus “‘the Profaneness and Immodesty’” that he felt “‘tainted’” (69) the play—“‘suitable for the Drury Lane stage’” (68), and a version of Southerne’s *Oroonoko* that “stripped” it of all of its “‘low wit and dull obscenity.’” Given Hawkesworth’s career-long tendency toward “‘moral purgation’” (79), and his clear admiration for Richardson, it is perhaps not so strange that *Pamela* was used as a model for the *Voyages*, a piece of “work” (I.vii) that Hawkesworth imagined would be his opus and lift him to the pinnacle of his career as a much-respected writer and moralist.

Gilding” and, indeed, Richardson became well known for his “powerfully presented ‘warm’ scenes of rape, seduction, dueling, suicide, and murder attempts” (Flynn 16). The “constant defense” that Richardson had to offer up for the suggestive particulars that he wrote into his novels would later prompt him to admit that he retrospectively thought that he had perhaps “‘been too copious’” in detailing his “warm scenes” (18). Perhaps, in retrospect, Sir Joseph Banks also wished that he hadn’t provided such lavishly detailed scenes of (less scientifically benign and) more “curious and interesting” (Hawkesworth II.54) interaction with indigenous women in his *Endeavour* journal, for they also appeared in Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*. Stories of Britannia’s sons interacting so intimately with Tahitian women<sup>31</sup> certainly attracted intense “interest” among the domestic readership; and the uproar that emerged after the publication of the *Voyages* was so intensely damaging to Hawkesworth’s reputation that it is rumored to have cut his life short.<sup>32</sup> During “‘The Great Voyage Controversy of 1773,’” Hawkesworth and his *Account* were both accused of inaccuracy, indecency, pornography, and even of “‘Providential heresy.’”<sup>33</sup> In *The Life of James Cook*, Beaglehole writes that when Cook read “his tale” told by

---

<sup>31</sup> In “‘Southern Passions Mix with Northern Art’: Miscegenation and the *Endeavour* Voyage,” Bridgett Orr writes that Hawkesworth’s *Account* “produced a minor moral panic” which cast “doubt on the navigators claims to disinterested science and awaken[ed] fears of untrammelled female lust. At the same time, the incessant repetition and recirculation of the most ‘indecent’ materials of Hawkesworth bears witness that sexual curiosity as much as revulsion governed the responses of the educated classes” (212).

<sup>32</sup> John Lawrence Abbott, Hawkesworth’s biographer, notes that “Hawkesworth lived only six months after the publication of his *Voyages*” and addresses rumors of death by “‘high living...chagrin...possible suicide...intentionally taking immoderate doses of opium’” (187). Abbott dismisses these possibilities, and notes that: “There seems little question that whatever the immediate physical cause of death, the awful environment of turmoil he had inhabited the preceding months fatally compromised his will to live” (190).

<sup>33</sup> Quotations taken from Abbott’s biography, pages 160 and 157.

Hawkesworth “in the first person as the discoverer,” he was “‘mortified’...because he did not recognize himself—and could hardly do so when so much of Banks appeared as Cook, with original nautical blunders by Hawkesworth himself” (439).<sup>34</sup> It is clear that the level of shock that the public expressed upon the publication of the *Voyages* fell far short of the (apparently fatal) level of shock that the controversy caused for Hawkesworth, himself, who—from all indications—appeared to believe that he was writing a tale of one moral hero’s victory over rampant vice.

Hawkesworth was, and—it may be argued—still is, under scrutiny for the authenticity of a work that he never claimed was entirely factual. Indeed, during the period in which Hawkesworth was writing, the concept of something that was “value-neutral” and wholly authentic and empirical was still evolving and England was still very much engaged in determining what the rhetoric for the “Age of Enlightenment” should look like. It is quite clear in the “General Introduction” of the *Voyages* that Hawkesworth was aware that the literary choices that he was making in favor of adding “interest” compromised the “authenticity” of Cook’s “naked account.” In his “General Introduction,” Hawkesworth flatly argues for “the superiority of narratives of fiction over narratives of fact”: “His problem...was to move the logs and journals of those who had so painfully made their way around the world’s oceans towards the kind of literature he approved of, narratives that would entertain and instruct the general reader” (Edwards, *Story* 87). The “I” that appears in the *Voyages* was, of

---

<sup>34</sup> In his “General Introduction,” Hawkesworth indicates that “the manuscript would be submitted to the Gentlemen in whose names it would be written” (I.v). According to Beaglehole, Cook “was surprised to learn from the introduction” of the *Voyages* “that the manuscript had been read to him at the Admiralty for his approval, after which it had been given to him to peruse, and such emendations as he had suggested had been made” (439). “The authenticity of the text of the *Voyages* was...much in question,” Abbott relates, “and not merely by translators but by two of the captains, Carteret and Cook himself” (159).

course, unrecognizable to Cook himself because “the ‘I’ of Cook’s voyage, ostensibly the great captain...is at once a blend of Cook, Banks, and Hawkesworth” (Abbott 182), “a curious, three-headed monster” (Edwards 89). Or, to complicate things even further, the “I” of the *Voyages* male quest may be read—according to Hawkesworth’s own statements in his “General Introduction”—as a fusion of Cook, Banks, Hawkesworth, and Richardson’s “perfect nun” (*Pamela* 116) and her “very pretty romantic turn for virtue” (101). Hawkesworth’s Cook is quite clearly a fictional character and, admittedly, Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* hold little historical value for scholars interested in what actually happened in Tahiti during the summer of 1769; but is that really all that is at stake? In *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Mary Louise Pratt notes (via the example of the *Voyage* controversy) that “[e]mbellishment had not always been so welcome, nor sentiment either” (88) in the travel literature genre. If that were the case, however, wouldn’t it seem a strange choice to commission John Hawkesworth—a progressive romance writer—to pen the official account of Cook’s *Voyages*? Hawkesworth’s *Account* has received little attention for what it is: a consciously constructed, fully aesthetic piece of literature. It has been argued, most notably and succinctly by Percy Adams in *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*, that travel literature and its “tradition of verisimilitude” had great “importance in the evolution of the novel” (34). More recently, in *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*, Philip Edwards underscores how tremendously popular travel literature was in the eighteenth century, “study[ing] the way...voyages were reported,” and noting that “all voyage narratives are self-serving;” that “to watch (as we so often can), the

development of a narrative is to see the record being adjusted, massaged, and manipulated” (10). Little has been said, however, about the impact that novelistic form had upon the travel logs that emerged in the eighteenth century. The great character of Captain Cook that Hawkesworth models on Richardson’s *Pamela* and the epically scaled *Account* that emerges raises a series of interesting and largely unexamined issues. The fact that the British Admiralty chose to task the moralist fiction writer, John Hawkesworth (who turned to another moralist fiction writer for guidance), to document the major scientific travel expedition of the age would suggest that the tremendously popular work that emerged—and all of its intrinsically novelistic facets—impressed upon the consciousness of the population who read it and gave ideological shape to their understanding of the journey, the undertakers of those journeys, and the larger imperialist project. Further, Hawkesworth’s admission that he sought guidance from Samuel Richardson and his seminal novel, *Pamela*, would imply that Richardson’s reach and the reach of the novelistic structure and device was even greater than we have thought that it was. It also begs that we address the following question: Why were the characteristics and behaviors of period female novel heroines, specifically, being appropriated by eighteenth-century male adventurers and discoverers?

Mirroring Richardson’s novel, Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* are consciously constructed as a defense of the “I”/interior/domestic against the exterior/savage. Our virtuous Captain “goes domestic”<sup>35</sup> rather than savage; and Hawkesworth carefully creates a feminine space within the bounds of a hyper-masculine text and mission

---

<sup>35</sup> This quotation is borrowed from Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life*. The quotation will be discussed in greater detail later in the chapter.



through his construction of the narrator Captain. Hawkesworth's *Cook is Pamela*. In his first-person *Voyages*, Hawkesworth's narrator positions the Captain against all "others," the natives and his own men included, and through "noting the similitude and dissimilitude" (*Voyages* I.v) Cook is ultimately represented as an enlightened, benign, and singularly domestic "angel of light" (*Pamela* 69). It is my contention that despite evolving but increasing pressure to produce accounts that were empirically-sound, value-neutral, and stripped of emotion, writers of travel logs were consistently drawing upon the literary conventions of the novel. In order to fully understand the "novel hero" that Hawkesworth develops in his version of Captain Cook, we must first look at Richardson's heroine, Pamela. In the following section, "Beset on all Hands": "Fair Pamela's Trials," I will provide a reading of *Pamela* as a source for Hawkesworth's exceedingly chaste and virtuous narrator, paying close attention to the ways in which Richardson uses the rhetoric of exotic locale, "other," and adventure. A Richardsonian reading of Hawkesworth's Captain will follow these observations in the next section, entitled "Hawkesworth's Cook; Or, Virtue Rewarded." I will look closely at Hawkesworth's manipulations of the logs and "authentic" papers that he received from Cook, Banks and the other travelers and his use of Richardson's *Pamela* in producing his rendition of "Captain Cook." As Edward's points out, despite the fact that the "attack came on several fronts" (86), "Hawkesworth *Account of the Voyages* was never withdrawn or replaced" and because for "over a hundred years, his laundering of the actual record of the remorseless advance into the Pacific was all that was available...[f]rom an aesthetic as well as a political view he did great damage" (92). Despite the opinion of Edwards

and even the opinion of Cook himself, who was appalled at the liberties that were taken with his account of the *Endeavour* Voyages, Hawkesworth's effective Richardsonian casting of the naval captain motivated and secured Cook's apotheosis. The mutiny on the *Bounty* secured Bligh's place in history as one of the most unsuccessful travelers and in the last section, I will provide a close reading of Bligh as a foil to Cook. The final section is titled "'Mr B.': The Pitfalls of Excess and Passion," a title which refers to all three Mr B.s—Richardson's Mr B., Banks, and Bligh—and the common Achilles heel that renders each of them incapable of keeping their boundaries intact.

*"Beset on all Hands": "Fair Pamela's Trials" <sup>36</sup>*

Both Richardson's Pamela and Hawkesworth's Cook are being subjected to trials in isolation. In *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life*, Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse provide a reading that connects the American captivity narrative to Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and Richardson's *Pamela* (1740). The captivity narrative of Mary Rowlandson, Armstrong and Tennenhouse argue, "anticipated *Crusoe* in representing the English in the New World as an abducted body...usually—though not always—female bodies" (204). Defoe's *Crusoe* "represents intellectual labor as the source of political power" (188), and the isolated English protagonist learns to exert control

---

<sup>36</sup> The first citation is from page 113 of *Pamela*. The second is contained within the editor's interruption on page 123.

over his situation by using the “irrational”<sup>37</sup> which “enabl[es] him to conquer the world simply by conquering himself” (184). Like Richardson’s *Pamela*, “*Crusoe* singly-mindedly preserves intact the magical boundary defined by his skin from any and all invaders...he goes domestic” (201). Armstrong and Tennenhouse argue that “there are important similarities between the two works of fiction,” and suggest that Richardson “simply replaces *Crusoe*’s island in the New World with the interior spaces of the household, the female body, and the private world of the emotions as revealed in *Pamela*’s letters to her parents” (200). The remnants of “*Crusoe*’s island in the New World,” the rhetoric of otherness and trials in isolation, permeate *Pamela*, supporting Armstrong’s and Tennenhouse’s suggestion. *Pamela* is infused with the consciousness of a travel narrative. In the transition between *Pamela* and the *Voyages*, I would argue, Hawkesworth simply replaces *Pamela*’s “deplorable bondage” (*Pamela* 148) in Mr B.’s country house with a male, English narrator made “PRISONER in [his] own boat” (*Voyages* II.14) and “the private world of emotions as revealed” in his journals. The narrative movement that Armstrong and Tennenhouse trace in their important theoretical analysis—from a factual American captivity narrative to *Crusoe* to Richardson’s “domestic” and novelistic English captivity narrative—echoes Percy Adam’s assertion that the travel log/captivity narrative significantly impacted the development of the novel. Another layer is added to this well accepted thesis when it is acknowledged that in selecting a model for his *Endeavour* chronicles, John Hawkesworth took Richardson’s captivity novel and

---

<sup>37</sup> In Chapter Seven, “The Reproductive Hypothesis,” Armstrong and Tennenhouse read irrationality via “the intrusion of dreams into Locke’s theory of consciousness” and the “empty space” that is offered. “Indeed in the century elapsing between Locke and Malthus, authors developed the cultural space inhabited by dreams ...Essentially opposed to reason, this space was implicitly female” (184).

applied its literary devices to his British Admiralty-commissioned, “official” *Account*. Simply put, in Hawkesworth’s *Account*, the “domestic”—as defined in Richardson’s *Pamela*— is exported.

The copious descriptions of the trials that Pamela and Hawkesworth’s Cook negotiate during the course of their texts (both written in first person and in letter/journal form) are intended to generate an emotional response and to convey a moral lesson. *Pamela* begins with a lengthy list of moral duties that the “Editor” feels that fiction must fulfill. Phrases like “IF to *divert* and *entertain*, and at the same time to instruct” and “IF to paint VICE in its proper colours, to make it *deservedly odious*; and to set VIRTUE in its own amiable light, to make it truly lovely” (21) could have originated from the pages of one of Hawkesworth’s *Adventurer* essays. In the “Preface” of *Pamela*, the “Editor” indicates that while the pages of *Pamela* are “embellished with a great variety of entertaining incidents...which have their foundation in *truth* and *nature*” (22), the text intends, first and foremost, to impart a moral lesson. In the “General Introduction” to his *Voyages*, Hawkesworth expresses the same philosophy. As previously stated, any moral lesson that Hawkesworth hoped to convey in his *Voyages* was lost among the scenes of rakish aristocratic indulgence that Hawkesworth had plucked from Banks’ journal and added to the *Account*. These depictions of vice ultimately overwhelm Hawkesworth’s depictions of Cook’s virtue. Both Richardson and Hawkesworth were heavily critiqued for their tendency to over-illustrate “warm” scenes. It is important to note, however, that in both *Pamela* and the *Voyages*, vice is associated with very particular characters or types, in particular those like Mr B. and Banks who abuse the power and libertine luxuries associated with

their exalted stations. The tension that Richardson depicts between Pamela and Mr B. is a microcosmic example of the very real tension that existed in Richardson's eighteenth-century world between the (emergent, Puritanical) middling and (entrenched) aristocratic classes. Cynthia Griffin Wolff argues that "[a]ll of Richardson's major characters"—including fervently virtuous, poor Pamela—"are engaged in secularizing an essentially Puritan attitude" (5), an attitude that was marked by an interest in "[p]rolonged introspection, a tendency urgently and repeatedly to question behavior and motives" and "a tendency to formulate an objective embodiment of the self – in a diary or journal, for example" (9). This feeling that "[a]ll of life was, in some sense, a religious trial" (23)—the eighteenth-century perspective that Wolff associates with the emergent Puritanical, middle class— may be detected in both Richardson's and Hawkesworth's heroes. "Poor Pamela's" defense of her virtue is inflated and quite literally figured as a type of moral quest.

The process of documenting the trial—and, most importantly, of positioning oneself against all others—is of central importance for both Richardson and Hawkesworth. The ways in which Hawkesworth deploys this strategy will be discussed in the following section. In *Pamela*, "desperate as [her] condition seems," the domestic heroine uses her pen to document that "these trials are not of [her] own seeking, nor the effects of [her] presumption and vanity," and is certain that she "shall be enabled to over come them, and in God's own time, be delivered from them" (129). Pamela "continues [her] writing still" to provide written record of "what

dangers [she has] been enabled to escape” (117).<sup>38</sup> In Richardson’s novel, Pamela situates “the account she herself gives of all of this; having written it journal-wise” (129) within a larger tradition of moral literature about other virtuous creatures in danger of being overwhelmed by vice. Pamela, the “perfect nun” (116), calls up biblical images, “representing herself as an angel of light, and mak[ing] her kind master and benefactor, devil incarnate” (69), as “cunning as Lucifer” (89). She references a series of fables,<sup>39</sup> becoming like “the grasshopper in the fable... in one of my lady’s books (108); “the city mouse and the country mouse” (109); and “[t]he poor sheep in the fable...tried before the vulture, on the accusation of the wolf!” (214).<sup>40</sup> In consciously casting herself in opposition to her captors in her “History,” Pamela often turns to the rhetoric of that which is “other”— savage, bestial, or animalistic. “May I” writes Pamela in Letter XV, “*Lucretia* like, justify myself with death, if I am used barbarously!” (65). Pamela is “vexed” at devilish Mr. B. and every “barbarous joke” (101) that he issues. Sexual deviancy or moral looseness is also implied when Pamela attaches the rhetoric of “other” to Mrs. Jewkes and Monsieur

---

<sup>38</sup> As John Pierce points out in “Pamela’s Textual Authority,” the “only identity, the only authority, and the greatest degree of power [Pamela] has are manifest in her writing, a textuality giving voice to an identity Mr B. would willingly debase and silence” (Blewett 9). Pierce’s observation that Pamela’s interest in writing what she herself calls “a little History of myself,” “follows in the tradition of eighteenth-century writers who seek to obtain a greater degree of credibility for their narratives by invoking an empirical bias to set against the idealizing impulse of romance.” Pierce cites the example of McKeon’s “naïve empiricist” (10), but this interest in an empirical ideology that Pierce locates in Richardson’s novel conjures up larger images of the project of the travel writer and the fine balance that Hawkesworth was attempting to strike between “naked narrative” and “interest” in his *Account*.

<sup>39</sup> Hawkesworth was invested in “championing shorter fiction—the fable, or tale, especially of an oriental nature” (Abbott 34), as being the most effective genre for merging entertainment with moral value.

<sup>40</sup> Stuart Wilson notes that “we find metaphors drawn from the areas of experience most familiar to a child, the worlds of animals and plants, and from their literary representations most familiar to Pamela in the Bible and Aesop’s Fables” (81) in “Richardson’s *Pamela*: An Interpretation.”

Colbrand.<sup>41</sup> “Wretched, wretched Pamela” (113) abhors being “in the hands of a woman that seems to delight in filthiness” (139); and Mrs. Jewkes spends the first half of the novel being described as lasciviously “barbarous” (144) in myriad ways. She is a “Jezebel” (156); a “wicked brute” (180); “a disgrace to her sex”; an “impudent creature” (209), and full of “unwomanly wickedness” (212). Pamela complains that Mrs. Jewkes “can hardly keep her hands off of [our virtuous protagonist],” and that Jewkes “talked more like a vile London prostitute, than a gentleman’s housekeeper” (209). Monsieur Colbrand is described as “the most hideous monster [Pamela] ever saw in [her] life” (196). Pamela is terrified of this “giant of a man...large boned and scraggy,” with “two great scars upon his forehead” and “foreign grimaces” (197) that convey unspoken sexual intent.

If the characters of Pamela and Cook may be read as representatives of the virtuous middle class who are locked in struggle against the rakish tendencies of the aristocratic Mr B. and Banks (and the general, sexual perversity of all “others”) then Miss Sally Godfrey—the most problematic and least discussed character in Richardson’s novel— may be said to be *Pamela’s* most powerful representative of the pitfalls of carnality. Sally Godfrey haunts *Pamela* like the muted yet powerful sexualized Tahitian female body haunts Hawkesworth’s *Account of the Endeavour* voyage. In Richardson’s text, Pamela, having firmly placed herself on a pedestal high above her captors, declares that she is “above making an exchange of [her] honesty for all the riches of the Indies” (221). This was apparently not the case for Miss Sally

---

<sup>41</sup> Wilson argues that: “In the characters of Mrs. Jewkes and Colbrand, Pamela sees two aspects of raw sexuality, one feminine, the other masculine...the imagery suggests that her imagination equates illicit promiscuity with bestiality” (84). Such images “express her fear and detestation of...unrestrained sexuality” (85).

Godfrey. Miss Godfrey's existence is awkwardly announced by Lady Danvers in the last hundred pages of the book; long after Pamela's virtue has successfully been secured by marriage to Mr B. "I fear," Lady Danvers alerts Pamela, "that you have been prevailed upon, and have lost your innocence, and added another to the number of fools he has ruined" (406). Faced with the results of his sister's indiscretions, Mr B. assures his young bride that "[s]he shall know it all" (452) and exposes the story. Throughout the last pages of the novel, "foolish thing that [Pamela] is," "this poor Miss Sally Godfrey runs into [her] head," and though she "dare not ask...about the poor lady," she is racked with questions: "wonder[ing] what became of her! Whether she be living? And whether anything came of it?" (458). Indeed, something did come of the tryst, and Pamela's suspicion that the young "pretty miss" Miss Goodwin is "a nearer relation to [Mr B.] than a niece" (497) is soon confirmed. Seeing that Pamela wants "to know what's become of the poor mother," Mr. B. explains that Sally Godfrey "lives in Jamaica" (501), which causes Pamela to reflect upon Miss Godfrey's moral fortitude in the face of her undoing:

...it showed she was much in earnest to be good, that she could leave her native country, leave all her relations, leave [Mr B.], whom she so well loved, leave her dear baby, and try a new fortune, in a new world, among quite strangers, and hazard the seas; and all to preserve herself from further guiltiness! (502)

Transported to the colonies after falling from grace in the domestic space of England, Sally Godfrey is nearly rendered invisible.<sup>42</sup> Unable to be physically present to the

---

<sup>42</sup> "Mr. B. emerges from amorous skirmishes around the countryside," Gwendolyn Needham notes, "unscathed and unrepentant." "That he can feel remorse, however Richardson shows by recounting the youth's more serious affair with Miss Sally Godfrey...When poor Sally refuses to continue their illicit love, Mr. B. acts 'honorably' according to class code: he gives her a large sum when she leaves the



child that she would not “suffer...to be called by her name” (501), Sally and “her spouse sent a little Negro boy...as a present, to wait upon her...[b]ut he was taken ill with smallpox, and died a month after he was landed” (505). Richardson’s novel ends with a disturbing letter from “Mrs B—to Lady G—” in which Pamela provides a “little specimen of [the] *nursery tales and stories*” that she tells to “entertain” and instruct her “Miss Goodwin and...[her] little boys” (521). Among the litany of lessons provided at the end of *Pamela*, the example of Mr B.’s fallen lover is underscored in one of the stories: “The poor deluded female, who, like the once unhappy Miss GODFREY, has given up her honour, and yielded to the allurements of her designing lover, may learn from her story to stop at her *first fault*; and, by resolving to repent and amend” look toward the possibility of a “kind Providence” in order to avoid the plight of the “prostitute” and “wicked courses” that lead her “into filthy diseases and an untimely death; and, too probably, into everlasting perdition” (518).

Miss Sally Godfrey, to borrow again from the terminology used in the *Imaginary Puritan*’s reading of *Crusoe* and *Pamela*, failed to “go domestic.” Her inability to “preserve intact the magical boundary defined by h[er] skin from any and all invaders” renders her an anti-“Richardsonian heroine.”<sup>43</sup> In “‘I Wonder Whether Poor Miss Sally Godfrey be Living or Dead’: The Married Woman and the Rise of the Novel,” Charlotte Sussman offers a reading of *Pamela* via Michael McKeon’s

---

country, assumes responsibility for their illegitimate daughter, and settles on the child an ample fortune for a gentlewoman” (445).

<sup>43</sup> In her reading of *Pamela* “as a test case of proto-Romantic sensibility, as a paradigm of cornerstone for later evolutions of the genre” (100), Catherine Gemelli Martin characterizes Miss Sally Godfrey as the “false hero” who interrupts the true heroes narrative to “present claims” (103).

*The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740* and Nancy Armstrong's *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*.<sup>44</sup> Sussman points out that "[w]hile Richardson's novel itself retains strategically placed images of what happened to women not as exemplary as Pamela, McKeon and Armstrong suppress the representations of physical and economic violence that surround the happy ending of *Pamela*" (90). Central to Sussman's observation is the case of Miss Sally Godfrey and the fact that "Richardson's novel needs to introduce into their lovers' clinch a possible third position...in order to finally legitimate Pamela and B.'s love for one another." The example of Sally Godfrey and the "extremely unhappy ending" of her romance "is designed to establish Pamela and Sally Godfrey as polar opposites" (Sussman 97), creating a firm "alignment of Pamela with the category 'soul,' and Sally with the category 'body'" (98). Sally Godfrey, Sussman notes, "emigrates to Jamaica," and "can only offer her daughter 'a little Negro boy'" to provide "proof of her connection to imperialist profit." She is "condemned to register her presence through commodities" (98). Because Miss Godfrey offered "sexual intercourse" rather than Pamela's "exchange of discourse" (Sussman 98), she operates in opposition to Richardson's "angel of light" and is aligned with Mrs. Jewkes, Monsieur Colbrand, and all of the other individuals of questionable characters that Pamela "others" in her letters. The fact that Miss Sally Godfrey is cast out of England to Jamaica, "transport[ed] to the margins" (Sussman 100), literally and figuratively, to

---

<sup>44</sup> Both Armstrong's and McKeon's texts, Sussman argues, "take *Pamela* as exemplary of the important socioeconomic changes of the eighteenth century in England," and agree that "*Pamela* holds the key for an account of the parallel rise of the novel and of the middle class." The analyses differ in that "[f]or McKeon, *Pamela* is the culmination of various discursive paradigms of the seventeenth century, while for Armstrong, the novel is still the most effective transmitter of the powerful discourse of domesticity" (89).

live “among quite strangers,” is central. Because she has failed to “go domestic,” Miss Sally Godfrey is forced out of her native, civilized space and into an exotic, savage locale that is associated with the rhetoric of over-sexed bestiality that Pamela borrows in describing the “barbarous” Mrs. Jewkes, and Monsieur Colbrand’s “foreign grimaces.”

*Hawkesworth’s Cook; Or, Virtue Rewarded*

The lesson contained within Richardson’s novel is clear: faced with issues of “sexual contract,”<sup>45</sup> one may either “go domestic” (preserve all boundaries and “achieve prosperity without compromising domestic virtue”)<sup>46</sup> or “go savage.” The same Richardsonian lesson is consciously offered in Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*, where Cook’s “domestic” virtue and piety are textually defended against barbarous elements in the South Seas. The plausibility of coupling the characters of Pamela and Cook in this type of analysis might initially seem questionable because of issues of gender difference. Catherine Gimelli Martin reads “*Pamela* as a test case of proto-Romantic sensibility, as a paradigm or cornerstone for later evolutions of the genre” (100), arguing that Richardson’s novel was groundbreaking because within the “ethical values” of the text, “chastity” is “interpreted as a universal code applicable to both genders and to every social degree.” “Writing, like earlier forms of enchantment,” Martin continues, “directs the progress of the hero/heroine and reveals his/her inner virtue.” This movement within Richardson’s *Pamela* anticipates “later developments

---

<sup>45</sup> Sussman borrows this expression from Armstrong’s *Desire and Domestic Fiction*. It is cited on page 92 of her article.

<sup>46</sup> Again, Sussman quotes Armstrong on page 92 of her article.

of Romanticism” where “[h]eroes in general, whether male or female, begin to take on the ‘feminine’ qualities of passivity,<sup>47</sup> strongly internalized conscious or ethics, and sexual repression” (106). The way in which Martin reads *Pamela* as a precursor of the chaste, thoughtful Romantic hero (“male or female”) is of particular interest when looking at the connection between Richardson’s heroine and Hawkesworth’s hero. The narrator of Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*, in fact, represents a supremely virtuous Cook: a Hawkesworthian “moral purgation” of the actual Captain. While the surrounding text evidently sparked horror as an exposé of the reality of English/native sexual interaction and the carnage created by imperialist gunpowder, Cook—alone—manages to emerge looking far more like Prospero than Kurtz. As Beaglehole acknowledges, for better or worse, “for a hundred and twenty years, so far as the first voyage was concerned, Hawkesworth *was* Cook.”<sup>48</sup> “Hawkesworth had a tendency to idealize Cook” (Abbott 183) and, in turn, his *Voyages* helped deify the Captain and “fuel a myth that was to motivate a nation for more than a century—the myth that an

---

<sup>47</sup> It is difficult to think about James Cook as being marked by “passivity,” given the degree to which the Captain’s “humanist image” (Obeyesekere 9) has recently come under assault. In reading the *Account*, however, it is interesting to note that Hawkesworth is very careful to couch any “account[s] of massive destruction” (37) among carefully phrased philosophical ruminations about the nature of adventurous trials. In the “General Introduction” of the *Voyages*, Hawkesworth writes: “I cannot however dismiss my Readers to the following narratives, without expressing the regret with which I have recorded the destruction of poor naked savages, by our firearms...this however appears to be an evil which, if discoveries of new countries are attempted, cannot be avoided, resistance will always be made, and if those who resist are not overpowered, the attempt must be relinquished.” He notes that “if such expeditions are undertaken, the execution of them must be intrusted to persons not exempt from human frailty; to men who are liable to provocation by sudden injury, to unpremeditated violence by sudden danger, to error by the defect of judgment or the strength of passion, and always disposed to transfer laws by which they are bound themselves, to others who are not subject to their obligation; so that every excess thus produced is also an inevitable evil” (I.xvi). In order to rationalize the mission, the Captain must be rendered as being particularly rational. It would seem that Hawkesworth is aware that Cook’s journal entries needed to be tempered a bit... and thus, the additions. In his introduction to the Penguin edition of *The Journals of Captain Cook*, Edwards notes that Cook “was deeply upset by the freedom Hawkesworth had taken with his work...supplying him with sentiments he had never expressed” (x).

<sup>48</sup> As quoted in Abbott’s *John Hawkesworth: Eighteenth-Century Man of Letters* on page 186.

island kingdom through sea power and administrative genius could impose a *Pax Britannica* on the major portion of the world” (186). This being the case, Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* was the first text to secure Cook a place as a rational, Enlightened, and benign national figure. Whether or not the eighteenth-century reading public was able to look past all of the horrors of tattooing and grape shot and venereal disease to glean the moral of the story from Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*, Hawkesworth had written a moral—in the character of Cook, himself— into the text. Hawkesworth’s Captain— due to a very “domestic heroism,”<sup>49</sup> — “preserves intact the magical boundary defined by his skin from any and all invaders” and manages to defend himself from all external savagery with all of the fervor of a true “Richardsonian heroine.”

