

Chapter Three

Authors

There was once a time when Captain James Cook, as an officer of the Royal Navy, navigated ships from Britain to the South Seas and around the world. The journals arising from those navigations are often understood to connect back to his experiences during these voyages. For some people, there is an ideal association in which the author, the voyages, the journals and the books are all placed in a causal sequence through which the reader can more or less directly access Cook's navigational and authorial activities. Yet Cook's connection to his voyages has been the cause of some controversies, which turn on basic points concerning the nature of writing, of knowledge, and of the world. *How* Cook is imagined and how this image is related to the texts that bear his name have a profound impact on how the world he describes is understood. And therefore also on the specific articulations of the world as a terrain for economic, moral, and political activity. Thus, how we understand what Cook was doing, as both navigator and author, will affect how we understand the forms through which knowledge of the places of the world are organized.

There is an extensive and varied literature on how the concept of the author should be understood. Debates have focused on the author's relationship to the meaning of the text. Some writers have based what the text means on the author's intentions. Others have reduced the author's control of the meaning in favour of either a close reading of the text as such, or a move to something outside of the text (whether to historical events, modes of production, structures of language, or the responses of the reader) which decide what the text means. Writers such as Michel Foucault would be

interested less in Cook's biography and more in how the idea of Cook functions in relation to the text. His skepticism will be useful here. Foucault writes,

the author is not an indefinite source of significations which fill a work; the author does not precede the work; he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one limits, excludes, and chooses; in short, by which one impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction.¹

The same can be said of authors who write non-fiction. What we will be interested in, therefore, is the way that Cook becomes someone who is invoked to organize different discourses about the world. Foucault continues:

The author function is therefore characteristic of the mode of existence, circulation, and functioning of certain discourses within a society.²

One important conclusion that Foucault draws in his discussion is that the account of authorship is intimately tied to different ways of constituting truth. He writes, for instance, that

those texts that we now would call scientific — those dealing with cosmology and the heavens, medicine and illnesses, natural sciences and geography — were accepted in the Middle Ages, and accepted as “true,” only when marked with the name of their author. “Hippocrates said,” “Pliny recounts,” were not really formulas of an argument based on authority; they were the markers inserted in the discourses that were supposed to be received as statements of demonstrated truth.³

The voyages are not simply the printed repository of facts about the world, they are also models about how the world should be known. And in this model, Cook is articulated as the ideal observer. As a result, in considering the articulations of place in Cook's voyages, it is important to first consider the functions that Cook as an author plays in relationship to the text.

¹ Foucault, “What is an Author?”, page 119.

² Foucault, “What is an Author?”, page 108.

³ Foucault, “What is an Author?”, page 109.

Obviously, as the voice in the text, Cook ties the text together into a single, coherent narrative. Through three voyages, and over 10 years of travel, Cook's voice describes, discusses, and analyzes places, peoples, and issues throughout the world. The focus on a single author increases the coherence with which the places of the world can be accounted for. For this reason, the coherence of the author helps establish the coherence of a particular way of understanding the world. Through three voyages, the single authorial perspective persists.

One of the features typical to novels, according to Todorov, is the presence of many voices in the text. There are a wide range of characters who interact throughout the novel, giving a much greater sense of a dialog than occurs, say, with a scientific treatise. In the printed account of Cook's voyages, there are also many voices. However, these voices are related and organized by the first person voice of Cook, who becomes the sovereign centre around which the other voices are collected, quoted, organized, spoken to and judged. The drama of the voyages, it should be emphasized, is the drama of knowledge. As the journals progress, the reader is offered a history of Cook's own engagements with both the world and the previous texts that described the world. He appeals to grids in which he narrates his wanderings through time and space, discovering for himself not only discrete knowable objects, but also how it is possible to know anything. As the narrator of the voyage, Cook is fashioned into an ideal of the rational surveyor, someone who is able to enter into dialog with alternate accounts (written, verbal) but who retains the capacity to finally judge the truth.

But Cook does not simply present a true account of the world; he also narrates the process by which he arrives at that account. The reader is encouraged to identify with this process. Susan Stewart has noted that with the rise of the novel in the 18th century,

a new process of reading evolves from this new form of realism, a reading which gives the reader the status of a character. The reader comes to “identify with” the position of Tom Jones, Pamela, Joseph Andrews, with the “proper name” and not with a lesson, a signified.⁴

In the same way, readers are encouraged to identify with particular characters in the voyages, such as Banks, Anderson and most importantly Cook himself. It is through these characters that the reader is given not only a particular description of the world, but a sense of how proper descriptions of the world ought to be created. As both the author and subject of the voyages, therefore, Cook encourages the readers to see the world through his eyes. At the very least we become his confidants.

1. The Author and the Book

But the relationship between the reader and Cook’s authorial voice is far from automatic. To create Cook in the text, books had to be produced, characters had to be described, and readers had to be properly oriented in relation to both authors and texts. How Cook is created as the author of his voyages is thus important, insofar as the presentation of his character shows how a particular world view was both created and justified.

Whatever the printed texts may suggest, the creation of the official printed versions of Cook’s voyages was complicated and often controversial. As the captain, Cook wrote the entries in the ship’s official journals. The preparation of the journals for the press, however, was a considerable intellectual, technical, and institutional process stretching over many years. In this process, Cook was only one of many people involved, and he was often absent at crucial stages of the production. Thus, even though Cook is the voice of the narrator *within* the journals, there is good reason to suspect

⁴ Stewart, *On Longing*, page 4.

any direct connection between Cook the author, Cook the narrator and Cook the source of the text.

In the first voyage, the manuscript journals kept by the people on board the *Endeavour* were collected together by Cook as the ship returned to England, and they were handed over to the Admiralty. According to the Admiralty's version of the voyages:

in the morning of the 30th [of September, 1770,] I took into my possession the log-book and journals, at least all I could find, of the officers, petty officers, and seamen, and enjoined them secrecy with respect to where they had been.⁵

While there may be an element of administrative secrecy in Cook's acquisition of these journals, the control over the texts was also connected to another project. The journals were eventually given to John Hawkesworth, a professional writer in London, to produce a single narrative of the voyage for publication. Hawkesworth had been paid a fortune, over £6000, to produce the collection.⁶

Hawkesworth's account of this voyage was first published as part of a compilation which included the earlier voyages of Byron, Wallis, and Carteret, who also had sailed into the South Pacific. The full title, suggesting the larger project of which Cook was the final part, was: *An Account of the Voyages Undertaken by the Order of His Present Majesty for Making*

⁵ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume II, page 281. Throughout the dissertation, references to the admiralty edition of Cook's *Voyages* will take the form "Admiralty, *Voyages*", where Volumes I and II contain the account of the first voyage, Volumes III and IV the second, and Volumes V, VI and VII the third. The edition used here is the 1821 reprint, published by Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown. References to other editions of the voyages will specify the editor and the title, such as "Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*". As will become evident, there are assumptions embedded in these citation practices.

⁶ The amount Hawkesworth was paid is discussed in Beaglehole introduction to *Cook's Journals*, Volume I, page xlv.

Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere, and Successively Performed by Commodore Byron, Captain Wallis, and Captain Carteret and Captain Cook, in the Dolphin, the Swallow and the Endeavour. The unity of the collection is emphasized by the institutional connection between the captains, the Admiralty, and king George III, on whose sovereign authority the voyages were undertaken. It is important to note that, when first published, Cook's voyage was not described as Cook's "first voyage." Cook's voyage was the second and third volumes of the set, and no other voyages were planned for him at that time. It was only later, after Cook's death, that the texts were rearranged so that Cook's three voyages were re-titled and published together as a single collection, while the voyages of Byron, Wallis and Carteret slipped into obscurity.⁷

For the published account of the first voyage, Cook is the captain of the *Endeavour*, but the connection between the captain's journal and the published account is complex. The text that was written by Cook in the ship's journals was clearly important in the final work. However, Hawkesworth's *Account* also includes texts from other journals and his own comments. Yet, while the sources of the published account were numerous and intermixed, the text is nonetheless held together by Cook's narrating voice. Information that Hawkesworth derived from other journals (and Joseph Banks's in particular) are typically transformed into Cook's own voice, so that the account is a single, unbroken narrative.

Hawkesworth's rendition of the first voyage resulted in perhaps the most vitriolic attack on an editor in English history. He was criticized by navigators for inaccuracies and poor organization of the geographical

⁷ They were still published from time to time, but only in much larger compilations such as Pinkerton's *A general collection of the best and most interesting voyages and travels in all parts of the world*, published in 1808, and William Kerr's *A General History and Collection of Voyages*, published in 1814 and 1815.

information. He was criticized by people in the reading public for making the narrative too boring by including too much technical information (coordinates, tides, weather patterns). He was criticized for writing with “balanced periods, turgid ornaments, and becoming sentiments” that did not capture Cook’s character or “plain unvarnished narrative.”⁸ Hawkesworth was also criticized for the moral content of his *Account*, whether by the clergy for describing licentious and immoral behaviour, or by others for offering his own moral judgments on the events and peoples described in the voyages. The book was too detailed and not detailed enough. The descriptions were too accurate or not accurate enough. The narrative was too entertaining or not entertaining enough. And so, while the book was one of the most widely read and talked about books of late 18th century Europe, everyone was critical of at least some aspect of it.

While Cook was not the one who brought the text in the *Account* together, he was still connected to the text in complex and sometimes undesirable ways. Where information included in the *Account* was inaccurate or critical, he was often blamed along with Hawkesworth. For instance, as Beaglehole writes in his introduction to Cook’s second voyage, Cook faced a hostile reception at the island of Saint Helena because:

Hawkesworth, speaking as Cook, had printed too much Banks, and Banks had been too uncomplimentary in his observations on that island.⁹

In his own introduction to the voyages, Hawkesworth claims that Cook had approved of them, but Cook did not see a copy of the printed version until he arrived at the Cape of Good Hope in 1775, on his way back to England at the end of the second voyage. As Beaglehole notes in his *Life of Captain James Cook*,

⁸ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 89.

