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Abstract

This paper introduces a set of six essays for a special issue of the Journal of Historical Geography on ‘The art of travel and exploration’. Taking the voyages of Captain Cook as a reference point, it argues that the centrality of Cook in the historiography of exploration and its attendant visual culture has tended to eclipse other important visual records and archives, which the essays here are instead concerned to address. They are, therefore, post-Cook, focusing on the period from the 1770s to the 1840s, to offer a variety of interpretative strategies, and treating of subject matter relating to a series of distinct global places and cultures, as a means of demonstrating the significance of diverse forms of visual culture connected with travel and geographical exploration. It takes mapping, and in particular an artistically enhanced version of Cook’s chart of the southern hemisphere made on his second voyage, as a case study both to suggest the interconnectedness between art history and historical geography through travel imagery, and also to outline the ways the essays here move beyond the Cook paradigm, through addressing in various, individual ways four key critical areas which mark out travel imagery from other forms of visual culture. Broadly, these can be defined as: issues of time, place and circumstances of production; practices of observation and recording; the imperial context; the influence of Cook.
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Over the past two decades much scholarship in historical geography and related fields has been concerned with travel and/or visual culture. This has prioritized an interdisciplinary approach that has conflated or elided previous distinctions between, for example, imperial history, geography, anthropology and art.\textsuperscript{1} Travel, its historical practices and cultures, in this sense assumes a paradigmatic status, as a phenomenon that defies any single scholarly categorization and demands a multi- or interdisciplinary analysis. This is particularly the case for eighteenth century studies, and above all in relation to British culture, where the recent ‘imperial turn’ in (visual) cultural studies has emerged, at least to a large extent, from an abiding concern with travel and related issues in literature, anthropology, social and economic history, historical geography, and even theatre studies.\textsuperscript{2} This is, of course, in one sense a reflection of the vast proliferation in travel-related material occasioned by the rapid expansion of geographical exploration and global empire during the course of the eighteenth century. Yet it is also an indication of the abiding priorities that have underpinned British art history and visual culture studies of this period, in emphasizing hitherto an overwhelmingly insular approach that has displaced issues of travel and empire as matters for serious consideration; and perhaps the only surprise is that it has taken so long for art history and visual culture studies to attend seriously and in depth to this extensive and challenging field of scholarship.

Travel literature as a genre, for example, was among the most popular forms of publication for an avid eighteenth-century readership, ranging from the novel to shipwreck survivor narratives to the detailed reports of Admiralty or East India Company voyages, and thus inhabiting the fertile interstices between fact and fiction, and flourishing as an endless
horizon of imagined geographies. The importance of exploration to this cultural outpouring, and particularly the three circumnavigations of James Cook between 1768 and 1780, can hardly be overstated: and travel generally, and Cook’s voyages in particular, have received extravagant attention in literary studies. However, the literary accounts of these voyages were equaled, if not superseded, by a rich corpus of visual imagery produced both during and after the voyages, to an unprecedented scale and standard, by artists specially appointed to them; which demonstrated an increasing primacy for the visual over the verbal, in being ‘part of a more general cultural conviction current in the late eighteenth century, which saw pictorial forms occupy a privileged position in the communication of knowledge’. Ever since Rüdiger Joppiani and Bernard Smith’s magisterial survey in the mid-1980s, the ‘art of Captain Cook’s voyages’ has attracted an increasing amount of scholarly interest across a diverse range of academic disciplines. However, in art history the ‘art of Cook’s voyages’ has largely been treated either as exceptional and effectively unique, or else as typifying so fully a genre of travel imagery, that the rest requires little or no discussion.