To some degree, Hawkesworth’s rendition of the *Endeavour* voyages functions as what Mary Louise Pratt terms an “anti conquest,” utilizing “strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment as they assert European hegemony” (7). The South Sea expeditions of Cook, Pratt argues, mark the beginning of the “‘great age’ of scientific travel” and the emergent importance of the “naturalist-collector.” Cook’s voyages also “marked an end: the last great navigational phase of European exploration” (39). In Hawkesworth’s rendition of Cook, the voice of Pratt’s “naturalist-collector” (via the influence of the journals of Sir Joseph Banks/“interest”) overwhelms the voice of the

---

<sup>49</sup> In “‘Infamous Commerce’: Transracial Prostitution in the South Seas and Back,” Laura J. Rosenthal notes that “Cook’s particularly domestic version of heroism has been observed by many commentators—his humility, his unassuming country life, his simplicity, his devotion to his family, and most of all his chastity.” Rosenthal notes the “attention to domestic detail,” “almost feminine details about care, cleanliness, and linen,” that Cook catalogs in his *Voyage to the South Pole* (194). “In Cook’s highly praised *Voyage*—intended, in part, to correct John Hawkesworth’s scandalous account,” Rosenthal writes, “feminine domesticity becomes Britain’s major export” (195). See *Monstrous Dreams of Reason: Body, Self and Other in the Enlightenment*.

navigational past (Cook/“authenticity”). In a work that has been termed a “salute to Banks” (Abbott 182) the voice of the “naturalist collector” saturates the text. Within the first few pages of the *Voyage*, Hawkesworth’s narrator expresses a level of support and interest in the categorizing quest of his on-board scientists that never appears in Cook’s own journal; noting that before having even reached Madeira, “Mr. Banks and Dr. Solander had an opportunity of observing many marine animals, of which no naturalist had hitherto taken notice” (2). The Latin terminology of the Linnaean system peppers the pages of the *Voyages* and are followed by lush descriptions of places and things that are “beautiful beyond imagination” (8), placing the text immediately in opposition to Cook’s own far more sober, navigational account. Pratt’s reading of the “naturalist-collector” and the part that he plays in the rhetoric of “anti-conquest” is key in Hawkesworth’s *Account* because “[t]he ‘conversion’ of raw nature into the *systema naturae* is a strangely, abstract, unheroic gesture, with very little at stake.” In having his hero attach himself to the project of the “naturalist-collector,” even articulating himself in the same rhetorical mode of this “anti-conquest” figure, Hawkesworth’s Captain becomes aligned with a more “benign, often homely figure, whose transformative powers do their work in the domestic context of the garden or collection room.” Hawkesworth’s Cook is, thus, more firmly removed from antiquated realm of the hyper-masculine, aggressive “navigator or... conquistador” (Pratt 33). The example of Pratt’s “anti-conquest” draws attention to the power that is harnessed when Hawkesworth’s narrator is more clearly connected to the “simultaneously innocent and imperial” (33) rhetoric of the benign, scientific voyage. Through the inclusion of Banks’ naturalist observations and

Hawkesworth's philosophical and historical observations, the narrator of the *Voyages* is rendered more "intellectual" (Pratt 31), "secular and lettered" (29). Captain Cook, the once "unlettered seaman" (Edwards xi), is suddenly "in the know" in Hawkesworth's *Account*; and is able to join the other gentlemen in scoffing at the "Ladies" in Madeira who, upon "hear[ing] that there were great philosophers among" the group on the *Endeavour* "asked...several questions that were absurd and extravagant in the highest degree" (II.6).

But to note that Hawkesworth's text contains more of the "naturalist-collector" rhetoric of "anti-conquest" via Banks is not to suggest that Cook's status as the central protagonist or hero is at all diminished. In constructing his *Account*, Hawkesworth moves beyond the narrative provided by the true Captain Cook, beyond the journal of Banks and the "naturalist-collector" rhetoric that he supplies, and looks specifically at Richardson's domestic captivity novel. In the case of Hawkesworth's Cook, then, Pratt's theory falls short because it fails to include the impact that the novel had upon the increasingly novelistic travel logs that were emerging in the eighteenth century. In the tradition of other bodies that find themselves isolated (on Crusoe's island or in Mr B.'s country house), Hawkesworth's Cook defends his boundaries on and off of the *Endeavour* through intellectual labor; and the power that he wields is intrinsically connected to writing. This whole notion of defense through (innocuous, feminine) writing rather than (active, masculine) physicality adds another layer of complication to Pratt's "anti-conquest" model. Like Richardson's Pamela, the narrator of Hawkesworth's *Voyages* is conscious of his position within a larger narrative tradition. When the *Endeavour* reaches Staten Island, Hawkesworth's Cook

is aware that “Lord Anson was there in the beginning of March...which may account for the difference of his description of it in from ours” (II.39), and is aware that the “account” given by “Hermit’s fleet...is extremely defective; and those of Schouton and Le Maire are still worse” (II.41). In New Zealand, Cook is well-versed in the work of the “principal navigators, whose authority has been urged on this occasion...Tasman, Juan Fernandes, Hermite, the commander of a Dutch squadron, Quiros, and Roggewin” (III.42). He has read “a French work, intitled *Histoire des Navigations aux Terres Australes*, which was published in 1756” (III.161). Hawkesworth’s Cook also calls upon the language of romance, fables, and mythology. “[T]o us, who for a long time had seen nothing but water and sky,” the Captain writes upon arrival at Otaheite, “these groves seemed a terrestrial paradise” (II.45); the “whole scene realized the poetical fables of Arcadia” (II.52). In describing a wrestling contest in Otaheite, the narrator notes in it a “rude resemblance” to “the athletic sports of very remote antiquity” which “even our female readers” may remember from the “account given of them from Fenelon in his *Telemachus*” (II.75).

More importantly, like Pamela, the fictionalized Captain’s defense rests upon his ability to generate a picture of his superior character and quality in the narrative; as later actions will be judged against the success of this image. In *Pamela*-esque fashion, the heroic Captain is distinguished from every other Englishman on board the *Endeavor* and every indigenous person that they encounter. Hawkesworth’s Cook is the only “domestic” and arguably “feminine” fixture on a completely male voyage. The Captain is actually far more actively “domestic” than Pamela, who spends more



time writing than working during her domestic servant years. Extraordinarily conscious of his function as caretaker, Cook expresses an almost “maternal” interest in the quality of food served on the *Endeavour*. He is gleeful that his “albatross...dish was universally commended” (II.42), that the “cuttle-fish” soup was “one of the best soups [the crew] had ever tasted” (II.44), and that in Tahiti he was able to serve “pork to the ship’s company for the first time” (59). In New Zealand, the Captain is thrilled to discover “excellent celery...which proved to be a powerful antiscorbutic” (II.202) and makes certain that his men “who had long been at sea” eat their vegetables with “great pleasure and advantage” (III.20). He is equally intrigued by the culinary habits of indigenous peoples, expressing horror that the “destitute and forlorn” people of Tierra del Feugo have “no implement even to dress their food” (II.37), and interest in the fact that the Tahitian women “eat of plantains very heartily; a mystery of female economy...which none of [them] could explain” (II.66). Having spent so much of his time “gather[ing]...suppl[ies] of ...greens” (III.112), and worrying over the crew’s diet, Hawkesworth’s Captain seems hesitant to accept reality when “[t]he scurvy...began to make its appearance among [them], with many formidable symptoms” (III.93). The possibility that “Mr. Buchan” might have perished not because of pre-existent “epileptic fits” (II.58) but because of having spent months eating only pork in close-quarters on a filthy ship is never entertained. Likewise, “First Lieutenant Mr. Hicks” dies from “a consumption” that the heroic narrator insists that he had before the *Endeavour* even left England. “It may truly be said,” writes Hawkesworth’s Captain, that Hicks “was dying through the whole voyage, though his decline was very gradual till we came to Batavia” (III.250). A “domestic”

concern and sense of responsibility that leads to downplaying illness and death may be found in Cook's *Journals*, but the response of Hawkesworth's Cook is more complicated. Cook generates the post-Batavia death list by scripting the names of each person who died in his *Journal* daily. In Hawkesworth's version, the list is collapsed into a paragraph, which lessens the feeling of horror that the reader experiences at watching the list grown longer with each entry. Occasionally, however, Hawkesworth's Cook offers details about specific individuals who perish. When a sailor "throw[s] himself overboard" before the ship reaches Otaheite, the Captain writes that "the loss of this man was the more regretted as he was remarkably quiet and industrious" (II.45).<sup>50</sup> When Tupia dies in Batavia, the Captain notes that Bank's "loved" him "with the tenderness of a parent" (III.200). Further, there is a dramatic sense of fear in Hawkesworth's *Voyages*, and the narrator admits that their "distress was now very great...death was every day making advances upon us, where we could neither resist nor fly" (III.199). At these points in the text, there is a sense of shame that is rooted in the failure of the Captain's "domestic" efforts to quell that "fatal effects of [their] climate and situation" (III.198).

At moments of rupture in the *Voyages*, when incidents of violence or bad behavior erupt through the otherwise scientifically descriptive and benign narrative, Hawkesworth's hero responds by strategically separating himself from the incident and its participants through the power of writing. Like Pamela, Hawkesworth's Cook

---

<sup>50</sup> I compare portions of Cook's *Journal* to Hawkesworth's *Voyages* in the following notes not to try to determine what actually happened, but to see how Hawkesworth's "work" is altered by omission and altered emphases. Note the difference in tone between Hawkesworth's Captain and Cook in his *Journal*: "Peter Flower seaman fell over board and before any assistance could be given him was drown'd, in his room we got a Portuguese" (23).

is the observer and recorder of inappropriate behavior and never the participant; and if a grim effect should result from a decision that was his, the Captain always buffers the account with large amounts of explanation. Interestingly, many instances of lashings and other forms of corporeal punishment that are documented in Cook's *Journal* are omitted from Hawkesworth's *Account*.<sup>51</sup> Perhaps even more interestingly, the crew on-board Hawkesworth's *Endeavour* are generally only punished when they injure the natives. While in Tahiti, Cook is informed that the ship's "butcher had threatened, or attempted to cut [Tubourai Tamaide's] wife's throat with a reaping hook." After the judicious Captain "call[ed] up the butcher, and after a recapitulation of the charge and the proof, [Cook] gave orders that he should be punished" and the "Indians saw him stripped and tied up to the rigging" to be whipped (II.64). On another occasion in Tahiti, "complaint being made...by some of the natives, that two of the seaman had taken from them several bows and arrows...[Cook] punished each of the criminals with two dozen lashes each" (II.91). The Huaheineans, "to their honour" "shewed some signs of disapprobation, and prescribed a good beating" for one of their own countrymen at the hands of the British after being told that he had stolen from them" (II.160). Only once, in Otaheite, when "some of the ship's company broke into one of the store-rooms, and stole a quantity of spike nails" does Hawkesworth's Cook resort to punishing some members of his crew "with two dozen lashes" (II.88) on his own authority. The Captain is rendered far more benevolent

---

<sup>51</sup> In Cook's *Journal*, there is a steady stream of descriptions of punishment: "Punished Robt Anderson Seamon and Willm Judge Marine with twelve lashes each...and John Readon Boatswain Mate with twelve lashes for not doing his duty in punishing the above men" (22); "Punished Richd Hutchins Seaman with 12 lashes for disobeying command" (44); "Punished Archd Wolf with two Dozn lashes for theft, having broken into one of the Store rooms and stolen from thence a large quantity of spike Nails" (55); Punished James Tunley with 12 lashes for takeing Rum" (58); "This morning I released Robt Anderson from confinement at the intercession of the Master" (61); etc., etc.

toward his crew and the natives of Tahiti through these omissions and details; but seems to grant the natives more credit than his crew on many occasions. Though the Captain takes time to “remark with concern, that [the natives of Tahiti are] capable of practicing petty frauds against each other, with a deliberate dishonesty” (II. 107), that they are “the errantest thieves upon the face of the earth” (II.62), the narrator displays a curious tendency to assume that his own men are at fault if anything is amiss. When the “astronomical quadrant... to [his] great surprise and concern was not to be found,” the Captain “at first suspected that it might have been stolen by some of his own people” (II.69). And it is “not without some reluctance” that Mr. Banks’ “accuse[s] [the Indians] of having stolen his knife” (II.62). Hawkesworth’s Cook tells the English reader not to “hastily conclude that theft is a testimony of the same depravity in [the Tahitian native] as it is in [them]”; for “an Indian among penny knives, and beads, or even nails and broken glass, is in the same state of trial which the meanest servant in Europe is among unlocked coffers of jewels and gold” (II.63).

It is not that all natives are being rendered more “civilized” in Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*. The natives of Tahiti are condemned with less fervor than the “savages” (II.27)<sup>52</sup> of Tierra del Fuego, whose “vacant indifference” leads the Captain to conclude that: “Curiosity seems to be one of the few passions which distinguish men from brutes” (II.28). The natives of New Zealand are “unfortunate and inhospitable” (III.186), and even being cast as the most tolerable of all natives doesn’t save the people of Otaheite from being labeled thievish and immodest. Regardless of location or which group of indigenous people they are interacting with, however, the British

---

<sup>52</sup> Interestingly, the term “savage” is not used in Cook’s *Journal*.

sailors seem to be degenerating rapidly. Hawkesworth's narrator uses the vocabulary of savage, bestial "other"—the same rhetoric that Pamela uses when positioning herself above her captors back in the "domestic" space—to condemn his errant, English crew. When one of the *Endeavour's* crew has his "musquet" snatched away" by "one of the Indians," the Captain suggests that the sailor's decision to have the marines fire upon the thief is due to "the natural petulance of power newly acquired, and...a brutality in his nature" (II.57). After the quadrant is stolen, the Captain is quick to announce that the "confining of Tootah [was] contrary to [his] orders," and hesitates to completely reject that natives' claims that their chief "had been beaten and pulled by the hair" while in captivity<sup>53</sup> because he is concerned that "the Boatswain had behaved with a brutality which he was afraid or ashamed to acknowledge" (II.72).<sup>54</sup> It is "cowardice, or cruelty, or both" that causes a British sailor to "level a third piece" at one of the natives of Oteroah "as he was swimming away" (172). Hawkesworth's Captain is forever "giv[ing] strict orders that [natives] should not be fired upon," but the savage inhumanity of his English crew makes them "ready to take away the lives that were in their power, upon the slightest occasion" (II.93). In the few cases in which Cook orders violence against the natives, it is only after it had "become necessary to repress them." In New Zealand, the natives are so

---

<sup>53</sup> Pamela is, of course, wooed with clothing and other commodities before she ends up being kidnapped by Mr. B. The issue of captivity is interesting because, of course, it is Cook that ends up kidnapping natives in the *Voyages* by using the "power of presents" (II.182). He is constantly trying to "get some of the people into [his] possession" (II.181). It is only after "little Tayeto, Tupia's boy" is "seized...and dragged...down into the canoe" of a native group from New Zealand that Cook feels compelled to name a piece of land after what seems to be a popular activity on the *Endeavour*, and "Cape Kidnappers" (II.192) is christened.

<sup>54</sup> In Cook's *Journal*: "Immediately a resolution was taken to detain all the large Canoes that were in the Bay, and to seize upon Tootaha and some others of the Principle people and keep them in Custody until the Quadt was produce'd." Only later did Cook give "order that if Tootaha came either to the Ship or the Fort he was not to be detain'd, for I found that he had no hand in taking away the Quadrant" (49).

“unfortunate and inhospitable” (II.186) that the Captain is “obliged to fire upon them in...defence” and four are “unhappily killed” (II.181). Always rational, benevolent and virtuous, Hawkesworth’s Captain must be forced to the furthest limits before he will react with the level of “brutality” that he sees all around him. He is, indeed, “beset on all hands” (*Pamela* 113).

But the single most important attribute that secures the fictionalized Captain’s status as an enlightened, “domestic” hero is his chastity. In ““Southern Passions Mix with Northern Art’: Miscegenation and the *Endeavour* Voyage,” Bridget Orr asserts that “chastity...played a crucial role “in the image that was constructed of Cook as a “hero of science and humanity.” Orr notes that “Banks’ most recent and authoritative biographer, Harold B. Carter, suggests that in Tahiti, not even the Quaker Sidney Parkinson was without a mistress, leaving Cook the only man on board the *Endeavour* without a Tahitian lover” (225). Orr argues that “Cook’s singular self-restraint, which stood in such striking contrast to the conduct of Banks and the rest of the crew, meant he served as a figure whose disinterested humanity, untainted with sensual indulgence, helped redeem an increasingly tattered ideology of exploration and colonization” (218).<sup>55</sup> Hawkesworth’s Captain does not display the “disinterested” quality that marks Cook in his own *Journal*. Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*, of course, included a wealth of lascivious “interest” and detail through his use of Banks’ journal. But the Cook of Hawkesworth’s *Account* makes a concerted effort to

---

<sup>55</sup> Cook’s “invulnerab[ility] to sexual stirrings” is reminiscent of Dee Ann DeLuna’s argument about the “Virginal hero” quality of Robinson Crusoe. In “Robinson Crusoe, Virginal Hero of the Commercial North,” DeLuna notes that on the island and during all subsequent travels, Crusoe is so completely focused on making physical improvements or functioning in mercantile space that matters of sexuality are subsumed. Also in reference to Crusoe, James Joyce famously said: “He is the true prototype of the British colonist. ... The whole Anglo-Saxon spirit is in Crusoe: the manly independence, the unconscious cruelty, the persistence, the slow yet efficient intelligence, the sexual apathy, the calculating taciturnity.”

separate himself from Banks and his “aristocratic deviance” (Orr 218) even as he relates the wealthy botanist’s sexual antics. Hawkesworth’s Captain expresses a curious interest in Banks’ sleeping arrangements: documenting when “Mr. Bank’s tent was got up;” when “he slept on shore for the first time” in Tahiti (II.59); that “Oberea . . . was very pressing to sleep with her attendants in Mr. Bank’s tent” (II.94); that Banks would “undress” before his Tahitian slumber parties “as his custom was” (II.101); that “particularly Mr. Banks” would sleep “frequently in [the Tahitian natives’] houses in the woods, without a companion, and consequently wholly in their power” (II.117). While never actively involved in questionable sexual activity, Hawkesworth’s Captain is always ready to observe, document, and make sweeping statements about the crews’ and natives’ habits. Earlier in the voyage, the narrator forms an opinion of the “Ladies” of Rio de Janeiro without even having even stepped foot in town through “what Dr. Solander saw of them when he was on shore.” Though the Captain admits that “[t]his censure is certainly too general,” he goes on to state that: “It is, I believe, universally allowed, that the women, both of the Spanish and Portuguese settlements in South America, make less difficulty of granting personal favours, than those of any other civilized country in the world” (II.19). Once the *Endeavour* exits the “civilized . . . world,” things only get more grisly. Hawkesworth’s Captain proved to his “domestic” audience with great success that the native people (in particular, women) of Tahiti have “no idea of indecency” (123), and the British crew no sense of restraint by offering a set of graphic examples in the *Account*.<sup>56</sup> Cook is so thoroughly the detached “voyeur” in these scenes of

---

<sup>56</sup> The five central examples include: A “curious and interesting” scene involving Banks, Tomio, “a very pretty girl” and the “milk of a cocoa-nut” (II.54); Banks’ “great astonishment” at finding Oberea

English/native interaction that he is able to turn the carnal incidents in Tahiti into a series of “questions which [have] long been debated in philosophy” about whether “shame...is implanted by Nature, or superinduced by custom” (II.79-80).

Hawkesworth’s Captain mulls over the origins of the “venereal disease” that has “made the most dreadful ravages in the island”; expressing concern about the *Endeavour’s* role in the transmission of the disease and noting that by the time they “left the island it had been contracted by more than half the people on board the ship” (II.145-6).<sup>57</sup>

The effect of the chaste Captain’s approach to issues of sexuality in Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* is reminiscent of Sussman’s comments about the relationship between Pamela and Sally Godfrey in Richardson’s novel. Like Pamela, Hawkesworth’s Cook is aligned with “the category ‘soul’” (97). All others—the rakish aristocrat Banks, a crew that has become associated with rash “brutality,” and a native population that has “no idea of indecency”—are aligned “with the category ‘body’” (98). They are “polar opposites” (97). While all others have “gone savage,” Hawkesworth’s Cook has managed to “go domestic”; “preserv[ing] intact the magical boundary defined by his skin from any and all invaders” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse 201). Hawkesworth died on November 17, 1773, less than six months

---

“in bed with a handsome young fellow of about five and twenty” (II.66); a “very singular ceremony” that involved “Oorattooa...taking up her garments all round her to the waist” for Mr. Banks (II.77); “Vespers of a very different kind” in which “A young man...performed the rites of Venus with a little girl...before several of our people” (79); and Mr. Banks thinking himself “fortunate in being offered a place [to sleep] by Oberea” before being robbed “after taking off his clothes, as was his constant practice” (82).

<sup>57</sup> Again, Hawkesworth’s Captain seems interested in separating himself from the men on board. In speaking about venereal disease and his desire to “prevent its progress” in his *Journals*, Cook admits that that: “all I could do was to little purpose for I may safely say that I was not assisted by any one person in ye ship” (56).



after the publication of his *Voyages*, and was never able to defend his “work.” The accusations of inaccuracy, religious indecency and pornography that erupted in the wake of the publication of Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* have haunted the text and its author into the twenty-first century; and Hawkesworth and the piece of literature that he arguably envisioned as his greatest work as a moralist have received little attention. Hawkesworth’s Richardsonian Captain, whose chastity and virtue separates him from all savage and morally corrosive elements, has had tremendous impact upon the mythologizing of Captain Cook. Though the *Account* certainly operates as an exposé of the violent and “savage” elements of imperial interaction, Hawkesworth’s Cook emerges a benevolent, benign, rational, and singularly Enlightened “angel of light” (*Pamela* 69), a true Richardsonian Heroine.

“Mr B.”: *The Pitfalls of Excess and Passion*

It was Sir Joseph Banks who pulled William Bligh out of obscurity and placed him on the *Bounty*. In the roughly twenty years between Banks’ excursion on the *Endeavour*, the damaging effects of Hawkesworth’s exposé, and the development of a proposal to transport breadfruit from the Pacific to the West Indies to provide inexpensive food for slaves, Banks had acquired a vast amount of power in the British imperial enterprise. Whether or not the kernel of the breadfruit idea came from Banks himself (he had, of course, seen the plant when traveling with Cook; Dampier, too, had written about it), Banks:

...advised on the purchase of the ship, which was renamed the *Bounty*, and he personally recommended that William Bligh, aged thirty three,

and the sailing master of the *Resolution* on Cook's last voyage, should be commander and purser. Bligh wrote to Banks to thank him for bringing about the appointment, but when Banks visited the *Bounty* at Deptford he found that Bligh had not been told the object of the voyage. When Banks enlightened him he said that he was 'delighted with the idea of rendering such service to the Country and mankind.' (Edwards, *The Story of the Voyage* 130)

It had been a long wait for William Bligh. He had, of course, been on the *Resolution* and had borne witness to Cook's murder at the hands of the native Hawai'ians.

Cook's death was an utter disaster to Bligh's nautical career because the famous Cook would be unable to champion the young man with ambitions of captaincy and, in the complicated realm of eighteenth-century naval politics, this meant that Bligh would be pushed off the critical path. The final insult came with the publication of Cook's incomplete *Resolution* journal, which erroneously attributed credit for a series of maps and charts which Bligh had produced for and with Cook to Lieutenant Henry Roberts (who had since died and so was unable to clear up the issue). His "hand shaking with rage he could barely contain, Bligh drew a thick, angry line through the sentence and wrote in the margin":

*None of the Maps and Charts in this publication are from the original drawings of Liet. Henry Roberts, he did no more than copy the original ones from Captain Cook who besides myself was the only person that surveyed & laid the Coast down, in the Resolution. Every Plan & Chart from C. Cook's death are exact copies of my works. Wm Bligh.*" (Toohey 28)

Thus, William Bligh was both literally and figuratively marginalized. In the seven years that elapsed between the *Resolution*'s return to England and his being selected to lead the *Bounty* voyage, Bligh spent enough time with his career in a state of suspended animation to develop a unhealthy level of resentment. Everyone else had been promoted and had made money. William Bligh was not even a Captain, only

Mr. Bligh; Mr B., whose emotions were raw and who could be “very passionate” (Madison, Introduction, *The Bounty Mutiny*, xv). When Banks (the Mr B. of the *Endeavour* voyage) finally approached him, Bligh threw himself into the project. Banks found and renamed the *Bounty* and immediately began to repurpose the ship, creating a giant nursery in the great cabin to hold a large number of breadfruit trees, most of which would be taken to the English West Indies and some of which would be delivered to the newly created Kew Gardens. Bligh was fully engaged with all physical preparations as well; stocking provisions and reading about ways in which to avoid the ravages of scurvy, preparing the nurseries and learning about botany. In essence, Bligh focused all of his energy on managing the “oeconomy” of space rather than self, an error that would have disastrous consequences. The damaging hallmark of all of the Mr B.s—Richardson’s Mr B., Mr. Banks on the *Endeavour*, Mr. Bligh—is their failure to control their selves. The most critical part of “good oeconomy,” the variety of masculine domesticity that we have been addressing, is not the ordering of physical space but the ability to manage the self and behave in a chaste, virtuous and humane manner. Mr. Bligh’s “oeconomy” was particularly dangerous because it involved lack of self control in combination with exaggerated and obsessive control over domestic life on the ship; namely, provisions. Richardson’s Mr B. and Mr. Banks learned their lesson and were able to recuperate: Mr B.’s acquired virtue was also rewarded, ultimately, and he secured Pamela, the “angel of light” (69); scarred by the record that Hawkesworth published of his bad behavior in Tahiti, Mr. Banks recovered by controlling and censoring the story that Britain was being told about travels of discovery and adventure. Mr. Bligh would not be able to salvage his image

after his “bad oeconomy” bred a mutiny despite his aggressive attempt to textually defend himself.

Given all that rested upon the *Bounty* opportunity, the first in nearly a decade, and the national importance that Bligh had attached to the breadfruit mission, the moment when Fletcher Christian and a few other men stormed Bligh’s cabin on April 28, 1789, must have been horrifying. Of course, according to Bligh’s account (and most of the primary texts about the mutiny are by the *Bounty*’s Mr B.), it was as surprising as it was horrifying:

Just before sun-rising, Mr. Christian, with the master at arms, gunner’s mate, and Thomas Burket, seaman, came into my cabin while I was asleep, and seizing me, tied my hands with a cord behind my back, and threatened me with instant death, if I spoke or made the least noise...I demanded the reason for such violence, but received no other answer than threats of instant death, if I did not hold my tongue. (5)

Allegedly unaware of any motive for mutiny, Bligh was cast out of the *Bounty* with a subset of the crew: “...bore away across the sea, where the navigation is but little known, in a small boat, twenty-three feet long from stem to stern, deep laden with eighteen men; without a chart, and nothing but my own recollection and a general knowledge of the situation of places, assisted by a book of latitudes and longitudes, to guide us” (20). What is most interesting about Bligh’s record of his mutiny-induced “trial in isolation” is the degree to which he is conscious of this narrative being his defense. Almost immediately—directly after detailing Christian and company forcing him into the open-boat— Bligh thanks “Mr. Samuel,” to whom he is “indebted for securing [his] journals and commission, with some material ship papers”: “Without these I had nothing to certify what I had done, and my honour and character might

have been suspected, without my possessing a proper document to have defended them” (7). Further:

As soon as I had time to reflect, I felt an inward satisfaction, which prevented any depression of my spirits: conscious of my integrity, and anxious solicitude for the good of the service in which I was engaged, I found my mind wonderfully supported, and I began to conceive hopes, notwithstanding so heavy a calamity, that I should one day be able to account to my King and country for the misfortune. (10)

More unbelievable—and really, ridiculous—is the image of Bligh cast adrift in his miserable, crowded boat, tenaciously hunched over his journal in the rain: “After writing my account, I divided the two birds...every person thought he had feasted” (35). And on the beach: “I had my journal on shore with me, writing the occurrences in the cave, and in sending it down in the boat it was nearly snatched away but for the timely assistance of the gunner” (18). It was entirely possible, of course, that Bligh’s version of the mutiny story might be the only record ever to make it home to England and Bligh likely hoped that this might be true. In the *Story of the Voyage*, Edwards notes that:

Bligh knew the importance of monopolizing the published record, or at least the importance of getting in first, establishing an official version, and investing it with authority. His own vituperative disagreements with the official version of Cook’s last voyage, especially what James King recorded, remained quite literally marginalized...With himself in command, he was intolerant of alternative views. His first lieutenant on the *Providence* wrote: ‘Among the many circumstances of envy and jealousy, he used to deride my keeping a private journal, and would often ironically say he supposed I meant to publish.’ In the open-boat journey, he kept writing materials strictly to himself. It was not just a rhetorical way of putting things to say that the moment Bligh was forced into the *Bounty*’s launch, on 28 April 1789, with his eighteen companions, he entered on a long voyage of self-exoneration, self-justification, and self-congratulation. (131)

Though “[f]abrication and lying... play no part in Bligh’s presentation of himself” Edwards writes, “he was adept at suppression” (132), and so while reading Bligh’s narrative, it is just as important to witness what is *not* being recorded (and there was a fair amount), such as the fact that while forcing Bligh into the launch, Fletcher Christian supplied him with his own sextant.

First, William Bligh must be situated within the framework developed in this chapter; the gap between the aristocratic (Mr B., Banks) and the puritan, “middling” protagonist (Pamela, Hawesworth’s Richardsonian Cook) who consciously constructs a written defense of the boundaries of their brand of virtuous, domestic heroism or “oeconomy.” Bligh was middle class, he had little education, and he articulated some class anxiety in his narrative, writing that some of the young men on the ship were from good families and backgrounds; better than his. Bligh wrote that “Christian, the captain of the gang, is of a respectable family in the north of England” (10). Christian was also “...an excellent scholar...” (E. Christian, *APPENDIX* 150). Mr. Bligh—like Hawkesworth’s Cook—depicts himself as being far more actively “domestic” than Pamela, exerting a huge amount of energy detailing the control that he extends over the domestic space of the ship. Both Bligh and Cook were captains and pursers, but “it was recognized as a dangerous combination”:

Pursers were objects of almost universal suspicion because they distributed provisions, accounted for every ounce of food and every farthing of expense. Pursers were the brokers of every transaction on a ship and had to find a profit in the transactions if they were to win back the surety they had laid down... Shipwreck, mutiny, or accident was never a reason to compensate a purser for his losses... When it came to captains who were also pursers, sailor’s stomachs were also spaces of power. (Denning 23)

It would later come to light that Bligh's double role as captain and purser and his obsessive control over provisions was an issue during the *Bounty* Voyage: "...their discontent was increased from the consideration that they had plenty of provisions on board, and that the Captain was his own purser" (E. Christian 136). Bligh's focus on food was a small aspect of an almost pathological complex about maintaining general, domestic order:

A few hours before [the mutiny], my situation had been particularly flattering. I had a ship in the most perfect order, and well stored with every necessity for both service and health: by early attention to those particulars I had, as much lay in my power, provided against any accident, in case I could not get through Endeavour Straits, as well as against what might befall me in them; add to this, the plants had been successfully preserved in the most flourishing state: so that, upon the whole, the voyage was two-thirds completed, and the remaining part in a very promising way; every person on board being in perfect health, to establish which was ever amongst the principal objects of my attention. (10-11)

It seemed shocking to Bligh that a mutinous uprising could possibly crop up in such a well-ordered ship; that, somehow, everyone should be content with rows of salted pork, healthy breadfruit trees and healthy bodies. Perhaps, had this "Mr B." spent more time controlling his passions and less time trying to control his "wooden world," he would not have ended up cast adrift in the launch. In the launch, however, this focus on provisions (though with very good reason) continues and is visible throughout Bligh's narrative. "[F]ully determined to make what provisions I had last eight weeks, let the daily proportion be ever so small" (21), Bligh "got a pair of scales, made with two cocoa-nut shells; and, having accidentally some pistol-balls in the boat, 25 of which weighed one pound, or 16 ounces, I adopted one, as the proportion of weight that each person should receive of bread at the times I served

it..." (25-26). Later, "determined to know the exact quantity of bread I had left; and on examining found, according to my present issues, sufficient for 29 days allowance" Bligh "determined to proportion my issue to six weeks" (33). The narrative is really a running commentary on the trials of trying to preserve, secure, and divvy up provisions—rum, wine, bread, salted pork, captured birds ("noddies" and "boobies"), turtles, wild beans—among those who are worst off, whom Bligh fondly refers to as "my invalids" (48). Of the three altercations that are reported in the narrative, two have to do with provisions. Bligh reports that there "are only two pounds of pork left" and that since he "could not keep [it] under lock and key as [he] did the bread" the pork "had been pilfered by some inconsiderate person" (41). In another incident, a group sent out to capture birds "returned, with only twelve noddies" because of "the folly and obstinacy of one of the party, who separated from the other two, and disturbed the birds." The "offender" is given a "good beating" (48). Perhaps in an attempt to avoid the same accusations of "Providential heresy" that plagued Hawkesworth, Bligh never misses an opportunity to prostrate before divine intervention, counting almost everything as a "blessing of Providence" (29). Bligh makes certain that his charges recognize "providential circumstance" (38), "directed...prayers" (42), "returned God thanks for his gracious protection, and with much content took [their] miserable allowance" (37). When the group finally reaches a safe port, Bligh writes:

But, instead of rest, my mind was disposed to reflect on our late sufferings, and on the failure of the expedition; but, above all, on the thanks due to Almighty God, who had given us power to support and bear such heavy calamities, and had enabled me at last me to be the means of saving eighteen lives. In times of difficulty there will generally arise circumstances that bear more particularly hard on a



commander. In our late situation, it was not the least of my distress, to be constantly assailed with the melancholy demands of my people for an increase of allowance, which is grieved me to refuse... When I reflect how providentially our lives were saved... with scarce anything to support life, we crossed a sea of more than 1200 leagues, without shelter from the inclemency of the weather; when I reflect that in an open boat, with so much stormy weather, we escaped foundering, that not any of us were taken off by disease, that we had the great good fortune to pass the unfriendly natives of other countries without accident, and at last happily to meet with the most friendly and best of people to relieve our distress... (62-3)

Bligh credits “the assistance of Divine Providence” (64) for helping him craft himself into a life-preserving hero.<sup>58</sup>

In an attempt to assign cause for the mutiny not to his own behavior or conditions on board the ship, Bligh preemptively scripts his defense against all others:

It will naturally be asked, what could be the reason for such a revolt? in answer to which, I can only conjecture that the mutineers had assured themselves of a more happy life among the Otaheitans, than they could possibly have in England; which, joined to some female connections, have most probably been the principal cause of the whole transaction. The women of Otaheite are handsome, mild, and cheerful in their manners and conversation, possessed of great sensibility, and have sufficient delicacy to make them admired and beloved. The chiefs were so much attached to our people, that they rather encouraged their stay among them than otherwise, and even made them promises of large possessions. Under these, and many other attendant circumstances, equally desirable, it is now perhaps not so much to be wondered at, though scarcely possible to have been foreseen, that a set of sailors, most of them void of connections, should be led away; especially when, in addition to such powerful inducements, they imagined it in their power to fix themselves in the midst of plenty, on the finest island in the world, where they need not labour, and where the allurements of dissipation are beyond anything that can be conceived. (11)

---

<sup>58</sup> Bligh also seeks to situate himself in a larger narrative (as Hawesworth’s Cook and Pamela do). At one point he writes: “The chart I have given, is by no means to supersede that made by Captain Cook, who had better opportunities than I had, and was in every respect properly provided for surveying... Perhaps, by those who shall hereafter navigate these seas, more advantage may be derived from the possession of both our charts, than from either singly” (51-52). The effect is different, however. It feels as though even as Bligh bobs along in his launch in the rain, he is desperately trying to make his mark upon nautical history.