⁹ Beaglehole, *Cook’s Journals*, Volume II, page cx.

Cook read them, and was surprised beyond measure; worse, he was 'mortified'. He was mortified because he did not recognise himself — and could hardly do so when so much of Banks appeared as Cook, with original nautical blunders by Hawkesworth himself....¹⁰

According to Beaglehole, Cook felt that neither the voice nor the claims were his. In his introduction to the Admiralty's edition of the second voyage, Beaglehole includes a letter from Cook that seems to refer back to the problems that arose with the first voyage.

And now it may be necessary to say, that, as I am on the point of sailing on a third expedition, I leave this account of my last voyage in the hands of some friends, who in my absence have kindly accepted the office of correcting the press for me; who are pleased to think, that what I have here to relate is better to be given in my own words, than in the words of another person, especially as it is a work designed for information, and not merely for amusement; in which it is their opinion, that candour and fidelity will counterbalance the want of ornament.¹¹

If this is "surprise beyond measure," Cook is hiding it very well. In another place Beaglehole quotes from a letter that Cook wrote to Commodore Wilson, in which Cook writes of the second voyage that:

It will want those flourishes which Dr. Hawkesworth gave the other, but it will be illustrated and ornamented with about sixty copper plates, which, I am of opinion, will exceed every thing that has been done in a work of this kind As to the Journal, it must speak for itself. I can only say that it is my own narrative, and as it was written during the voyage.¹²

But Cook's criticism of Hawkesworth here is not about the way that

¹⁰ Beaglehole, *The Life of Captain James Cook*, page 440. Beaglehole does not say where an account of Cook's response to reading Hawkesworth's edition can be found.

¹¹ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume III, page xxii.

¹² Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, page xcliii. Note Cook's claim that the illustrations in that were to be included in the book "will exceed every thing that has been done in a work of this kind." Illustrations will be discussed in chapter four.

Hawkesworth combined different voices into a seamless narrative. Cook is claiming that the second voyage is his own narrative, but he criticizes Hawkesworth for the flourishes and inaccuracies, which Cook contrasts to his own “candour and fidelity.” The concern for the confusion of authorship in the first voyage appears to be Beaglehole’s more than Cook’s. In any event, one significant change for the second voyage is that Cook was given much more control over the text.

Even before the second voyage came to an end, the Admiralty, the publishers, and the reading public were all prepared for the texts that would be brought back with Cook’s return. As with the first voyage, the authors, manuscripts and printed texts of the second voyage were all surrounded by administrative controls, which are again described in the published account of the voyage. The journals of the people on board were again taken by Cook before the ship reached Britain. On the 16th of March, 1775, as the ship was approaching the Cape of Good Hope, Cook writes that:

I now, in pursuance of my instructions, demanded of the officers and petty officers, the log-books and journals they had kept; which were delivered to me accordingly, and sealed up for the inspection of the Admiralty. I also enjoined them, and the whole crew, not to divulge where we had been, till they had their Lordships’ permission so to do.¹³

The Cape of Good Hope was the first place that the ship touched at which was part of the European-dominated tracks to Asia. Before that place, it would have been difficult for someone to send a manuscript to Europe on another ship. At the Cape of Good Hope, however, it would have been easy to find another ship to smuggle an alternate account of the voyage back to England.

The institutions and processes that took control of the journals were largely the same for the second voyage as they were for the first, with the

¹³ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume IV, page 226.

exception that Cook was given more control over the journals to write the Admiralty's account of the voyage. As with Hawkesworth, Cook still employed other journals, although he often made the shift from one narrator to another more obvious through the use of quotation marks and other typographical devices. Cook also relied on Doctor Douglas to correct his grammar and spelling. It was also Douglas who saw the journals through the final stages of printing. As with the first voyage, Cook did not see the final proofs — he had already left England on his third voyage into the Pacific.

Neither of the captains of the ships from the third voyage returned to England. Cook was killed in the Sandwich Islands and Clerke died of tuberculosis several months later on the north-eastern coast of Asia. Nonetheless, on the return to England, the same preliminary procedures were followed. The journal attributed to John Rickman goes into somewhat more detail than the official account, suggesting not only the authority that existed behind the control of the texts, but also some of the social hierarchies that were in place. As the ship was nearing Canton,

Commodore [Gore] called all hands aft, and ordered them to deliver up their journals, and every writing, remark, or memorandum that any of them had made of any particular respecting the voyage, on pain of the severest punishment in case of concealment, in order that all those journals, writings, remarks or memorandums, respecting the voyage, might be sealed up, and directed to the Lords of the Admiralty. At the same time requiring that every chart of the coasts, or of any part of any of the coasts where we had been, or draught of any thing curious might be delivered up in like manner, in order to accompany the journals, &c. all which was complied with; and the papers were made up and sealed accordingly in sight of the whole crew, the papers of the commissioned officers by themselves, the papers of the non-commissioned officers by themselves, and the papers of the marines and common men by themselves.¹⁴

The task of preparing the third voyage for publication was again given to

¹⁴ Rickman, *Journal of Captain Cook's Last Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, pages 382-3.

Doctor Douglas. The result was a three volume collection: the first two books based primarily on Cook's journals, and the third, beginning with Cook's death in Kealekakua Bay on February 14, 1779, on the journals of James King, who became captain of the *Discovery* after the death of Captain Clerke in 1779. In the final volume, King narrates the last stages of the voyage, from the Sandwich Islands back to the northern Pacific and the around the Cape of Good Hope to England.

2. Other Authors

The official accounts of Cook's three voyages was complicated by a variety of other accounts published which did not claim to have Cook as the author. In spite of the Admiralty's attempts to control the journals on board the ships, several people nonetheless published accounts of the voyages. The controversies that were created here are different from those created by the published accounts that closely connect the books with Cook as an author. Cook still exists in these books in relation to the voyages, but he is no longer the source of the texts. He is the one who commands the ships, but there are now other voices, which by their very existence are not obedient to the Admiralty.

The first account of the first voyage was published anonymously in 1771, beating Hawkesworth's edition to the public by several months. The account was short (roughly 130 pages), contained no illustrations, and offered only the bare details of the voyage. But the book was the first published account of the voyage, and initially sold well.

The second unauthorized book that was published from the first voyage was the journal of Sydney Parkinson, an artist brought on the voyage by Joseph Banks. Sydney died on the return voyage, so the journals were published, with some opposition from Banks and others, by his brother

Stanfield. The book was also relatively short and lacked a coherent narrative, but it included a number of high-quality engravings based on drawings made by Sydney (see picture 9).

Stanfield Parkinson's description of his conflict with Joseph Banks over his brother's manuscript journal is relevant here insofar as it suggests the extent to which Banks, Hawkesworth, and the Admiralty attempted to maintain control over the published accounts of the voyages.¹⁵ According to Stanfield, Banks tried to stop him from publishing his brother's journal by limiting Stanfield's access to the manuscript, then in Banks's possession, by bribing him, or by offering various remonstrances and threats. Stanfield writes:

To delay this design, and, if possible, suppress my book, which was almost ready to appear, Doctor Hawkesworth, whose compilation was not so forward, filed a bill in chancery against me, setting forth that I had invaded his property, by printing manuscripts and engraving designs, which I sold to Joseph Banks, and which Joseph Banks had afterwards sold to him: even Doctor Fothergill supporting this misrepresentation, by affirming that I had made such sale to Mr. Banks, of which he was a witness. On this application an injunction was granted by the court of chancery, to stop the printing and publishing of my work. Nay, Doctor Hawkesworth, not contented with praying for the suppression of my book, modestly desired also to have delivered up to him the printed copies of it, which I had, at the expence of several hundred pounds, prepared to offer the public.¹⁶

The money Hawkesworth was hoping to make from the publication of his version is an obvious explanation for his legal maneuvers. To be the first one to publish an account of the voyages would mean greater sales. Stanfield Parkinson suggests this motivation himself:

¹⁵ See Parkinson, *A Journal of a Voyage to the South Seas, in his Majesty's Ship, the Endeavour*, Preface.

¹⁶ Parkinson, *A Journal of a Voyage to the South Seas, in his Majesty's Ship, the Endeavour*, page xxi.

Indeed the whole purpose of the bill appears to be litigious, and calculated to answer no other end than to delay my publication, till he should get the start of me and publish his own: and this end, to my great damage and loss, it hath answered. In the mean while, and pending the suit between us, it is said that this prudential author sold the property of his own book, for no less a sum than six thousand pounds: a sum that probably would not have been given for it, had not an injunction been obtained against the publication of mine; which contains an authentic journal of the last and principal voyage, viz. that of his majesty's ship *The Endeavour*.¹⁷

Stanfield suggests that Banks's motivation was also self-interest, not for money, but for the artifacts and specimens that had been collected by Sidney Parkinson, and were at that point in Banks's possession. However, while these explanations are relevant, there are also institutional reasons for limiting the publication of alternate accounts of the voyage.¹⁸ We should recall the steps taken by the Admiralty to secure the journals of the people who sailed on all the ships. It is likely, therefore, that the desire to control the publication of alternate accounts was connected to the desire of the institutions involved to have their account of the voyage dominate. The primary contest was over who was able to speak about the South Pacific, and whether that voice should be institutional or private. What is interesting is how concerned the Admiralty was to produce an authorized version at all. The other voices, such as Parkinson's, were threats to authority, not only because of what they might say, but also because they were saying anything at all.

¹⁷ Parkinson, *A Journal of a Voyage to the South Seas, in his Majesty's Ship, the Endeavour*, page xxii.

¹⁸ In his introduction to the first voyage, Beaglehole quotes Horace Walpole, who claims that Hawkesworth received a £1000 advance from Banks in addition to the money he received from the booksellers, Stahan and Co. (see Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume I, page ccxlix).