Yet, when travel in general can be identified as one of the dominant themes and narrative structures of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century British literature; and when maritime travel, in particular, had such a deep-seated significance for a developing mythology of national identity in terms of its supposed maritime destiny, it is surely important to consider the abundance of travel-related imagery produced in this period in association with military, commercial or exploratory voyaging, and not only that stemming from Cook’s voyages, important as they are. This is true not just of the extensive visual records comprising landscape, topography, coastal profiling, or ‘ethnographic’ representations of native peoples and artefacts; but of other abundant forms of graphic imagery that constitute essential primary source material for historical geography but are not conventionally addressed by art
historians, such as hydrography and cartography. Maps offer the most obvious site of congruence – or collision – between the languages of art history and historical geography; and it is worth considering some of the implications of this disciplinary and semiotic overlap, as a means to point to some of the issues of representation in related, figurative travel imagery, with which the essays in this volume are concerned. Even though the authors here rarely engage directly with maps and charts in their discussions of travel and exploration, the range of imagery they analyze, like maps and mapping, occupies an ambiguous place within the genres of visual culture; and in their very ambiguity, maps and travel imagery throw light onto disciplinary genealogies that help us to understand the relation between art history and historical geography, with which all the essays here are directly or implicitly concerned. Mapping also offers a convenient point of departure, so to speak, for reflecting on the dominant presence of Cook and how the authors here negotiate, subvert or otherwise engage with his massive historiographical influence.

It now goes virtually without saying that mapping is far from ideologically neutral – ‘the record of man’s attempt to understand the world he lives in … a seemingly objective image of the land [which] lays stress on its basis as at once mathematical and scientific measure of the earth’s surface’ – but is the product of a densely complex, discursive matrix of signs and systems of signification, and is therefore ‘a way of conceiving, articulating, and structuring the human world which is biased towards, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations’. The same must be said of the mass of ostensibly documentary, illustrative art work produced in the context of travel, which for the most part has been treated as just that – documentary illustration. Yet, like maps, the mass of travel-related visual culture of this period can be interrogated for its ideological underpinnings and biases, not least through observing its ‘silences’, the way such apparently transparent images ‘exert a
social influence through their omissions as much as the features they depict and emphasize’. Thus many of the essays here are explicitly concerned to read ‘against the grain’ images that on the surface might appear as largely unproblematic and uncontentious.

However, there is a parallel history at play here that complicates the issue. For, maps, at least of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, have been tied to a larger history of science and empirical geographical knowledge. In many respects this is certainly justified: the difference is undeniable between the world map of the first half of the eighteenth century and that of the early decades of the nineteenth, in terms of the remarkable transformation in the degree of data presented. And here again Cook emerges as a pivotal figure, not least because the difference in cartographic data was almost entirely dependent on navigation and developments in navigational charting. As Roy Porter has observed, the lacunae in geographical knowledge of the world, which ‘in late seventeenth-century maps had joined Australia to New Guinea, New Zealand, Tasmania and the ‘Southern Continent’ had been dispelled by the end of the century - thanks largely to Cook’.

Maps were thus annexed to a related history of technology, whereby improvements in mapping have been seen as an integral part of a broader cultural shift linking geography with empiricism. This plays out in their visual appearance in significant ways. Cook’s charts are notable for their pared-down austerity, in the attempt to record no more than what was securely measured, surveyed and sounded. This can be seen as part of an eighteenth-century shift towards what Michael Bravo has identified as a discourse of precision, by which differential judgments were increasingly made relating to geography, science and culture, and which ‘focuses our attention on the relationship between scientific curiosity on the one hand and precision on the other’. According to Nicholas Thomas, an ideal of detached, scientific
curiosity was held to underpin voyages of exploration, and to authorize their reliability, through their representation textually, visually and through practices of collecting. Eighteenth-century curiosity, Thomas writes, was crucial to imperial ideology and practice, in legitimating it as at once ‘invasive and acquisitive, but … dissociated from exploitation and profit’, or ‘the motive you have when you don’t have a motive’.¹³ Cook’s charts, in their reduced, abstracted ‘matter-of-factness’, similarly invite an empirically detached reading of them, as a form of representation ‘without a motive’, a rhetorical strategy that extends across the engraved illustrations for the published voyage accounts, particularly the de-contextualized, specimen-like views of native Pacific artefacts.¹⁴ For Charlotte Klonk and Luciana Martins, this change was also closely tied to an artistic and aesthetic reformulation of the scientific apprehension of nature, particularly prompted by the exponential growth in travel and travel illustration, which resulted in a dismissal of ‘conventional pictorial formulae, such as the sublime, the picturesque and the beautiful, in favour of a more “naturalistic” representation, giving priority to detailed observation of particular cases’.¹⁵ One related development was the widespread artistic experimentation with plein-air oil painting and direct observational study, so familiar from standard art-historical accounts of the period (even though these practices had been undertaken decades earlier), which focus on the work of artists such as Thomas and Paul Sandby, Thomas Jones, William Hodges and John Webber (whose work on Cook’s second and third voyages respectively provided an analogue to the ‘scientific’ visual language of the charts, coastal profiles and botanical drawings made by others on board), through to Constable, Turner and the Varleys in the ‘decade of English naturalism’ of the early nineteenth century.¹⁶ Martins argues that this entailed a shift in the ‘boundaries between science and art’, such that the ‘practice of drawing in the field was not merely a way of illustrating, or of decorating, texts: it was becoming a mode of scientific expression in itself.’¹⁷ Across all forms of visual culture, therefore, the decades beginning
with Cook’s voyages witnessed a profound transformation, formally, aesthetically and ideologically, prompted by or in response to the cultural impact of travel and exploration. Thus, in a similar way, the geographic, geological, ethnographic, and quasi-anthropological visual records that all the authors in this volume address in more or less direct or oblique ways (particularly Bonehill, Godby, Eaton and Wood) can be seen to relate significantly to eighteenth-century concerns with precision and curiosity, exemplified in Cook’s voyages, and manifested in recording practices based on direct observation.