According to Bligh, the root cause of the mutiny was the ever-present pitfall of carnality and the lure of the Tahitian women—the same group that enticed and irreparably tarnished the reputation of Sir Joseph Banks years prior. Bligh asserted that he heard the mutineers cheering “‘Huzza for Otaheite,’” (10) after he was forced into the launch and assumed that they were bound for Tahiti. Bligh was not corrupted, his chastity and sexual boundaries remained preserved, and he elevates himself by issuing this thoughtful diatribe on the dangers of unchecked appetite from his open air boat. It does seem that Bligh was exceedingly chaste. In his Introduction to *The Bounty Mutiny*, R.D. Madison writes that Bligh was constructing a “self that he increasingly reveals as fastidious” in his narrative and repeats that at one, prudish point, “[d]espite being assured of the protocol, Bligh declined to denude himself from the waist up as a prerequisite to meeting a Tahitian dignitary” (xiii). Still, there is a gap in Bligh’s rendition of the story that causes pause, and he articulates too plainly and too frequently throughout the narrative that he is conscious of the fact that he needs to craft his defense. Is it really plausible that a mutiny resulted solely from the crew’s desire to spend more time with their Tahitian favorites? The ramifications for mutinous behavior were severe, as evidenced by the punishments of Ellison, Millward and Burkitt who were “hanged with high priority” in October 1792. There is one, small allusion in Bligh’s narrative that implies that something larger was going on in the floating breadfruit nursery:

...Notwithstanding the roughness with which I was treated, the remembrance of past kindnesses produced some signs of remorse in Christian. When they were forcing me out of the ship, I asked him, if this treatment was a proper return for the many instances he had

received of my friendship? he appeared disturbed at my question, and answered, with much emotion, ‘That, — captain Bligh,—that is the thing—I am in hell—I am in hell.’ (10)

What did Fletcher Christian mean? What did his hell look like?

It is far easier to control and place yourself on the heroic side of the record when yours is the only record. Bligh only references the mutineers once more in his narrative. At the very end of his record, Bligh writes that the mutineers will likely not “suspect that the account of their villainy has already reached their native country” (63). It had been “copied into all the English newspapers” that “...When [when the mutineers] returned to Otaheite, after executing their infernal project, the natives, suspecting some mischief from the non-appearance of the Commander and the gentlemen with him, laid a plan to seize the vessel and crew; but a *favourite female* of Christian’s betrayed the design of her countrymen” (E. Christian 148). Bligh likely couldn’t imagine that a counter weight to his story would ever be added. In a chapter appropriately entitled “The silence of Fletcher Christian,” Edwards writes:

For an affair that has been so hotly and vociferously debated and disputed since it happened, the contemporary printed record is this and one-sided...it is illuminating to focus on what was available to the public at the time. Bligh published his *Narrative of the Mutiny* as soon as he got back to England in 1790. His wider account, *A Voyage to the South Sea*, which included a slightly revised version of his *Narrative*, was edited for him by James Burney and Banks and published in 1792, which he was at sea in the Providence on his second (and successful) attempt to collect the breadfruit plants. Then in 1794 Bligh published his *Answer to Certain Assertions* challenging the argument of Edward Christian that it was his own behaviour that caused the mutiny. And that is all that was printed from those who sailed in the Bounty. (131)

Edward Christian tried to defend the mutinous actions of his brother. He approached the damage control in three ways: (1) by providing a record of oral testimony that depicted Fletcher Christian as being a well-respected sailor and good man; (2) by

attempting to argue that Fletcher Christian was a chaste and virtuous man who wasn't interested in the carnal lures of Tahiti, a line of argument that wasn't particularly successful; and (3) by asserting that it was ultimately Bligh's "very passionate" (151) nature and his inability to temper his demeaning, belittling and verbally (not physically<sup>59</sup>) abusive treatment of his crew that caused the mutiny. Edward Christian argued that his brother "never had a female favourite at Otaheite, nor any attachment or particular connexion among the women": "It is true that some had what they call *their girls* or women with whom they constantly lived all the time they were upon the island, but this was not the case with Christian." "Until this melancholy event," Edward Christian argues, "no young officer was ever more affectionately beloved for his amiable qualities, or more highly respected for his abilities and brave and officer-like conduct." His colleagues noted that Fletcher Christian was "*a gentleman...a man of honour...adorned with every virtue...*" and no one ever heard him lose his temper or "*heard him say Damn you, to any man on board the ship*" (149). In this respect, it appears that Fletcher Christian and Mr. Bligh were quite different. The most damning evidence that Edward Christian offers details the excessively passionate Mr B.'s use of "bad language":

They declare that Captain Bligh used to call his officers 'scoundrels, damned rascals, hounds, hell-hounds, beasts, and infamous wretches'; that he frequently threatened them, that when the ship arrived at

---

<sup>59</sup> Dening notes that "Bligh was not a physically violent man... He was much milder than Cook." (62): "Cook flogged 20 percent, 26, percent, and 37 percent, respectively, on his three voyages...Bligh, on the *Bounty*, flogged 19 percent (63). Further: "It was not till the *Bounty* reached Tahiti that Bligh physically punished his men with any intensity (127)...Bligh always made didactic theatre with his floggings. He always flogged his men in the presence of Tahitian chiefs, their attendants and the common people...a more complete form of degradation. That sort of humiliation breeds hatred. That extravagant exemplarity is bad language" (128).

Endeavour Straits, ‘he would kill one half of the people, make the officers jump overboard, and would make them eat grass like cows’; and that Christian, and Stewart, another midshipman, were as much afraid of Endeavour Straits, as any child is of a rod. Captain Bligh was accustomed to abuse Christian much more frequently than the rest of the officers, or as one of the persons expressed it, ‘whatever fault was found, Mr. Christian was sure to bear the brunt of the Captain’s anger.’” (135)

More details surfaced at the trials of the mutineers in August, 1792, and were reported in the “Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court-Martial.” John Fryer, master of the *Bounty*, who had a contentious relationship with William Bligh from the beginning, reported that during the mutiny, Fletcher Christian said that he had “...been in hell for weeks past” and that “Captain Bligh ha[d] brought all this upon himself...” (77):

Q. What did you suppose Christian meant, when he said he had been in hell for a fortnight?

A. His frequent quarrels with, and abuses from, Captain Bligh.

Q. Had there been any recent quarrel?

A. The day before, Captain Bligh had been challenging all the young gentlemen and people with stealing his cocoa-nuts.” (82)

Edward Christian discussed the cocoa-nut incident (which is one of the “suppressions” in Bligh’s narrative) in his *APPENDIX*. Apparently, when Bligh discovered that Fletcher Christian had taken one of his cocoa-nuts, Mr B. had “called him ‘a thief’ and other abusive names” and then punished the entire crew, telling them: ““You are allowed a pound and a half of yams to-day, but to-morrow I shall reduce you to three quarters of a pound”” (136). It seems to be true that “[w]hen it came to captains who were also pursers, sailor’s stomachs were also spaces of power” (Denig 23). Mr B.(ligh) was utterly incapable of controlling his excessive passions when he felt that his control over physical order (and specifically, provisions) was being threatened. His explosion over the cocoa-nuts, it seems, finally caused the

mutiny— but it was just another in a seemingly endless stream of tirades over food. The crew was penalized for taking liberties with provisions and they were punished by being denied provisions. In *Mr. Bligh's Bad Language: Passion, Power and Theatre on the Bounty*, Greg Denning notes that “‘Sad passion’ was John Fryer’s favourite description of Bligh’s rages” and that “‘Oeconomy’ was Bligh’s own approving word for managing resources”:

‘His damned oeconomy’ was the phrase that a weak and dying David Nelson used to describe the cause of their sufferings. Much of the ease of mind that Bligh felt at the beginning of this terrible voyage came from the ‘oeconomy’ he planned for it and engaged his men to follow. His ‘sad passions’ came mostly from the breaches and suspicions he detected in the working on his ‘oeconomy.’ (100)

Bligh’s brand of domesticity, then, was particularly dangerous. It did not involve the virtuous, almost maternal role of the caretaker that Hawkesworth’s Cook assumed. Rather, Bligh’s pathological need to maintain control over his “wooden world” was the source of his anger management issues.

Earlier in this chapter, it was illustrated that at moments of violent or disruptive rupture in the *Voyages*, Hawkesworth’s hero responds by strategically separating himself from the incident and its participants through the power of writing—that, like Pamela, Hawkesworth’s Cook is the observer and recorder of inappropriate behavior, and never the participant. While Bligh was not physically violent, he was certainly verbally abusive. The excessive passions of the *Bounty*’s Mr B. made him behave inappropriately, and these passions were every bit as crippling and damaging as the carnal passions of the other two Mr B.’s (Banks and *Pamela*’s rakish aristocrat). Denning situates the *Bounty* mutiny within “some of the tensions that Europe was experiencing as it changed its systems of social control,” especially

in “institution[s] of discipline, like the navy.” The emergent brand of “[o]fficers in new navies and new armies must be ‘gentlemen’”: A “‘gentleman’ had the social knowledge of how institutions worked” and “managed violence.” A “‘gentleman’” writes Denning, “did not use bad language.” Fletcher Christian, with his superior family and education and his unwillingness to use abusive language, was said to be a gentleman. Mr. Bligh was not. At the moment of mutiny, according to the oral record captured by Edward Christian, Fletcher was incredulous when Bligh expressed confusion over why he was being forced out of his ship: “‘Can you ask, Captain Bligh, when you know you have treated us officers, and all these poor fellows, like Turks?’” (E. Christian 142). Bligh was treating his crew “like Turks” because he had mentally “othered” them and determined that they had gone savage in their intimate interactions with the people of Otaheite. Denning argues that there was something about the ship and her crew in Tahiti that “triggered Bligh’s rage at how distant the wooden world of the *Bounty* was from what he ambitioned it to be”:

There, in such an ambivalent space, even the language of the crew began to change. What stuck in the memory of those who tried to describe Christian on the morning of the mutiny was the sort of Tahitian-English pidgin he was using. ‘Mammoo’ (*mamu*), ‘Silence’, they remember him shouting...there is a suggestion that the crew of the *Bounty* had been marked by something more than tattoos at Tahiti. They had begun to intersperse Tahitian words in their speech with one another...Bligh might rage at their seamanship, but it was more than their incompetence that angered him. They were touched and changed by something outside their wooden walls. They showed it on their skin and in their speech. (57-58)

One must not underestimate the power of language. Pamela and Hawkesworth’s Cook are separated, elevated, and ultimately mythologized through the power of the written word. Despite his very conscientious effort to harness the power of writing, Bligh is

undercut by the corrosive power of ungentlemanly speech. Perhaps Bligh read the tattooing and the Tahitian/English linguistic markers as indicators that members of his crew were “going native”— but his response to their perceived savagery only lay Mr B.’s innate savagery bare. Bligh was not a gentleman. He used bad language. Though not aristocratic, like the other Mr B.s, Bligh abused the power of his elevated station within the power dynamic of the ship. As Edwards writes:

Bligh could only behave in this way because those whom he loved to torment could not answer back. He was shielded and protected from retaliation by the whole grim terror-structure of naval discipline, which made him inviolable and invulnerable... Fletcher Christian finally snapped... The act of mutiny was an act of madness. (140)

Mr B.(ligh) reads very much like Richardson’s Mr B. in this context, tyrannically abusing the powerless. As much as Bligh tries to “other” Fletcher Christian and the mutinous crew by suppressing his own passionate transgressions using the power of the written word, he is haunted by the excess of his own bad language. Bligh fails to exert control over his own self, fails to preserve his boundaries intact, and exerts excessive control over food. Bligh’s “damned oeconomy” proved too much for a number of his crew to bear.

To return to the binaries that have been developed throughout this chapter, Hawkesworth’s Cook (via Richardson’s *Pamela*) is aligned with the category “soul”: benevolent, benign, rational, Enlightened, chaste and virtuous, he engages in intellectual labor (writing) to control his world and his self. The opposite end of the spectrum—the category “body”— has been occupied by those who fail to control their selves: *Pamela*’s Sally Godfrey; the women of Otaheite; the two rakish, aristocratic Mr B.s (even if they do end up redeeming themselves). Those associated



with “body” are marked by untempered passion and emotion, action or aggression, and are associated with all of the trappings of the “other.” Subjected to a “trial in isolation” (be it Pamela’s imprisonment at Mr B.’s country manor house or trapped in the confines of the floating, wooden worlds of the *Endeavour* or *Bounty*) one may either “go domestic” or “go savage.” Through the power of writing, Hawkesworth’s Captain Cook is positioned against all “others,” the natives and his own men included, and through “noting the similitude and dissimilitude” (*Voyages* I.v) Cook is ultimately represented as an enlightened, benign, and singularly domestic “angel of light” (*Pamela* 69). Bligh’s attempt to position himself against all others in his narrative fails. The binaries collapse once the evidentiary record of Bligh’s oral infractions emerge and so, both Mr B.(ligh) and Fletcher Christian are aligned with the category of “body”—the excesses of their passions landing them on the wrong side of history’s record. I have described the presence of the carnal “other” in *Pamela* and Hawkesworth’s *Account of the Endeavour* voyage in terms of ghosting, arguing that Sally Godfrey haunts *Pamela* like the muted yet powerful sexualized Tahitian female body haunts Hawkesworth’s *Account*. Fletcher Christian, to use Bligh’s language, “dissipat[es]” when subjected to the “allurements” of Tahiti (11), the mutineer and his accomplices disintegrate and melt into terra incognita. The only image of Fletcher Christian that we are left with and haunted by<sup>60</sup> is Bligh’s very odd description:

---

<sup>60</sup> Bligh’s narrative, too, has some decidedly dark, “gothic” moments. The morning after the mutiny, the eighteen “walked down the beach, every one in a silent kind of horror” (18); and during the voyage in the open-boat, there were moments when “some of [the] people seemed half dead; [their] appearances horrible,” being filled with “horror and anxiety” (31-2). By the end of the ordeal, “extreme weakness, swelled legs, hollow and ghastly countenances, great propensity to sleep, with an apparent debility of understanding, seemed to be melancholy presages of their dissolution” (55); and so

Fletcher Christian, master's mate, aged 24 years, five feet nine inches high, blackish, or very dark brown complexion, dark brown hair, strong made; a star tatowed on his left breast, tatowed on his back-side; his knees stand a little out and he may be called rather bow-legged. He is subject to violent perspirations, and particularly in his hands, so that he soils any thing he handles. (Bligh, *AN ANSWER TO CERTAIN ASSERTIONS* 162)

Later, back at home in England, Ellison, Millward and Burkit (three of the muntineers who had been picked up by the *Pandora*) would be “hanged with high priority” in October 1792. The French and Haitian Revolutions were underway, the Paris September Massacres had just occurred, Louis XVI and his family were in prison, and England and the rest of the world was reeling with anxiety about threat to social order, the politics of revolution, and the potential destructive power of the disgruntled, subjugated masses; racial and social “others” who were behaving monstrously. The gothic genre would emerge in response to these anxieties in the 1790s and the gothic heroine would become that moment's representation of what it meant to be vulnerable in the midst of the dangerous and chaotic unfamiliar.

---

the sailors in the launch appear to be dissolving as well. At Timor, the rescued men are described as being “specters” with “ghastly countenances” and “eyes of famine” (61).

### Chapter 3: The Attempted Seduction of Mungo Park: Mr B.(anks), Moorish Banditti, and the Mysteries of Africa

Mungo Park's *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (1795, 1796, and 1797), published in 1799, the "Journal" of the adventurer's attempt to trace the course of the elusive Niger River, is "drawn up from original minutes and notices made at the proper moment...preserved with great difficulty" and "offered to the Public by the direction of [Park's] noble and honorable employers, the Members of the African Association" (xxiiiv). It was, not surprisingly, the seemingly omnipresent and omnipotent Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820) who stood up The Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Inland Parts of the Continent of Africa in the summer of 1788. Mungo Park, the young Scotsman educated in medicine who likely met Banks through his brother-in-law, a botanist and founding fellow of the Linnaean Society, was first appointed on Banks' recommendation to serve as assistant surgeon on the *Worcester*, an East Indiaman bound for Sumatra. When he returned from the voyage, Park—who had been asked by Banks to conduct botanical and zoological research while abroad—presented his new patron with a number of specimens and anatomical watercolors of different fish and animals to add to Banks' ballooning collection. Later, and likely at Banks' very convincing urging, Mungo Park offered to serve as an explorer for the African Association. To volunteer for such an expedition was certainly not without risk. The Association had previously dispatched three other adventurers with little gain—the American, John Ledyard, died quickly of illness; Simon Lucas' journey was cut short by a tribal rebellion; and Major Daniel Houghton

(who is referred to often in Park's *Travels*) sent one last penciled note home reporting that he was in good health and en route to Timbuktu before disappearing into the mysterious continent and being presumed dead.<sup>61</sup> Period knowledge of the interior of Africa relied upon Leo Africanus' antique 1526 *Description of Africa*, and British maps from the 1790s depict the interior of the continent as being essentially blank and unknown; the pale trace of the Niger running from north east to south west and dissolving into the uncharted wilderness. Due to the scarcity of information about the continent, as Debbie Lee notes in *Slavery and the Romantic Imagination*, in an era of extreme interest in travel and travel logs, "Africa was pursued with more attention than the rest of the world put together" (23). In 1795—one year after the publication of Ann Radcliffe's influential new type of gothic novel, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*—Mungo Park, who had been hand-selected, trained up, and groomed by the formidable Sir Joseph Banks, set out from Gambia to expand Europe's knowledge of the interior of the "dark continent" and trace the Niger. As Bernard Waites points out in the Introduction of Park's *Travels in the Interior of Africa*, the journal "is a splendid record of what it was, in terms of its original objectives, an unsuccessful journey of exploration." Park "did not reach Timbuktu, and he mapped the course of the Niger for only a relatively short distance," but "his safe return from the hitherto elusive

---

<sup>61</sup> Park confirmed Houghton's death during the course of his first exploration in Africa and reports it in the *Travels*. He first references Houghton when he encounters a "monarch" (46) who is "Pagan": "I had heard that he had acted towards Major Houghton with great unkindness, and caused him to be plundered" (47). Later, in Simbing: "From this village Major Houghton (deserted by his Negro servants, who refused to follow him into the Moorish country) wrote his last letter with a pencil to Dr. Laidley" (94). And finally, Park writes talks about Houghton's death at the hands of the "unfeeling Moors": "Whether he actually perished of hunger or was murdered outright by the savage Mahomedans is not certainly known; his body was dragged into the woods, and I was shown, at a distance, the spot where his remains were left to perish" (95). During these textual moments, Park is situating himself in a larger tradition of African exploration: "I knew that Major Houghton had collected similar information in the same manner" (179).

river was regarded as little short of miraculous” (xviii), particularly since Park was forced to endure months of captivity at the hands of King Ali and the Moors. In Africa, the most frightening and disorienting of spaces on the periphery, and in particular during his hellish captivity, Park starts to construct his adventuring self after the 1790s model of female vulnerability; the gothic heroine. At many moments, Park’s descriptions of the haunted and haunting landscapes of Africa and the looming threat of attack by wild animals and banditti are viscerally reminiscent of an Ann Radcliffe novel, and the plagued and petrified male adventurer is rendered feminine in his defenselessness and isolation. The same meta-narrative that shaped the domestic hero/ines applies; but as Mungo Park strives to survive and keep his boundaries intact during a particularly lonely and brutal trek through Africa, the gothic aesthetic and associated language of fear, “horror,” and “terror” infiltrate the text. Mungo Park’s depiction of his “novel hero” self is the most “feminine” traveler that will be encountered in this study, far more feminine and vulnerable, really, than Charles Dibdin’s fictional “Female Crusoe,” *Hannah Hewit*, the subject of the next chapter.

Park had some help in developing his deeply literary *Travels* and its unique aesthetic and writing style. As previously noted, there was a great amount of interest in Africa, and Sir Joseph Banks made very certain that any account about the continent would be adequately adjusted and polished. As noted by Waites, “Park had a distinguished helpmate in Bryan Edwards MP,” Fellow of the Royal Society and “former West Indian planter who had made his literary reputation with a *Civil and Commercial History of the British Colonies in the West Indies* (1793)” and who

became Secretary of the African Association in 1795. Edwards also “opposed the abolition of the slave trade and was a highly plausible spokesman for the West Indian interest” (xv).<sup>62</sup> In light of Edward’s anti-abolition position, the little commentary that exists on the crafting of Park’s *Travels* has focused largely upon whether or not Edwards imposed his political perspectives upon Park’s chapter on slavery.<sup>63</sup> Directly after Park returned to Britain from Africa (via a slave ship on a triangle trade route), Edwards “prepared an abstract of [Park’s] journey for the African Association on the basis of information given him by [the explorer], which was incorporated wholesale into the published *Travels*” (xv-xvi). In their article, “Virtual Empires,” Debbie Lee and Tim Fulford assert that the challenge that Banks and the members of the African Association faced was to ensure that a narrative was generated that would “enthral the public without alienating scientists for whom travelers’ narratives were a major, but frustratingly unverifiable source of knowledge”; again, to strike that unavoidable but critical balance between the power of the empirical and the power of the aesthetic:

---

<sup>62</sup> There is no biography of Edwards (his papers have never been located) and so we can only guess at his larger thoughts and perspectives based upon his more prominent and preserved writings. The most comprehensive summary of Bryan Edwards work and professional career may be found in Olwyn M Blouet’s “Bryan Edwards, F.R.S., 1743-1800, in the *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* (Vol. 54, No. 2, May 2000).

<sup>63</sup> Early in the text, Park writes that “Slaves are the chief article” of trade in Africa: “Most of these unfortunate victims are brought to the coast in periodical caravans, many of them from very remote inland countries, for the language which they speak is not understood by the inhabitants of the maritime districts...the poor wretches are kept constantly fettered, two and two of them being chained together, and employed in the labours of the field; and I am very sorry to add, are very scantily fed, as well as harshly treated...The Negro slave-merchants...are called Slatees”(21). In the chapter on Slavery in Africa, Park reinforces that slavery is a part of the fiber of Africa itself and that the children of slaves “are born to no other inheritance” (279). Further, slavery in the continent “probably had its origin in the remote ages of antiquity” and insofar as the “discontinuance of that commerce” is concerned: “the effect would neither be so extensive or beneficial as many wise and worthy persons fondly expect” (290). There is also a Gothic moment when Park is faced by native Africans who, with “looks of horror” and “great terror” repeatedly asked [him] if [his] country men were cannibals”; asked him “what became of slaves after they had crossed the salt water” (296). Seizing an “opportunity of returning (though by a circuitous route) to [his] native country” on a slave ship, Park asserts that conditions on the British ship were not as bad as those on “American slave ships” whose crew were “more rigid and severe” (335).

Edwards made sure Park's narrative was "interesting and entertaining" and had Banks "cast [his] eye" over each chapter for final approval (9 October 1798 in the Banks collection, 2: 204). Together, they ensured that it used a style that was trusted by scientists and philosophers, a style associated with the Royal Society. That style, as historian of science Steven Shapin has argued, was one in which theoretical investments were precluded. It was empiricist, uncontroversial, and polite, intended to persuade readers that the writer was a reliable witness because he was a disinterested gentleman, free from the desire to gain personally from his testimony (Shapin 1994, 122-24, 240-50). Park had to speak (or write) properly, to sound like a gentleman-amateur, so that gentlemen of science, themselves often amateurs, would trust his testimony when they had no means of checking it. Only then would his claims be believed, only then his text be accepted as truth and accorded the status of knowledge. (14-15)

The degree to which Edwards was involved in shaping the complete, final *Travels* is uncertain. Some contemporaries and the handful of modern critics who have written on the topic have asserted that Edwards essentially functioned as a co-author in developing the narrative: Lee and Fulford call Edwards a "ghost-writer" (14). After *Travels* was published, Sir William Young, another member of the African Association, "credited Edwards with the 'judicious compilation and elegant recital of the travels of Mungo Park.'" When the Scottish adventurer took angry exception to Young's assertion, a letter of apology was written that Park was allowed to use publicly. Ultimately, we do "have Edwards' word that his contribution to the manuscript from about Chapter X onwards was editorial rather than co-authorial." It does seem certain, however, that Banks made sure that Park was carefully trained by Edwards to generate the *right kind* of travel account—something perhaps along the lines of what Shapin describes but, I would assert, with an interesting and rather melodramatic twist that seems often to elicit an emotional rather than rational response. In one letter that Edwards wrote to Banks keeping him apprised of the

status of Park's developing *Travels*, Edwards wrote: "Park goes on triumphantly— He improves in his style so much by practice, that his journal now requires but little correction; and some parts, which he has lately sent me, are equal to anything in the English language" (Waites, Introduction to *Travels*, xvii). From this statement, it does seem that Banks and Edwards (and perhaps Park, himself) were conscious of the fact that there were creating something aesthetic rather than purely scientific. The point is that it is utterly impossible to determine where Edwards ends and Park begins. The *Travels* reads as a cohesive account: the tone of the text is uniform and there are no competing voices that the reader is able to identify and disentangle. This observation, though, does not in any way diminish the importance of being cognizant of the very intentional effort that went into mass producing Sir Joseph Banks' vision of Mungo Park and of Africa.

Sir Joseph Banks was controlling the way in which the British Empire was being "romanced": Banks was shaping the story that the empire was telling itself about itself and its project of expansion, which involved sculpting male adventurers— like Mungo Park—into "novel heroes" that the British consumers could incorporate into their own evolving imperial narrative. Banks—"scientist, collector, traveler, advisor of monarch and ministers, and President of the Royal Society"— was the "unseen hand, the shadowy impresario of Britain's colonial expansion in the era before the state had created a governmental machine to administer the empire." Banks "sent explorers out to Africa, Australia, China, and the poles" and "prepared their journals for publication." The rapidly expanding British empire was arguably "Banks's empire," and he alone controlled "a network designed to shape the



circulation of both literary and scientific “knowledge” about remote places and unfamiliar cultures” (Fulford, Lee, *Mental Travelers*, 118).<sup>64</sup> After the scarring *Endeavour* incident, when Hawkesworth’s depiction of the rakish scientist, “Mr B.” gone native spawned a number of satirical attacks, Banks “took steps to ensure he never again lost control of the way exploration was presented to Western eyes”: “He...had a supervisory role over all the narratives of the expeditions with which he was associated,” making certain that the “travel books were carefully prepared to excite public interest— but without embarrassing the explorers” or “pander[ing] to a mass reading public which craved sensation.” Sir Joseph Banks stood squarely behind the burgeoning publishing industry which was “mass marketing remote regions to the European public on an unprecedented scale”: the eighteenth-century readership “consumed travel narratives and devoured danger from the comfort of their homes” (121). Number 32 Soho Square—a house and a series of buildings that mushroomed across the London property— was Banks’ control center: “It was Banks’s home but it was also an Aladdin’s cave of the exotic” (123). Inside, Banks’ “staff and protégés reproduced the fruits of his travels and arranged the seeds and specimens, the letters and documents that poured in from gardeners, scientists, and ministers from all over the world.” “Fully open to scholars,” 32 Soho Square also “held hundreds of maps and travel narratives—effectively becoming a repository of remote places as reconstructed by European knowledge systems” (124). Descriptions of Banks’ 32 Soho Square are, appropriately, I would argue, reminiscent of “Strawberry Hill,” an English villa in the Gothic Revival style, built by Horace Walpole, who is generally

---

<sup>64</sup> In an earlier article, “Virtual Empires,” Lee and Fulford echo this point and actually go so far as to compare Sir Joseph Banks and Bill Gates, arguing that both used cutting edge information technologies to control their webs of influence, dominate the market, and grow their own empires.

believed to have developed the gothic style of fiction, marrying romance and horror, in *The Castle of Otranto* (1764). In Strawberry Hill, Walpole and his architects spent roughly twenty five years and vast amounts of money to cannibalize medieval, “gothic” architectural features from castles, monasteries, and cathedrals—bustresses, turrets, ribbed vaults, arches, stained glass, and other elements—and expand Walpole’s little castle into a rambling, cobbled together monstrosity. Strawberry Hill was a physical extension of Walpole’s larger gothic project. Walpole’s stated aim in writing *Otranto* was to meld elements of medieval romance, which he felt to be too fanciful, with elements of the modern novel, which he felt was too aligned with and confined by realism. The “romance novel”—long dismissed as being too tawdry and potentially corrupting to press into the hands of young and impressionable (generally female) readers—was redeemed by Samuel Richardson and his *Pamela*, which he asserted was “novel” because it demonstrated how minute particulars, carefully arranged, could both interest and educate the reader. To period critics, Walpole’s *The Castle of Otranto*—a “gothic” romance flooded with raw emotion and physical and psychological terror, infused with dark and superstitious elements, and gutted of any pretense of instructional or moral intent—was quickly viewed as a literary regression and the “gothic” as being a toss away genre. The first edition of *Otranto* was also published under the guise of being actual medieval romance from Italy that was discovered, translated, and republished, and so the gothic novel also came to be aligned with fake or distorted documentation. *The Castle of Otranto*, which is almost hysterically over-the-top, and the melodramatic gothic fiction that followed it were focused on eliciting an extreme emotional response that resulted from the

presentation of a set of characteristics: haunted and dark spaces; disorientation and madness; physical and psychological terror and horror; the mysterious and fantastical; superstitious rituals<sup>65</sup>; stock heroes and quick-to-faint heroines who are plagued by some combination of unknown and damning secrets and persecuted by a number of gothic villains, including bandits or banditti, tyrants, maniacs, magicians, monsters, demons, ghosts, or other macabre “others.”