For the second voyage there were also other voices that were published. An anonymous book was published in 1775, and has since been attributed to John Marra. The book included some illustrations, but little information that could not be found in the official account. The book's appeal was based primarily on the timing of its publication. Marra's account was printed the same year that the ships returned, and over a year before than the official version was produced.¹⁹

The most controversial (and substantial) book published from the second voyage was a two volume account by George Forster, published in 1777. In his biography of Cook, Besant summarizes the controversies connected to the publication of this book. Reinhold Forster (George's father) seems to have thought that he would be called upon to write the history of the voyage, to succeed the great Hawkesworth. On his return he still imagined that he would be expected to do this, and actually began it, but found that the captain's journal was to be kept separate from his own. Lord Sandwich, however, undertook to present Cook and Forster with the plates, engraved at the expense of the Admiralty, of all the drawings and maps made during the voyage to accompany the journals; and Forster was informed that he would not be called upon to write the history of the voyage at all, but to send in his observations as they were. Unless he agreed to this, he would forfeit any share in the profits of the work. Here the son saw his chance. He was not bound, he said, by any agreement which his father had made. He therefore wrote his own account of the voyage, and, on the whole, though somewhat flowery and exaggerated, it is a very good book indeed. The Government and Captain Cook, unfortunately, took a different view of his obligations, and, it is said, expressed these views so strongly that the two Forsters found that no further appointments would be offered them, and retired to their

¹⁹ In *The Life of Captain James Cook*, page 456, Beaglehole claims that the book was published in 1776. However, the *Bibliography of Captain James Cook* notes that the title page of the first printing is dated 1775. The supporting documents discussed by Beaglehole suggests, however, that the book was not printed until 1776, although perhaps early in the year. The official version was published in 1777.

native country [of Germany], where I know not what became of them.²⁰

The power of institutions is evident. Not only did the Admiralty pay for the production of the engravings, it also used the potential profits of the book to try to stop alternative accounts. Finally, the institutional powers in England were brought to bear against the Forsters, who were more or less frozen out of the patronage system on which the scientists at the time depended. As with Parkinson, the Admiralty was unable to stop the publication of Forster's account. However, the combination of the pressures that the Admiralty was able to bring to bear against Forster and the support that it was able to offer Cook helped ensure that Cook's account would succeed.

Forster's account was widely read at first, and sometimes published alongside Cook's account, but, until very recently, had not been reprinted in English past the 1770's. By the late 19th century, Besant could tell his readers that "we will follow this voyage [of Cook's] with the help of Mr. George Forster's book rather than that of the captain's journal, which everybody has read."²¹

In a short work attacking some of the claims made in Forster's book, William Wales, one of the astronomers on the second voyage, argues that the book was in fact written by the elder Forster, but published under the son's name to avoid the contractual obligations that had been placed on the father. Wales also challenged Forster's accuracy, criticizes him for copying information from Cook's published account, and attacked his character, all in the harshest tones.

George Forster published two responses: one directed at Wales and the other at the Earl of Sandwich, whose hostility towards the Forsters he explains by the fact that the elder Forster refused to give the Earl's mistress a

²⁰ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 92.

²¹ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 97.

collection of live birds from the South Pacific, and instead gave them to the queen. However, beyond the personal attacks and reputations, there is a considerable amount at stake in this controversy. Not only is Forster's account the most substantial unauthorized account of any of Cook's voyages. The book also offers the most substantial challenges to Cook's claims to accurately and completely describe the world. Specific aspects of this challenge to Cook's account will be considered below. What is important to note here is that one key implication of the Admiralty's policy here is that the voyages become much less controversial, and that the controversies that exist occur within a single narrative rather than between narratives.

Also in 1777, William Wales published *The Original Astronomical Observations Made in the Course of a Voyage Towards the South Pole....* The book, published by the authority and at the expense of the Board of Longitude, was composed primarily of tables, but also contained a lengthy introduction that discussed the scientific instruments and techniques used during the voyage. Unlike George Forster's narrative, Wales's *Observations* are designed to complement the Admiralty's narrative, and by publishing key scientific information in a separate book of tables, it helped solve one of the stylistic problems faced by Hawkesworth, allowing Cook to avoid including extensive detail on these matters.

The third voyage also resulted in several alternate accounts. Among other published works was an anonymous account, later attributed to John Rickman, and a two volume account by William Ellis, the assistant surgeon to both vessels. These were both first published in 1781, the same year as the official edition. With Cook both celebrated and dead, the controversies surrounding the publication of competing accounts of the voyage do not seem to have been as severe. The controls still existed, but the subsequent institutional and legal battles were much less prevalent.

For all three of the voyages, the competing accounts have tended to fade away, either reprinted in facsimile editions (as several of them were by Da Capo as part of the *Bibliotheca Australiana* series), folded into a broader narrative of Cook's life (as were portions of Forster's version by Besant), or not reprinted at all (as were many of the smaller works engaging in specific controversies, such as Wales's response to Forster's account or Dalrymple's response to Hawkesworth's introduction). On the other hand, the authority which Cook's voice exerts over the accounts of the voyages has, over time, become supreme. But this does not mean that his original words have been reinstated, or even that the original printed accounts have remained intact.

3. Editors and Biographers

Beginning in 1780, other accounts of Cook's voyages were produced, and throughout the 19th century the copies of Cook's voyages multiplied. But the copies were not all the same. Although all the editions of Cook's voyages were more or less based on the Admiralty's edition, each of them contained different selections and were characterized with different commentaries. Most of these editions shortened the three voyages down to a single volume, often less than 400 pages. Some editions included additional text or illustrations, others pared the text down or rewrote it to make the voyages accessible to younger readers or acceptable to specific groups.²²

The first biography of Cook was published in 1788. Written by Andrew Kippis, the book was entitled *A Narrative of the Voyages Round the World*

²² For an extended list of the editions of Cook's life and voyages, see Beddie's *Bibliography of Captain James Cook*. Printed in 1970, the book lists over 500 printed accounts of the three voyages, either separately and included in larger collection. This total does not include subsequent biographical accounts of Cook's life (such as Kippis) or later edited versions (such as Barrow's or Kitson's, both of which became very popular in the 19th and early 20th century).

Performed by Captain James Cook, With an Account of His Life During the Previous and Intervening Periods. A Fellow of the Royal Society, Kippis published the first significant reworking of the three voyages, in which he includes two of the dominant frames for understanding the voyages: first, by including an account of Cook's life (and character), and second, by including a summary of exploration up to the time of Cook's first voyage. With the original publication there was some sense of Cook's relationship to his immediate predecessors (Wallis, Carteret, Byron), but with Kippis, the scale of Cook's historical position became grand. Cook was connected to a long line of heroic European navigators, from Columbus to Drake to Anson, and he is made worthy of his inheritance by the high moral qualities he exhibited early in life. With Kippis, there is a significant concern: what to make of Cook's voyages becomes as important as a concern for repeating accounts of the voyages themselves. Thus, in the conclusion, Kippis notes that:

a monument in Westminster Abbey would be of little consequence to the reputation of Captain Cook. His fame stands upon a wider base, and will survive the comparatively perishing materials of brass, or stone, or marble. The name of Cook will be held in honour, and recited with applause, so long as the records of human events shall continue in the earth; nor is it possible to say, what may be the influence and rewards, which, in other worlds, shall be found to attend upon eminent examples of wisdom and of virtue.²³

Kippis recites Cook's name with applause, and presents the voyages to his reader as a demonstration of the qualities of Cook's character. Representing enlightened Christian Europe, Cook's actions throughout his voyages are used to emphasize specific ways of understanding the world and the possible relationships between people. Rather than articulating places in terms of location, as a geographical discourse would, Kippis uses Cook's authority to articulate places as a moral terrain, where the contrast between civilized and

²³ Kippis, *Life of Cook*, page 424.

savage predominates the difference between Europe and the South Pacific.

Another important editor of Cook's voyages was John Barrow, who first published *Cook's Voyages of Discovery* in 1860.²⁴ In Barrow's account, Cook is a hero, but his heroic voice is given a specifically scientific and military tone. The enumeration of coordinates, which pervades the Admiralty's edition, have generally not been included. The edition emphasizes Cook's scientific descriptions of places, but these descriptions are focused on the geographical surveying of land rather than the geometrical positioning of islands. The South Pacific has become more like a continent.

One interesting point concerning Barrow's edition is that there are in fact two distinct editions. The first, initially published in 1860 by A. C. Black and reprinted by them up until 1930, is in the first person. The second, initially published in 1906 by J. M. Dent as part of their Everyman's Library, is in the third person. The shift from the autobiographical to the biographical is an important variation in the accounts of Cook's voyages. Specifically, the change points to the different ways that objectivity and voice are connected. In the first person narrative, the truth of the narrative is tied to the tone of the narrator, who must constantly reassure the readers, as Cook does, that the account is as complete and accurate as possible. For this reason, the voice of Cook not only includes an account of the voyage, but also an account of how he comes to believe that his descriptions are true. We are given an internal history, a confession of sorts, where the reader is encouraged to adopt Cook's perspective on the world. In the third person, on the other hand, the objectivity is created by the transcendent narrator, who gives an account, not only of the voyages, but also of Cook, who is the primary character. We are

²⁴ This John Barrow (1808 - 1898) was *not* the John Barrow (1764-1848) who travelled to Africa in an expedition organized by the Admiralty, with the support of Joseph Banks, to determine if the Niger and the Congo rivers were confluent.

given an external history, a hagiography of sorts, where the reader is not encouraged to adopt the perspective of Cook so much as the perspective of the transcendent narrator. Cook no longer reassures the reader that he can be trusted; the narrator/editor acquires that function.