A significant exception to the generally austere character of Cook’s charts, and one of the most remarkable and memorable images from the voyage records, is the allegorized representation of the chart of the Southern Hemisphere, completed towards the end of the second voyage (fig. 1). One of the few examples in Cook’s charts fully incorporating allegorical figures, it demonstrates both the integration of map-making with other forms of visual representation, and also the explicit linkage of the map with discourses of western imperialism; it is therefore worth considering in detail.

The joint product of the work of at least three people, it shows two cartographic projections elided together, but these are linked through the allegorical figures to abstract social and civic ideals. In addition, through the prominent inclusion of a quotation from Virgil’s *Aeneid*, the ‘scientific’ geographical and cultural goals identified with cartography are linked to a classical literary tradition, while the overall composition frames these within an enveloping idea of globalism. The elaboration of Cook’s chart of the southern hemisphere through the addition of allegorical, Atlas-type personifications by William Hodges adapts it more to the role of an emblematic headpiece. Its creation was described by Johann Reinhold Forster:
*Febr. Ye 8th* This Wind seems to conduct us nearer & nearer to the end of our Carreer. We … are also now round the Globe. I suggested to Capt Cook, to call the First Isle we have met with here to the South, *South Georgia* … To the Map representing the Southern Hemisphere & our Ships track on it, Mr Hodges added the figures of *Labour & Science* supporting the Globe, to which I added the motto\(^{19}\)

The addition of the figures of Labour and Science imaginatively and playfully re-works the meaning of the chart by placing it within a free adaptation of the longstanding iconography of Atlas supporting the globe, picked up by Forster, and thus emphasizing an idea of globalism. However, the figures are not carrying the world symbolized as such – it is not the symbolic globe of Atlas – but the world as mapped: navigated and charted in ‘scientifically’ geographical form.

