

## Scientific vs. Sentimental Narrative in the Travels of William Bartram and Mungo Park

Kifah Al-Omari  
The Hashemite University-Jordan

**Abstract:** *There are two main modes of narrative that travel writers may apply in their writings: the scientific and the sentimental mode. These two modes seem to be totally distinct and incompatible. The aim of the present paper is to show that this is not really the case. To do so, the paper will discuss two important works of travel literature: William Bartram's Travels of William Bartram (1791) and Mungo Park's Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa (1799).*

*The main argument of the paper is that while Bartram's narrative is mainly scientific and that of Park is mainly sentimental, one may find in Bartram moments of sentimental narrative and other moments of the scientific narrative in Park. Such moments are equally, if not more, important. So, both writers are much more complex than simply to designate them as scientific and/or sentimental. The paper argues also that finding them to be scientific as well as sentimental entails so many consequences, one of which is that their claim of disinterestedness is not totally true. Both writers switch from one mode of narrative to another in order to obscure their colonialist aims. On the one hand, Bartram's scientific observations are sometimes implicitly shaped by his race and gender as a white male. On the other, Park's sentimentality cannot hide his colonial interests. Having said so, however, both writers try to suggest a link between the outside world of nature and the inside world of mankind in order to emphasize their belief in the theory of monogenesis which advocates the common origin of all human beings.*

There are two main modes of narrative that travel writers may apply in their writings: the scientific and the sentimental mode. Apparently, these seem to be distinct and incompatible; one of them necessarily excludes the other. The aim of this paper is to show that this may not be really the case. The sentimental and the scientific narratives that one finds in certain works of travel literature are not necessarily incompatible; on the contrary, they might be complimentary. One of the two modes can be used to enhance the other, not to exclude it. To prove this, the paper will discuss two important works of travel literature: William Bartram's *Travels of William Bartram* (1791) and Mungo Park's *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa* (1799). Bartram and Park are two important travel writers who have influenced many other writers, especially in the nineteenth century, when travel literature becomes a distinctive form of writing that is related to the imperial discourse of the age.

While Bartram's narrative is mainly scientific and that of Park's is mainly sentimental, one may find in Bartram moments of sentimental narratives and

other moments of the scientific narrative in Park. Such moments are equally, if not more, important. The two writers are much more complex than simply to designate them as scientific and/or sentimental. They switch from one mode of narrative to the other within very few lines. By doing so, they try to convince the reader that they are both objective and sympathetic with the native people. Having said so, however, the paper argues that their claim of objectivity and disinterestedness is not always true; their observations are sometimes implicitly shaped by their race and gender as white male travelers who have colonial interests in the land they are exploring, something that they themselves would not deny. On the other hand, the paper will also argue that despite their colonial aims, the two writers believe in the common origin of all human beings. They sympathize with the native Indians and the slaves who inhabit the lands they explored. They believe that those people are capable of adopting the European modes of civilization. What helped them to adopt such a view is the complementarity between the scientific and sentimental narrative in their works. This complementarity is contested later in the first half of the nineteenth century when scholars began to think that these two modes of narrative are totally distinct. Samuel George Morton and the other members of the 'American School' of ethnology believe that the sympathetic and humanistic role of the observer should be sharply distinguished from the objectivity required from the naturalist. Because of this distinction, they adopt the polygenesis, rather than monogenesis theory of race; that is, the diversity rather than the unity of human beings.

Before going into the details of these arguments, it is worth it at the outset of this paper to define the scientific and sentimental modes briefly. In her introduction to Mungo Park's *Travels*, Kate Ferguson Marsters (2000:23) defines sentimentality as "the degree of emotional sympathy [the writer] resonates with in regard to his subject matter". The scientific mode, on the other hand, marks the writer's detachment from his subject matter to be more involved in the outside world of nature. In her book *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, Mary Louis Pratt (1992:77) gives a similar distinction between these two modes. She says that the information in sentimental narrative is textually relevant "in so far as it bears upon the speaker-traveler and his quest". In scientific writing, on the other hand, information is relevant "in so far as it attaches to goals and systems of knowledge institutionalized outside the text" (Ibid: 77). So, in the former, the writer is directly involved in his narrative and provides his own personal emotions to the reader. He sometimes comments overtly on his encounters with the outside world and the people or animals that inhabit it. In the latter, on the other hand, the writer aims to be totally objective by limiting himself to the natural phenomena, though he sometimes comments on what he observes. The two modes of narrative were widely recognized at the end of the eighteenth century, especially in the works of travel literature. What remains is to see whether they are compatible or not and the consequences of applying them in such works.

