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Abstract

Until recently, critical attention given to captivity narratives has focussed upon two key types. The first, frontier tales of white settler captivity at the hands of Native Americans, have received the most scholarly attention. The second type to attract critical interest is concerned with Mediterranean trade, and the captivity of Christians on the Barbary coast, particularly during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This study, by contrast, examines lesser-known, British captivity narratives of the Romantic era, including those available in the Travel Writing section of the Corvey archive, some of which have received little, if any, critical attention to date. The study ranges in location from North America and Africa to India. These British captivity narratives are valuable and subversive documents revealing the sometimes troubled progress of British colonialism and imperialism. These narratives yield fruitful study as texts in their own right, and should be seen as more than overlooked historical sources. The thesis discusses the complex relation of such narratives to ‘truth’.

It has been suggested by critics such as Pratt (1992), Baepler (1999), and Snader (2000), that captivity narratives are a ‘safe’ site for the representation of British vulnerability, as the fact of publication presupposes an outcome favourable to imperial authority. This thesis argues against this presumption. By following Edward Said’s influential 1978 work *Orientalism*, postcolonial analysis of imperial and colonial texts has paid scant attention to the fluidity of the boundary between coloniser and colonised, self and Other. This thesis uses the work of Homi K. Bhabha as a way forward from this position. Bhabha questions the binary formulation of colonial relations, arguing that colonial discourse is fundamentally and necessarily ambivalent. The narratives examined in this thesis are used to exemplify this ambivalence, through consideration of the discourses of savagery and civilisation, the representation of British captives at the hands of non-Europeans, and the possibility of ‘going native’. This thesis argues that captivity narratives cannot be considered a ‘safe’ site for the representation of the vulnerability of both British individuals and of British national identity, because in Bhabha’s view, the ambivalence of colonial discourse unsettles its authority.
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Introduction

This thesis argues that the captivity narratives under consideration in this study are highly ambivalent texts that cannot viewed as a ‘safe’ site for the representation of British vulnerability at the hands of Others, as is suggested by critics who view publication of the narratives as a ‘happy ending’. These British captivity narratives of the Romantic period reveal the vulnerability of both British individuals and British national identity, counter to those views of colonial and imperial history1 which represent Britain as an indomitable empire, and those postcolonial2 theories which emphasise the domination of the coloniser over the colonised above interaction. This thesis reacts against theorists such as Said (1995) and Pratt (1992) who suggest that colonial discourse is always in the service of the colonial power. Steve Clark (1999) argues that Mary Louise Pratt’s model of travel writing in Imperial Eyes (1992) presupposes an organised imperialism which did not always exist in precarious new colonies:

Narratives of encounter are undeniably dominated by the viewpoint of the mobile culture, yet it is possible to exaggerate the degree of superiority implied (Clark, 1999:5).

1 The differences between colonialism and imperialism are discussed later in this chapter, pp. 46-7.
2 I have chosen not to hyphenate the terms ‘postcolonial’ or ‘postcolonialism’, because I am in agreement with McCleod who suggests that the hyphenated term suggests a temporal definition, rather than ‘disparate forms of representations, reading practices and values’ (McCleod, 2000:5).
This is particularly the case in captivity narratives where the more mobile culture’s vulnerability is implicit in the captive’s situation. This vulnerability is contrary to contemporary views of British superiority over its Others, and because of this, captives’ representations of experience have a complex relation to ‘truth’. Captive narrators must negotiate contemporary discursive constraints in order to produce accounts of their vulnerability at the hands of non-Europeans. In *Imperial Eyes* (1992), Pratt argues that ‘survival literature’ (a category which includes captivities) is a safe site for the representation of experience which troubled assumed conventional national hierarchy:

> The context of survival literature was ‘safe’ for transgressive plots, since the very existence of a text presupposed the imperially correct outcome: the survivor survived, and sought reintegration into the home society (Pratt, 1992:87).

Baepler (1999) makes a similar point when discussing Barbary captivity narratives:

> any captive who wrote a narrative survived the ordeal...That the writer has returned to a place where she is free to record and represent her experience is evidence of her success and the greatness of her society (Baepler, 1999:33).

Snader (2000) also follows Pratt in arguing that captivity narratives are a ‘safe’ site, suggesting that despite the disruption of imagined national hierarchy within captivity narratives, the fact of publication restabilised this balance through knowledge gained of the captor culture. However, Colley (2002) argues against this view that publication is discussed in Chapter 2, ‘Savagery and Civilisation’.
in effect a ‘happy ending’, and believes that those reversals suffered during captivity are too discomforting to be erased. She suggests instead that:

Scrutinised closely and in detail, captivity narratives are often ambivalent, even subversive documents, because by definition they are about Britons or other Europeans being defeated, captured and rendered vulnerable by those not white, or Christian, or European (Colley, 2002:176).

Although the narratives under consideration in this thesis contain representations of the unpleasant treatment and conditions suffered by captives, they also include ambivalent views of both the captor and captive cultures. Whilst they nominally uphold the attitudes of the metropolitan centre, captivity narratives also challenge European ‘scientific’ standardisation of knowledge of other countries. The vulnerability of the captive, along with the intimacy borne of long contact with indigenous individuals, results in a troubling alternative view of Britons and their Others. As will be seen, some captives found certain aspects of their situation more congenial than might be expected. As Clark suggests:

Even the variant narratives of exile - those of the hostage, migrant or slave, do not preclude the experiences of curiosity and pleasure in new circumstances (Clark, 1999:3).

Added to the individual vulnerability of a Briton in a captive situation, such potentially positive aspects of the captive experience clearly threaten discourses of British national

---

4 As discussed in Chapter 3, ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’.
5 Discussed further in Chapter 4, ‘Going Native’.
superiority. However, whilst the captive’s narrative may represent positive aspects of their experience, it necessarily and simultaneously maintains views of the superiority of British culture in order for the captive to be able to reintegrate into home society. As this thesis is arguing against the position that Western texts are uniform in their representation of the Other, Homi Bhabha’s (1994) contribution to colonial discourse analysis in this respect, is significant to my thesis. Bhabha complicates Said’s notion of colonial discourse presented in *Orientalism* (1995), by arguing that colonial discourse is ambivalent because of the complexity of colonial identities, and thus of the relations between coloniser and colonised.  

This is a useful concept when addressing the range of representation within the captivity narratives under discussion.

In this introduction I discuss the narratives under discussion in the thesis. I then contextualise the thesis with an account of the critical history of the captivity narrative, which is followed by consideration of the contemporary market for captivity narratives. The next section defines important terms used in the thesis, and the final part of the introduction gives an overview of the thesis’ structure. I will begin with a brief summary of the circumstances surrounding British captivities during this period.

**Historical context:**

Colley (2002) notes that images of the British empire taken from the period of high imperialism, by emphasising British dominance, overlook the experiences of captive Britons in colonial locations (Colley, 2002:5). However, before 1730, it was openly acknowledged that Britons could become victims of the slave trade. Due to the colonial

---

6 Bhabha’s work is an extension of Said’s position on colonial discourse, which is discussed further in the section on *Orientalism*, pp. 54-57.
importance of the Mediterranean, this zone became the locus for captivities on all sides, as Snader (2000) points out:

In the early stages of the captivity tradition, no stable relationship developed between a consistently captive-taking culture and a consistently captive culture, and no pattern of blame attached to any particular people. Instead every people, even the English, seemed intent on taking captives within a framework of global competition (Snader, 2000:64).

Snader suggests that continued British involvement in Muslim slave trading in the Mediterranean was downplayed, as the power of the Ottoman empire declined and European nations began to dominate Mediterranean trade. He states that:

By the 1720s the British and the French had attained nearly complete naval domination over the Mediterranean and perceived the corsairs as pesky vestiges of an empire now superseded by modern Western trading powers (Snader, 2000:133).

However, in Captives (2002), Colley counters this commonly held view of the decline of the Ottoman empire, suggesting that this perception is heightened by hindsight. She argues that even after the Battle of Waterloo in 1816, British officials were circumspect in their ambitions regarding the Ottoman empire, viewing the likelihood of completely subduing it as ‘wholly unrealistic’ (Colley, 2002:66).

Colley suggests that Barbary corsairs continued to have a greater impact than might be expected, given the increasing technological domination of the British navy (2002:66-7).
Whatever the state of the Ottoman empire during the revolutionary period, it is clear that the increasing importance of inter-European rivalry at this time cannot be overstated, having a profound effect upon both individual captives and upon the attitudes of those in the metropolitan centre. Colley (2002) highlights the impact of inter-European rivalries on imperial efforts, pointing to Anglo-French conflict from 1793 to 1815 and the threat of invasion by Napoleon. Blaming a British lack of manpower for the high numbers of soldiers and seamen taken captive during these hostilities, she also discusses the difficulty in calculating a figure for the number of prisoners taken, and notes that conventional estimates usually exclude the thousands of royal navy prisoners taken by American privateers, plus those hostile European powers: the French, the Spanish and the Dutch. In India at this time, the East India Company’s territorial gains directly affected British captives. According to Colley (2002), the lack of unified state or national ideology in India at this time was the vital circumstance that allowed for British success, whilst this very complexity and India’s vast population meant that India could never be wholly captured. For example, British defeat at the Battle of Pollilur (1780) revealed the tentative nature of British gains in India, as sixty of eighty-six officers as well as two thousand lower ranking soldiers lost their lives, with ‘thousands more been taken captive and forced to defect’ (Taylor, 2004:29). In their opposition to British expansion in India, during the wars of 1779-84, Haidar Ali, ruler of Mysore, and his son Tipu Sultan, made formal French alliances:

James Scurry’s narrative (1824) highlights the importance of inter-European rivalry for captives. For example, on a voyage to St Helena prior to his captivity, Scurry’s ship became involved in stand-offs with French ships (Scurry, 1824:17-22). Fortunes varied in this and later skirmishes, but it is interesting to note that Scurry’s danger came from rival European expansionist forces, rather than the Muslim ‘Other’. As will be seen most clearly in the narrative of James Scurry (1824), discussed at length in Chapter 3.
French sponsorship of Indian resistance, which persisted even after 1800, was one reason why Mysore and its Muslim warlords provoked such persistent British concern (Colley, 2002:274).

Inter-European rivalries also affected captives taken in America. Michelle Burnham (1997) describes the ransoming of colonial captives by their Native American captors to rival European powers, and how captives became commodified by their exchange between cultures (Burnham, 1997:11). For example, Hannah Swarton’s narrative (1702) relates that she was taken captive by Native Americans in 1690 and subsequently sold to French-Canadian colonists, as were countless others then and later. After 1756, Britain and France committed to successive treaties to exchange prisoners-of-war, wherever the two armies were opposed in the world:

All prisoners in this war, whether in Europe or outside it, were now declared to be potentially the business of Britain and France, and not just their respective nationals...colonists seized by the French or their Indian allies...now became London’s responsibility (Colley, 2002:173).

Thus, many captives might more properly be thought of as ‘prisoners of war, rather than as victims of some instinctual “savage” aggression’ (Sayre, 2000:7) as the ransoming of captives to warring European powers became an accepted part of colonial life.

Through this type of captive ransoming and exchange, in the U.S. captivity tradition, the threat of Native American captivity became combined with fear of Roman Catholicism (Sayre, 2000:178).
Discussion of the captivity narratives chosen for analysis:

After deciding to focus on captivity narratives, the first task after an initial survey was to narrow down the choice of titles to a number suitable for this project. In most previous critical works, this has been achieved by selecting a single location as a focus. However, I have endeavoured to discuss a variety of locations, as my guiding criteria for selection was to examine the narratives of British captives of the Romantic period. I concentrate on British narratives from this period, as these have so far received much less critical attention than the narratives of American colonists, or those of British captives from the Early Modern era. However, this seemingly simple categorisation is subject to complications, and Colley (2002) points out the slippery nature of who might be counted as a British captive, which included various groups at various times, such as: ‘French Huguenots, Hanoverians, colonial Americans, and the multi-ethnic inhabitants of Minorca and Gibraltar’ (Colley, 2002:120).

Notwithstanding the latitude Colley allows in her definition, I have taken a slightly narrower view where possible, by giving most attention to the narratives of captives raised in Britain and held captive outside Europe. These criteria, unfortunately, have meant the exclusion of interesting narratives featuring captives from other nations, and in locations as disparate as Africa and Japan. II However, as I link the captivity

II Such excluded narratives include Vasilii Golovnin’s (1818) *Narrative of my captivity in Japan, during the years 1811, 1812 & 1813*, an unusual account of captivity in the Far East, by a Russian captive. Other narratives available in the Corvey collection are Judah Paddock’s (1818) *Narrative of the Shipwreck of the Oswego*, and John Tanner’s (1830) *A Narrative of the Captivity and Adventures of John Tanner*. Although accessible, with the exception of the Japanese account by Captain Golovnin, these narratives move too far from this thesis’ interest in the British context.
narratives under discussion to issues of British national identity, this approach afforded
the most useful material. I have chosen eight narratives published from 1816 to 1824,
although some describe events which took place many years before the date of
publication. These narratives include representations of captivity in India, Madagascar,
North America, and Africa. Appropriate narratives are taken from various sources
including the Corvey archive, some of which have received very little critical
attention, and are not readily available. Certain narratives, whilst outside my own
selection criteria, contain points of interest and reference for the study, and these have
been used accordingly where they support the thesis. Those narratives chosen for
inclusion in the thesis are outlined below:

1. Scurry, James (1824) *The captivity, sufferings, and escape of James Scurry, who was
detained a prisoner during ten years, in the dominions of Hyder Ali and Tippoo Saib,*
written by himself

The preface to this narrative states that Scurry was born in Devonshire, the son of an
adventurous mariner. According to Scurry’s widow and son, he undertook his first
voyage at the age of seven. In 1780, the fourteen-year-old Scurry began a series of
adventures, captivities and escapes at the hands of Europeans and their allies, which

---

12 The Corvey archive contains a handful of titles within the Travel Writing section
whose titles suggest an area of writing set apart from the usual travel literature.
Amongst the multitude of wanderings, rambles, observations, accounts, travels, tours,
journeys, expeditions, visits, excursions, voyages, discoveries, adventures, scenes,
sketches, accounts, handbooks, and guides, are narratives of captivity. These are
narratives of involuntary separation from the familiar, from country, and from loved-
ones.

16 James Scurry was born into a family where captive experience was already a fact of
life, as his father had been taken prisoner following the battle of Bunker’s Hill during
the American Revolution in 1775.
would ultimately lead to his long Indian captivity. In December 1781, Scurry’s ship was sent to the East Indies, surviving a terrible storm only to be taken by French ships at five days’ distance from Madras. Thus, falling into French hands, Scurry and five hundred British prisoners landed at Cuddalore and were sent to one of Haidar Ali’s forts at Chillembroom. Scurry was captive in India from 1782-1793, but the narrative was not published until two years after Scurry’s death in 1822. Notice of publication in Blackwood’s Magazine (Feb 1824, No LXXXV, vol.XV:241) shows that Scurry’s narrative cost only 4s. Despite these humble origins, this narrative has been brought to light by Linda Colley, and has merited a mention and brief quotation in William Dalrymple’s White Mughals (2002). Scurry’s narrative has been included to illustrate the representation of the mental and physical sufferings of individual captives, but also to show the vulnerability of British national identity, and the relation of a low-status captive to discourses of British superiority.

2. Whiteway, William (1824) ‘Additions to James Scurry’s Narrative, Communicated by William Whiteway, his Companion in Captivity and Escape’ in James Scurry The captivity, sufferings, and escape of James Scurry, who was detained a prisoner during ten years, in the dominions of Hyder Ali and Tippoo Saib, written by himself. London: Fisher, 269-376

Scurry’s narrative is extensively appended by testimony from his fellow captive William Whiteway. Whiteway’s additions are used to broaden the discussion of captivity narratives in relation to ‘truth’.

14 In ‘Going Native’ (2000) and Captives (2002).
15 Dalrymple refers particularly to Scurry’s adoption of local habits (2002:28).
3. Buchan, George (1820) *A Narrative of the loss of the Winterton East Indiaman, wrecked on the coast of Madagascar in 1792; and of the sufferings connected with that event: to which is subjoined a short account of the natives of Madagascar, with suggestions as to their civilisation/ by a passenger in the ship:*

In the August of 1792, the East Indiaman *Winterton* was wrecked on a reef off Madagascar drowning over forty crew and passengers. On Madagascar, almost half of the survivors of the wreck went on to die of malaria. On leaving Madagascar for Madras, those still remaining were captured by the French on their journey and temporarily imprisoned on Mauritius, before finally reaching their destination in August 1793. The narration of this captivity narrative is shared by George Buchan, a passenger bound to take up his position as writer for the East India Company, and the only surviving officer of the *Winterton*, Captain John Dale. Although Buchan and his companions do not suffer captivity at the hands of the indigenous population, they experience the full vulnerability of their situation and face the impossibility of leaving Madagascar for a protracted period. The narrative has been used by Jean Hood (2003) in her recent account of the loss of the *Winterton*, but has not otherwise attracted notice. This narrative is included in my analysis for its evidence of contemporary British attitudes towards its ‘Others’, as well as exploration of how higher-class Britons negotiate contemporary discourses of British superiority. The *Loss of the Winterton* also relates to issues of narrativity, as the product of the combination of the testimony of two separate survivors.

4. Jewitt, John R. (1824) (f.pub.1815) *The Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt, Only Survivor of the Ship Boston, during a Captivity of Nearly Three Years among the*
Savages of Nootka Sound: With an Account of the Manners, Mode of Living, and Religious Opinions of the Natives:

Born in Lincolnshire, the blacksmith Jewitt was persuaded to emigrate to America in 1803 for the chance of a better life. The vessel he took, the American trade ship *Boston*, was captured and all her crew, excluding Jewitt and the American John Thompson, were killed by the indigenous inhabitants at the established fur-trading post of Nootka Sound. Jewitt’s narrative was edited from his journal kept during his captivity, and also includes testimony garnered from later interviews with the former captive (Drimmer, 1985:217). The narrative first appeared in America in 1815, where it enjoyed continued and considerable success (Stewart, 1987:7). The narrative was first published in London the following year. Jewitt’s narrative has been included particularly for its representation of the captive’s adaptation to captor culture. It is also used to discuss authenticity, as Jewitt’s published account contains important differences from the journal.

5. Adams, Robert (1816) *The Narrative of Robert Adams, a sailor, who was wrecked on the western coast of Africa, in the year 1810, was detained three years in slavery by the Arabs of the Great Desert, and resided several months in the city of Timbuctoo: with a map, notes, and an appendix:*

In 1810, Robert Adams was on board the *Charles*, which was shipwrecked off the African coast, north of Senegal. Captured by the indigenous inhabitants, Adams was forced into the desert as a slave, where he changed hands several times. Eventually, By Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme & Brown.
Adams and his masters were captured in turn, and according to the narrative, Adams was taken to Timbuktu.17 This narrative has attracted interest from critics as the first by an African-American, although in fact the narrative is related by the editor Samuel Cook, due to Adams’ illiteracy. This text has been included, despite the captive’s American national identity, as it illustrates the importance of the returned captives’ knowledge of the captor culture and geography particularly clearly. It also illuminates discussion of the production of captivity narratives, particularly in relation to illiterate captives.


This narrative by the New England sea captain James Riley was a huge success following its publication in 1817.18 Riley’s narrative tells of his wreck off the western coast of North Africa in 1815, and his capture and slavery in the Sahara desert. Riley represents his sufferings in a florid manner, and the narrative has been included for examination in the thesis partly due to its atypical style. It also holds evidence relating

17 Whether or not Adams was the first Westerner in Timbuktu is a controversial point. See Baepler (1999:205-6).

18 A third person version of Riley’s narrative can be found in Cyrus Redding’s 1833 collection of tales *A History of Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea, Vol. II* as ‘Loss of the American Ship Commerce 1815’, pp. 271-316.
to discussion of authenticity, particularly the difficulties of translating the language of his indigenous captors.

7. Fay, Eliza (1821) (f.pub.1817) *Original Letters from India: containing a narrative of a journey through Egypt and the Author's imprisonment in Calicut by Hyder Ally. To which is added, an abstract of three subsequent voyages to India. By Mrs. Fay:*

The *Letters* form the narrative of Eliza Fay, an attorney’s wife who became a captive of Haider Ali of Mysore, and her subsequent adventures. Fay was captured in 1779 and held for fifteen weeks, having travelled to India in order to gain a post for her dissipated husband Anthony Fay, in the newly established Supreme Court at Calcutta. This narrative has been included because of the proximity of Fay’s capture in India to that of James Scurry, and the attitudes revealed towards assumed British superiority by a higher-class captive.


Hickey’s memoirs span from 1749 until his return to England in 1808. They include representations of his various periods in India, as well as his capture in 1782 by the French Admiral de Suffrein in Ceylon. Hickey’s work has been included in the thesis for its depiction of British life in India during the formative period of the Raj, and to

Barbara Hofland uses Fay’s experiences in her novel *The Captives in India: A Tale, and A Widow and a Will* (1834) set in 1783. Hofland was correct in her presumption that Fay’s narrative, having been published in Calcutta, was unknown in Britain until the publication of *Captives in India*. It then existed only in this attenuated form, and as Butts notes, Hofland’s books for the adult market were markedly less popular than her juvenile literature (Butts, 1992:41).
show how views of British superiority were complicated by the vulnerability of British power in India at this time.

Thus the captivity narratives I have chosen represent a variety of captives in terms of age, gender, and social class. Each narrative highlights aspects of contemporary discourses of British superiority, and the captive narrator’s negotiation of these constraints.

Critical history of the captivity narrative:

In order to determine the relation of this thesis to the field, it is necessary to establish the current state of criticism of the captivity narrative. A considerable body of scholarship has amassed around the American captivity tradition, \(^{90}\) and this is particularly clustered around key texts of female captivity, such as those of Mary Rowlandson (1682) and Hannah Swarton (1702). \(^{91}\) There are also various anthologies of some lesser-known American texts readily available.

Outside the American tradition, there is also significant critical interest in Barbary captivity narratives. The recent publication of an anthology of American captivities in this location, *White Slaves and African Masters* (1999) edited by Paul Baepler, shows how this genre is beginning to become more accessible. However, Barbary captivities

\(^{90}\) This interest was sparked in the 1970s, ‘fostered by myth-archetype literary theory’ in American literary studies. Early studies of these American captivity narratives are notably by Richard Slotkin and Leslie Feidler (Sayre, 2000:16).

\(^{91}\) Moves in the 1980s to acknowledge the importance of gender in literary studies have resulted in much interest in such female-centred texts, and have secured their place in the captivity narrative canon. Frederick Drimmer’s early collection of American captivity narratives (1985) (f. pub. 1961) shows the previous gender bias, as all fifteen narratives focus on male captives.
tend to be beyond the remit of this study in terms of date, as the majority of such British captivities were the result of early European involvement in Mediterranean trade. There is also a strand of Australian interest in captivity narratives of the nineteenth century, although due to the later colonisation of that continent, these texts are fewer.

In discussion of a British captivity tradition, the text that some scholars have claimed as the first account of an Englishman in American captivity is the tale of Job Hortop, *The Trauailes of an English Man* (1591). Snader (2000) argues however, that as this narrative contains no forced detention, such American narratives form only a ‘strand’ rather than the root of the genre. Instead he suggests that the first captivity narrative produced by an Englishman, and focussed exclusively on the experiences of Englishmen captive in foreign land, was Thomas Saunders’s chapbook published in 1587, which initiated several common patterns found in later narratives, by describing ‘sordid accommodations, paltry food, abject labour, and harsh punishment for trivial offences,’ (Snader, 2000:20). Captivity narratives telling of the Oriental captivities of

Eliza Fraser’s narrative (1837) has been the object of recent critical interest. See McNiven, J. et al. (1998) *Constructions of Colonialism: Perspectives on Eliza Fraser's Shipwreck*, and Kay Schaffer (1995) *In the Wake of First Contact: the Eliza Fraser Stories*.

The full title of Hortop’s narratives runs: *The Trauailes of an English Man, Containing His Sundrie Calamities Indured by the Space of Twentie and Odd Yeres in His Absence from His Native Countrie; Wherein Is Truly Decyphered the Sundrie Shapes of Wilde Beasts, Birds, Fishes, Fowles, Rootes, Plants, &C. With the Description of a Man that Appeared in the Sea, and Also of a Huge Giant Brought from China to the King of Spaine.*

Full title: *A True Discription and Breefe Discourse, of a Most Lamentable Voyage, Made Latelie to Tripolie in Barbarie, in a Ship Named the Iesus: Vverhin Is Not Onely Sheuued the Great Miserie, That Then Happened the Auctor Hereofand His Whole Companie, Aswell the Marchants as the Marriners in That Voiage, According to the Curssed Custome of those Barbarous and Cruell Tyrants, in Their Terrible Vusage of Christian Captiues: But Also, the Great Vnfaithfulnesse of Those Heathnish Infidels, in Not Regarding Their Promise. Together, With the Most Wonderfull Judgetment of God, upon the King of Tripolie and his Sonne, and Great Numbers of His People, Being All the Tormentors of Those English Captiues. Set Fowrth by Thomas Saunders, One of Those Captiues There at the Same Time.*
British seafarers which followed Saunders’ chapbook became a London publishing phenomenon in the seventeenth-century. Snader argues that the movement from earlier, generalised accounts such as those of Inquisitorial martyrs, to the individualised accounts of single captives from the mid-seventeenth to the late eighteenth-centuries, was particularly important to the development of the captivity genre.

In arguing for the primacy of the British captivity tradition over the American, Snader emphasises the relatively late advent of American narratives, which did not outnumber British texts until the mid-eighteenth century. Additionally, Snader argues that the length and complexity of American narratives did not surpass British standards until the nineteenth century. Thus, Snader concludes that by the time of the publication of Mary Rowlandson’s narrative in 1682, the British captivity narrative already had an established and separate identity. Snader goes on to refute the value of Mary Rowlandson’s narrative commonly thought of by scholars as a ‘foundation text’, and held up as the generically pure example of the captivity narrative. Burnham (1997) also criticises the generic degeneration model posited by some critics. In this argument, captivity narratives begin life as an essentially ‘truthful’ genre containing a significant religious component. Later, under the influence of sentimental fiction, captivity narratives are transformed as they take on more lurid elements and become debased by commercialism. Burnham notes that this view is often the result of national bias, as early critics of the captivity narrative saw the genre as ‘uniquely American’ (Lervemier

---

24 These persisted until nineteenth century (Snader, 2000:19).

Snader also criticises the more recent work of Michelle Burnham (1997), citing the same tendency to vaunt a particular version of the captivity narrative, in Burnham’s case, that of Hannah Dustan (1702) (Snader, 2000:128).
This alternative view of the history of the captivity narrative is significant for this thesis, as Snader believes that concentration on Mary Rowlandson’s narrative has resulted in the mistaken perception that all captivity narratives maintain a clear divide between a ‘savage’ captor and a ‘civilised’ captive culture. For example, he suggests that what later appears as a ‘natural’ or historical division between Christianity and Islam in captivity narratives, is in fact a later addition, as Inquisitorial narratives where Protestants and Muslims are held captive together show. Later captivity narratives, up until the late eighteenth century, still blurred boundaries between Western and non-Western cultures. Snader refers to such narratives of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as ‘proto-orientalist’, arguing that ‘the Orient’ as a totalising concept belongs to the nineteenth century, but that stereotypes abounded in earlier texts. He cites British ethnographic confusion and homogenisation, such as the labelling of Arabs, Berbers, Moors, Turks, Jews, African and Balkan slaves, and ‘renegados’, simply as ‘Turks’ and ‘Moors’. Similarly, in Captives (2002), Colley argues against the established critical approach to American captivity narratives as a unique genre, by suggesting instead that earlier narratives of Islamic captivity were adapted to a new time and location (Colley, 2002:140). To further separate the American from the British tradition, Snader points out that religious discussion forms a relatively small component of British captivity

97 The conclusion of this argument is that only when freed of this ‘enfeebling’ effect, can American literature reach its full artistic potential.

98 It should be noted, however, that critics such as Burnham reject the assertion that this divide exists in Rowlandson’s narrative (Burnham, 1997:17).
narratives, \(^{29}\) but that it is a dominant element of Puritan texts from America. This secular tradition of British narratives ‘grew out of the modernist, secular impulses of science, liberalism, nationalism, and individualism’ (Snader, 2000:280).

Rather than being related to the American captivity tradition, Snader argues that British narratives have a closer generic relation to slave narratives.\(^{30}\) He cites accounts of indentured servants taken to America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who sometimes compared themselves to black slaves. Royall Tyler’s early American novel *The Algerine Captives* (1797) makes this comparison explicit, a connection that Snader argues would not be made in a British work, because of the way in which ‘the rhetoric of native British liberty spills over into a discourse of human rights’ (Snader, 2000:283). Snader suggests that this may be one reason for the demise of the British captivity genre, as these servants’ narratives were generally superseded by those of black slaves:

\(^{29}\) A notable exception to this trend is William Okeley’s narrative (1675), a captive in Algiers from 1639 to 1644. This text is heavily informed by Protestant religiosity, and Vitkus suggests that rising contemporary anti-Catholicism prompted its delayed publication in 1675 (Vitkus, 2001:125). However, Vitkus also argues that the strongly Calvinist element of the narrative may have been provided in part by Okeley’s editor, as Okeley believed that the narrative as written by his own hand was unfit for publication (Vitkus, 2001:126). There is also a stronger religious overtone in John Jewitt’s narrative than is usual in British captivity texts, perhaps because the narrative was initially prepared for the American market.

\(^{30}\) Baepler (1999) is cautious of comparison between slave and captivity narratives, as captives put themselves in the path of danger ‘as travelers engaged in mercantile or military enterprises’. He also points out that for white captives, there was the possibility of liberty and return to their ‘intact family and social structures’ (Baepler, 1999:28-9). Burnham (1997) links the female-centred, American captivity narrative with both slave narratives and sentimental novels, based on the notion that all three genres share the same affective reader response of sentimental tears.

Snader notes that these narratives set themselves against the dominant Anglo-American culture, whereas those written by Britons in other settings would have enjoyed a potentially more congenial audience (2000:282).
Perhaps the decline of British captivity narratives, both factual and fictional, lies in the rise of British anti-slavery literature. Increasing awareness of American slavery may have made the rhetoric of liberty seem contradictory or hypocritical when applied to British captives in other lands, or accounts of American slavery may have supplanted accounts of British captivity in providing readers with a vehicle for identifying with abject experience, feeling the value of liberty, and rousing moral indignation (Snader, 2000:283).

Thus, although the captivity narrative is not a discrete genre, its range of forms have received varying levels of critical attention, with American narratives the most frequently analysed.

Whilst captivity narratives have been extensively compared to one another, certain critics have made attempts to link the captivity narrative with the novel. Snader (2000) suggests that critics Armstrong and Tennenhouse are mistaken in viewing Mary Rowlandson’s American captivity narrative (1682) as a precursor to Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1740), and thus to finding the origins of the English novel in the American captivity tradition. Instead he argues that it was the British captivity narrative

According to Snader, the British captivity tradition did not acknowledge the fact of institutionalised slavery, despite its focus on ‘British liberties and the tyrannies of foreign peoples’ (Snader, 2000:282). Snader notes that Robert Drury’s narrative (1729) is an exception to this rule, as it depicts Drury’s own involvement in the slave trade after his release from captivity in Madagascar.

Derounian-Stodola’s (1998) collection includes one entirely fictional narrative, generally known as the ‘Panther Captivity’ (1787), due to the pseudonym of its author, Abraham Panther, rather than by its true title, *A Surprising Account of the Discovery of a Lady Who Was Taken by the Indians*. Derounian-Stodola argues that such early fictionalisations are directly antecedent to later novels featuring Native American captivity by Susanna Howell Rowson, Charles Brockden Brown, James Fenimore Cooper, Lydia Maria Child, and Catherine Maria Sedgwick, and also of later novelists (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xiv).
which was pivotal to the novel’s development. He maintains that until 1750 onwards, readers in London associated captivity narratives with Oriental settings rather than American ones, and that *Pamela*’s 1740 publication, ten years before this date, poses a clear chronological problem. Also discussing this suggested relation between American narratives and sentimental fiction, Bumham (1997) claims that later American captivity narratives are ‘virtually indistinguishable’ (Bumham, 1997:49) from sentimental novels, citing Samuel Richardson’s work in particular. However, she does not elaborate on which ‘structural and stylistic elements’ (Bumham, 1997:49) contribute to this relation. Bumham does give one textual example of the similarity between Richardson’s eponymous heroine in *Pamela* and the captive Hannah Dustan (1702), by suggesting that Pamela’s behaviour, if examined, may appear to be reprehensible. However, as her conduct is set against that of her captor Mr. B., and is necessitated by her captivity, the deception that Pamela must practise becomes morally acceptable, in the same way that Dustan’s violence is transformed into heroism (Bumham, 1997:58). Bumham points to Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s linking of Rowlandson’s narrative with Richardson’s *Pamela* as evidence of transatlantic exchange between genres. Rather than crediting the American captivity tradition in this way, Snader argues that the British captivity tradition of Oriental captivity narratives most easily made the transition to fiction for several reasons: Firstly, he cites the narrator-hero of the captivity narrative with his ‘even-handed tone’ (Snader, 2000:128). Secondly, Snader sees mercantile or artisanal

34 ‘For modern scholars of the captivity narrative, Hannah Dustan offers a radical antithesis to Mary Rowlandson, an alternative archetype of the female captive and her place within Puritan society...Rowlandson piously trusted in God to deliver her...Dustan took matters into her own hands with a tomahawk’ (Sayre, 2000:180).
35 Similarly, although James Scurry (1824) characterises his captors as naturally disposed to dishonesty, when he and his fellow captives fool their captors in order to escape, this is presented as an instance of British superiority (1824:170-171). See Snader on the depiction of the British captive’s guile overcoming the inferior intellect of the Oriental captor (Snader, 2000:135).
narrators as prototypes for the self-reliant, capitalist heroes featured later in Daniel Defoe’s novels. He also cites Richard Head’s popular *The English Rogue* (1665) and William Rufus Chetwood’s *Adventures of Robert Boyle* (1726). In these examples, as well as in Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Captain Singleton* (1720), captivity functions as ‘a colonial apprenticeship for a picaro or mercantile hero’ (Snader, 2000:138). Finally, Snader suggests that the psychological tension caused by the situation of the captive proved amenable to fictional translation and representation. Thus, according to Snader, the Oriental captivity genre spawned earlier, more extensive, and more popular fictional imitations than the American tradition:

Oriental captivity thus furnished one of the central plot lines animating a body of fiction that scholars have described as an important precursor for Richardson’s novels and a crucial element in English fiction’s shift from amatory plots towards piety, “virtue,” and psychological interiority (Snader, 2000:129-30).

Snader discusses the fiction of Penelope Aubin, Eliza Haywood and William Rufus Chetwood published during the 1720s, linking these three writers to the beginnings of the novel, as he argues that they:

mix the captivity plot with elements of romance, defining idealized Western sexual subjects through images of Oriental lust and dramas of besieged chastity

Snader also notes the continued currency of Chetwood’s *Robert Boyle*, which was being reprinted well into the nineteenth century (Snader, 2000:169). Snader highlights Robinson Crusoe’s captivity in Sallee (Snader, 2000:140-1). Also see Colley’s *Captives* (2002) on Crusoe’s Barbary captivity as a generic link (Colley, 2002:1).
that anticipate Richardson’s novels in their emphasis on the sexual constitution of identity and on individual freedom to choose a marriage partner. With further extensions, complications and revisions, this pattern continues to animate the English novel, whether we consider Pamela’s confinement in the various houses of Mr. B., the London peregrinations of David Simple or the Man of Feeling, Evelina’s experiences in the fashionable world, or Emily St. Aubert’s confinement at Udolpho (Snader, 2000:131).

Moving on towards the end of the eighteenth century, Snader argues that the contribution of the Oriental captivity narrative to the development of the novel is particularly evident in characterisation, and describes three main character types: the improvisational subject who masters an alien environment; the insular subject who protects his or her virtue; and the divided subject who crosses boundaries of ethnicity, class, and gender. He emphasises that the Oriental captivity narrative is transformed through these characterisations from texts containing actual physical constraint to other forms of control, and taken into a familiar setting:

Like the early fictionalized captivity narratives of the 1720s, later eighteenth-century fictions produce subjective interiority through representations of dependence, doubt, frustration, hesitation, internal conflicts and resolutions.

As discussed in Chapter 4, ‘Going Native’, both James Scurry (1824) and John Jewitt (1824/1815) take indigenous wives under an arguable amount of duress. This concentration on interiority found in late eighteenth-century fiction is not matched in the captivity narratives under discussion in this thesis, which have a tendency to omit such detail, despite the obvious potential for exploiting the mental sufferings of the captive. For example, Baepler notes that the American Robert Adams’ narrative Tacks a sense of interiority - ‘his thoughts and feelings are absent’ (Baepler, 1999:21), particularly as the use of his editor as an amanuensis means the narrative is written in the third person.
They thrive on tensions between subjugation and rebellion, conformity and transgression. In bildungsromans such as Fielding’s *Tom Jones* and Burney’s *Evelina*, although the main plots avoid the melodrama of physical confinement, the subplots still contain minor episodes of imprisonment, kidnapping and forced marriage (Snader, 2000:170).

Colley (2002) has also made this link between the novel and the captivity narrative in the late seventeenth century, arguing that the captivity narrative:

> meshed comfortably with the tradition of spiritual autobiography, while also becoming coloured by the novel, by Daniel Defoe’s and Jonathan Swift’s tales of encounter, shipwreck and endurance, and subsequently by Samuel Richardson’s stories of virtuous, captive females, *Pamela* and *Clarissa* (Colley, 2000:174).

Sayre (2000) notes that captivity featured in fiction of the late eighteenth century was transformed in order to address contemporary concerns. For example, events surrounding the death of Jane McCrea were written in novelistic form by radical French Republican Michel Rene Hilliard d’Auberteuil in 1784, entitled *Miss McCrea: A Novel of the American Revolution*. The novel includes characters without historical foundation, and events surrounding Jane’s death are altered into a sentimental mode, where Jane is seduced from her Patriot father by a British soldier. In this version of the tale, Jane is scalped by Native Americans on her way to the British force’s camp.