I would argue that Banks and Walpole were really engaged in similar projects; projects that involved processing and presenting depictions of dark, primitive, or foreign “otherness” for public consumption. Consider, for a moment, the natural correlations between the gothic genre and the circumstances surrounding the emergence, shaping, and mass production of the travel narrative in the eighteenth century. In both cases, disorienting and potentially madness-inducing collisions with crude and primitive “otherness” result in emotional, melodramatic textual expressions of physical and psychological terror and horror. Also, in both cases, there is marked anxiety about truth and authenticity of the document. This observation speaks to Jonathan Lamb’s hypothesis in *Preserving the Self in the South Seas 1680-1840* that period ventures into physical terra incognita opened also “the terra incognita of the mind, those hidden spaces where ugly and unsociable impulses lie hidden.” Lamb goes on to argue that “[t]he popularity of books of travels, growing to greater heights as the century advanced, must be explained, then, not in terms the truth they produced (for they were broadly regarded as lies) but in terms of their *potent dramatization of the feelings* incident to the preservation of the self” (6- emphasis mine). Here, Lamb

---

<sup>65</sup> Gothic references to superstition were often aligned with Roman Catholicism, which was deemed a more pagan, irrational and violent religion—reference the Inquisition and the gruesome Spanish Catholic push into the New World.

notes, in these places of contact, “the self suffers a sea change into something off and strange, subject to moods, passions, and corruptions not easily transmitted to a polite audience” (12). Further, in the accounts of these deeply emotional and irrational voyages, “the confusions and passions incident to modern life acquired the glamour of romance by being magnified, not explained and sublimed as a coherent national enterprise” (6-7). In describing Walpole’s *Otranto*, I very intentionally used the gendered word “hysterical” to describe the effect of Walpole’s gothic aesthetic as being “almost hysterically over-the-top.” Lamb’s ambitious analysis of fractured, voyaging selves leaves the issue of gender unaddressed on every level. He does not discuss traveling female bodies or the native women involved in the sex trade. Lamb does not even address the ways in which the “sea-change” that primes the “terra cognita of the mind” and a total loss of rational, reasoned and stable behavior might be read as a shift toward more “feminine” attributes—fickle, fluid, irrational, and emotional. These descriptors are also, of course, aligned with the great gamble of voyaging and venturing itself: Pocock’s “Fortuna” (the blind, Roman goddess) and chance were the sworn enemies of sturdy, Age of Reason thinking. This study involves an analysis of the disorienting sites of contact between British “self” and (sometimes British but) always savage “other(s)” in (real, imagined, or heavily altered) tales of travel. If the site of contact—physical and mental terra incognita—is by its very nature disorienting, and if being submerged in this type of environment renders the subject vulnerable to an irrational, emotional response, it is perhaps only logical that the *illogical* gothic manifests itself in these spaces of confused rupture. In his analysis of the culture of gaming and the development of the eighteenth-century

novel in France, *Enlightenment and the Shadows of Chance*, Thomas Kavanagh asserts that this evolving narrative form and period interest “in probability theory and its relation to the guiding ideas of the Enlightenment” may be yoked to their understanding that much “was at stake in this struggle to tame, domesticate, and render innocuous the brute reality of chance” (25). Of course, if the “brute reality of chance” is part and parcel of terra incognita, it is more difficult – if not impossible—to establish control in that environment. The best hope for imposing rationality that the marooned or captive or traveling body has in this foreign environment is through exerting control over the self—domesticating the self in an attempt to preserve the self when faced with threatening, dissipating, and dissolving otherness. This exercise, initiated and perfected by Sir Joseph Banks, in mass producing and selling “novel heroes” who are textually domesticated by writers hand-picked to romance that particular expedition and adventurer or who (in the case of Park) are instructed to textually self-domesticate, is a cornerstone of the process of controlling the story that the British empire will tell itself about expansion.

Ironically, Walpole’s rather hysterical gothic aesthetic would ultimately be redeemed by a writing woman, Ann Radcliffe, whose “explained supernatural” and well-behaved heroines righted the reputation of the genre by supplying a much-needed dose of rationality and virtue. In essence, Radcliffe salvaged the “gothic” from the literary rubbish heap in the same way that Richardson salvaged the “novel.” Terry Castle notes that despite the fact that Radcliffe “wished to reawaken in her readers a sense of the numinous—of invisible forces at work in the world” since the “Enlightenment, arguably, had done much to eradicate such feeling” (xxi), Ann

Radcliffe was, at her core, “a rationalist of a sort” (Introduction, *Mysteries of Udolpho*, xxii). Though Radcliffe infused her novels with a strong sense of the supernatural, “all of the circumstances of her narrative, however mysterious, and apparently superhuman, were to be accounted for on natural principles, at the winding up of the story” (xxii-xxiii). The “new mysteries” that Radcliffe develops in her gothic works “are those of the imagination” (xxii) and “the human mind itself [becomes] a kind of supernatural entity” (xxiii). Radcliffe was attempting to introduce a new, psychological supernatural into the post-Enlightenment, literary world; to strike a careful balance between an aesthetic that draws upon emotion and religion while retaining enough rationalism that her work would not be dismissed as being—like Walpole’s work—too hysterically over-the-top to warrant serious attention. Ann Radcliffe’s “explained supernatural” or “rational gothic” project and her novelistic strategy bears discussion because she was grappling with the same core issues that period writers were faced with: tension between the clear need to take a rational, empirical, value-neutral, “masculine” approach to stake claim in truth and authenticity and the equally compelling desire to secure the attention and interest of the audience by pressing a more subjective, emotional, “feminine” aesthetic-based approach into use. For all of the reasons outlined above, it is not so surprising that Park utilized gothic aesthetics when relating the story of his plunge into the “physical and mental terra incognita” of Africa. The gothic aesthetics that are presented in Mungo Park’s *Travels*, however, are not “gothic” in the overblown Walpolean sense: Park is too conscious of how critical it is to align himself with some measure of rationality. Instead, it is a Radcliffean sense of the gothic that appears in Park’s

*Travels*; aesthetically rich and psychologically and emotionally engaging, but sufficiently reserved and enlightened to secure sober interest. In Radcliffe's "explained supernatural," the rational tamed or domesticated the disordered supernatural. Radcliffe's fourth and most popular novel, *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, was published in 1794. *Udolpho* was likely a fashionable topic of conversation during the period in which Park was compiling and shaping his *Travels*, which would be published in 1799. There is no proof that Park read *Udolpho*, but there are elements of the novel and, most importantly, of the gothic heroine herself, that are echoed in Park's *Travels*. Radcliffe's Emily St. Aubert, the only child of a landed rural family, is taught by her loving father "to strengthen her mind; to ensure her to habits of self-command; to teach her to reject the first impulse of her feelings...and to acquire that dignity of mind, that can alone counterbalance the passions" (5). The terror that Emily, Radcliffe's enlightened "angel of light" (317), is subjected to in *Udolpho* is her immersion in a larger, gothic structure of fickle and confused chance that she must attempt to reason her way through. First orphaned, then sent to live with an aunt who is duped into marrying Montoni, a tyrannical gamester and "ungrateful, artful man" (280) who imprisons them both in a castle, it quickly becomes clear that the only control that Emily has is the control that she is able to exert over her self. Her father's lessons on "self-command" are Emily's only salvation in this confused gothic landscape that is haunted by chance and physically and sexually threatening banditti. Though the aesthetics are different, the core lesson is really quite similar to the one offered up in *Pamela*, another story about an "angel of light" (69) whose virtue and self-command are rewarded after a trial in isolation. In Park's *Travels*, the Scottish

adventurer has less control than Cook in his *Endeavour* voyage. There is no crew and no “wooden world”; no floating pod of Britishness in the midst of all of the vast—but somewhat charted—unfamiliar. There is only a lone Scotsman with a handful of native guides in the middle of a continent that is truly dark, truly unknown, and animated by chance. Like Emily, Park is even taken captive by a Moorish Montoni, king of the African banditti. It is in this fraught, shadowy space in which the adventurer has no control that the gothic creeps in, and Park responds by behaving like a Radcliffe hero(ine) since his only chance at survival involves establishing complete self-command.

Park’s *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* begins—like so many other eighteenth-century travel logs—with the author’s assertion of authenticity and truth. Park quickly asserts that his *Travels*, as “a composition... has nothing to recommend it but the *truth*,” that “[i]t is a plain unvarnished tale, without pretensions of any kind, except that it claims to enlarge, in some degree, the circle of African geography” (xxiiv). Park goes on to thank his “noble and honourable employers, the Members of the African Association” and express “regret that [this published note of gratitude] is so little commensurate to the patronage [he has] received.” The author also draws attention to the included supplementary maps by Major James Rennel, F.R.S., and points to “a narrative, in abstract, of my travels, by Bryan Edwards, Esq.” “[I]t is impossible that I can present myself before the public,” Park writes, “without expressing how deeply and gratefully sensible I am of the honour and advantage which I derive from the labours of those gentlemen.” “Thus aided and encouraged” (xxiv), Park was able to produce the eminently readable and hugely popular *Travels*



*in the Interior of Africa*. Park asserts that his willingness to place himself in harms' way stemmed not from inability to refuse Sir Joseph Banks, but from his "passionate desire to examine the productions of a country so little known, and to become experimentally acquainted with the modes of life and character of the natives." Conscious of the fact that if he "should perish in [his] journey," all his "hopes and expectations should perish with [him]," Parks steeled his resolution by reaffirming that he "knew that [he] was in the hands of men of honour" (2). Park set out from Gambia, after having spent some time with another one of Banks' close contacts—Dr. Laidley—from whom Park was able to "learn the Mandingo tongue, the language in almost general use throughout this part of Africa, and without which [Park] was fully convinced [he] could never acquire an extensive knowledge of the country or its inhabitants." Park also spent time conducting "researches of this kind"—"collect[ing] information concerning the countries [he] intended to visit...and...observing the manners and customs of the natives in a country so little known to the nations of Europe, and furnished with so many striking and uncommon objects of nature." The time spent at Dr. Laidley's camp was also intended to acclimate Park to the weather and expose him to some of the illnesses present in the disease belt, specifically "the fever, or seasoning, to which Europeans, on their first arrival in hot climates, are generally suspect" (6-7).

Large swaths of Park's *Travels* involve relating "researches of this kind"—the landscape, the animals, myriad types of people and their religious and cultural practices, etc.— but Park does not relate these details in the typical bland, factual

way.<sup>66</sup> In *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Mary Louise Pratt argues that “[t]hough he certainly could have done so, Mungo Park did not write up a narrative of geographical discovery, observation, or collection, but one of personal adventure.” Pratt is correct in her observation that Park’s narrative does not function like John Barrow’s narrative, *Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa in the Years 1797 and 1798, 1801*, and others in which the “travelers are chiefly present as a kind of collective, moving eye” (59), a sober, rational, and detached collector of classifiable, geographical, anthropological, and zoological information. This would fall more along the lines of what Fulford and Lee imagined the model would have been for Banks and the African Association’s type of log; Shapin’s “empiricist, uncontroversial, and polite” travel narrative that would be as easily consumed by the masses who were eager for an exciting adventure yarn as by the scientists and philosophers who had little else to pin their knowledge upon. Admittedly, Park’s narrative bucks these models, but it is not true, as Pratt goes on to assert, that “[t]here is no landscape description at all” (78) in Park’s *Travels*. The first example of such a description appears very early on in the text:

---

<sup>66</sup> Park reports that the natives’ “...domestic animals are nearly the same as in Europe,” but that they have not domesticated the elephant and “acquired the skill of taking this powerful and docile creature, and applying his strength and faculties to the service of man” (10). Thus, “application of animal labour to the purposes of agriculture is nowhere adopted” and “labour is universally performed by slaves” (11). Park details the “Negro Nations inhabiting the Banks of the Gambia: the Feloops, the Jaloffs, the Foulahs, and Mandingoes...” (13), making anthropological statements like the following: “The Mandingoes, generally speaking, are of a mild, sociable, and obliging disposition. The men are commonly above the middle size, well shaped, strong, and capable of enduring great labour the women are good –natured, sprightly, and agreeable...” (17). Further, Park details the “particular national mode” of dress and the fact that their “small and incommodious hovels...A circular mud wall about four feet high, upon which is placed a conical roof, composed of the bamboo cane, and thatched with grass, forms alike the palace of the king and the hovel of the slave” (18). Park offers comments upon the practice of taking a “plurality of wives,” and upon “hereditary slavery” (19). A very large amount of time is spent discussing divisions in the population along religious lines: The natives Park encounters are “divided into two great sects—the Mahomedans, who are called Bushreens, and the Pagans, who are called indiscriminately Kafirs (unbelievers) and Sonakies (i.e. men who drink strong liquors)” (29).

The country itself, being an immense level and very generally covered with woods, presents a tiresome and gloomy uniformity to the eye; but, although nature has denied to the inhabitants the beauties of romantic landscapes, she has bestowed on them, with a liberal hand, the more important blessings of fertility and abundance. (8)

There are descriptions of landscapes, but this is not the voice of an emotionally detached, “disinterested gentleman” (as Shapin might say) scientist. The word “romantic” appears again and again in the *Travels*, first in the above excerpt, but repeatedly in the latter half of the narrative which is, interestingly, the portion of the text that Edwards claimed not to have had as much influence over. At one point, Park notes that “[t]he road was particularly romantic, between two rocky hills; but the Moors sometimes lie in wait here to plunder strangers” (174-175). He later writes about “a romantic village called Kooma” (222) and at another point “a most romantic stream...” (306). Pratt’s thesis is that Park, rather than representing the “landscanning, self-effacing producer of information” who is “associated with the panoptic apparatuses of the bureaucratic state,” represents the “sentimental, experimental subject” who “inhabits the self-defined ‘other’ sector of the bourgeois world, the private sphere” (78). In this way, Park is recognized as being a different kind of hero, a rather romantic hero who, Pratt points out, is feminized over the course of the *Travels* (“another anti-conquest”), particularly when he “becomes the object of the female gaze” (82). Pratt argues, however, that the “private sphere” that Park comes to inhabit over the course of the text, “home of desire, sex, spirituality, and the Individual,” in fact “embodies ideals not of domesticity, but of commerce and private enterprise.” (78). There is certainly no doubt that a current runs just beneath the surface of Park’s *Travels* that speaks directly to British commercial interest in

Africa; this was one of the explicit charges that Park received from Banks and the other members of the African Association. Early on, Park notes that in economic “transactions... it is obvious that the white trader has infinitely the advantage over the African” (23) and he bluntly writes that he “endeavoured...to collect all the information [he] could concerning those important branches of African commerce—the trade for gold, ivory and slaves.” “Such was my employment during the remainder of my stay,” Park writes roughly halfway through his narrative, and he proceeds to “lay before [his] readers the result of [his] researches and inquiries” on this topic (238). Though the natives’ “simple and active way of life preserve them from many of those disorders which embitter the days of luxury and idleness” (255), Park spends more time “lamenting that a country so abundantly gifted and favoured by nature, should remain in its present savage and neglected state” (277):

Much more did I lament that a people of manners and disposition so gentle and benevolent, should either be left as they now are, immersed in the gross and uncomfortable blindness of pagan superstition, or permitted to become converts to a system of bigotry and fanaticism which, without enlightening the mind, often debases the heart. On this subject many observations might be made; but the reader will probably think that I have already digressed too largely. (277-278)

It is in this way that Park rather melodramatically highlights the ways in which Africa might benefit from falling under Britain’s commercial interest and attention. I would argue that Park is not himself, as Pratt asserts, “the picture of the entrepreneur;” that would imply an aura of agency that does not surround the representation of Park at all. It was, of course, Banks, entrepreneur extraordinaire, who was actively captaining the empire-building venture from 32 Soho Square. Rather, Park is the picture of an intensely

vulnerable, British stranger in a strange land: “I was *a stranger*, I was *unprotected*, and I was a *Christian*...From sunrise to sunset I was obliged to suffer, with an unruffled countenance, the insults of the rudest savages on earth” (114). Though history showed that the *Travels* did initiate a larger push into Africa, Park wrote himself as the helpless, inert, “anti-conquest” personified, using the gothic heroine, the 1790’s vision of female distress, as a model.

In effect, through reading Park’s *Travels* and bearing witness to his attempted seduction by the hyper-sexual African women and the “romantic” landscape itself, the captivated eighteenth-century readership were also seduced by haunting, dark, emotionally intense Africa. In *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa*, having stated that he will “detain the reader no longer with introductory matter, but proceed...to a regular detail of the incidents which happened, and the reflections which arose in [his] mind, in the course of [his] painful and perilous journey, from its commencement until... return to the Gambia” (23), Park’s narrative begins. “On the 2d of December 1795 [Park] took [his] departure from the hospitable mansion of Dr. Laidley” (24) and finds “before [him] a boundless forest, and a country, the inhabitants of which were strangers to civilized life, and to most of whom a white man was the object of curiosity or plunder.” The tone of the text is deeply melodramatic from the beginning and Park pauses to note that he “...had parted from the last European [he] might probably behold, and perhaps quitted for ever the comforts of Christian society” (28). Mungo Park’s *Travels* is

really very different than any of the other travel logs and reads like a Radcliffe novel at moments like the following:

The stillness of the air, the howling of the wild beasts, and the deep solitude of the forest, made the scene solemn and impressive. Not a word was uttered by any of us but a whisper; all were attentive, and every one anxious to show his sagacity, by pointing out to me the wolves and hyenas as they glided like shadows from one thicket to another. (50)

Further along in the narrative, Park writes that “[i]n other parts” of Africa: “the disconsolate wanderer, wherever he turns, sees nothing but around him but a vast indeterminate expanse of sand and sky—a gloomy and barren void, where the eye finds nothing to rest upon, and the mind is filled with painful apprehensions of perishing with thirst.” Here, “[s]urrounded by this dreary solitude, the traveler sees the dead bodies of birds which the violence of the wind has brought from happier regions; and as he ruminates on the fearful length of his remaining passage, listens with horror to the voice of the driving blast, the only sound that interrupts the awful repose of the Desert” (145). At other points, the text is punctuated by the narrator “writing to the moment,” italicizing intensely emotional inner reflections upon his likely, imminent demise:

A little after noon, when the burning heat of the sun was reflected with double violence from the hot sand, and the distant ridges of the hills, seen through the ascending vapour, seemed to wave and fluctuate like the unsettled sea, I became faint with thirst, and climbed a tree in hopes of seeing distant smoke or some other appearance of a human habitation, but in vain; nothing appeared all around but thick underwood and hillocks of white sand (160-161)...I cast a melancholy look over the barren wilderness, but without discovering the most distant trace of a human dwelling. The same dismal uniformity of shrubs and sand everywhere presented itself, and the horizon was as level and uninterrupted as that of the sea...I was suddenly affected with sickness and giddiness, and falling upon the sand as if the hour of my death was fast approaching.

*“Here then (thought I), after a short but in-effectual struggle, terminate all my hopes of being useful in my day and generation; here must the short span of my life come to an end. (162-163)*

Later in the narrative:

...I sat for some time looking around me with amazement and terror. Whichever way I turned, nothing appeared but danger and difficulty. I saw myself in the midst of a vast wilderness, in the depth of the rainy season, naked and alone; surrounded by savage animals, and men still more savage. I was five hundred miles from the nearest European settlement... I confess that my spirits began to fail me. I considered my fate as certain, and that I had no alternative but to lie down and perish. The influence of religion, however, aided and supported me...I was indeed a stranger in a strange land, yet I was still under the protecting eye of that Providence who has condescended to call himself the stranger’s friend. At this moment, painful as my reflections were, the extraordinary beauty of a small moss, in fructification, irresistibly caught my eye. I mention this to show from what trifling circumstances the mind will sometimes derive consolation...*Can that Being (thought I) who planted, watered, and brought to perfection, in this obscure part of the world, a thing which appears of so small importance, look with unconcern upon the situation and sufferings of creatures formed in his own image?—surely not!*” (225)

Repeatedly, “[w]orn down by sickness, exhausted with hunger and fatigue, half naked, and without any article of value by which [he] might procure provisions, clothes, or lodging, [Park] began to reflect seriously on [his] situation” (195) in this deeply dramatic way. Park summons his energy textually, noting that “the idea of returning without having made a greater progress in discovery, made [him] determine to go forwards” (86), that despite all of the barbarity and cruelty that he had encountered “to return to England without accomplishing the object of my mission, was worse” (154) than the alternative. Repeatedly, the reader is witness to Park “summon[ing] all [his] resolution, and determin[ing] to make another effort to prolong [his] existence” (163). Interestingly, in moments of extreme duress, Park is not as likely to call upon god or reference “Providence” as he is to reflect upon the

tragedy that would result if the scientific mission were to fail because of his death. When thanks to god are offered, they are framed in that same context: "...I saw with infinite pleasure the great object of my mission—the long sought for majestic Niger, glittering to the morning sun, as broad as the Thames at Westminster, and flowing slowly *to the eastward*. I hastened to the brink, and having drank of the water, lifted up my fervent thanks in prayer to the Great Ruler of all things, for having thus far crowned my endeavours with success" (178-9). When he finally realizes that he must turn back, Park assures himself by underscoring that if he proceeded into the Moors' territory, "advancing more and more within the power of those merciless fanatics," he "should sacrifice [his] life to no purpose, for [his] discoveries would perish with [him]." Park stops to articulate that he "hope[s] [his] readers will acknowledge that [he] did right in going no farther" (195) but, frankly: "whatever may be the opinion of my general readers on this point, it affords me inexpressible satisfaction that my honourable employers have been pleased, since my return, to express their full approbation of my conduct" (196). Park was under no illusions about who his masters were, and Sir Joseph Banks was chief amongst them. Even god's support was only desirable insofar as it helped Park to complete his mission and please his patron.

It is not just the intensely dark and dramatic descriptions of the landscapes that give the *Travels* a gothic cast. Shadowy "banditti"—hallmark villains of gothic literature—haunt Park's narrative. The Scottish traveler is constantly paying customs and duties and is plagued by the fear of pillage, of being "visited either by travelers or banditti" (28). It is never clear that the fear of banditti is justified because they are never actually spotted. This is reminiscent of *Robinson Crusoe* and his obsessive



work to protect his provisions and self from invisible enemies on what appeared to be a deserted island. Early on, Park writes: “I know not indeed that any danger was justly to be dreaded, but the Negroes were unaccountably apprehensive of banditti during the whole of the journey...” (39). Later, Park notes that his guides “informed [him] that in order to avoid the Moorish banditti, it was necessary to travel in the night” (93). At one point in the text, Park and his entourage (one of whom “wore a turban” startle a local who “mistook [them] for some Moorish banditti” (91). The interesting piece is Park’s conscious use of the term “banditti” to describe these “horde[s] of barbarians” who roam the text motivated by a desire “solely to rob and plunder” (160) Park and other unsuspecting travelers. In *The History of Gothic Fiction*, Markman Ellis notes that “Banditti”—“[d]erived from an Italian word *bandito* meaning ‘proscribed or outlawed’”—“had emerged as one of the stock properties of gothic fiction in the 1790s” and “had come to mean, in the seventeenth century, an organized gang of marauding brigands who lived in the mountainous districts of Southern Europe, especially Italy.” In his analysis, in a chapter entitled “Radcliffe and Gothic Masculinity: Banditti and Tyrants,” Ellis looks at the ways in which Radcliffe’s arch villain, Montoni, and the banditti of Udolpho are “heavily armed, passionate in their opinions, and quick to take offence—a masculinity which is the proper gender expression of their political status.” Further, in the heroine “Emily’s eyes, they are an explicit threat to her sexual safety” (58), a threat to her virtue. The textual presence of these “groups of wild...men, committing crimes or holding captives, exudes a lawless sexual excitement that hybridizes picturesque landscapes into the gothic” (59). As the Italian bandits are imported into the already

disconcertingly unfamiliar African landscape, the gothic element is compounded by the blur between the (rumored but never actually witnessed) roving “banditti” and everyone else. Essentially, in Moorish territories, the “expense of [the reigning king’s] government and household are defrayed by a tax upon his negro subjects...a tax upon the different Moorish korrees, or watering places...a tax upon all merchandise which passes thorough the kingdom...[b]ut a considerable part of the king’s revenue arises from the plunder of individuals” (143). Every Moor is a potential “banditti.” The Moors are described by Park as being “a subtle and treacherous race of people” who “take every opportunity of cheating and plundering the credulous and unsuspecting Negroes” (102) and everyone else who is subject to their power. The Moors “treated [Park] with the greatest insolence”: “I was Christian, and of course... my property was lawful plunder to the followers of Mahomet” (104-105). Ali, the king of the Moors, is depicted as arch enemy of Park and all strangers by extension. His “tyrannical and cruel” nature drives him to seek to do nothing but “plague the Christian” (114).

It is an interesting exercise to do a cross-comparison of Radcliffe’s Emily with Mungo Park in their individual times of captivity. In Udolpho, Emily experiences physical, psychological and sexual peril at the hands of Montoni and his rough-edged banditti. In Africa, Park certainly experiences physical and psychological peril at the hands of Ali and his Moorish captors, but not sexual peril.<sup>67</sup> Park is the wrong gender,

---

<sup>67</sup> At least, not of which the reader is explicitly made aware. At the end of the account of Park’s journey, the reader is told that Park confessed to his confidant, Sir Walter Scott, that “several remarkable and interesting adventures which had happened to him on his journey ... were not printed in his travels.” Park, apparently, understood the value of “omission” and opted not to “shock [his readers’] credulity, or render his travels more marvelous, by introducing circumstances which, however true, were of little or no moment, as they related solely to his own personal adventures and

of course. Interestingly, however, Park *does* become the object of a sexually-aggressive (if not threatening) gaze when he finds himself amongst Moorish women, “these harpies” who “were rude and troublesome in the highest degree” (44). Park is constantly surrounded by a throng of overly assertive Moorish women who are “very desirous to see [him].” At one point, Ali’s “whole seraglio” surrounds the defenseless adventurer, “some begging for physic, some for amber, and all of them desirous of trying that great African specific, *blood-letting*.” The greatest amount of attention, however, is placed on “the whiteness” of Park’s “skin and the prominency of [his] nose” since “[t]hey insisted that both were artificial”: “The first, they said, was produced when I was an infant, by dipping me in milk; and they insisted that my nose had been pinched every day till it had acquired its present unsightly and unnatural conformation” (49). The most discussed example of Park’s time as defenseless, male object of the sexually aggressive female gaze involves an incident when “a party” of women “came into [his] hut...to ascertain, by actual inspection, whether the site of circumcision extended to the Nazarenes (Christians) as well as to the followers of Mahomet.” Park is unable to determine if the women’s visit is prompted “from the instigation of others, or impelled by their own ungovernable curiosity, or merely out of frolic” but he does react with understandable “surprise at this unexpected declaration” and opts to “treat the business jocularly.” Park tells the group of inquisitive women that “it was not customary in [his] country to give ocular demonstration in such cases before so many beautiful women but that if all of them

---

escapes.” Details of “the horrors of captivity” were thus left untold, but Park told Scott that he was “much affected” by his captivity and that “he used to start from his sleep in great horror, supposing himself still a prisoner in the tent of Ali” (342). The value of “omission” was not, of course, recognized by Richardson and Hawkesworth, and the gratuitous details of virtue under siege that they provided earned them accusations of pornography.

would retire except the young lady to whom [he] pointed (selecting the youngest and handsomest) [he] would satisfy her curiosity...” (121). The concept of providing “ocular demonstration” has deep roots in the travel literature genre; roots that extend all the way back to Homer’s *Iliad*. The role that “ocular demonstration” played, specifically, in the mapping of Africa is discussed in “Mapping the Niger, 1798-1832, trust, testimony and ‘ocular demonstration’ in the late enlightenment” in which C.W. J. Withers analyzes the important role that direct observation played in the mapping of the elusive Niger. Mungo Park, of course, confirmed the direction of the Niger’s flow but was unable to determine where the river ended before he died in 1805. What is truly bizarre is the fact that Park uses the expression “ocular demonstration” not when discussing his mission— solving the geographical problem presented by the uncharted Niger— but when relaying a story involving him being asked to put his sexual organ on display before a curious group of women. The focus of “ocular demonstration” falls not upon a physical landmark but upon a physical body.

Park is always the central object of curiosity. Like Swift’s Lemuel Gulliver, even Park’s personal effects are objects of interest: “the pocket-compass soon became an object of superstitious curiosity” (117). Park is “constantly attended by as many of [the native Africans] as could conveniently see [him]; one party giving way to another as soon as curiosity was gratified” (70). Later, he is “surrounded by so great a crowd as to make it necessary for [him] to satisfy their curiosity by sitting still” (107). At many points, being the object of the Moorish gaze is decidedly uncomfortable and unpleasant:

I soon found myself surrounded by such a crowd that I could scarcely move; one pulled my cloaths, another took off my hat, a third stopped

me to examine my waistcoat buttons, and a fourth called out *La illah el allah Mahomet rasowl allahi* (There is but one God, and Mohamet is his Prophet), and signified, in a threatening manner, that I must repeat those words...Ali was sitting upon a black leather cushion, clipping a few hairs from his upper lip; a female attendant holding up a looking-glass before him. He appeared to be an old man, of the Arab cast, with a long white beard; and he had a sullen and indignant aspect. He surveyed me with attention, and inquired of the Moors if I could speak Arabic; being answered in the negative, he appeared much surprised, and continued silent. The surrounding attendants, and especially the ladies, were abundantly more inquisitive: they asked a thousand questions, inspected every part of my apparel, searched my pockets, and obliged me to unbutton my waistcoat, and display the whiteness of my skin; they even counted my toes and fingers, as if they doubted whether I was in truth a human being. (111)

And later:

I was no sooner seated in this my new habitation than the Moors assembled in crowds to behold me; but I found it rather a troublesome levee, for I was obliged to take off one of my stockings and show them my foot, and even to take off my jacket and waistcoat to show them how my clothes were put on and off; they were much delighted with the curious contrivance of buttons. All this was to be repeated to every succeeding visitor, for such as had already seen the wonders insisted on their friends seeing the same, and in this manner I was employed, dressing and undressing, buttoning and unbuttoning, from noon to night. (113)

During his Moorish captivity, Park never knows what his fate might be: “Some said that they intended to put me to death, others that I was only to lose my right hand” some said they would “put out my eyes which they said resembled those of a cat” (117). Park’s captivity is miserable expressly because he is the controlled object of curiosity. “The curiosity of the people would not allow me to sleep” (170), Park laments. “This studied and degraded insolence to which I was constantly exposed,” Park writes, “was one of the bitterest ingredients in the cup of captivity, and often made life itself a burden to me.” “In these distressing moments,” the captive adventurer asserts that he “frequently envied the situation of the slave, who amidst all

his calamities could still possess the enjoyment of his own thoughts; the happiness to which [Park] had for some time been a stranger” for “solitude was thought too great an indulgence for a distressed Christian” (119). At other points, Park’s curious “otherness” plays to his distinct advantage. Earlier in the text, when a member of Park’s entourage introduces the European traveler to his family, “the blacksmith” speaks of Park’s “adventures” and his “kindness” and the adventurer suddenly “appeared” in the narrative “like a being dropped from the clouds”: “every one was surprised that they had not observed me before; and a few women and children expressed great uneasiness at being so near a man of such an uncommon experience” (74-75). This moment reads like a textual self-apotheosis. Later in the *Travels*, when Park encounters a group of “Negro horsemen, armed with muskets,” his status as curious object is his salvation and is again framed in terms of divinity or the supernatural:

As I approached them their fears increased, and one of them, after casting upon me a look of horror, rode off at full speed; the other in a panic of fear put his hands over his eyes, and continued muttering prayers until his horse, seemingly without the rider’s knowledge, conveyed him slowly after his companion. About a mile to the westward they fell in with my attendances, to whom they related a frightful story. It seems their fears had dressed me in the flowing robes of a tremendous spirit<sup>68</sup>; and one of them affirmed, that when I made my appearance a cold blast of wind came pouring down upon his from the sky, like so much cold water. (84)

---

<sup>68</sup> This moment harkens back to Johnson (one of Park’s entourage) “producing a white chicken” which he “tied it by the leg to one of the branches” of a tree “and told us that we might now safely proceed, for that our journey would be prosperous”: “This circumstance is mentioned merely to illustrate the disposition of the Negroes and to show the power of superstition over their minds; for although this man had resided seven years in England, it was evident that he still retained the prejudices and notions he had imbibed in his youth.” Johnson offered the chicken as a “sacrifice to the spirits of the woods...a powerful race of beings of a white colour, with long flowing hair. I laughed at his folly, but could not condemn the piety of his motives” (63).