The scientific and sentimental modes of narrative are considered complimentary by some scholars and totally distinct by others. Pratt (1992:78), for example, adopts the earlier view and argues convincingly perhaps that the sentimental subject shares certain crucial characteristics with his scientific counterpart: “Europeaness, maleness and middle classness, of course, but also innocence and passivity”. The pronoun ‘I’ is for her the element which marks the line of complementarity between science and sentiment. On the other hand, there are other scholars who have a totally different view. Bruce Dian (2002: 1) clarifies this view when he refers to Samuel George Morton, George R. Gilddon, Josiah C. Nott and Louis Agassiz. For these scholars, human feelings have no place in the impersonal and objective scientific discourse. The present paper adopts the first view that emphasizes the complementarity between these two modes because it is difficult to separate them. Even the scientific traveler, as we will see in Bartram’s *Travels*, is expected to make some moralizing comments on the people he comes in contact with during his travels.

As Bartram and Park are Europeans who come in contact with the native Indians in the course of their travels, it is useful to refer at the beginning of this paper to what Pratt calls the ‘contact zone.’ She defines this term this way:

[S]ocial spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination - like colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out across the globe today (Pratt 1992: 4).

Pratt uses this term to refer to the space of colonial encounters, the space in which people geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations. These relations usually involve “conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict” (Pratt 1992:6). The meeting between two disparate cultures in the contact zone will produce what she calls ‘transculturation’; the subjugated people select and invent from materials transmitted to them by the dominant group, they decide what to absorb into their own, and what to use it for. The third related term that Pratt (1992:7) talks about is ‘anti-conquest.’ She uses this term to refer to “the strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment as they assert European hegemony”. As a whole, Pratt’s main concern in her book *Imperial Eye* is the interaction between sentimental and experiential travelers and the nineteenth-century discourse of imperialism. Despite the fact that her appeal is that of anti-conquest, her main argument is that natural history aims to enhance imperialism, which is similar to the argument of the present paper.

In his *Travels*, William Bartram wants to present himself as the disinterested and objective naturalist. He sees himself mainly as a scientist. He says at the beginning of his book that he embarked on his journey:

At the request of Dr. Fothergill, of London, to search the Floridas, and the western parts of Carolina and Georgia, for the discovery of

rare and useful productions of nature, chiefly in the vegetable kingdom...(1955: 29).

So, the main purpose of the journey is to discover “rare and useful productions of nature.” He also says in the introduction that “the attention of the traveler should be particularly turned, in the first place, to the various works of Nature” (1955: 15). This emphasis on science right from the very beginning aroused a lot of debate among scholars who try to decide whether Bartram’s book is a ‘work of science’ or ‘a work of art.’ Christoph Irmscher (1999:37) refers to John Seelye, L. Hugh Moore and Charles H. Adams as some of the critics who see Bartram’s *Travels* as a ‘work of art’. Other critics believe that it is first and foremost ‘a work of science.’ Douglas Anderson (1990:3) refers to Bruce Silver, who argues that Bartram is primarily a scientist. The present paper adopts the view of a third group of critics who believe that Bartram combines both ‘science’ and ‘art’ in his narrative. Critics like Irmscher and Anderson believe that a mere scientific reading of the book will not be useful to understand its hidden undertones. For these critics, Bartram wanted to supply his readers with more than a ‘dignified botanical shopping list.’ For Pamela Regis (1992:61), there are passages in Bartram that convey his awe and terror at the vistas he encountered. Such passages, Regis (Ibid) adds, receive more critical attention than the natural historical ones. The source of the debate for Regis is the assumption on the part of some critics that aesthetics and science must be warring points of view. The writer for these critics cannot be romantic and scientific at the same time. For Regis (1992:61), these are modern divisions “imposed from a perspective in which science is looked upon as positivism and art as extrarational”. But in Bartram’s day, adds Regis (Ibid), science and art are not at war with each other. The important thing to add here is that this is also true in Bartram’s text where aesthetics and science coexist together. For Anderson (1990:3), Bartram not only describes the natural phenomena of the American wilderness, but also comments as well on the political turmoil within which he worked and wrote. He adds that Bartram’s scientific mode gives him some remoteness that permits him to consider the broader implications of social transformation.