Another important account of Cook's life and voyages, first published in 1890, is Walter Besant's *Captain Cook*. Part of the *English Men in Action* series, which included not only celebrated navigators such as Drake, Dampier, and Anson, but also many military and political leaders. In *Captain Cook*, Besant is not offering an edited version of Cook's journals. Rather, admitting that he is "a biographer who loves his hero,"²⁵ Besant is offering a third-person biographical account of Cook's life as a whole, and he assumes that his readers have already read an account of the voyages. In fact, of the fourteen chapters in the book, only five are specifically concerned with the voyages. The first three chapters narrate Cook's early life, which was both a preparation for his eventual rise to greatness and a testing-ground for his character. As Besant notes when Cook first joined the navy,

There may have been other men in the service as well qualified as James Cook to command on a voyage of discovery. I doubt it — but there may have been. The man was ready, the chance came to him, and he proved himself equal to his fortune.²⁶

The next two chapters narrate the European exploration of the Pacific up to Cook's first voyage and two other chapters give an account of Cook's life between each of the voyages. The final chapters describe the impact that Cook and his voyages had on the ship's company, on Cook's reputation, on the British nation, and on the world. Besant also emphasizes Cook's activities as an author, complaining, for instance, of how Douglas undermined Cook's control over the journals. For Besant, this is especially true for the third

²⁵ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 13.

²⁶ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 43.

voyage.

Doctor Douglas, Bishop of Salisbury, edited the [narrative of the third voyage]. Unfortunately he also doctored it, and though he says in his introduction that Cook's journal was faithfully adhered to, he also owns to incorporating a quantity of matter from Anderson's journal.... It is, however, quite clear that many portions of the work have been rewritten or touched — not, it is true, in the lumbering style of Doctor Hawkesworth, but still touched. The straightforward directness and simplicity of Cook's own narrative of the second voyage are gone.²⁷

Here, Besant is not contrasting the manuscript journal with the printed accounts, and admits that he has not seen the manuscripts from any of the voyages. Besant, unlike Beaglehole a century later, is not arguing that the manuscripts themselves ought to be published. Rather, his criticisms of the journals for the first and third voyages focus on the different writing styles of Hawkesworth, Cook, and Douglas. The greatness of Cook is thus confirmed by his ability to translate his experiences and journals into an ordered, accurate text, with its “straightforward directness and simplicity.” And this, by implication, is also how voyages and the world ought to be understood.

With many of these later editors, Cook acquired an heroic status, a status which is suggested by a piece written by Joseph Conrad entitled “Geography and some Geographers.” Conrad suggests his own feelings as the ship he was on followed in Cook's path to the north of Australia.

Just as a clear sun sank ahead of my ship I took a bearing of a little island for a fresh departure, an insignificant crumb of dark earth, lonely, like an advanced sentinel of that mass of broken land and water, to watch the approaches from the side of the Arafura Sea. But to me it was a hallowed spot, for I knew that the *Endeavour* had been hove to off it in the year 1762 for her captain, whose name was James Cook, to go ashore for half an hour. What he could possibly want to do I cannot imagine. Perhaps only to be alone with his thoughts for a moment. The dangers and the triumphs of exploration and discovery were over for that voyage. All that remained to do was to go

²⁷ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 118.

home, and perhaps his great and equable soul, tempered in the incessant perils of a long exploration, wanted to commune with itself at the end of its task. It may be that on this dry crumb of the earth's crust which I was setting by compass he had tasted a moment of perfect peace. I could depict to myself the famous seaman navigator, a lonely figure in a three-cornered hat and square-skirted laced coat, pacing to and fro slowly on the rocky shore, while in the ship's boat, lying off on her oars, the coxswain kept his eyes open for the slightest sign of the captain's hand.²⁸

More than a ship's captain, Captain Cook, "the navigator without fear and without reproach,"²⁹ had become an icon through which it was possible to idealize the traveller's moral and spiritual relationship to movement in the world. He is deified, even on spots where he remained for only half an hour and did nothing remarkable. Cook thus becomes as a different kind of explorer, one who sets the stage for the global interactions of the 19th century, and one whose account of the world is not simply read because it is entertaining, but also because it is taken to be comprehensive and true.

The continued reproduction of Cook as an author and a captain is thus tied to various projects of celebration, in which Cook is portrayed as a great navigator, a humanitarian, a servant of the empire, and a key origin for distant colonies. But the celebration of Cook also ends up being self-congratulatory. As can be seen through the writings of these 18th and 19th century editors, Cook became a hero of the British Empire. Not only was he directly connected to specific projects, such as the British colonization of Australia and New Zealand, he and his voyages were also used to cast a long shadow on the nature of British exploration as such. But in all of these representations, Cook became less of an author and more of a fictional character, tied less to the specific actions, events, and objects of his voyages, and more to an abstracted pantheon of heroes representing English greatness.

²⁸ Conrad, "Geography and Some Explorers", in *Last Essays*, page 21.

²⁹ Conrad, "Geography and Some Explorers", in *Last Essays*, page 19.

The 19th century idolization of Cook and the published accounts of his voyages was challenged in the middle of the 20th century by the writings and editorial work of J. C. Beaglehole. Since the 1950s, Beaglehole's work has dominated the academic accounts of Cook's voyages. Not only has Beaglehole published an edited version of the manuscript journals of Cook and Banks, he has also published his monumental *Life of Captain Cook*, and a wide range of shorter works, including lectures and more general historical surveys of exploration.

One of the key criticisms directed towards Hawkesworth was that the words of Cook, Banks and others were mixed into a single narrative, where it was impossible to tell which person was the source of which phrase, description or opinion. The later editions made this problem worse by including additional editorial and biographical information. In contrast, one of the stated goals of Beaglehole's edition of Cook's voyages was to provide an edition of the journals that could serve "as a basis of scholarship." The result was a massive four-volume set, which was published by the Hakluyt Society. As with the editors of Cook's voyages in the 18th and 19th centuries, Beaglehole chose between different forms of presentation. In Hawkesworth's time, the choice was primarily between a fictionalized style which emphasized the narrative and a technical style which emphasized accurate and useful navigational information. Beaglehole, however, opts for neither of these. Rather, in keeping with academic norms arising from the late 19th century, he constructs a detailed archive of Cook's voyages, arranged on the principles of the author and the manuscript, that is, on handwriting and transcriptions.

What seems to bother Beaglehole most, perhaps because it creates the greatest difficulty in articulating Cook as an *author*, is the way that Cook's writings have been and continue to be submerged in a broad and blurred set

of texts. One of Beaglehole's editorial strategies, therefore, is to physically separate Cook's journals from those of other people on the voyages. The journals of Banks were published by Beaglehole in a separate two volume edition, while other accounts, such as the Forsters's, were not included at all. Many of the other journals connected to the voyages are attached to the end of Cook's journals and collectively labeled as "SUBORDINATE MS SOURCES." Beaglehole also offers an extensive introduction and detailed footnotes, but these are also carefully divided from Cook's writings. As a result, Beaglehole's editing establishes discretion between the words written by Cook and those written by others (including Beaglehole himself), while at the same time imagining the relationships between authors and texts to be largely unproblematic. Beaglehole's journals thus create a sense that the reader has direct access to Cook's experience, through the text written by his own hand, whose authenticity is guaranteed. At the level of the printed word, Cook has thus acquired an autonomous, if embedded, existence.³⁰

But what makes these words *Cook's* words?

While Beaglehole uses his own editorial authority to establish the emergence of Cook as an author, there is a general failure in his discussion to consider how the words that can be found in the manuscript journals came about. Beaglehole appeals to handwriting, which establishes that Cook was the one who wrote the words down, but is this enough to make Cook the author? The problem is that the written words were not the only words on the voyage. Granted that the words are written in Cook's hand, what makes him an author rather than a journalist or a secretary, reporting the words of

³⁰ The ideal relationship between the printed words and the manuscript is further emphasized by a recent electronic edition of Cook's first voyage, produced by the Australian National Library, which allows users to switch from the transcript to a digital image of Cook's manuscript.

others that he has overheard on board? For the first voyage Beaglehole mentions Cook's textual relationship to Banks, but he limits their connection to borrowing each other's *written* words. However, the two men also lived together in very close quarters on the *Endeavour*, and it is implausible that they did not discuss a wide assortment of topics, which would have a bearing on what Cook ultimately wrote in his journals. Likewise, when discussing the second voyage Beaglehole makes no mention of the possible influence of the Forsters on what Cook wrote.³¹ Cook may have been an author because he had a wide variety of people on board who gave him things to write about and offered him different ways of expressing what has happened or what has been seen. But, like the secondary written accounts, these conversations do not become part of the written journals or part of Beaglehole's account of Cook as an author.

The twin goals of establishing Cook as an author and of creating a printed and purified version of his journals suitable for scholarship are connected to Beaglehole's glorification of Cook as a hero. But Cook is a new kind of hero. As Beaglehole's introduction to the journals makes very clear, Cook is to be placed in opposition to and above all those who had come before him and many who come after. While the earlier Europeans who went into the Pacific were typically characterized as inept, fanatical, self-interested and barbaric, Cook was the epitome of the rational navigator who could take all the jumbled opinions, superstitions and lies and turn them, through personal verifications and scientific methods, into a single, accurate whole. As Paul Carter has pointed out,

³¹ The relationship between Forster and Cook (and between the competing accounts of the second voyage) requires more study. Beaglehole, echoing William Wales, adopts the relatively standard denunciation of Forster and very little else is said of him (see Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, page xlvii - xlviii).

Beaglehole's approach imitates the empirical scepticism he finds so admirably characteristic of Cook. But Beaglehole's admiration is also a form of self-legitimation: for, of course, under the guise of writing Cook's life, Beaglehole is also furnishing a justification for his own historical method.³²

Thus Beaglehole, following in the tradition of Cook scholars, has appealed to the idealized account of Cook to justify his own project. Like the medical reformers who freed the insane from the horrors of darkened dungeons, Cook frees the traveller from the horrors of confused space. And, in the same way, Beaglehole frees Cook from the confusions of the text.