When the visual division between Park as white, Christian, defenseless captive and brown, Mahomedan, savage captor begins to break down, our novel hero is disoriented. As he spends more time in Africa, in his tattered clothing and with his tanned skin, “I was constantly taken for a Moor” (177) Park writes. Further adding to the confusion, Park’s “beard, which was now grown to an enormous length...was always beheld with approbation or envy”: “I believe in my conscience they thought it was too good a beard for a Christian” (142). When Park finally returns to Gambia, his “dress and figure were now so different from the usual appearance of a European, that [the lady innkeeper] was very excusable in mistaking [him] for a Moor.” When Park “told her [his] name and country, she surveyed [him] with great astonishment, and seemed unwilling to give credit to the testimony of her senses” (331). Dr. Laidley “received [Park] with great joy and satisfaction, as one risen from the dead” and the European adventurer wastes no time in shedding his “othered” exterior, “resuming the English dress and disrobing [his] chin of its venerable incumbrance” (332).

There is no doubt in Mungo Park’s Africa that the Moors are the very worst of humanity; “the rudest savages on earth” (114). Most alarming, perhaps, is that the Moors are literate, capable, and domineering; able, even, to capture and completely control Park, the Scottish adventurer, for an extended period of time. It is not markers of race so much as those of religion that sour a group of individuals. “The Moors are rigid Mahomedans, and possess, with the bigotry and superstition, all the intolerance of their sect...” (138). In considering the pagan “Negroes” that he encounters in his *Travels*, Park stops to consider how “greatly it is to be wished that the minds of a people so determined and faithful could be softened and civilized by the mild and

benevolent spirit of Christianity” (14). When, as in the case of the “Foulahs,” “the uncharitable maxims of the Koran” have already infiltrated the group, it is too late for any missionary-type wishing, for those maxims have already “made them less hospitable to strangers, and more reserved in their behaviours.” In Park’s assessment, it seems that one very unattractive byproduct of the Koran is that it allows the converted “to consider all the Negro natives as their inferiors; and when talking of different nations, always rank themselves among the white people” (53). Park frequently describes the pagan Africans as “these poor Negroes” and spends much of his time “very pleasantly” with these natives, since “their company was the more acceptable, as the gentleness of their manners presented a striking contrast to the rudeness and barbarity of the Moors” (108). The Negroes, “[t]hese hospitable people,” are looked upon by the Moors as an abject race of slaves and are treated accordingly” (131). Further, “Christians were looked upon ... as the devil’s children, and enemies to the prophet” (128) and so are also damned by the Moors. Park flatly states that it “is impossible for [him] to describe the behavior of a people who study mischief as a science, and exult in the miseries and misfortunes of their fellow-creatures,” but he certainly spends a large amount of time riddling the *Travels* with blistering commentary on the negative attributes of the Moors. “It is sufficient to observe” writes Park, “that the rudeness, ferocity, and fanaticism, which distinguish the Moors from the rest of mankind, found here” – in the white, Christian, defenseless traveler— “a proper subject whereon to exercise their propensities.” Though the narrative is peppered with warnings, Park offers one lengthy diatribe on the evils of the Moors that culminates in a final warning to future adventurers or colonizers:



I have observed that the Moors in their complexion resemble the Mulattoes of the West Indies, but they have something unpleasant in their aspect which the Mulattoes have not. I fancied that I discovered in the features of the most of them a disposition towards cruelty and low cunning; and I could never contemplate their physiognomy without feeling sensible uneasiness. From the staring wildness of their eyes a stranger would immediately set them down as a nation of lunatics. The treachery and malevolence of their character are manifested in their plundering excursions against the Negro villages. Oftentimes, without the smallest provocation, and sometimes under the fairest professions of friendship, they will suddenly seize upon the Negroes' cattle, and even on the inhabitants themselves. The Negroes very seldom retaliate. The enterprising boldness of the Moors, their knowledge of the country, and above all, the superior fleetness of their horses, make them such formidable enemies that the petty Negro states which border upon the desert are in continual terror while the Moorish tribes are in the vicinity, and are too much awed to think resistance. Like the roving Arabs, the Moors frequently remove from one place to another, according to the season of the year or the convenience of pasturage... This wandering and restless way of life, while it inures them to hardships, strengthens, at the same time, the bonds of their little society, and creates in them an aversion towards strangers, which is almost insurmountable. Cut off from the intercourse with civilized nations, and boasting an advantage over the Negroes, by possessing, though in a very limited degree, the knowledge of letters, they are at once the vainest and proudest, and perhaps the most bigoted, ferocious, and intolerant of all the nations on the earth—combining in their character the blind superstition of the Negro with the savage cruelty and treachery of the Arab. It is probable that many of them had never beheld a white man before my arrival at Benowm; but they had all been taught to regard the Christian name with inconceivable abhorrence, and to consider it nearly as lawful to murder a European as it would be to kill a dog. The melancholy fate of Major Houghton, and the treatment I experienced during my confinement among them, will, I trust, serve as a warning to future travelers to avoid this inhospitable district. (146-147)

The anxiety in Park's long-winded warning is tangible. What is it about the Moors that is so threatening? Is it their "enterprising boldness" and their superior horsemanship? What fuels the Moorish arrogance that allows them to view themselves as being superior to other native Africans and on par with white Europeans? Is it the fact that "[w]ith the Mahomedan faith is also introduced the

Arabic language” (54)? The “poor Negroes” that Park expresses such compassion for are no threat, “[a]s the Negroes have no written language of their own” (16). When Ali first “surveyed” Park, he “inquired of the Moors if [his captive] could speak Arabic” and “being answered in the negative, he appeared much surprised, and continued silent” (111). Park is aware that when dealing with the Moors of Africa, he is not dealing with a set of common, unlettered savages.

The pattern that we have seen across the texts discussed throughout the study continues in Mungo Park’s *Travel in the Interior Districts of Africa*, albeit with a Radcliffean gothic cast: The British body in peril; marooned or rendered captive in a manor house or ship or Moorish camp; the tension resulting from the attempted preservation of virtuous, English self against savage, bestial other either managed with success (or not) by a recurring set of tools or strategies that are pressed into service—control exerted over physical self; control exerted over physical space; and writing. In the case of Mungo Park, especially during his period of captivity at the hands of the Moors, who are threatening and savage because they are lettered and organized, the British prisoner has very little control over his physical self and his physical space. In this situation, rather than behaving like Emily St. Aubert, Park is initially rather Pamela-like in his approach— his strategy is to appear as incompetent as possible. While Park is kept captive in Ali’s camp: “I had laid it down as a rule, to make myself as useless and insignificant as possible” (115-116). Utterly at the mercy of everything around him, Park seems to obsess over caring for his horse and controlling its wellbeing. This “poor animal,” “this worn-out associate of my adventures...lay panting on the ground” and Park reacts “with sympathetic emotion”

filled with “apprehension that [he] should [him]self in a short time lie down and perish in the same manner of fatigue and hunger“ (193). The only control that Park is able to achieve is through writing, and it is through writing himself as a humane, civilized, “lonely captive perishing of thirst amidst the wilds of Africa” (134) that Park is able to best preserve his self and the indelible projection that he develops of his self. Words have tremendous power in Park’s Africa and only those who are lettered wield any sort of control over the gothic environment. Consider the lettered Moor who, “[p]roud of his acquirements... surveys with contempt the unlettered Negro, and embraces every opportunity of displaying his superiority over such of his countrymen as are not distinguished by the same accomplishment” (139). At many points, Park’s familiarity with words, literally, saves him. Throughout the narrative, Park speaks of “the wonderful contagion of superstition” among, specifically, the pagan Negroes, another gothic element in the text.<sup>69</sup> He writes frequently about “certain charms or amulets called *saphies*, which the Negroes constantly wear about them”: “These saphies are prayers or rather sentences from the Koran, which the Mahomedan priests write on scraps of paper, and sell to the simple natives, who consider them to possess very extraordinary virtues.” Park underscores that “all the natives of this part of Africa consider the art of writing as bordering on magic” and acknowledges that “I was myself lucky enough, in circumstances of distress, to turn this popular credulity in this respect to good account” (33). Later in the narrative,

---

<sup>69</sup> References to superstition occur throughout the text: saphies which “contained the Lord’s prayer“ (190) or other bits of writing; native women’s naïve belief in “MUMBO JUMBO,” a “strange minister of justice“ who wields the “rod of public authority” (34); and “An eclipse” which “is supposed to be effected by witchcraft” (252).

Park is asked by a “landlord” to repay him by “writ[ing] a saphie to protect him from wicked men” on a “writing-board”:

I therefore wrote the board full from top to bottom on both sides; and my landlord, to be certain of having the whole force of the charm, washed the writing from the board into a calabash with a little water, and having said a few prayers over it, drank this powerful draught: after which, lest a single word should escape, he licked the board until it was quite dry.

A “saphie writer was a man of too great consequence to be long concealed” (217) and so Park becomes known locally for his magical writing abilities. About a month into his Moorish captivity, Park “endeavoured to beguile the tedious hours by learning to write Arabic”:

The people who came to see me soon made me acquainted with the characters; and I discovered, that by engaging their attention in this way they were not so troublesome as otherwise they would have been. Indeed, when I observed any person whose countenance I thought bore malice towards me, I made it a rule to ask him either to write in the sand himself, or to decipher what I had already written, and the pride of showing his superior attainments generally induced him to comply with my request. (127)

At a later point, when Park is “suspected” of being “some Arab in disguise” because of “the colour of [his] skin (which was now become very yellow from sickness), [his] long beard, ragged clothes, and extreme poverty,” a potentially dangerous group is willing “to admit that [he] was a white man” because they witness that he “could read” a copy of “our *Book of Common Prayer*” (234). After Park escapes captivity and returns to Gambia, he “produced Richardson’s Arabic Grammar to some Slatees” who “were astonished to think that any European should understand and write the sacred language of their religion” (293). Park is also conscious of his place in a larger narrative of discovery— frequently referring to those who went (unsuccessfully)

before him. There is also a tendency to insert fables into the text. Park captures some of the “diverting stories” of “*Seniora*” (“a black woman, who had formerly been the *chere-amie* of a white trader named Hewett”), noting that these “stories bear some resemblance to those in the Arabian Nights’ Entertainments; but in general, are of a more ludicrous cast.” He goes on to “abridge one of them for the reader’s amusement” and details the “STORY OF CATCHING A LIVE LION” (26). This conscious acknowledgement of the power of writing is, again, another tie to Radcliffe and the way in which she inserts poetry and epitaphs into *Udolpho* to situate herself within a larger literary tradition. Mungo Park is fully cognizant of the importance of the log that he is writing and how critical it is that his papers (if nothing else) make their way home to England. Park travels light, with only “beads and writing paper” (50), for trading and documenting. Along the way, Park “delivered most of [his] papers to [a trusted guide] Johnson to convey them to Gambia as soon as possible, reserving a duplicate for [him]self in case of accidents” (104). Park is consistently asking Johnson to “take particular care of the papers [he] had intrusted him with...” (158). When Park finally does return home to England, he “remained for a considerable time stationary in London, and was diligently employed in arranging his materials for the publication of his travels... assiduously employed in compiling and arranging his account of his travels.” Park was “leading the life of a severe student”: his “materials for [the resulting *Travels*]... consisted of short notes or memoranda written on separate pieces of paper forming an imperfect journal of his proceedings” and “[w]here these were wanting, [Park] supplied the deficiency from his memory” (337-338).

The self-crafted “novel hero” that Park produces in *Travels in the Interior of Africa* is depicted, first and foremost, as being intensely vulnerable during this *Travels*, but particularly during his captivity, in Africa. Park and every other native group that he encounters are cast in opposition to the truly brutal, male Moors, of which Ali is king. Park does take a compassionate tone when writing about the “poor Negroes,” and nearly all women, but it is perhaps motivated by the fact that he is so clearly reliant upon the women’s compassion. The text is filled with examples of African women taking pity on the lone, white, Christian stranger who has been cast into this strange wilderness. Early on in the narrative, “an old female slave” when “told...that the king’s people had robbed [Park] of all [his] money... with a look of unaffected benevolence, immediately took the basket from her head, and showing [him] that it contained ground-nuts, asked [him] if [he] would eat.” Park writes:

This trifling circumstance have me peculiar satisfaction. I reflected with pleasure on the conduct of this poor untutored slave, who, without examining into my character or circumstances, listened implicitly to the dictates of her own heart. Experience had taught her that hunger was painful, and her own distresses made her commiserate those of others. (62)

Later, when Park’s “fate was drawing to a crisis,” it is Ali’s first wife, “Fatima (who... had the chief direction in all affairs of state)” who “looked kindly on [him], and ...was at length moved with compassion towards [him]” (135).<sup>70</sup> During his wanderings, it is “an old motherly-looking woman” who “set before [Park] a dish of kouskous” and “corn for [his] horse” and causes Park, “[o]vercome with joy at so unexpected a deliverance” to lift up “[his] eyes to heaven and whilst [his] heart swelled with gratitude, [he] returned thanks to that gracious and bountiful Being,

---

<sup>70</sup> Of course, “Queen Fatima and a few others of high rank” reserve their compassion for strange white men and Park notes that they do not hesitate to “vent their anger upon their female slaves” (141).

whose power had supported [him] under so many dangers, and had now spread for [him] a table in the wilderness” (166). Later, when “no person would admit [Park] to his house,” it is “a woman” who “perceiving that [he] was weary and dejected” took Park in and “performed toward a stranger in distress” the “rites of hospitality.” The “worthy benefactress” calls for the assistance of “the female part of her family” who tend to Park and “lightened their labor with songs” about their guest: “The poor white man, faint and weary, came and sat under out tree. He has no mother to bring him milk, no wife to grind his corn...Let us pity the white man; no mother has he.” Park expresses that he was “oppressed by such unexpected kindness” from his “compassionate landlady” (182) and her female helpers. This particular incident inspired Georgiana Cavendish, the Duchess of Devonshire’s poem “A Negro Song” (1799) in which Parks, the “White Man,” is urged to bear witness and “Remembrance of the Negro’s care.”<sup>71</sup> Park does not hesitate to lavish praise on “the female part of the nation,” who “sympathized with [him] in his sufferings, relieved [his] distresses, and contributed to [his] safety.” Park writes: “I do not recall a single instance of hard-heartedness towards me in the women” (244). During his *Travels*, allegiance

---

<sup>71</sup> Debbie Lee writes that Mungo Park was also “the subject of a play called ‘Mungo’s Address.’” In fact, this “Mungo’s Address” was actually a poem that prefaced a popular period play; a poem that was published in *THE BEE, or Literary Weekly Intelligencer* in 1793 Edinburgh which predates, of course, Mungo Park’s return from Africa. Interestingly, “Mungo” was actually a period “stock symbol of the suffering, abused African” (Sandiford 70), a trope that stemmed from a stage character named “Mungo,” “the ‘cheeky’ black servant in Isaac Bickerstaff’s hugely popular comic opera *The Padlock* (Drury Lane, 1768)... the ‘first blackface comic figure on the London stage’” (Carlson 139). Though the aligning of Mungo Park’s unusual first name with the tragicomic, exceedingly popular “Mungo” of the 18<sup>th</sup> century stage- see also similar characters in *Inkle and Yarico*, Southerne’s and Hawkesworth’s *Oroonoko*, Matthew Lewis’s *The Castle Specter*- is a mistaken correlation, the representations staged in these plays could speak to the aesthetics presented in Park’s *Travels*. Dramatic representations of hypersexual blackness (though attached to black, *male* bodies in these plays - the love interest is inevitably white, female, and vulnerable to this magnetism), do appear in Park’s *Travels*. They are, though, attached to the black, *female* body, and so the standard dynamic is flipped upside down as Mungo becomes the feminized, white figure, whose boundaries are preserved intact and those virtue is rewarded.

developed between Park and the African women and the eighteenth-century female readership and literary community responded by latching onto Mungo Park. The standard dominant power dynamic is utterly disrupted in Park's *Travels*. The white, male, Christian stranger, when placed in gothic Africa, is rendered utterly powerless and vulnerable and almost wholly reliant on the kindness of women. In Mungo Park's own language, in this environment, it is "a white man" who is "the object of curiosity or plunder" (28); a position typically reserved for women, exotic "others" and for simultaneously romantic and horrifying Africa, herself. Perhaps what the female audience was responding to was the fact that they recognized the circumstance that Mungo Park discovered himself in when he traveled into the interior districts of Africa. Helpless, alone, and without agency and control, Park constructed himself as a Radcliffean gothic heroine rather than as a "disinterested gentleman" of science.

Park's resulting *Travels* is a visceral picture of raw humanity under pressure. Lee, Pratt, and other scholars have argued that the immense popularity of Mungo Park's *Travels* ultimately supplied the political momentum necessary to launch a British initiative to push deeper into the continent, a consequence that was likely unintended by Park but certainly championed by Banks. In reading Park's representation of gothic Africa and her dangerously competent and brutal Moorish inhabitants, however, it is difficult to imagine that the *Travels* could have inspired any further engagement with frightening and unfamiliar Africa. The point of Radcliffe's "explained supernatural" was to diffuse gothic fear with rationality, but there is no point at which the horrors of Park's *Travels* dissipate through the magic application of measured logic. The indelible image that the reader is left with is of a



continent that is unfamiliar, deeply foreign, unknowable, and frightening. Park's core geographic mission had failed since he had to turn back and was never able to complete the map of the Niger, but his first achievement was his survival; his ability to preserve his boundaries intact despite constant assaults on his white Christian body and psyche. In Africa, as detailed in his narrative, Park was reduced to an exposed and defenseless "object of curiosity or plunder." Back home in England, he became "an object of much interest and attention" (340), a "man whose mind was full of ambitious views, and of adventurous and romantic undertakings" (339), but an object nevertheless. It is clear that Park's greatest accomplishment was the sublime *Travels* that he generated and the gothic novel hero(ine) that he developed who would haunt both England and Africa for centuries. Park's Africa is depicted as being haunted by Moors, banditti, horrifying animals, and superstitions. In returning from Africa, Mungo Park was haunted by memories of Africa and of "the horrors of captivity," in particular, confessing to Sir Walter Scott that "he used to start from his sleep in great horror, supposing himself still a prisoner in the tent of Ali" (342). Park's Africa haunted the consciousness of his European readership; the lure of the simultaneously romantic and terrifying "dark continent" inspiring more exploration, ill-advised or not. And, yet, it was not just the "colonial specter" that was actively haunting domestic space in the case of Mungo Park. In Waite's introduction to the *Travels*, he writes that "[m]emories of Park, six feet tall, broad-shouldered and big-bearded, persisted in the local lore until the last years of the nineteenth century" (xx). As previously noted, there are also multiple points in the text itself when Park encounters (in lore) the ghosts of "English subjects" (or the American) who had ventured into

Africa before him and other textual moments in which Park participates in self-apotheosis or self-spiriting. The “novel hero” that Mungo Park develops in *Travel in the Interiors of Africa* behaves not as a “sentimental hero” (as Pratt asserts), but as a Radcliffean “gothic hero(ine)” and the travel narrative itself— quite rightly— contains all of the trappings of a literary genre that is born of moments of contact with haunted and haunting “others” in utterly foreign spaces.

## Chapter 4: Strange “Fac Simile”: Addressing Dibdin’s *Hannah Hewit* and Representations of the Eighteenth-Century Female Adventurer

In the previous chapters, I have detailed the ways in which a set of British, eighteenth-century male adventure heroes were “domesticated”—or appropriated traditionally feminine attributes. In 1719, Defoe develops an “oeconomic,” “domestic housewife” kind of hero in *Robinson Crusoe* and in 1726, Lemuel Gulliver’s perverse “oeconomy” and inability to self-domesticate results in disintegrating madness. Hawkesworth’s paragon of virtue Captain Cook (modeled after Richardson’s *Pamela*, 1740), was published in 1773, and his ability to control his self and his crew provides a stark contrast to Captain Bligh’s “damned oeconomy” and explosive fits of passion which ultimately resulted in the mutiny on the *Bounty* (1789). Post-French (American and Haitian) Revolutions, Mungo Park behaves like a Radcliffian gothic hero(ine) (*Udolpho*, 1794), as he *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (published 1799). While it is necessary, even critical, for the successful traveling man to be both male and female— male enough to survive the voyage, journey, or captivity, and female enough to be able to self-domesticate or manage the “oeconomy” of self and space— if a woman enters the sphere of adventure or discovery, as in the case of Charles Dibdin’s fictional *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe* (1796), she is not granted the same allowances. Apart from more common relations of the Grand Tour, there were a small handful of eighteenth-century, British women who accompanied their husbands on more exotic journeys that were diplomatic (Lady Wortley Montagu’s

*Turkish Embassy Letters*, 1716) or humanitarian in nature (Anna Maria Falconbridge's *Narrative of Two Voyages to the River Sierra Leone during the Years 1791-1792-1793* and Mary Ann Parker's voyage to Botany Bay in 1794-1795); but these relations do not bear comparison to the genre at which we have been directing our attention: the travel narrative that involves adventure or discovery. There were, of course, no female equivalents to male captains and explorers like James Cook, William Bligh, and Mungo Park. There were no women, either, who had the resources, position, and power to function as Sir Joseph Banks functioned, managing the empire-building enterprise from home, serving as patron to wave after wave of fledgling explorers and shaping the travel narratives that were being delivered into the hands of a hungry eighteenth-century readership. In the recently published *The Discovery of Jeanne Baret*, Glynis Ridley must cobble together the story of a French woman who disguised herself as a man and used her peasant's knowledge of plants and herbs to function as assistant to the naturalist on Bougainville's voyages in the 1760s because Baret, herself, left no memoirs or logs. The brutal reality that Ridley exposes in her book—the hideous conditions on board the ship and the level of abuse suffered by the seafaring bodies, most of all Baret, whose true gender is ultimately discovered—creates a visceral response and demonstrates clearly that women were not welcome on male missions. In reality, there was no space for white, European women in quintessentially masculine enterprises that involved expansion and empire-building. Even in fiction, Charles Dibdin's attempt to imagine a British "Female Crusoe" who could be masculine and invulnerable enough to survive a perilous

experience resulted in a text that was ridiculed and dismissed upon publication and has been left virtually unaddressed for hundreds of years.

Interestingly, however, women do appear and are a central feature in Henry Neville's influential *The Isle of Pines* (1668), a slim volume that has been regarded as being another potential source for the canonical, male castaway that Defoe develops in *Robinson Crusoe*, a key eighteenth-century story of travel.<sup>72</sup> Making the same claims to authenticity that we have observed throughout the genre, *The Isle of Pines* begins with Neville asserting that the story is a "true relation of certain English Persons, who, in the days of Q. Elizabeth, making a Voyage to the East India, were cast away, and wrecked upon [an] Island" in "Terra Australis Incognita." All of the people on board the vessel were "drowned, except one Man and four Women, whereof one was a Negro." Many years after the wreck, the survivors—their numbers greatly increased—were discovered by a "Dutch Ship driven by foul weather there." The "whole relation" that is included in Neville's text is said to be "written by the Man himself" (2)—George Pines, the original Adam of the island—and is carried back to Europe by the Dutch. To summarize, after surviving the "great terror" of the "miserable wreck," the man and four women were able to "land [them]selves" on an island." The gendered power dynamics are clear from the beginning of the narrative. The memoir is written in first person and George Pines immediately begins to refer to the women as "my female company" (7), "my company who were very much troubled for want of me" whenever he is out of sight. Gratefully, there are no "wild people" (8) on the island and "neither was there any hurtful beast to annoy [them]...on the contrary, the countrey [was] so very pleasant, being always clothed in

---

<sup>72</sup> See David Fauset, *The Strange and Surprising Sources of Robinson Crusoe*.

green, and full of pleasant fruits, and variety of birds, ever warm” that “this place, had it the culture that skilful people might bestow on it, would prove a Paradise” (11).

These castaways, however, male or female, are not depicted as being terribly talented when it comes to maintaining a basic “oeconomy.” The island being simple and bountiful – a Paradise already, really—there is no time spent domesticating nature, which quickly leads to a failure in self-domestication or self-control. “Idleness and fulness of every thing,” writes the male narrator, “begot in me a desire of enjoying the women,” and so the island is governed not by discipline but by “lust” (12). George Pines “consorts” with all of the women but has a favorite in the most socio-economically advantaged captain’s daughter. The descriptions of “my Negro” (with whom the man consorts to “try the difference”) who is hyper-fertile and resistant to pain are stereotypically racist (13). The only order imposed on the island involves what may only be described as a breeding schedule that is maintained by George Pines: “My custom [was] not to lie with any of them after they were with child till others were so likewise; and not with the Black at all after she was with child, which commonly was the first time I lay with her, which was in the night and not else” (14). Soon, the castaways have “no thought of ever returning home...having resolved and sworn never to part or leave one another, or the place.” George Pines, “by his several wives” had “forty-seven children” and his “wives having left bearing, [his] children began to breed” (15). Order is imposed in this area, too, and a breeding schedule is designed for the second generation of Pine Islanders which results in there being “in all of the sorts,” male and female, “one thousand seven hundred eighty and nine” inhabitants by the time that the Dutch ship arrives (18). In writing about *The Isle of*

*Pines* in 1920, Worthington Chauncey Ford stated that he “would apologize for taking so much time on a . . . hoax did it not offer something positive in the history of English literature”: “It has long been recognized as one of the more than possible sources for Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*... Neville’s is believed to have been the first employment by an English author of island life for the whole story.” The central lesson that appears in *The Isle of Pines* is the same lesson that will be repeated in *Robinson Crusoe* and, as I have argued, in other eighteenth-century travel narratives: the successful traveler or castaway is the domesticated or disciplined adventurer. After George Pines dies, having spent his lustful days on the island tracking only his progeny, things fall apart. There are uprisings (the second of which the more orderly, disciplined and skilful Dutch have to put down) that stem from licentious crimes—like rape—in this wanton, chaotic, undomesticated space. Neville’s polygamous utopia ends of being a dystopia because the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines are incapable of controlling their space and their selves.<sup>73</sup>

As Ford notes, in developing *Robinson Crusoe*, “Defoe excludes the most important feature of Neville’s tract—women . . .” (48); but, as I have argued, though the physical women disappear in the transition from the *Isle of Pines* to *Crusoe*’s island, Defoe’s male protagonist, in fact, absorbs the aspects of femininity that he will need to tame his island and his self. *Robinson Crusoe* is ultimately successful because he an “oeconomic,” “domestic housewife” type of castaway; a “novel hero” who has

---

<sup>73</sup> In “Monarchy, Disorder, and Politics in *The Isle of Pines*, Peter G. Stillman argues that: “Neville’s *Isle* contains a republican treatment of rule and misrule, political pornography for a dissolute time of blatantly sinful sexual behavior by royalty, a re-examination of patriarchal rule in the Bible and the present, the portrayal of a state of nature, and a story of colonial plantation and reproduction, complete with issues of race and miscegenation” (147).

both male and female characteristics. There are no physical women on Crusoe's island, however, and it does seem when women enter the narrative in the examples that we have encountered thus far—in *The Isle of Pines* or in *Gulliver's Travels*—the result is chaotic dystopia. Perhaps Defoe recognized that an eighteenth-century readership could not accept a woman on Crusoe's island or in Crusoe's role but Charles Dibdin, evidently, did not. While it is plausible—even desirable and necessary for success—for a male adventurer or castaway to possess both masculine and feminine attributes, rendering a female protagonist along the same lines is more complicated, as evidenced by the reception of Dibdin's sprawling *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe* (1796). Dibdin's novel has received scant critical attention over the past few hundred years. When it first hit the marketplace, the text sold poorly and reviewers were deeply critical of the narrative's odd and uneven blend of romance and realism, particularly in regards to the far-fetched Hannah herself.<sup>74</sup> To be clear, Charles Dibdin was an incredibly prolific and well respected musician, dramatist, songwriter, actor and novelist,<sup>75</sup> which is to say that *Hannah Hewit* was not the

---

<sup>74</sup> Purported to be written by Hannah herself, *Hannah Hewit* was met with the same types of criticisms that Claudia Johnson notes in *Equivocal Beings* were (and have continued to be) lodged against many texts in the 1790s that were written by women—too little realism and too much excess and improbability. Perhaps conscious of the rampant criticism that female writers of the period were up against, authoresses and their dubious morality are railed against repeatedly throughout *Hannah Hewit*. “I hope,” the narrator announces, “for the honour of my sex” that when women's “writings verge toward obscenity, 'tis not because that style is natural, or habitual to them, but because it is necessary to write indecently to please an indelicate age” (I.7). Though as a child, Hannah had “secretly envied, and devoutly wished that, in time, [she] might aspire to the enviable distinction of being considered a female writer” (I.6), she later realizes that “lady writers often do not practice the values that they preach.” Hannah can not imagine “how the age could, with any degree of patience...receive lessons of virtue and morality from women, the notoriety of whose practices have the broad lie to their precepts” (II.19).