Colley suggests that the circumcision of British men at Sriringapatnam in the 1780s has parallels with sentimental novels, particularly the rape scene in *Clarissa* (1747-8) (Colley, 2002:182). Such a circumcision is portrayed in James Scurry’s (1824) narrative and discussed in Chapter 3, ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’.
Presented as partly responsible for her own demise, the figure of Jane McCrea became a vehicle to exhort the American people not to lament ‘the loss of British wealth and protection’ (Bumham, 1997:78). Sayre (2000) states that d’Auberteuil’s novel is illustrative of a trend in late eighteenth-century fiction:

Although the Indian captivity does not occur until the final scenes of the novel, the entire work is characteristic of how the captivity genre began to intersect with other concerns in popular literature in the late eighteenth century, particularly the issues of the independence of young women and the relationship between sexual and political virtue (Sayre, 2000:350).

Similarly, Snader (2000) sees British attitudes towards colonialism and slavery affecting the treatment of captivity episodes within novels during the eighteenth century. He argues that along with anxiety about the colonial project, comes the contraction of such episodes (Snader, 2000:285). This interesting phenomenon was preceded by an earlier example of literary reticence on captivity during the seventeenth century, which Matar outlines:

not a single English dramatist addressed the theme of English captivity (although they wrote about Continental captives), even at a time when thousands of Britons were held in North Africa and when petitions, protests, and parliamentary debates focused attention on their cause (Matar, 2001:38).

He suggests that the avoidance of this topic is directly related to the rise of a British sense of national identity and superiority:
A national identity was being forged based on Protestant election, capitalist enterprise, and naval superiority. But while this identity of power and expansion was being celebrated in verse and in prose, in masques and in sermons, Britons in North Africa were facing enslavement, humiliation and Islamic assertiveness (Matar, 2001:35).

This earlier reticence is comparable to the lack of contemporary novels written during the Romantic period addressing those situations facing genuine captives, the focus falling instead on Inquisitorial episodes and thus looking back to the Early Modern period and an alternative, European location. Snader suggests that when novelists approached Oriental captivity towards the end of the eighteenth century it was from a very different perspective to that of earlier writers of the 1720s:

Although after the 1720s the plot of foreign captivity inspired only occasional episodes in British fiction, much more prominent narrative patterns such as the virtue-in-distress plot, the Gothic, and the bildungsroman adapted the plot of subjugation and alienation to increasingly domestic environments of social tyranny (Snader, 2000:170).

41 For example, Godwin’s eponymous hero in St Leon (1799), like Ann Radcliffe’s nominal hero Vivaldi in The Italian (1797), is imprisoned by the Inquisition on the word of an unknown accuser.
42 Snader also points out that British writers used episodes of foreign captivity in fictional narratives as early as 1665, and argues that the fictional captivity narrative prominent during the 1720s was important to the development of both travel writing and the novel. He notes that fictional captivity narratives after the 1720s usually focussed on a passive male captive in a sentimental mode (Snader, 2000:5-8).
Matar argues that such moves are open to question. Despite this type of critical attention being focussed on a generic link between captivity narratives and the novel, or on the formulation of a discrete generic identity of the captivity narrative:

Literary critics have been eager to treat all the captivity accounts together in order to arrive at some generic framework that can contain them all, claiming that they were the precursors of the novel, as G.A. Starr declared, or that they were early models for later “orientalist” writings, as Joe Snader stated. But such formalizing ignores the differences in narrative voices, the uncertainty and multiplicity of authorship... and various modes of publication (Matar, 2001:34).

In agreement with Matar on this point, this thesis is not concerned with the relation of the captivity narratives under discussion to other genres, or to one another. Rather, analysis focuses on the narratives as examples of colonial discourse. As Matar also suggests, a key area in understanding the complexity of captivity narratives is the conditions of publication.

Publication and Reader Reception:

Sayre (2000) notes that several American captivity narratives were contemporary ‘bestsellers of their day’, including that of Mary Rowlandson (1682) (Sayre, 2000:3).

As Derounian-Stodola points out:

Colonial discourse ‘is the complex of signs and practices that organize social existence and social reproduction within colonial relationships’ (Ashcroft et al., 2000:42).

Other extremely popular narratives include that of John Jewitt (f.pub. 1815), discussed in this thesis, and Seaver’s *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison* (1824) a
The writers of Indian captivity narratives - whether actual ex-captives or editors - often kept an eye on the market (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xvii).

This awareness of their potential readership on the part of the producers of American captivity narratives affected both the content of the narratives and the timing of their publication. Even where the captive experience was part of colonial life, there were still constraints on publication, due to the need to show the colonies as a place for opportunity and conquest. As Matar states:

Only in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, after the colonists were assured of the upper hand, did accounts of captivity among the Indians begin to appear (Matar, 2001:38).

Whilst, as Snader (2000) has acknowledged, the British captivity genre found favour at a particular historical moment, there are various ways to account for its proliferation during this period. The readers’ own proximity to danger, which Drimmer (1985) argues is the key to the appeal of American captivity narratives does not, however, account for the popularity of captivity narratives with a European readership. The British metropolitan reader was in little fear of the type of events depicted in captivity narratives literally overtaking them, unless they stepped into the world of trade and celebrated ‘white Indian’ (Derounian-Stodoloa, 1988:xviii). Also analysed in this thesis, Captain James Riley's (2000) account of the loss of his ship Commerce (f. pub. 1817), is a hugely popular and much printed American narrative (Riley, 2000:v), selling almost a million copies between 1817 and 1859 (Riley, 2000:vi).
colonialism, simply because the British subject must leave native shores to be put in the captive situation.

Colley (2002) has shown that the reaction of British metropolitan audiences depended heavily on the contemporary political situation in relation to the settings of the narratives, which were subject to fluctuation. Snader (2000) is in agreement with Colley when he points to a lack of interest in Britain in those captivity texts originally published in America. Although early American captives saw themselves as British subjects, Colley notes that the British market for narratives of American captivity was influenced by the British view of American colonists. She points out that:

before 1750, printers and publishers in Britain reached the commercial decision that there was only limited demand for tales of settler captivity at the hands of Native Americans, even though Britons in America and Britons at home were ostensibly one, united imperial people (Colley, 2002:152).

Colley suggests two main reasons for this early lack of interest on the part of the British metropolitan reader. First, ransoms for American captives were raised by colonists themselves and thus there was not much publicity in Britain, unlike the case of Barbary captives where money was raised through the church. Second, the strong Puritan element of these texts was ‘alien and even uncongenial’ (Colley, 2002:154) to Anglican readers in Britain. However, by the mid-eighteenth century this perception was changing, and after the outbreak of the Seven Years War (1756-63) substantial numbers of British troops and their families crossed the Atlantic. As a result the metropolitan

45 Although Barbary corsairs did make raids on the south coast of England and Ireland and took captives in the early seventeenth century (Colley, 2002:50).
market for tales of Native American captivity would ‘sky-rocket’ (Colley, 2002:161).

After the loss of the American colonies, returned captives in Britain were initially seen as an embarrassing evidence of imperial defeat, and this is one reason, Colley argues, why there were no published captivity narratives for some time (Colley, 2002:287). Moreover, this delayed publication was still constrained:

> When these writings did begin appearing in print, they did so only anonymously or posthumously, and invariably after heavy editing (Colley, 2002:288).

Public interest in India increased after the loss of the American colonies in 1783, but although the political and colonial situation differed from that of America, there remained an element of reluctance on the part of captives to publish narratives, or to be identified when they did. Colley speculates that some of this reticence was a result of the fact that many captives had been circumcised, and that this was seen as an ‘indelible assault on their identity, an irreversible ‘Othering’ (Colley, 2002:288). The British market for the narratives was also lacking. As the 1780 reverses of the Battle of Pollilur were possibly permanent, there was unwillingness in Britain to draw attention to India through captivity narratives. Colley argues that these factors contributed to the lack of interest in reading about British sufferings in India. However, as with so much in British political life, the change that caused a later surge in interest in British captivity narratives from India was allied to Britain’s relation with France. Colley argues that because of the French-Muslim alliance in India, loyalist reaction in Britain against

46 John Jewitt’s narrative (f.pub.1815) was not published in Britain until over twenty years had passed since his Native American captivity, illustrating the lack of interest in American narratives in the British market place at the turn of the century.

47 Accordingly, James Scurry’s narrative was published posthumously in 1824, over thirty years after his release from captivity.
Revolutionary and Napoleonic France meant that Tipu and Napoleon... became two sides of the same coin’ (Colley, 2002:297). Under these conditions, the earlier treatment of British captives in India during the 1780s was used as evidence that Tipu Sultan was an oppressor, and Indian captivity narratives also became useful as a tool for countering accusations that the East India Company were military despots. With this political point to prove, unsurprisingly, the British state and the East India Company became pivotal in collecting and publishing Mysore captivity narratives.

Despite the variation in the appetite for captivity narratives, published collections from the period hint at the taste for ‘real life’ adventures, such as the two volumes of Clarke’s *Naufragia, or Historical Memoirs of Shipwrecks and of the Providential Deliverance of Vessels* (1806). Taylor suggests that the public appetite for such tales of shipwreck and disaster was heightened by the continued reprinting and popularity of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719). Despite the suffering of George Buchan (1820) and his fellow castaways on Madagascar, his narrative attracted little attention and there is no publication notice for *Loss of the Winterton* in either the *Edinburgh Review* or *Gentleman’s Magazine* in 1820. Buchan’s narrative was noticed in *Blackwood’s Magazine’s ‘Monthly List of*

---

48 In British propaganda Tipu Sultan, like Napoleon, was depicted as a usurper (Colley, 2002:297). On British notions that Mysore and Revolutionary France were linked see Bayly, *Imperial Meridian* (Bayly, 1989:113-14).
49 Mysore narratives presented the human face of British imperial forces, but there were disadvantages to re-imagining British troops as ‘men of feeling’. Concentrating on the sufferings and pathos in such texts as William Thomson’s influential *Memoirs of the Late War in Asia* (1788), with its borrowings from the sentimental fiction of Richardson, Colley suggests that the more distasteful aspects of British imperial endeavour were sidelined. However, Colley points out that this could also be seen as a form of feminisation of British troops (Colley, 2002:304), although such representations were linked more widely to the British belief in their own superior humanity, and by extension their high level of civilisation (Colley, 2000:300-302).
50 Dalyell’s *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea* (1812) includes the tale of a real-life Crusoe in the ‘Adventures of Philip Ashton, who after escaping from pirates, lived sixteenth months in solitude on a desolate island, 1723’. 

---
New Publications’ (June 1820, no.XXXIX vol. VII p.336), although Buchan was not named as author. From this list we also learn that the narrative was published in 8vo costing just 7s 6d. Compare this to Robinson Crusoe lavishly reissued in the same year, with advertised editions costing up to £5 5s, and it becomes apparent the continued appeal of the fictional shipwreck victim was far higher than Buchan’s real-life experiences.

However, there remained a market for captivity narratives, and potential profits were at stake. As Pratt (1992) notes of travel writing:

"Travel literature did not remain immune to the professionalization of writing in the eighteenth century. Now that it had become a profitable business, traveler-writers and their publishers relied more and more on professional writers and editors to ensure a competitive product, often transforming manuscripts completely, usually in the direction of the novel. Debates about embellishment, seductiveness, naked truth, and the like are often debates around the role of these figures, and the compromise involved in writing for money (Pratt, 1992:88)."

The publication of Robert Adams’ narrative in 1816 was explained thus by the Africa Office, in the following notice preceding the text:

"Gentlemen,

I beg leave to present to you the narrative of the sailor, Robert Adams, in the form which I conceive will be most interesting to you and to the..."
public, and most useful to the poor man himself, for whose benefit it has been committed to the press.

However, the idea that Adams is the main beneficiary from the narrative is disingenuous at best. The briefest look at the detailed contents list following this notice show that the true purpose of the narrative, far from the philanthropic benefit to the individual captive, is the dissemination of ‘facts’ about the African interior which was at this time little known.\footnote{De Witt Clinton thought James Riley’s (2000/1817) narrative of captivity in Africa was similarly of particular interest due to ‘its illustrations of the geography of a country hitherto so little known’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xviii). Dates of first editions of historical texts are referenced following the date of the edition cited in the thesis where this differs, as shown in this footnote.}

The editor was especially interested in Adams’ narrative due to the ‘the recent embarkation of Major Peddie and his companions, to explore those very parts of Africa’ (Adams, 1816:xii). As the example of Adams’ narrative shows, there were other reasons for, and benefits of telling captivity stories beyond financial advantage. Regarding American captivity narratives, Derounian-Stodola suggests that:

\begin{quote}
One un-stated motive in the fact-based texts was to counter captivity’s disunifying and disordering effects by unifying and ordering the experience in print (1998:xvii).\footnote{She also argues that this phenomenon is more visible in female-authored texts, as women ‘were often presented as more traumatized than captive men’ (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xvii).}
\end{quote}

However, despite the various potential benefits of publishing captivity narratives, certain captives remained reluctant to do so. Colley (2000) suggests that published versions of captivity narratives (as opposed to manuscripts) were largely by ‘women
and artisanal men’ and that this was due to the relative social status of captives. She argues that for captives from lower social classes:

> it may have been easier to testify to an experience of vulnerability in print than it was for officer class males (Colley, 2000:176).

Mills (1988) explains that women would choose to publish within low-status, ‘non-literary’ genres, such as travel writing and diaries, in order to avoid criticism. Captivity narratives contain many elements of both these genres, so we may conclude that they would have been accorded a similar ‘non-literary’ status. As many others before her, Eliza Fay (1821/1817) offers a prefatory apology claiming that her narrative was written initially for a private audience, rather than intended for publication. Moreover, she is represented as satisfying the clamouring of her immediate circle by publishing the narrative for a wider audience, as the preface states that ‘she was repeatedly urged by several of her friends to publish some account’ (Fay, 1821/1817:iv). The preface to the published edition credits a change in the public perception of female authors as the reason for Fay’s publication of the letters (Fay, 1821/1817:iv-v). Eliza Fay’s first edition was thus not published until 1817, due to her former refusal to publish the letters around 1782, shortly after the events described. However, such reluctance does not accord with what can be surmised of Fay’s character. The narrative presents a formidable woman; she has the fearlessness to travel great distances, to leave her

---

ST As Bekkaoui points out in his introduction to Elizabeth Marsh’s narrative (2003), Marsh delayed publication of her narrative by some thirteen years until 1769 because the suspicion that it might throw upon her character. A Barbary captive in 1756, Marsh’s reticence was the result of her connection with Prince Sidi Mohammed ben Abdallah who attempted to persuade her to renounce Christianity for Islam, and to take a place in his seraglio.
feckless and philandering husband, and to set up her own successful business in India. It is unlikely that such a woman would fear public censure so much as to prevent publication of her narrative, pointing instead to a conventional apology.

We can see a similar dynamic at work in George Buchan’s preface to his account of the loss of the *Winterton* (1820). With the typical diffidence of a prefatory apology, Buchan refuses to gauge the potential of *Loss of the Winterton* to interest the reading public with its novelty:

> The following has been the lucubration of not many days, as any one [sic.] who reads it will too well see. If I find it excites any interest, I will probably recur to the intention I first entertained of somewhat extending it. If not, I shall with very little regret lay down the pen that I have felt a sort of indolent reluctance in taking up (Buchan, 1820:vii-viii).

Given that *Loss of the Winterton* generated relatively little interest, its author takes great pains to present himself as a reluctant writer. Both George Buchan and Captain Dale’s narratives are presented as unintended for print. Buchan describes his own early account of events as being ‘no way fitted for the public eye’ (Buchan, 1820:iv) and Dale’s narrative as ‘not intended to go beyond the domestic circle’ (Buchan, 1820:v).

---

54 Taylor calls Eliza Fay ‘Catty, gallant and long-suffering’, describing her as ‘one of Calcutta’s most vivid personalities’ (Taylor, 2004:11)
55 Riley (2000/1817) also claims that his narrative was published due to ‘the strong and repeated solicitations of many of my valuable friends’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xii), and that his original purpose in writing the narrative was to show his friends his ‘unparalleled sufferings’ and ‘not for the particular purpose of making them public by means of the press’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xii).
interesting to note some contrary evidence to these claims in the version of the narrative included in *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea* (1812). The editor Dalyell explains:

*The materials for the narrative of this shipwreck were transmitted from India to England, by Mr John Dale, third-mate of the Winterton; and arranged for publication by some of the gentlemen about the India House (Dalyell, 1812:205).*

This suggests that due to their social status, both Buchan and Dale felt compelled to present the publication of their narratives as unpremeditated. However, this type of reticence was not the norm for captives of lower status. As Colley (2002) argues of British captives held in Mysore:

*As for common soldiers and seamen, the constraints on what they wrote and published could be sparser still...Some [Mysore authors] were conventional patriots, warriors and careerists, anxious to serve their country, the East India Company, and the politicians. Others were not (Colley, 2002:280).*

This is a significant point, as the variation of the captives’ relation to the imperial centre, and thus to their relation to contemporary discourses of British national superiority, is highly complex and variable. This further supports the overall argument of this thesis, that representations of British captives in relation to Others is not necessarily uniformly hegemonic.
Definitions of terms:

In order to indicate the theoretical, methodological and analytical framework of this thesis, it is important to define certain terms.

*Culture*:

The definition of ‘culture’ is important to this thesis, as it links to ethnographic concerns and discourses of ‘savagery’ and ‘civilisation’ discussed in Chapter 2. In *Keywords* (1976) Raymond Williams identifies three definitions of ‘culture’, and two of these definitions are pertinent to this study because of their intimate association with the notion of ‘civilisation’.56 Williams’ definition of culture as the general intellectual development of society is linked to Enlightenment thought and the European belief in Europe’s own superior position in setting a universal standard for the relative incremental measurement of civilisation. Williams’ definition of ‘culture’ as associated with ‘the arts’ and by extension, with the upper classes, is relevant because of its assumption that cultivation of the mind is linked to the degree of civilisation of any given society. As Young explains:

The social reference of cultivation was allied to the earlier distinction between the civil and the savage: to be civilized meant to be a citizen of the city (preferably walled), as opposed to the savage (wild man) outside or the more

---

56 Young (1995) notes that E.B. Tylor in *Primitive Culture* (1871) used the terms ‘culture’ and ‘civilisation’ interchangeably and was not unusual in this (1995:46).
distant barbarian roaming in the lands beyond...This refined culture of the city was first named as ‘civilization’ in English by the Scot James Boswell...in 1772 (Young, 1995:31).

Young points to two antithetical ideas in Victorian anthropology: a ‘progressivist’ view of human perfectibility and evolution from savagery to civilisation, and a ‘degenerationist’ view in which humans, originally white and civilised, had degenerated over time into savagery. Industrialisation lent itself to the view of modern civilisation as ‘fallen and diseased’ (Young, 1995:42) and thus ‘culture’ came to be seen as the antithesis of ‘civilisation’, as Romantics developed a passion for ethnicity and a return to national, traditional cultures:

Romantic writers after Rousseau turned to primitive or popular culture for the ground of their ideological interrogation of European civilization’ (Young, 1995:37).

Also relevant is Herder’s anthropological view of culture presented in *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* (1784-91) and his insistence on the plurality of ‘cultures’, or the beliefs and behaviours of distinct groups of people. Williams and other historians credit Herder with initiating:

Romantic reaction against the grand claims for civilization...articulating the reaction against secular human progress that was emerging at a key stage in the contradictory development of European capitalism (Young, 1995:37).
Thus, Young suggests that Herder’s relativism was a ‘sign of Romantic questioning of dominant Enlightenment ethos of civilization, progress, perfectibility - and equality’ (1995:42). Enlightenment enthusiasm for other cultures (especially the imperial - India, China, Persia, ancient Egypt and Rome) was seen as a way of:

achieving a cultural distance from which a writer such as Montesquieu, or Swift, could construct an ideological critique of contemporary Europe (Young, 1995:36-37).

Thus, when I use the term ‘culture’ in this thesis, it will be in Herder’s sense of the diverse ‘cultures’ of different peoples.

Colonialism and Imperialism:

Although colonialism and imperialism are often confused with one another, colonialism has been defined as just one practice resulting from imperialism (Fulford and Kitson, 1998:3). McLeod had identified imperialism as:

an ideological concept which upholds the legitimacy of the economic and military control of one nation by another (McLeod, 2000:7).

Colonialism, on the other hand, necessarily includes the establishment of a settler population from the dominant nation. Thus, colonialism is both spatially and temporally specific. However, as Boehmer’s circumspect definition of colonialism suggests, British ‘attempts to govern’ indigenous populations did not always meet with complete success
(Boehmer cited in McLeod, 2000:8). It has been suggested that imperialism predates colonialism (Loomba, 1998:4), although some critics use the term ‘imperialism’ to describe colonialism which is contemporaneous with capitalism. According to Leninist theory, imperialism is the apogee of capitalism, and the role of capitalism in this view allows a distinction to be made between colonialism and imperialism. Due to the element of economic control exercised by capitalist societies, direct colonial intervention becomes unnecessary. In this model, although economic control is the primary tool of imperialism, it should be noted that in some cases political control is also significant (Loomba, 1998:5-6). Loomba suggests that attempting to separate colonialism and imperialism in temporal terms may not be as useful as differentiating them spatially. In this spatial definition, imperialism is the phenomena of control from a metropolitan centre (Loomba, 1998:6-7), and it is in this sense that it is used in this thesis.

Captivity:

Sayre (2000) suggests that the sensation of captivity may be felt simply as the result of separation from one’s own culture or religion (Sayre, 2000:10) claiming that ‘religious or national difference alone is enough to constitute the sensation of captivity’ (Sayre, 2000:10). Similarly, Snader (2000) likens early colonists to captives, suggesting that:

the conditions of early colonial trade could easily lead Europeans to imagine the first colonists as relatively powerless figures, surrounded by hostile alien
cultures, dependent on powerful governments, and in many way analogous to captives (Snader, 2000:86-7).

This argument holds similarities to Colley’s chapter ‘Captives in Uniform’ in Captives (2002), which suggests that ordinary East India Company soldiers suffered such appalling conditions that they could be likened to captives. However, this wider definition of captivity is not used in this thesis.

_Captivity narrative:_

Defining what may be counted as a captivity narrative is potentially problematic, and as Bumham (1997) points out, the captivity narrative occupies an uncertain generic space:

> captivity narratives - like the captives who wrote them - occupy a space suspended between coherent generic forms (Bumham, 1997:34).

Colley (2002) avoids a generic definition by suggesting that captivity narratives are ‘a mode of writing rather than a genre’ (Colley, 2002:13). In contemporary editions of Blackwood’s Magazine, captivity narratives or travel writing may be found in various categories in the ‘Monthly List of New Publications’. Showing the fluidity of generic definition, in April 1824 the list features ‘Novels and Travels’ and ‘Voyages and Travels’ as separate categories. However, in the following numbers this alters to ‘Novel and Tales’ compounding the sense of contemporary uncertainty of generic boundaries.

57 This argument is based on the narrative of Robert Knox (1681), a captive colonist who achieved economic success and escaped, and on other figures who reverse their initial subjection ‘at both a personal and a national level’ (Snader, 2000:88) such as Francis Knight.
Adding further to the confusion, one might also find such narratives under the heading ‘Miscellanies’. This confused generic status is due in part to the multitude of ways in which many captivity narratives initially found their way into the public domain. In the case of American captivity narratives, Derounian-Stodola (1998) lists ‘interviews, newspaper stories, folklore, tall tales, poems, sermons, plays, dime novels, histories, broadsides, ballads, military correspondence, and biographies’ (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xii) as sources. Rather than appearing as works in their own right, many well-known American captivity narratives came to attention by such means. This list will be broadly familiar as the multi-faceted influences on eighteenth-century novels. However, if one accepts Hunter’s (1996) definition of the novel as focused on ordinary people and ordinary contemporary situations (Hunter, 1996:9), then the differences between captivity narratives and novels become clearer. British captivity narratives are largely representations of the experiences of ordinary individuals in the most extraordinary situations, and quite unlike those experienced by most metropolitan readers. Captivity titles do bear a close affinity to the titles borne by novels before the term ‘novel’ had been crystallized, such as “‘romances,” “adventures,” “lives,” “tales,” “memoirs,” “expeditions,” “fortunes and misfortunes,’” (Hunter, 1996:9). However, in the case of the captivity narrative a key word is ‘narrative’. Whilst it marks out the text as ‘factual’ or ‘true’ by capitalising on the origins of the word and its connection to history and biography, at the same time ‘narrative’ is associated with the art of story telling, highlighting the difficult boundary between fact and fiction discussed at length in Chapter 1. In addition, Derounian-Stodola (1998) includes the sentimental novel in her

58 For example, Derounian-Stodola highlights Jemima Howe’s A Genuine and Correct Account (1792), describing it as ‘fact-based but fiction-orientated’ (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xix).
wider definition of the captivity narrative, which is extremely inclusive, and she describes thus as:

any story with a captor (usually from a minority group) and a captive (usually from a majority group). This taxonomy accommodates such distinct, but sometimes overlapping, forms such as the slave narrative, the spiritual autobiography, the providence tale, the UFO abduction story, the convent captivity narrative, the sentimental novel of seduction, as well as the Indian captivity narrative (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xi).

Pratt (1992) encompasses ‘captivity narrative’ within the larger category of ‘survival literature’, which she identifies as: ‘first person stories of shipwreck, castaways, mutinies, abandonments, and (the special inland version) captivities’ (Pratt, 1992:86).

Baepler (1999) also notes that captivity narratives ‘might just as easily be called ‘survival’ narratives’ (Baepler, 1999:33). However, I am not using the term ‘survival’ narrative in this thesis since it contains the assumption that survival is key element of the narratives, thus privileging the argument that the return of the captive renders captivity narratives a safe site. To use the term ‘captivity’ maintains focus on the significant and ambivalent elements of the narratives.

59 Famous slave narratives such as Harriet Jacobs’ *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl* (1861) and *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass* (1845), both of which document the struggle to freedom of black slaves in America, share features of the captivity genre.

60 There are captivity narratives which deliberately capitalise on the popularity of sentimental fiction in America at this time. Derounian-Stodola (1998) points to Jemima Howe’s *A Genuine and Correct Account* (1792) and *A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan* (1795) as examples. In the case of Kinnan’s narrative, Derounian-Stodola argues that the sentimental mode was exploited to heighten the effectiveness of propaganda against Britain and her Native American allies (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xix).
Postcolonialism:

It is important for me to discuss the relation of this thesis to postcolonial theory, as I am relating the narratives under discussion to contemporary discourses of British national superiority. Therefore, as I attempt some form of colonial discourse analysis, this section briefly summarises some of the difficulties present in the field of postcolonial study.

The least contested meaning of the term postcolonialism is the temporal sense in which ‘post’ suggests ‘after’ colonialism. However, some critics believe that it is better to use terms such as ‘once colonised-countries’ or ‘countries with a history of colonialism’ (McLeod, 2000:5) as they argue that it is premature to consider the world postcolonial in this sense. However, it can be argued that the world is in fact postcolonial given the decolonisation which has marked the twentieth century, but that imperialism continues today. As Hulme (1995) suggests, the term ‘postcolonial’ can be used to describe the world as it exists following the loss of the great Western European empires, and it is in this sense that this term is used in this thesis. More controversially, the ‘post’ in postcolonialism can also be seen to mean coming after colonialism in an ideological sense (Loomba, 1998:7). It is this sense that the term is most contested by critics. Some suggest that the alternative term ‘neo-colonial’ should be used, as colonial ideology has not been automatically removed by the official withdrawal of colonial government. Furthermore, the term ‘colonial’ in postcolonialism is also problematic, as it can be seen

61 However, it should be noted that colonialism as a practice long predates the great Western empires. Anne McClintock (1994) takes this view in ‘The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term ‘Post-Colonialism’.
as suggesting that colonial history is the only history of the once-colonised country. As Loomba asks:


Furthermore, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has argued that view of the pre-colonial is so distorted by the lens of colonialism, that it can no longer be successfully recovered (Loomba, 1998:17-18).

Aside from the issues of its definition, postcolonialism has become a vast and various theoretical area, but despite the many viewpoints within postcolonialism, as Young (1995) has suggested, the work of Said, Spivak and Bhabha dominates the field (Young, 1995:165). Like many comparative theories, postcolonial theory has been accused of being a totalising theory, taking little account of the variety of experiences due to location, gender or class. *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) as a groundbreaking study of postcolonial literatures has been variously criticised for its tendency towards homogenisation. Included in this are the failure to account for gender or class differences; not accounting for the differences between previously colonised nations; and finally, the assumption that all literature from such locations is primarily concerned with colonial history, colonial discourses and ‘decolonising the mind’ (McLeod, 2000:28). There is also much debate as to the place of postcolonial literatures and

Kay Schaffer (1998) also argues that the effect of Western philosophical frameworks on historical texts is the loss of an authentic indigenous presence, in ‘Whose Cannibalism?: Consumption, Incorporation and the Colonial Body’.

Mishra and Hodge (1994) characterise *The Empire Writes Back* as a totalising project in ‘What is Post (-) colonialism?’
theory as objects of study in the Western academy. It has been suggested that postcolonialist theorists accept former British Commonwealth locations as a focus for study too readily, when other locations may well be considered to fit postcolonial criteria. Moreover, there is debate surrounding the issue of how to fit the study of postcolonial texts and theory into conventional degree courses, and whether or not this amounts to tokenism, as some critics argue that the category of postcolonial literatures merely ghettoises literature from countries with a history of colonisation.

Most problematically for the Western academic, it has proven difficult to take a position within postcolonial theory which is not politically suspect. Some critics argue that postcolonialism is better described as ‘neo-colonialism’ because it is ‘at the service of the very phenomenon, colonialism, which it seeks to contest’ (McLeod, 2000:246). In this view, because postcolonialism is the product of Western institutions, it is ‘insensitive to historical context and happy to generalise’ (McLeod, 2000:249). Furthermore, pro-theorists may also be accused of giving scant attention to phenomena such as economic and social conditions and reducing all phenomena to the ideological. If it is argued that language creates reality rather than reflecting it, then these ‘concrete’ phenomena are reduced to text. Too heavy a reliance on poststructuralist thought and the rejection of master narratives by critics can be seen as obsfucating ‘the international workings of multinational capital’ (Loomba, 1998:13). McLeod explains this position:

outside the ivory tower, oppressed people continue to kill each other, oblivious to the ‘hybridity’ of their decentred subjectivities and their mistaken pursuit of discredited metanarratives (McLeod, 2000:252).
There is also the problem of a Foucauldian view of power within postcolonial theory. Some politically committed theorists suggest that if power is everywhere, then it is nowhere in particular, and therefore difficult to resist (Loomba, 1998:50). This question of agency is one which continues to cause much debate within the field.

*Colonial discourse analysis:*

Chrisman and Williams (1993) define colonial discourse as:

> the variety of textual forms in which the West produced and codified knowledge about non-metropolitan areas and cultures, especially those under colonial control (Chrisman and Williams, 1993:5).

Thus, colonial discourse analysis is that branch of postcolonial theory which is:

> interested in how stereotypes, images and ‘knowledge’ of colonial subjects and cultures tie in with institutions of economic, administrative, judicial, and biomedical control (Loomba, 1998:54).

The question of agency is raised by Phillips (1999), who characterises this strand of postcolonial theory as being concerned with:

---

65 Sarup notes that Foucault’s ‘concept of resistance remains undeveloped’ (Sarup, 1993:84). However, she also points out that the lack of a general theory of power in Foucault’s work may be seen as one of its strengths, ‘his value lies in particular analysis’ (Sarup, 1993:80).
the ways in which the contradictions and inconsistencies of colonial discourse produce a locus of instability from which the central epistemological, ontological and legislative terms of the West can be challenged (Phillips, 1999:64).

Due to its Foucauldian origins, colonial discourse analysis assumes that historical contexts influence the production of meaning in literary texts, but also that ‘literary representations themselves have the power to influence their historical moment’ (McLeod, 2000:38). As McCleod states, ‘Language...constitutes our worldview by cutting up and ordering reality into meaningful units’ (McLeod, 2000:18) and thus, as Hall argues, ‘language is constitutive of difference rather than reflective of it (Hall, 2000:17), as Said argues in Orientalism (1995).

Orientalism:

Edward Said’s 1978 classic study Orientalism, as the foundational text of colonial discourse analysis, provides a starting point for many debates of relevance to this thesis. Said uses the term ‘Orientalism’ both to refer the academic discipline of studying the Orient, and also to the general ‘ontological and epistemological distinction made between “the Orient” and (most of the time) “Occident”’(1995:2). Said also defines Orientalism as a discourse in the Foucauldian sense, one which homogenises oriental cultures and limits what may be said about them, where the role of institutions is key. Although this study is concerned with the period of the then nascent academic discipline, it is the discussion surrounding the third sense of ‘Orientalism’, that of Orientalist discourse, which most enlivens this thesis. As will be shown in Chapter 2’s
discussion of savagery and civilisation, Europe was seen as being at the undisputed peak of an historical progress toward civilisation. According to Said, the ‘Orient’, or what is now referred to as the Middle East, was defined negatively in relation to this and other characteristics of Western European metropoles.66 The supposed Western virtues of order, sexual restraint, industry and liberty, were counterpoised by imagined Oriental disorder, sexual licentiousness, laziness and tyranny. Moreover, this was not, as might be supposed, a simple justification for the colonial involvement of Western states in Oriental locations. Said argues that ‘Orientalism’ in fact paved the way for colonialism. However, despite its far-reaching implications, Orientalism has received much criticism.

Robert Young (1990) notes a number of methodological difficulties in Orientalism. Chief among these is that Said’s argument the Orientalism is a Western construction which bears no relation to reality, whilst also claiming that Orientalist knowledge was used in the service of colonialism. As Young asks:

How then can Said argue that the ‘Orient’ is just a representation, if he also wants to claim that ‘Orientalism’ provided the necessary knowledge for an actual colonial conquest? (Young, 1990:129)

66 Although Said specifically discusses the Middle East in Orientalism, as Ashcroft and Ahluwalia note: ‘the methodology of Orientalism has been appropriated by a wide variety of authors who have deployed it in various geographical locations, into many different contexts of cultural relations and different types of power struggle’ (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:138). In Culture and Imperialism (1994) Said himself introduces materials from ‘Africa, India, parts of the Far East, Australia, and the Caribbean’ (Said, 1994:xi).
A serious difficulty with *Orientalism* with regard to this study is that Said’s argument can be effectively applied only to a relatively short historical moment - that of high imperialism (Clark, 1999:7). Said’s suggested period of 1815-1914 is reduced by Clark, who suggests the 1840s as a more suitable start date. The texts in this study belong then either, in Said’s view, to the very earliest portion of this period of particularly rapid European expansion, or in Clark’s view, they can be considered to pre-exist Orientalism. If the texts studied here belong to an earlier historical moment, then some postcolonial theory, with its totalising view of European power, is of limited use. Said’s study, with its emphasis on the political, pinpoints Napoleon’s 1798 invasion of Egypt as the defining moment in the birth of Orientalism, ‘which better suits Said’s demonstration of European power in the discourse’ (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:70). Moreover, Said’s thesis has been criticised for not allowing the possibility of Western resistance to Orientalism’s totalising theory, a criticism which is particularly relevant to this thesis which, in part, argues in favour of the appreciation of the

Said discusses nineteenth-century texts in *Orientalism*, but notes that Orientalism includes three aspects: ‘first, the changing historical and cultural relationship between Europe and Asia, a relationship with a 4,000 year history; second, the scientific discipline according to which, beginning in the early nineteenth century, one specialized in the study of various Oriental cultures and traditions; and third, the ideological suppositions, images and fantasies about a region called the Orient’ (Said, 2000:199). Of the three, only the scientific discipline is confined to its beginnings in the nineteenth century. Said particularly cites the period 1815-1914 as central to the advancement of Orientalism, as a ‘period of unparalleled European expansion’ (Said, 1995:41). However, he also notes that ideas about Orient as part of the learned discipline were part of a long tradition of Orientalist thought identifiable as far back as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: ‘Only the source of these rather narcissistic Western ideas about the Orient changed in time, not their character’ (Said, 1995:62). Moreover, in *Culture and Imperialism* (1994) Said states that: ‘we can locate a coherent, fully mobilized system of ideas near the end of the eighteenth century’ (Said, 1994:68). Despite this, it is important to note that the experiences of the captives, and the probable date of production of the texts chosen for inclusion in this thesis, predate 1798, and thus also predate Said’s view of the beginning of modern Orientalism.
complexity of representation of the Other in Western texts. As this thesis is concerned with the representation of savagery and civilisation, the fact that Said’s argument has been accused of rendering the binary division between East and West as static throughout history is also problematic. Finally, as Young (1990) points out, Said’s division of Orientalism into two constructive origins, classical scholarship on the one hand, and the descriptions of ‘travellers, pilgrims and statesmen’ on the other, undoes the argument that Orientalism has ‘hegemonic consistency’ (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:78).

Said presents a fully developed theory of resistance in *Culture and Imperialism* (1994), where he states: ‘Never was it the case that the imperial encounter pitted an active Western intruder against a supine or inert non-Western native’ (Said, 1994:xii). He also argues that: ‘no matter how apparently complete the dominance of an ideology or social system, there are always going to be parts of the social experience that it does not cover and control’ (Said, 1994:289). In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said describes the process of ‘contrapuntal’ reading, where: ‘As we look back at the cultural archive, we begin to read it not univocally but contrapuntally, with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts’ (Said, 1994:59). Said’s theory of resistance and his emphasis on the value of contrapuntal reading is significant for this thesis, as it evidences Said’s view of cultural identities as hybrid and fluid. Said argues that despite their achievements, nationalist movements such as negritude sustain the division between coloniser and colonised, stating that: ‘Nativism, alas, reinforces the distinction even while revaluing the weaker or subservient partner’ (Said, 1994:275). Said also asserts in the 1995 ‘Afterword’ to *Orientalism* that: ‘one of the great advances in modern cultural theory is the realization, almost universally acknowledged, that cultures are hybrid and heterogeneous and, as I argued in *Culture and Imperialism*, that cultures and civilizations are so interrelated and interdependent as to beggar any unitary or simply delineated description of their individuality’ (Said, 1995:348-9).