4. Fact and Fiction

Debates over the proper characterization of Cook and his voyages, in which Beaglehole participates, revolves around three primary contrasts: between fact and fiction, between realism and romanticism, and between complete and partial descriptions. These will be considered in turn. Taken together, these contrasts are used to characterize not only what Cook wrote, but also how he wrote, and how he should be connected to both the voyages and to a complete, objective account of the world. What is at stake in considering Cook's status, in other words, is the capacity to speak the truth, or at least to speak with authority as an author who is writing about the world.

Throughout his commentaries, Beaglehole maintains that Cook deserves the status of an author, which means not only that his words ought to be divided from the words of others, but also that there is something which Cook does to his words which is worthy of praise. He is not simply producing the log of a ship's master, which typically contained information regarding the ship's location, the state of the crew, and a brief account of any land, situations, or events that were experienced. The typical log was organized in terms of naval time, meaning that the days began and ended at noon.

³² Carter, *The Road to Botany Bay*, page 13.

Locations were organized by longitude and latitude, and the measurements of space, time, and physical conditions such as temperature were given as consistently and accurately as possible. Mathematics was used to clarify a bland representation of space, but not to make it more interesting. As Beaglehole describes it,

A log had a number of separate columns, entered up with details of the winds and the ship's behaviour and management. In a separate, wider column, the log-keeper wrote down what were called 'remarkable occurrences' — not curious occurrences, that is, or psychologically unsettling occurrences, but simply occurrences deemed worthy of remark.³³

A good example of a simple log is the one published by Thomas Gilbert in 1789, who recounted the voyage he made from New South Wales to Canton as the captain of the *Charlotte*. Here are some typical entries, which occurred in September, 1788.

Thursday, 11th. Fresh gales and squally, with rain, wind from E. N. E. to E. At ten the Barwell East-Indiaman, from Bencoolen, anchored here.

Friday, 12th. The weather moderate and cloudy, the wind from E. N. E. to E. and E. S. E. At ten A. M. the pilot came on board, to take the ship to Whampona. At half past eleven weighed and made sail, and at half past nine P. M. came to an anchor in five fathoms and a half water.

Saturday, 13th. The first part squally; the middle and latter parts light breezes and clear weather, wind E. N. E. and N. E. At six A. M. weighed and made sail, the yawl ahead, towing; and at half past eleven brought to in six fathoms and a half.³⁴

Gilbert's writing, which more or less follows this style for the entire 85 pages of the book, is a simple and straightforward representation of some basic facts of the voyage.³⁵ The simplicity is intentional. In the introduction to his

³³ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 7.

³⁴ Gilbert, *Voyage*, page 82.

³⁵ That this account was published is itself interesting, and is likely connected to the success of

Voyage, Gilbert explicitly notes the choice he has made in his writing style and has eschewed the “literary embellishments” which make narratives such as these amusing. What Gilbert wants to present is clear and accurate knowledge that could be useful to other navigators, but which will have little or no appeal to anyone else. He has produced his book with a particular audience in mind, and has written his journal for them.

But a log of this kind, even if published, does not make Gilbert an author as Beaglehole understands the term. According to Beaglehole, in a lecture he delivered in 1970 where he reflected on Cook’s emergence as a writer, Cook’s journals during his early voyages were unremarkable. “The naval officer had to keep a log and a journal. Cook’s are no worse and no better than anybody else’s.”³⁶ These journals were written for institutional use, primarily for the Admiralty, and served as a form of accounting.

What do they tell us? They tell us where he went; they tell us, briefly, about the exploding powder-horn, and that he ran his vessel on a rock; but as a record of impressions, as the reflection of a personality, they really do not count for much. We must read between the lines, we must use our imagination, we must look at the charts; and then we get something. We do not get it explicitly.³⁷

Typical ship’s logs were ideally impersonal. Beaglehole points out, for example, that Cook fails to mention in one of his early logs an important meeting he had with Samuel Holland. The encounter is related in letters that he sent to his friends in England. As Beaglehole notes, the meeting “was a personal matter, however interesting, not a ship matter.” The primary function of the log was thus to provide a basic representation — an accounting — of the ship through space and time.

voyages such as Cook’s.

³⁶ Beaglehole, “Cook the Writer”, page 7.

³⁷ Beaglehole, “Cook the Writer”, page 6.

Cook's journals for his three voyages into the Pacific were significantly different. They contain considerable detail and indicate that Cook spent some time writing and rewriting them. In his lecture, Beaglehole argues that "on [the first] voyage Cook learnt how to shape his experience into words."³⁸ Cook's later journals offer an expanded account of the voyages, which include descriptions of religious, cultural, and biological topics that were either absent or marginal in his previous journals. In the first voyage many of these topics were described by Banks in his own journal. Beaglehole notes that, while writing the journal during the first voyage, Cook would read Banks's journal and frequently borrow passages or turns of phrase. Beaglehole claims that the borrowing was mutual: "Go through Cook and Banks together, and you will have adequate material for the game of 'parallel passages'."³⁹ While Cook's experiences along the North American side of the Atlantic were "an apprenticeship for discovery," Beaglehole sees the *Endeavour* voyage as "an apprenticeship in reporting on discovery."⁴⁰ Cook was learning how to write.

For the Admiralty's version of the second voyage, Cook's journals were the primary source, and Cook had considerably more control over the final published product. Beaglehole notes that there is an important difference between the two handwritten versions of Cook's journal for this voyage: one was organized on ship time, the other on civil time. What this suggests to Beaglehole is that Cook began to prepare his writings for publication while the ship was still at sea. Changing the form of the log to civil time was necessary so that his readers would not be confused by the nautical day.

³⁸ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 8.

³⁹ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 9. He does not offer evidence to support the claim that the borrowings were mutual, as opposed primarily in one direction or another.

⁴⁰ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 8.

Another indication that Cook was making himself into an author, for Beaglehole, is that Cook was also editing and rewriting his journals before he had returned to England. Passages are crossed out, annotations are added, and different ways of expressing something are included. In other words, the journals from the voyages to the South Seas (and from the last two in particular) include Cook's authorial notes to himself and preliminary versions of what would become the published text, along with what was typically included in a ship's log. Cook is becoming an author who is anticipating the publication of his journals for a wide readership.

But this development in Cook's authorial activity also seems to make Beaglehole uneasy. In his lecture, Beaglehole associates Cook with Keats:

if one is interested in Cook as a mind one discovers, in the development of his text from log to printed page, something of the same order of fascination that recent students have revealed in the development of thought and diction in the poems of, say, a Keats.⁴¹

But Beaglehole pulls back immediately: "I am not suggesting that Cook's prose is as good as Keats's poetry." All that Beaglehole wants to establish here is that Cook's writing developed and that the development can be seen in the ways he edits his journals while at sea. For Beaglehole, all that Cook is doing differently in these journals is expanding the amount of information he is including and expressing it better (that is, more accurately, in greater detail and with more appropriate words). Cook's log is no longer simply an accounting of the ship to the Admiralty, it is an accounting of the world to the reading public.

5. Authorship and Reliability

Through the account of Cook that emerges from Beaglehole, and others before him, Cook becomes someone who is capable of dividing fact

⁴¹ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 18.

from fiction. Not only does Cook give the position and condition of the ship, he uses that information to engage in an extended discussion with other navigators (or at least their published accounts), whether to affirm their speculations, question their generalizations, or reject their claims about the world.⁴² Cook is not the first source of most of the facts that he reports. There were many sources which he had access to, either directly or through various compilations such as Dalrymple's *An Historical Collection of the Several Voyages and Discoveries in the South Pacific Ocean*. Williams notes, for instance, how "the buccaneers' accounts provided first-hand information on the ports, anchorages and watering places of the South Sea."⁴³ However, for Williams, Cook nonetheless represents a significantly different attitude towards the knowledge that is acquired and represented.

James Cook was at Tahiti by 1769, on a voyage prompted by motives of scientific investigation as well as of trade and navigation, and a new era of European exploration and exploitation had opened.⁴⁴

One thing that Cook's journals offer is reliability. A great deal of what was already written was true, but it was necessary to sort out what was true from what was not. Of course, the connection between travel writing and fiction has a long history. As Neil Rennie notes,

The commonplaces of South Sea travel literature were present in the literature of real and imaginary travel long before the Western discovery of the South Seas, and can be traced from classical times through the early accounts of the new world of America to the accounts of the South Sea islands that lay beyond.⁴⁵

⁴² It may be that Cook's voyages were the first exploration books that offered significant cross-referencing to other works travel journals. In part, this is because he had more published accounts to work with and the time to read them while at sea. After Cook, the engagement with other navigators was a primary aspect of the engagement with places.

⁴³ Williams, *The Great South Sea*, page 133.

⁴⁴ Williams, *The Great South Sea*, page 273.

The facts and fictions of the South Pacific were often impossible to separate without controversy: a fictional account often appealed to accepted facts (such as with *Robinson Crusoe*) while a factual account, even if it did not contain obvious fictions, often adopted fictional tropes and narrative structures. Finally, there were some works, such as *Madagascar : or, Robert Drury's Journal, During Fifteen Years Captivity on that Island*, possibly written by Daniel Defoe, which are still subjects of controversy. While Rennie explores the reasons that have been given for or against treating Drury's *Journal* as factual, he also points out that it is more important to notice that people have such a difficult time deciding one way or the other.⁴⁶

Rennie also discusses how fictional places often influenced the organization of European exploration. When the area where a place was rumoured to exist was searched and the place was not found, there was a tendency to push the place back to an area farther away and still unexplored. Thus the Christian "earthly Paradise" or the lands of Prester John retreated "westward from advancing geographical knowledge."⁴⁷ Cook's second and third voyages were likewise motivated by the desire to find mythical places: the southern continent in the second voyage and the north-west passage in the third. But after Cook's voyages, there were no large unexplored areas left to push the mythical places to. What Cook establishes through his voyages, therefore, is a final division between fact and fiction in the Pacific. He ties together accounts of places and completes the outline of the world.