<sup>75</sup> Dibdin's reputation was initially established when he wrote the music to the play of *The Padlock*, produced at Drury Lane under Garrick in 1768. Interestingly, Charles Dibdin himself played the part of Mungo—the comedic, black-face caricature of a servant from the West Indies – with noted success. He later produced shows at the Lyceum and the Surrey Theater. Dibdin developed a “one man show” type of variety performance, entertaining London with his songs, music, and recitations of his lyrical poetry.



product of an author who was typically dismissed by eighteenth-century literature, music, and art circles. *Hannah Hewit* was Dibdin's only real flop. The *Freemasons' Magazine* "paid [Dibdin's] novel a somewhat backhanded compliment when it wrote that 'with all its improbabilities, and even absurdities, *Hannah Hewit*... lays strong hold on the attention; and pleases us in defiance of our better judgment' (*Freemason's* 420)" (Thompson 14).<sup>76</sup> This analysis holds true for even the modern reader: *Hannah Hewit*, both the heroine and the tale, are so wonderfully over-the-top that it is difficult to put the novel down. Alleged "to be written by herself," *Hannah Hewit* tells the "history" of a woman who is plainly of "uncommon mental and personal accomplishments," detailing in three bloated and winding volumes her "interesting adventures in almost every station of life, from splendid prosperity to abject adversity." The improbable premise immediately set forth (on the title page) is that Hannah is actually a survivor of the 1782 sinking of the famed, historic *Grosvenor* East-Indiaman off of the coast of Africa who then manages to be cast away a second time "for three years" as the "sole inhabitant of an island in the South Seas"—likely somewhere off of the coast of Africa.<sup>77</sup> *Hannah Hewit*, the first

---

Dibdin garnered considerable success writing patriotic, nautical ballads that tended to issue anti-French sentiment. He wrote a staggering 1400 songs and dramatic pieces. In addition, Dibdin penned his *Musical Tour through England* (1788), his *Professional Life*, an autobiography published in 1803, and a *History of the Stage* (1795). He also wrote the following novels: *The Devil* (1785); *The Younger Brother* (1793); and *Hannah Hewitt* (1796).

<sup>76</sup> Carl Thompson writes that: "Undaunted by the comments, Dibdin returned to the figure of the 'Female Crusoe' in 1798, reworking *Hannah Hewit* the novel into a two-act musical entertainment" (14). Thompson provides an analysis of the adjustments that Dibdin made in converting the novel to a theatrical piece in his article.

<sup>77</sup> "Hewit's Island" is listed in *The Dictionary of Imaginary Places* as being "off the east coast of Africa, north of Madagascar": "A mountain peak, like that of Tenerife, affords a good panoramic view. Through lush vegetation, a river descends to the sea, onto a ridge of rocks rather like the Giant's Causeway. In the rainy season there are violent storms. Hannah Hewit, an English lady, was stranded

representation of a British, female body cast away into completely deserted space,<sup>78</sup> details with long-winded meticulousness the incredibly successful marooned existence of this epically resourceful heroine. The female narrator, “having at last managed to make an iron pen” and “ink” writes her “grand work” or “history” (II.204) on “dried plantain leaves” (II.203):

I shall enumerate the time and trouble all this process took me, which will be found very little when it is considered how few resources I had but what immediately resulted from the fertility of my invention, and how little knowledge I had of what expedients others had adopted in similar exigencies; for whether it was from a dread of mind, or any other cause, I will not pretend to say, but I had never in my life read Robinson Crusoe, Alexander Selkirk, Peter Quarles, not any of those books, which of course would have afforded me, in my situation, many serviceable hints. This last circumstance I mention among other reasons to defend my fame as a writer; and I beg, if it should appear that any of my expedients or contrivances bear a similitude to those of the persons above mentioned, the matter may be candidly weighed, and allowance made for the necessity of adopting similar measures in similar situations. (II.191-2)

Dibdin’s assertion is that Hannah’s “life” biography, which was “written by herself” ended up being lost “on one of the Scilly islands” on its way back to England (“fell a prey to the fisherman, smugglers”); was acquired by “a Grub-Street Poet...in that obscure part of the world”; and finally “by some circuitous route...the whole of these materials came into [Dibdin’s] possession”— “a large, loose, indigested mass; that [he] separated, methodized, and regulated” (i-ii). The note “To the Public” is about

---

on the island in 1782” (290). After looking at the charts and journals that she discovers on the wrecked French *Endeavour*, Hannah “concluded that [she] was upon one of the Comora islands” (251).

<sup>78</sup> Carl Thompson spends a paragraph looking at the only other three Robinsonnades with female protagonists “published in English before *Hannah Hewit*”: “These were Penelope Aubin’s *Life of Charlotta Du Pont* (1723), the anonymously authored *The Female American: or, The Adventures of Unca Eliza Winkfield* (1767), and an English translation of Margueritte Daubenton’s French novel, *Zelia in the Desert* (1789).” Still, Dibdin appears to be “the first writer...prepared to contemplate a female protagonist surviving wholly on her own in the desert island setting,” Hannah is the only protagonist whose “origins are working class, rather than genteel” and she is the only “Female Crusoe” who engages in “cross-dressing” (13).

addressing authorship anxiety and asserting that “this history is, at least, essentially true” (vii)—that it is not merely a “Fac simile” (v), or worse, a counterfeit recasting of Hannah’s more famous (and believable) male Crusoe counterpart.

In addressing anxiety stemming from questions of authenticity, Dibdin writes: “Don’t we know that Don Quixote, instead of being written by Cervantes, was found, and I believe in a chest, among the writings of Cid Hamet Benanjulo?” (iv). Dibdin’s citing of *Don Quixote* is interesting because, arguably, there is more “similitude” between *Hannah Hewit* and many elements of the picaresque tradition than there is between *Hannah Hewit* and the far more sober Robinson Crusoe and his real life, male castaway models. The fact is that our “Female Crusoe” one-ups the traditional, male Crusoe at every turn. Dibdin acknowledges that “upon the first blush there may appear something of the extravaganza in this work” (xi), and there is a steady supply of humor (intentional or not; and likely not) provided as Hannah’s lower class, traveling body moves through the “labyrinth” (III.251) of her life and adventures, relying upon her “own sagacity” (III.29). Hannah is not herself a *picaro*, of course, in the true sense of the word, but there are certainly a number of rogues in the text: her own “husband was a villain” (II.115) and his roguish behavior drives the series of unfortunate events that land Hannah on her island. This picaresque, meandering sense of excess or “extravaganza” is palpable in *Hannah Hewit*. When the “Female Crusoe” is depicted as adopting male attributes or behaving in a masculine way, the result is, even if unintentionally, excessive and comedic. In *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender and Sentimentality in the 1790’s—Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*, Claudia L. Johnson calls attention to the historic moment at which, in the wake of the

gruesome and disorienting French Revolution, Edmund Burke very convincingly argued that civil order depended upon nurturing the “sensibility” of men, developing the traditionally feminine qualities such as sentiment, tenderness, veneration, awe, gratitude, and even prejudice. Johnson argues that as a widely varied multitude of writers were politically motivated to start representing public figures as men of feeling and make sentimentality a public duty, customary gender roles were displaced. Women’s feelings were represented as being inferior, pathological, or even criminal. Johnson argues that, during this period of profound political conflict, female writers like Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, and Austen, deployed textual depictions of grotesqueness, strain, and excess as indices of ideological conflict. “For Watt and others,” Johnson writes, “such excess is lamentable, a failure of aesthetic judgment resulting from the misguided authorial decisions to indulge in ‘fugitive’ fads rather than to carry on the great realistic tradition of prose fiction that ‘rose’ earlier in the eighteenth century” (2). Rather than providing the traditional reading of sentimentalism as a innocuous softening or “feminization of culture,” Claudia Johnson shows that as these feminine traits were stolen away and wholly appropriated by men, period women were denied both a “distinct gender site” (11) and narrative terms for describing their own subjectivity. In this misogynistic environment, women ran the risk of becoming “equivocal beings”; stuck at either end of the gender spectrum and being rendered either too feminine or too masculine. In the case of *Hannah Hewit*—a picaresque, low class, traveling figure who survives by her wits in a corrupt world— as the “Female Crusoe” is pushed to extremes, grotesque moments of rupture and comedic hyperbole infiltrate the narrative and a carnivalesque aura

settles over the text. In Bakhtinian fashion, the dominant trope (Male Crusoe) is subverted by the extreme “Female Crusoe” and her chaotic, humorous, winding narrative. The result is a near-thousand page “extravaganza” that burlesques the traditional, male Crusoe.

In the prefatory material, Dibdin quickly initiates his defense of the extraordinary “Female Crusoe,” asserting that Hannah only wrote the narrative out of the moral obligation that she felt to relate her remarkable story to the world “by recording, upon the leaves of a tree, in an uninhabited island, the sad vicissitudes of [her] unfortunate life” (I.7). Dibdin continues the defense in the advertisement “To the Public”:

If Hannah could have had a foible, I think it would have been this: Her intellects were strong, her inventions prompt, and her conclusions sound and just... In short, she had those requisites without which no female can be absolutely a writer; and if these deceived her into an opinion that a moral application would be made of her work, and that under the idea of doing good for evil, she should do a great deal to please a world that had done a great deal to vex her, the error will, of course, be pardoned in favour of the intention.

“Added to the exquisite feminine susceptibility,” Hannah Hewit, “had a male mind” (vi): she is quite literally figured as a “equivocal being.” It is difficult to detect, however, even a hint of “feminine susceptibility” in Hannah Hewit. In drafting the first British “Female Crusoe,” Dibdin perhaps recognized that he could not place a less than remarkable and wholly invulnerable woman in a position of exposure and distress in foreign territory. To do so would be sadistic and result in a story that would not be fit for polite, public consumption; stories, for example, like those that involved the speculative fate of the actual British women who survived the wreck of the *Grosvenor* only to dissolve into Africa, perhaps taken captive by sexually savage

natives.<sup>79</sup> Hannah Hewit, though physically gendered “female” lacks a key attribute—a sense of “feminine susceptibility”— that has been leveraged by her adventuring, male counterparts. Hannah’s “male mind” overwhelms the “Female Crusoe,” and Dibdin’s concentrated focus on her perennially strong and remarkable “intellects...inventions” and “conclusions” renders the text, itself, unwieldy and absurd. Dibdin’s “Female Crusoe” project failed and *Hannah Hewit* was rejected by eighteenth-century critics and readers. Only a very small handful of modern scholars have addressed Dibdin’s unusual novel. In *Empire Islands: Castaways, Cannibals, and Fantasies of Conquest*, Rebecca Weaver-Hightower argues that Hannah Hewit’s success as a castaway in “making a domicile for herself, controlling her food supply, disciplining her body and mind—in short, acting in what the narratives depict as a masculine matter” is undercut by the fact that “Hannah is clearly presented as the exception to the rule of typical femininity.” This is certainly true, but Weaver-Hightower goes on to assert that Hannah’s “successful colonization results not from innate attributes but from her transformation from being on the island” (57-8). There is no evidence in the actual text to support this argument. As will later be discussed at length, only the last half of Dibdin’s tome details Hannah’s time on her island. The first four to five hundred pages describe the myriad ways in which Hannah is almost providentially born and groomed for her marooned existence. The opening epigraph of the novel, from Act 5, Scene 2, of *Hamlet*, is: “There is an especial providence in

---

<sup>79</sup> See Stephen Taylor’s *Caliban’s Shore: The Wreck of the Grosvenor and the Strange Fate of her Survivors*.

the fall of a sparrow.”<sup>80</sup> Rather than being made *from* her experience on the island, Hannah Hewit is made *for* her experience on the island. The most complete treatment of *Hannah Hewit* occurs in Carl Thompson’s 2008 article, “The *Grosvenor* Shipwreck and the Figure of the Female Crusoe: *Hannah Hewit*, *Mary Jane Meadows*, and Romantic-Era Feminist Debate” in which Thompson strikes upon many of the historic moments that Claudia Johnson addresses in her book. Thompson points out that *Hannah Hewit* has “two claims to literary fame”: it is “the first novel in [a] long line of fictive treatments of the wreck” of the *Grosvenor* and “the first fiction to use the Eastern Cape as a setting”; also, Dibdin’s novel “creation of a *female* Crusoe character seems to have resonated in Britain in the late 1790s, an era of intense feminist and anti-feminist debate.” Thompson recognizes that *Hannah Hewit*, as “clumsily constructed, aesthetically unsatisfying and, in places, morally dubious” as it is, has left scholars wondering “whether it requires, or deserves, such close scrutiny” (9). Still, Thompson argues, the curious novel might provide an interesting vantage point to the “imagining of new forms of female heroism and agency” (10) at the end of the eighteenth century. Thompson’s article seeks largely to situate Dibdin’s novel historically and, perhaps because he himself is of the camp that questions whether or not the text deserves a close reading, he does not offer one. Thompson acknowledges that the text and the intentions of its author are “hard to gauge” (11) at points. When the “extravaganza” of the novel is most colorful, it is easy to think that

---

<sup>80</sup> There are a large number of allusions to Shakespeare in *Hannah Hewit*—beginning with the epigraph and continuing throughout: “Hewit told a round and unvarnished tale, as Othello says, yet there appeared to me, something mysterious in it” (I.157); “‘You have heard,’ said Walmesley, ‘of one Billy Shakespeare... ‘All the world’s a stage.’” (I. 167); “old Shylock” (I.178); “Sheakespear calls it, a raging tooth” (I.214); “like poor Ophelia, I had pansies for remembrance, and I had rue” (III.105); “Well charming Shakespeare, hast thou sweetly said that ‘mercy is twice blest’” (III.111); “cat like watch, as Shakespear calls it...” (III.18).

“Hannah’s more extravagant achievements may be faintly tinged with a chauvinistic agenda... Yet to construe *Hannah Hewit* too starkly as an anti-feminist satire would be to misjudge the mood of the novel” (12). *Hannah Hewit’s* complexity is in the representation of the “Female Crusoe,” herself—a strange, inflated “fac simile,” indeed, of her male counterpart.

Successful project or not, *Hannah Hewit* provides the only representation of a “Female Crusoe” who is, truly and with great success, going it alone on a deserted island and by virtue of this fact, alone, warrants attention. Following from Thompson’s statement, examples of “female heroism and agency” are near non-existent in narratives that involve adventure and discovery because women had no place in characteristically masculine enterprises that involved expansion and empire-building. In culling through period literature that does involve traveling female bodies, Dibdin’s very appealing “Female Crusoe” stands alone in the level of independent success that she achieves, but Hannah was fictional; she was, in fact, so fictional and implausible a woman that she was virtually ignored by the reading public. To sharpen this point, it is worth briefly relating, as a foil, *The History of Miss Katty N---* (1757), a narrative which involves *A faithful and particular Relation of the female protagonist’s Amours, Adventures, and various Turns of Fortune, in Scotland, Ireland, Jamaica, and in England. The History of Miss Katty N---* and *Hannah Hewit* are comparable in a few respects. *Miss Katty N---* is similarly scaled: it, too, involves a long, winding relation of a woman on the move. *Katty N---* traces the history of an orphaned young woman through “many various scenes of Poverty, Want, Imprisonments, and unaccountable Embarrassments” (2) through different geographic



locations, much like Dibdin's novel. In both cases, Katty and Hannah's bodies are put in motion because they have made poor choices in the men that they have decided to attach themselves to and so those men (who the women inexplicably forgive and trust again and again) become the source of all of the female protagonists' joys and sorrows. Both Hannah's and Katty's lives are irreparably damaged and their travel propelled by forged stories that defame their characters and call their virtue into question. There are critical differences between the two texts as well. Hannah Hewit, who is born destitute, moves from extreme poverty to wealth and back to extreme want with typical "extravaganza." Miss Katty N--- is a gentlewoman who "foolishly squander[s] away [her] money in support of an extravagant, ungrateful brother" (III.94) and so ends up penniless. It is because Katty is a gentlewoman, currently impoverished or not, that makes it impossible for her to gain employment and support herself honestly as a barmaid or housekeeper. The key element that separates the two female traveling bodies, however, is this: Hannah Hewit is able to survive and survive fantastically well through use of her intellect, industry, and resourcefulness while Miss Katty N---, bound by the limits of a more realistic atmosphere, is reliant upon the charity and kindness of strangers. What makes Hannah Hewit so very different is articulated clearly in the introductory material of Dibdin's novel: Hannah Hewit, "had a male mind" (vi). The addition of these masculine attributes, the same attributes that separate Hannah Hewit from all other female protagonists and enable her to survive so well in every phase of her life, grant the text that contains our "Female Crusoe" a fantastical quality that, clearly, has been difficult for readers, critics and scholars to process with any seriousness. There is no subtlety in Dibdin's representation of

Hannah's "male mind"; the attribution of these masculine characteristics results in a "Female Crusoe" that is, unarguably, larger-than-life. Dibdin's novel and his "Female Crusoe" give us room, however, to ask a set of questions about what space (if any) is left for the eighteenth-century female adventurer and what aesthetics are at play in a tale of a woman in motion.

*Hannah Hewit* is the *Female Crusoe* and so a very direct and productive comparison between Hannah and her male, "oeconomic" predecessor may be made through a close reading of Dibdin's "hero(ine)." Though there are many moments of symmetry between Defoe's and Dibdin's castaways, the representation offered in *Hannah Hewit* is always exaggerated. *The Female Crusoe* opens with the narrator ruminating on "whether these particulars will ever be made public":

Heaven only knows...but, as they contain the history of a harmless and inoffensive individual, whose life has been checquered by a train of extraordinary events; as they shew the firmness, and vigour, with which providence vouchsafes to endow the human mind in proportion to its various trials; and, above all, as it proves in every line the indulgent, and benevolent care with which our all merciful Creator is graciously pleased to watch and protect the meanest of his creatures, so I think it is my duty to trust these sheets to chance, in hopes, through one of those unforeseen accidents, by which men are permitted to wonder and admire, many a fair eye, and many a manly heart, may pay for a tribute of sympathy to the memory of Hannah Hewit. (I.1-2)

Hannah's "father, whose name was Higgins, worked occasionally in the coal mines" and was "an honest man" who, "with the assistance of [her] mother, who spun worsted, and knit stockings" (I.2-3) struggled to raise their children. Yet, "[n]ever was a family so marked by misfortune," and so when Hannah was "only five years old [she] lost [her] father...mother, and brother, and sister" in an "extraordinary manner" that involved a fire, mistaken stabbing, and a drowning. From that first of

many excessively tragic moments, Hannah was “no longer a child” of mortals, but the child of “providence, whose daughter I am, and in whose care I have always been” (I.5). In terms of “juvenile adventures” (*HH* I.1), Robinson Crusoe is figured as a bourgeois, “middle state” character who exists in the “Middle of Two Extremes, between the Mean and the Great” (*RC* 5). Crusoe “neglected his [father’s] Counsel” and “truly Prophetic” statements (6) in which he warned his son about the pitfalls of greed and unchecked appetite, of turning ones’ back on good, moderate “oeconomy,” and so Crusoe incited divine anger and created his own tragedy. By contrast, Hannah is born into total, abject poverty, quickly loses her parents and most of her siblings in a freak and bizarrely violent accident, and seems to lose all agency over her own story as she is pulled through the narrative by omnipresent, omnipotent, and omniscient Providence. Alone and destitute as she is, however, “before [Hannah] was ten years old, [she learned to] spin, knot, sew, stitch, darn, make gloves, mend shoes, do rush, straw and cane work; write, draw, paint a hobnail, and play upon the guitar” (I.8). Soon after, Hannah becomes a “manufacturer in the japan line” where her “employ was to paint birds, beasts, butterflies, fruit, and landscapes upon urns, tea boards, bread baskets, and toilette boxes” (I.9). Hannah’s work ethic and accomplishments would put Pamela and young Robinson Crusoe to shame. In fact, Hannah’s “judgment and opinion came to be so celebrated , that before [she] was fifteen, [her] abilities were considered as equal to a fortune” (I.13).

Hannah is the paragon of virtue *and* of industry in the dirty and difficult “manufacturing place” in which she comes of age. The town is populated largely by “loose women” and men with “diabolical qualities” (I.21) like arch-rogue, Thomas

Sourby, who is at the root of every evil, “secret design” (I.37) and who “had ruined the principles of many young men and young women too, in the neighborhood, a matter of no great difficulty...where so many males and females of all ages and complexions promiscuously work together” (I.19). Hannah’s industrial period is depicted as being dangerous. “[A]rtless as [she] was,” Hannah asserts that it “is easy for women, completely virtuous, to penetrate the arts of designing lovers” and so she is “astonished that they ever fall into a snare.” Though Hannah believes that “[t]he confident and brutal manner in which Clarissa confesses Lovelace<sup>81</sup> eyed her in the coach from Hampstead would have been enough for [her]” (I.39), Hannah only very narrowly escapes being raped because she is saved by her dear friend and protector William Binns, who is “exactly the reverse of Sourby, his heart being as good as the others was wicked” (I.21). Another young woman, Susan Wingrove, ends up being murdered not by a man (it is Hannah’s future husband, John Hewit, who is wrongly accused of the murder and flees, disappearing from the text for thirty or so pages) but by a jealous friend, Jenny Rhodes (who is later “hanged at Warwick” (I.33) for infanticide). In this period of Hannah’s life (the first part of the novel), the reader is introduced to every character of importance; almost all of whom will (providentially, Hannah would say) somehow appear on the island almost a thousand pages later. Hannah exchanges letters with her brother “Captain Higgins” who tells her of the “fortune” that he has acquired, the “mutiny” he was involved in, and the “little infant” that he saved who he “mean[s] to call...Britannia” (I.49). Captain Higgins also writes letters about “Charles Walmesley...a handsome man and worthy character” (I.59)

---

<sup>81</sup> Another reference to *Clarissa* is made on page 71 in the first volume: “Clarissa in the eyes of Lovelace.”

who sails with him. Walmesley will later become entwined in the story in a particularly picaresque way since it will be discovered that for some period of time, he and John Hewit (who had fled charges of murder), wandered the English countryside and sailed together occasionally inognito; sometimes using each others' names and (most oddly) at points with Hewit calling himself "Blinky," wearing "a black patch upon [his] eye" and with his skin "stained...with walnut shells" (I.125-6)<sup>82</sup> and with Walmesley "in the character of a bear" (I.132). Hannah also hears tales of her horrible other brother, a lawyer's clerk who is perpetually in cahoots with Sourby; who associated with "those pests of society, pettifogging attorneys"; and who "married a woman he knew to have been kept by a man of fashion" only to "beat her for not prostituting herself" when she converts herself into an "honest wife" (I 67).

Most importantly, it is during her time in the "manufacturing place" that Hannah meets her future husband, "John Hewit, the author of all [her] pains and pleasures" (I.11). The first encounter is brief because John ends up fleeing shortly thereafter, but the impression that he makes upon Hannah is indelible. Her attraction to Hewit is described in terms of "destiny" and as being motivated by Hannah's "wayward fortune." In *Robinson Crusoe*, Crusoe's major mistake is turning his back on his "oeconomically" virtuous, middle class father to try his luck. A shift in Hannah's "destiny" is registered when she meets John. Falling in love with John Hewit is Hannah's first (and only) mistake, but the havoc that it wreaks upon her life is disastrous. John Hewit lacks virtue and industry, he does not have a strong sense of "oeconomy," and Hannah seems aware of this from the beginning:

---

<sup>82</sup> This textual moment conjures up the stories that were old about Charles II hiding in the English countryside after the Battle of Worcester in 1651. The stories described Charles II trying to disguise himself as a servant by staining his skin with walnut shells.

John...though a man of indifferent character, bad connections, low conversation, and only an apprentice to a tinman; why, or wherefore, I did not know, won my heart in spite of me; and, for him, I rejected with disdain the most eligible offers. (I.14)

“[W]hatever he might be in other respects,” however, “John Hewit was the handsomest man eyes every beheld,” and so Hannah opts to overlook the fact that “[h]is father,” was convicted of committing a “highway robbery” and so was “transported for life,” and that John Hewit himself has a “vile character” and “was illiterate, uninformed, and brutal.” “[W]ith what pleasure,” gushes the female protagonist, “did I contemplate the glory I should reap in reclaiming...instructing, polishing and civilizing him” (I.15). The domestication that takes place in the novel is not that of the heroine herself—Hannah is already a fully domesticated paragon of virtue and industry—but of her future husband, John Hewit. John becomes Hannah’s primary and most important project and she is fueled by “the flattering expectation of reforming poor Hewit” (I.16), a project which she intends to “put into practice” with “beneficence and philanthropy” (I.15-6) if he should ever return.<sup>83</sup> Eventually, due to the good fortune of her brother, Captain Hewit, Hannah grows to be as “rich as a Jew, and as happy as a queen,” thus swinging from, as Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* puts it, the “Mean” to the “Great”—quite literally overnight. Though her brother begs her to “come and live with him at Bristol,” Hannah knows that “exchanging a life of industry for a life of idleness was little suited to [her] taste,” and she is loathe to leave

---

<sup>83</sup> Though John Hewit is the prime target of Hannah’s “philanthropy”—the female protagonist is so exemplary a citizen that, as her par amour wanders the countryside dodging the law, Hannah diverts herself with another “philanthropic scheme” (I.116): “It had always been my idea, that of the labouring people had some rational mode of employing the Sunday, they would be less inclined to frequent alehouses, and get into debauchery, particularly in manufacturing towns” (I.115) for, ultimately, purposeful work would quell “malignant spirits who hatch infernal designs to sap the foundations of domestic quiet” (I.116-7).

the manufacturing place because of the “hope [she] had of, once more, seeing John Hewit” (I.55) if he should ever return. Finding herself in increasing “need of a protector” in the perilous manufacturing neighborhood, since her “talents were such an object of envy, and [her] conduct was so exemplary” (I. 85), Hannah is delighted when John Hewit finally returns “home as a vagrant” after having wound his way through England, sometimes in costume; having teamed up with Walmesley, who, apparently, “made a devilish good bear” (I.146); and having served as a crew-member on Captain Higgins’ ship before being “shipwrecked on the coast of Suffex” (I.79). Having been thorough his own formative adventure, Hewit asserts that he is “not the same John Hewit [he] was when [he] left this place” (I.154); that he is now “sober and industrious” (I.155), wholly domesticated and “oeconomically” sound.<sup>84</sup> With her brother’s blessing, Hannah “give[s] her hand to the hero of the piece” (I.218) and so the first volume of the novel ends with Hannah being yoked—very, very unevenly—to John Hewit.

In her marriage, Hannah is the “oeconomic man” of the house. In the second volume, the chasm between Hannah’s impeccable character, drive, and general virtuous industry, and that of her unimpressive husband only widens. At the beginning of book two, Hannah notes that: “It is the custom of writers to terminate a history on the marriage of their Hero and Heroine” (II.1). In this case, though, the novel is not this kind of a story. John Hewit’s role is really very minimal. As stated, Hannah’s fatal flaw—the only lapse in her otherwise impeccable judgment—is

---

<sup>84</sup> Using nautical terminology, Captain Higgins (also safely returned from the shipwrecking), explains that—conscious of the fact that “[y]oung girls, in love affairs...generally go to sea without rudder or compass”—he, John Hewit, and Walmesley had used some trickery to see if Hannah, when it came to her love for John, was “sailing with a squall that might overset [her], or a steady breeze likely to bring [her] into port” (I.210).

loving and marrying John Hewit, and this is the only way in which John Hewit motivates the story. He is, as Hannah puts it from the beginning, “the author of all her pains and pleasures” (I.11), but he is quite literally absent from the history of *Hannah Hewit* for perhaps eighty percent of the narrative. The clear marital role reversal that is depicted in the middle portion of the novel is unusual. From the beginning, all hopes are pinned on Hannah, and the newlyweds’ well-wishers “paid [her] the compliment of saying, that with prudence, like [Hannah’s], success could not fail to crown our endeavours” (II.3); that if John Hewit “was only careful and industrious, assisted by ingenuity like [Hannah’s], [they] could not fail of making a fortune” (II.4). And, indeed, the couple does make a fortune though it stems exclusively from Hannah’s remarkable—to the point of ludicrousness— “abilities” (II.5): “my genius was inexhaustible.” At one point, Hannah develops a “sovereign remedy” with the catchy name, ““The Universal Specific; or, Essence of May Dew, impregnated with Spirit of Owl’s Dung”” (II.21), which was “to cure, or rather prevent, every possible species of disorder to which the human frame is liable” (II.20). Hannah’s “taste was now consulted in everything”: “The Hewit cap, the Hewit bonnet, and the Hewit robe were all the fashion...every poor artist in town courted [her] opinion...all the poets dedicated their work to [her]...and [her] patronage was sought by all of the frequenters of the Orange Coffee-house” (II.14). John and Hannah Hewit develop “plenty of means to keep up a large and opulent acquaintance” and, at one particularly striking moment in the text, Hannah confesses that “as the sum of all [her] wishes was the happiness of [her] husband, [she] gave into, perhaps more extravagance than, at first, was prudent” (II.8), indulging her luxury-hungry husband



with a “superb villa... a coach and a phaeton, both with springs of [her] invention” (II.8), and anything else that he desired. It is Hannah who, she confesses, “never had a true relish for any of this pleasure” and who prefers to spend time with their children “contemplating the beauty of a leaf, or a flower, in an insulated green-house, and hermitage, which [she] had built in a very large piece of water, and in which [she] took greater pleasure, than in all the vain tinsel and tawdry trappings of a ball-room.” Hannah is driven “at times into a very deep melancholy” when she faces off with a life that is “all pleasure and no happiness” and in which she “could not find in all the variety of the characters that surrounded [her] a creature like [her]” (II.10). Hannah is represented as being conscious of her status as an anomaly within the bounds of Dibdin’s text. In this ultra-luxurious, artificial environment, ironically, Hannah’s “greatest pleasure [is] to take [her] children to [her] little island, and watch [her] improvements...separated from human society” (II.11).