There is a connection in Bartram between the moral world of mankind and the disturbances of nature. At the beginning of his journey he was ‘cheerful and happy in the prospect of a quick and pleasant voyage; but, alas!

[H]ow vain and uncertain are human expectations! How quickly is the flattering scene changed! The powerful winds, now rushing forth from their secret abodes, suddenly spread terror and devastation; and the wide ocean, which, a few moments past, was gentle and placid, is now thrown into disorder... (1955: 29).

Bartram considers this disorder in nature as an ill omen for him. He can only feel happy when the storm comes to an end:

The tempest now relaxed ... and the steady western wind resumed *his* [emphasis mine] peaceful reign. The waters were purified ....

So it is with the varied and mutable scenes of human events on the stream of life ... (1955: 66).

Bartram goes on to give a lengthy account of this storm, which becomes “both a familiar means of chastening human pride and an emblem of human psychology” (11). The storm in this sense is an inner and outer phenomenon, “an instrument of god and an intrinsic weakness in the ‘chain’ of reasoning in which men too readily come to place their trust.”

Bartram’s narrative, then, is much more complex than simply to be designated as scientific and /or sentimental. It is a form of discourse between the two modes. He describes different things in the outer world and, at the same time, his internal responses to them. For Pamela Regis (1992:41), the individual action in Bartram’s *Travels* is represented through narrative. This action is both “external, as Bartram moves through the world, and internal, as he experiences his own action” (Ibid: 41). Similarly, Christoph Irmischer (1999:46) emphasizes the complexity of Bartram’s narrative. Bartram’s detailed botanical discussion of the plant *Franklinia* may serve as a good example to illustrate this point:

a flowering tree, of the first order for beauty and fragrance of blossoms: the tree grows fifteen or twenty feet high, branching alternately; the leaves are oblong, broadest towards their extremities, ...; the flowers are very large, expand themselves perfectly, ...; the borders of the petals are crisped or plicated: these large white flowers stand single and sessile in the bosom of the leaves, and being near together towards the extremities of the twigs, and usually many expanded at the same time, make a gay appearance... (1955: 66).

One can notice here how Bartram’s discussion of this plant is skillfully embedded in, and framed by, his narrative. Irmischer (1999:46) points out that this narrative culminates in a subjective impression; especially when Bartram says that *Franklinia* makes “a gay appearance”.

Bartram’s lack of objectivity can also be seen in his contradictory descriptions of the uncultivated landscape. To do so, he uses different styles and shifts in tone and voice. His claim of disinterestedness is not totally true. Throughout the book, the readers are only reading his fantasy because his travel narrative, though scientific, is written from his own point of view as an interested white traveler. Actually, he doesn’t deny that his exploration is not only to discover new lands but also to open these lands for European commerce:

This vast plain, together with the forests contiguous to it, if permitted (...) to be in possession and under the culture of industrious planters and mechanics, would in a little time exhibit other scenes than it at present, delightful as it is; for by the arts of agriculture and commerce, almost every desirable thing in life might be produced and made plentiful here (1955: 199).