Of course, fiction remained closely tied to the articulation of facts. Whatever Cook's attention to fact, the voyages were taken up into the literature of the day. The age of discovery was also the age of the novel. Thus

⁴⁵ Rennie, *Far-Fetched Facts*, page v.

⁴⁶ Rennie, *Far-Fetched Facts*, page 58.

⁴⁷ Rennie, *Far-Fetched Facts*, page 12.

when Rennie turns to discuss the impact of Cook's description of Tahitian sexuality and Omai's visit to England, it becomes evident that Cook's voyages, whatever his intent, became a source for intense literary activities. As Andrew Kippis noted in 1788,

Captain Cook's discoveries, among other effects, have opened new scenes for a poetical fancy to range in, and presented new images to the selection of genius and taste.⁴⁸

For Beaglehole, however, the integration of the voyages into the literature of the day is not because Cook's journals themselves included literary or fanciful passages. In spite of the evident impact that the journals had on literature, for Beaglehole Cook remains intact as an author who could speak accurately of facts in opposition to fiction. That other people fictionalized parts of Cook's account does not reduce the scientific quality of his original account as such.

For Beaglehole, one of the alternatives to the "fullness and accuracy" of the descriptions in that Cook includes in his journals is romanticism, and "there is certainly no attempt to romanticize" in Cook's writings.⁴⁹

Beaglehole's use of "romantic" as a primary term to focus on Cook's qualities as an observer and an author is interesting. In his introduction to the second voyage he claims that "Cook is no romantic"⁵⁰ because he has no desire to sail without a second ship, while Banks⁵¹ and Pickersgill⁵² are described (negatively) as romantics, by which Beaglehole means that they lack a serious, accurate sense of reality or control over themselves. As Beaglehole notes,

There was something desperately serious about Pickersgill, as about so many romantics; viewing his life as a whole, perhaps one sees also a little of the pathetic.⁵³

⁴⁸ Kippis, *A Narrative of the Voyages Round the World Performed by Captain James Cook*, page 418

⁴⁹ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 13.

⁵⁰ Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, page xxiv.

⁵¹ Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, xxvii.

⁵² Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, 35.

Romanticism is thus a limitation of character and mind which taints a person's descriptions of, and relations to the world. Cook, by being distanced from such romanticism, is able to provide a more accurate, direct account of the places and peoples that are encountered on his voyages. Cook, of course, still has to use words and eventually uses them well. As Beaglehole notes,

True, if words are to reflect facts accurately, to give other people the full roundness and experience of facts, they need an intimate knowledge of both their concreteness — for they too have a potential concreteness — and their subtle interconnections, the wavering 'atmosphere' round some of them like that Cook found round the planet Venus when he observed it from Tahiti in 1769; of the sort of latent, almost physical property, that makes them burst, sometimes, into illuminating fire when two of the concrete pieces are brought together.⁵⁴

One may wonder how Beaglehole would account for Cook's own appeal to romanticism, not as a negative label, but as a way to describe the world. The most appropriate passages are from the second voyage, where Cook is more directly connected to the published versions. One example is when the ships had crossed the antarctic circle. Here, for instance, the Admiralty's edition reads:

The large pieces which break from the ice islands, are much more dangerous than the islands themselves; the latter are so high out of water, that we can generally see them, unless the weather be very thick and dark, before we are very near them; whereas the others cannot be seen in the night, till they are under the ship's bows. These dangers were, however, now become so familiar to us, that the apprehensions they caused, were never of long duration; and were, in some measure, compensated, both by the seasonable supplies of fresh water these ice islands afforded us, (without which we must have been greatly distressed,) and also, by their very romantic appearance, greatly heightened by the foaming and dashing of the waves into the curious holes and caverns

⁵³ Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, 35.

⁵⁴ Beaglehole, "Cook the Writer", page 20.

which are formed in many of them; the whole exhibiting a view which at once filled the mind with admiration and horror, and can only be described by the hand of an able painter.⁵⁵

Beaglehole's transcription of Cook journal reads:

the pieces which break from the large Islands are more dangerous then the Islands themselves, the latter are generally seen at a sufficient distance to give time to steer clear of them, whereas the others cannot be seen in the night or thick weather till they are under the Bows: great as these dangers are, they are now become so very familiar to us that the apprehensions they cause are never of long duration and are in some measure compencated by the very curious and romantick Views many of these Islands exhibit and which are greatly heightned by the foaming and dashing of the waves against them and into the several holes and caverns which are formed in the most of them, in short the whole exhibits a View which can only be discribed by the pence of an able painter and at once fills the mind with admiration and horror, the first is occasioned by the beautifullniss of the Picture and the latter by the danger attending it, for was a ship to fall aboard one of these large pieces of ice she would be dashed to pieces in a moment.⁵⁶

While the published version of this description has been reworked, the “romantic” description of (ice) islands and the appeal to the superiority of painters over writers to capture such scenes can be found in both versions. Cook seems untroubled by his appeal to romanticism as a meaningful, and even necessary, part of his account. Unfortunately, Beaglehole does not consider in any detail what he means by romanticism, especially its epistemological and cosmological aspects, and so the relationship between Cook and romanticism remains controversial.

⁵⁵ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume III, page 75.

⁵⁶ Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume II, page 98-99. This entry is dated Wednesday, February 24th, 1773. Note that while the published version refers to “ice islands”, the ship's log refers only to “Islands” as such. It is not clear whether this change is relevant or how.

In *Imagining the Pacific*, Bernard Smith devotes an entire chapter to the time Cook spent among the ice islands during the second voyage. One of the obvious differences between the discussions offered by Smith and Beaglehole is the way that Smith's reading mixes together many different texts (including works by Coleridge) while Beaglehole's reading is a highly policed organization where secondary writings and commentaries are set apart, clearly labelled, and then largely ignored. Beyond this, however, there is a basic epistemological point that divides the two commentators, which is the conflict between two different ways of characterizing the world. The first, which is shared by Beaglehole and the Cook he describes through the journals, is one based on meticulous empiricism coupled with skepticism towards things that have not been directly experienced. Here, the best account of the world is one that is given by a reliable witness who can write with "fullness and accuracy." The second approach, offered by Smith, creates a stronger connection between art and information about the world. On this reading, romanticism is not connected to error, it is another, perhaps better way of describing the world. As Cook writes in the passage given above, the ice islands were a "View which can only be described by the pencil of an able painter and at once fills the mind with admiration and horror." And this is not the only time where Cook either appeals to the illustrations that accompany the journals or, more to the point, simply says that some things cannot be adequately described in words. By integrating Cook's journals with poetry and painting, Smith is offering us a different account of what is meant by "full and accurate." Cook remains an author, but he has become a different kind of author, attempting to describe a different kind of world. And he needs other people with other skills to do it well.

Beaglehole does not discuss the value of painting as either a complement or a substitute for writing. More importantly, he does not

consider in any detail what a “full and accurate” description would entail. Beaglehole’s account of Cook’s voyages and of knowledge continue to exist within the discourse of accounting, where discrete and visible objects can be described with clarity and completeness. But this is precisely the point against which “romanticism” reacts. When Beaglehole dismisses Pickersgill’s “pathetic” attempt to view “his life as a whole”, he is appealing to his own basic assumption that the realistic view of a whole is through the well-organized collection of discrete objects. However, while this is clearly an important aspect of Cook’s account, it is not obvious that Cook rejects every other form of description and, therefore, that he would close off his journals from all forms of either poetry or romanticism. The world must be understood as both parts and wholes.

In addition to his claims concerning how Cook describes the world, Beaglehole also claims that Cook begins to include himself in his journals. Recall Beaglehole’s characterization of Cook’s early logs, which, “as a record of impressions, as the reflection of a personality, they really do not count for much.” With the journals from the major voyages, all of this changes, and the reader is presumably able to see Cook’s personality. In a general way this is likely true, but it poses a problem insofar as the increase in personal expression threatens the apparent objectivity of the descriptions. If Cook is putting more of his personality into the journals, can his account still be trusted as objective? Beaglehole’s response to this question appeals to Cook’s character, which enhances rather than undermines the reliability of the journals. For instance, Beaglehole claims that Cook did not “dramatize, ... even himself.”

There is a famous instance on the second voyage: ‘I whose ambition leads me not only farther than any other man has been before me, but as far as I think it possible for man to go’ — he saw himself at that moment, certainly, turning back without sorrow from

the edge of the ice-field; and there is a simple eloquence, and an eloquent rhythm, in the words. But I doubt if it was a dramatic vision.⁵⁷

Beaglehole then goes on to note that “these voyages are not made for the sake of despairs and exultations, or for the improvement of a literary style.” They are made for “the improvement of Geography and Navigation.” But this characterization of the content and goals of Cook’s journals is too simple insofar as it misrepresents the importance of despairs and exultations, which connect to the status of Cook as an objective observer.

It is possible to find at least some emotional, spiritual and personal content in the journals. Cook is often angry, frustrated, or disappointed at the natives, his crew, and the ship itself. Cook also displays the muted exultations of the middle class: specifically concerning the profitability of commodity transactions and breaches of authority and friendship. And he admits that he is ambitious. At least this much Beaglehole would likely agree with. His objection is directed more towards the extreme emotions that can seriously taint a person’s account of the world.

Why does Beaglehole believe that Cook turned back from the fields of ice “without sorrow”? An obvious reason is Cook’s own reporting of the turn. The complete passage in Beaglehole’s edition of the journals is as follows:

I whose ambition leads me not only farther than any other man has been before me, but as far as I think it possible for man to go, was not sorry at meeting with this interruption, as it in some measure relieved us from the dangers and hardships, inseparable with the Navigation of the Southern Polar regions.⁵⁸

The shift from “was not sorry,” in Cook’s manuscript, to “without sorrow,” in Beaglehole’s discussion, is significant for the way that Beaglehole tries to characterize Cook’s emotional presence in the journal. Although similar,

⁵⁷ Beaglehole, “Cook the Writer”, page 21

⁵⁸ Beaglehole, *Cook’s Journals*, Volume II, page 322.