What goes so very far up must come down, and so after the Hewit family’s “fortune grows fickle” as it becomes clear that the “tin mines” they made heavy investments in have “turned out a bubble” (II.24) they are cast out of upper class society.<sup>85</sup> The experience is unpleasant but it does have one very positive result: Hannah notes that she “had long wished to give Hewit a distaste to the world, and this fairly completed [her] purpose” (II.27). Hannah is the partner in the marriage who charts their course of action, who behaves as the assertive and action-oriented man, and informs her husband that “[i]t is absolutely necessary...to exist by our industry or

---

<sup>85</sup> The “fashionable friends...left [Hannah and John] as if [they] had been a contagion”: “The cry was—How could such upstarts presume to vie with people of fashion?” (II.25). Hannah was attacked by the very artists who had courted her support; she was “lampooned in a song called *Pride out of tune*,” “caricatured,” and was the subject of “a poem under the title of ‘*Sappho in the Tin Mines*’” (II.26).

starve.” Ready to “embrace [her] fortune, though ever so humble, out of affection” (II.40) for John Hewit, Hannah formulates a “plan,” which she acknowledges “at first, will look a little romantic” (II.39). The family’s “grandeur shall be changed to humility” as they “visit those parts of the kingdom where [they] are unknown” (II.40), traveling between “manufacturing town[s]” (II.46), moving among the industrial, “dingy race” whose “faces...shirts and...minds” all “seemed to be equally grimed” (II.47), and trying to mask Hannah’s “fair skin and delicate hands” (II.50) and the family’s “decent manners and appearance” which “exposed [them] to ...suspicion” (II.49). After “nearly three years” (II.55), the family is forced to “go to France” to escape debtors. It is in France that Hannah’s fortune truly turns. Her daughter is almost immediately struck with a “violent fever” and “die[s] in [her] arms” (II.90).<sup>86</sup> But, worst of all, John Hewit starts behaving strangely in France: he “grew melancholy, his temper was soured, he lost his health” (II.104) and “he could not bear the sight” of their new daughter. Despite the fact that “he never in his life had a moment’s cause of suspicion for [Hannah]” (II.105), and quite frankly owed everything that he had ever gained to the splendors of his miraculously virtuous, brilliant, and hardworking wife, John Hewit is duped into believing that Hannah has been unfaithful (with Binns, who suddenly crops up in France) and that their new

---

<sup>86</sup> The narrator also makes it very clear that she loathes France and the French: “If the world was faulty in my own country, how much the term ought to be magnified speaking of France. Go where I would I found nothing but human wolves disguising their natural ferocity with the grimace of monkeys (II.97).” The common Frenchman is described as being “[s]pecious, guarded, dawning, fraudulent, faithless, volatile, sanguinary, and merciless”—an “animated lie that should be reversed to be understood.” At the time when Hannah is in France, she sees the “Court of France” in its “most splendid brilliancy” (II.99) and ruminates that: “...should ever a revolution take place...should order be destroyed, virtue confounded, religion annihilated, the crown trampled underfoot, and riot, anarchy, and massacre reign triumphant, it would be accomplished by the lowest dregs of the people who would lord it and tyrannize over the rest” (II.102). Despite the fact that Hannah is of the lower classes and comes of age amongst the meanest of the mean in gritty, industrial Britain, there is certainly no sense of solidarity with the downtrodden masses on either side of the English Channel.

baby is, in fact, not his. Hannah returns home one evening to discover a “letter” from her husband which “informed [her] that he was then underweigh aboard an East-Indiaman” since he “could not stomach living with an adultress” (II.111). John Hewit, irrational, intemperate, and incapable of controlling his self, even goes so far as to confess that he had “more than once meditated to murder [Hannah] in [her] sleep” but opted instead to trust her “to the care of providence” (II.112). Stunned by the knowledge that her “husband was a villain” (II.115), though she seemed fully conscious of John Hewit’s seamy and immoderate bits when she first decided to make him her domestication project, Hannah “shuddered with agony, and fell lifeless on the floor” (II.113). It is rare for Hannah Hewit to be overwhelmed with feminine emotion and, literally, lose her senses. In truth, it’s rare to see Hannah behaving like a female at all. These moments always result in response to something involving John Hewit; the otherwise unflappable Hannah’s one point of vulnerability. Shortly after John Hewit abandons them, Hannah’s new baby dies and so, unencumbered by small children (it is not clear where her son had gone, but he too will reappear on Hannah’s island years later) and driven by “Fate,” Hannah “sailed in the spring of the year 1781 and, arrived, in something less than eight months, at [her] brother’s house in Surat.” Hannah hoped to find her husband in India, but instead, her brother Higgins “shewed [Hannah] three letters from Hewit” (II.121) which made it clear that the villainous abandoner “was now convinced” (II.123) that Hannah, “the most amiable and most injured of wives” (II.124) “was perfectly innocent” (II.123) and so, in pursuit of her again allegedly reformed John Hewit, Hannah books passage on a ship that is heading back toward Europe.

The ship that Hannah ends of boarding is the ill-fated, historic East Indiaman, the *Grosvenor*, which—as *Hannah Hewit*’s readership would know—“was shipwrecked, between latitude 27 and 32, on the Coast of Africa” (II.127) in 1782. When the *Grosvenor* foundered on the brutal, southeastern shore of Africa, nearly all of its large number of passengers—which included representative of the “mean” to the “great” and everything in between, different races, and a number of women and children—were left on the wild, desolate coast of the dark continent. In “The *Grosvenor* Shipwreck and the Figure of the Female Crusoe,” Carl Thompson writes that though “the wreck itself had occurred 14 years previously, the story of the *Grosvenor* disaster was still current in 1796”:

In 1791 George Carter had published his *Narrative of the Loss of the Grosvenor East Indiaman*, based on the testimony of one of the survivors, and in 1792 Jacob Van Reenan’s *Journal of a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope* had given an account of a Dutch expedition dispatched from Cape Town in 1790 to search for any survivors from the wreck. This expedition was mounted because of persistent rumours that some of the *Grosvenor*’s female passengers were still alive, living amongst the local African tribes. The original newspaper coverage had dwelt at some length on the prospect of white women enduring (in the parlance of a later era) a ‘fate worse than death’ at the hands of black men; and thereafter there were a series of alleged sightings of these unfortunates. These kept the *Grosvenor* story running throughout the 1790s, and in fashioning a tale of a female survivor of the *Grosvenor* wreck—something that is announced prominently in the novel’s lengthy full title—the commercially astute Dibdin clearly sought to cash in on the continuing public interest in the wreck. (10-11)

However, in “fashioning a tale of a female survivor of the *Grosvenor* wreck,” it seems that Dibdin was aware that he could not create a female protagonist or “Female Crusoe” who was anything close to being an actual woman. The real ladies of the *Grosvenor* tragedy were middle to upper class (one of whom was eight months pregnant) and speculating about what had happened to those women—so absolutely

vulnerable in punishing Africa—was too vicious a project.<sup>87</sup> A cross comparison of the historic accounts of the wreck of the *Grosvenor* with *Hannah Hewit* suggests, however, that Dibdin was deeply familiar with the tragedy. The female protagonist provides “[s]ome account of the dreadful distress experienced by the passengers and crew of the *Grosvenor* East-Indiaman,” detailing the “fatal blow” of the three-masted square-rigger striking land with horrible force: “[T]he passengers, and particularly the ladies, must inevitably have perished, had it not been for a most unexpected and providential circumstance, by means of which every soul that remained got on shore without the smallest of difficulty” (II.132). The castaways first interactions with the Africans also closely resemble the primary materials: the “inhabitants constantly plundered us, and when we resisted, beat us.” But Hannah’s “foreboding heart, which always too fatally anticipated [her] sufferings, had, in the midst of [her] distraction, providentially dictated [her] to supply [her]self with whatever might be useful...in an emergency” (II.133-4). In the case of *Robinson Crusoe*, it is the protagonist’s father who issues “truly Prophetic” (6) warnings. In *Hannah Hewit*, the protagonist herself is prophet-like. Later, the protagonist will explain:

That mixture of pleasurable and painful suspense that has assailed me on the eve of every great event during my life, produced a

---

<sup>87</sup> Taylor details these fascinating stories and sightings in *Caliban’s Shore*, being careful to note that the information that he supplies is “necessarily speculative, while being consistent with this evidence” (221). Perhaps the most interesting chapter is Chapter 18, which speculates about the fate of a few of the middle to upper class women on the ship (one of whom, Lydia Logie, was eight months pregnant at the time of the wreck). Taylor writes: “After the terror of the shipwreck had come recognition of a world order turned upside down—where the means of authority were lost and black brigands held their sway, where a sailor was better fitted for survival than a gentleman and where their own husbands were as helpless as they...Nothing could have prepared them for the moment when the moral universe collapsed entirely, and Coxon and other men of their own class walked away” (219). There were a number of rescue attempts, and Taylor writes about “a settlement unique in Southern Africa, of a people known as the amaTshomane who were descended from shipwreck victims” (222) who may perhaps have heard of the white women wandering the area and absorbed them into their clan.

presentiment that convinced me such an event was at hand, nor was it long before my expectations were verified. (II.240)

Quietly arming herself for future disasters, Hannah and the group (just like the *Grosvenor* survivors) “resolved to traverse the country in hopes, at length, to fall in with some of the Dutch settlements,” but their “troubles increased” (134):

Treachery from the natives, destruction from famished wolves, lions, and tygers; raging hunger we could not appease, and parching thirst, which we were obliged to allay in the most shocking and unnatural manner, menaced us in such horrid and various forms, that we seemed like so many devoted wretches waiting for death as the only kind friend we could implore to terminate our shocking and degrading miseries. (II.139)

*Hannah Hewit* deviates from the *Grosvenor* narrative when the “degrading” result of the tragedy is cast in the following terms (emphasis mine): “A set of fine, sensible gallant men, and handsome, elegant, *educated* women reduced to a state more filthy than brutes” (II.140). First, of course, it is surprising to see any emphasis being placed on the education levels of women and, second, Hannah— though likely handsome and elegant from the attention that she garners throughout the text—is not educated in any formal sense. The specter of the white women—“we compared ourselves to the children of Israel in captivity” (II.145) “commanded to sing the Lord’s song in a strange land” (II.146) — being subjected to a sexual “fate worse than death” does appear when the narrator writes that the ladies tended to: “yield to the proposals of the Caffres, provided they involved no actual violation of our honour, in which case, it is but little to say, that we would rather have sacrificed our lives than have consented” (II.145). The most surprising direct tie-in to the actual story of the *Grosvenor*, however, appears in the introduction of the “Malayan... Trout” who had allegedly “been guilty of several murders in his own country and had therefore taken

shelter among the Caffres.” (II.137). The historical “Trout, as the castaways knew him—he would seem to have been named Traut by the Dutch—was a frontier fugitive” who was “a Javanese slave of the Dutch who had escaped and fled up the coast beyond the colonists’ reach” and who had developed a relationship with the local African “Pondo, who valued his knowledge of the outside world” (Taylor 113). Trout appears and reappears in the narratives, and comes to be represented as a “disconcerting, even sinister figure” (II.117):

He had been honest in his advice, but he had rendered neither favour nor service. Having been a slave of the Dutch, he had no reason to like the Europeans, and seeing that they were bent on self-destruction, he now determined to plunder them. The seamen did not encounter him again, but afterwards he figured in the collective memory as a malign figure manipulating the events that followed... As Thomas Lewis put it: ‘The Malay was a rogue as he shewed the natives where [our] pockets were.’ (120)

An interesting moment of picaresque “extravaganza” comes in *Hannah Hewit* when the female protagonist encounters Trout with “his sallow face, his lank black hair, and his wild looks, in which there was an uncommon ferocity” and “could not help thinking [she] had somewhere seen a resemblance of him...imagined [she] had at sometime of other heard his voice” (II.137). Before she can place the roguish Malayan, Hannah is captured by “two Caffres” (II.146) and “delivered into the power of Trout who guess [her] distraction, announced himself as the villain—Sourby!” (II.147). And so, the arch-roogue of Hannah’s difficult young life in the “manufacturing place” who had spent the past number of years doing evil with Hannah’s wicked law clerk brother suddenly reappears in Africa (having been

transported)<sup>88</sup> and attempts to steal Hannah (“he never loved any woman but me”) and “escape... to Madagascar” (II.150). After a scuffle with another man on board the ship, Sourby is (“mark the finger of Providence” and “unerring justice”) knocked into the sea and “nipt in two” by a shark: “He had been a shark to his fellow creatures” (II.161) and so “he himself became a prey to the merciless monster, whose remorseless voracity had been his imitation” (II.162).<sup>89</sup> While fending off Sourby/Trout, Hannah pauses to consider the fate of her fellow *Grosvenor* survivors. Directly before Hannah’s kidnapping, the plan was announced “for the men to take Caffre wives, and the women to take Caffre husbands, which if they refused to do, they would be killed and eaten” (II.153). To face this option of comingling with the natives or being the object of cannibalism was not—and could not be (if the text was to be socially acceptable)—Hannah’s fate. After this outlandish series of events, Hannah ends up on her deserted island.

The actual story of the *Grosvenor*, so fresh in the public imagination in the 1790s, and the fact that Dibdin chose to have Hannah Hewit manage to survive that un-survivable disaster before surviving a second wreck and then beginning her incredibly successful stint as the “Female Crusoe” provides testimony to just how absurdly remarkable the heroine is. As soon as Hannah is alone and cut loose from the deadweight of her less than extraordinary *Grosvenor* survivors, things start to

---

<sup>88</sup> In *Maiden Voyages and Infant Colonies*, Deirdre Coleman notes that both of the colonies that she is discussing in her text—Botany Bay in New Holland and Sierra Leone in West Africa—“were established in the wake of the revolt of the old colonies in America, a revolt which had raised two new problems for Britain. Where would Britain now send her excess convicts, and what accommodation could be afforded dispossessed loyalist refugees?” (1). Initially, convicts were transported to West Africa, but so many died that they started sending them to New Holland.

<sup>89</sup> A later reference to the shark suggests that the “shark was a cannibal... Owing I support... to being bred on the coast of Africa” (III.185).



improve drastically. Sitting on the beach alone, Hannah does allow one moment of panic, but it is very brief and measured compared to Robinson Crusoe's post-marooning panic:

I was so sunk with melancholy and petrified with horror, that my harassed faculties could scarcely teach me to think... I had but two things, to perish or to be resolute. If gracious Providence had saved me from the Shipwreck, afterwards from certain death, or dishonor among the Caffres, and at length from the perilous voyage in a small vessel upon a tremendous sea, why should I accelerate my Fate? (II.168)

Hannah is depicted as being far more rational more of the time on her island than her male counterpart ever was on his island. The excess that Hannah deals is in her excessive industry, ingenuity, virtue, and "sagacity" (II.152). Hannah finds herself on an island "abounding with wilderness and luxuriancy" and immediately finds "manna in the wilderness" to sustain herself (II.172). The "Female Crusoe" spends her first day exploring her surroundings and the "researches so beguiled the time" (II.173) that nightfall soon comes and Hannah "slept in great tranquility," confident in her own ability "to ruminate on [her] own situation and to consider of every expedient necessary for [her] to adopt, in order to make it as comfortable as possible" (II.176).

Robinson Crusoe had a boat to salvage from and Hannah does not, but still:

...the smiling morn found me as cheerful as itself, what had I do wish for but shelter, food, and raiment, and these the birds that warbled round my head found easily and were thankful for the blessing. Why then should I repine? A thousand houses, built of the most beautiful materials and erected in the most perfect architect, courted my acceptance. A single rock could furnish for me a magnificent dwelling with all its compartments. For food, I could not have luxuries, but I could imbibe health at every mouthful, and for cloathing, the inhabitants of that part of the world, needed none; and even if it were necessary, to an ingenious mind, something might be easily contrived (178) out of leaves, feathers, and a variety of other materials that I could already perceive I should find in much greater abundance than would be necessary to answer my purpose. (II.179)

Powered by her “cheerful disposition” and a sense of “general thanksgiving,” Hannah sets out to settle her “greatest apprehension, that [she] should...discover whether any part of the place was inhabited” (II.179). It is not, and so Hannah, continues to explore and work her island into her own geographic memory—noting that one area is “not very unlike the Giant’s Causeway in Ireland” (II.181) and that another is “like that part of the Derbyshire rocks near Castleton” (II.182)—and then determines that it is “high time to square a sort of life [she] should lead by something like method and regularity” (II.183) and gets to work. Perhaps anticipating that the reader might question the plausibility of Hannah being capable of making “a complete window by way of skylights...and contrive a most comfortable bed” (II.187) in her new “divided and subdivided... apartments” (II.184), the narrator stops to point out that “difficulty stimulates invention, and active minds succeed best when they struggle with opposition” (II.185). The speech is reminiscent of Crusoe’s but Hannah’s clever adaptation to her marooned existence is far more seamless and remarkable. As time passes, Hannah’s “researches,” “scheme[s]” (II.189) and “experiments” (II.195) become more and more productive and impressive. She “spun...a large quantity of common thread” (II.189) and “at last, formed a sort of dress cut in the fashion, and laced on it the manner of a harlequin’s jacket and trowsers” (II.190), so, the carnivalesque, picaresque heroine is outfitted appropriately for her role on her island. “For [her] head [she] formed a sort of helmit out of rushes, which [she] lined with fine cotton,” and “for [her] feet [she] made sandals of very small osiers, which [she] lined with cotton and fastened with laces.” Within no time at all, Hannah Hewit has created from nothing “a habitation, a bed to lie on, cloathes to cover [her], two cane

chairs, an ozier table, covered with a mat, and several other conveniences” (II.192). Hannah’s made-from-scratch “comfortable situation” (II.193) is a far cry, indeed, from the Robinson Crusoe’s goat skin shift and cave dwelling—and he had the advantage of salvage and testosterone. Hannah turns blacksmith and makes a “complete hammer” (II.199), which proves not to be difficult since she “had been perfectly instructed in these matters at Wolverhampton,” when she worked in the factories. These textual moments undercut Weaver-Hightower’s argument that Hannah’s “successful colonization results not from innate attributes but from her transformation from being on the island” (57-8). Hannah’s natural wit and ingenuity and her exposure to all different types of labor seem to have providentially prepared her for this very moment, and she excels. Hannah forages for “shellfish...oyster” (II.200) to eat and “conger eel...for the oil that it would yield.” She even discovers that a “shark’s skeleton” makes an “excellent saw” (II.201) and that “a comb” may be “formed out of the shell of a land crab.” Having worked diligently to supply herself with all that was necessary, Hannah “thought it no crime if [she] went on to luxuries, as it would give a new spur to [her] genius, and employ [her] mind” (II.202). She begins working on her “grand work...[her] history” (II.204) and “apportioned [her] time so as to have alternatively some labour and some amusements.” (II.205). Hannah is able to develop “a pleasanter and more nutritive beverage than tea” (II.206) which she takes with plantain “Yorkshire cakes” (II.207), and work on writing, “painting and music” by lamp light since she had “made several lamps” (II.208).

As on Crusoe’s island, there are unpleasant moments on Hannah’s island, but she seems to be able to manage them more effectively and rationally. A “monstrous

mass” of birds descend upon Hannah’s island annually, but she uses the migration to her advantage and learns to “furnish [her]self with eggs...feast upon the young ones” (II.210) and make preserved “potted birds” (canning in sea shells) which she asserts could have been served in London as a “rarity” and “considered as a delicious luxury at the first tables” (II.214). There are also “swarm[s] of monkies” (II.211) and a run-in with a “monstrous large baboon” which Hannah attacks with her “hammer,” and “laid ...dead at [her] feet” (II.213). The waves of illness are the most difficult parts of Hannah’s time on the island. On her “birth day”—when the readers finds out that she is “thirty nine”—Hannah is “seized with a vertigo...violent fever” and “delirium” (II.217) that leads to “horrors” (II.218) and the “Female Crusoe” “digging [her] own grave.” At various points, Hannah will be subjected to illness that leads to “delirium” (II.232), which will ultimately prompt her to “change [her] habitation” (II.238) since she believes that living in rock and the dampness is not helping matters. There is a “hurricane” (II.219) and an “earthquake” (II.224). Then, to Hannah’s “horror” she spots “a most hideous and frightful creature” of the “lion or tyger kind” (II.227), which she later discovers was part of the cargo (“a lioness, big and strong, as a present for the queen of France” (III.24)) of the *Entrepreneur* which has run “firmly aground” (II.227) in a storm. Hannah soon sees “boats full of people, striving to stem the fury of the surge, and in seeing them [she] knew [she] saw so many people devoted to destruction”: “In short, my fears were prophecies. The boats all sunk; and every soul perished” (II.228). The only moment at which we see Hannah reduced to tears is at this moment:

I wept aloud... This interval, in which the weakness of human nature got the better for a moment of that strength of mind which had hitherto

borne me out through all my trials, though poignant, was short; I soon resumed my wonted fortitude; and the recollection that self preservation was a duty I owed to that Being who gave me a life to preserve. (II.230)

Discovering the wreckage, Hannah “examines the ship” (II.242.); finds “five dead bodies” (II.243), including the corpses of a “husband and wife...in each others arms” (II.244) whose “two skulls and bones” she will place as a grotesque “memento mori” in her chapel” (III.59); and begins gathering “intelligence” from “letters, pocket books, and other documents” and “things of use” like “knives, scissars, housewives” (II.244), “salt beef, dried tongues, ham, potted fish,” (II.249), “[f]lour, Indian what, rice, barley, potatoes...oriental seeds...wine...cordials, sweetmeats, spices...cottons, muslins, gingham...shawls and ornamental papers...tea” (II.251). Hannah also “changed [her] strange weeds for some night clothes” and “went to bed for the first time in eleven months in a bed” (II.248) salvaged from the wreck. Still, “what pleased [Hannah] most, was the carpenter’s chest, the master’s and the doctor’s” (II.251)—the most practical tools—and being a “true mortal, [her] ideas enlarged with [her] possessions... [She] resolved to build...a new habitation, consisting of different apartments, on the lawn before the cavern” (II.258), “an extensive lawn covered with the most beautiful verdure, and planted, as if with some human hand, with clumps of orange, citron, and a prodigious variety of other oriental fruit trees” (II.265-6). Again taking advantage of the situation, Hannah leverages the spoils of the tragedy, builds “a tackle” (II.254) starts designing the plans for “a place...in which strength will vie with symmetry; which shall evince taste, elegance, a knowledge of proportion; that shall at once brave the fury of the storm, stem the course of the inundation, and yet be handsome and ornamental” (III.46). The dwelling, which includes “a vestibule, a

saloon, a storehouse, a kitchen, a chapel, and a dormitory” is made of “brick and mortar...formed from the earth” in a “better principle than those which are made in England” and so “may induce an imitation” of Hannah’s superior “plan” for masonry (III.48). Hannah manages to “raise a dome...a skylight” (III.51) and make “glass” out of “calico” which, once painted with several “coats of gum” becomes “properly transparent” (III.53). The “bed chamber” is “elegant and comfortable” (III.57) and decorated with “chintz” (51) and the “utensils” in her kitchen are “made out of the ship’s copper” (III.51). Hannah’s “schemes” keep growing more and more grand, more and more implausible, and more and more entertaining. Hannah leverages the salvage from the aptly-named *Entrepreneur*, to increase her own production. The first concrete benefit of the tragedy that Hannah is able to secure is the cub of the dead lioness that becomes “domesticated” (II.14)<sup>90</sup> in Hannah’s care and learns to function as her protector and “labourer” (III.63). Robinson Crusoe has domesticated cats; Hannah has Leo, a lion, to defend her wonderful, created world:

I was safe and in the midst of plenty. The riches of the east courted my acceptance and my faithful lion secured me from every peril...I treated him exactly as I would a favorite cat, made palatable meals for him, and gave him no animal food but what I previously dressed, which no doubt softened his natural ferocity, for no lamb was ever so gentle, no spaniel so obedient. (III.41-2)

Hannah also “found in the ship a multiplicity of flower seeds... intended for the gardens at Versailles” and determines not just to plant a garden but, “by inoculation, grafting and inarching, to make the cassia tree bear olives, the shaddock team with

---

<sup>90</sup> The “lioness” springs at Hannah and ends up falling and being killed upon a “pointed prominence of rock” (III.3). Hannah refuses to “kill the thing that flew to [her] for protection” (III.5) and so keeps the cub. Later, the same lesson will be repeated when Hannah discovers a “young buffalo” (III.109) and opts “to preserve his life and trust to Providence to restore [hers]” and so find “the mother” and is able to procure “milk”: “truly here had virtue its reward” (III.110).

pomegranates, and the plantain to bend with clusters of tamarinds” (III.68). Having “found aboard the Entrepreneur... a great variety of colours for painting” Hannah makes from “earth, bones, flowers, the blood of a sea-snake... admirable colours of [her] own” and “determine[s] to make a piano forte for her saloon.” It is no longer enough to document her story on dried plantain leaves, Hannah is now “prepared to “write [her] history, to paint it, and to set it to music” (III.73). She discovers a book “[f]rom Levoisier on chemistry” (III.91) and begins a series of “undertakings” on “pneumatic chemistry” (III.89). Most unbelievably, believing that she “should find no great difficulty in making an automaton,” Hannah creates a robot from clock parts that can “converse pretty well,” programmed to say ““O ow I luv u Anna”” (III.95). Over and over again, the “Female Crusoe” asserts and reasserts the importance of “keeping [her] mind in continual occupation” (III.60) and how her “labour solaced [her]” (II.64):

To exercise my mind was my greatest pleasure, and my greatest comfort; and those who have most indulgence will be happiest to find that a lone woman, who had not a single motive for life, should have the fortitude, the prudence, the religion to live miserable and resigned... two years and a half without seeing a human face... (III.97)

Hannah Hewit—the “Female Crusoe” with a “male mind” – saves herself by doing “whatever necessity or inclination induced [her] to do” and so, “solaced by so many amusements, all of them rational; how strongly [her] mind bore up against... troubles” (III.70).

Hannah’s enlightened stoicism can only be disrupted by John Hewit and any reminder of him. Driven by one “fatal instance of imprudent curiosity” (II.259) or perhaps “fate,” Hannah feels “impelled to pay the *Entrepreneur* another visit”

(II.257) and so discovers a sea chest with “the name of John Hewit studded upon [it] in small brass nails!”: “My very blood froze within me, the place swam round with me, and I fell with violence on the ground” (II.258). Hannah is described as being “like Pandora” (III.12), and when she does muster up the nerve to open the chest, she “discovered too plainly that it belonged to [her] husband” (III.18). From this moment forward, Hannah starts to unravel. Finding the name John Hewit on the “fatal chest” (III.32) is the Robinson Crusoe “footprint” moment of Hannah Hewit; the moment when the heretofore completely rational, stable, and rather male “Female Crusoe” starts to behave in a haunted and strange manner.<sup>91</sup> The changed Hannah immediately considers “suicide,” expressing that the “susceptible reader” would be “touch[ed] to the soul...could [she] find language to picture the forlorn, the fallen, the heart sick situation to which [she] was reduced” (III.21). Hannah has survived (and survived well) being orphaned at five; a meteoric rise to riches and equally dramatic plunge back into poverty; the death of her children and abandonment by their father; an epic shipwreck and a second wreck that results in her being castaway solo on an island for a number of years. It is near impossible, though, for Hannah to “save [her] poor heart from sinking” (III.22) when she sees John Hewit’s “own hand writing” and thinks about him “fir[ing] the very gun as a signal of distress” (III.23) off the coast of her island before drowning on the wrecked *Entrepreneur*. Hannah all but shuts down after this discovery; she “would kiss John Hewit’s hair, enclosed in a trinket... read a

---

<sup>91</sup> The night of the discovery, Hannah “dreamt John Hewit came to [her] all bloody” and told her that “he had been torne by the jaws of a lion” and she wakes in a “delirium” with a “violent fever” (II.269). Hannah is plagued by “horrid dreams... a more sanguinary kind, and related to nothing but wounds and murder” (III.113) in which “Hewit, [her] brother, Binns, Walmesley, Sourby, were perpetually swimming before me in so many fantastic shapes, that when I awoke I seemed to be on the verge of madness” (III.112).



fragment of a repentant letter, on which [she] could plainly perceive he had shed tears, then drop a tear on it [her]self...then place it near [her] heart” (III.27). As much as she tries to bury herself in her labor and find solace, Hannah is utterly disrupted by the discovery of “the fatal chest” (III.40) and the knowledge that she had been so close to being reunited with her (as John Hewit calls himself in his letters) “REPENTANT HUSBAND” (III.33). The speaking automaton—one of Hannah’s greatest technical achievements— now says ““O ow I love u Anna”” (III.95) “so much in the tone of John Hewit’s voice” that Hannah “began to fear it might introduce a melancholy” and so she “placed it in a corner of [her] dormitory” (III.96). Hearing the “hollow voice” of the automaton call her name during a dream propels Hannah into “strong hysterics” (III.115) and she becomes “wild with terror” (III.118), sick and skeletal, roaming the island in her salvaged white nightgown, and spending her time “Like poor Ophelia” (III.105) constructing her own “tomb” and painting a pictorial summary of her story on the walls of her chapel. Hannah’s final mental and emotional collapse comes when a “baboon...caught [her] in his arms” (III.98) and threatens her in what is depicted as being a sexual way, linking back into the mythology of the women of the *Grosvenor* and rumors of their fate in oversexed Africa. “Heaven knows” the narrator asserts, what might have happened had Leo, Hannah’s “noble protector, on hearing [her] voice...not flown to [her] assistance”: “It was like a gallant Englishman protecting innocence from distress...like Binns” (III.98) defending Hannah from Sourby’s first attempt on her virtue back in England.<sup>92</sup> When the “hideous baboon” returns a second time, “poor Leo” (III.123)

---

<sup>92</sup> Leo is so personified that, when Hannah is later discovered on her island by John Hewit and tells of “domesticating the young lion,” the relationship “almost excited in Hewit another fit of jealousy”

loses his life in defense of his mistress and Hannah is “completely overcome” and left swimming in “something more than madness,” becoming a “miserable lunatic” (III.124).

It is in this state that Hannah is suddenly discovered by John Hewit, her brother, Walmesley, Binns, and her son, who are alive and on her island. In another moment that harkens back to *Robinson Crusoe*, the mentally fragile, specter-like Hannah is spotted by the men and described as appearing as “either a ghost, or a devil, or a woman in a white gown” (III.129).<sup>93</sup> The men’s “wonder at finding [Hannah] upon a desolate island in the midst of plenty” (III.134) is underscored by their core assertion that it is more likely that something supernatural created the plush domestic space on the island than a woman. The phantom-like Hannah is found in a “sacred place” (130) and her discoverers marvel that “one would think this was Lapland, and that [they were] among the witches!” (III.153). Captain Higgins asks his sister “who built this fine palace,” professing that “if [he] did not know [Hannah] to be [his] sister, [he] should take [her] to be some Queen of the Fairies in the Arabian Nights Entertainments.” The world that this “Female Crusoe” has created, indeed, “looks more like magic than reality” (III.157), and Hannah and “everything” that she has “created by the suggestions of [her] fancy, and the labour of [her] hands” (III.158) is wildly over the top. The men spend the last portion of the novel “admir[ing] the fecundity of [Hannah’s] genius” (III.186) and with John Hewit admitting that “her

---

(III.187).

<sup>93</sup> Hannah is literally hiding in her self-created crypt when she finally recognizes “the voice of [her] husband” and “tearing open the doors of the tomb, and presenting [her]self to their astonished sight, [she] flew to his arms, fell upon his neck, and burst into tears” (III.132). Since the “scene that followed not tongue, not pen, nor pencil can describe” (III.133), details of the reunion give way to statements like Walmesley’s: ““The ways of Heaven...are dark and intricate, puzzled with mazes, and perplexed with errors”” (III.152).

mind was always superior to [his]" (III.192) and to everyone else's for that matter. The final chapter of the book is boldly titled (albeit self-consciously): "CHAPTER VIII: WHICH MIGHT BE CALLED IF THE TERM COULD BE SO FAR STRAINED, THE LIVING APOTHEOSIS OF HANNAH HEWIT." At this moment, Hannah Hewit is promoted above supernatural status to deified status. The "Living Apotheosis" stems from the moment at which Hannah issues a speech about the "miracle" that precipitated "so many extraordinary and unheard of circumstances" to be "combined in so remote a part of the world, to bring a number of friends together" (III.251):

Take up any part of our stories, in almost any part of it, and you will find it a kind of index pointing to this day. Whenever we have been within a hair's breadth of individual happiness, some singular event has prevented it; why? That we might now be happy together. Nor could this happiness be accomplished till the malignant fiends that were perpetually thwarting our hopes and refining our virtue, like gold in fire, were no more... Fate called us together as a shepherd calls his sheep into the fold. Will you say this was chance? Was it chance, that I have been three years on this desolate island, as it were to expect you? Was it chance that my husband was hurried to different parts of the world for the same three years... Was this by chance? Miracles do not happen by chance. No; we are a set where uncommon trials have never warped us from our moral duties. Our lives have been watched by that eye that regards virtue with benignity, and this happy meeting is the reward of our truth and fidelity. (III.253-254)

Hannah convinces the less sagacious men that they have on her island "an Eden" and that "it will be [our] own faults if [they] do not make it paradise" (III.256) and so they all (barring Captain Higgins) decide to stay. An "extravaganza" to the very end, Hannah Hewit develops, colonizes, plans to populate (her son marries her niece, Britannia), economically legitimate (she plans "to establish a commercial treaty

between great Britain and her New Colony” (III.270)), and document the establishment and history of her very own “Eden.”