It is important to note that Said rejects reductive readings of his work. In his ‘Afterword’ to the 1995 edition of *Orientalism*, responding to views of Orientalism as an ‘an attack on Western civilisation’, Said states: ‘I deplore so simple a characterization of a work that is...quite nuanced and discriminating in what it says about different people, different periods, and different styles of Orientalism. Each of my analyses varies the picture, increases the differences and discriminations, separates authors and periods from each other, even though all pertain to Orientalism’ (Said, 1995:337).
In this thesis, the term ‘Other’ is taken to mean the constructed notion of whatever is considered antithetical to the European, metropolitan self. It is important to note that there were images of Otherness in circulation before colonialism (Loomba, 1998:58), but that colonialism produced a deluge of images from contact with non-Europeans, and so created its ‘Others’ on a vast scale. McLeod (2000) points to the ambivalence inherent in the Western construction of the Other:

> in the discourse of colonialism, colonised subjects are split between contrary positions. They are domesticated, harmless, knowable; but also at the same time wild, harmful, mysterious (McLeod, 2000:53).

This ambivalence at the heart of colonial discourse can be observed in the narratives under discussion in this thesis.

Another critic whose work is helpful in understanding relations between Europeans and Others is Mary Louise Pratt. In *Imperial Eyes* (1992) Pratt coins two terms that are of particular relevance to this thesis.

*contact zone:*

This is Pratt’s term for the colonial space where colonists and indigenous peoples ‘meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination’ (Pratt, 1992:4).
transculturation:

Pratt describes transculturation as a ‘phenomenon of the contact zone’ questioning ‘the ways in which European constructions of subordinate others have been shaped by those others’ (Pratt, 1992:6) Pratt suggests the ways in which colonised peoples use selected elements of the dominant culture to construct an identity using the dominant culture’s own terms, or, ‘the process of inter-cultural negotiation and selection’ (Loomba, 1998:68). Pratt’s notion of transculturation acknowledges the fact that the distance which Western writers attempt to put between themselves and the colonised could not be maintained in the contact zone.

Hybridity:

Homi Bhabha’s (1994) work is of considerable interest in relation to my analysis. Hybridity is a term often used within postcolonial theory, and it is of relevance in this thesis particularly in its use by Bhabha as contestatory to Said’s view of colonial discourse, as presented in *Orientalism* (1995). In Bhabha’s view:

There is always, in Said, the suggestion that colonial power is possessed entirely by the colonizer which is a historical and theoretical simplification (Bhabha, 1983:200).

Loomba (1998) also explains Bhabha’s contention that:
In discursive terms, there is no neat binary opposition between the coloniser and the colonised, both are caught up in a complex reciprocity (Loomba, 1998:232).

In ‘The other question’ (1994a) Bhabha characterises the ambivalence within colonial discourse by describing the ‘otherness’ of the colonial subject as:

at once an object of desire and derision, an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity (Bhabha, 1994a:67).

Thus, McLeod (2000) identifies hybridity as:

a way of thinking beyond exclusionary, fixed, binary notions of identity based on ideas of rootedness and cultural, racial and national purity (McLeod, 2000:219).

**Ambivalence:**

In Bhabha’s work, a related concept to ‘hybridity’ is ‘ambivalence’. Ambivalence is created by the fact that coloniser and colonised are not in a binary relation of direct opposition to one another, but rather that the relationship is characterised by simultaneous attraction and repulsion. Like hybridity, ambivalence upsets the authority of colonial discourse by contesting binary division, as Bhabha argues, ‘The question of the representation of difference is … always also a problem of authority’ (Bhabha, 1994b:89). However, ambivalence itself is not an unproblematic concept. According to Ashcroft et al., ambivalence:
gives rise to a controversial proposition in Bhabha’s theory, that because the colonial relationship is always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction (Ashcroft et al., 2000:13).

This is significant because of the question of the agency of the colonised in Bhabha’s formulation, if in fact, colonial discourse is destined to undo itself despite or regardless of resistance on the part of the colonised (Ashcroft et al., 2000:13). However, in ‘Signs taken for wonders’ (1994c), as Young (1990) notes, Bhabha argues that ‘the discursive conditions of colonialism do not merely undermine the forms of colonial authority but can actively enable native resistance’ (Young, 1990:149). As Ashcroft et al. explain:

The problem for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumptions, habits and values - that is, ‘mimic’ the coloniser. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects (Ashcroft et al., 2000:13).

In ‘Of mimicry and man’ (1994b), Bhabha discusses this ambivalent phenomenon of mimicry, which he describes thus:

colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite [original emphasis] (Bhabha, 1994b:86).

Furthermore, Bhabha (1994b) argues that mimicry is only ever a small step away from mockery:
The ambivalence of colonial authority repeatedly turns from *mimicry* - a difference that is almost nothing - to *menace* - a difference that is almost total but not quite [original emphasis] (Bhabha 1994b:91).

Thus, Bhabha argues that hybridity challenges imperial ideologies:

If the effect of colonial power is seen to be the *production* of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions, then an important change in perspective occurs (Bhabha, 1994c: 112).

In this way, Bhabha contests the hegemonic view of colonial discourse formulated by Said in *Orientalism* (1995).

Despite the importance of Bhabha’s work within the field of postcolonialism, the concept of hybridity has been criticised by various scholars. Young (1995) warns of the danger that the term ‘hybridity’ remains connected with its origins in racialist theory:

hybridity...has not slipped out of the mantle of the past, even if, in its appropriation by black cultural theorists, hybridity has been deployed against the very culture that invented it in order to justify it divisive practices of slavery and colonial oppression...the identification here of hybridity with cannibalization and creolization as a means towards a critical contestation of a dominant culture suggests that the threat of degeneration and decay incipient upon a ‘raceless
However, postcolonial theorists continue to use the term ‘hybridity’ despite Young’s caution, for example, Smith (1999) states that:

The fact that ‘hybridity’ has become a progressive term is another example of that familiar historical pattern in which a derogatory label, connoting regression and disintegration, is recuperated and used to disrupt the very patterns of control which first gave rise to it (Smith, 1999:250-1)

Whilst many scholars have been happy to follow Bhabha by employing the term ‘hybridity’ in the sense it is used in colonial discourse analysis, Bhabha’s hybrid colonial subject has been criticised for being homogenous, and not taking account of location, or of gender or class differences (Loomba, 1998:178). Shohat (1996) calls for hybridity to be theorised in more particular terms:

Hybidity, like the ‘post-colonial’, is susceptible to a blurring of perspectives. Hybridity must be examined in a non-universalising, differential manner, contextualized within present neo-colonial hegemonies (Shohat, 1996:331).

Postcolonial theories of hybridity are also criticised for their tendency to ‘downplay the bitter tensions and the clash between colonisers and the colonised’ by disguising the ‘alienation’ linked with nationalist movements (Loomba, 1998:181). Further, as Bhabha’s work has a linguistic and psychoanalytical basis, it has been accused of

\[70\] Also see Young *White Mythologies* (1990) on this point, p 146.
reducing the material conditions of colonial exchange to representation (Loomba, 1998:179). However, as Phillips (1999) suggests:

Bhabha’s work may be seen as an attempt to mobilise a necessarily paradoxical generalisation. Theory is in some sense indispensable for in its absence one is abandoned to the multiplicitous and otherwise ungrounded realm of contingent being (Phillips, 1999:70).

Thus, Bhabha’s work has been extremely influential in postcolonial theory and has attracted a concomitant amount of criticism. Nevertheless, Bhabha’s formulations of hybridity and ambivalence are most useful concepts for the purposes of this thesis, as they question the authority of colonial discourse. As the assumption that colonial discourse is always is in the service of imperialism underpins the argument that captivity narratives are a safe site for the representation of British vulnerability, this questioning of the authority of colonial discourse is key to my overall argument in this thesis.

Structure of the thesis:

The thesis begins with a contextualising chapter. Chapter 1, ‘The Complexity of Captivity Narratives’, which addresses the status of captivity narratives as texts. Issues discussed in this chapter include questions of representation, for example, the constructedness of ‘reality’, the operation of discourse, and the division between fact and fiction. Other factors which complicate the relation of the narratives to ‘truth’, such as subjectivity, memory, and translation are examined, along with the importance of
contemporary views of, and captive narrators’ claims to, authenticity. This chapter also analyses the significance of the captivity narrative’s stylistic features in relation to discourses of British national superiority. I argue that the negotiation of the discursive constraints by captive narrators reveals the ambivalence of colonial discourse rather in opposition to views of colonial discourse as hegemonic, and thus the impossibility of claiming captivity narratives as a ‘safe’ site.

Chapter 2, ‘Savagery and Civilisation’, is the first of three analytical chapters. This chapter discusses the representation of both Britons and Others in relation to discourses of savagery and civilisation, by discussing the inherent ambivalence in such discourses and relating this to examples found in the captivity narratives analysed in this thesis. Reviews of Hulme’s (1992) work on ‘Carib savagery’ versus ‘Oriental civilisation’, Bongie’s (1991) notion of the two discursive strands of ‘the exotic’, and Young’s (1995) account of ‘scientific racism’, are used to show the inherent ambivalence of discourses of savagery and civilisation. This chapter also considers the notion of the ‘noble savage’, whilst a section on ‘the East’ examines the problematic relation of Islamic cultures to the discourse of civilisation. Finally this chapter debates the position of Europeans in relation to discourses of civilisation, considering the representation of assumed British constitutional superiority, colonial culpability, and the relative civilisation of Britain in comparison with other European nations. I argue that the ambivalence of discourses of savagery and civilisation highlighted in this chapter deny the hegemonic view of colonial discourse posited by Said’s *Orientalism* (1995).  

71 As discussed earlier in the thesis (pp.54-7), Said’s later work complicates this position. Said’s discussion in *Orientalism* is also very particular regarding the time and location of various types of Orientalism, problematising such an oppositional stance.
Furthermore, the representation of such ambivalence in the captivity narratives under discussion denies them status as a ‘safe’ site.

Chapter 3, ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’, analyses the representation of British vulnerability in the captivity narratives under consideration. This chapter begins by reviewing a Foucauldian view of power relations and examining the concept of ‘Othering’. The discussion then moves to the ambivalent position of the captive in relation to ‘scientific’ discourses of knowledge such as aesthetics and ethnology, in order to show how captivity narratives unsettle the notion of colonial discourse as hegemonic. The inherent ambivalence of colonial discourse is highlighted by the relation of lower status captives to social hierarchies implicit in such discourses. The following section on captivity and suffering examines the representation of the vulnerability of the captive, showing how captives are denied their assumed superior position as Britons. The representation of captive vulnerability includes examples of passivity at the hands of captors, and this is further complicated by male captives’ negotiation of the discourse of British masculinity. This chapter also considers the significance of the representation of the reversal of ‘the gaze’ established as the privilege of the European, male. The final section, power and class, suggests how the representation of British vulnerability is further problematised in the case of captives from the upper classes, because of the assumption of the superiority of the lettered, European male, and the captive’s negotiation of these constraints. Thus, I argue that captivity narratives cannot be viewed as a safe site for the representation of such British reversals, as the evidence presented in the chapter shows that the discourse of colonialism is ambivalent, rather than hegemonic.
Chapter 4, ‘Going Native’, discusses the representation of British subjects taking on the identities of stigmatised races in the captivity narratives. This chapter questions the possibility of a binary division between self and Other, by looking first at examples of colonial contact, and then at examples taken from the captivity narratives under discussion. This chapter considers the representation of captive marriages to Others, religious conversion, and the adoption of local habits and dress, arguing that the captive narrator must negotiate complex discursive constraints. The section on renegades shows how the possibility of ‘going native’ is further complicated by the representation in the narratives of those who crossed over to indigenous culture voluntarily. The final section, on the escape and return of the captive, argues that the British national identity of the returned captive is represented as quite altered by the captive’s proximity to the Other. I conclude this chapter by arguing that the return of the captive does not unproblematically mean the rejection of the possibility of ‘going native’, and thus that the narratives are not a ‘safe’ site for such representations.

The Conclusion to the thesis restates the most significant elements of each chapter. It then suggests some implications of my work, and the possibilities for further research in light of this study.

Thus, this thesis argues that the captives’ return does not negate representations of British vulnerability represented in the narratives, nor does return negate the possible lure of indigenous culture. If colonial discourse is acknowledged to be more various, as suggested by Bhabha (1994), then its authority is destabilised.
Chapter 1: The Complexities of Captivity Narratives

Introduction:

This chapter considers how accurately returned captives represent their experience in their narratives, as there are many factors which problematise the notion that captivity narratives, as a ‘non-fictional’ genre, are therefore ‘truthful’. It would be unsafe to assume that captivity narratives should be taken as ‘true’ and uncomplicated accounts of historical events, and the work of Foucault (1972) and White (1981) is discussed in order to show the constructedness of ‘reality’ and of the representation of reality. Following this discussion is an account of the history of the emergence of the division between fact and fiction, in order to explore contemporary thought on generic expectations with regard to truth-telling. The focus then turns to the social status of the captive, the effect of this on the representation of experience in the narratives, as well the effect on reader reception. This section includes discussion of the role of editors and extra-textual witnesses. Further difficulties for captive narrators in relation to authenticity are explored in the section of the chapter focusing on reticence, memory, and translation. Finally, the emphasis given in captivity narratives to authenticity is examined, along with the strategies adopted by captives and their publishers to give narratives status as the ‘truth’, such as plain style and prefatory remarks. That the captivity narratives under consideration have a complex relation to the ‘truth’ of the captive’s experience is important to this thesis, which argues that captive narrators must negotiate discursive constraints created by their position as Britons vulnerable at the hands of Others. Contemporary perception of the authenticity of the narratives is also significant, as they created, maintained, and were products of, discourses relating to the
perception of the relative positions of races in relation to ‘civilisation’. I will begin by examining the relationship of the author to narrative.

Author and narrative:

Foucault (1972) problematises idea of the ‘self’, suggesting one reason why captivity narratives cannot be read simply as autobiographies, or as the direct relation of experience. He argues that the ‘I’ of the text can in no way be taken to bear a direct relation to the persona of the author, preferring to call the author the ‘author-function’ (Foucault, 1972:55). However, Foucault does not deny the existence of the author as a person:

there can be no signs without someone, or at least something, to emit them. For a series of signs to exist, there must – in accordance with the system of causality – be an ‘author’ or a transmitting authority. But this ‘author’ is not identical with the subject of the statement; and the relation of production that he has with the formulation is not superposable to the relation that unites the enunciating subject and what he states (Foucault, 1972:92).

In a captivity narrative, as a ‘non-fictional’ genre, the critical assumption might be that the narrator and author are a single entity. This is opposed to ‘fictional’ works where a distinction between the author and the narrator function is made, implying that only ‘fictional’ and thus supposedly ‘artistic’ works demand this distance. However, the ‘non-fictional’ text such as a captivity narrative requires that an incoherent and
subjective experience of ‘reality’ be packaged into a recognisable and distinct generic form, which the reader has a competence to make sense of. As Mills (1988) points out:

The narrator is a construct which gives coherence to a variety of voices, or discourses (Mills, 1988:65).

In the case of a captivity narrative, the escape or release of the captive is implicit in the publication of the text, and as Mills argues, the knowledge of the conclusion of a narrative affects the way that it is read (Mills, 1988:74). In particular, because of the tendency to view history as a chronological series of connected events, the narrative is written in a way which denies the rearrangement of events after the fact to create a coherent plot. This denial results in the assumption that the captivity narrative, as an element of the captive’s biography, is the unmediated representation of the ‘reality’ of his/her experience. However, White (1981a) makes this point when discussing narrativity:

However, an example from one of the captivity narratives under discussion in this thesis reveals the recording of this process. In the ‘Introductory Details’ to the narrative of the American Robert Adams, the editor Samuel Cook notes: ‘It is proper to mention...that all the information contained in the Narrative was drawn from Adams, not as a continuous and strait-forward story, but in answer to the detached, and often unconnected, questions of the Editor’ (Adams, 1816:xvi). Adams is presented as an indulgent relater of his adventures, and in the first instance he does not volunteer to relate the story, rather, he is ‘accidentally recognised’ (Adams, 1816:xi). Neither is he presented as a storyteller, as the editor states that Adams ‘scarcely related anything without his attention being directly to the subject’ (Adams, 1816:xvi). This attempt at authentification might be viewed as evidence that Adams had no coherent story to relate, or that he was directed to answer in certain ways by leading questions. As Cook himself admits, the gentlemen who examined Adams directed him towards points of their own interest, particularly relating to Adams’ knowledge of Timbuctoo (Adams, 1816:xvii).
every narrative, however seemingly ‘full’ is constructed on the basis of a set of events which *might have been included but were left out* (White, 1981a: 10).

Such narrativisation, White (1981b) argues, allows the description of events to be:

the means by which to judge them, even while we pretend to be merely describing them (White 1981b:253).

According to Foucault, we organise ‘reality’ through speech acts, or what he terms ‘statements’ (Mills, 1991:10), which are bound by unspoken rules. These systems of discursive rules, described in Foucault’s *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), are autonomous in that the rules of a discourse are both created by, and determine the nature of, that particular discourse. Following Foucault, critics such as Hayden White (1981) and Edward Said (1995) argue that conventions governing the textual world can affect our engagement with ‘reality’ (Mills, 1988:58). In ‘The Order of Discourse’ (1981) and later work, Foucault becomes interested in constraints on writing, ‘especially those imposed by power relations’ (Mills, 1991:69). According to Foucault, writing is constrained by economic, social, political, historical and personal forces, which limit what can be said:

on the basis of the grammar and the wealth of vocabulary at a given period, there are, in total, relatively few things that are said (Foucault, 1972:119).

77 Of particular interest in relation to this thesis, Said’s *Orientalism* (1995) argues that conventional representations of the Orient as fundamentally ‘Other’ were essentially preparation for the acceptance of British colonial expansion.
Thus, the captive narrator is not freely writing the absolute ‘truth’ of his/her experience. As Mills argues in the case of travel writing, such a text is not:

expressing the truth of the author’s life, but rather, it is the result of a configuration of discursive structures with which the author negotiates (Mills, 1991:9).

Fictionality:

The status of texts as the products of the negotiation of discursive constraints gives captivity narratives, a complex relation to fictionality. As a ‘factual’ genre, captivity narratives are seen as low status in comparison to ‘artistic’, fictional works. However, Mills (1988) states that there is no inherent difference between ‘factual’ and ‘fictional’ writing on the basis that both are created ‘textual worlds’ (Mills, 1988:23) rather than representations of ‘reality’. Moreover, Colley (2002) states that looking for ‘absolute, unadulterated verisimilitude’ (Colley, 2002:92) in captivity narratives of this period would be anachronistic, as contemporary readers did not distinguish clearly between fact and fiction. In order to understand the earlier view of what are now regarded as distinct poles, it is helpful to trace the historical development of a generally perceived division between fact and fiction.

According to Davis (1996), the distinction that is now made between fact and fiction was not maintained before the eighteenth century. Prior to this, he suggests, history and fiction blur into one another from Greek and Roman times, until the end of the sixteenth century (Davis, 1996:68). The documentation of history was begun in the sixteenth
century by the Society of Antiquaries, but did not really take hold as a practice until the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Despite this, sixteenth-century balladeers did attempt to add authenticity to their stories through methods such as attaching witness accounts. This was not an attempt to mislead readers, as Davis states, ‘many readers knew their newes was not trewe and did not think that fact very significant’ (Davis, 1996:54). However, he also points out that:

this does not mean there was no criteria for fact or fiction during this period, but rather that genres were not defined by their allegiance to truth-telling or invention (Davis, 1996:67).

However, changes during the seventeenth century soon rendered the distinction between fact and fiction both significant and necessary. Political conflict conducted in pamphlets between Cavaliers and Roundheads raised the possibility that printed news could be factually accurate, whilst representing differing ideological standpoints. Davis suggests that this was a turning point in the need to consistently define the difference between fact and fiction, arguing that:

the crucial change in the news/novels discourse came during the middle of the seventeenth century, when news became ideological, and in so doing also became one of the powerful creators of ideology (Davis, 1996:77).

According to Davis, this instability within the news/novels discourse arose paradoxically at the time that typography was gaining status as a potentially ‘veracious discourse’ (Davis, 1996:153). Thus, by the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the
increased legitimacy of print had made it necessary to separate fact from fiction. The Stamp Act of 1712 was introduced as an attempt to ban the majority of newspapers by imposing taxation according to the size of the paper on which they were printed. As printers moved to avoid the tax, in 1724 amendments to the Act specified that the tax applied to news content, rather than the size of the publication. At this point, what constituted taxable news, as opposed to novels, histories, biographies and so on, had to be delineated by law:

Only when the legal system moved toward a definition of fact and fiction during the eighteenth century would the news/novels discourse have to move toward a definition as well (Davis, 1996:92).

However, this legal distinction did not result in a sudden clarification for readers, and Davis argues that no single author exemplifies the continued confusion of the boundary between fact and fiction better than Daniel Defoe.

Davis maintains that Defoe’s position within the news/novels discourse is unique given his journalistic training, his novel writing career, and what Davis describes as ‘the oddity of his own life’ (Davis, 1996:155). He suggests that there was a change in Defoe’s attitude toward fiction, caused by the division of the news/novels discourse and the increased need to distinguish between fact and fiction. To illustrate this, Davis opens with Defoe’s claim in the preface to Robinson Crusoe (1719) that the work was true, and Charles Gildon’s angry response to this stance in An Epistle to Daniel Defoe (1719), emphasising that Gildon’s attack was based solely upon the notion that the work was a fiction (rather than a lie, or libel) (Davis, 1996:156). In response, Defoe defended
the Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe (1719) by stating that the fictitious elements were allegorical, in the style of Bunyan’s The Pilgrim’s Progress (1678).

Gildon remained unconvinced by this argument, leading Defoe to make Crusoe himself speak in the preface to counter suggestions that the narrative was untrue. Davis argues that the manner in which Defoe claimed that his works were ‘true’, allegorically or actually, gradually altered over time. In Colonel Jack (1722), Defoe presents the possibility that his hero-narrator may not relate unadulterated historical fact, (leaving Defoe the editor blameless) but that this should not concern the reader. This was a significant change, as now neither the editor nor the reader knew whether the narrative was true, thus hinting that some, if not all of the narrative, was fiction. Defoe’s preface to Moll Flanders (1722) merely implied that the work was true, but made no outright claim, whilst also suggesting that Moll may not be a reliable relater of her own adventures. Later, in the preface to Roxana (1724) this trend continued, as Defoe claimed only that the ‘foundation’ of the narrative was true, although he did claim some authority as a somewhat dubiously linked eyewitness.

Defoe’s troubled relation to the division between fact and fiction has also caused difficulties to modern readers, evidenced particularly by the case of Robert Drury’s 74

74 Davis also discusses similar issues of the tension between fact and fiction in Defoe’s political writings, citing Defoe’s 1702 pamphlet The Shortest Way With Dissenters. This pamphlet was written in opposition to a bill which would remove the right of Dissenters to hold political office. By taking a High Tory opinion to extremes, The Shortest Way With Dissenters was intended to inflame moderate opinion against the bill. However, both sides were aggrieved to discover that the pamphlet was a hoax. Davis argues that Defoe’s release from prison following this debacle, notably by agreeing to write for the Tory Robert Harley’s Review, shows that Defoe must have viewed all writing as essentially artificial or fictional, or he could not have so easily turned to writing for his political enemies. Davis also points to Defoe’s physical disguises and false names adopted for his role as a secret agent, as evidence for Defoe’s capacity for deception. Davis suggests that this type of maneuvering affected Defoe’s novel writing, and cites his tangled involvements in both the Whig and the Tory press as helping to lay the foundations of Defoe’s later, ambivalent novelistic stance.
narrative of Madagascan captivity (1807/1729) and its attribution to Defoe. Despite its exaggerations and errors, plus the plagiarized elements, which Colley calls ‘standard practice in the eighteenth century’ (Colley, 2002:15), archeologists Parker-Pearson and Godden (2002) have recently produced evidence that Drury’s narrative is, in fact, authentic. John Dayell, contemporary editor of *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea* (1812) says this of the speculation surrounding Drury’s narrative:

Some suspicion was at one time thrown on the fidelity of Drury’s narrative... but, considering the testimonies of the author’s veracity, and comparing his relation with authentic accounts of Madagascar, as also a brief history of the same disaster, which came from another of the shipwrecked persons, it is probably to be admitted as genuine (Dalyell, 1812:404).

George Buchan (1820) uses Drury’s narrative as the authority for his comments on Madagascan religion in the ethnographic section of his narrative, showing that he considered Drury’s narrative to be authentic (Buchan, 1820:117). However, this opinion was not universally held and Drury’s narrative continued to be attributed to Defoe.  

This enduring critical debate highlights the difficulty that contemporary readers might have had in distinguishing fact from fiction in the modern sense. However, even as the distinction between fact and fiction was made clearer, readers continued to give writers

---

"The 1807 edition cited in the bibliography is attributed to Defoe.

\(^7\) Also see Snader (2000) on this debate, p 113.

\(^7\) For example, the edition attributed to Defoe held in Sheffield Hallam University’s Corvey collection (1807) entitled *The Adventures of Robert Drury, during Fifteen Years Captivity on the Island of Madagascar*. Adams calls Drury’s narrative a ‘fireside fabrication’ (Adams, 1962:237).
some leeway, particularly within the travel writing genre. As one early nineteenth-century editor says of a narrative in his collection:

There are certainly many events narrated by Monsieur Viaud, which tend to render his Story as a true narrative of Facts, very dubious. Some Persons have, in consequence, declared the whole to be a Fiction; and even the French themselves have lately given it a place...among their Voyages Imaginaires. But if the whole of every French Narrative must be assigned to the regions of Fairy Land, because...It is given to lying: I should imagine that the tomes of Voyages Imaginaires would be prodigiously increased, and comprise no inconsiderable proportion of French Literature (Clarke, 1806:viii).

Despite this type of complaisance, travellers who related their adventures often received short shrift from contemporary periodicals, who were often suspicious of the travel writing they reviewed. An example of this tendency can be seen in one reviewer’s comments in Blackwood’s Magazine regarding Mr Barrow’s relation of his travels in the interior of Africa. The reviewer describes the work as being, ‘puffed and placarded with most audacious quackery in every corner of the town’ (no. XXXI, vol. vi, October 1819:78). Thus, captives were following a long tradition of writing held suspect by discerning readers, although Colley (2000) argues that:

---

78 Adams singles out the Gentleman’s Magazine as particularly prone to criticism of traveller’s narratives (Adams, 1962:227).
while these texts sometimes contain fictional interludes, together of course with a tithe of lies and errors, their overall factual anchorage can usually be tested (Colley, 2002:13).

It was a commonplace that one could expect a returned traveller to take a certain amount of latitude with the facts of an account in favour of excitement and interest. However, whilst in Madras, Eliza Fay (1821/1817) assures her sister of the veracity of certain ‘traveller’s tales’ they had heard prior to her journey:

I must now assure you that I have actually seen several of those things with my own eyes, which we girls used to think poor Captain S—took traveller’s liberty in relating, such as dancing snakes, Jugglers swallowing swords &c...the prismatic colours and graceful motions of the snakes may give pleasure which the other exhibitions never can (Fay, 1821/1817:228).

It was not just the reliability of the individual narrator that might be queried, as travel literature was prone to editorial plagiarism of material from earlier texts (Adams, 1962:89), and as Snader (2000) points out, editors frequently made recourse to the ‘exotic’ to give narratives more appeal. For example, James Scurry’s narrative (1824) contains some details that rather stretch the bounds of possibility, such as a snake sporting a human arm, a tall tale presumably from just such a source. Such hackneyed marvels were loudly denigrated at the time, as illustrated by the eighteenth-century

Derounian-Stodola argues that earlier American captivity narratives were essentially the real-life stories of individuals, which were then used in a didactic way. However, she suggests that in an increasingly secular America, captivity narratives later became transformed into purely fictional forms, being ‘written and read for entertainment’ rather than ‘edification’ (Derounian-Stodola, 1998, xiii-xiv).
editor of travel literature J.F. Bernard, as he ‘inveighed against incredible serpents’ (Adams, 1962:226). However, such embellishment could be accepted without being considered wholly harmful to the narrative as a representation of real events. In the ‘introductory details’ to The Narrative of Robert Adams (1816), a footnote on the reaction of two of the gentleman examiners to Adams’ story states that there were doubts regarding the accuracy of some of Adams’ information. They did, however, accept the ‘general truth’ of his testimony (Adams, 1816:xix).

Establishing the veracity or otherwise of former captives’ narratives certainly appears to have been the prime concern of the periodicals when dealing with such texts, and the interest caused in the *Edinburgh Review* by the publication of Robert Adams’ narrative is illustrative of this preoccupation. The nineteen pages dedicated to Adams’ narrative in the *Edinburgh Review* are not extracts from the narrative itself, as was common practice, but rather a lengthy defence of Adams’ reliability. His tale attracts notice not as an account of individual suffering, but as a source of information on the then little-known African interior. For evidence of how important this type of information was considered, we can look to the reporting in *Blackwood’s Magazine* of the continuing saga of Major Gray’s expedition to Africa. The importance of reader perception regarding captivity narratives in relation to fact and fiction is due to the


This extensive defence was included at the opening of Adams’ narrative, and is reprinted in Baepler’s anthology *White Slaves, African Masters* (1999:208-213).

Discussing Early Modern captives in Barbary, Matar (2001) comments on the potential usefulness of the returned captive to the state: ‘Upon returning home, captives gave depositions about their ordeals. From the many that have survived...it is clear that their purpose was to provide the government with information about maritime affairs, geography and naval danger. Captives were asked not about their suffering and circumstances but the names of ships that had been seized, the number of their conationals [sic] held with them...the ransoms that were demanded, which of the captives had colluded with the enemy and which had converted to Islam’ (Matar, 2001:32).
position of travel writing and captivity narratives as part of contemporary discursive structures. Snader (2000) discusses the importance of empirical data within the captivity genre, as a method of increasing Western knowledge of alien cultures. It becomes logical in this value structure that the ‘truth’ of the narrative comes to be viewed as the most significant aspect of such texts.\(^{83}\) However, Snader argues that this general ethnographic utility is undercut by the uniqueness of the individual captive’s experience, something often capitalised upon as a selling point for the narratives. This tension is what leads to the various forms of extra-textual authority appealed to by captives.\(^{84}\)

\(^{83}\) Adams (1962) discusses how eighteenth-century travel literature coloured the view of the world being received by metropolitan readers, pointing out the importance of travel literature both in terms of information and entertainment between 1660 and 1800 (1962:223).

\(^{84}\) Scurry’s narrative (1824) is a prime example of this, including both an editorial framework and extensive report from another witness.
Low status authors:

The testimony of captives would be further subjected to negative scrutiny where captives themselves were of low social status. Lower-class captivity narrators had to make further appeals for the authenticity of their narratives, made necessary because the low social standing of the captive resulted in further scepticism on the part of readers, as Mills states, 'The higher the status of the author the more likely it is that the text will be considered 'true' (Mills, 1988:47). This is evidenced in the number of strategies of authentification presented in captivity narratives written by or about low-status individuals. Prefaces are vital in this function, providing evidence to buttress the claims of lower-class captives. Robert Adams’ narrative (1816) is an interesting case in point. When Adams is recognised in London as having been recently in the African interior, he is taken to the offices of the African Company where:

No time was lost in questioning him...His answers disclosed so extraordinary series of adventures and sufferings, as at to at first excite a suspicion that his story was an invention (Adams, 1816:xii).

Adams was examined by various gentlemen, including the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other peers. As evidence of the narrative’s veracity, the narrative also includes a testimonial from Mr. Dupuis, the newly returned British vice-consul at Mogadore, who had negotiated Adams’ release. As Adams was illiterate, his editor, Samuel Cook,

---

85 In order to give his narrative authority, James Riley (2000/1817) also looks to high status individuals whom he describes as ‘men of respectability and unquestionable veracity’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xiv). His narrative includes two ‘certificates’ affirming the truth of the account, one from Riley’s second mate on board the Commerce.
claims to have endeavoured to represent the narrative exactly as Adams described, in effect presenting himself as an amanuensis. Cook insists that:

not a single liberty either of addition or suppression having been taken with the plain statements of Adams: even the imperfect orthography of the names and places, as they were first written to imitate Adams’s pronunciation, remains uncorrected (Adams, 1816:xxxi)

However, the admission on the contents page that Adams was in receipt of ‘a Gratuity from the Lords of the Treasury’ raises the suspicion that Adams told Cook what he wished to hear in return for the reward, especially when later this description is further qualified, and described as a ‘handsome gratuity’ (Adams, 1816:xx).86 In the case of James Scurry (1824), an ordinary seaman, rather than use the testimony of high status individuals, the editor uses the preface and a supplementary chapter to the narrative to explain the circumstances of Scurry’s early and later life, in an attempt to convey the captive’s reliability, and thus the authenticity of his narrative.

One practical reason why narratives from low status authors were considered potentially suspect is that a side effect of low social status was a concomitant lack of education. This could further compromise the perceived authenticity of captivity narratives from such sources. Colley (2002) reflects on the provenance of Barbary captivity narratives, in light of the high rate of illiteracy amongst Barbary captives. According to Colley, just fifteen Barbary narratives by Britons who were certainly held captive survived from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Moreover, she argues that these narratives are not

86 Adams’ reward was also projected to include the expected profits from the sale of the narrative.
entirely representative, as it would be unusual for an ordinary sailor to be educated enough to write:

Since producing a lengthy narrative usually (though not invariably) demanded a measure of literacy, the proportion of seamen among these authors was lower than among the total number of Britons held in this Mediterranean zone (Colley, 2002:89).

It was not impossible that a sailor might be literate, however, and Taylor gives the example of William Habberley, who had been apprenticed to the sea as a teenager and documented his experience of the wreck of the *Grosvenor* East Indiaman off the South African coast in 1782 (Taylor, 2004:47). In the case of the narrative of James Scurry (1824), however, Scurry’s apparent literacy is potentially problematic. Scurry was just fourteen years old when he set sail on his fateful journey to which was to lead to his ten-year captivity in India. It is also reported, by the anonymous editor of the narrative, that Scurry first went to sea at the age of seven, and that the sources of this information, his widow and son, do not know the means by which he became literate. In addition, there is an editorial apology on behalf of Scurry regarding possible ‘inaccuracies or inelegancies that may appear in his language’ (Scurry, 1824).\(^87\) This is explained by using Scurry’s own observation that his captivity between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five prevented his improvement in this area.\(^88\) Here then, Scurry is presented as

---

\(^{87}\) The preface to Scurry’s narrative is not paginated.

\(^{88}\) James Riley (2000/1817) also claims in his preface that he has not ‘had the advantages that may be derived from an Academic education’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xii). However, later in the preface he claims to have learned Arabic with great speed, aided by his earlier study of Spanish and his knowledge of ‘Turkish and other Oriental history’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xiii). He states that he learned to read, write and speak both French and Spanish during time spent in France as an adult (Riley, 2000/1817:5).
speaking not only the artless language of the lower classes, but also of youth, as another truth claiming device. The preface informs the reader that the narrative has been published posthumously, as Scurry died in 1822, also explaining how the practical business of setting down the narrative took place. Clearly it was felt that readers must be informed of the conditions of production for the tale to be believed. Scurry claims to have written the account himself on the return passage to Britain and to have finished it once back on terrafirma. However, the ‘supplementary chapter’ to the narrative reveals that Scurry’s brother-in-law helped him to improve his writing and arithmetic on his return to England, a process which reportedly took two years. More questions are raised later, when it is noted that despite the claim that the account was written en route to Britain immediately following Scurry’s escape, the returned captive is reported as being no longer able to speak English. This was not an uncommon result of a long, foreign captivity according to other narratives, and such difficulties are reported in The Narrative of Robert Adams (1816). Similarly in the case of Madagascar: or Robert Drury’s Journal (f.pub. 1729), it was suggested that there might be a problem with attribution to the putative author as ‘Drury lost the ability to speak English, let alone to write it fluently’ (Parker-Pearson & Godden, 2002:196).

Editors/multiple authorship:

Low-status captives, then, were forced by their lack of education, or even illiteracy, to rely on editors in order to produce their narratives. The intervention of editors, however, was problematic for captive narrators. As Colley (2002) suggests of Barbary captivity narratives by low status authors:
Narratives might be further compromised if they were the work of more than just the captives themselves. Since most of those seized by the corsairs were poor and of limited or no education, they often depended on others - friends, patrons, London publishers or whatever, to get into print, and sometimes to aid them with the business of writing itself (Colley, 2002:91).

An early example of the difficulties caused by this for captive narrators is the narrative of John Rawlins (1622) captive in Algiers 1621-2, presented as ‘an unpolished work of a poor sailor’ (Vitkus, 2001:98). Much of the narrative is in the third person, suggesting another writer, although this too is used as a truth-claiming device ‘to render the account more accurately, from an objective distance’ (Vitkus, 2001:97). However, this is a misleading claim as Derounian-Stodola (1998) suggests:

Autobiography preserves the subject-author’s biases and blind spots, but biography, although it often claims greater objectivity, also includes the biographer’s prejudices (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xiii).

How much Scurry’s narrative (1824) was tampered with by his editor is uncertain, however, there is evidence that the editor was not averse to making amendments. Scurry’s fellow captive William Whiteway, the editor tells the reader:
has communicated many anecdotes, that cannot fail to prove highly interesting to the reader. Some of these, if they had been known in time, might have been interwoven in the preceding account (Scurry, 1824:275). 89

The claim for Scurry’s authorship is repeated in the supplementary chapter written by the editor:

Thus far the narrative of this unfortunate adventurer has been written by himself; and, with some trifling variations, the account has been given in his own language...The remaining particulars have been collected from the statement of his widow and son, and partly from detached papers (Scurry, 1824:250-1).

The editor explains the rationale for the inclusion of William Whiteway’s appendix thus:

his surviving companion bears testimony to its general truth, he being a fellow-sufferer of the hardships and cruelties which it details. At the same time, he points out what he conceives to be a few inaccuracies into which his friend had fallen, with respect to names, chronological arrangement, and motives which led to several events, which the memorial of James Scurry contains. All these are, however, of subordinate consideration, serving more to

89 There is other evidence of the editor’s intervention in the narrative. For example, while surrounded at a fort following his escape, Scurry describes the aggressor group as, ‘looking as fierce, perhaps, as Falstaff did when giving an account to Prince Henry of the numbers he had slain’ (Scurry, 1824:195-6). It is likely that this type of literary allusion is the work of the editor.
confirm the truth of the narrative, than in any branch to impeach its veracity
(Scurry, 1824:273).