The circular chart of the southern hemisphere, in zenithal equidistant projection, is only part of the cartographic representation. It is linked to a horizontal strip of map in *Plate Carrée* projection representing the circumference of the earth from the equator to 30° S. This has an important visual and semiotic relation to the two figures: for, Labour, a bulky, muscular Atlas-like figure, whose physiognomy is directly based on Hodges’s portrait depictions of Maori or New Caledonian natives, is bent over by the insupportable weight of the globe.\(^{20}\) Science, however, a slighter, classically proportioned figure, based on a Tahitian visual type, is gracefully and athletically posed, and holds the earth without difficulty: his supporting arm embraces it along precisely the same equatorial band shown in the horizontal chart. Each of the two figures thus corresponds to a different cartographic projection, so that the weight of
the globe held by Atlas/Labour, we understand, is dissipated through the geographical knowledge supplied by cartography/Science. The quotation supplied by Forster emphasizes the point. ‘Ipsa subido humeris; nec me labor iste gravabit’ (‘I will carry you upon my shoulders; for me this task is no burden’) describes the passage in the Aeneid where Aeneas carries his father Anchises out of Troy, a reference supported visually in the comparative age and youth of Hodges’s figures of Labour and Science; so that the increase in global geographical knowledge, substantially enabled by Cook’s own voyages, is associated not only with ‘science’ through the practice of navigation and cartography, but also with rhetorical discourses of heroic history and natural familial ties. Forster explained his use of the line in his Journal: ‘for though Labour supports the Globe with the utmost Exertion of Power, Science seems to do it with great Ease’.\textsuperscript{21} In other words, the progress of technology, industry and modernization, which must implicitly include cartography, print-making and related visual material, is inseparable from commercial global imperialism, indicating that cartography in this period was hardly ideologically neutral, but served the ends of the commercial maritime state: while colonialism and navigation could not have taken place without cartography and its refinements, maps and charts were not simply passive tools to implement a preconceived ideology. They were constitutive to it.

There is much more that could be said about this rich and fascinating image, but what I want to emphasize here is how it complicates and blurs the conventional distinctions between art and mapping, and among the intellectual and academic histories of art, science, travel, cartography and historical geography. It also points clearly (as a good map should) in the direction of a vast range of imagery beyond the crucial but narrow frame of the Cook voyages, that could and should come under art-historical scrutiny through a cross-disciplinary approach with historical geography; whether this be the more familiar art of William Hodges
or Thomas and William Daniell in India, and its relationship with contemporary military cartographic surveys, or the relationship of the landscape imagery of Thomas Hearne, George Robertson or Agostino Brunias in the West Indies to the transformation of islands’ geography wrought by the plantation system, or else the mass of travel-related visual material that lies in archives across the world largely unnoticed by historians of art and visual culture. It points towards a way of mapping the relation of art to travel and exploration. In particular, it illuminates at least four principal areas of critical engagement, which distinguish the arts of exploration and travel from other forms of visual cultural production, and with which all the essays in this volume are in diverse ways concerned. Broadly, these areas, several of which I have already touched on, might be summarized as: issues of time, place and circumstances of production; practices of observation and recording; the imperial context; the influence of Cook. In the first place, the specificity of the chronological and geographical moment in the voyage when this collaborative, hybrid image was produced, as recounted in Forster’s Journal, is crucial to its meaning: created towards the end of the voyage, in celebration and expectation of a successful expedition and return to England, and naming and appropriating the Falkland Islands in honour of George III. Secondly, its combination of visual registers alerts us both to the currency of precision and curiosity as values for the production of travel imagery, and also their relation to the philosophical interpretation of raw data, exemplified in Hodges’s personifications of Labour and Science. The naming of South Georgia at once implies the imperial context, but also suggests how provisional, contingent and, in some senses, improvisatory that context could be: in particular, it alerts us to what Daniel Clayton has termed ‘the spatiality of imperialism’, the question of how ‘visions of empire … and attitudes of dominance over distant lands [are] shaped geographically’, and in this case it is important to emphasize how that shaping is produced through hybrid visual form, involving a composite of mapping and classical allegory. Finally, its collaborative nature necessarily
qualifies the received and still dominant understanding of Cook as the individual colossus bestriding the histories of travel and exploration, and their attendant visual cultures.

So, while the essays in this volume derive from predominantly art-historical preoccupations, they offer fertile and fundamentally interdisciplinary perspectives on the range of issues I have attempted to outline. Despite my concern in the above discussion with Cook’s voyages, this volume actively looks beyond Cook, covering a broad period ranging from the 1770s to the 1840s, and offering an alternative genealogy for the history of exploration and its visual record. John Bonehill confronts this head-on, by looking in detail at Joseph Banks’ voyage to Iceland as a deliberate move away from Cook, going literally in the opposite direction and promoting Banks as an equally, if not more, influential figure on art and exploration. While Cook’s first voyage and Banks’ participation in it was an unavoidable reference point for the latter’s subsequent journey to Iceland, Bonehill argues that the record of his northern expedition ‘is arguably a far more complete record of the range of Banks’ interests at this date than the art that survives of the Pacific voyage’. Moreover, it complicates the relation of exploratory voyaging to national discourse, as modelled on a binary of metropolis to periphery. In becoming annexed for publication with Thomas Pennant’s expanded *Tour of Scotland*, with its evaluation of the Highlands in the wake of the Jacobite Rebellion, Banks’ account of his northern voyage becomes, Bonehill argues, a work of ‘national imagining’, filtering domestic cultural anxieties through discourses of natural history and scientific curiosity, in which the practice of drawing is paramount.