“sorrow” connotes a much stronger emotion than “being sorry” does, and so the *absence* of sorrow indicates a stronger resistance to such dangerous emotions.

There are other accounts of Cook’s emotional state at the extreme edge of the navigatable world, which may help clarify how the account of the world through the voyages can be tied to Cook’s emotional state. The account offered by Kippis in 1788, for instance, is as follows:

Though our commander had not only the ambition of going farther than any one had done before, but of proceeding as far as it was possible for man to go, he was the less satisfied with the interruption he now met with, as it shortened the dangers and hardships inseparable from the navigation of the southern polar regions. In fact he was impelled by inevitable necessity to tack and stand back to the north.⁵⁹

Here, “sorry” is replaced by the much more utilitarian and much less emotional “less satisfied.” Cook’s self-control and rationality is thus emphasized, at the cost of any depth of character. The bland accounting of space has turned inward.

But even if the voyages were not made “for the sake of despairs and exultations,” they nonetheless frequently contain descriptions of such emotions. However, the only times that Cook uses “sorrow” in the journals is when he is describing the emotional state of the natives, who are overtaken by such strong feelings. Cook’s journal from the second voyage, for instance, reads:

In this boat Omai went ashore, after taking a very affectionate farewell of all the Officers; he sustained himself with a manly resolution till he came to me then his utmost efforts to conceal his tears failed, and Mr King, who went in the boat, told me he wept all the time in going ashore.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Kippis, *A Narrative of the Voyages Round the World Performed by Captain James Cook*, page 218.

⁶⁰ Beaglehole, *Cook’s Journals*, Volume II, page 322.

In this passage Cook does not describe Omai's internal emotional state and focuses instead on his external behaviours.⁶¹ But the distinction that he is making between the natives and the English (at least the better kind of English — the regular sailors were prone to tears as well), is the control the English are able to have over their stronger emotions. The English may be sorry, but they are not sorrowful.

The exultations of other people on board can be described and connected to their character (or the character of a larger group), but Cook does not participate in that emotional life. Or, at least, he seldom describes his own emotional life. Cook exists as an observer whose own emotional state is seldom recorded in the journals. He sometimes relates what he is feeling, but almost always this is done when those feelings are immediately tied to his issuing commands or taking other actions.⁶²

Cook's lack of emotions is not only tied to self-control, it is also tied to the ability to judge others. After noting that Omai "wept all the time in going ashore," Cook immediately turns to an assessment of Omai's character — "Whatever faults this Indian had ..." — and a short reflection on Omai's connection to England. In the same way, in Beaglehole's account of Cook's feelings when turning the ship away from the southern ice-fields, he is implicitly re-affirming the values and status of the English middle class in its relation to the rest of the world.

⁶¹ The words in King's journal are "Omai took his leave of us with a manly sorrow, until he came to Captⁿ Cook, when wth all ye eloquence of sincerity he express'd his gratitude & burst into tears." (Beaglehole, *Cook's Journals*, Volume III, page 240, footnote 4)

⁶² The decision to turn the ship away from the high southern latitudes is no exception. He writes that he was "not sorry at meeting with this interruption, as it in some measure relieved us from the dangers and hardships, inseparable with the Navigation of the Southern Polar regions." The internal state is used to explain a decision affecting the voyage.

The third basic issue that characterizes the connection between Cook, his voyages, and the world, is the issue of perspective. While the journals and the Admiralty's edition of the voyages are organized as if there was only one observer, throughout the voyages members of Cook's crew are also collecting experiences and other data for their own records, for their superiors, and for the broader reading public. An uncountable number of events occurred on the ship while Cook was asleep or otherwise not in a position to act as a direct observer. Most sightings of land, for instance, were not initially *his*, but rather the sightings of various members of the crew.

Some of the writings from other people are included in the printed accounts in ways that make the inclusion explicit, such as when Cook includes accounts given by Mr. Anderson of how the Tahitians prepare the bodies of their dead — “Such were Mr. Anderson's remarks to me”⁶³ — or the account of Captain Furneaux after the two ships were finally separated during the second voyage, which is included as a separate chapter in the published version.⁶⁴ It is important to notice that this information is almost always from either the officers or the supernumeraries (the astronomers, the surgeons, the botanists). These are the people who are trusted, and whose words can be directly included in a reliable account of the voyage.

At other times, however, the inclusions are not obvious or are not trusted. Rather, Cook appeals to what “we” saw or what he had heard from either the natives or the sailors. As Paul Carter notes when describing the unequal relationship of Europeans and native peoples to history,

by its nature, history excludes all that is not quoted or written down. Only what has been transcribed is available for interpretation. Only documents can be compared, ordered, interpreted and judged.⁶⁵

⁶³ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume VI, page 50.

⁶⁴ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume IV, pages 229 to 240.

Cook only documents specific kinds of information in his voyages. He provides the names and locations of all the important landmarks along the route, as well as descriptions of the places and the peoples that the ship encounters. Everyday life on board the ship or on the land is rarely described except when it concerns the discipline and the health of the crew. Sailors and natives may have opinions, but if included in the ship's journal at all, these are not to be trusted until confirmed.

As participants in the production of text connected to the voyages, the natives and the sailors exist beyond the interactions of the gentlemen, and are secondary characters (named or unnamed) in the general narrative of the voyage. The anonymous book attributed to Rickman claims that, given the structures of authority, the sailors often were not even able to speak, at least to the officers and the gentlemen. He writes that,

Among the seamen on board a king's ship, there are always some expert navigators, whose judgment, ripened by experience, is much to be depended upon; but the misfortune is, that these men are never consulted, nor do they even dare so much as to whisper their opinion to their superior officer. Like gamesters standing by, they can see the errors of the game, but must not point them out till the game is over. This was the real case on board the *Discovery*.⁶⁶

The limited perspective of the officers, and of Cook in particular, has also

⁶⁵ Carter, *The Road to Botany Bay*, page 326.

⁶⁶ Rickman, *Journal of Captain Cook's Last Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, page 78. It may be recalled that, in 1707, a sailor on board the warship *Association*, keeping his own reckoning, challenged the judgment of the navigators on board the ship, and claimed that the ship and the whole squadron were much further east than the navigators had calculated. The sailor was immediately hanged for mutiny. The ships, however, were much further to the east, and were quickly sunk on Scilly Isles, with a loss of over two thousand men. The connection between knowledge and authority on a ship of the King's navy was very tight, with authority being the dominant term.

been pointed out in print. In the introduction to his account of the second voyage, Forster questions Cook's ability to include all the facts of the voyage. Forster suggests a distinction between different spheres of expertise — Cook is able to articulate the character of the ship (its position, its movements, and its condition), but he is not all-seeing, and his skills in articulating some facts from the voyage do not mean that his account is complete. Forster argues, in the introduction, that:

At first sight it may seem superfluous to offer two relations of this voyage to the world; but when we consider them as narratives of interesting facts, it must be allowed that the latter will be placed in a stronger light, by being related by different persons. Our occupations when in harbour were widely different; whilst captain Cook was employed in victualling or refitting the ship, I went in quest of the manifold objects which Nature had scattered throughout the land. Nothing is therefore more obvious, than that each of us may have caught many distinct incidents, and that our observations will frequently be foreign to each other. But above all, it is to be observed, that the same objects may have been seen in different points of view, and that the same fact may often have given rise to different ideas. Many circumstances familiar to the navigator, who has been bred on the rough element, strike the landman with novelty, and furnish entertainment to his readers. The seaman views many objects on shore with a retrospect to maritime affairs, whilst the other attends to their oeconomical uses. In short, the different branches of science which we have studied, our turns of mind, our heads and hearts have made a difference in our sensations, reflections, and expressions.⁶⁷

In his account of the second voyage, Forster includes descriptions of events such as plays that the common sailors performed while the ships were at sea. Likewise William Wales describes some of the frequent arguments and controversies that occurred on board, specifically revolving around George Forster. For instance, Wales writes that as the ships were preparing to leave, Forster

⁶⁷ Forster, *A Voyage Round the World in His Britannic Majesty's Sloop, Resolution, Volume I*, page viii.

came on board at Plymouth, with very exalted notions of himself: in consequence of which, he was continually making comparisons between himself and the officers, not much to their advantage; or, it may well be supposed, in their opinion, very consistent with truth and politeness. Neither did the common people shew him sufficient respect, of which he made frequent and very ill-natured complaints to the captain. They also disturbed his rest with their noise, singing, and, as he says, perhaps sometimes with swearing. ⁶⁸

Wales largely accepts that Cook did not include all of the facts of the voyage. But Wales turns Forster's criticism of Cook against Forster, whose own account becomes the smutty, base version of the voyage. Besant, who often praises Forster's account, describes it as containing "the humbler details."⁶⁹ In contrast, Cook provides the rational, scientific, and proper account.

6. Cook's Authority

Over two hundred years, there have been many texts and many authors. But each of them have focused on the voyages of Captain Cook. Other parts of Cook's life may be included, and the voyages may be placed within a larger collection of texts, but the focus remains on the three voyages themselves. The frequent appeal to the captain in describing the voyages underlines Cook's status as the ship's commander and thus his ownership of (and responsibility for) the voyage. While the legal organization is central to articulating Cook's relationships to his crew, they are also relevant to articulating Cook's relationship to the printed voyages. The book attributed to Rickman, for instance, is entitled *Journal of Captain Cook's Last Voyage to the Pacific Ocean on Discovery; Performed in the Years 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779*. This book is clearly not *written* by Cook, but he still dominates the identity of the voyage. In other words, Cook is the author of the voyage, whoever created

⁶⁸ Wales, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account*, page 6.