Whiteway’s additions cause clear difficulties for the authentification of Scurry’s narrative. Despite the editor’s assertion that Whiteway’s comments function to corroborate Scurry’s narrative, the publication of testimony counter to that of the original narrative is problematic. Despite the claim that Whiteway corrects only minor details of Scurry’s narrative in order to satisfy the expected doubters, in fact many of his observations are not related to Scurry’s narrative at all, and are a series of loosely connected incidents and opinions relating to the British in India. These methods of documentation are seen by the editor as improving the narrative in terms of entertainment, information and validation. However, there is a tension in the introduction of multiple, and even conflicting, perspectives, due to editorial intervention. As Snader (2000) argues:

Such anticipations of sceptical reactions on the part of English readers suggest that a single voice of plain documentation cannot encompass the extraordinary demands of captive experience (Snader, 2000:57).

Whiteway is not the only additional witness cited by the editor, as anonymous individuals with Indian experience are appealed to as evidence of the authenticity of Scurry’s narrative. However, the limitations of this are explicitly expressed:

---

90 For example, Scurry claims that Hector Monroe marched on Hyder Ali causing the latter’s retreat (Scurry, 1824:92). However, Whiteway contends that Monroe retreated on hearing of Colonel Baillie’s defeat (Whiteway, 1824:279-80).
Few, indeed, among them had the misfortune to be eye-witnesses of the miseries which it records; but being fully acquainted with the general character of Hyder, and his son Tippoo, they entertain no doubt of the cruelties which are ascribed to the mandates of these eastern despots. With many of the transactions to which James Scurry alludes in his narrative, they were intimately acquainted; to the truth of which they bear their most unequivocal testimony, making due allowances for those variations in opinion and language, which are inseparable from human testimony, when different individuals give an account of the same event (Scurry, 1824:272).

We may speculate on Whiteway’s possible motivation for commenting on Scurry’s narrative. Whiteway did not receive pay on his return to England, as he was captured whilst serving on an Indiaman, rather than a King’s ship. Given this precarious financial situation, there is the possibility that Whiteway’s testimony may not be reliable, particularly as Scurry himself was dead by the time Whiteway’s amendments were added to the narrative. However, it is not the issue of factual accuracy that is the important point for this thesis; rather it is the fact that both voices compete whilst published in the same account, and this within a genre where truth-telling is supposedly held at a premium.91

91 It should be noted, however, that as Whiteway’s narrative is appended to Scurry’s, it does not disturb the main narration.
Reticence:

Discussing travel writing, Adams (1962) suggests a number of possible motivations for editorial intervention, including financial gain, prudishness or the improvement of reputations (1962:86-7). When piecing together the events following the wreck of the *Grosvenor* from various accounts, Taylor (2004) highlights how these were liable to present differing interpretations of events, some more flattering to British sensibilities than others. Less savoury behaviour, particularly that of higher ranking individuals, was often expunged from the record or mitigated. An example of this is found in George Buchan’s narrative (1820). Despite the fact that the *Winterton’s* Captain Dundas possessed two chronometers with which to calculate longitude, he was very much mistaken as to his position in the Mozambique Channel. To add to the Captain’s difficulties, contemporary charting of the area was inadequate. Nevertheless, Hood (2003) describes his failure to take soundings as ‘negligence’ (Hood, 2003:40), although both Buchan and John Dale, who produced accounts of events, were careful not to apportion blame to any officer. John Dale’s report, written in Madras for Cornwallis, was scrupulously loyal (Hood, 2003:175). As will be seen later in discussion of ideas of savagery and civilisation, fellow Europeans may also deserve criticism, presenting the narrator with the challenge of maintaining ‘truthfulness’ whilst not destabilising the view of Europeans as members of superior, civilised nations. For example, Captain Dale suffers from a lack of compassion on the part of the Portuguese when he completes the dangerous voyage to Sofala in Mozambique, arriving in a desperately weak condition. How a narrator should represent ill-behaviour on the part of fellow Europeans is problematic. Dale wrestles with this difficulty openly:

92 These were not standard Navy issue until 1825 (Hood, 2003:15).
We were totally at a loss to account for conduct so repugnant to the principles of humanity; and as it is opposite to the treatment we experienced in other Portuguese settlements, nothing would have determined me to mention it, but a due regard to truth and impartiality, which I hope will be found to characterise this Narrative (Buchan, 1820:190).

Memory:

Paradoxically, despite his reticence regarding the behaviour of high-ranking individuals, George Buchan is also keen to display his privileging of ‘truth’ over a good story in his narrative. He suggests that he has omitted interesting details in the pursuit of ‘truthful’ representation, claiming that:

I heard from Mr. H— some wonderful circumstances attending the recovery of the raft...but I am unable to narrate them with sufficient accuracy (Buchan, 1820:39).

James Scurry (1824) is similarly aware that readers may doubt the accuracy of his memory of events, some of which had taken place more than a decade previous to them being set down. Anxious to be believed, he claims to have left out any scenes where his memories are imperfect, so that the truthfulness of his claims will not be doubted. According to the editor, Scurry states that:
his narrative might be considerably enlarged, were he to delineate the various scenes he has been called to witness; but having some doubts as to the exact period of their occurrence, and the circumstances connected with them, he has omitted the relation altogether, that nothing might furnish an occasion to impeach his veracity (Scurry, 1824).

George Buchan’s preface (1820) also deals with the issue of truth telling and memory, where he makes the distinction between the ‘remembrance’ of events and the ‘record’ of them.94 This is to allow the inclusion of events which Buchan left out of his initial account written shortly after the shipwreck, which in his youth he had considered ‘beneath the historian’s dignity’ (Buchan, 1820:vi). Here, Buchan attempts to style himself as the relater of fact. However, as might be expected, the passage of years has in fact affected the view of events represented in the narrative. For example, the survivors of the Winterton wreck left Madagascar bound for Mozambique on board the Joachim, when their ship was captured by the French,95 the war having spread to distant waters.96 Taken to Mauritius by their French captors, the castaways waited on the mercy of the Jacobin Club to improve their situation. Buchan was later to gloss over the difficulty of

91 The preface to Scurry’s narrative is not paginated.
94 James Riley (2000/1817) defends his own memory of events in the preface to his narrative. Despite the fact that much of the narrative is written purely from memory, Riley states that, ‘I committed the principal facts to writing in Mogadore, when every circumstance was fresh in my memory, (which is naturally a retentive one,) and I then compared my own recollections with those of my ransomed companions:...each particular event was of a nature calculated to impress itself so powerfully on the mind, as not easily to be effaced’ (Riley, 2000/1817:xii).
95 This fate was to befall Captain Dale again in January 1794 when he was captured from a company ship and transferred to the Semillante (Hood, 2003:201).
96 War was declared on 1st February 1793.
these negotiations, but when writing immediately after events, he described the National Assembly as the hostage of mob rule by the Jacobin Club (Hood, 2003:179-80).97

Translation:

Aside from the difficulties of accurately representing their own actions, motivations and speech, a further difficulty encountered by captives is that of a language barrier between the captive and captor. Matar (2001) points out in his introduction to seven narratives of Barbary captivity, that captives often used their claimed knowledge of captor language as evidence of their own truthfulness (Matar, 2001:3-4). The captives’ translations acted as signs of their acquaintance with local manners and customs, as well as the truth of their own view of dealings with captors. The captivity narrator reports the words and actions of Others within the narrative, but it is open to question how reliably the captive is able to represent those with whom s/he cannot effectively communicate. To take an example from George Buchan’s narrative (1820), on landing on the Madagascan shore John Dale confidently relates this interaction with the indigenous inhabitants of the island:

four of the natives...enquired for the captain, saying that the King of Baba wanted him; and that when he went to him, the King would give water and whatever else was wanted (Buchan, 1820:52).

97 These difficulties were overcome by the personal pleas of the Winterton women Isabella Cullen and Charlotte Bristow to the National Assembly, resulting in the castaways being granted their freedom to continue to Madras on board the Henry, arriving in January 1794.
However, the ‘natives’ lead Dale, not to the King, but to another group of castaways. Dale admits, ‘this was most likely what the natives had meant, though we did not comprehend them’ (Buchan, 1820:53). Echoing John Dale’s optimism in his own ability to translate indigenous language, the American captain James Riley (2000) addresses the difficulty of translation in the following manner:

I have put down what I knew at the time to be their exact meaning, as nearly as I could translate their words and signs combined (Riley, 2000/1817:xii).

Although this statement acknowledges the possibility of misinterpretation, Riley regales the reader with an inventory of his knowledge of numerous languages and concludes:

in the course of a very few days, I was able to comprehend the general tenor and drift of their ordinary conversation, and to find out the meaning of their signs and gestures (Riley, 2000/1817:xiii).

However, when describing one such laboured exchange Riley admits that:

My shipmates...could not understand one syllable of what they said, or of their signs, and did not believe that I was able to communicate at all with them (Riley, 2000/1817:66).

Also casting doubt on Riley’s ability to accurately render the statements of his captors is his desperate plea written in a letter to a potential and unknown deliverer, ‘For God’s sake, send an interpreter’ (Riley, 2000/1817:171).
These types of difficulties encountered by captive narrators trying to claim the ‘truth’ of their representations led to captives and their editors making further moves for authentification. Truth claiming was part and parcel of the captivity genre, frequently emphasising the ‘plainness’ of the narrative, in a manner related to a long rhetorical tradition. Prefatory apologies were part of the traveller’s defence against attacks on their truthfulness, although they too became a hackneyed device (Adams, 1962:228). For example, James Scurry’s (1824) prefatory apology for the plain style in which he claims his narrative is written is linked to authenticity through the belief that simplicity and artlessness are equivalent with truth and authority. Given the difficulties for captivity narrators, especially those of low status, in claiming truthfulness, considerable effort is expended on ensuring that a tale from such a source can be believed. In Scurry’s narrative this begins with the epigraph:

No flowery words adorn this artless tale,
Here simple truth alone is to be found (Scurry, 1824).

Snader points out that this conventional format was used by the earliest captive narrators and their publishers to give their tales more authority as true accounts:

Throughout the Anglophone captivity tradition of the seventeenth century, a prefatory apology for a “plain” style or a “plain” author functioned as a

---

98 Joan Parks discusses the distinction between ‘history’ and ‘poetry’ in early modern literature. Writers of ‘history’ set the genre against ‘poetry’ to claim a higher ‘truth’ value, and made use of the prefatory apology for the plainness of prose style as a further indicator of this (Parks, 1999:282-3).
shorthand declaration of scientific rigour. When merchants, seamen and American settlers apologised for that style that suited their humble social position, their ostensible humility acted as a claim to empirical truth (Snader, 2000:50).

Discussing the importance of the type of language used in a text to its relation to ‘truth’ value, Mills (1988) explains that if the style of the language is perceived as ‘neutral’ and ‘clear’, it will be considered as evidence of the ‘truth’ presented in the text. However, as Mills also shows, Roland Barthes argues that this type of writing is itself a stylistic convention, which he names ‘la clarté’ (Mills, 1988:80). This is significant because if this convention is read as being transparent, rather than being recognised as a style, the presumed ‘truth’ of that text will be seen as coinciding with authority. Accordingly, the captivity narrator is deeply concerned with claiming this simple style that was considered the marker of authenticity." When making the following comments in her narrative, Eliza Fay (1821/1817) was a prisoner in Egypt, and the caravan she was travelling with had been captured by the local bey. She begins to embellish her account with an emotional comment about England, but as quickly as this bursts forth, she controls the impulse:

Oh England! dear England! how often did I apostrophise thee, land of liberty

99 The preface to Jewitt’s narrative (1824/1815) states that the narrative is an unchanged version of Jewitt’s own manuscript, as, despite editorial reservations about Jewitt’s style, ‘it was deemed advisable to dispense with an attempt at ornament, which could only have been obtained at the expense of authenticity’ (Jewitt, 1824/1815:iii). Similarly, James Smith’s (f.pub.1799) preface to his narrative of Native American captivity states that he has gone against advice ‘to employ some person of liberal education to transcribe and embellish it - but believing that nature always outshines art, have thought, that occurrences truly and plainly stated, as they happened, would make the best history, be better understood, and most entertaining’ (Sayre, 2000/1799:263).
and safety—: but I must not review my thoughts—: a simple narrative is all I dare allow myself to write (Fay, 1821/1817:99).

Editors too used this claim of plainness, as exemplified by this contemporary editor of tales of shipwreck:

> It has been thought best to avoid as much as possible awakening sympathy in the reader’s mind, by any display of language, for the simplest narrative of such calamities will kindle a consentaneous feeling in every bosom (Redding, 1833: v-vi).

This viewing of plainness as ‘truth’, and thus a virtue, had a national dimension. In particular the British saw the French as prone to using elaborate language compared to British simplicity. As a British sailor, Scurry’s style might be seen as typically sparse, as exemplified when he describes the truly pitiable state of the newly circumcised captives. One might be surprised by the matter-of-fact relation of these sufferings, but Snader (2000) considers the effects of captive narrators’ plain style of writing upon their readers:

For further discussion see Michele Cohen, (1996) *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*. Similarly, American colonists came to compare themselves favourably with British in these terms. For example, in Hilliard D’Auberteuil’s novel *Miss McCrea* (1784), London is identified with corruption and excess. As England’s agent, Belton is presented as seducing the heroine Jane with his over-refined linguistic talents, ‘never had anyone employed with more art such vivid and passionate expressions’ (Sayre, 2000/1784:366).

James Scurry’s narrative (1824) shows occasional moments of the opposite, sentimental impulse. Scurry describes the escaped captives’ eventual meeting with British forces as ‘a pathetic scene’ (Scurry, 1824:206). Dr Little, the British officer Scurry meets with, is represented as the archetypal ‘man of feeling’. Scurry reports that on the relation of the captives’ tale, Dr Little’s ‘sensibility was touched, and the tears trickled down his face as fast as they could flow’ (Scurry, 1824:206).
an unadorned style...can also drive readers to maximal impressions of horror, shock and alienation. Even in sections narrating first-person suffering, the captives often describe their sufferings in a laconic manner (Snader, 2000:50).

However, rather than being related to the affective response of the reader, Pratt (1992) suggests that the debate over the style of narratives was related to the social position of the writer:

Stylistic debates as to the relative values of “embellishment” and “naked truth” often reflected tensions between the man of science and the man of sensibility, or between the lettered and popular writer (Pratt, 1992:87).

George H. Evans, editor of a reprint of Riley’s *Sufferings in Africa* (f. pub. 1817), makes much of Riley’s supposedly plain and ‘refreshingly matter of fact’ style (2000:vi). However, despite the claims of a ‘plain style’ made by the contemporary editor Anthony Bleeker, Riley’s prose makes use of poetic diction and descriptive passages, particularly of physical suffering. The narrative is unusual in the amount of vivid detail it gives of physical suffering, earning the description of ‘sensational’ from Sayre (2000:11). Evans also suggests that Riley’s use of this supposed ‘plain style’ is evidence of the sophisticated literary taste of the author:

---

102 Whether the work of Riley or Bleeker, the narrative contains phrases that are literary in tone, for example, ‘Night had now spread her sable mantle over the face of nature’ (Riley, 2000/1817:21).
Plain men prefer the complex sentence, the long word, and the imagined elegance of ‘fine’ writing. The more educated prefer just the opposite. The Anglo-Saxon word, the brief declarative sentence, the plain style of writing are normally the model of the literary man. Riley’s is eminently the plain style, and reflects the hand of an unplain man (Riley, 2000:vi).

According to Pratt, there are essentially two types of narrator in travel writing: the ‘manners-and-customs’ narrator, where the narrator is largely absent from the text, and the ‘sentimental’ figure, featuring a foregrounded narrator (Pratt, 1992:64). Sayre (2000) argues that American captivity narratives ‘claimed factuality both through eyewitness accounts of outward events and subjective representations of the captive’s inward state’ (Sayre, 2000:9). However, as Charles Batten has shown in work on eighteenth-century travel writing, male travel writers would omit inner representation because of ‘textual and publishing pressures’ (Batten cited in Mills, 1991:49). As Clark (1999) argues:

Travellers...may be distinguished from realist characters through the virtual absence of individual motivation. There are remarkably few direct avowals of either positive impulses of curiosity or invigorating novelty, or negatives ones of grief or bereavement (Clark, 1999:13)

I argue in Chapter 3, ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’, that these omissions are also the result of discursive constraints on British captives, who must attempt to maintain their assumed superior position over Others.
The omission of the representation of such interiority is related to the notion that distance creates objectivity.\textsuperscript{104} The idea of presenting an objective truth is implicit in one of the footnotes to George Buchan’s narrative (1820), as he states:

\begin{quote}
It is with much unwillingness I speak thus \textit{personally}, but it must be obvious, that in a narrative such as this, it would not be easy to make things fully understood without occasionally doing so (Buchan, 1820:30).
\end{quote}

Here Buchan highlights a central difficulty for captive narrators. Whilst they must attempt to maintain the appearance of, or at least lay claim to, the plain style seen as coinciding with authority, they must necessarily foreground themselves as protagonists in their narration. This has implications for the captivity narrator’s relation to colonial discourse. Pratt observes that the system of natural history associated with the European, male observer, ‘created…a utopian, innocent vision of European global authority’, terming this phenomenon ‘anti-conquest’. Pratt also suggests that a foregrounded narrator, like the self-effacing narrator of ‘scientific’ texts, partakes of this ‘innocent vision’:

\begin{quote}
The sentimental protagonist, too, is constructed as a non-interventionist European presence. Things happen to him and he endures and survives. As a textual construct, his innocence lies less in self-effacement than in submissiveness and vulnerability (Pratt, 1992:78).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{104} This is the case in the development of non-fictional genres, but in fiction of this period, interiority became increasingly allied with authority. As Hunter argues, one of the ways in which novels may be distinguished from their fictional predecessors (romances) is the novel’s emphasis on subjectivity (Hunter, 1990:23-4). Similarly, Watt discusses how ‘the authority and the illusion of print’ facilitate the relation between truth and subjective experience in the novel (Watt, 1974:197-8).
Pratt argues that these contradictory modes are complimentary to one another in the service of the imperial project:

European expansion is as sanitized and mystified in the literature of sentiment as in the informational/scientific mode (Pratt, 1992:78).

Thus, for Pratt, both science and sentiment were used in travel texts as signs of the innocence of the European presence in indigenous lands, and that this innocence was associated with objectivity and disinterestedness. However, Pratt’s model is problematic in the captive situation. Pratt argues that the European traveller’s ‘submissiveness’ and vulnerability equates with innocence. However, the captive’s vulnerability is not comparable to that of the free traveller. In the case of the captive narrator, whilst the representation of vulnerability does indeed serve in part to mitigate the captive’s complicity in colonial endeavour, it also unsettles the relation of the captive to discourses of British national superiority.

Conclusions:

This chapter has shown that the captivity narratives under consideration have a complex relation to ‘reality’ and ‘truth’, because of the nature of reality as a discursive construct, and because of the complex relation between textuality and reality. The narration of ‘real’ events is subject to discursive constraints on writing suggested by Foucault, and also complicated by issues such as reticence, memory and the difficulty of language translation. Added to this are issues of captive illiteracy, education and editorial
intervention and multiple authorship. The expectations of contemporary readers with regard to the 'truth' value of captivity narratives is significant, particularly in influencing the claim to 'plain style' which characterises the captivity narratives under discussion. However, the captivity narrator is compromised stylistically by the necessity of the captive becoming the foregrounded figure of the narration. Due to the extremity of his/her situation, the representation of the captive's vulnerability cannot be fully transformed into innocence (and by extension — authority). Thus, the captive narrator holds a complex relation to discourses of national superiority, which are discussed further in the next chapter.
Chapter 2: Savagery and Civilisation

Introduction:

This chapter examines the discourses of savagery and civilisation within captivity narratives in order to show that assumptions of British national superiority are not hegemonic. As this thesis examines the difficulties of representing the captivity of British subjects in non-European zones by Others and their European allies, it is necessary to establish why such captivities were considered an affront to British sensibilities. The importance of contemporary British thought on savagery and civilisation to the production and reception of narratives of British captivity is outlined by Snader (2000):

the experience of captivity among an allegedly savage or barbarous people posed a fundamental challenge to British concepts of their own national liberty, character and civility (Snader, 2000:6).

However, it is questionable whether a firm British sense of identity was as clearly formed during this period as has been generally suggested, and whether, as Young (1995) suggests:

the old essentializing categories of cultural identity, and of race, were really so essentialized, or have been retrospectively represented as more fixed than they were (Young, 1995:27).
In addition to questioning the fixity of British national identity, and thus the stability of the civilised qualities attributed to Britons, this chapter explores the complex representation of indigenous peoples in relation to discourses of savagery and civilisation. This chapter discusses how savagery and civilisation were conceptualised in the West, beginning with an outline of the long-standing ‘Mediterranean’ discourse of civilisation traceable back to classical times. Following this is a discussion of contemporary racial theories, and how these nascent ‘sciences’, which would reach their apogee in the later nineteenth century, were already affecting debate on the nature of human civilisation. Discussion of ‘savagery’ then centres around two antithetical positions on savages: the cult of the ‘noble savage’, versus the denigration of savage culture as inferior. Critics of the captivity narrative are divided in their views on the effects on European ideas produced by contact with ‘savage’ cultures. Whilst some, such as Hilary Stewart (1987), the modern editor of John Jewitt’s narrative, read such material as revealing details of the ‘savage’ culture, Schaffer (1998) argues that accounts of contact with indigenous peoples only provide information about the more mobile culture, what Schaffer refers to as the ‘fears and fantasies of the British’ (Schaffer, 1998:86). Whilst it would be wrong to reduce travel and captivity texts solely to information gathering and dissemination exercises about non-European cultures, it is also misguided to view them as merely reflecting European anxieties, although such texts do reveal much of the British view of themselves and their sense of their relative civilisation. This chapter examines how these views are exemplified in the captivity texts under discussion, but also how evidence from the captivity narratives problematises the assumption of national superiority. It questions whether the assumption of British superiority over its Others was clear, using evidence from captivity narratives to reveal the ambivalent relation of Britons, and Others, to
Discourses of civilisation:

‘Civilisation’ as a term was used in the eighteenth century to refer both to a process of progressive improvement of culture, as well as the end product of this process, and various thinkers mapped out the stages of this progression. As Young (1995) discusses, the Marquis de Condorcet’s *Outline of the Intellectual Progress of Mankind* (1795) delineated civilisation as a series of ten incremental, progressive stages. Moreover, in the late eighteenth century, such works as Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* (1776) and Richard Payne Knight’s poem ‘The Progress of Civil Society’ (1796) outlined the progression of civilisation in terms of economic development. Young notes that in the nineteenth-century, this was simplified into three basic stages of human progress toward civilisation: savagery, barbarism, and finally, civilisation. J.S. Mill’s essay

‘Civilization’ (1836) ‘formalized the trio not as general categories but as a hierarchy of the historical stages of man’ (Young, 1995:35). In *Colonial Encounters* (1992), Peter Hulme discusses two discourses affecting European views of non-European societies: those of Oriental civilisation and Carib savagery. The discourse of ‘Oriental

---

105 Europeans were often viewed negatively in terms of their civilisation by indigenous populations. On the coast of Africa, oral history told of izilwane or wild beasts (Taylor, 2004:99). This referred to white men, based on local experience of a sixteenth-century shipwreck of a Portuguese vessel in the same location as the loss of the *Grosvenor*. The seaman and *Grosvenor* survivor William Habberley caused a similar reaction when he encountered one group of indigenous inhabitants, reporting that they gazed at him ‘with as much fear as if I was some dangerous monster’ (Taylor, 2004:159). Similarly, *Blackwood’s Magazine* suggests how the *Winterton* survivors may have been seen by the Madagascans: ‘The aversion of the Indians to all strangers is well known. The only name by which foreigners (even the British) are known in the island [Madagascar], is, “Jungulee,” equivalent to “wild men,” and answering literally to the Dutch *Bosch-men*, and the uncouth Malay *Ourang-outang*’ (October 1820, no. XLIII, vol.VIII:32).
civilisation’, originated with Marco Polo, whilst the ‘Herodotean discourse of savagery’
was based on Herodotus’ work on the savagery of the ‘barbarian’ beyond Greek
borders. Hulme explains:

As the European nations, especially England, took on their imperial roles, the
classical world of the Mediterranean grew in importance as a repository of the
images and analogies by which those nations could represent to themselves their
colonial activities (Hulme, 1992:35). 106

Thus, colonial discourse characterised European nations as identifiable with earlier
imperialists, assuming the superior position in the binary distinction made between
cultures. However, as Hulme (1992) also points to an alternative discourse, that of
‘Oriental civilisation’, it can be seen that colonial discourses of savagery and
civilisation were far more complex than this binary opposition would suggest.

‘Scientific racism’:

Added to the long-established, classical view of civilisation came the ‘scientific’ interest
in the relative positions of races and cultures, as a vital component of British views of
their own identity. According to Young (1995):

However much they may have been denigrated by being placed lower in the
scale, these other societies were by the same token nevertheless essential to the

106 For further discussion of the importance of the classical world to European national identities see Leoussi (1997) ‘Nationalism and racial Hellenism in nineteenth-century England and France’. 106
European sense of self and concept of civilization (Young, 1995:35).

The new ‘scientific racism’ attempted to rigidly categorise all human life, first classified into twenty-eight varieties in the 1770s by the German J.F. Blumenbach (Young, 1995:64). As Young explains:

Race was defined through the criteria of civilization, with the cultivated white Western male at the top, and everyone else in on a hierarchical scale, either in a chain of being, from mollusc to God, or, in the later model, on an evolutionary scale of development from a feminized state of childhood (savagery) up to full (European) manly adulthood (Young, 1995:94).

This hierarchical scale provided those at the top – educated European men – with the power to encompass the unfamiliar into the schema, as Pratt (1992) puts it:

One by one the planet’s life forms were to be drawn out of the tangled threads of their life surroundings and rewoven into European-based patterns of global unity and order. The (lettered, male, European) eye that held the system could familiarize (“naturalize”) new sites/sights immediately upon contact, by incorporating them into the language of the system (Pratt, 1992:31).

Young argues that from the late eighteenth century until the mid-nineteenth century ‘public attitudes towards race were “relatively benign”’ (Young, 1995:118), whilst for
later racial theorists ‘anatomy was destiny’ (Young, 1995:121). He takes the establishment of the Ethnological Society in 1843 by J.C. Prichard, and its rival the Anthropological Society set up in 1863, as markers of this change. However, Young’s position homogenises the complex attitudes to race found earlier and underestimates their effects. Totalising theories were indeed being articulated from the mid-nineteenth century, but there were pressing reasons why such attitudes were gaining less formalised currency before the existence of the Victorian ‘scientific’ societies. The announcement in 1786 by linguist William Jones to the Bengal Asiatic Society that Sanskrit was the ultimate source of the Greek and Latin languages, and thus of modern European languages, was to have a profound effect on the influence of ‘scientific racism’. In Young’s view:

physiological classification of racial difference was transformed from the mere taxonomy of ethnography by the discoveries in contemporary linguistics (1780-1820s) of the Indo-European family of languages...which linked European languages to Sanskrit and an ultimate proto-language originating in the Asia from which the Aryan Caucasians had supposedly come (Young, 1995:65).

Upholding the unquestioned dominance of Europe in the light of Jones’ discovery became urgent business, as his work was linked to the very foundation of European civilisation.

Hudson (1996) argues that before the work of Linneaus, Buffon and Blumenbach, amongst others, ‘racism’ could exist as little more than a visceral distrust of physical difference’ (Hudson, 1996:252).

Loomba (2002) points out that, ‘The rise of modern racism is often seen in terms of a shift from a cultural (and more benign) to a more biological (and inflexible) view of racial difference. But though the biological understanding of race made it more pernicious, we should be wary of...suggesting that a ‘cultural’ understanding of race is somehow benign or flexible’ (Loomba, 2002:38).
The chain of being:

There were, however, different ways of viewing the chain of being. As Young discusses in *Colonial Desire* (1995), those taking a liberal or ‘monogenist’ view of the differences between races, such as the French natural historian the Comte de Buffon (1707-1788), believed that all humanity had descended from Adam and Eve (Bohls, 1995:55) seeing differences in skin colour as the effect of climatic conditions in different locations. However, J.C. Prichard in *Researches into the Physical History of Man* (1813), identified whiteness as the product of civilisation, believing that the first humans were black, and that the progression towards civilisation included the lightening of the skin.\(^{109}\) Even more problematically, biological determinism suggested that racial differences were created by God. Adepts of this increasingly popular view, or ‘polygenists’, such as founders of the Anthropological society Dr James Hunt and Richard F. Burton,\(^ {110}\) viewed Africans as a separate species, but ‘even liberal thinkers like Buffon often compared Africans to monkeys or apes’ (Bohls, 1995:55).\(^ {111}\) Thus, on the scale of civilisation, Africans were seen as the lowest order of humanity. Other writers such as Edward Long in his *History of Jamaica* (1774) used such polygenist racial theory as an apology for slavery (Kitson, 1998:20). In one of the narratives under consideration in this thesis, it can be seen that although George Buchan (1820), an East India Company servant shipwrecked on the coast of Madagascar, makes open attacks on

\(^{109}\) Kitson (1998) notes that Blumenbach argued that the first humans were white, and that the existence of other races was the consequence of ‘degeneration’ (Kitson, 1998:19).

\(^{110}\) The Anthropological Society was set up in 1863 as a rival to the Ethnological Society founded in 1843 by monogenist J.C. Prichard (Young, 1995:66).

\(^{111}\) James Riley (2000/1817) describes an African tribesman in his narrative, claiming that ‘his face resembled that of an ourang-outang more than a human being’ (Riley, 2000/1817:18).
the slave trade in his narrative, this view of the scale of civilisation is implicit in his comments. His assessment that Madagascans are ill-suited to slavery maintains, despite his abolitionist stance, the notion that certain races are suited to such an existence. He says of Madagascans:

though well, I may say, elegantly, shaped, they are not a people possessed of much muscular strength; and the temper of their minds perhaps somewhat accords with the appearance of their bodily frames. Their dispositions, light and cheerful, with considerable intelligence, according to the extent of the means, must be ill-adapted to the rugged horrors of an enslaved state (Buchan, 1820:103).

Buchan also makes an assumption of progress when he attempts to fix Madagascan society on the scale of civilisation. He concludes that it is inferior to that of Sumatra and Java, but superior to what he terms ‘Hottentot’ society, and that of other South African tribes prior to their ‘improvement’ by missionaries (Buchan, 1820:143). He offers this optimistic assessment of the Madagascan people, subject to the ‘civilising’ influence of European missionaries:

the Madagascar disposition must be much changed since I knew it, if I may not safely aver, that, with a ladder thus fixed, it will not be long before they climb high in the scale of being (Buchan, 1820:44).

---

119 The Dutch colonists’ appellation for the Khoïkhoï people of South Africa (Loomba, 2002:43).

113 Fulford (1998) notes that the establishment of a colony at New South Wales meant that it became ‘aborigines who were to rival the ‘Hottentot’ for the distinction of being, in European eyes, the lowest link in nature’s chain between man and animal’ (Fulford, 1998:42).
Many other writers also believed in the positive effects of education on those considered to be lower in the chain of being. As Young (1995) explains:

The concept of culture was developed as part of the Enlightenment stress on education as enculturation: this radical egalitarian position, whose origins can be traced back to Locke and in which became the basis of much nineteenth-century Liberal thought, underlies the Enlightenment claim of the fundamental equality of all men and women (Young, 1995:32).

Even with this equality at its foundation, such a concept of culture was used as the basis for the imposition of European values on non-European societies. As Young outlines:

‘culture’ was used in a progressive sense...as a particular form or type of intellectual development, namely the improvement of the mind by education and training (Young, 1995:32).

When advocating a ‘civilising’ mission in Madagascar, and arguing that the indigenous inhabitants are neither so vile nor virtuous as they have been painted, Buchan uses a particular notion of ‘culture’. He calls upon the idea of ‘culture’ as an improving force, and suggests that the British are ideally placed in the chain of being to provide the ‘right culture’ and education necessary for Madagascan progression:

That they have many of the vices and defects incidental to an uncivilised people is certain; but it is equally so...that they possess the seeds of many excellent
qualities which right culture would very soon bring to maturity (Buchan, 1820:135).

Buchan laments the effect of the African climate on British missionaries and the attendant loss of life, likening the missionaries to ‘martyrs of former times’ (Buchan, 1820:221). However, he suggests that if the climate forces British missionaries to leave Madagascar, there remains an alternative method of civilising the population:

We have seen the inhabitants of New Zealand, Africa, and other distant countries, conveyed to England for the purpose of mental improvement, and returning to their native climes to impart to their countrymen the lights with which their own minds had been stored...such was the feeling of attachment for the English that existed...among the people around St. Augustine, that I do not think they would hesitate to commit some of their youthful relatives to the charge of any persons whom they saw interested in their welfare (Buchan, 1820:222-3).

In a similar vein, Buchan also uses the trope of bringing ‘light’ to the ‘darkness’ of Madagascar:

as the distant sun affords a faint glimmering to the benighted inhabitants of the polar region, so the increasing light of the present age may be shedding a gleam on the inhabitants of Madagascar (Buchan, 1820:120).
Thus, even at this relatively early period of British colonial expansion, Buchan’s position contains an unspoken justification of the white man’s burden - the duty to bring knowledge, order and ‘civilisation’ to those considered to be lower on the chain of being. As James (1997) states:

Post-reformation theology had provided a mandate for European expansion in America and Africa where, it was alleged, native populations had ignored or neglected what God had provided (James, 1997:55).

In the light of this position of apparently unquestioned European dominance and superiority, the possibility of racial mixing was to become a matter of deep concern to European thinkers. Young (1995) discusses the way in which Count Arthur Gobineau (1816-82) theorised the effects of racial mixing in his ‘Essay on the Inequality of Races’ (1853-5),\(^{114}\) and came to a radically different conclusion to that of men like Buchan. Viewing the Aryan race as the source of all civilisation, Gobineau sees the decline of civilisation as an inevitable effect of the racial ‘degeneration’ caused by miscegenation.\(^{115}\) This pessimistic prognosis is in opposition to Enlightenment ideals of human perfectibility, and holding this view, Gobineau sees no hope of educating what he sees as the contaminated. In a similar but paradoxical way, without mixing with whites, he sees other races as otherwise beyond civilisation, rendering education and missionary work ineffective. Young states that Gobineau’s ideas are:

\(^{114}\) There was no English translation until 1915.
\(^{115}\) He sees this evidenced particularly amongst the lower classes of the colonial, metropolitan centres of Paris and London (Young, 1995:113).
a racialized version of Rousseau’s equally paradoxical argument that humans are only constituted as fully human by the society that must also corrupt them, the origin of the Romantic idea that civilization brings about a material progress at the expense of unchanging ‘natural’ values of cultural and spiritual life (Young, 1995:112).

The exotic:

The potentially negative effects of civilisation are discussed by Chris Bongie in his study of the exotic. In *Exotic Memories* (1991), Bongie defines exoticism as:

> a nineteenth-century and existential practice that posited another space, the space of an Other, outside or beyond the confines of “civilisation” (Bongie, 1991:4-5).

In this space, one could ‘escape the “world’s corruption and degradation” to go elsewhere and thereby transform the constitutive mediocrity of the modern subject’ (Bongie, 1991:21). However, he argues that the distinction made between savagery and civilisation was gradually effaced by the continued progress of Western colonialism and imperialism, but that ‘exoticism’ in the nineteenth century relied on the possibility of this divide. Bongie credits the nineteenth-century preoccupation with exoticism as occurring due to the resurgence in interest in individualism in reaction to ‘the emergence of mass society’ (Bongie, 1991:13).116 He also suggests that the possibility

---

116 Bongie cites the importance of both ‘factual’ and ‘fictional’ relations of tales of adventure in this process. He also suggests that ‘Enlightenment anthropology’ furnished ‘nineteenth-century exoticism with much of its conceptual apparatus (the “noble
of the exotic belonged to a particular historical moment, arguing that by the second half of the nineteenth century, the possibility of finding such an exotic space was problematised by writers such as Jules Verne, foreshadowing the work of twentieth-century critical theorists such as Theodore Adorno and Claude Levi-Strauss (Bongie, 1991:4-5), who concentrated on the effects of the global homogenisation of culture. The gloomy theoretical position that space for the exotic no longer existed, arrived at by the late nineteenth century, came from the difficulties in reconciling the possibility of the continued existence of the exotic within the compass of an expanded Western civilisation which had seemingly reached the limits of the globe:

By 1880 the age of exploration was largely over: the globe had been mapped to such an extent that little or no territory was beyond the pale of Euro-American knowledge and techniques of control and communication (Bongie, 1991:18).

However, the discourse of exoticism did not unproblematically present the exotic as a refuge from the corrupting effects of civilisation. Bongie makes a distinction between two types of exoticism - ‘exoticist’ and ‘imperial’: Whereas exoticizing exoticism privileges less developed, savage territories, figuring them as a possible refuge from overbearing modernity, imperialist exoticism affirms the hegemony of modern civilisation (Bongie, 1991:17). Thus, Bongie’s exploration of the exotic shows that colonial discourses of savagery and civilisation were fundamentally ambivalent.

savage,” the evolutionary dichotomy between “primitive” and “civilized” societies and so on’ (Bongie, 1991:13-14). Bongie also points to the fact that these two discursive origins of exoticism have a distinctly national provenance; English in the case of the adventure novel and French in the case of Enlightenment thought. However, he suggests that despite this, exoticism can still be seen as ‘a transnational phenomenon’ (Bongie, 1991:14).
The 'noble savage'?