In other essays here, such as Michael Godby’s detailed scrutiny of Samuel Daniell’s views of South African landscape and cultures, Natasha Eaton’s account of the visualization of caste in
early-nineteenth-century India or Marcus Wood’s analysis of Debret’s representations of slaves in 1820s Brazil, Cook’s influence is almost or entirely absent. Ostensibly, for instance, Samuel Daniell’s *African Scenery and Animals*, which forms the subject of Godby’s discussion, might appear to share common traits with the visualization of the Pacific in Cook’s voyage accounts; but under close analysis, the urgent context for the volume of prints emerges as the political status of the Cape itself, as an imperial hinterland under contestation between Dutch and British East India Companies, in which the focus is on the relationship among indigenous populations, the settler communities, and the natural environment. Against this backdrop, Godby suggests, Daniell’s ‘images may be seen to represent a commentary on the institution of colonialism’, and thus need to be understood in the context of prevailing discourses of empire, slavery and freedom, which in this case at least were temporally specific: in the particular moment of the First British Occupation of the Cape, Daniell’s remarkable ‘ability to recognize both the individuality of his indigenous portrait subjects beyond the borders of the colony, and the authenticity of their several cultures, appears to have depended on a willing acceptance of their freedom’. In this case, therefore, the art of exploration and travel becomes imbued with historical issues of slavery and colonialism that are more familiar from scholarship on the plantation culture of America and the West Indies.

In this context, Cook emerges as a more nuanced, malleable and precisely located influence on subsequent travel discourse, having far greater resonance, perhaps for obvious reasons, in a Pacific context than elsewhere. So, he is certainly discernible in Augustus Earle’s images of Pacific peoples and island landscapes that Leonard Bell discusses, and emerges as the critical presence for understanding the topographies of 1840s Tahiti in my own account of British naval officers’ representations of Pacific landscape, but is displaced by other, more contingent factors in South Africa, India or South America. A parallel presence, more or less explicit,
that runs as an undercurrent through several of the essays, is, much more surprisingly, slavery, which operates as a critical factor at many levels in the interpretation of a variety of different sets of imagery: most obviously in Marcus Wood’s essay, which engages with the representation of slavery in Brazil directly, but also in Eaton’s discussion of India, and Bell’s analysis of Earle, as well as Godby’s account of Daniell’s *African Scenery*, already cited. The more positivist historical account associated with the art of Cook’s voyages and its subsequent influence in developing a more empirical, ‘scientific’ form of visual representation is thus countered by a more problematic and less familiar historical trajectory in the relation of art to travel and exploration.

Similarly, ‘empire’ when filtered through the lens of travel becomes a much more problematized concept in these essays. While all of them to some extent can be seen to treat imperial issues, imperialism is by no means uniformly understood or applied, but becomes instead contingent, tenuous and elusive, and once more variable according to location, involving ‘processes of differentiation as well as ... universalist formulations of imperial right and territory’.24 Thus not all the essays here assume an expansionist British imperial frame of reference: the Portuguese empire in Brazil that forms the arena for Debret’s drawings and prints in Marcus Wood’s discussion can be seen rather as an empire of retreat and displacement, for the Portuguese court in the face of Napoleonic advances through the Iberian peninsula. Natasha Eaton’s account of Balthazar Solvyns’ taxonomic images of Indian castes perhaps takes the most familiar understanding of empire, conventionally understood, specifically that of British-occupied India of the early-nineteenth century. Yet even here, Eaton interrogates and subverts any stable idea of empire, firstly by deftly emphasizing how art and artists in India were imbricated in a world of financial and other forms of speculation, founded on the practices of the East India Company; and secondly, by taking Solvyns’
Manners, Customs, Character, Dresses and Religion of the Hindus as a work of exploration, ‘navigating’ caste, to demonstrate how ‘conflicting definitions of manners, customs, costume and physiognomy staged caste as a site for cross-cultural contestation’; with the result that the very idea of ‘likeness’, so central to visual representation in the modern western world, above all in the context of travel and exploration, becomes destabilized and unreliable.