⁶⁹ Besant, *Captain Cook*, page 106.

the text. As Beaglehole notes, “Cook’s death brings his journals at an end. The voyage is still his.”⁷⁰

By focusing on the legal and sovereign organization of identities in the voyages, Cook is not simply a journalist or an important character. He is also the captain of the ship. Cook’s relationship to the journals, therefore, acquires a more proprietary and strictly representational character. His status depends on a combination of his (political) control over the ship and his (legal) representation of the voyage as such. Cook thus owns the actions of the people on board, and, in a sense, acquires both the responsibility and the credit for the voyage. As a result, when he writes that “I sailed”, we should understand the “I” in terms of the sovereign “I,” the commonwealth which consolidates the identities of its members. There are countless examples. But Cook is obviously not the only person engaged in these activities on the ships. The relationships establishing Cook’s control over the voyage also expand his actions to include all those who are under his command. Cook’s location in the system of representations is thus complex. On the ship, he is representing the Admiralty, the King, and the Country to other places. He is also representing the voyages back to the Admiralty, the King, and the Country. He not only commands, but must give an account of his commands. The result, as will be argued later, is that Cook’s status as an author exemplifies the status of those at the center of the empire, and so challenges to his authority are challenges to authority as such.

This reading of Cook’s position is not fanciful. It should be noted that ships were typically organized as corporations in which all members have a share. On one voyage in the 17th century, for instance, Dampier was to “receive one-sixteenth of the owners’ net profits from the venture.”⁷¹ Many

⁷⁰ Beaglehole, *Cook’s Journals*, Volume III, page v.

⁷¹ Williams, *The Great South Sea*, page 144.

other examples from the buccaneers and other adventurers can be found. Of course, the legal organization of voyages undertaken by ships of the King's navy was somewhat different. The captain is not answerable to his crew — a contractual agreement does not exist between them — and the voyage does not have the status of a venture. Rather, the captain is an intermediate level of authority, who remains subject to the Admiralty but who acquires a sovereign-like status in relation to the ship. He acquires command over the ship. He becomes the ship. His control over the ships (and by implication the voyages) is thus constituted through the legal and political arrangements of 18th century England. He is directly answerable to the lords of the Admiralty, who are themselves answerable to the king. His capacity to represent the voyages (to speak both for and of the voyages) is thus an expression of his relationship to English sovereign-power.

Some of people who were connected to the voyages argued that the ability to use the first person in describing the actions of the ship as a whole is limited to Cook. In his response to Forster's account of the second voyage, William Wales criticizes of Forster adopting the central position. For instance,

In page 194, He says, "We hoisted a boat out, and sent the master to sound." Doctor Forster might have had humility enough to have said, a boat was hoisted out, and the master sent to sound; as the master certainly was not under his directions.⁷²

A considerable amount of Wales's criticism of Forster is in terms of Forster's presumption to assume a greater claim to authority than Wales thought was proper. In fact, in the unofficial accounts of the voyages such as Forster's, the first person plural is common. On the other hand, the third person here, when placed alongside Cook's use of the first person, corresponds to a traditional account of sovereignty, where the acts of the collective arise from

⁷² Wales, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account*, page 70.

the will of the sovereign but are in some way possessed by every member of the body politic. “We” do something because the Captain commands it to be done. This allows Cook’s first person and the anonymous third person accounts to be consistent.

On the other hand, Wales does not offer a similar criticism when Cook takes credit for what happens on the ship. In the second voyage, for instance, Cook writes that:

As we began to be in want of water, I hoisted out two boats and took up as much as yielded about ten tons.⁷³

Of course, Cook was not the only person who hoisted out the boats, and quite possibly did not touch the boats at all. But Cook is the captain, and if, as Wales claims, it is important to maintain “the propriety of referring the merits of every performance to its proper author,”⁷⁴ then Cook is not overstating his authority. But the “I” in this passage is the sovereign “I” of authority, rather than of immediate action.⁷⁵

In addition to criticizing the way that Forster includes himself in the collective activities of the ship, Wales also criticizes the specific claims that Forster makes about the world. Sometimes, Wales directly challenges Forster’s ability to determine the true facts of the voyage. He states, for instance, that Forster

had neither skill nor opportunity to make the necessary observations for determining the matters of which he speaks.⁷⁶

⁷³ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume III, page 268.

⁷⁴ Wales, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account*, page 2.

⁷⁵ But if Cook is the sovereign, and Forster is a subject, then Forster’s use “we” is consistent with 17th century accounts of political order, at least insofar as all members of the political body have a collective responsibility for the actions of the body (that is, the actions that arise from the sovereign).

⁷⁶ Wales, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account*, page 103.

The debates at this point are between two scientists who are making competing claims about the world. Although Wales is claiming superior knowledge, the two men are at least engaging in a debate as equals. Other times, however, Wales challenges Forster's claims by appealing to people of status who were on board the ship. As he writes,

I am authorised by Lieutenants Pickersgill and Smith, and some other gentlemen, who were in the Endeavour, to declare, that there is not the least foundation [for Forster's claim that] Captain Cook, in the *Endeavour*, battered the Loo-fort at Madeira.⁷⁷

In the same way, Wales concludes his *Remarks* on Forster's account of the second voyage as follows:

The pains and trouble, which I have taken in collecting and digesting my information, have retarded the publication longer than I wished, or even expected; but my ship-mates are now scattered abroad; few remaining in England, and fewer still in, or near London, and I was unwilling, by a vague and uncertain reply to Doctor Forster's calumnies, to leave room for future disputes with that gentleman, who, I am fully satisfied, cannot controvert any thing which I have advanced, on better authority than his own bare assertions, the delusiveness of which, in many instances, at least, I have irrefragably demonstrated. Such assertions cannot, therefore, be regarded as proofs of any thing whatever, or even merit the least notice, unless supported by more respectable authority; neither will any be taken of such by me.⁷⁸

For Wales, the problem with Forster's account is not so much its inaccuracies (of which many could have also been found in Cook's account, as Wales himself implies). What is more important to Wales is the *impropriety* of Forster's account, challenging as it does the structures of authority.

Forster, for his part, does not question Cook's authority over the ship. The title of Forster's account of the second voyage is *A Voyage Round the World in his Britannic Majesty's Sloop, Resolution, Commanded by*

⁷⁷ Wales, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account*, page 12.

⁷⁸ Wales, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account*, page 110.

Captain James Cook, During the Years 1772, 3, 4, and 5. Cook is thus the person who must represent the voyage to the Admiralty, but he is *not* the one who necessarily represents the voyage to anyone else. In other words, truth and power are divided, and Cook cannot command the truth.

In his discussion of the author, Foucault has urged us to consider: what does it matter who is speaking? An important part of Foucault's answer focuses on the relationship between writing and transgression.

Texts, books, and discourses really began to have authors (other than mythical, 'sacralized' and 'sacralizing' figures) to the extent that authors became subject to punishment, that is, to the extent that discourses could be transgressive.⁷⁹

But just as authors became responsible once texts could be transgressive, author also became important when texts were connected to a regime of truth, especially when that regime is based on personal experiences and reliable second hand information. And so when Cook refers either to himself or to others in the text, the references are couched in a narrative of trust, which is itself tied to the political and economic structures that locate people in different classes in society. In the third voyage, for instance, Cook writes:

I am indebted to Mr. Anderson for a considerable share of what follows in this and in the following chapter. In other matters I have only expressed, nearly in his words, remarks that coincided with mine; but what relates to the religion and language of these people, is entirely his own.⁸⁰

Responsibility is, of course, an important aspect of this passage, as is the desire to give Anderson due credit for his data. But there is also an important strategy here insofar as the creation of reliable authors is a crucial way to create reliability in an empiricist world. At other times we hear of sailors jumping ship and being brought back, but the accounts that they give of

⁷⁹ Foucault, "What is an Author?", page 108.

⁸⁰ Admiralty, *Voyages*, Volume V, page 433.

themselves are almost always from the captain's perspective; or, better yet, from the perspective of sovereign authority itself.

By focusing on important controversies that arose when people attempted to find a single author in the text, the dominance of Cook over his voyages is well-established, but not because he is the sole or even primary source of the text. He is the author for institutional and strategic reasons, connected both to the power of the Admiralty and to the desires of later commentators to characterize the voyages. The account of Cook as an author is thus not only a way of guaranteeing the truth of the descriptions, it is also a way of locating Cook in the broader social formations of science and politics. Roland Barthes once summarized a particular, once dominant way of characterizing the author as follows:

The author is reputed the father and the owner of his work: literary science therefore teaches *respect* for the manuscript and the author's declared intentions, while society asserts the legality of the relation of the author to the work...⁸¹

As an idealized author who presented the world to his readers on an enlightened platter, Cook has been articulated as the father of his text, as one of the important fathers of the 19th century. However, against this characterization it has been argued that Cook's relationship to the text is problematic. He is not the autonomous, more or less obvious source of meaning who translated his experiences into text. Rather, Cook was part of an expansive system of institutions, which gave him authority over his ships and then authority over his texts. Cook, of course, was dead for most of this history. But there were reasons for locating Cook as the sovereign voice of the voyages. It is not simply that he is given credit, but also that the act of giving him credit is an important way to give credit to the people and institutions that created and sustained him. The celebration of Cook's authority, in other

⁸¹ Barthes, *Image-Music-Text*, page 160.

words, is tied to the celebration of specific forms of knowledge and power which begin to cover the world.

The next chapter will focus on issues arising from attempts to resolve the three voyages into a single coherent text. Just as Cook has been created by institutions, so have the published accounts of his voyages. The institutions that are relevant here are not only those that created and maintained Cook's authority, but also those that produced, distributed, and interpreted the printed books.