Views of Others were thus conflicted and there is much evidence in the captivity narratives under discussion of the negative representation of the indigenous. For example, attitudes towards what was seen as Carib savagery were typified by fear of alleged native practices such as witchcraft and cannibalism. In his narrative of shipwreck on the Madagascan coast, George Buchan (1820) discusses the indigenous practice of ‘witchcraft’, even attributing the crime of infanticide to the native population despite seeing no evidence of this during his time on the island. Buchan makes the assumption that if such incidents occurred, they were deliberately concealed from the British survivors. He states that:

When James Riley’s (2000/1817) ship is wrecked off the coast of North Africa he describes one of the indigenous inhabitants in extremely negative terms saying, ‘I could not but imagine that those well set teeth were sharpened for the purpose of devouring human flesh!’ (Riley, 2000/1817:18). However, the only real threat of human flesh being consumed comes from the captives themselves in their desperation. Riley admits to having to physically restrain one of his men ‘to prevent him gnawing his own flesh’. He also relates catching others in the act of the attempted infanticide of a four-year-old boy, ‘They were so frantic with hunger, as to insist upon having one meal of his flesh’. However, Riley persuades them that, ‘it would be more manly to die with hunger than to become cannibals and eat their own or other human flesh,’ (Riley, 2000/1817:81). Michael Alexander (2001), writing on Eliza Fraser’s shipwreck on the Great Barrier Reef in 1836, suggests that Australian aborigines may have engaged in cannibalistic practices (Alexander, 2001:37). He also discusses the propensity of European sailors to cannibalise their shipmates in extremis (Alexander, 2001:33). Schaffer argues that the obsession in literature with cannibalism is a manifestation of Western anxieties about imperial control and the possibility of ‘incorporation and devourment of the colonial body’ (Schaffer, 1998:104). Schaffer discusses the relation between these anxieties and the rise of the middle classes, capitalism, and colonialism: ‘fantasies of cannibalism prevalent in colonial tales of shipwreck, are modern fantasies arising out of modern anxieties about the instability of the self. They are not about ‘the other’ except that the other is interior to the self (Schaffer, 1998:102).

There are few parts of the world where the pernicious science of witchcraft and necromancy is practiced more than here...those practices are said, according to various authorities, to operate to a destructive extent, in occasioning the death of many children, born in what are reckoned unlucky months, and unlucky days, and hours (Buchan, 1820:119).

However, as Bongie (1991) has shown in relation to the exotic, Western texts did not uniformly present the indigenous in a negative light, often suggesting instead that ‘primitive’ cultures resulted in uncorrupted people and society. Reports from Cook’s voyages of 1768-80 contributed to the view of an Edenic ideal of island life as one untouched by the corruption of civilisation, and the South Sea Islander Omai was feted by London society. Taylor (2004) highlights the popularity of this view in the metropolitan centres:

Between Cook and his French contemporary, Louis de Bougainville, who was captivated by Tahiti, the fashionable salons of London and Paris were flushed with enthusiasm for the philosophy of Rousseau and the purity of the noble savage (Taylor, 2004:88).

When the castaways of the Grosvenor East Indiaman found themselves on the South African shore in 1782, according to Habberley’s account, they were treated with indifference by the indigenous inhabitants, who appear to have been more interested in the newcomers’ possessions rather than their persons or their predicament (Taylor, 2004:81). Taylor compares this representation with the more interesting fiction created in George Morland’s representation of the encounter in his painting entitled ‘African
Hospitality’ (1790). Morland’s picture took such artistic licence since it was commissioned by the fledgling Emancipation movement who had a vested interest in showing the ‘beastliness in Europeans and humanity among Africans’ (Taylor, 2004:80). This vaunting of indigenous kindness can be compared to the experiences of the Winterton survivors in Madagascar, as represented in contemporary periodicals. The Gentleman’s Magazine of April 1794 describes the Madagascan natives as noble savages,119 praising their ruler in effusive terms:

The poor untutored tenant of the shade displayed an anxious solicitude to yield them every succour in his power; evincing, in the strong language of nature, that charity, in its noblest acceptation, needs not the aid of philosophy or civilization to nurture it into practice (Gentleman’s Magazine vol. lxiv, April 1794:378).

In this positive article, praise is heaped upon the ‘King of Babau’, not just for his behaviour towards the shipwrecked Britons, but for his ‘manners’, ‘form’ and ‘countenance’ (Gentleman’s Magazine vol. lxiv, April 1794:378). On their eventual arrival in India, the Winterton survivors penned a letter describing the king in glowing terms, which was printed in the Calcutta Gazette on 27th February 1794 (Hood, 2003:195-6). However, the view of the Madagascan natives presented in Buchan’s Narrative of the Loss of the Winterton (1820) is much more complex than this article suggests, and much negative behaviour is also reported. Moreover, the illusion of the

119 In some respects, this idealised notion of the ‘noble savage’ was just as distancing as the more obviously negative ‘Othering’, as it too rendered the ‘savage’ non-human.
noble savage was shockingly shattered by Cook’s murder by South Sea islanders in 1780 (Taylor, 2004:87-8).

America:

In the North American context, complex European attitudes towards Native Americans were also illustrative of the savage and Edenic discourses of savagery current during the Romantic period. Snader (2000) argues that:

 Whereas French Jesuits favored images of the noble savage, the British emphasised indolence and violence, providing ideological justification for large-scale settlement and encroachment on native lands (Snader, 2000:178).

It should also be noted that British colonial attitudes towards Native Americans were extremely complex and varied between colonies. As Hulme states in Colonial Encounters (1992), whilst New England Puritans established ‘a very clear division between civilization and savagery’ (Hulme, 1992:139), in Virginia the situation was very different, due to the difficulty of establishing the colony. The Virginian colonists relied on contact with the indigenous population in order to gain the necessaries of life. Moreover, as Colley discusses in Captives (2002), the metropolitan British view of Native Americans was related to a shift in how Britons and American colonists viewed themselves and their shared identities. Before 1776, white colonists thought of themselves as British rather than American, and captivity amongst Native Americans

190 Contemporary fascination with the notion of the ‘noble savage’ can be seen in literature of the period. For example, Sarah Harriet Burney’s novel The Shipwreck (1816) illustrates both sides of the savagery debate.
was seen as an affront to this British national identity. Many Britons were shocked by the apparent unpredictability of Native American violence, and opposed it to what they saw as their own humane and ‘quintessential^ civilised’ (Colley, 2002:182) approach to war and its prisoners. Sayre points out that captives taken in America during wars between colonists and Native Americans, or between rival colonial forces, should more properly be seen as prisoners of war, ‘rather than as victims of some instinctual “savage” aggression’ (Sayre, 2000:7), and thus domestic attitudes towards American captives taken by Britain were mixed. Whigs and radicals saw them as martyrs, victims of George III and fellow-Britons, but to others, they were rebels. Officially they were viewed as ‘the King’s misguided subjects’ (Colley, 2002:219), as the British state did not recognise the legitimacy of American claims to independence.

As the American colonists’ birth rate quickly rose and Britain began to lose its control over the colonies, Native Americans came to be seen as ‘less an unmitigated menace than potentially armed auxiliaries in the business of empire’ (Colley, 2002:164). At home in the minds of ordinary Britons, a similar pattern could be seen, where some saw Native Americans as ‘better Europeans in the sense of being freer, more natural, more generous even’ (Colley, 2002:198). Colley notes that these ambiguous attitudes can be seen in post-war English and Scottish novels, but argues that the best reflection of this simultaneously ‘repelled and admiring’ (Colley, 2002:188) reaction to Native Americans is found in captivity narratives. Conflict in America between colonists and imperial forces resulted in the production of many captivity narratives which dealt with the savagery of opponents, and of Native Americans, by clearly linking the two.

Unwillingness to validate American government led to British reticence regarding the

captivity narratives of their own forces, as to an imperial force in its own colony, these captives were embarrassing evidence of failure. The Americans, however, had no such qualms about using captivity narratives and tales of other British atrocities to their advantage. 122 A particularly dominant example of this is the propaganda storm surrounding the death of the loyalist Jane McCrea in 1777, at the hands of pro-British, Native Americans. During the American Revolutionary war, Native Americans became increasingly represented as the agents of an oppressive British force in captivity narratives, and reports of Jane McCrea’s death at the hands of ‘Indians’ allied to Britain became particularly celebrated. Hilliard-d’Auberteuil’s novel Jane McCrea (f.pub.1784) blames the British forces for the outrages committed against colonists by Native Americans, stating that the British:

kept these Indians continually intoxicated in order to increase their ferocity ...

These simple people did not love cruelty for its own sake, but for the reward offered by Europeans. It is not, then, upon them that our horror for the crimes should fall but on the nations that provoked them, nations that dare to call themselves civilized (Hilliard-d’Auberteuil, 2000 /1784:372).

The actual events behind this popular story are unclear, but as is often the case, it was the perception of events that proved decisive. Despite the appearance of varying versions of the story, reaction to it prompted an unusually high rate of enlistment in the American patriot forces (Burnham, 1997:76). As testament to the continued power and almost mythological status of Jane McCrea’s story, a detail from John Vanderlyn’s American Revolutionary writers began to align British forces with blacks and Native Americans, as evidence that their violence had ‘Othered’ them from Americans despite a shared inheritance (Colley, 2002:231).

121
painting *Death of Jane McCrea* (ca.1804) is used on the cover of Derounian-Stodola’s (1998) collection of captivity narratives. The painting depicts a terrified and dishevelled McCrea held in the powerful grip of two muscular and malevolent-looking Native American men. Ominously, one of her captors holds her hair as the other holds his axe ready to strike. Despite the lack of a definitive version of the narrative (such as could appear in a collection) the resonance of the story continues. Colley (2002) suggests that some of these stories promulgated by American revolutionaries were not without foundation, listing common cruelties and outrages committed by the British army. However, she also points out that the pro-British were victims of similar violence, and argues that loyalist forces were a heterogeneous mix of Europeans, allied Native Americans and thousands of black slaves, as well as American Loyalists (Colley, 2002:232-5). Thus, the heterogeneous forces on both sides meant that neither side could claim a legitimate monopoly on ‘civilisation’. Such attitudes towards the relative savagery or civilisation of Native Americans, Colley argues, show not only how changeable such views were, but also how rather than reflecting innate qualities, the attribution of savagery or civilisation to Native Americans was politically motivated. For an example of the complexity of the relation of Native American, ‘savage’ cultures to discourses of savagery and civilisation, we can turn to John Jewitt’s narrative (1824/1815). Jewitt complicates the binary division between savage and civilised by

---

123 Despite the story’s absence from the anthology.  
124 Hilliard d’Auberteuil’s (2000/1784) sentimental novelisation of the McCrea story, published in French, was considered too inflammatory for publication in Britain during the 1780s due to the ‘polarized political climate’ of the time (Sayre, 2000:349). However, its author was inspired by the American patriot struggle for independence to hope for a successful republican revolution in his native France.  
125 Colley explains the apparently strange phenomenon of non-whites aligning themselves with an imperial nation like the British as easily accounted for: black slaves hoped that British victory would end slavery in America, and Native Americans joined Britain in the hope of preserving indigenous lands from white, American, colonial frontiersmen (Colley, 2002:232-5).
representing various Native American tribes as having differing degrees of relative merit in relation to civilisation. His favourable description of the ‘chief of the Klaizzarts’ reveals Jewitt’s criteria:

[he] could speak tolerable English, had much the more the appearance of civilised man than any of the savages that I saw...extremely well formed, with a skin almost as fair as that of an European, good features, and a countenance expressive of candour and amiableness...He was much neater in both his dress and his person than any of the other chiefs (Jewitt, 1824/1815:174).

The description of this individual as having certain valued European traits in both manner and appearance denies any simple binarism between self and Other, and this representation of civilisation amongst ‘savages’ is evidence of the ambivalence of the discourses of savagery and civilisation.126

The East:

As has been seen, attitudes towards so-called ‘savage’ societies were extremely complex and variable, but where a society was viewed as what Hulme (1992) describes as an ‘Oriental civilisation’, representing the ‘savage’ elements within that society was further complicated. Such was the case of India which, as James (1997) argues, ‘lay firmly within the compass of the civilised world which had been known to Greek and Roman historians and geographers’ (James, 1997:56). Similarly, Colley (2002) discusses the ‘element of awe’ (Colley, 2002:106) with which Britain regarded Islamic

1 See discussion of ‘ambivalence’ in the Introduction, p.60 ff.
states, and recognises several points of similarity between British and Islamic cultures, such as the monotheistic and international nature of their respective religions. She also points to the importance of the written Islamic tradition, urban culture, and the grandeur of imperial cities as crucial to the British view of Islamic societies as ‘civilised’.

Loomba (1998) points to the paradoxical view of the East as savage due to an excess of civilisation:

Medieval notions of wealth, despotism and power attaching to the East (and especially to the Islamic East) were thus reworked to create an alternative version of savagery understood not as a lack of civilisation, but as an excess of it, as decadence rather than primitivism (Loomba, 1998:109).

James Scurry’s narrative (1824), with its Indian setting, negotiates a difficult course between this view of Islamic civilisation and the representation of the inferiority of his captors. Also capitalising on the view of Oriental society as civilised, in his appendix to Scurry’s narrative, Scurry’s fellow captive William Whiteway (1824) regales the reader with minute details regarding Tipu Sultan’s magnificent bodyguard of eight hundred pike-men and the Indian leader’s sumptuous procession to the capital. He describes Tipu Sultan’s seraglio as a ‘sumptuous prison’ containing an estimated two to three thousand women (Whiteway, 1824:313). Similarly, Scurry relates the richness of the captured palace at Mysore. He describes the jewels, plate, furniture and carpets, arms, china, and most importantly amongst these other treasures, ‘a very large and curious library’ (Scurry, 1824:241). Scurry highlights the benefit of written Muslim tradition to British erudition:
This library, which contains many thousand volumes, will, it is presumed, be presented by the army to the English nation; if so, it will form the finest, most curious, and valuable collection of Oriental learning and history, that has ever been introduced to Europe (Scurry, 1824:241).

Along with this acknowledgement of the importance of Islamic knowledge, as if to narrow the gap between British and Islamic cultures, Tipu Sultan is compared directly to a British gentleman. Scurry describes his captor’s love of hunting, ‘His tiger-cats, or leopards, would always accompany him, and with these he used to course, as our gentleman do with hounds’ (Scurry, 1824:111). Although he does not usually describe individuals, Scurry favours the reader with this one portrait of Tipu Sultan:

In his person he was majestic, about five feet nine inches and a half in height, with large eyes, an aquiline nose, and remarkably broad shoulders; his complexion was about two shades lighter than quite black (Scurry, 1824:129).

This ‘majestic’ Tipu Sultan clearly deserves a certain amount of British respect, and Whiteway confirms that Tipu Sultan is a noble sight. Colley (2002) shows that during the 1780s, even Tipu Sultan’s captives described him in ‘moderate or even respectful terms’ (Colley, 2002:298) putting the emphasis on his pale skin. By the end of the eighteenth century however, British descriptions of Tipu Sultan became less flattering. Attitudes towards him had become increasingly negative following the fall of Seringapatam in 1799, ‘but they remained complex and continued to fluctuate after his

\footnote{This is an important element of such descriptions, as lightness of skin colour was correlated with civilisation.}
death as they had during his life’ (Colley, 2002:299). This helps to account in part for the variety of attitudes presented by Scurry and Whiteway in their accounts.

Despite the notion of Oriental civilisation, Islamic culture was frequently represented in negative terms in Western texts. In his study of Oriental captivity narratives, Snader (2000) discusses John Locke’s influential *Two Treatises of Government* (1689-1690). One of the ways in which Locke develops his argument for liberal thought is by using examples of European captives in the Orient. These unfortunate individuals, represented as at the behest of an arbitrary power, stand as a counterpoint to the ordinary British citizen who is ‘subject to a sovereign power only by his own consent’ (Snader, 2000:68). Snader points out that this type of criticism is one of many such stereotypical representations of alien government:

As in portraits of Oriental governments more generally, corruption spills from the leader down through the hierarchy of his underlings (Snader, 2000:75).

Colley (2002) points out that it was not until after 1750 that British complacency regarding their own government led to the association of corruption and despotism with such regimes, to be used as the rationale behind imperial takeover. Both Scurry (1824) and Whiteway (1824) present British power in India as incontestable, solid and

\[126}\]

\[129\] Colley (2002) reveals how earlier British captives were made to feel their inferiority to their captors, and how their appearance - their skin and clothes - were thought ridiculous and ugly. She argues that it is not until later captivity narratives, such as those of late eighteenth century, that ‘national and often racial conceit’ (Colley, 2002:116) is revealed on the part of British captives. This was part of a gradual shift towards viewing Muslim empires as vulnerable. However, such a sense of British superiority is seriously curtailed in Scurry’s narrative, as discussed further in the next chapter.
fixed, a fantasy that is undone by the very relation of their tales, as well as in individual
details contained in the narrative. In a paradoxical attempt to represent the superiority of
the British, Scurry interrupts his narrative with the story of Colonel Baillie’s 1780
defeat at Pollilur. This provides an opportunity to introduce details regarding
struggles between Haidar Ali, his son Tipu Sultan, and the British, and the details are
selected to show the brutality of the former in contrast to the bravery and effectiveness
of the latter. However, in reality, at least on the home front, Baillie’s defeat had caused
British consternation and panic. Colley quotes the then prime minister, Lord North, as
saying that the defeat ‘had engaged the attention of the world...and had given rise to so
much public clamour and uneasiness’ (Colley, 2002:271). Haidar Ali is also presented
as particularly unchivalrous and blood thirsty. Scurry (1824) reports that British
officers:

saw many of the heads of their countrymen presented to the conqueror;-some of
them by English officers, who were compelled to perform that horrid task!

(Scurry, 1824:94)

Haider Ali’s conduct is represented as counter to the British view of themselves as
‘humane in the conduct of war, impressively merciful’ (Colley, 2002:182), and the
captivity narratives examined in this thesis do reveal this British conceit. As Scurry
proudly claims of one Indian siege, ‘no defenceless inhabitant [was] killed, or any
woman treated with wanton brutality’ (Scurry, 1824:234).

\footnote{It is worth noting that in fact Scurry was not in India at the time of this battle in
September 1780. The East Indiaman he was on board was not sent to the East Indies
until 1781, so these are not events of which he would have first hand knowledge.}
Representations of British constitutional superiority:

There are further representations of the failings of the Mysore princes in Whiteway’s additions to Scurry’s narrative. Whiteway relates that Tipu Sultan sees his whole kingdom as his own ‘private property’ (Whiteway, 1824:373) having inherited despotic principles from his father. British victory over the Mysore ruler is attributed to Tipu Sultan’s poor judgement, and it was even reported that Tipu Sultan was ‘subject to fits of mental derangement’ (Scurry, 1824:220). Scurry states that Tipu Sultan:

> had dismissed from his council his faithful friends...and had called into his service, men of little experience or capacity, who won his favour by flattering his caprices (Scurry, 1824:220).

There is much made of Tipu Sultan’s supposed failings in Scurry’s narrative, particularly his brutality. Whiteway continues his criticism of the Mysore princes by stating that ‘both the limbs and the lives of their subjects, however exulted, were at their disposal’ (Whiteway, 1824:374). Scurry relates that Tipu Sultan punishes criminals by making them ride a wooden horse with spikes on the saddle, ‘nine rows of sharp spikes, about three quarters of an inch long’ (Scurry, 1824:112). However, according to Scurry’s report, Tipu Sultan’s favourite punishment is to have such guilty parties attached to elephants’ feet and dragged until dead, ‘with no faces left’, Scurry adds grimly (Scurry, 1824:113-4). According to Scurry, it is not only criminals who

---

It is interesting to note this in light of George III’s second breakdown in 1788 and the wild stories about him abounding during the Regency. Although such details suggest British constitutional superiority by implication, in his 1799 narrative of captivity with Native Americans, James Smith (2000) compares the English penal code used in the mid-eighteenth century unfavourably with that of
become victims of Tipu Sultan’s brutal caprices, and he also relates that three of Tipu Sultan’s principal officers are fed to his caged tigers. Scurry also recounts the punishment of a group of Christians who had supported the British forces against Tipu Sultan:

their noses, ears and upper lips, were cut off; they were then mounted on asses, their faces towards the tail, and led through Patam, with a wretch before them proclaiming their crime (Scurry, 1824:104).

This horrific mutilation is intended to act as a deterrent to others, although the punishment is not one reserved for Christians, as Scurry explains:

It was not unfrequently [sic.] that two or three hundred noses and ears would be exhibited in the public market, but to whom they belonged we could not learn (Scurry, 1824:118).

Whiteway later describes the appearance of those punished in this manner as ‘horrid beyond expression’ (Whiteway, 1824:289) but notes that it is not a punishment exclusively to the territories of Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan. By emphasising the brutal and seemingly arbitrary nature of Tipu Sultan’s punishments, Scurry’s narrative implicitly suggests that a free Briton in his/her own country, and under his/her own ‘savages’. He argues, ‘Their not annexing penalties to their laws, is perhaps not as greater crime, or as unjust or cruel, as the bloody penal laws of England, which we have so long shamefully practised’ (Sayre, 2000/1799:340).

Scurry reports that Indians have fashioned a method of replacing a lost nose with part of the forehead and that the more enterprising British were apparently not above taking advantage of Indian desperation in this regard. John Levesley ‘who was a presumed doctor’ (Scurry, 1824:158) performed a botched version of this operation for a small fee.
We remembered our native soil, where freedom of the subject is co-equal with that of his sovereign, and despised those wretches (Scurry, 1824:166).

In a continuation of this vaunting of liberty, Whiteway replicates a conventional argument for British intervention in India:

In the overthrow of such a tyrant, and of such a government, every friend of humanity must sincerely rejoice (Whiteway, 1824:375).

According to Whiteway, in place of this despotic government and its attendant crimes against British ideals of liberty, an imperial administration now oversees a progressively improved regime, sanctioned by God, and India has been saved from its former darkness:

A liberal and enlightened policy now extends over British India, dispensing, in rich variety, blessings that the ancestors of the present generation never knew. Thus under the superintending providence of God, the empire of unrestrained power has been curtailed (Whiteway, 1824:376)

One thinks first of Godwin and the trials in England to see the limits of supposed British liberty. In Britain in 1793, a nervous government at war with France cracked down on radical activity, as all expressions of ideas of equality, whether between classes, sexes or nations became suspect. In 1794 the Treason Trials of forty-one radicals took place, and many radicals were ready to go into exile in order to protect themselves from arrest. For further discussion of the trials see Marshall (1984) pp. 135-9.
It was not just India which was represented in captivity texts of the period as being constitutionally inferior to Britain. In the long section of his narrative entitled *Short Account of the People of Madagascar*, George Buchan (1820) describes the Madagascan political system as being made up of petty chiefs ‘chiefly engaged in war and plunder’ (Buchan, 1820:98) and there is a patronising note in Buchan’s description of native government:

> like the inhabitants of Joanna, they have much delight in assuming the titles of English princes and noblemen. The King’s power seems very absolute; but whether from choice or legal obligation, it was the practice for questions of importance to be decided by a sort of council of state, who commonly held their deliberations under the shade of a large tamarind tree. The province was divided into several subordinate governments, the chiefs of which came occasionally to render homage to the king. During our stay, no less a personage than the Prince of Wales died at St. Augustine’s Bay, where he was governor (1820:160).

Despite describing a highly organised system, Buchan undercuts this with his focus on the tamarind tree as the site of the native ‘parliament’. He also mocks the propensity of the local population to take British aristocratic titles. Although Buchan refers to the Madagascan king as ‘the King of Baba’, a name which he admits is ‘entirely a European appellation’ (Buchan, 1820:106), the king has titled himself ‘King George’ and

Johanna, as it was commonly known to sailors, is now known as Anjouan, on the Comoro Islands in the Mozambique channel (Hood, 2003:157).

Madagascan religious beliefs are also held up for ridicule in Buchan’s narrative, being compared unfavourably with his own Protestant viewpoint. For example, Buchan explains that: ‘It is a mortal offence in the Madagascar eye to put salt into milk...as they think that doing so will be fatal to the cows. I am not certain if they have yet discovered the infallible remedy of throwing some quickly over the right or left shoulder (Buchan, 1820:123).
introduces his wife as ‘Queen Charlotte’. Such indigenous behaviour in this location is also reported by Eliza Fay (1821/1815) on her return to India in 1784 on board the Lord Camden. When the ship anchors at Johanna, north of Madagascar, she reports her own amusement at the indigenous adoption of British aristocratic titles:

We were much amused with the high titles assumed by them. The Prince of Wales honoured us with his company at breakfast...H.R.H. the Duke of York officiated as boatman, and a boy of fourteen, who sold us some fruit, introduced himself as the Earl of Mansfield (Fay, 1821/1817:343).

Representations of colonial culpability:

Although savage society is presented as lacking the enlightened civilisation of Europe, Snader (2000) points to a central difficulty within captivity narratives; that captives are often violent despite the fact that this is supposedly a marker of the barbarity of the alien culture. Bongie (1991) suggests how a more generalised European view of their enlightened constitutions could be squared with less savoury behaviour in the name of colonial endeavour:

Enlightenment was henceforth to be judged only according to the standards of democracy; despotism, as a positive political alternative, was banished from much of the Continent. However, although the liberal position achieved dominance within Europe, the idea of a “legal” or “enlightened” despotism

Pratt (1992) suggests that European competition ‘bound European powers together in finding new...legitimating ideologies: the civilising mission, scientific racism, and technology based paradigms of progress and development (Pratt, 1992:74).
maintained a certain validity in the realm of “unenlightenment,” that is to say, abroad (Bongie, 1991:34).

Similarly, in *White Mythologies* (1990) Young notes that John Stuart Mill’s writings on liberty are predicated upon this distinction first being made between ‘cultures of civilisation and barbarism’ (Young, 1990:124). He also states:

> Mill’s statements about the compatibility of British democracy with a despotic colonialism are shown to contain the contradiction which Bhabha implies is a central condition of the discourse of Western democracy (Young, 1990:150).

An example of this ambivalent position can be seen in James Scurry’s narrative (1824). As an individual, and according to his own testimony, Scurry is not personally responsible for acts of violence. However, he is captured as a result of his employment by the East India Company, which is hardly a neutral position. George Buchan (1820) is more forthright about the effects of colonial endeavour in his narrative:

> it is painful to think, that wherever European discovery has extended, many evils have followed in its train; and there is no modern nation which has taken any active part in such pursuits, that can claim an exemption from a long catalogue of imputed wrongs, or that has not been the author of many calamities to unoffending millions (Buchan, 1820:99).

Similarly, William Whiteway (1824) lays blame firmly at the door of the expansionist powers:
Let the philosopher, the historian, the traveller, and such as are acquainted with our Asiatic affairs, look back on the behaviour of the Europeans, from the year 1770 to 1780, and they will find occasion, if not to exculpate these merciless tyrants, to behold others involved in crimes, on which no Englishman can reflect without a blush (Whiteway, 1824:336).

The tale of General Matthews related in Scurry’s narrative illustrates that atrocities were committed on both sides in India, by its reference to the Anantpur massacre (1783). Matthew’s troops had stormed a fort at Anantpur, where, Scurry reports:

all the inhabitants [were] wantonly and inhumanly put to death, and their bodies thrown into several tanks in the fort...How far such a crime could be justifiable, on the part of the English, I leave to those of superior judgement (Scurry, 1824:98).

Colley (2002) explains the effect of the publicity surrounding the Anantpur massacre on domestic British opinion. The British press made repeated accusations that British forces, headed by Matthews, had killed four hundred women, and as a result, Colley argues:

Despite Whiteway’s comments about the improving effect of British rule in India, Scurry’s earlier assessment is more honest in its pragmatic emphasis, as he states: ‘This powerful empire...is now razed, as it were, to its foundations...The importance of this event, to the power and commerce of Great Britain in the East, is not within the reach of ordinary calculation’ (Scurry, 1824:221-2).

And thus the defensive tone of the Mysore captivity narratives she discusses.
Mysore captives found themselves castigated not just as losers, but as aggressors complicit in atrocity. In 1783, the year before most of the captives were freed, the *Annual Register*, a periodical associated with Edmund Burke, printed both a flattering obituary of Haidar Ali and a letter from an East India Company ensign accusing his comrades in southern India of pillage, rape and massacre (Colley, 2002:294).

According to Scurry (1824), this altercation was to cause further suffering following Tipu Sultan’s discovery that the Malabar Christians loaned money to General Matthews for the support of the British army. Scurry reports that by extension, Tipu Sultan holds the Christians responsible for the massacre at Anantpur. In a footnote, Scurry clearly blames the British General for the sufferings of the Malabar Christians, but it should be noted that Whiteway tells a different version of events leading to their punishment. He explains that when a fort held by General Matthews was surrendered to Tipu Sultan, the English took as much treasure as they could carry with them. The bags of loot were discovered, and to emphasise English cupidity, Whiteway reveals that some men then ‘resorted to expedients that must not be expressed’ (Whiteway, 1824:307). In either version however, it is the English who are held firmly to blame for the fate of their fellow Christians.

This is not an isolated instance of the criticism of colonial endeavour, as can be seen in other captivity narratives analysed in this thesis. For example, John Jewitt’s narrative (1824) lays the blame for ‘savage’ aggression with European traders. Jewitt criticises:

According to Scurry, Tipu Sultan is further incensed by the Christians’ refusal to give their daughters up to his seraglio, playing on stereotypical anxieties surrounding Christian women being sexually preyed upon by non-Christian men.
the manner in which our people behave towards the natives. For though they are a thievish race, yet I have no doubt that many of the melancholy disasters have arisen from the imprudent conduct of the captains and crews of the ships...in exasperating them by insulting, plundering, and even killing them on slight grounds (Jewitt, 1824 (1815):129).

In a further example, George Buchan (1820) criticises Robert Drury for partaking in the slave trade after his own rescue from Madagascan captivity:

We find him without remorse, the active agent in conveying to the distant settlements of Jamaica, and Virginia, in America, ship-loads of suffering slaves (in 1717 and 1720.) It never appears to have occurred to his thoughts, that he was inflicting on every one of those wretched individuals, distress probably far greater than he had himself been enduring (Buchan, 1820:104).

However, this is not solely a charge against individuals, but also against Britain as nation. Buchan criticises:

the odious traffic in slaves, one of the severest scourges that Madagascar has experienced from European alliance; and one which Britain has had a large share in inflicting (Buchan, 1820:102).

One cannot help but find these types of statements from Buchan problematic, given his position in the East India Company’s employ. Thus, the narratives under discussion
reveal the complexity British discourses of relative civilisation, and of European
innocence or culpability.

**Representations of British superiority over fellow Europeans:**

Despite such criticisms, Britons frequently represent themselves as being more civilised
than their European counterparts in the business of colonisation. George Buchan (1820)
makes a distinction between the European nations by criticising the conduct of the
French in Madagascar, accusing them of ‘acts of extreme injustice and cruelty towards
the unfortunate inhabitants’ (Buchan, 1820:99). Colley (2002) notes that it was a
feature of British imperialism to believe strongly in the superiority of British humanity
and compassion, as opposed to the uncivilised barbarity of their European opponents:

> European writers at this time were agreed that the treatment of prisoners-of-war
> was a significant measure of a nation’s level of civilisation (Colley, 2002:283).

This notion of British superiority can be seen in James Scurry’s narrative (1824), when
he compares his treatment on being taken captive by French forces unfavourably with a
reversal of the situation three months earlier. Whilst he claims to have given French
prisoners some of his own scanty provisions, Scurry reports his own poor treatment at
the hands the French.

---

141 Buchan also vaunts the superiority of the conduct of British castaways over French,
citing an example reported in the *Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews*, comparing the
behaviour of the English crew of the *Alceste* with the French crew of *La Meduse*
(Buchan, 1820:67).
In addition, fellow Europeans may not always be as culpable for British misfortunes as might be suggested in captivity narratives. Scurry’s narrative poses the question of who is to blame for his captivity. At first glance it seems that the French who give up Scurry and the other prisoners to Mysore are the guilty party for sacrificing fellow Europeans to non-European force. At the end of the first chapter of his narrative, Scurry is left wondering why he and his companions have been abandoned by the English authorities, and it would seem that his fate is indeed in British hands. It is interesting then, to turn to William Hickey’s (1995) conversation with the French Admiral de Suffren, in which the Admiral defends his action of handing over English prisoners to Tipu Sultan:

His argument was that since Lord Macartney, the Governor of Madras, refused an exchange of prisoners, he had no alternative but to hand them over the only ally of France in the area... If Tipoo Sultaun, or those serving under him, broke their faith in this particular, why [was he] to be so blamed...? (Hickey, 1995/1913:344-5).

Thus, it can be seen that colonial discourse was fundamentally ambivalent about the rightness of colonial endeavour, as well as the inherent qualities of the coloniser and the colonised.

Hickey quotes the number of prisoners handed over by the French to Mysore as around four hundred and fifty. Scurry states that five hundred prisoners landed at Cuddalore in 1781 and were sent to Hyder Ali’s fort in Chillenbroom. Despite the slight anomaly in numbers, it is fair to assume that these are the same group of prisoners, which is notably large. The hand over of this group would also have been a fresh enough event in the British mind for Hickey to discuss the subject with Suffren at the beginning of 1783.
Conclusions:

This chapter has shown that European discourses of savagery and civilisation were ambivalent constructs. The work of Hulme (1992) and Bongie (1991) show that there were several discourses of savagery and civilisation current at this time, and Young’s (1995) account of ‘scientific racism’ suggests that racialist discourses from the period of high imperialism were nascent, though not inconsiderable, during the period covered by this thesis. Analysis of the captivity narratives under discussion reveals that whilst captive narrators indulge in a certain amount of ‘Othering’ and vaunting of British dominance, they also complicate this discourse of assumed superiority by their representations of both Britons and Others in the contact zone. As highlighted in the narratives of George Buchan (1820), James Scurry (1824), and William Whiteway (1824), the captive narrator is in a paradoxical position when negotiating the discourses of savagery and civilisation. Whilst, on the one hand, s/he must represent the savagery of the Other in order to contrast it with his/her own superior civilisation, s/he must also represent the reciprocity of relations, because as I argued in Chapter 1, an excess of British vulnerability complicates those discourses emphasising British superiority. These delicate negotiations of discursive constraints are discussed further in the next chapter, ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’.
Chapter 3: Power and Colonial Captivity

Introduction:

This chapter considers the paradox represented in captivity narratives that British subjects, as the representatives of a supposedly superior, colonial power, could be subjugated by non-Europeans. It discusses strategies adopted by captive narrators in order to negotiate the discursive constraints implicit in their position as Britons, whilst simultaneously representing personal suffering at the hands of ‘Others’. Imagined national superiority is further complicated by the representation of the behaviour and treatment of the different classes of Britons who found themselves in the extreme situations represented in captivity narratives. Class position affects how the captive’s suffering may be represented, as low-born narrators of captivity narratives are excluded to some extent from relating emotional suffering by their socially inferior position. Moreover, the way in which higher-class Britons may relate their sufferings is also restricted by the increased need to maintain something of the façade of supposed British superiority. This chapter examines how the texts under consideration represent the ways in which Others inflict suffering, both physical and non-physical, on Britons of all social classes. In the context of captivity, representations of suffering may take many forms, and as the narratives show, physical deprivations such as starvation and dehydration, as well as injury and illness may arise from circumstances, or from ill-treatment by captors. These physical hardships are exacerbated by other types of suffering represented in the narratives, including humiliation and homesickness. This chapter discusses a variety of sources in order to illustrate the vulnerability of British subjects represented in captivity narratives. George Buchan’s narrative (1820) of
shipwreck off Madagascar is used to examine the representation of the physical effects of privation and disease. James Scurry’s narrative of Indian captivity (1824) contains representations of physical suffering inflicted by captors, in addition to instances of humiliation and emotional suffering. Eliza Fay’s narrative of captivity in India (1821/1817) also focuses on the representation of the experience of humiliation by non-Europeans whilst in captivity, as does that of John Jewitt (1824/1815) in Native American captivity. This chapter also discusses Stephen Taylor’s account of the experiences of the Grosvenor castaways, shipwrecked on the South African shore in 1782. Taylor (2004) constructs his account from many sources, including the unpublished manuscript account of survivor William Habberley, and George Carter’s A Narrative of the Loss of the Grosvenor East Indiaman (1791). The experiences of the castaways reveal the way that the vulnerability of Britons in such situations is represented in Western texts. William Hickey’s memoirs of India and his travels during the period 1769-1808 (1995/1913) are used to explore the representation of the treatment of upper-class, British captives, in non-European zones. This chapter discusses the way in which the representation of the vulnerability of captives runs counter to some postcolonial theories such as Pratt’s Imperial Eyes (1992), which emphasises Western dominance over its Others by suggesting that colonial discourse is always in the service of imperialism. Thus, postcolonial theories such as Said’s Orientalism (1995), which concentrate on indigenous subjection, prove to be problematic in the context of captivity narratives, where the focus is not on the subjection of indigenous peoples, but rather the vulnerability of individual representatives of the colonial power. Elements of Foucault’s (1978,1980) work on

There is also a version of events surrounding the loss of the Grosvenor to be found in ‘Wreck of the Grosvenor East Indiaman, on the coast of Caffraria, 1782’, in John Dalyell’s Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea (1812) pp. 1-39.
discursive constraints, and the work of theorists who follow him, are relevant to the discussion in this chapter, particularly those who focus on the discursive constraints of the period such as Bohls (1995) and Snader (2000). I will begin by examining power.

**Power relations:**

Derounian-Stodola (1998) states that at its core, the captivity narrative is ‘all about power and powerlessness’ (Derounian-Stodola, 1998:xii). Perhaps this is not the most helpful way to view the power relations displayed within captivity narratives, since they are highly complex and about much more than the basic binarism ‘power and powerlessness’ suggests. Moreover, in *The History of Sexuality Volume I* (1978) Foucault argues that there is no such concept as ‘powerlessness’. According to Foucault, power is not something possessed by individuals, or determined by economic relations as suggested by Marxist theorists such as Louis Althusser. Rejecting such a ‘repressive hypothesis’, he argues for a radically different notion of power. As Thomborrow (2002) explains:

Foucault resists theorising power in terms of dominance and ideology, and moves towards a concept of power as a complex and continuously evolving web of social and discursive relations (Thomborrow, 2002:7).

Foucault (1978) argues that resistance is always found co-existing with power, indeed, we might say that it was predicated upon it. Furthermore, power is a productive force, in that the continual negotiation and exchange between power and resistance can create new ideas and behaviours. Foucault (1980) suggests:
If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse (Foucault, 1980:119).