Likewise, all of these essays address fundamentally the practice of direct observation in visual representation produced in the context of travel and exploration, and the concomitant, deeply complex notion of eye-witnessing.25 Leonard Bell’s discussion of the art of Augustus Earle in relation to the writings of Charles Darwin and their shared experience of voyaging, demonstrates how deeply – indeed, inseparably – involved their artistic and scholarly practices were in the phenomenology of travel and direct observation; and he speculates on the extent to which one practice informed the other, while also exploring the divergences between the two men in their accounts of the same phenomena on the same voyage. Their shared reliance on eye-witnessing and direct observation as the basis for recording travel and exploration, Bell contends, means that, ‘even if Earle’s travel art only ever had a small part to play in the visual culture of modern science, the representations of this ‘minor’ artist nevertheless embody the dynamics of inquiry and reviewing, and the imaginative capacities necessary for the ground-breaking, paradigm-shifting work later of Darwin’.

Other essays here, however, demonstrate that, like empire, eye-witnessing was not imbued with universal values. In Jean-Baptiste Debret’s drawings of the day-to-day workings of the Brazilian slave system, which Marcus Wood analyses, eye-witnessing and the practices of looking, in the contexts of travel and cross-cultural exchange, assume an intensely moral charge (albeit an ambiguous one), imbuing the images, as Wood contends, with ‘a forensic
clarity of observation, a desire to see and register the truth through the sheer ferocity of looking closely’. This allows Wood to make a startling, original and provocative insight into the conventional art-historical account of the rise of *plein-air* painting as tied to a Romantic sensibility: he challenges the assumptions implicit in this art-historical narrative and instead not only reinforces the connection between direct observation in artistic practice and travel, as already outlined, but also makes the further case for the moralization of vision in the specific context of slavery, which in Debret’s work is manifested as ‘an honesty of vision and a precision of form that allowed him to produce an artistic commentary on slave trauma unique in its emotional depth and formal range’. This also adds a further dimension to the discourse of precision, discussed above.

My own essay, concluding the set, draws together these issues of empire, vision, and specificity of place, in investigating the visual records of British naval officers visiting Tahiti and the surrounding region during the contested period of the 1840s, with the French occupation of Tahiti and the Marquesas creating a flashpoint of Franco-British imperial rivalry in the region. This, I argue, informed and was filtered through the seemingly innocuous landscape views produced by naval officers travelling through the South Pacific, by which they referenced the abiding presence and loss of Cook as the determining source of British geopolitical authority there. Less an art of exploration, these naval officers’ landscape views instead historicize exploration, through reference to the seminal figure of Cook, and annex it to an imperialist ideological agenda. Cook is thus brought firmly back into the picture, but in a very changed, mid-nineteenth-century frame.

While the essays as a collection, therefore, cover a broad geographical – indeed, global – span, ranging from Iceland to Tierra del Fuego, they each are based on a case study that
explores the wide range of issues raised through an interdisciplinary approach to the visual culture of travel; principal among which is the way visual representation interleaves with discourses on the nature of human society, social progress or decline, customs and manners, or geopolitics, as filtered through the representation of topography, climatology, ethnography and environment. In one sense, they suggest that it is methodologically unavoidable to deal with this category of visual culture without recourse to historical geography, and it is thus entirely appropriate that they feature in this journal. In a fundamental, complementary sense, they draw attention to an extensive and heterogeneous range of visual material that sustains and merits serious and detailed scholarly analysis: in the end, therefore, it is the over-riding contention of this volume that such material proffers important challenges to conventional historical and art-historical assumptions, and needs to be put on the map.
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