*Hannah Hewit* ends with the “Female Crusoe asserting”: “If the vice I painted appeared ugly, and the virtue beautiful, it was all I had a right to expect” (III. 272). This is almost an exact recasting of a statement in the foreword of Richardson’s *Pamela*: “IF to paint VICE in its proper colours, to make it *deservedly odious*; and to set VIRTUE in its own amiable light, to make it *truly lovely*...” (21). To return to the binaries that have been developed throughout this study, Hannah Hewit is aligned with the category “soul” and is armed with the male and female characteristics that other successful travel or adventure heroes possess: she is benevolent, benign, rational, Enlightened, chaste and virtuous, and engages in intellectual labor (writing) to share the lesson of her remarkable trial in isolation. Hannah leans most heavily upon her “male mind” and is extraordinarily successful at exerting command over her bourgeois body and managing to stay the picaresque course using her wit in a narrative marked by “the extravaganza” (xi). Hannah’s one damning mistake is attaching herself to John Hewit, who is aligned with the category of “body” and who fails to manage his passions, appetite, and self throughout the text. In sum, Crusoe is punished because he turns his back on the stable “oeconomy” of his father and the middle state and Hannah is punished because she falls in love with and marries John Hewit and becomes inextricably joined to his bad “oeconomy.” At the end of story, there is hope for John Hewit’s permanent redemption as he and his wife begin to further settle their “Eden”; a project which might extend to Hannah’s continued work at her husband’s domestication (which will be easier in isolation). At the end of

*Hannah Hewit*, however, it is the bourgeois “Female Crusoe,” who is a paragon of both virtue *and* industry. Hannah Hewit is more successful at managing her self and space than any other traveling body that we have encountered, male or female. She is, in fact, too remarkable, too successful, and so devoid of “feminine susceptibility” that she strikes a ridiculous figure in this genre and emerges only a bizarre “fac simile” of her male counterparts.

## Conclusion: Vulnerable at the Peripheries

In concluding, I will return to one of the questions raised in the Introduction: Why, in constructing the British, eighteenth-century male adventurer—one of the most critical cogs in the empire-building machine—were period writers drawing upon the trope of domesticity and characteristics more typically associated with defenseless, female protagonists in period novels? The reaction of eighteenth-century readers and critics to Charles Dibdin’s “Female Crusoe” project yields some clues. *Hannah Hewit* failed because Dibdin was aware that he could not tell a story about a real woman with “feminine susceptibility” in great distress on the peripheries of civilization. The author gutted Hannah of vulnerability to the degree that the “Female Crusoe” was rendered oddly “male” and too strange to be taken seriously. The suggestion is that moving around on the fringes in dark and unfamiliar space was incredibly anxiety-provoking (as Lamb suggests), and so the whole project of adventuring or discovering was recognized during the period as being precarious business. I believe that British, eighteenth-century male travelers and their editors were appropriating varying doses of “female susceptibility” and applying them to crafted “novel heroes” to represent the difficulties of the empire or colony building mission in mental and terra incognita. In essence, in constructing their “novel heroes,” the central trope that travel writers were identifying with and borrowing from period domestic and gothic novels was a sense of vulnerability that stemmed from depictions of exposed woman in dangerous spaces. The most effective way to

manage the anxiety that resulted from disturbing encounters with “otherness” was through another appropriated strategy: domestication of self and space or good “oeconomy.” Early representations of this approach, *Robinson Crusoe* (published over twenty years before Richardson’s *Pamela*) and Swift’s satirical, *Gulliver’s Travels*, are about vulnerability and managing angst by exerting control over self and space, either successfully or unsuccessfully. In this study, the pattern is traced across Hakesworth’s Richardsonian Captain Cook, struck against the example of William Bligh and his “damned” and ultimately damning “oeconomy”; and the exceedingly feminine Mungo Park who must defend his virtue against the brutish Moors in gothic Africa. Backdropping all of these examples is a visceral feeling of vulnerability when facing trials in varying degrees of isolation at the peripheries of the British Empire.

Part of understanding this application of “feminine susceptibility” to the “novel hero” requires that we reconsider the way in which the project of traveling, adventuring, discovering, and other examples of engagement with empire were understood in eighteenth-century Britain. In *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600-1850*, Linda Colley points out that the disparity between Britain’s immense imperial ambitions, on the one hand, and its modest domestic size and resources, on the other, was significant:

Some might argue that these material factors—Britain’s marked limits in terms of geographical size, population, armed forces, and for a long time, military technologies—were of only secondary importance. That manifestly a vast British empire came into being and therefore that these constraints must have been of less significance than the will, self-confidence, even arrogance that allowed growing numbers of great Britons to view the overseas world as a site for action, conquest, and exploitation. Yet those living in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and evening the early 1800s, were rarely able to see things this way. There is certainly abundant evidence throughout this period

of individual Britons asserting their unbounded superiority to all foreigners, both European and non-European. But as more thoughtful or battle-hardened spirits among them acknowledged, where global power was concerned, arrogance and jingoism were never enough. Language, culture and complacency had no automatic witchcraft capacity by themselves to magic away more rudimentary deficiencies in terms of numbers and available force. (9-10)

Despite the vision of a supremely confident world power that has evolved over time, eighteenth-century Britain was self-consciously small, incredibly overextended, and often confronted with enemies that were bigger and more formidable than they were, all of which made developing and “sustaining a large overseas terrestrial empire a challenging and chancy business” (10). There were many, many points of failure in Britain’s attempts to extend its global reach. Colley’s reading of an eighteenth-century England that conceived of the imperial project as something that was not at all a certain bet but a very serious gamble helps us to understand why period travel writers might have been seeking out models of vulnerable bodies to tell their stories about activities at the edges of the empire. The focus of Colley’s study is British captives, and she explains why representations of the imprisoned, individual body matter in the context of a larger, uncertain, imperial project in the following way:

‘The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system’ writes the anthropologist, Mary Douglas, and in times of stress the body’s ‘boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened and precarious.’ In just such a way, the bodies of English men and women, seized in successive captivity crises overseas, mark out the changing boundaries over time of Britain’s imperial aggression, and the frontiers of its inhabitants’ fears, insecurities, and deficiencies. (12)

The captivity narrative of Mary Rowlandson, Armstrong and Tennenhouse argue, “anticipated *Crusoe* in representing the English in the New World as an abducted body...usually—though not always—female bodies” (204). Before the shipwreck,



Crusoe is a slave in Morocco, describes his time at sea as imprisonment, and—at a few points—depicts his time on the island as captivity. Gulliver is a captive, “kept man” or tightly monitored guest during his *Travels*. Hawkesworth’s Cook (modeled after Richardson’s famous domestic captive, Pamela) is described as being a “PRISONER in [his] own boat” (*Voyages* II.14). Mungo Park is vividly described as the supremely vulnerable “prisoner in the tent of Ali” (342). The project of imperialism, writ large, was not as stable as we might have imagined, and in the texts that we have encountered, the concept of captivity is deployed over and over again as our “novel heroes” are rendered powerless in trials in varying degrees of isolation in the unfamiliar and savage peripheries. It is not so surprising, then, that in looking for literary models of vulnerability, travel writers looked first at female heroines in domestic and gothic novels, who were, like the British Empire herself, self-consciously small, exposed, and at the mercy of more powerful adversaries. The domestic heroine (Pamela, for example) was the mid eighteenth-century’s vision of “feminine susceptibility”; the gothic heroine (like Radcliffe’s Emily St. Aubert) was the end of the century’s vision of distressed, feminine vulnerability. In both cases, however, these heroines manage their positions of powerlessness by controlling their boundaries; by managing space (to the very little degree that they are able) and, most importantly, by managing their selves. The successful “novel heroes” that have been addressed have emerged from their trials intact by following the same approach.

Feelings of vulnerability at the peripheries results in gothic language that expresses fear, “terror” and “horror.” As in the texts that spawned relevant feminine models, there is a visible effort in the travel narratives that that we have encountered

to manage the chaos by drawing a clean line between “self” and “other” and stand up a number of other divisions between the familiar and the foreign. When these divisions break down, a “gothic” aesthetic creeps in. In their analyses of domesticity, both Karen Harvey and Michael McKeon argue that the conflation of the private and the public and associated binaries such as home/away, female/male, and domestic/foreign, may be found in domesticity. In the shared, discursive space between the development of travel narratives (real, imagined, or heavily altered) and the domestic or gothic novel, more binaries emerge: aesthetic/empirical; novel/travel narrative; emotional/value-neutral. Still more binaries have cropped up during the course of this study as we have followed our “novel adventurers” on their voyages and quests of discovery: self/“other”; virtuously chaste/vice-ridden; inside/outside; familiar/wild; providence/fortune; civilized/gothic. In *Empire and the Gothic: The Politics of Genre*, Andrew Smith and William Hughes reference Freud’s influential comments on “The Uncanny” or “Das Unheimliche” (1919). Freud provides a semantic analysis of the German adjective *heimlich*, stressing the etymology of *heim* (“home”) which means “friendly” and “comfortable” at the same time that it signifies “secret” and “hidden.” In our discussion of the domestic and ways in which domesticity is being distorted, it is particularly appropriate, if coincidental, that Freud’s essay focuses on the word for “home.” For Freud, psychologically, there is something innately frightening in that which is most familiar. Thus, the uncanny (*unheimliche*) is really the estranged or repressed familiar. Smith and Hughes argue that Freud’s notes on the uncanny are of particular relevance in the gothic genre because:

This conflation of opposites (which occurs because the home is also the place of dangerous, private secrets) enables a gothic collapse between living/dead, human/non-human, self/other. This model of collapse also underpins the process in which the colonizing subject is displaced in its confrontation with racial otherness that is both strange, distanced and exotic, and yet the site upon which racial, psychological, and sexual anxieties are projected. In effect, difference and distance become erased. (3)

Both in the realm of domesticity and in the gothic genre, the binaries do not hold and there emerges a surprising, and potentially horrifying, sameness in the difference. In *Adventures in Domesticity*, Shannon Harrow argues that: “If, as Edward Said said, colonialism haunted England’s literary subconscious, domesticity ghosted colonialism.” Domesticity, then, has always been about both ends of the poles; “about both the English subject and the colonial specter—at once Jane Eyre and Bertha Antoinette Mason” (17). In this study, which has involved an analysis of the interpenetration between the domestic/gothic novel and the travel narrative, the tangible tension that is felt in the texts is the disconcerting possibility that there is no firm boundary between constructed, virtuous self and savage other. Following from Harrow’s interpretation of Said: it is about both Robinson Crusoe and Friday; about both Pamela and Sally Godfrey; about both Cook and Bligh and the women of Oceania and the *Bounty*’s savage, mutinous crew; about Mungo Park and the Moorish banditti and inappropriately voyeuristic African women; about Hannah Hewit and the looming sexual threat posed by amorphous “others.” The source of the horror in Swift—a vivid example of Freud’s *unheimlich*— is Lemuel Gulliver’s realization that there is no separation between his English subject self and the colonial specter; it is the presence of “the yahoo within” that inspires dissolving terror in Swift’s anti-hero.

If they are to emerge from their ordeals in one piece, the most critical project of all vulnerable bourgeois bodies—whether marooned on an island; held captive by Moors, rakish aristocrats or Lilliputians; or imprisoned within “wooden worlds”— is to maintain their boundaries intact. Imagine, for a moment, the process by which Defoe set about to write his 1719 *Robinson Crusoe*; to develop a novel before the genre existed. Perhaps he was surrounded by accounts published by Edward Cooke, Woodes Rogers, and Richard Steele that detailed the time that Alexander Selkirk spent on Juan Fernandez Island. Perhaps he had even read Mary Rowlandson’s account of her time in captivity. What stylistic and aesthetic elements did Defoe add to flesh out these spare narratives and bring the story to life— to make it engaging, entertaining, and edifying all at the same time? How different was this process from the process that John Hawkesworth engaged in when he sat down at his desk in London in 1772-3 with the logs of the Captain and crew of the recently returned *Endeavour* and a copy of Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela*? Was the scene very different in the rolling, green hills of Scotland in 1798-9 when Mungo Park—having rescued his *Travels* from the editorial power of Sir Joseph Banks’ chosen guide, Bryan Edwards—sat down to shape his own story of his time in the *Interior Districts of Africa*? Is it possible that Mungo Park had read the popular *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794) or engaged in a conversation about Ann Radcliffe and her new variety of socially-acceptable gothic that involved chaste and virtuous heroines and an “explained supernatural” that was more acceptable in enlightened circles? In *The Story of the Voyage*, Philip Edwards underscores that his objective is not “to add to or correct the history of imperialism,” emphasizing that the book “is not a study of

eighteenth-century voyages and the profound effect those voyages had on human history; it is a story of the way those voyages were reported” (12). Edwards, as has been discussed, tries to maintain another binary: the division between the “actual” travel log and literature that was born from tales of travel, to draw a hard line between the accounts of Cook, Bligh, Park and texts like *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver’s Travels*, and *Hannah Hewit*. As I have demonstrated, the process by which all of these tales of travel were constructed was quite surprisingly similar: the writer began with the skeletal, dry account and animated it by including novelistic conventions and addressing novelistic concerns. The crafted “novel heroes” of the tales—if successful— were marked by characteristics borrowed from the chaste, virtuous, female protagonists of period novels. To return to Edward’s quote, if in the travel writing industry (which generated a tremendous amount of interest and revenue), the “voyages were reported” by a process in which the empirical and the aesthetic were being married, then how does that change the nature of “the profound effect these voyages had on human history?” In effect, in developing oddly feminine, domestic, or “oeconomic” “novel heroes” like Hawkesworth’s Richardsonian Cook or the deeply vulnerable, Radcliffean Mungo Park, the male adventurer and his role in the anxiety-provoking process of empire-building was being “romanced” in a very particular way. The suggestion is that the impact of the domestic or gothic novel has greater reach than we have been willing to acknowledge; a reach that stretches beyond the limits of (feminine/aesthetic) literature and into the realm of (masculine/empirical or factual) historical record. Ultimately, this observation does, indeed, “add... to the history of

imperialism” since the centrality of the “story” and the intrinsically feminine nature of the “story” that lies at the heart of the “history of imperialism” is exposed.

## Bibliography

- Abbott, John Lawrence. *John Hawkesworth: Eighteenth-Century Man of Letters*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John Hawkesworth: Friend of Samuel Johnson and Editor of Captain Cook's Voyages and of the *Gentleman's Magazine*." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 3 (Spring 1970): 339-350.
- Adams, Percy G. *Travelers and Travel Liars, 1600-1800*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1983.
- Anolik, Ruth Bienstock and Douglas L. Howard, eds. *The Gothic Other: Racial and Social Constructions in the Literary Imagination*. North Carolina: McFarland Press, 2004.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Armstrong, Nancy, and Leonard Tennenhouse. *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.
- Backscheider, Paula R. *Revising Women: Eighteenth-Century "Women's Fiction" and Social Engagement*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Barros, Carolyn, and Johanna M. Smith, eds. *Life Writings by British Women, 1660-1815: An Anthology*. Boston, Northeastern University Press, 2000.

- Batten, Charles. *Pleasurable Instruction: Form and Convention in 18th Century Travel Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Beaglehole, J.C. ed. *The Endeavour Journal of Joseph Banks 1768-1771 (Volume I and II)*. Sydney and London: Angus & Robertson, Ltd., 1962.
- Beaglehole, J.C. *The Life of Captain James Cook*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Blewett, David. *Passion and Virtue: Essays on the Novels of Samuel Richardson*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Bligh, William and Edward Christian. *The BOUNTY Mutiny*. New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 2001.<sup>94</sup>
- Blouet, Olwyn M. "Brian Edwards, F.R.S., 1743-1800." *Notes & Records of The Royal Society*, vol. 54 no 2 (22 May 2000): 215-222.
- Bohls, Elizabeth A. and Ian Duncan, eds. *Travel Writing 1700-1830: An Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Bolyanatz, Alexander H. *Pacific Romanticism: Tahiti and the European Imagination*. Westport: Praeger/Greenwood, 2004.
- Brown, Julia Prewitt. "Robinson Crusoe's 'Tent upon the Earth.'" *The Journal of Architecture*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (2008): 365-378.
- Brown, Laura. "Reading Race and Gender: Jonathan Swift." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 23 (1990): 425-443.

---

<sup>94</sup> This text includes an introduction by R.D. Madison, which I refer to in the chapter, as well as (1) A Narrative of the Mutiny on Board His Majesty's Ship *Bounty*, by William Bligh; (2) Minutes of the Proceedings of the Court-Martial held at Portsmouth, August 12, 1792. On Ten Persons charged with Mutiny on Board His Majesty's Ship the *Bounty*, with an Appendix by Edward Christian; (3) An Answer to Certain Assertions Contained in the Appendix to a Pamphlet, by William Bligh; (4) A Short Reply to Capt. William Bligh's Answer, by Edward Christian.



- Calder, Alex, Jonathan Lamb, and Bridget Orr, eds. *Voyages and Beaches: Pacific Encounters, 1769-1840*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- Carlson, Julie A. "New Lows in Eighteenth-Century Theatre: The Rise of Mungo." *European Romantic Review*, Volume 18, Issue 2 (April 2007): 139 – 147.
- Cheek, Pamela. *Sexual Antipodes: Enlightenment Globalization and the Placing of Sex*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Coleman, Deirdre, ed. *Maiden Voyages and Infant Colonies: Two Women's Travel Narratives of the 1790s*. London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1999.
- Coleman, Deirdre. *Romantic Colonization and Anti-Slavery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600-1850*. New York: Anchor Books, 2002.
- Dampier, William. *A New Voyage Round the World*. New York: 1500 Books, 2007.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe* (Norton Critical Edition). New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1994.
- DeLuna, Dee Ann. "Robinson Crusoe, Virginal Hero of the Commercial North." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 28.1 (2004): 69-91.
- Denning, Greg. *Mr. Bligh's Bad Language: Passion, Power, and Theatre on the Bounty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Dibdin, Charles. *Hannah Hewit; or, The Female Crusoe*. London: Printed for C. Dibdin at His Music Warehouse, No. 411, Strand, 1792.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> The publication date of the novel is often listed as being 1792, but advertising notices in the press in 1796 make it clear that this is the correct publication date.

- Dodsley, Robert. *The Oeconomy of Human Life*. 1781 edition. March 2010  
<https://books.google.com>
- Donovan, Robert A. "The Problem of *Pamela*, or, Virtue Unrewarded." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, Volume 3, Issue 3, Restoration and Eighteenth Century (Summer 1963): 377-395.
- Edmond, Rod. *Representing the South Pacific: Colonial Discourse from Cook to Gauguin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Edwards, Philip, ed. *The Journals of Captain Cook*. London, New York, Victoria: Penguin Books, 1999.
- Edwards, Philip. *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Ellis, Markman. *The History of Gothic Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, Ltd., 2000.
- Fausett, David. *The Strange and Surprising Sources of Robinson Crusoe*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- Flynn, Carol Houlihan. *Samuel Richardson: A Man of Letters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Ford, Worthington Chauncey. *The Isle of Pines (1668): "An Essay in Bibliography."* Boston, The Club of Odd Volumes, Merrymount Press, 1920.
- Fox, Christopher, ed. *Jonathan Swift's Gulliver's Travels* (Norton Critical Edition). New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2001.
- Fraiman, Susan. "Shelter Writing: Desperate Housekeeping from *Crusoe* to *Queer Eye*." *New Literary History* 37 (2006): 341-359.

- Fulford, Tim, Debbie Lee, and Peter J. Kitson. *Literature, Science, and Exploration in the Romantic Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Fulford, Tim and Debbie Lee. "Mental Travelers: Joseph Banks, Mungo Park, and the Romantic Imagination." *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, Vol. 24, Issue 2 (2002): 117-137.
- Fyfe, Christopher, ed. *Anna Marie Falconbridge: Narrative of Two Voyages to the River Sierra Leone during the Years 1791-1792-1793*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
- Geras, Norman, and Robert Wokler, eds. *The Enlightenment and Modernity*. New York: St. Martin's Press Inc., 2000.
- Guadalupi, Gianna, and Albert Manguel. *The Dictionary of Imaginary Places*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt, 1999.
- Harrow, Sharon. *Adventures in Domesticity: Gender and Colonial Adulteration in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Trading in the Blush: Domesticating the Colony in Anna Maria Falconbridge's Narrative." *Journal of African Travel-Writing* No. 5 (October, 1998): 25-37.
- Harvey, Karen. "Men Making Home: Masculinity and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *Gender & History*, Vol. 23, No. 9 (November 2009): 520-540.
- Hawkesworth, John. "Account of the Voyages... in the Southern Hemisphere, Volume II-III, London: 1773 South Seas; Voyaging and Cross-Cultural Encounters in the Pacific (1760-1800). National Library of Australia. January 2011 <http://southseas.nla.gov.au/>
- Hooper, Glenn and Tim Youngs, eds. *Perspectives on Travel Writing*. London: Ashgate Publishing, 2004.

- Horner, Avril and Sue Zlosnik. *Gothic and the Comic Turn*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Johnson, Claudia. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender, and Sentimentality in the 1790s—Wollstonecraft, Radcliffe, Burney, Austen*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: W. Strahan, 1755-56.
- Juengel, Scott J. "Mungo Park's Artificial Skin; Or, the Year the White Man Passed." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 47 no. 1 (2006): 19-38.
- Kaul, Savir. "Reading Literary Symptoms: Colonial Pathologies and the *Oroonoko* Fictions of Behn, Southerne, and Hawkesworth." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Volume 18, n.s., 3, The South Pacific in the Eighteenth-Century: Narratives and Myths (November 1994): 80-96.
- Kavanagh, Thomas. *Enlightenment and the Shadows of Chance: The Novel and the Culture of Gambling in Eighteenth-Century France*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Kelly, Ann Cline. "Gulliver as Pet and Pet Keeper: Talking Animals in Book 4." *English Literary History (ELH)*74.2 (2007): 323-349.
- Kramnick, Jonathan Brody. *Making the English Canon: Print Capitalism and the Cultural Past, 1700-1770*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Lamb, Jonathan. "Circumstances Surrounding the Death of John Hawkesworth." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Volume 18, n.s., 3, The South Pacific in the Eighteenth-Century: Narratives and Myths (November 1994): 97-113.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Minute Particulars and the Representation of South Pacific Discovery." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Volume 28, Issue 3 (Spring 1995): 281-294.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Preserving the Self in the South Seas 1680-1840*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Lamb, Jonathan, Vanessa Smith and Nicholas Thomas, eds. *Exploration and Exchange: A South Seas Anthology, 1680-1900*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Leask, Nigel. *Curiosity and the Aesthetics of Travel Writing, 1770-1840: 'From an Antique Land.'* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Lee, Debbie. *Slavery and the Romantic Imagination*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Lee, Debbie and Tim Fulford. "Virtual Empires." *Cultural Critique*, No. 44 (Winter, 2000): 3-28.

Levine, Philippa, ed. *Gender and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Lincoln, Margarette. "Mutinous Behavior on Voyages to the South Seas and Its Impact on Eighteenth-Century Civil Society." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 31.1 (2007): 62-80.

Mackie, Erin, ed. *The Commerce of Everyday Life: Selections from "The Tatler" and "The Spectator."* Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 1998.

Mahlberg, Gaby. "Historical and Political Contexts in *The Isle of Pines*." *Utopian Studies*, Volume 17, Issue 1 (January 2006): 111-129.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Critical Reception of *The Isle of Pines*." *Utopian Studies*, Volume 17, Issue 1 (January 2006): 131-144.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Publishing History of *The Isle of Pines*." *Utopian Studies*, Volume 17, Issue 1 (January 2006): 93-99.

- Martin, Catherine Gimelli. "On the Persistence of the Quest-Romance in the Romantic Genre: The Strange Case of *Pamela*." *Poetics Today*, Volume 12, Issue 1 (Spring 1991): 87-109.
- McKeon, Michel. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Mounsey, Chris, and Caroline Gonda, eds. *Queer People: Negotiations and Expressions of Homosexuality, 1700-1800*. New Jersey: Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp., 2007.
- Mullan, John. *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Needham, Gwendolyn B. "Richardson's Characterization of Mr B. and Double Purpose in *Pamela*." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 4 (Summer 1970): 433-474.
- Neville, Henry. *The Isle of Pines: or, A late discovery of a fourth island in Terra Australis Incognita. Being a true relation of certain English persons, who, in the dayes of Queen Elizabeth, making a voyage to the East Indies, were cast away, and wrecked, upon the Island near to the coast of Terra Australis Incognita, and all drowned, except one man and four women, whereof one was a Negro. And now lately, An. Dom. 1667. A Dutch ship, driven by foul weather there, by chance have found their posterity (speaking good English) to amount to ten or twelve thousand persons, as they suppose. The whole relation follows, written and left by the man himself, a little before his death, and declared to the Dutch by his grandchild. Licensed, June 27. 1668*. London, Printed in the year M,DC,LXVIII. [1668]. Eighteenth-Century Collections Online. Gale. University of Maryland College Park. December 2010 [http://find.galegroup.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&contentSet=ECCOArticles&type=multipage&tabID=T001&prodId=ECCO&docId=CB130547118&source=gale&userGroupName=umd\\_um&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE](http://find.galegroup.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&contentSet=ECCOArticles&type=multipage&tabID=T001&prodId=ECCO&docId=CB130547118&source=gale&userGroupName=umd_um&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE).

- Nussbaum, Felicity A. *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660-1750*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1984.
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Orr, Bridget. "Southern Passions Mix with Northern Art': Miscegenation and the Endeavour Voyage." *Eighteenth-Century Life*, Volume 18, n.s., 3, The South Pacific in the Eighteenth-Century: Narratives and Myths (November 1994): 212-231.
- Owen, C.M. *The Female Crusoe: Hybridity, Trade and the Eighteenth-Century Individual*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2010.
- Park, Mungo. *Travels in the Interior of Africa*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2002.
- Parks, George. "The Turn to the Romantic in Travel Literature of the Eighteenth Century." *Modern Language Quarterly* 25 (1964): 22-33.
- Percy, Carol. "Grammatical Lapses in Dr. John Hawkesworth's *Voyages* (1773)." *Leeds Studies in English*, New Series XXVI (1995): 145-168.
- Percy, Carol. "In the Margins: Dr. Hawkesworth's Editorial Emendations to the Language of Captain Cook's *Voyages*." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature*, Volume 77, Number 6 (November 1996): 549-578.
- Pocock, John Greville Agard. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thoughts and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; Revised Edition, 2003.
- Porter, Roy, and G.S. Rousseau, eds. *Exoticism in the Enlightenment*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1990.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

- Radcliffe, Ann. *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Reider, John, and Larry E. Smith, eds. *Multiculturalism and Representation: Selected Essays* (Volume 10). Honolulu: College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii, 1996.
- Richardson, Samuel. *Pamela: or, Virtue Rewarded*. New York: New American Library, 1980.
- Richetti, John, ed. *The Columbia History of the British Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Cambridge History of English Literature, 1660-1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Ridley, Glynis. *The Discovery of Jeanne Baret: A Story of Science, the High Seas, and the First Woman to Circumnavigate the Globe*. New York: Crown, 2010.
- Rivers, Isabel, ed. *Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England: New Essays*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2003.
- Rogers, Woodes. *A Cruising Voyage Around the World: First to the South-Seas, Thence to the East-Indies, and Homewards by the Cape of Good Hope. Begun in 1708 and Finish'd in 1711*. Crabtree, Oregon: Narrative Press, 2004.
- Rosenthal, Laura J. and Mita Choudhury, eds. *Monstrous Dreams of Reason: Body, Self, and Other in the Enlightenment*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; Cranbury: Associates University Presses, 2002.
- Roulston, Christine. *Virtue, Gender, and the Authentic Self in Eighteenth-Century Fiction*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.



Sahlins, Marshall. *How 'Natives' Think: About Captain Cook, for Example*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Sandiford, Keith Albert. *Measuring the Moment: Strategies of Protest in Eighteenth-Century Afro-English Writing*. Susquehanna: Susquehanna University Press, 1988.

Selcraig, Bruce. "The Real Robinson Crusoe." *Smithsonian Magazine* (July 2005) March 2010 [www.smithsonianmag.com/history-archaeology/crusoe.html?c=y&page=2](http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history-archaeology/crusoe.html?c=y&page=2).

Sherbo, Arthur. "Swift and Travel Literature." *Modern Language Studies*, Vol 9, No 3, Eighteenth-Century Literature (Autumn 1979): 114-127.

Shinagel, Michael. Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (A Norton Critical Edition; Second Edition). New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1994.<sup>96</sup>

Smith, Andrew, and William Hughes, eds. *Empire and the Gothic: The Politics of Genre*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd, 2003.

Spearman, Diana. *The Novel and Society*. London: Routledge, 1966.

Stillman, Peter G. "Monarchy, Disorder and Politics in *The Isle of Pines*." *Utopian Studies*, Volume 17, Issue 1 (January 2006): 147-170.

Sussman, Charlotte. "I Wonder Whether Poor Miss Sally Godfrey Be Living or Dead': The Married Woman and the Rise of the Novel." *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism*, Volume 20, Number 1 (Spring 1990): 88-102.

Tautz, Birgit. *Reading and Seeing Ethnic Difference in the Enlightenment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., 2007.

---

<sup>96</sup> The Norton Critical Edition of *Robinson Crusoe* contains a number of "Contemporary Accounts of Marooned Men" (Dampier, "Moskito Indian"; Cooke, "Rescue of Alexander Selkirk"; Rogers, "Account of Alexander Selkirk's Solitary Life"; Steele "On Alexander Selkirk") and a number of eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth-century writings on *Robinson Crusoe* which I refer to.

Taylor, Stephen. *Caliban's Shore: The Wreck of the Grosvenor and the Strange Fate of her Survivors*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2004.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. "The Americanization of *Clarissa*." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 11.1 (1998): 177-196.

*The History of Miss Katty N----. Containing a faithful and particular relation of her amours, adventures, and various turns of fortune, in Scotland, Ireland, Jamaica, and in England. Written by herself. London, [1757?].* Eighteenth-Century Collections Online. Gale. University of Maryland College Park. December 2010 [http://find.galegroup.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&contentSet=ECCOArticles&type=multipage&tabID=T001&prodId=ECCO&docId=CB130957486&source=gale&userGroupName=umd\\_um&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE](http://find.galegroup.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&contentSet=ECCOArticles&type=multipage&tabID=T001&prodId=ECCO&docId=CB130957486&source=gale&userGroupName=umd_um&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE).

Thompson, Carl. "The *Grosvenor* Shipwreck and the Figure of the Female Crusoe: *Hannah Hewit*, *Mary Jane Meadows*, and Romantic-Era Feminist and Anti-Feminist Debate." *English Studies in Africa*, 51, 2 (2008): 9-20.

Toohey, John. *Captain Bligh's Portable Nightmare*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1999.

Tosh, John. "New Men? The Bourgeois Cult of Home." *History Today*. December 1996: 9-15.

Viviès, Jean. *English Travel Narratives in the Eighteenth Century: Exploring Genres*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2002.

Walsh, Marcus. *Shakespeare, Milton, & Eighteenth-Century Literary Editing: The Beginnings of Interpretive Scholarship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Warner, William B. *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1684-1750*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1998.

- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding*. Berkely: University of California Press, 2001.
- Weaver-Hightower. *Empire Islands: Castaways, Cannibals, and Fantasies of Conquest*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Wilson, Stuart. "Richardson's *Pamela*: An Interpretation." *PMLA*, Volume 88, Issue 1 (January 1973): 79-91.
- Withers, C.W.J. "Mapping the Niger, 1798-1832, trust, testimony and 'ocular demonstration' in the late enlightenment." *Imago Mundi*, vol. 56, 2 (2004): 170-193.
- Wolff, Cynthia Griffin. *Samuel Richardson and the Eighteenth-Century Puritan Character*. Connecticut: Archon Books, 1972.