Some critics, such as Robert Castel (cited in Mills, 2003:123-4), argue that Foucault’s notion of power, where no power relation is one of complete domination, eliminates the possibility of resistance by locating power everywhere. If power is everywhere, it is argued, then resistance is unnecessary. However, in Foucault’s view, rejection of the repressive hypothesis of power grants agency to individuals, rather than viewing them as passive ‘dupes of ideological pressures’ (Mills, 2003:34). However, individual action remains within limits proscribed by the operation of discourse.

For Foucault, power and knowledge are intimately linked, and he formulated the concept of power/knowledge (1980). Foucault is concerned with describing how societies govern what can count as knowledge at different times, and charting the process of exclusion of those forms of knowledge which are not validated by those in positions of authority. He rejects the veneration of certain Western thinkers, such as philosophers and scientists, as the supposed individual producers of knowledge. In Foucault’s view, the role of such individuals is diminished and the role of institutions is key to society’s production of knowledge. However, it is not the case that such knowledges remain institutionalised. Rather, they become the basis of generally

144 ‘Edward Said...said he finds such an understanding of power disabling for politically engaged criticism’ (Loomba, 1998:50).
accepted ‘truths’ within a given society. Foucault (1980) suggests that the notion that knowledge is the search for an objective ‘truth’ is spurious, and that analysis of both the past and the present can show the constructedness of the ‘truths’ held by a society, and how these are subject to change through time. However, although what counts as knowledge is ratified by institutions, Foucault does not make a distinction between ‘truth’ and ‘false consciousness’ in a Marxist sense, seeking only to bare the process of creating and maintaining such a distinction. He argues that:

the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientificity or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false (Foucault, 1980:118).

Thus for Foucault, knowledge is power, and, equally, power allows the creation of knowledge. Foucault argues that power struggles are productive of knowledge, as evidenced by bodies of knowledge created about those who are marginalised by Western society, such as women or homosexuals. However, this type of knowledge production is problematic for scholars, who by making such groups the object of their study set themselves in a superior power relation, regardless of intention. Inevitably the power struggles inherent in colonialism mean that knowledge was produced about colonial locations and indigenous people in those locations, as argued by theorists such as Said (1995) and Pratt (1992). Foucauldian analysis suggests that there is no ‘true’ description of colonial locations and people (given that all knowledge is constructed and all statements that have force are restricted by the workings of discourse), but this is
problematic for some postcolonial theorists. Much postcolonial theory rests on the
desire to show that discourses about indigenous people and lands can be proven to be
false. For those who follow Foucault and accept discourse theory, such as Said, this
marks an ambivalence in position which is open to criticism.14

Othering:

Said argues in Orientalism (1995) that discourse functions in such a way that it creates
and reflects a pattern recognisable in Western literature concerning the representation of
non-Western locations and indigenous peoples. ‘Literature’ in this context is not meant
in the narrow sense of canonical works identified by institutions, as colonial discourse
theory is not predicated upon a necessary distinction between the ‘literary’ and the ‘non-
literary’. In drawing on Foucauldian discourse theory, Said accepts the importance of all
texts in producing and being produced by discourse, including those which initially may
be thought of as appearing relatively benign, such as travel texts.146 Said analyses the
structures of thought and practices in the nineteenth century which produced such texts.
Said identifies generalisations in Orientalism, consisting of negative representations of
the colonial when compared with the West, a process which Said calls ‘Othering’, and
he identifies certain modes of representation which are repeated within such texts.
Oriental culture, he argues, is homogenised, presented as devoid of individuals, and thus
becomes more easily encapsulated and known by the West, as I have shown in Chapter
2. Said also identifies the negative representation of Oriental culture when held up in
comparison to supposed Western norms:

14 See Young (1990) p. 129 on this point.
146 However, Said has been criticised for vaunting certain canonical writers (Loomba,
the Orient and the Oriental... become repetitious pseudo-incarnations of some
great original (Christ, Europe, the West) they were supposed to have been

The narratives under discussion are written from a Western perspective, and do include
many elements which Said identifies as ‘Othering’. The narratives are replete with
examples of Western stereotyping of Oriental Others, including the negative
characterisation of indigenous people as, amongst other ‘failings’, lazy, corrupt,
intemperate, and sexually promiscuous, in opposition to the supposed virtues of the
Western individual.

Whilst Said has argued that colonial locations and inhabitants are homogenised in
Western texts, one of the recognised criticisms of Said’s *Orientalism* is that it
homogenises the West and does not allow for dissenting Western voices against the
Orientalist stereotype (McLeod, 2000:48-9). It has been suggested that this is the
result of discourse’s homogenising tendencies (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:60). As
discussed in the previous chapter on savagery and civilisation, Peter Hulme (1992)
argues that there were in fact multiple colonial discourses in circulation, not all of which
were negative, citing representations such as the ‘noble savage’, or the notion of
indigenous locations as Edenic and comparing them favourably with a corrupted West.
Furthermore, and key to this thesis, such a homogenous view of the West does not allow

However, Said argues against this criticism in his 1995 ‘Afterword’ to *Orientalism*:
‘this was one of the implied messages of Orientalism, that any attempt to force cultures
and peoples into separate and distinct breeds or essences exposes not only the
misrepresentations and falsifications that ensue, but also the way in which
understanding is complicit with the power to produce such things as the “Orient” or the
for the experience of subjugation of the Western subject. Lewis has suggested that Said’s elision of women’s roles in imperialism is mistaken, and that due recognition of this has ‘undercut the potentially unified, and paradigmatically male, colonial subject outlined in Said’s Orientalism’ (Lewis cited in Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:81). As the narratives discussed in this chapter show, and attest to by their very existence, this figure of the coloniser is not the only representative Western presence within such texts. Ashcroft and Ahluwalia argue that this apparent remissness on the part of Said is simply the effect of his deliberately taken position of opposition. His stance does not necessarily mean, they suggest, that Said must offer an alternative to Orientalism. Perhaps this is so. However, this does not remove the problem of the existence of ‘counter-hegemonic voices’ (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:74) or mean that others should not pursue such an alternative account. A further difficulty for this study is that Said’s use of discourse theory is selective, and ‘emphasises dominance and power over cultural interaction’ (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia, 2001:70). As Williams and Chrisman note, there has been relatively little attention given to ‘the extent to which the subaltern may have played a constitutive role’ in colonial discourse (Williams and Chrisman, 1993:16). As the narratives in this study show, cultural interaction between colonisers and colonised was a highly complex set of relations of mutual influence. Moreover, Mary Louise Pratt shows in Imperial Eyes (1992) the impossibility of maintaining a rigid distinction between self and Other in colonial locations. Pratt discusses the phenomenon of the ‘contact zone’, where cultural exchange necessarily dissolved strict boundaries between coloniser and colonised, highlighting the importance of ‘ongoing relations’ (Pratt, 1992:6). Whilst the ‘fruits of empire... were pervasive in shaping European domestic society, culture and history’ (Pratt, 1992:6), the contact zone was the location of ‘transculturation’, where the colonised took selected elements of the
coloniser’s culture into their own, and vice versa. Thus, Pratt argues, a Western view of its Others is necessarily affected by those Others.

Following on from Said, Pratt (1992) has identified further instances of the negative representation of Others. She describes a feature of travel writing where indigenous inhabitants are effectively erased from the text by travel description, which emphasises the physical survey of the landscape as the object of interest of the colonial power. However, Pratt also argues that such texts may be read ‘against the grain’ of the dominant meaning, where representations of negative indigenous ‘characteristic’ behaviour is seen as evidence of their refusal to conform to colonial rule. Similarly, Johannes Fabian (1983) has discussed the negative representation of indigenous cultures in Western texts. According to Fabian, colonial discourse includes viewing indigenous cultures in terms of Western history, by consigning them to an earlier stage of Western development. Fabian also argues that use of the present tense by a narrator, what he terms the ‘ethnographic present’, is a method of producing stasis and thus knowledge of indigenous culture (Fabian, 1983:39). Snader (2000) points out that such ‘scientific’ descriptions when given in captivity narratives are also written in the present tense, with a return to the past tense heralding the resumption of personal narration. As a result, he argues:

a travel description stands as a hermetically sealed unit of scientific practice, purporting to catch the timeless essence of a particular locality by divorcing it from the temporality and contingency of narration (Snader, 2000:42).
The captivity narratives under discussion contain sections which privilege the British as the surveyors of indigenous land and cultures, thus negotiating within dominant, contemporary discourse. However, the experiences of British captives represented in some of the narratives problematise this notion of the indigenous inhabitants as the object of the gaze, when British captives describe themselves as the objects of native curiosity.

Captives and ‘scientific’ knowledge:

Drawing on Foucault, Elizabeth Bohls (1995) analyses the discourse of aesthetics which was significant during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries for the construction of captivity narratives. The discourse of aesthetics attempts a standardisation of knowledge, creates knowledge about marginalised groups, whilst the ideal of so-called ‘scientific’ distancing from the object gives this discourse power and authority as ‘truth’. Bohls is concerned with the use of systematic and exclusive discursive structures in aid of the colonialist and imperialist project. In the case of the ‘universal standard of taste’ in aesthetic discourse, a European, male elite formulated and disseminated its sanctioned forms of knowledge. Bohls’ explanation of the ‘generic perceiver’ as conceived by Hume, Kant and Burke is useful for this study, in that it describes those excluded from judging this ‘universal standard of taste’. This included women, ‘the Vulgar’, and non-Europeans. This idea is useful as the captive is excluded as an aesthetic subject on a number of counts. Primarily, the captive holds a precarious position between the European and non-European. As Bohls shows in relation to landscape aesthetics, a description written according to the Royal Society's guidelines

As will be discussed further in Chapter 4, ‘Going Native’.
avoided and elided the particular, and this denial was a founding tenet of aesthetic discourse. The paradigm of disinterested contemplation meant that the aesthetic was considered to be divorced from material or utilitarian concerns, and thus the aesthetic subject distanced himself from the object of his gaze. Bohls shows how theorists of the picturesque such as Gilpin and Richard Payne Knight, as well as aestheticians like Shaftsbury, Hume, and Reynolds, shared this strategy of distancing. In the case of ethnography, the Royal Society published guidelines for travellers and taught ‘British intellectuals to associate traveller’s reports with the progress of a global, systematic, and objective ethnography’ (Snader, 2000:40). This was in the form of standardised headings covering a range of areas of knowledge about an area and its peoples. This is part of what Snader refers to as a ‘broad, but never complete shift in the practice of travel writing from the fabulous to the scientific’ (Snader, 2000:41). Although captivity narratives were marketed on the strength of the particularity of individual experience, they too included sections of such ‘scientific’ geographical and ethnological information. Indeed, as with the attempt of British intellectuals to standardise aesthetic ‘taste’, this pseudo-scientific detachment results in the assumption of authority. As Bohls argues of aesthetic discourse:

Aesthetics epitomizes a system of power/knowledge whose sterile universality is founded on keeping its Others at arms length (Bohls, 1995:245).

Somewhat precariously, given that the aesthetic subject is necessarily concerned with social status.

The masculine pronoun is used advisedly in this case, as the aesthetic subject was presumptively male.
This comment on the aesthetic could equally be applied to the discourse of ethnography. However, this distance cannot be maintained under conditions of captivity, particularly those which cover many years, as a dangerous proximity with Others is an inherent part of any captive experience. If the captive adopts (forcibly or otherwise) non-European religion, custom, dress or language, the cultural crossing destabilises the captive’s potential as an aesthetic subject. According to aesthetic discourse, the aesthetic subject is absolutely and necessarily distanced and superior to the non-European, or ‘savage’. For a number of reasons, captivity narrators hold an ambiguous position in relation to aesthetic discourse. Far from enjoying this notional position of superiority, the captive is frequently represented as marked by his or her debilitating labour in the service of the captor. This also highlights the notional class of the aesthetic subject, as frequently the captive is excluded from being an aesthetic subject by his or her social standing. Global expansion by colonial powers granted travel to those from lower social classes, and in certain respects these travellers continued in a long tradition of male, elite Grand Tourists. Captive narrators are often ordinary sailors, for example, perhaps lower-ranking officers. As has been discussed in Chapter 1, narrators sometimes ranked low enough on the social scale to be illiterate, and to require the services of an editor, in order to bring their stories to the attention of the public. As (frequently) male Europeans, captives sometimes attempt to take their place as aesthetic subject. Despite his lower-class status, James Scurry (1824) adopts that authoritative and patriotic position by indulging in some of this type of information dissemination in his narrative.

According to Bohls, the Grand Tour as training for diplomats during the Tudor period still affected later travellers: ‘The patriotic traveler (presumptively male) was expected to collect useful information for country and sovereign, to note geography and fortifications’ (Bohls, 1995:25). Many a later patriotic, male traveller felt that it behoved them to make report of these facts in their narratives. In male-authored captivity narratives, details regarding battles, ships, geographical locations of forts and palaces, minute inventories of munitions and so on, are standard fare.
through the occasional inclusion of details of locations, such as in this description of Seringapatam as:

an island in the midst of a continent, charmingly situated, and surrounded by the Cavery river; distant from Madras 296 miles. It is about four miles in length, and about one mile and a half in breadth across the middle, where the ground is highest, whence it gradually narrows, and falls toward the extremities. At the west end there is a fort of very considerable strength, about three miles in circumference, mounting at least 190 pieces of cannon, including what were in the cavalices (Scurry, 1824:125-6).

By including such information within their narratives, captives make implicit claims for their disinterestedness, which is particularly problematic in the colonial situation, and doubly so in the captive situation, as the paradigm of disinterested contemplation is based on gendered assumptions of power. The male captive is in some respects placed in a feminised, subordinate position, as will be discussed later in this chapter. Thus, the captive is in a complex relation to ‘scientific’ discourses of knowledge which assume European superiority.

As will be shown later in this chapter, British treatment at the hands of non-Europeans is discomforting for a colonial power holding to ideas of its own superiority over its Others. As Colley (2002) suggests, the fact of a captive’s return and the publication of a narrative does not restore this preferred order unproblematically (Colley, 2000:176). For this reason, such captivities could not be represented artistically in a forthright manner. The publication of captivity narratives was troubling enough, even where they
represented the sufferings of lower-class Britons, and more so where those from higher classes were rendered vulnerable. For this reason, British captives negotiated a precarious path between the adoption of a dominant position as aesthetic and scientific subject, and the representation of individual vulnerability and suffering.

Captivity and Suffering:

A large part of the disquieting evidence of Western displacement from a position of supposed superiority in captivity narratives is found in the representation of corporeal distress. The captive’s concentration on the body, most often as a site of suffering, is linked to the privileging of the mind underpinning aesthetic discourse. Bohls (1995) explains:

The “Vulgar” thought of as trapped in their bodies, were disqualified from “high” cultural pursuits under the dualistic metaphysics that separates the body from the mind and valorizes the latter (Bohls, 1995:159).

The tormented or diseased body is only too prominent evidence of the captive’s troubled relation to the aesthetic, with its supposed autonomy from moral, political or utilitarian concerns. Frequently in the narratives, attention is drawn to the captive’s material needs: the need for adequate nutrition, and protection from the elements. In addition, the Western body is also represented in the narratives as being vulnerable to injury and disease. Examples of such sufferings represented in the captivity narratives under discussion are examined in the following section.
George Buchan (1820) considered himself, and others on the *Winterton* wreck, fortunate that events had left more survivors remaining than might have been expected, following the breaking up of the East Indiaman. However, the coast of Madagascar was a largely unknown and inhospitable place to be wrecked. It was famous as a haunt of dangerous pirates, and the fate of those on board a French ship lost at St. Augustine in 1777, who had been subsequently sold into slavery, did not bode well for the castaways (Hood, 2003:44). Despite avoiding the perils of slavery, there were many casualties amongst the *Winterton* survivors in Madagascar. Buchan himself suffered from what was almost certainly malaria, the prevalence of which was key reason for the failure of earlier colonisation attempts on the island. By the middle of January 1793, eighty of the shipwreck survivors had fallen victim to disease on Madagascar, and the death toll was to rise further on their later removal to Mozambique. Buchan (1829) later points to his continued ill-health occasioned by the loss of the *Winterton*; referring to events in October 1797, and the sinking of a second ship in Bengal Bay he attests:

> My constitution had been severely shaken from the effects of my shipwreck in the *Winterton*, and the sufferings connected with the deadly climate of

---

1 Defoe’s *The King of Pirates* (1719) added to this reputation.

2 Disease in foreign location is not solely the experience of the captive, but it significantly increases captive misery and danger.

3 Shelley’s *The Last Man* (1994) (f.pub. 1826) illustrates how disease was associated with foreign climates, as the plague pandemic first breaks out in Egypt. Cantor (1997) asserts that the plague in *The Last Man* is identifiable with imperialism, and that its geographical origins and spread back to the imperial centre are part of the process of ‘reverse colonisation’ (Cantor, 1997:197). Also see Gonzalez (1996:56). In an example from a captivity narrative, Eliza Fay (1821/1817) and her husband fell prey to a disease in Grand Cairo which, ‘had every sign of the Plague, except that it was not mortal’ (Fay, 1821/1817:79). See Alan Bewell (2000) *Romanticism and Colonial Disease* for a discussion.

---
Madagascar, from which I was, at that period, far from having recovered (Buchan, 1829:125).

As well as the effects of disease, in further instances of bodily suffering in Buchan’s narrative (1820), on Buchan’s part of the Winterton wreck, the survivors suffer the effects of extreme thirst, resorting to the ‘sucking of lead’ to help relieve it (Buchan, 1820:63-4). Dale and Buchan also report severely lacerating their feet on coral rocks. The American captain James Riley (2000) is characteristically more dramatic when relating the damage to his feet caused during his captivity in the desert. He recounts that, ‘The situation of our feet was horrible beyond description, and the very recollection of it, even at this moment makes my nerves thrill and quiver’ (Riley, 2000:63).

Whilst Buchan’s sufferings were related to events and the conditions in Madagascar following the wreck of the Winterton, evidence of the captive’s corporeal distress also includes physical suffering directly inflicted by captors. For example, James Scurry’s (1824) initial confinement at one of Hyder Ali’s forts reveals the distressing physical conditions of those imprisoned. He reports in a footnote that he has witnessed:

whole families, or their carcasses rather, lying in different spots...The few miserable survivors would plunge at one of our carrion bones, though thrown into excrement (Scurry, 1824:46).

---

155 George Buchan’s 1829 Practical Illustrations of a Particular Providence was published in Edinburgh by William Oliphant, who specialised in a worthy strain of didactic and juvenile literature.
This can be compared with Eliza Fay’s (1821/1817) description of the fetid location in which she too was held in India. She describes her party as:

crowded [sic.] together in a horrid dark place scarcely twenty feet square,
swarming with rats, and almost suffocating for want of air (Fay, 1821/1817:172).

Thus, captives are represented as being subjected to physical ordeals as the consequence of their captivity.

Captive passivity and the discourse of British masculinity:

One of the most dramatic representations of captor-inflicted physical suffering is found in James Scurry’s narrative (1824). In this episode, Scurry and several other boys are subjected to forced circumcision as preparation for joining the Mysore forces. The captives are given extra guards to protect them from rats, and Scurry likens himself and his fellow captives to ‘young sucking pigs’, ‘lying in our blood as we were’ (Scurry, 1824:64).\(^\text{156}\) Snader (2000) points out that captive narrators sometimes described themselves using animal images, especially in instances where the captive becomes passive, which he describes as ‘tantamount to a loss of civilisation and manhood’ (Snader, 2000:82). It has been suggested Derounian-Stodola (1998) that captivity narratives vary in style according to the gender of the captive, broadly along the lines that the narrative of a female captive will place extra emphasis on her physical passivity

\(^{156}\) Fortunately almost all the captives recovered, although one perished from loss of blood.
and emotional state. Snader agrees with this view, citing ‘the captivity plot’s colonialist drive and celebration of masculine self-assertion (Snader, 2000:159).

However, this ‘masculine self-assertion’ is challenged by reading the captivity narratives discussed in this study, where the relation of passivity and feminisation predominates. This type of passivity is frequently evident in captivity narratives written by men, and furthermore, Clark (1999) suggests that such a feminised position is available to all male, European travellers. He argues that the male traveller is feminised through:

- absence of control over the domestic domain; removal from accustomed areas of work-expertise; and vulnerability to unpredictable encounters (Clark, 1999:20).

Whilst male travellers may suffer such feminisation, unquestionably the captive is more vulnerable than the traveller to these difficulties. Although Scurry’s relation of his circumcision is a clear example of physical suffering, his narrative also includes elements of non-physical suffering caused through humiliation and coercion. Lengthy descriptions of embarrassing defeats during the Mysore war of 1780-4 are also included in Scurry’s narrative, and one may wonder why these losses take up so much narrative space, as they are clear evidence of British failings. Describing a mural on Darya Daulat Palace just outside Seringapatam, which depicts Colonel William Baillie’s famous defeat at Pollilur in 1780, Colley (2002) shows how their enemies portrayed the British as effeminate in comparison with the Indian and French troops. The British are depicted as wearing uniform red coats, despite the historical inaccuracy, and Colley sees this as


There is further discussion of the representation of Scurry’s circumcision in Chapter 4, ‘Going Native’.
connected to the association in India of red with eunuchs and women. In a further example of British passivity, the vulnerable situation of the Grosvenor castaways would certainly be shocking to the contemporary British mind. The survivors of the wreck are represented as being surrounded by ‘natives’ and unceremoniously deprived of their few possessions. Later, the captain passively accepts the stripping of the castaways of their last remaining possessions, including the ladies’ valuables, which had been hidden in their hair. The outrage of the gentlemen at this humiliation avails them nothing, and the account of this incident shows the extreme impotence of even the high-ranking men to defend themselves or the women. Taylor notes the indignation that such incidents aroused in Britain.

Mills (1998) argues that when nineteenth-century women dealt in the ‘factual’ genres permitted to them (autobiography and travel writing) they were restricted in what they could relate by the need to conform as far as possible to contemporary standards of female behaviour. In other words, it was difficult for them to describe events where they may have demonstrated traits generally perceived as ‘masculine’ (Mills, 1998:87). However, Michelle Burnham (1997) argues that women’s captivity narratives are especially interesting to readers due to the agency permitted to female captives by their extreme situation, where they cross social boundaries imposed by patriarchal culture (Burnham, 1997:3-4). In captivity narratives written by men, a similar restriction to that described by Mills operates, and the expectation of ‘manly’, British behaviour affects

---

159 Also see Sinha (1995) *Colonial Masculinity: the ‘manly Englishman’ and the ‘effeminate Bengali’ in the Late Nineteenth Century.*

160 Perhaps by way of explanation of this passivity on the part of the castaways, Taylor points to their fear that the ‘natives’ were innately physically superior to themselves, describing their extraordinary agility and speed (Taylor, 2004:150).

161 Taylor also notes that those shipwrecked off the British coast could be subjected to similar ordeals themselves (Taylor, 2004:121).
what events the captive may relate and how they may be represented. Although Burnham states that crossing cultural borders causes the captive ‘psychological trauma’ (Burnham, 1997:3) there is little evidence of this represented in the narratives examined in this study, as there were discursive limits imposed on captivity narrators regarding what types of sufferings may be represented within captivity genre. Captives in the narratives under discussion rarely permit themselves space within the narrative to present non-physical suffering. In one short section of his narrative, James Scurry (1824) praises the beauty of Indian nights but longs for England, hinting that he has left a romantic attachment behind:

> But, alas! They were no beauties to me; the ever-prevailing impression still corroding my mind, with my heart ready to burst at the thought of being forever cut off from all that were near and dear to me. I had no prospect, not the most distant hope, of ever seeing again my country, parents, friends, or one who was equally the object of my tenderest solicitude (Scurry, 1824:164).

Here Scurry highlights the mental suffering of supposing himself to be forever exiled from England, although this section and the following example are the only such passages presented in the narrative. By 1784 and the East India Company’s peace with

However, evidence from Taylor’s account of the Grosvenor wreck (2004) reveals that victims of shipwreck or captivity suffered on a psychological level. The fourteen-year-old Price shed tears of distress during one encounter with the Xhosa tribe, which by his own admission was an instance of their kindness towards the survivors. The Xhosa were so confused by his tearful response and the like reaction of others that they withdrew from the scene (Taylor, 2004:150). The American Captain James Riley (2000/1817) also reflects on his emotional difficulties in the aftermath of his ordeal in Africa, relating his tormenting nightmares and sleepwalking (Riley, 2000/1817:259). However, the narrative does not end on this vulnerable note, closing instead with a chapter entitled ‘An account of the great African Desart—of its inhabitants, their customs, manners, dress, & —a description of the Arabian camel or dromedary’ (Riley, 2000/1817:294).
Tipu Sultan, the extent to which Scurry and his fellow captives have been absorbed into the locality by their service in the Mysore army becomes clear. When the captives are not returned to the British, Scurry explains:

now we had the painful knowledge, that our destiny was irremediable! and we had the mortification of seeing numbers of our officers and men marched out of the fort for Madras, while ever we were cut off from every hope of ever reaching our country or our friends (Scurry, 1824:139).

Scurry’s brief episodes of interiority are confined to such instances where they relate to patriotic sentiment. Even as he admits that the British captives are humiliated by their captors, Scurry represents this in terms of manly outrage at the reversal of their assumed superior position as Britons. He reports the attitude of his captive group towards the treatment offered to them by their captors:

We had the feelings of Englishmen, and we suffered from their insults more severely than from their punishments (1824:165).

George Buchan (1820) indulges in some attempt to convey emotional suffering and includes literary quotation in his narrative. Describing the homesickness of the Winterton's ship’s surgeon, Buchan turns to Cowper by using the following quotation:

Homesickness was not confined to the captive or victim of shipwreck, also affecting others bound up in colonial endeavour, such as East India Company servants in the colonies. Buchan was to hold such a position himself once he finally arrived in India on 16th January 1794 (Madras Almanac, 1803:111). Buchan’s fellow company servant and correspondent William Thackeray sent this lamentation to Thomas Munro (later Governor of Madras 1820-7) in a letter dated 2nd September 1809: ‘I hate this place more and more everyday...In fact every reason - every inducement private and public
When I think of my own native land,
In a moment I seem to be there;
But, alas! recollection at hand,
Soon hurries me back to despair (Buchan, 1820:160).

Again the representation of emotional suffering is confined to the patriotic sentiment of homesickness. However, the need for British captives to maintain something of their position as supposedly superior to captor culture is paramount. The discursive limits of representation for individual captives is the reason for features found in the narratives, such as this emotional reticence.

The gaze:

The British perception of an assertive national identity is further compromised in captivity narratives by the captive’s vulnerability to the gaze. Although travel writing is, according to Mills, ‘licensed by conventions to gaze or spy to a greater extent than in other narratives’ (Mills, 1988:67), captives represent themselves as the object of the gaze in an uncomfortable reversal of this convention. As Colley (2000) argues:

prompt one to make haste home & I should think to stay there - I would give one of my limbs almost to be able to go there, & whenever I think of the seven of eight years which I must at least remain here...I feel like Ulysses after his shipwreck. Ithaka seems more distant than ever’ (IOIC, Mss/Eur/F151/20/77). Colley’s chapter ‘Captives in Uniform’ in Captives (2002) focuses on lower-class soldiers in the British army, but is nevertheless illustrative of similar suffering.

Pratt (1992) discusses the use of a panoramic convention in travel texts, which creates an uninhabited landscape, erasing both the indigenous presence and the European observer: ‘The activity of describing geography and identifying flora and fauna structures an asocial narrative in which the human presence...is absolutely marginal’ (Pratt, 1992:51).
Becoming a captive meant that, far from gazing speculatively at non-Europeans from a position of detachment and strength, and recording what they saw, Britons became instead the passive object of their gaze (Colley, 2000:177).

Pratt (1992) cites Mungo Park’s *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (1799) as an instance of what she terms ‘reciprocal vision’, as Park ‘repeatedly portrayed himself as subjected to the scrutiny of the Africans’ (Pratt, 1992:81). Pratt sees this as evidence of Park’s cultural relativism. However, in the captive situation the reversal of the gaze engenders a level of vulnerability not present in the travel account. Many captives suffered the indignity of being viewed as an object of native curiosity, going against the notion of the gaze as the preserve of the privileged, European viewer. Moreover, captivity narratives show British captives as objectified not by the upper-class, European male assumed as the generic perceiver, but by those excluded from that category. Captivity accounts abound with instances of the European male as a spectacle, scrutinised by the ‘vulgar’, the lower classes, women, and, what is worse, all of these groups emphatically non-European. There are many instances of this type of captive vulnerability at non-European hands revealed in the narratives. In one such example, Eliza Fay (1821/1817) and her fellow captives are stared at by locals in Calicut, much to her distress. She relates that her captors:

compelled us to walk a mile thro’ a heavy sand, surrounded by all the mob of Calicut, who seemed to take pleasure in beholding the distress of white people, those constant objects of their envy and detestation...our guards detained us for nearly an hour, in an open Square, till the Governor’s [Sudder Khan] pleasure
should be known. He sat all the while smoking his Hooka, and looking down
upon us; when having sufficiently feasted his eyes, he ordered us to be taken to
the English Factory (1821/1817:145).

In James Scurry’s narrative (1824), when he and his fellow captives arrive at
Seringapatam, they become the object of the non-European inhabitants’ gaze,
apparently of all classes. Scurry describes being ‘gazed at by innumerable
multitudes...who had never beheld such as sight before’ (Scurry, 1824:59).
Later, the captives become a farcical object for the curiosity of passers by, and remain so, stripped
of their British appearance, ‘We were now, every morning, paraded before the palace in
full Mohammedan dress’ (Scurry, 1824:68). The British in Scurry’s narrative are
frequently figures of ridicule or spectacle and the scene of the captives’ circumcision is
not the only occasion when the idea of the British theatre is invoked by Scurry to
illustrate their plight. The captives’ European clothes are taken and replaced with
‘coarse habits’ (Scurry, 1824:65), and as they are considered unclean, they are cleansed
with hot water. Scurry ruefully comments:

Similarly, James Riley (2000/1817) describes being the object of fascination for the
indigenous people of North Africa, relating that they were, ‘stroking down my trowsers,
feeling my head and hands, examining my shoes, and feeling into my pockets, &c.’
amongst his Native American captors: ‘They crowded around me in numbers, taking
hold of my clothes, examining my face, hands and feet, and even opening my mouth to
see if I had a tongue’ (Jewitt, 1987/1815:121).

Location may vary but this motif of being gazed upon remains. For example, the
Russian Captain Golovnin held captive in Japan relates that, ‘In every village, on our
arrival and departure, we were surrounded with crowds of both sexes, young and old,
whom curiosity to see us drew together’ (Golovnin, 1818:104). Golovnin attempts to
undercut the force of the reversal of the gaze by stating that in such situations, ‘every
one behaved with the utmost decorum. I particularly marked their countenances, and
never once observed a malicious look, or any signs of hatred towards us, and none
showed the least disposition to insult us by mockery and derision’ (Golovnin,
1818:122).
Here was no small diversion for idle spectators... to see us jump out of the coppers half scalded (Scurry, 1824:65).

Similarly, during a siege where two British captives manage to escape, those remaining are starved and kept in irons, and the reader is being invited by Scurry to view the group as a tableau:

Here was a scene indeed! our women in tatters, our children naked, and ourselves in nearly the same state, without food, or any means of procuring it; the women weeping aloud, the infants crying for nourishment, and ourselves expecting to be massacred...if Hogarth had been present at this crisis, what a fine subject for his pencil! (Scurry, 1824:150-1)

A similar example of such a view of captives is given in Eliza Fay’s narrative. The Fays get permission to remove from a fetid, crowded room in the fort in which they are held, and sleep in unused lofts. However, they are tormented and terrified throughout the night by bats. Fay describes this scene in theatrical terms, relating that ‘the rats also acted their part in the Comedy’ (Fay, 1821/1817:174). In James Scurry’s narrative, during the circumcision of fifty-two boys aged twelve to seventeen, the captives become a spectacle, almost in the manner of a farce. Scurry describes the event:

seizing the youngest...four of those stout men held his legs and arms, while the barber performed his office... and in two hours the pious [sic.] work was finished...with the effects of the majum, some were laughing, and others crying;
which, together with the pain, rendered our condition truly curious and ludicrous
(Scurry, 1824:63-4).

Later, when Scurry and his fellow escapees are surrounded by enemies at the Mahratta
fort the group is described as:

looking as fierce, perhaps, as Falstaff did when giving an account to Prince
Henry of the numbers he had slain (Scurry, 1824:195-6).

By likening them to actors, Scurry reflects the drama of the situation, but also by the
reference to Henry IV Part I, he identifies them with the lovable but low character of
Falstaff. However, this is an ambiguous image, as Falstaff is a figure of fun in the scene
Scurry highlights, and this perhaps reflects the Muslim leaders’ attitudes to British
forces as witnessed by Scurry in India. Colley (2000) points out that:

Who gets to laugh, and conversely who gets habitually laughed at, are some of
the best indicators in any time or place of where power and confidence reside
(Colley, 2002:293). 167

In several instances in Scurry’s narrative, as well as a being presented as a spectacle, the
British captives and their countrymen are considered laughable. 168 Tipu Sultan’s eldest

167 This can be compared to Mary Rowlandson’s (2000) (f.pub.1682) distress amidst the
laughter of her Native American captors. She complains that, ‘they, like inhuman
creatures laughed, and rejoiced to see it’ when she fell from a horse and struggled to
cross a river (Rowlandson, 2000/1682:141).
168 Buchan (1820) comments on the comical appearance of the Winterton ladies
following the wreck, as they were forced to wear men’s shoes and whatever clothing
could be salvaged (Buchan, 1820:55).
son orders the beating of one of the boys in Scurry’s group, as he was unable to ‘sing and dance in the English manner, for him to laugh at’ (Scurry, 1824:214). If proof were needed of the Mysore Sultan’s low opinion of the British, the entertainment at his ‘games’ certainly provides it. At Tipu Sultan’s games, the British are parodied by a man on stilts affecting intoxication, much to the hilarity of onlookers. Scurry describes the scene:

there would everyday appear a man on lofty stilts, with one of the Company’s uniforms on; at one time he would seem to take snuff, at another tobacco; then he would affect to be intoxicated; in short, it was intended as a burlesque on the English, and to make them appear as ridiculous as possible in the view of the numerous spectators (Scurry, 1824:135-6).

This representation of the British as ridiculous can also be seen during an episode in which the captives are presented with their Muslim wives. During a scene of confusion in a crowded market, there are arguments among the captives over which wife belongs to whom. Here Scurry’s reference is explicit:

Our enemies seemed to enjoy this in a manner that would have done honour to a British theatre (Scurry, 1824:120).

James Riley (2000/1817) relates that one of his captors’ black slaves ‘sneeringly addressing me by the name of Rias, or chief, would set up a loud laugh, which, with the waggery he displayed in his remarks on us, kept the whole family and several strangers... in a constant roar of laughter’. Riley’s fellow captive complains bitterly at ‘being obliged to bear the scoffs and derision of a d—d negro slave’ (Riley, 2000/1817:77).
Not only are the captives made into unwitting and unwilling players for their captor audience, Scurry likens them to the risible characters in a British farce, and there is clear anxiety in these comments. However, using the British theatre as a touchstone may be a way for Scurry to compare the ‘courtship’ of their new wives with accepted models at home. This description also, perhaps, glosses over the seriousness of the issue for the British reader.

Power and Class:

Whilst the representation of British captives being subjugated by non-European captors was disquieting to British readers, the supposed superior relation of the British captive to his/her non-European captor is further complicated by the relative social status of the captive. Where the captive narrator is a higher-class individual, or the lower-ranking captive represents the treatment of their social superiors by non-European captors, the maintenance of a superior relation to captor culture is even more significant. Some of the captives held in India during this period were high-ranking naval officers, and thus ‘what happened to them was a matter of national prestige’ (Colley, 2002:289). Some found captivity at the hands of non-Europeans unbearable, and their higher social status was no barrier to suffering. In Scurry’s narrative (1824), following an escape attempt from the fort, conditions for the captives were made harsher as the group were put in irons. However, their leader, Lieutenant Wilson, suffered a worse fate, being:

stripped, and flogged with tamarind twigs very severely, when they plastered his back over in sugar, and exposed him to the sun (Scurry, 1824:49).

Scurry relates that the British prisoners were marched to Chillenbroom and put in irons for a further two months, then marched again to Bangalore, whilst coupled in hand irons, some without shoes. The officers were not spared this humiliation, and the other captives were affected by this reversal of fortune, as the upper classes became a spectacle for the lower. Scurry describes this humiliation:

We had the painful sight of seeing them [officers] pass us in irons; a state of degradation that affected many of us (Scurry, 1824:50).

However, not all upper-class captives were subjected to such ill-treatment. At the beginning of 1783, gentleman William Hickey (1995) found himself in a captive situation, being on board a ship in Trincomalee which had been taken from the Dutch by the French. The French (rightly) suspecting that the ship was in fact British hoped to make a prize of her, and Hickey recounts the French Admiral de Suffren’s leniency to the upper class Britons on board:

although he might, and perhaps ought, in strict justice, in such a case to consider and treat us as prisoners of war, he would not treat us as such (Hickey, 1995/1913:343).

Indeed, Hickey took dinner with his captor, who later secured Hickey’s passage to Madras and even made presents to ‘Mrs Hickey’ (Charlotte Barry). 171 Hickey was

171 Andrew Blayney’s *Narrative of a Forced Journey through Spain and France, as a Prisoner of War, in the Years 1810 to 1814* (1814) is an interesting example of upper class captivity, as Blayney was a high-ranking officer. He makes claims in the narrative
fortunate that he was not handed over to French allies in a non-European zone, like Scurry and his fellow captives.

Captivity also exposed higher class Britons to an unwanted proximity to the lower classes. This further complicated the representation of the experience of captivity related by higher-class captives. Following the Grosvenor shipwreck, Taylor (2004) suggests that, ‘never had a company from so broad a spectrum of British society found itself so distant from the old certainties’ (Taylor, 2004:82). He also describes this mixture:

nabobs formed up with soldiers, officers with tars; men in tailcoats and breeches stood beside those in shirts and linen trousers; women, in what remained of their finery were at last on terms of equality, as well as intimacy with their ayahs (Taylor, 2004:110).

A similar social mix was thrown together on board the Winterton, and the shipwreck added to the strain. In the extreme circumstances social order proved difficult to maintain among the castaways, and George Buchan (1820) observes the tenuous nature of authority in such situations. Initially Buchan reports that social boundaries remain intact, and the Winterton’s third mate John Dale recounts how a mess was formed including ladies, officers and cabin passengers, ‘leaving the people to act as they chose’ (Buchan, 1820:61). However, later the wealth of the Winterton’s cargo is distributed against the usual dictates of social status, apparently from fear of ‘the people’ (Hood, 2003:131) and results in a temporary class reversal. Buchan explains:

for the freedom of movement his rank allowed him, and thus the importance of his observations.
though at the time little viewed as a matter of amusement, it might have been
almost ludicrous to see the soldiers, &c. and their wives, metamorphosed into
ladies and gentlemen, while those who had usually been recognised in the latter
capacity, were actively engaged in culinary and other menial offices (Buchan,
1820:155).

However, the newly wealthy soon spend all their gains without thought and ‘the higher
classes had then no difficulty in obtaining whatever domestic help they wanted’
(Buchan, 1820:156). The lower orders are presented throughout Buchan’s narrative as
needing the guiding authority of the higher classes to prevent calamity. As the
Winterton sank, Buchan reports the calm of the gentlewomen, admonishing the vocal
panic of the wives of soldiers and sailors (Buchan, 1820:32). Similarly the gentlemen on
board a life-saving raft are shown preventing the instinct of self-preservation of the
lower classes from oversetting it (Buchan, 1820:47). Buchan does not condemn their
behaviour, believing it to be the inevitable consequence of the situation. However, this
attitude is damning of the lower classes by portraying them as naturally unrestrained
and in need of control. It also marks out Buchan’s attempt to position himself in

172 There are also examples of this type of behaviour in Scurry’s (1824) narrative. The
editor reports that Scurry is paid a pension first of £7, and later £18 per annum.
However, he adds that, ‘like true British sailors, a considerable portion was squandered
away in thoughtless extravagance’ (Scurry, 1824:252).
173 Buchan (1820) laments the difficulty in maintaining authority over the crew in the
circumstances of a shipwreck. Similarly, James Riley (2000/1817) is unable to take
charge of his drunken crew after their shipwreck. He complains, ‘now unrestrained by
my authority... were most of them in such a state, that instead of assisting me, they
tended to increase my embarrassment’ (Riley, 2000/1817:20).
174 In another instance of this, Buchan relates that a sailor is killed by cupidity when his
clothing, loaded with coins, pulls him under the surf. Similarly, realising the importance
of maintaining friendly relations with the indigenous inhabitants on whom the
castaways relied for the necessities of life, Buchan reports that the officers worked to
superior relation, not only to the indigenous inhabitants of Madagascar, but also to the lower-ranks Britons on board the *Winterton*. Bohls (1995) explains how the aesthetic subject was marked out by his freedom from labour which allowed him to cultivate the necessary faculties to recognise the ‘universal standard of taste’. The importance of this ‘universal’ standard for the welfare of the state, in the eyes of a civic humanist such as Reynolds, cannot be overstated. Bohls argues that:

> The “security of society” depends on this kind of solidarity among the governing elite against all those who, because their views are confined to sense gratification and private interest, pose a constant danger to the state

(Bohls, 1995:76).

However much Buchan attempts to minimise the social consequences of the *Winterton* wreck, the class reversal, however represented is evidence of further disturbing disruption to the hierarchies of discourses of British superiority.

That the vulnerability of the captive as troubling to colonial discourse is exacerbated by the representation of the sufferings of higher class captive can be seen in the example of the wreck of the *Grosvenor*. The first widely available account of the loss of the ship was edited from the experiences of one of the survivors, John Hyne. The editor, George prevent friction between the sailors and locals, complaining that, ‘It is impossible to prevent the propensity that the lower rank of Europeans have to look on a black face with an eye of superiority, and on their first arrival among the inhabitants of a hot climate, to treat them as inferiors’ (Buchan, 1820:151).

On board the *Grosvenor* as passengers were such luminaries as William Hosea, Resident of Murshidabad, and his wife Mary. In their charge for the journey back to Britain was the seven-year-old Thomas Chambers returning to be educated in England according to custom. The Hoseas had left their three-week-old daughter Charlotte with Sir Robert and Lady Chambers (the same who protected Eliza Fay, after she was befriended by Mary Hosea).
Carter, had heard details of the wreck whilst in India, and spotting a market for such a story he published the *Narrative of the Loss of the Grosvenor* (1791) through John Murray. Carter’s narrative focussed on another a ingredient that sparked public interest - the fate of the ladies. The unknown fate of the passengers caused much speculation which generally focussed on the gentleman passengers’ loss of a lifestyle of ease and the imagined sexual threat to the women passengers from African men (Taylor, 2004:170-1). One particular report that Lydia Logie, wife of the *Grosvenor*’s chief mate, had been taken captive by ‘savages’ found fertile ground in the public imagination in both Britain and Bengal (Taylor, 2004:176). The interest in this story was much heightened by Lydia Logie’s social status and the fact that she was visibly pregnant at the time of the shipwreck. Almost a decade after the *Grosvenor* wreck, a report in the *Calcutta Gazette* suggested that Lydia Logie, who had ‘lived with one of the black Princes by whom she had several children’ (Taylor, 2004:208) was finally dead. Her brother reacted to the idea of ‘this horrid connexion’ with disbelief recorded in his diary (Taylor, 2004:211) but British newspaper reporters took a ‘certain savage glee’ in the idea of the *Grosvenor* women’s sexual vulnerability (Taylor, 2004:232). As a measure of how the ‘abduction’ of any female passengers remained in the public mind, recurrent rumours of sightings of white women in Kaffir society continued to be speculated upon. It was suggested that these white women had ‘gone native’, they could not be prevailed

176 A version of the events surrounding the loss of the *Grosvenor* is also included in Dalyell’s *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea* (1812). (See Critical Review 1814 vol.lxxiv p.380). William Habberley, another *Grosvenor* survivor, wrote his own memoir of the shipwreck and his subsequent adventures entitled *Loss of the Grosvenor East Indiaman*, written around 1810 (Taylor, 2004:247). The memoir is the only first person account of events, and Taylor suggests that it was intended to reach a large audience whose interest in the *Grosvenor* had not yet waned, and that Habberley used *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) as a model (Taylor, 2004:248). The account did not reach its intended readership however, as it was never published. Taylor suggests that Habberley’s narrative lacked Carter’s gift for storytelling and the sensationalising of certain scenarios. For example, Carter’s narrative alluded to the potential pleasures to be taken in the nakedness of African women (Taylor, 2004:163).
upon to leave Africa (Taylor, 2004:190) and that their children were fathered by African men. This possibility became a source of public fascination shown by ‘popular entertainments about English ladies lost among tribesmen who dressed in skins’ (Taylor, 2004:208). Whilst Taylor argues that oral tribal history contains evidence that the Grosvenor women may well have survived and lived in Africa, he also sees the denial of this possibility by some British commentators as understandable: ‘English society saw theirs as a fate worse than death and out of kindness wished them dead’ (Taylor, 2004:221). Cyrus Redding’s version of events ‘The Grosvenor East Indiaman, 1782’ in A History of Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea, Vol. II (1833), also ends with speculation on fate of Mrs Hosea, Mrs Logie and Mrs James. British readers were certainly not above the enjoyment of a certain amount of titillation, as the earlier success of Elizabeth Marsh’s The Female Captive (1769) shows. This offers some explanation for why the fate of the Grosvenor stimulated such interest in Britain compared to loss of the Winterton. They were similar ships and both were lost on hostile and dangerous shores. Both ships carried the usual complement of well-to-do passengers of both sexes. British concern can be summed up quite simply in the supposed or feared fate of the gentlewomen passengers. As Taylor explains, the actual fate of the Grosvenor's female passengers became subsumed by their continued identification with sexual captivity (Taylor, 2004:232) and the fears (and pleasures) of this idea for the British male. Thus, the Grosvenor narrative illustrates how the representation of British vulnerability upset the assumption of British national superiority within colonial discourse, and also shows how this was heightened by the status of upper class captives, because of their assumed relation to discourses of ‘scientific’ knowledge of the Other.
Conclusions:

This chapter has considered how representations of captive vulnerability illustrate the ambivalent nature of colonial discourse. Whilst the narratives under discussion contain examples of ‘Othering’, they also reveal the troubled relation of the captive to discourses of ‘scientific’ knowledge. In the case of lower class captives, this is as a result of captive attempting to take a position within discourses related to social, as well as national hierarchies. Moreover, the reversal of ‘the gaze’ of the privileged European viewer, along with the representation of physical suffering, unsettle the relation of British captives to colonial discourse. I have also argued in this chapter that the representation of the captive’s passivity is complicated by captive negotiation of the discourse of British masculinity. The relation of the captive to imagined national and social hierarchies is further problematised by the representation of class reversal, the democratisation of classes, and the suffering of upper-class captives at the hands of Others. Thus, the ambivalence of colonial discourse represented in the narratives links to my overall argument that captivity narratives cannot be considered a ‘safe’ site for the representation of British vulnerability as Pratt (1992) has argued. Rather, this ambivalence shows that colonial discourse, in these particular narratives, and perhaps colonial discourse in general, is not always in the service of imperialism.
Chapter 4: ‘Going Native’

Introduction:

As discussed in the previous chapter, ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’, Britons during this period could be extremely vulnerable at the hands of ‘Others’, and this was a perturbing prospect to fellow Britons at home. However, another danger of contact with Others, particularly within the close confines of the captive situation, was that a Briton might find their new life potentially congenial. The fear that those who travel from the imperial centre will discover pleasures which could make them forsake their native land goes back to classical literature. Peter Hulme (1992) points to the Lotus-Eaters in *The Odyssey*, ‘whose food makes Odysseus’ sailors lose the desire to return home’ (Hulme, 1992:187). This fear was not unfounded, and evidence from the narratives discussed in this thesis shows that captives might resist the pull of the imperial centre and ‘go native’ in some circumstances. The term ‘going native’ is problematic, however, as it contains assumptions of superiority in the notion that Westerners might be able to pass as indigenous. As this chapter will show, there are often difficulties in making such a clear separation between the indigenous and the colonial. The work of Homi Bhabha (1994) is useful here, as it challenges the notion of clear separation. According to Bhabha, the colonised is ambivalent within colonial discourse because s/he moves perpetually between similarity and difference. Similar, because easily ‘knowable’ in the colonist’s terms, but different, because distance between the coloniser and the colonised must be maintained. As Bhabha suggests that the authority of colonial discourse is predicated upon the representation of difference, the evidence of the ambivalent relation between self and Other represented in the captivity narratives under discussion is significant. If
colonial discourse is seen to be ambivalent, and its authority questionable, then captivity narratives cannot be considered a safe site. Thus, representations in captivity narratives of the failure to maintain this separation between Britons and Others means that the discourse of European superiority over the indigenous, with its reliance on the detached observation of the ‘scientific’ subject, is threatened. In some respects the captive may be seen as uniquely powerful due to the knowledge s/he gains of captor culture. Despite this, the captivity narratives under discussion contain representations that would have been disturbing to the contemporary British mind, not only because of the vulnerability represented, but also the cultural crossing of the captive to indigenous habits.

Binary division between Britons and Others:

In discussing the division between self and Other, it is important to note that representation of British national identity was more complex during this period than has been suggested. As Young (1995) argues, the idea of the Englishness of the past has been generally presented:

in terms of fixity, of certainty, centredness, homogeneity... Perhaps the fixity of identity for which Englishness developed such a reputation arose because it was in fact continually being contested, and was rather designed to mask uncertainty (Young, 1995:2).
This notional fixity of British character is related to the discourse of Western superiority, and thus ‘going native’ is evidence of the instability of this relation between Britons and Others. However, the instability of the British national character is just one disturbing element of the representation of Britons in contact with Others, as the notional character of the Other as comprised of inferior traits is sometimes not the view represented in the captivity narratives under discussion. Although Said’s theory of ‘Othering’ suggests that Western texts uniformly reduce the Other to a summary of imagined qualities and behaviours, Snader (2000) highlights variations in the disposition of the captors delineated in captivity narratives. These range from those captors providing education, to those inflicting torture on their captives. Examples of the representation of this type of variation amongst individuals belonging to the captor culture are to be found in the narratives examined in this thesis. For example in James Scurry’s narrative (1824), despite some of the more shocking treatment the captives receive at the hands of their captors, Scurry does not ignore individual instances of kindness. When he and his fellow captives are bound so tightly with ropes that Scurry fears it may prove fatal to them, they are assisted by one of the captor officers. Moreover, Scurry adds, ‘This was done on his part at great risk: may God reward him for it!’ (Scurry, 1824:74). Later, following his eventual escape, Scurry meets and comments upon a Moorish killadar. Scurry describes the man as:

open, generous, and facetious, he formed a striking contrast to the generality of Asiatic Mohammedans, who are empty, subtle, and cruel

(Scurry, 1824:201).

177 This notional fixity of British national identity was represented in fictional works of the period. For example, in de Stael’s novel Corinne (1807), the hero Oswald is presented as retaining an inner rigidity of national character. 178 A killadar was the person in command of a fort in India at this time.
Whilst Scurry allows for individual difference, he undercuts this by confirming the widely held view of Others highlighted in Said’s *Orientalism* (1995). In this comment, Scurry sums up the difficulty of representation for the captive narrator. His narrative must include representations of his individual experiences and observations, whilst simultaneously upholding the discourse of European superiority over its Others. However, the situation which allows Scurry to make his observations on the killidar, his captivity, and thus his knowledge of local languages which allow him to converse with this man, denies the maintenance of a strict boundary between Britons and Others.

It is also questionable whether this boundary was maintained prior to captivity, and the previous experiences of British captives prior to their captivities should also be considered. Due to difficulties recruiting sailors, British captains would use Italian sailors and ‘Lascars’ (sailors from India or South East Asia) and both these were on board the *Grosvenor* when it was wrecked on the South African coast (Taylor, 2004:48). Already exposed to such varied company, contact with indigenous people may not be so shocking to British sensibilities as generally represented. Likewise, a sailor like Scurry (1824) would be used to mixing with non-British and non-Christian sailors, and this must necessarily have affected his response to captivity among Muslims. Similarly, Colley (2002) suggests that as British presence in India relied upon the indigenous population so heavily, when Britons were taken captive, they did not suffer a level of trauma as significant as that of Barbary captives, as they were already

179 It is a feature of captivity narratives to demonstrate this type of confusion. So-called contradictions in the narrative of Mary Rowlandson (2000) (f.pub. 1682) for example, where Rowlandson shows instances of the individual kindnesses of her captors in contrast to the demonization of the race as a whole. Michelle Burnham (1997) points to slippage in Rowlandson’s use of pronouns revealing that she identifies with her captors at certain points during the narrative (Burnham, 1997:22).
involved in the alien culture. However, it was this very fact that caused so much domestic anxiety – that those who spent time in India would ‘go native’.

Colonial contact:

Sayre (2000) argues that the cultural crossing which critics of the captivity narrative associate with the genre is not simply the result of captivity, but the effect of colonial contact, especially as some crossings were evidently voluntary (Sayre, 2000:6).

Dalrymple has shown in *White Mughals* (2002), his recent study of Hyderabadi society in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, that boundaries between Indian and British were fluid at this time, and that imperialist histories have misrepresented the breadth of the divide between cultures in the formative years of the Raj. He also notes that this cultural exchange worked symbiotically, pointing to the crossing over of Indians to western ways (Dalrymple, 2002:xli).

Dalrymple argues that his research uncovers:

>a world that was far more hybrid, and with far less clearly defined ethnic, national and religious borders, than we have been conditioned to expect, either by the conventional Imperialist history books written before 1947, or for that matter by the post-colonial work coming from new generations of scholars, many of whom tend to follow the path opened up by Edward Said in 1978 (Dalrymple, 2002:xl-xli).

---

180 For example, William Hickey’s mistress, Jemdanee, is described as European in her manners (Hickey, 1995/1913:388).
Dalrymple focuses on the Kirkpatrick family, and tells the story of the British Resident Lieutenant Colonel James Achilles Kirkpatrick, his adoption of local dress and custom, and his voluntary conversion to Islam for the love of Khair un-Nissa, who became his wife in 1800 (Dalrymple, 2002:xxxii). Dalrymple’s study highlights that early colonial contact created relations between the coloniser and colonised that were not as unambiguous as images of the Raj from the period of high imperialism would suggest. There is a caveat, however, when considering the example of James Kirkpatrick. Hyderabad was an altogether different location to the major British strongholds of Madras, Calcutta and Bombay. However, Kirkpatrick’s behaviour does suggest the lure of Indian ways to British representatives in the colonies, and not only to the lower orders of society acknowledged as ‘renegados’. Kirkpatrick’s successful immersion in Indian culture and language proved that those who could master the indigenous culture could benefit greatly and that there were many advantages of cultural crossing.

Captivity, sex and marriage:

As the example of James Kirkpatrick shows, both captives and other colonial representatives found that proximity to Others sometimes resulted in the ultimate crossing of the supposed divide between the British and the indigenous - the taking of non-European women as lovers and wives. In the case of the captive, this is particularly likely because the definition of ‘captivity’ in the narratives is wider than might be expected, as Snader (2000) explains:

Ballhatchet (1980) makes a similar point, ‘There may have been few inhibitions in frontier regions, but once British rule was firmly established the opportunities for irregularities were quickly reduced’ (Ballhatchet, 1980:1)
the captivity narrative was never simply a record of imprisonment. Instead of allowing British captives to waste in dungeons, foreign cultures made them into household servants, family members, gang laborers, or sometimes even government functionaries. As a result of this immersion in a foreign culture, the captive often gained, and certainly claimed, a more intimate experience of the foreign than would a mere jailbird (Snader, 2000:5).

As captives lived out their captivities, intimacy with indigenous life was inevitable. In his narrative, Robert Drury (f.pub. 1729), who captures his wife according to native custom in Madagascar, pre-empts the readers’ reaction to his marriage to a ‘native’ woman with this explanation:

Some of my Readers, will, perhaps, wonder how I could so passionately love a black woman; but let them consider, I had been several years in the country, and they were become natural to me (Drury cited in Parker-Pearson & Godden, 2002:101).

William Hickey (1995) makes this comment on the issue of his connections with Indian women:

Having from my earliest youth been of an amorous disposition, I began to feel the effects of a long continence. I therefore one night sent for a native woman, but the moment I lay myself down upon the bed all desire ceased, being succeeded by disgust. I could think of nothing but her I had forever lost, and the bitter recollection rendered me so miserable that I sent off my Hindustani
companion untouched. The same circumstance occurred to me three successive times. Nature, however, at last proved too powerful to be surmounted, and I subsequently ceased to feel the horror that at first prevailed at the thoughts of a connection with black women, some of whom are very lovely; nor is it correct to call them black, those that come from the upper provinces being very fair (Hickey, 1995/1913:382).

Hickey provides an interesting counterpoint to Drury, Scurry (1824) and Jewitt (1824/1815) on the issue of their relationships with indigenous women for a number of reasons. The most important consideration for this study is his status as a free man. As the quotation shows, it is rather the loss of his beloved ‘Mrs Hickey’ (Charlotte Barry), than the nationality of his intended companion, which Hickey claims gave him most pause during these failed sexual encounters. It is significant that Hickey attributes his final acquiescence to ‘nature’, echoing Drury’s claim that ‘native’ women had become ‘natural’ to him over time. Later Hickey, like so many Company servants before him, lived with an Indian bibi, or companion, for a year, and believed that she had borne him a child nicknamed ‘Young Mahogany’ due to his very deep complexion. It turned out, however, that this acknowledged child was in fact the son of one of Hickey’s kitmuddars. Following this domestic debacle, Hickey later cohabitated for ten years with another Indian woman, named Jemdanee. She bore Hickey a son whom he describes as ‘remarkably fair’ (Hickey, 1995/1913:394). The pair were separated only by Jemdanee’s death in childbirth, and Hickey describes their relationship as one full of

In White Mughals (2002) Dalrymple estimates, from records of Bengal wills from 1780-5 in the India Office, that the majority of Company servants took Indian mistresses (Dalrymple, 2002:34). He also charts the decline of such relations, and their eventual removal from the histories of notable Britons in India (Dalrymple, 2002:52). A Kitmutgar was a Muslim servant whose principal duties involved the serving of food (Yule, 1903:486).
love and good humour. However, Dalrymple argues that Cornwallis’ personal fear of another defeat like the one he had suffered at the hands of George Washington, coupled with emerging ideas of so-called ‘scientific racism’ meant that, by the nineteenth century, the climate was increasingly less favourable to those who had become involved in local life (Dalrymple, 2002:49-50). From 1786 Cornwallis, as Governor-General, introduced a raft of measures to prevent the burgeoning Anglo-Indian population from gaining power, including the barring of Anglo-Indian offspring from subsequent employment in the East India Company’s service. As Colley (2002) discusses, troops in India were discouraged from settling or marrying, especially as Indian wives and children were not permitted to accompany their husbands and fathers when they were sent back to Britain. Some of this opposition to racial intermarriage was caused by xenophobia, but Colley also highlights British anxieties surrounding the ‘half caste’ or Anglo-Indian population in India. Successful Creole and mixed-race revolutions in South America against Iberian imperialism were an example of the possible political consequences of allowing this population to continue to grow unchecked. There was also the persistent fear that intermarriage would somehow contaminate British males.

The motherless child of this happy union was taken in by Mrs Turner, the wife of Hickey’s business partner, to be brought up as one of her own. One can only surmise the child’s prospects had he lived beyond early infancy and shared the complexion of ‘Young Mahogany’, because as Dalrymple has shown, children of such unions were more fortunate if fair skinned. Such fairer children could be sent to be educated in Britain, and ultimately ‘absorbed into the British upper classes’ (Dalrymple, 2002:51). The Admiral in Fanny Burney’s The Wanderer (f. pub.1814) expresses such sentiments, asserting that: ‘a man who could go out of old England to choose himself a wife, never deserves to set foot in it again! If I knew any worse punishment, I should name it!’ (Burney, 1991/1814:16).

On a slightly contradictory note, it was also feared that because of their perceived lower-class origins, this population might contaminate the reliable sepoy regiments if allowed to settle (Colley, 2002:339).
Due to their immersion in captor culture, James Scurry (1824) and John Jewitt (1824/1815) did take non-European wives. However, the need for male captives to maintain their supposed superior position in relation to their captors means that the representation of their relations with non-European women needed to be carefully handled. Hilary Stewart (1987) suggests that John Jewitt’s account of his marriage to a Native American woman reveals just this impulse. In his narrative, Jewitt relates that his marriage was forced, and that his own life, along with that of his fellow captive Thompson, was threatened if he refused. Significantly, Jewitt reports that he was allowed his own choice of bride (Jewitt, 1987/1815:143-4). However, Stewart points to an important alteration between this published version of events, and the same events as described by Jewitt in his journal.\(^{187}\) The journal entry shows that far from choosing his wife in accordance with his own wishes, Jewitt was presented with a wife by the chief, with no option of refusal.\(^{188}\) In the journal entry, Jewitt justifies his acquiescence thus:

> It is very much against my inclination to take one of these heathens for a partner, but it will be for my advantage while I am amongst them, for she has a father who always goes fishing, so that I shall live much better than I have anytime heretofore (Jewitt, 1987/1815:143).\(^{189}\)

\(^{187}\) Jewitt kept his journal during his captivity from 1803-5, publishing it very soon after his rescue as *A Journal Kept at Nootka Sound* (Stewart, 1987:7).

Richard Hasleton, captive in Algiers in the late sixteenth century, declined the opportunity of taking a Muslim wife, stating that, ‘I had a wife in mine own country, to whom I had vowed my faith before God and the world, which vow, I said, I would never break while we both lived’ (Hasleton, 2001/1595:91).

\(^{188}\) In *Nationalism and Modernism* (1998) Smith argues that, ‘ethnic identities may be felt or adopted for quite rational reasons, for survival or gain’ (Smith, 1998:154).
This frank admission reveals the practical considerations which had to be made by captives, which Jewitt later elided in his published account in order to gloss over the affront on both a personal and national level. The need to maintain the representation of British superiority means that the published account of Jewitt’s captivity claims a self-assertion not reflected in the more proximal version of events. By omitting this detail of his material needs from his published account, Jewitt attempts to take his place as the distant observer of captor culture, denying his vulnerable and reliant position as captive. However, Jewitt fathered a child by his indigenous wife during this marriage, a fact that he does not mention until the final pages of his narrative (Jewitt, 1824/1815:229).

According to Stewart (1987), Jewitt may not have known of the child’s birth at the time of his rescue. He also notes that, ‘The infant was born close to nine months after the marriage, so perhaps Jewitt was not quite as distressed over having a beautiful Indian woman for a wife as he made out to be’ (Jewitt, 1987/1815:175). Thus, it can be seen that Jewitt’s representation is constrained by the ambivalence of colonial discourse in the narratives under discussion. By representing his marriage as of his own choosing, Jewitt denies his vulnerability at the hands of the Other, but in doing this suggests that he has ‘gone native’ by desiring an indigenous woman. By representing compulsion to take an indigenous wife, he claims the fixity of his internal national identity, but forfeits his assumed superiority over the other in the representation of his vulnerability. Here Jewitt illustrates Bhabha’s (1994) contention that colonial discourse’s representation of ‘otherness’ is always ambivalently positioned between repulsion and desire.

Just as in Jewitt’s narrative, the representation of James Scurry’s (1824) marriage to a Muslim women is problematic. However, Scurry takes a slightly different position to Jewitt in his 1815 account, by emphasising that his own marriage took place without his
volition. Miscegenation (as the consequence of marriage) was distasteful to the patriotic British palate, and Scurry is keen to show that the captives were passive during the marriage ceremony, stating that ‘the priest muttered something which we could not comprehend, and we were married’ (Scurry, 1824:121). Using the distancing device of the footnote, Scurry explains for the benefit of the British reader that the captives’ Muslim wives were mostly aged eleven or younger. Lest this alarm Britons, Scurry attempts to assure them by an observation that ‘native’ women mature (and decline) earlier than their European counterparts. It is unclear how Scurry might have felt towards his Muslim wife, as the few references to her are ambiguous. He describes his wife as ‘an affectionate creature’ (Scurry, 1824:122), although this sounds more like an Englishman’s love for his dog rather than a marital bond. However, he praises the women for their devotion saying:

> such was their affection, that I am inclined to think some of them would have braved death in our stead (Scurry, 1824:154).

However, according to Scurry, the wives’ apparent devotion is not fully reciprocated. In a later footnote, Scurry reports his wife’s suspicions that he will leave her should the opportunity arise (1824:178-9). These suspicions are well founded, and indeed, Scurry leaves her behind with a child of sixteen months old, never to see either of them again. However, he represents himself as reluctant to leave his wife and child, and the scene

---

190 This may be playing on British attitudes towards the custom of sati, by aligning Indian Muslim women with the popular image of the ‘devoted’ Hindu widow. Later in the narrative Scurry comments specifically on this phenomenon: ‘we had some painful opportunities of seeing the Bramin women ascend the funeral pile with the dead bodies of their husbands, apparently with as much composure as we would sit down to our breakfast’ (Scurry, 1824: 208). This comment may also tap into British assumptions about sepoy ductility and passivity, for which they too were praised.
where he takes his final leave of them is a rare instance of interiority. He relates his
difficulty in parting from them, and having escaped a few miles, describes himself as
wavering in his resolution whilst looking on the town that holds them. These
emotions related by Scurry may be genuine. Perhaps in a bid to keep reader sympathy
with Scurry, his publisher notes that Scurry wrote to India to try to find his wife and
child, and charged friends going there to bring them to England (Scurry, 1824:179).
This plan, however, may have been fanciful. As Colley (2002) points out, British
soldiers in service in India, where such a union had been allowed, were not permitted to
have their wives and children accompany them on their return to England (Colley,
2002:337). Here then, Scurry balances conflicting positions. A man who could leave
behind a legal wife and young child without a qualm could appear heartless to British
readers, yet the man who could abandon his country for their sake would not merit a
patriotic reader’s sympathy or attention. In his appendix to James Scurry’s narrative,
William Whiteway (1824) adds his observation that ‘native’ women are virtuous and
loyal, perhaps to counter the notion that ‘oriental’ women were sexually voracious,
particularly necessary if British men are represented as involved in marital relationships
with them. He illustrates this indigenous virtue by stating that the punishment for a
woman’s infidelity is to have her nose and ears cut off, and says:

> it is a tribute of respect due to female virtue, to state, that few are to be found
in this state of mutilation (Whiteway, 1824:370-1).

Scurry also relates that his fellow captive and escapee Richardson, goes back when
he is unable to leave his two children behind. Scurry assures the reader that Richardson
made his escape at a later date (Scurry, 1824:183).
Jewitt (1824/1815) also attempts to mitigate his marriage by representing the indigenous women as having qualities prized in the West. He reports that the women are, ‘extremely modest in their deportment and dress’ (Jewitt, 1824/1815:82). He also states as some slave women are offered to the crews of passing ships by their masters, ‘an opinion seems to have been formed by some of our navigators, injurious to the chastity of their females, than which nothing can be more generally untrue, as perhaps in no part of the world is that virtue more prized’ (Jewitt, 1824/1815:100). Unfortunately such descriptions of indigenous women cannot palliate the fact that the captives’ marriages are forced by their captors, and are therefore an affront to British national conceit.

Thus, the representation of British men as the husbands of non-European women, and even as the fathers of non-European children, remains troubling evidence of the proximity between Britons and Others. Furthermore, in some cases, captives never returned to Britain, choosing to remain with their non-European families. For example, former member of the Madras military and survivor of the Grosvenor shipwreck John Bryan remained in South Africa after marrying an African woman named Sipho (Taylor, 2004:201). He had no desire to return to Britain, nor to leave his wife and his child, a daughter. However, it was reported that Bryan did not give himself up entirely to local custom and remained in a monogamous relationship with Sipho rather than taking further wives (Taylor, 2004:204). However, the monogamous nature of this relationship would not necessarily mitigate the reaction of the British reader against the union. The potential discomfort that such relations may cause to the British, metropolitan reader is evident by the Gentleman’s Magazine’s handling of the report of the relationship of one of the Wintertori’s crew with a Madagascan woman. This man’s desire to remain on the island due to his ‘tender connection’ with a ‘jetty nymph’, rather
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than return to his former life, is represented as understandable when couched in the
language of romantic love and poetic diction. George Buchan notes that Captain Dale
observes in his manuscript account of the loss of the *Winterton* that, ‘One of our sailors,
it would appear, discovered charms here, (Madagascar,) I could not, in voluntarily
choosing to remain behind’ (Buchan, 1820:215). Thus, not all British males were
represented as attracted by the idea of a relationship with an indigenous woman, and the
fact that Dale is an officer is significant here.

Cultural markers and identity:

Domestic anxiety on this subject shows that contemporary Britons were aware of the
vulnerability of British national identity, and where captives represent their immersion
in captor culture they face the difficulty of maintaining their British identity in the mind
of the metropolitan reader. When relating the story of his circumcision and drugging
with ‘majum’, Scurry adds a footnote explaining how this drug is made and taken:

> This opiate is made either into liquid or solid, with sugar, from the boang tree,
> the produce of which they smoke with tabacco; it causes the most astonishing
> sensations. In the course of a few years we were in the habit of smoking it
> freely, to drown our troubles (Scurry, 1824:62).

Thus, here in the footnote is evidence of the captives’ willing adoption of a native habit,
and Scurry’s disclosure is disturbing. Similarly, whilst George Buchan (1820)
represents an excessive liking for alcohol as an indigenous failing, he also adds that
some *Winterton* survivors adopt a taste for the local brew, admitting that, ‘several of our
people...became very expert toaky drinkers’ (Buchan, 1820:141). Given that Oriental associations with drugs or alcohol formed a negative stereotype, these are dangerous admissions in some respects. However, in Scurry’s narrative, the information is presented in the form of an ethnographic observation made outside of the main narrative. This tactic was used to distance the narrator from the specificity of the time and place, conferring on him the status of an ‘aesthetic subject’, to use Bohls’ definition (1995). However, as Matar has suggested of earlier accounts of Barbary captivity by Britons:

Repeatedly, captives’ accounts of the “Mahometan” garments and foods they had to adopt, the even greater humiliation of conversion to Islam and subsequent circumcision, and the “sodomiticaH” abuse some captives reportedly suffered reminded Britons of the imperfect dominion of their national authority (Matar, 2001:36).

There are also mixed views recorded on those areas where captives were forced to adopt local habits in order to survive, such as sleeping conditions and food. For example, Scurry (1824) cooks and enjoys kedgeree, describing how the captives used ‘some rice, doll, and ghe, which we soon converted into a good dish of cudgereee’ (Scurry, 1824:197). The Grosvenor castaways were soon reduced to gratefully consuming a

109 Bohls argues that the paradigm of disinterested contemplation excludes women from the position of aesthetic subject.

109 In her American narrative, Mary Rowlandson (2000) (f.pub. 1682) not only finds it necessary to adopt a Native American diet, but also admits that by ‘the third week, though I could think how formerly my stomach would turn against this or that, and I could starve and die before I could eat such things, yet they were sweet and savory to my taste’ (Rowlandson, 2000/1682:147).
dog, and like other victims of such circumstances, were forced to eat food which they
would previously have viewed with distaste or loathing.

A further diminishing of the divide between the British and the indigenous is the result
of the captive’s knowledge of the captor’s language. Learning the language of the captor
is very significant, as it puts the captive in a different position in relation to the Other.
Such skills are the result of prolonged contact, and thus evidence of immersion in
indigenous culture. A number of events in Scurry’s narrative highlight the importance
of linguistic ability and the severity of the consequences of being unable to
communicate should not be underestimated. Scurry suggests that the captives were
unable to defend themselves against untrue allegations, and were beaten, because of
their inability to communicate effectively. Scurry describes one such beating of a
captive in plain terms, ‘He survived it; and we were surprised, for his body was as black
as a coal’ (Scurry, 1824:71). In a footnote, Scurry blames his renegade commander
Captain Dempster for these incidents, and it is clear that Dempster had the ability to
intercede on behalf of the captives, had he wished to do so. It appears that the
linguistically adept Dempster uses his knowledge against the captives, who are helpless
in their ignorance. Perhaps as evidence of how vulnerable Dempster may wish to keep
the captives, Scurry also relates that the group’s ‘interpreter’ was beaten and never seen
again. Furthermore, after their heads are shaved and their ears pierced, the captives
are ‘prohibited from speaking to each other in English’ (Scurry, 1824:74). All language

194 The example he gives of such a beating is actually a punishment for a captive’s
involvement in a physical fight. Scurry notes that William Drake, the unfortunate
captive cited, was beaten ‘for striking one of the slaves that had struck him’ (Scurry,
1824:70).
195 Scurry does not comment on the significance of this in his narrative. Vitkus (2001)
notes that ear piercing was, ‘a mark of a slave who loves his master and renounces his
right to freedom after six years’ labor’ (Vitkus, 2001:157).
at this stage then, including their mother tongue is denied them. However, by their escape, it becomes evident just how adept the captives have become in local languages. As they make their escape, an old man is terrified by their appearance until they speak to him in the ‘Tillingey language’ (Scurry, 1824:189). Using their newfound linguistic skills, the escaped captives persuade the old man to take them to a fort held by Mahrattas (English allies), at some risk to his own life. Once at the fort, their abilities prove useful again when they are in danger of being recaptured. Scurry reports that one of their enemies ‘roared out, in the Canary language to seize and bind us: this they supposed we did not understand’ (Scurry, 1824:191). Moreover, the captives are able to barter with the Killadar, by exchanging information for food. They answer his questions easily, since as Scurry explains, ‘we could all talk Moorish, but learned it not from choice’ (Scurry, 1824:197). It is important to note that the emphasis is on compulsion over desire, in order to separate Scurry and his companions from ‘renegados’ who chose to ‘go native’, and also to consider how the English language was considered a vital component of British national identity.\footnote{The plainness of the English language was linked to the discourse of British masculinity. See Michele Cohen (1996) \textit{Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century}.} If further proof were needed of the usefulness and power acquired along with native language, Scurry points to the example of his friend Lesage from the \textit{Hannibal}, who was killed during a siege when Scurry’s battalion was ordered to regain a fort taken by ‘a banditti of Canaries’ (Scurry, 1824:172). In this case, the importance and usefulness of language goes beyond the individual and becomes a national concern.\footnote{Bohls (1995) discusses Henry Clerval’s role as the ‘quintessential Man of Taste’ Shelley’s \textit{Frankenstein}, who has ambitions to use his study of languages for European colonialism in India.} When lamenting Lesage’s death, Scurry also bemoans the loss of his skills to Britain:
He had made such rapid proficiency in a knowledge of their manners and
customs, that, had he lived, he would have been an honour to his country, and a
rival to Sir William Jones in Asiatic literature (Scurry, 1824:176).

Whilst Scurry highlights the utility of ethnographic knowledge in aid of the colonial and imperial project, there is some distance between the gentleman scholar exemplified by Sir William Jones, and those who gain their knowledge of the Other through captivity and cultural crossover. Even though Snader (2000) sees captivity narratives as attempting to maintain a rigid difference between the Western self and alien Other, he notes that all captives ‘record moments when they failed to resist their captor’s efforts in cultural conversion’ (Snader, 2000:95). Snader investigates the effect of captivity on the captive’s cultural identity, particularly the important role of government and religion in a captive’s sense of self. He points to the fact that many captives were forcibly proselytised, as Scurry describes in his narrative.

Religious conversion:

Snader also suggests that those British captives who admit to religious conversion during their captivity are particularly anxious to prove their loyalty to their country on their return. This was not a phenomenon confined to the period covered by this study. Despite John Rawlins’ narrative (2001) (f.pub.1622) being deeply informed by religion and presenting Christianity in rigid opposition to Islam, when speaking of the conversion of English youths to Islam he must admit the possibility of voluntary

This is also a feature of American narratives, for example, that of James Smith (1799) captive from 1755-59. Smith ‘was careful to assure readers that although he had learned the ways of the Indians and admired their virtues...he retained a sense of his white identity’ (Sayre, 2000:259).
conversion. He describes the physical suffering that captives might be subjected to in order to effect their conversion to Islam, but qualifies this with an observation that some converted voluntarily:

They commonly lay them on their naked backs or bellies, beating them so long until they bleed at the nose and mouth...they strike the teeth out of their heads, pinch them by their tongues, and use many other sorts of tortures to convert them...Others again, I must confess, who never knew any god but their own sensual lusts and pleasures, thought that any religion would serve their turns and so for preferment or wealth very voluntarily renounced their faith and became renegadoes (Rawlins, 2001/1622:102-3).

Those who had made such voluntary lapses would be unwilling to admit to their choices on their return, as Chew suggests:

The general impression in England that Moslems practised forcible conversion was probably founded upon the reports of escaped or ransomed captives who hid under the pleas of compulsion their voluntary lapse from Christianity (Chew cited in Snader, 2000:97).

As Matar comments on earlier captives in North Africa: ‘Writers such as Pitts and Pellow gave lengthy descriptions of torture of which their captors were capable in order to emphasise their own courage (and indirectly justify their conversion to Islam). But the overwhelming evidence shows that North African captors took care of their captives in order to use them for work or to collect their ransom’ (Matar, 2001:16).

Richard Hasleton (2001) (f.pub.1595) represents his firmness in the face of the inducements offered to him to convert to Islam: ‘the king assayed to seduce me with promises of great preferment, saying, if I would serve him and turn Moor, I should want nothing ‘(Hasleton, 2001/1595:89). Hasleton was imprisoned for his continued refusal, and was offered several inducements, including money, a house and land and a wife.
Whilst Snader (2000) argues that religious conversion was largely voluntary on the part of British captives, James Scurry’s narrative (1824) presents an episode of forced circumcision. Tipu Sultan had succeeded his father Hyder Ali, ordering that Scurry and his fellow captives be included amongst his battalions of slaves. Fifteen young boys were selected, including Scurry, presumably as they were considered the most adaptable and useful, and sent to Bangalore where they met other ‘English youths’ similarly chosen. Altogether there were fifty-two boys with ages ranging from twelve to seventeen. However, in their present condition the boys were considered unfit to serve the Mysore state, and the renegade Captain Dempster gave the new captives the unwelcome news that they were to ‘be circumcised, and made Mohammedans of’ (Scurry, 1824:62). Scurry describes being drugged with ‘majum’, a drug made from ‘ganga (or hemp) leaves, milk, ghee, poppy-seeds, flowers of the thorn apple, the powder of nux vomica, and sugar’ (Yule and Burnell, 1996:539). A more detailed recipe of this drug than the one Scurry provides in his narrative is enlightening. Discovering that the drug includes nux vomica, a source of strychnine with its psychological effects, and thorn-apple or ‘datura’ which produces ‘temporary alienation of mind, and violent laughter’ (Yule and Burnell, 1996:298-9), and the situation of the boys as described by Scurry becomes extremely plausible. It certainly explains their uncontrollable laughter which Scurry represents during the procedure, but also explains their helplessness. Yule and Burnell also note a similar episode of ‘majum’ drugging.

The king’s women pointed out to Hasleton that ‘I was much unlike to come to any like preferment in my country’ (Hasleton, 2001/1595:91).

As discussed previously in Chapter 3, p. 164.

Circumcision of British men in Seringapatam at this time was not unusual. Colley estimates three hundred or more received the same attentions as Scurry (Colley, 2002:182).

This entry is under the slightly different form of ‘majoon’.
and circumcision contained in the Mysore prison diary of John Lindsay. Although the experience is not Lindsay’s own, the incident is quoted from a ‘Soldier’s letter’, it is significant that Lindsay relates it in his own captivity narrative. The soldier’s account is extremely similar to Scurry’s:

Our ill-favoured guard brought in a dose of majum each, and obliged us to eat it... a little after sunset the surgeon came, and with him 30 or 40 Caffres, who seized us, and held us fast till the operation (circumcision) was performed (Yule and Burnell, 1996:293).

Once installed in the Mysore forces, Scurry discovers that his new commander is the patriotic Briton’s nightmare - a deserter. He complains:

having Dempster for our commander, was no small mortification to us; knowing him to be a base wretch, and a deserter from the Bengal Artillery (Scurry, 1824:67-8).

Dempster’s lack of patriotism is evidenced by his willing adoption of native dress, and the captives view him with disbelief. He is described as wearing:

a large red turban, and a formidable pair of mustaches... we looked on him with great suspicion and surprise (Scurry, 1824:60).

Scurry’s account of his drugging and circumcision would suggest that it was forced, and he is always keen to present this in opposition to Dempster’s voluntary conversion.

Commenting on circumcision in his appendix to Scurry’s narrative, William Whiteway (1824) observes that the deserter Dempster ‘readily submitted to the condition of their acceptance, and underwent the Mohammedan rite’ (Whiteway, 1824:293). When later remarking on the circumcision of another renegade (Smithy), Whiteway also notes that:

> instead of being considered disgraceful, is deemed honourable, and viewed as a mark of favour towards those on whom the rite is conferred (Whiteway, 1824:347).

Here the language is expressing election rather than force, and shows the anxiety in Britain surrounding circumcision and its meanings. Whiteway further relates that fifteen of Colonel Baillie’s men were circumcised and forced into Dempster’s regiment (Whiteway, 1824:294). Interestingly, it is reported that these proselytised soldiers enjoy a good degree of freedom, as it was thought that they would be loyal to Mysore, following circumcision and the taking of an oath of allegiance. However, the ‘Moorish’ killidare whom Scurry meets during his escape is philosophical about the permanency of any such change, saying, ‘I suppose you will soon lose sight of the Prophet, now’ (Scurry, 1824:202). That such a man doubts the permanence of the captives’ conversion casts doubt on how trusted the captives were, and thus in turn how much freedom the captives would be given. Scurry claims to have relied on the possibility that religious conversion might result in a captive’s greater loyalty to the captor, in order to make his escape. To be allowed the amount of freedom of movement necessary, Scurry and his
fellow captives must convince their commander that their ties to Mysore are too long-standing to be severed, and they do so eloquently, telling him that:

we had long been in the service, and had long eaten the sultan’s salt, (a common expression among the Moors;) that many of us had children, and that we were becoming as themselves (Scurry, 1824:171).\(^{90}\)

In these lines, Scurry articulates the sum of British fears, that a Briton could become detached from his own land and ‘go native’. However, as the killadare’s comments show, captive converts would still be considered suspect, and the narratives suggest that this is rightly so. Colonel Baillie’s men resisted their new role in Dempster’s regiment by acting the part of spies, relaying their observations to Baillie and the other imprisoned officers, culminating in a plan to break the officers out of their prison. The conspiracy came to light when Dempster received a letter alerting him to the planned escape. One can only speculate that one of the converted captives found more benefit in pleasing his new commander Dempster, rather than freeing his former officers. Whilst such captives could not be trusted to be faithful to their new masters, this incident suggests that neither could they be relied upon to maintain loyalty to Britain. Even here in the relation of an incident which attempts to reassure the reader that a forced conversion must mean the retention of an inner core of ‘Britishness’, doubts about the necessity of this surface.\(^{206}\)

\(^{205}\) John Jewitt (1824/1815) states of himself, and fellow captive Thompson, that, ‘our release, and perhaps our lives, depended on our conducting ourselves so as to induce the natives to suppose we were not very anxious to leave them (Jewitt, 1824:204). He tells the chief Maquina that, ‘I had become reconciled to their manner of living, and had no wish to go away’ (Jewitt, 1824/1815:205).

\(^{206}\) Vitkus (2001) discusses the narrative of Joseph Pitts (1704), captive in Algiers and Mecca 1678-94, suggesting that the ‘truth value’ of Joseph Pitts’ narrative is
Renegades:

‘Renegados’ like Dempster, who had successfully crossed over into the alien culture, some gaining high positions, caused great British anxiety. Eliza Fay (1821/1817) was to find herself the captive of a similar character at Calicut in February 1780. The ‘renegado’ Captain Ayres, along with one hundred and fifty sepoys, boarded and captured the Fay’s vessel and the passengers were taken captive. Unfortunately for the Fays, the British Consul had already left Calicut, fearing an outbreak of hostilities with Hyder Ali. Fay describes Ayres’ brutality, reporting that ‘The least punishment inflicted by him was cutting off the noses and ears’ (Fay, 1821/1817:138). This is comparable to accounts given by Scurry of Tipu Sultan’s harsh punitive measures, suggesting that Ayres has become ‘Othered’ in the eyes of fellow Britons, by his willing desertion to Hyder Ali. According to Fay, Captain Ayres, with his ‘thievish countenance’ (Fay, 1821/1817:68) was a former highwayman sentenced to transportation, so it is notable that Ayres was already positioned on the margins of British society. However, Colley (2002) contests this general view of ordinary British soldiers in India as ‘quasi-criminal’ (Colley, 2002:334). Colley also accounts for high white desertion rates by reference to the East India Company’s officers ‘eclectic’ social background. Those in financial straits, she argues, were more likely to turn renegade, as well as those who were very young, when captured. In his additions to Scurry’s narrative, William Whiteway (1824) discusses a man known as ‘Dr Green’, a shady character who managed to make a living complicated by the fact that he became a ‘renegado’ by converting to Islam and attacking Christian ships in the Mediterranean. Pitts states that he offers his account in order to ‘make some manner...of restitution and reparation for my past defection’ (Pitts, 2001/1704:221). He attempts to do this by providing information on the Muslim Other, thus fulfilling a different definition of ‘truth’ to other British captivity narratives in Vitkus’ collection, by emphasising ‘empirical truth and accuracy of information rather than the “revealed truth” of religion’ (Vitkus, 2001:218).
as a quack doctor. Other such characters abound in this narrative, often attempting to
pass themselves off as knowledgeable and therefore useful to the Mysore state. For
example, one Captain White was disgraced for plundering the gunroom whilst his ship
was being captured, and handed over to Haidar Ali by the Count de Suffren. In order to
improve his situation, White claimed knowledge of ‘the art of casting cannon’
(Whiteway, 1824:342). In this narrative at least, perhaps there is a suggestion that
such renegades are from low social stock, for example, Whiteway describes an
Englishman who rises from humble soldiery, and through his ‘ingenuity’, learns how to
cast money (Whiteway, 1824:345). James Smithy, renegade commander of William
Whiteway’s battalion, has a darker past, as Whiteway admits:

While in the Carnatic, he was guilty of a crime towards a female; to avoid the
consequences of which, he deserted, and joined Hyder Ali (Whiteway,
1824:346).

Although Whiteway claims to have received ‘parental’ treatment from Smithy, the
narrative reveals Smithy’s serious personal failings. According to Whiteway, during his
time in the British army, Smithy learned herbal remedies and some basic surgery. On
the accession of Tipu Sultan, Smithy was promoted, and as his reputation grew he was
called upon to attend a woman taken ill in Tipu Sultan’s seraglio. The woman’s

---

907 Eventually White died ‘at the Old Baillie, for forging seamen’s wills’ (Whiteway,
1824:345).

908 This euphemistic expression suggests that the crime was rape. Whiteway later
mentions that ‘Dr Green’ was also involved in this incident ‘in which he partook, if was
not the projector’ (Whiteway, 1824:360).
recovery prompted Tipu Sultan to appoint Smithy his chief physician to the seraglio.\textsuperscript{209}

Whiteway describes the conclusion of this adventure, stating that:

\begin{quote}
This, however, was a dangerous situation for a man of his character, and...presented temptations he was unable to resist (Whiteway, 1824:350).
\end{quote}

By elaborating on the strict guard surrounding the women, Whiteway panders to European fascination with the rules of the seraglio, presenting a standard description:\textsuperscript{210}

the ladies, in these splendid prisons, are watched with the utmost circumspection, and concealed from the gaze of vulgar eyes. Even in the presence of the physician they appear hooded, and...nothing may be done but in the presence of a eunuch (Whiteway, 1824:350-1).

Despite these limitations, the incorrigible Smithy persuades one of Tipu Sultan’s women to escape with him. She lives with him in such seclusion that neighbours are unaware of her presence until she ‘indiscreetly’ screams during her labour and the whole affair is discovered. It is presumed that the woman is put to death for her crime, and Smithy is sent to the ‘Rock of Death’ at Nairandroog. However, he escapes by drugging his guards and his shady past is seemingly erased when he meets the British

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{209} Pratt (1992) notes the importance of Western medicine at this time, in ‘the Islamic world in particular, whose rulers often summoned European physicians to tend them (Pratt, 1992:83). The representation of Tipu Sultan’s belief in Smithy’s abilities is an example of the assumption of British guile over ‘native’ naivety.  
\textsuperscript{210} For discussion of the seraglio in Western imagination see Ruth Yeazell (2000) Harems of the Mind.
\end{flushright}
officer Captain Little, who finds Smithy ‘intelligent, and capable of giving much information respecting the strength and condition of the enemy’ (Whiteway, 1824:353-4). Here then, the renegade is accepted back into the fold on the basis of his knowledge of the Other. However, the flow of knowledge could go both ways, and those who ‘went native’ were a source of anxiety to patriotic Britons. Whilst there were those who defected to other European powers, the greatest anxiety was caused by the possibility of desertion to Indian regimes, as the renegade could give away this type of valuable knowledge. As Colley (2002) suggests:

He might...transmit to new, indigenous paymasters British military knowledge, information about emerging technologies, and superior conventions of leadership and discipline (Colley, 2002:320).

The type of incidents represented in Scurry’s narrative raise the possibility that ‘going native’ may have brought the prospect of a better life for those from lower classes.

---

91 The same officer who assisted James Scurry and his companions on their escape from the Mysore forces.

919 The American captive James Smith (2000) states in the preface to his 1799 narrative that, ‘The principal advantage that I expect will result to the public, from the publication of the following sheets, is the observations on the Indian mode of warfare’ as, he surmises, ‘the better we shall be able to defend ourselves against them’ (Smith, 2000/1799:263).

910 Similarly, Taylor suggests that for some of the Grosvenor castaways, Africa became ‘a world in which they were self-sufficient...finding a life that held its own pleasures and freedoms’ (Taylor, 2004:125). When a seaman from the Grosvenor decided to take his chances with the local tribe rather than remain with his fellow British shipwreck victims he was considered ‘disturbed in his mind’ (Taylor, 2004:93), but he was not alone in joining the indigenous inhabitants. Another survivor of the Grosvenor wreck, William Habberley, was saved from death and malnutrition by the Xhosa tribe and began to adapt to life amongst them including learning some of their language. However, Habberley did not stop thinking of his return to Britain. In contrast, the Irishman Lewis found his new life idyllic compared to the hardships of life at sea, and had to be earnestly persuaded to leave. Despite his evident desire to return to Britain,
Scurry’s narrative (1824) reveals that many Britons were willing to ‘go native’ for personal gain, and that some captives might not necessarily feel that their situation was pitiable is evidenced in William Whiteway additions (1824) to Scurry’s narrative. Whiteway was a cabin boy and reports his access to education, his respect for his teachers and his overall happiness in Mysore. Whiteway presents his experience in positive terms, and the displacement caused by shipwreck and/or captivity could result in an improvement in circumstances for those from lower classes. He describes his experience in India thus:

I was about fourteen, the oldest of the English boys; and, under the command of two officers, my countrymen, I was as happy as I could wish. I wanted for nothing, enjoyed good health, and was beloved by all (Whiteway, 1824:348).

Colley speculates that such unalloyed happiness may not have been the whole truth, but for the purposes of this thesis, the representation of Whiteway as happy to ‘go native’ is the significant point. Such representations reveal the ambivalent relation of captives to colonial discourse, with its emphasis on the superiority of British culture denied by the possibility of ‘going native’. However, Whiteway also represents the education even the more taciturn Habberley admitted to strong emotions on leaving the tribe, even relating that he cried on his departure (Taylor, 2004:164).

214 Matar notes that Thomas Smith, captive in Algiers, refers to ‘the happy time of my slavery’ (Matar, 2001:19). Joseph Pitts (2001/1704) points to Biblical precedent in Genesis, where Joseph is sold into Egyptian slavery by his brothers but thrives in his enslaved state (Pitts, 2001/1704:271).

215 When William Okeley, captive in Algiers 1639-44, found himself exchanged into the hands of a new master there is much improvement in his situation, as he states, ‘I found not only pity and compassion but love and friendship from my new patron. Had I been his son, I could not have met with more respect or been treated with more tenderness’ (Okeley, 2001/1675:168). However, ‘he might die and leave me to another or live to sell me to another who might be of another character’ (Okeley, 2001/1675:171).
provided for the British boys as evidence of British merit. As the editor of Scurry’s narrative explains:

For some time he was put to school, and every method was adopted to detach him from his native country (Scurry, 1824:274).

Although the British boys are clearly intended to become incorporated into the Mysore state, initially they are hindered by their lack of knowledge of indigenous language and the Indian rulers are as sure of the importance of education in the service of their country as any British patrician. Whiteway relates that he and other British boys were schooled for two years ‘in Mahratta learning, and in Arabic, as preparatory to acquiring some knowledge of the Persian language’ (Whiteway, 1824:355). There is a suggestion of British mental, as well as military superiority here, as Whiteway explains that Tipu’s interest in their education was in the hope of:

...deriving], from their particular mental powers, advantages that might enable him to contend with a foreign foe, whose military array wore a menacing aspect (Whiteway, 1824:358).

Snader (2000) points out that during the 1790s, Native American adoption plots were popular in the British imagination. Native adoption was seen as a reinforcement of obvious British merit, as Snader explains: ‘the novels rarely clarify the cultural logic behind the custom and instead treat it as an inexplicable vagary of native character’ (Snader, 2000:175).

Indeed, according to Whiteway, Tipu Sultan considers Europeans educated in certain areas are considered a potential national resource for the taking. He carefully nurtures European artists: ‘spar[ing] no pains to elicit their natural abilities, and to extinguish in their breasts all attachment to their native home’ (Whiteway, 1824:358).
His representation of the assumption of the superiority of British intelligence over that of captors is evidence of the ambivalence of colonial discourse. Thus, Whiteway’s narrative shows how colonial discourse included the assumption of British superiority over Others, but also how ‘going native’ destabilised this binary opposition, and Whiteway’s willingness to embrace his life as a Muslim means that his testimony occupies an equivocal position.

Escape and Return:

The extent to which those captives who returned to Britain appeared to be altered by their proximity to the Other, puts them an ambiguous relation to the notional fixity of British national identity. According to Snader (2000), many narratives reveal a tension between the altered exterior, through markers such as clothes or speech, and the supposedly unalterable, internal cultural identity of the captive. The opening of Scurry’s narrative (1824) shows an engraving of him wearing European dress, a circumstance that seems unremarkable until the reader encounters descriptions of the captive on his return to Britain. According to information collected by the editor from Scurry’s widow and son and presented in the ‘Supplementary Chapter’ to Scurry’s narrative, when Scurry and his fellow captives returned to London in 1793, crowds of boys followed them, attracted by ‘the singularity of their dress, their manners, and their colour’ (Scurry, 1824:251). This outlandish appearance was something that the captives shocked fellow Britons with whilst still in India. On meeting the servant of the British officer Dr Little, into whose protection the newly escaped captives fall, his surprise at their appearance matches the captives’ initial reaction to the renegade Captain Dempster. Scurry relates that he:
had never seen such a sight before. We were in Tippoo’s full uniform...blue turbans on iron hoops, tiger jackets, with a camel over our shoulders and tied around our loins, mustaches nearly reaching our ears (Scurry, 1824:205).

For many captives, the combined physical effects of cultural crossing, such as clothing, imprints of torture on the body, emaciation and darkened skin, mean that fellow Europeans do not recognise the captive as their own. Sayre discusses the example of John Tanner, who was mistaken for one of the colonists who had willingly adapted to the Native American way of life, and whose own brother did not recognise him (Sayre, 2000:14). Such obvious outward transformations inevitably impact on the captive’s reception and reintegration into their own society. Joseph Dupuis, British Vice-Consul at Mogadore, gives the following description of Robert Adams (1816), following Adams’ captivity in Africa. It shows many similarities to that of the returned Scurry:

The appearance, features and dress of this man upon his arrival at Mogadore, so perfectly resembled those of an Arab, or rather of a Shilluh, his head being shaved, and his beard scanty and black, that I had difficulty at first believing him to be a Christian (Adams, 1816:xxiii-xxiv).

Furthermore, both Scurry and Adams shared a loss of the ability to communicate effectively in their native language. As Dupuis says of Adams:

218 Thomas Phelps’ narrative (2001)(f.pub. 1685) shows how on his escape he claims that he could pass for a local: ‘the Moors also saw us but said nothing, mistaking us for their countrymen’ (Phelps, 2001/1685:209).
When I spoke to him in English, he answered me in a mixture of Arabic and broken English, and sometimes in Arabic only (Adams, 1816:xxiii-xxiv).  

In Scurry’s case, the physical effects of his captivity are amply illustrated, as even his own mother fails to recognise him. Furthermore, the changes are reported to go beyond appearance alone, and the editor of the narrative represents Scurry’s unwillingness to adopt Western manners on his return to Britain. The editor provides this description of Scurry’s behaviour on his return to Britain:

From his long confinement in India, and his involuntary conformity to Asiatic manners, he had nearly forgotten the customs of his early years, and the delicate refinements of his native land. To the wearing of English clothes he felt the greatest aversion...Of a knife and fork he had almost lost the use...His language was broken and confused...His body was disfigured with scars; and his skin was likewise so deeply tinged...that it was only a few shades removed from black...These combined peculiarities...brought upon him many an eager gaze (Scurry, 1824:253-4).

Descriptions of this type are evidence of how much a captive might be altered by proximity to the Other, particularly following an extended captivity. Despite his very obvious immersion in indigenous culture, one might wonder why Scurry, who was

219 It should be noted that it is not just exposure to an alien culture which could effect this type of transformation, merely removal from one’s own. Alexander Selkirk was marooned alone for four years and four months and in that time his rescuers found that, ‘He had so much forgot his Language through want of Use, that we could scarce understand him’ (Souhami, 2002:127). Selkirk also found the European food and drink given to him unpalatable, and that the clothes and shoes provided by his rescuers were constricting and uncomfortable.
captive from 1782 until 1793 did not attempt to escape before a decade had elapsed. Although Scurry’s extreme youth and his passivity in the text may be related, as Colley (2002) comments on captives’ situation in Mysore:

One of the reasons why few British POWs in Mysore in the early 1780s attempted to escape was because it was desperately unclear to them at this stage where exactly they should try to escape to (Colley, 2002:283).

Accordingly, Scurry made no escape attempts until Bengalore had been taken by Cornwallis, and he had himself witnessed the progress of the Mahratta forces whilst opposing them on behalf of Tipu Sultan. The first escape attempt proved abortive as two of Scurry’s group were wounded in fighting prior to the planned escape, with no further opportunity presenting itself for three months. A second attempt was also foiled, but finally at the third attempt, the captives escaped into the jungle during a march to Chitteldroog. Scurry escaped just before Tipu Sultan ‘unconditionally liberated’ all prisoners (Scurry, 1824:213), however a footnote states that only those who escaped regained their liberty. An article in the Gentleman’s Magazine, itself taken from the India Gazette February 4th 1793, reports on the escape of a Mr Becher from Seringapatam, and using Becher’s evidence makes the following statement:

Notwithstanding Tippoo’s repeated declarations that he had no more English prisoners in his possession, it is now evident, that all those declarations have been insincere (August 1793, vol.lxiii, p.758).
On the 18th May 1792 the London Gazette published accounts of two hundred Britons remaining in Mysore, using information from recent escapees like Scurry who had made contact with Cornwallis’ advancing armies. Over sixty were listed under their new Muslim names as well as their British identities. Most of these men, like Scurry, had not been in prison but in paid employment in Mysore. Company archives show that officials were aware of cases such as Scurry’s where captives wore Indian dress, had taken Indian wives, and ‘forgotten their cradle tongue’ (Colley, 2002:320).

Conclusions:

As this chapter has shown, the representation of captives ‘going native’ through the transformation of their physical appearance, religious conversion, and their adoption of indigenous habits would have been troubling to the British metropolitan reader, since it troubles the notion of a natural British superiority. The representation of British captives taking non-European wives, and fathering non-European children, as the ultimate cultural crossing, was most ambivalent of all, as the narratives of John Jewitt and James Scurry show. Moreover, representations in the narratives of those who were not captive and voluntarily ‘went native’ further complicates the assumption of British national superiority. Despite the knowledge of the Other gained by the returned captive, contemporary Britons would have found the possibility of ‘going native’ repugnant, and there remain today critics who prefer to see captivity narratives as a form of reassurance for the reader in the imperial centre. Snader (2000) concludes that captivity narratives are used as:

Scurry reveals that he is known by his ‘Moorish name, Shum Shu Cawn’ (Scurry, 1824:179).
a means of raising and finally rejecting the possibility that captives or other
European travelers might abandon civility and redefine themselves within the
terms of alien cultures (Snader, 2000:5).

However, this thesis argues that captivity narratives cannot be viewed as a safe site in
this way. Although the captive returns, his/her narrative is evidence of the blurring of
the distinction between self and Other, the possibility of ‘going native’ and thus the
ambivalence of colonial discourse in the narratives.
Conclusions:

In *Captives*, Colley disagrees with Pratt’s (1992) assessment that ‘survival literature’, a category in which Pratt includes captivity narratives, is a ‘safe’ site for the representation of vulnerable Britons. Colley argues that the captivity narratives she examines are evidence of the partiality of imperialist histories, revealing the troubled progress of British imperialism and colonialism that has been ignored by conventional accounts. Dalrymple (2002) too highlights omissions made from imperialist histories, but also points to another lack in the study of British imperialism. Dalrymple suggests that postcolonial theorists, being too ready to follow Said’s *Orientalism* (1995), also fail to take account of the complexity of colonial relations, and the fluidity of national and ethnic boundaries. This thesis attempts to address this observation, by analysing the way in which captivity narratives relate to colonial discourse. Within colonial discourse, Bhabha (1994) suggests that the colonised subject is ‘ambivalent’ - that the distance between coloniser and colonised is reduced by the strategies the coloniser adopts to make the colonised understandable in Western terms. At the same time, in order to preserve the distance between coloniser and colonised, the coloniser must represent difference. Thus, Bhabha argues that colonial discourse is always ambivalent, and that ‘Othering’ involves both desire and repulsion. According to Bhabha, colonial discourse will always be ambivalent because it wishes to create colonised subjects receptive to its culture and values, colonial subjects who will ‘mimic’ the coloniser. However, ‘mimicry’ will never reflect the coloniser exactly, thus there will always be difference. This destabilises the authority of colonial discourse, when ‘mimicry’ turns to ‘menace’, as the colonial subject’s mimicry threatens to become mockery. What this means for this thesis is that when reading texts such as the captivity narratives under discussion,
one must be mindful of the fact that although they may contain examples of ‘Othering’ of the type identified by Said, the ambivalent nature of colonial discourse means that there will be different representations of the relation between self and Other, as captive narratives negotiate the textual constraints created and maintained by colonial discourse.

My first chapter in this thesis discussed various complicating factors in the relation of captivity narratives to ‘truth’. These included issues such as reticence due to the desire to protect reputations, memory, and the translation of indigenous language by captives with varying levels of understanding. I also took a theoretical view of the nature of ‘reality’, by questioning the relation of narrative to ‘reality’, and the relation of the author to the ‘I’ of the text. Narrativisation constructs a select version of events, which suggest the ‘reality’ of the author’s biography by denying this process of selection. However, Foucauldian discourse theory proposes that the author is not free to express the ‘truth’ of his/her experience, but rather that the author must negotiate discursive constraints upon writing which limit what may be said within a particular discourse.

By tracing the historical development of the discourses of ‘fact’ and ‘fiction’ into the poles they are perceived as today, I established that contemporary readers were beginning to distinguish between fact and fiction in their generic expectations, and that the captivity narrative, along with other travel writing, was particularly concerned with authentification. This was in part because of the claims made by captive narrators and their editors for the ethnographic utility of their narratives due to the captive’s knowledge of the Other. However, this knowledge is attained by the captive’s dangerous proximity to the Other, through the captive’s immersion in indigenous culture. Thus the national identity of the British captive, and his/her relation to
discourses of British superiority is destabilised. Because of this, captive narrators made recourse to devices such as the prefatory apology for the ‘plain style’ that was seen as indicative of authority. Pratt (1992) contends that debates surrounding the style of the narration in such texts were more to do with the relative social status of captives and their editors, rather than the authority of the text. She suggests that both the foregrounded narrator of a sentimental mode, and the self-effacing narrator of the ‘scientific’ style, were equally the products of the same impulse to represent an innocent European presence in indigenous lands. According to Pratt, the foregrounded narrator achieved this apparently disinterested position through the representation of vulnerability. However, Pratt’s argument does not account for the ambivalence of colonial discourse. Both the level of vulnerability presented in the text, as well as the involvement of the captive in indigenous culture mean that s/he holds an ambivalent relation to colonial discourse with its assumption of British national superiority. Thus, I argued, captivity narratives are not a ‘safe’ site.

My second chapter examined the discourses of ‘savagery’ and ‘civilisation’ within the narratives, as these were fundamental to views of Britain as superior to her Others. My discussion centred on showing how these discourses were ambivalent, and exemplifying this through analysis of the captivity narratives under discussion. The work of Peter Hulme (1992) on the discourses of ‘Carib savagery’ and ‘Oriental civilisation’ shows this ambivalence present in colonial discourse. Hulme argues that the Western attribution of savagery or civilisation to different countries resulted in very different representations of those locations. This ambivalence is also seen in Bongie’s (1991) explanation of the ‘exotic’. The discourse of the exotic suggests that civilisation has a corrupting influence, and that the exotic thus becomes a refuge from the negative effects
of civilisation. Bongie characterises this strand of the exotic as ‘exoticising’ exoticism. At the same time, a second strand of the exotic, or ‘imperialist exoticism’, upholds the conventional view of national hierarchies. Also becoming current at this time, the discourse of ‘scientific racism’ similarly concerned itself with the relative position of cultures, and the hierarchical scale of the ‘chain of being’ depended on an assessment of each culture’s relative civilisation. The educated, European male was at the pinnacle of this scale, which descended to Africans, feminised and childlike, at its base. Despite the lowly position of so-called ‘savage’ societies on this scale, there are representations in the texts under discussion of the ‘noble savage’, an idealised notion of an individual whose society has been uncorrupted by negative effects of civilisation. These are not fixed representations however, as ‘savages’ are still represented as inferior to Britons in the narratives.

In the case of those cultures to which civilisation was attributed, such as the Islamic East, colonial discourse is equally ambivalent. Although the East is represented as having certain similarities with the West, ‘savagery’ is imputed through the suggestion that an excess of civilisation results in corruption and despotism. This is exemplified in the narratives by the representation of Mysore rulers Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan. Whilst the narratives represent British constitutional superiority over a despotic East, they also show this same assumption of superiority over ‘primitive’ societies. However, the ambivalence of colonial discourse is again evident, where the narratives represent British colonial culpability. The constitutionally enshrined freedoms of the domestic British subject do not extend to the subjects of distant territories, and thus Britain is represented in the narratives as despotic in its colonial endeavours. Although British narrators represent themselves as more civilised than their European rivals in the
business of colonial expansion, there are also examples of Europeans, including the
British, being represented negatively in these terms. In addition, there are
representations of the treatment of Britons at the hands of fellow Europeans which
question their civilisation relative to so-called ‘savage’ societies. Thus, this chapter
argued that colonial discourse is ambivalent in its representation of savagery and
civilisation, and that this is evidenced in the narratives under discussion. Whilst captive
narrators must represent the ‘savagery’ of their captors and thus, by extension their own
superior civilisation, this is problematised by the representation of British vulnerability
at the hands of Others. Thus, this ambivalence in the representations of captive
narrators, as they negotiate textual constraints, is evidence of the unsettling of the
authority of colonial discourse. The unsettling of this authority renders captivity
narratives an unsafe site for the representation of British vulnerability.

My third chapter, entitled ‘Power and Colonial Captivity’, focussed on the ways in
which captives represent their vulnerability at the hands of Others. This chapter began
by summarising a Foucauldian theorising of power relations in order to inform the view
of power relations in the captivity narratives under discussion, and also because of the
role of Foucault’s work in later colonial discourse analysis. Following this, I presented
an overview of ‘Othering’ defined in Said’s Orientalism (1995), along with some
criticisms of Said’s work, highlighting possible limitations of Said’s position for this
thesis. Mary Louise Pratt’s Imperial Eyes (1992) was discussed as a development of
Said’s work, in particular her analysis of the ‘contact zone’ as the site of
‘transculturation’. Pratt argues that the Western view of its Others is affected by those
others, through the impossibility of maintaining rigid distinctions between self and
Other in the contact zone. Pratt’s work was also used in order to elucidate the
examination of the captive’s relation to discourses of ‘scientific’ knowledge. Here I also reviewed the work of Snader (2000), who analyses the discourse of ethnology, and that of Bohls (1995), who considers the discourse of aesthetics, in order to further the discussion of ‘scientific’ knowledges as the preserve of the educated, European male. This chapter then turned to the captivity narratives under discussion, beginning by analysing the representation of physical suffering as clear evidence of captive vulnerability. The analysis then turned to representations of captive passivity, and the way in which this relates to the discourse of British masculinity. The representation of James Scurry’s (1824) circumcision was particularly pertinent to this debate. The discourse of British masculinity is also linked to the emotional reticence that the captivity narratives under discussion generally share as a feature. In further instances of captive vulnerability, I considered representations of the reversal of ‘the gaze’ in the narratives. The gaze is conceived of as the privilege of the educated, European male, and certainly Others are excluded from this. Lower class British males made claims to this position by their use of ethnographic and geographic observation in their accounts, although they hold an ambivalent relation to such discourses, which assume social as well as national hierarchies. Analysis of the narratives revealed an uncomfortable reversal of the convention of the gaze, which disturbs the relation of the captives to discourses of national superiority when they become the object of the fascination of Others. The final section of this chapter considered the effect of social class on the representations of vulnerability made by captive narrators. Representation of the vulnerability of the upper-class, British captive is problematised by his/her high-ranking position in the chain of being in relation to the Other. Also troubling to social hierarchies are representations of the democratisation, or even reversal of classes, in extreme circumstances such as those engendered by shipwreck. In conclusion, this
chapter related the ambivalence of colonial discourse to representations of British vulnerability and suffering at the hands of Others. Like Chapter 2, this chapter argued overall that the ambivalence of colonial discourse in evidence in the captivity narratives under discussion, means that the narratives cannot be considered a ‘safe’ site for the representation of British vulnerability.

In my fourth and final chapter, ‘Going Native’, I discussed the ways in which the narratives reveal ambivalent views of both self and Other. In this chapter I first discussed the fluidity of the boundaries between the coloniser and the colonised, by highlighting Dalymple’s (2002) study of Hyderabadi society during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. After discussion of William Hickey’s relations with indigenous women represented in his memoirs, used in order to illustrate something of contemporary views on this subject, I then moved to analysis of the captivity narratives, focussing first on the representation of sexual relationships and marriage within the confines of the captive situation. The narratives of James Scurry (1824) and John Jewitt (1824/1815) were of particular interest in this section as both represent their marriages to indigenous women. Discussion in this section centred on the representation of compulsion and desire in these relationships, and showed how the narratives of both captives represent ambivalent views of their ‘native’ wives and the marriage process.

The chapter then moved on to discussion of cultural markers and the national identity of the captive. In this section I argued that the captive’s adoption of local dress, customs, and language puts the captive into an ambivalent relation to colonial discourse. In discussion of the representation of religious conversion in the narratives, I suggested that religious conversion is a clear threat to the fixity of British national identity, and
that, as a result, captives who admit to conversion might be more anxious to prove their loyalty. This in turn affects the representations made by such captives. I also note the separation emphasised in the narratives between the captive and those who voluntarily cross over to indigenous culture, through the representation of renegades. I ended this chapter by questioning the status of the returned captive in relation to colonial discourse. On the one hand, the ethnographic and other ‘scientific’ observations s/he has amassed during the captivity may be considered as supporting the authority of colonial discourse. However, the possibility of ‘going native’, and its representation in the narratives, shows the ambivalence of colonial discourse through both the vulnerability of the captive and the potential allure of ‘native’ life.

Thus overall this thesis has made two original contributions to knowledge. Firstly, I have shown that representations of British vulnerability at the hands of Others in the captivity narratives under discussion reveal the ambivalence of colonial discourse. As this ambivalence unsettles the authority of colonial discourse, it cannot be argued that such representations of British vulnerability have been made in a ‘safe’ site, since this argument relies on the notion of colonial discourse as hegemonic. Secondly, I have contributed to knowledge in the field through analysing little known texts, particularly those of James Scurry (1824) and George Buchan (1820), which are not generally available outside the Corvey collection or the British library’s rare books, and bringing them to the attention of researchers in the field.
Implications:

The main implication of this thesis is that critics in the field of colonial discourse analysis could benefit from paying attention to the notion of ambivalence, and thus recognising that texts can do more than straightforwardly uphold or challenge colonial discourse. Perhaps in the past critics have chosen to analyse texts which exemplify their argument about colonial domination and Othering. The focus of this thesis on texts such as captivity narratives has shown that there exist texts within colonial discourse which do not so neatly uphold arguments about British imperial domination. A related implication to this, is that colonial discourse analysis needs to examine more ambivalent texts in order to understand the complexity of colonial discourse.

Further research:

The interesting findings of this thesis suggest the need for further investigation of the type of narrative examined in this study. The Corvey travel archive holds forty-two narratives about 'shipwreck and pirates'. The mere grouping together of these two categories as a sub-genre suggests the need for further research. As this work is done, the editing of such narratives to make them more accessible to other scholars is also necessary. The Corvey archive might also be used to answer the question of whether the enormously varied volumes of the belles-lettres collection hold further instances of the type exemplified by Barbara Hofland's *The Captives in India* (1834), which features Eliza Fay’s narrative. Although this study is limited to narratives of British captives, the removal of this criteria would open up examination of Romantic era captivity narratives.
published on the Continent. To move outside the period designated in this study, there is further work to be done in relation to narratives from the later British narratives of high imperialism.

Thus, this thesis has suggested a way forward for colonial discourse analysis, postcolonial analysis, and for the study of other texts of the Romantic period.
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