It is clear that Bartram is trying here to advise future imperialists to make use of this beautiful place. His 'imperial eye' can also be seen in this passage that calls for the 'European hegemony' that Pratt talks about:

Next day we passed over part of the great and beautiful Alachua Savanna, whose exuberant green meadows, with the fertile hills which immediately encircle it, would, if peopled and cultivated after the manner of the civilized countries of Europe, ..., accommodate in the happiest manner above one hundred thousand human inhabits ... and I make no doubt that this place will at some future day be one of the most populous and delightful seats on earth (1955: 211).

There are also many other similar passages that show Bartram's interest in the land he is exploring as a white traveler. If these lands are "peopled and cultivated after the manner of the civilized countries of Europe," they will be the happiest lands on earth. So, Bartram is not objective and disinterested as he claims to be.

However, one should not carry too far the claim that Bartram is not objective for two reasons. First, the ethos of disinterestedness was not as strict in Bartram's day as it is in our day. 'Science' and 'art' were not thought to be that much distinct in his time. Second, there are other 'sentimental' moments in the text where Bartram regrets the destruction of the cultivated land by human interference. For example, he expresses his regret for destroying the "fruitful Orange groves" when he says:

I have often been affected with extreme regret at beholding the destruction and devastation which has been committed or indiscreetly exercised on those extensive fruitful Orange groves ... by the new planters under the British government ... (213).

The new planters that Bartram talks about will remove the plantation and build, instead, spacious frame buildings:

Came to again, at an old deserted plantation, the property of a British gentleman, but some years since vacated. A very spacious building was settling to the ground and mouldering to earth (1955: 213).

It seems that Bartram is contradicting himself at certain moments in his narrative. At certain moments, he encourages future imperialists to come and cultivate these beautiful lands; at others, he regrets such cultivation because it is "destruction and devastation" of nature! He switches between two loyalties: one to his Europeanness, and the other to his 'love' of nature. The reason for this contradiction might also be the employment of the scientific and sentimental modes of narrative together at the same time. As a whole, it could be argued that he tries to appear as an 'anti-conquest' subject as defined by Pratt; to secure his innocence at the same moment as he asserts European hegemony.

The complementarity between the scientific and sentimental modes becomes more difficult for Bartram to employ when he relates his view about the Indians. It might be easier for him to switch between the 'personal' and the 'impersonal,' and vice versa, when he describes the natural scenes he observed in America and the effects of these scenes on him as an objective scientist. Things are not that easy when he discusses his reactions to the Indians and his encounters with them in what Pratt calls the 'contact zone'. In such moments, he seems to be more sentimental than scientific because he appears to be sympathetic to the Indians, though with certain reservations.

Before discussing Bartram's attitudes towards the Indians, it is useful to make some remarks about the different theories of race and the history of the encounter between the Europeans and Indians. Winthrop D. Jordan has written a whole book entitled *White Over Black: American Attitudes Towards the Negro: 1550-1812* to answer one question that seems to be simple: What were the attitudes of white men toward Negroes during the first two centuries of European and African settlement in what became the United States of America? He depends on many sources for his study, mainly on the written records of the period. He concluded by saying:

Within every white American who stood confronted by the Negro, there had arisen a perpetual dual between his higher and lower natures. His cultural conscience - his Christianity, his humanitarianism, his ideology of liberty and equality - demanded that he regard and treat the Negro as his brother and his countryman, as his equal. At the same moment, however, many of his most profound urges, especially his yearning to maintain the identity of his folk, his passion for domination, his sheer avarice, and his sexual desire, impelled him toward conceiving and treating the Negro as inferior to himself, as an American leper (1965: 581-82).

This is almost like Pratt's 'anti-conquest' where the attitudes of innocence and hegemony both coexist at the same time in any confrontation between a white American and a Negro. So, the question raised by Jordan at the beginning of his book is not a simple question, it is rather a very complex one that has received so many answers.

In order to better understand what really happens in the encounter between Europeans and Indians, it is useful to have in mind the debate about the different theories of race. These are theories that try to account for the origin of human beings. In his introduction to Samuel Stanhope Smith's *An Essay on the Causes of the Variety of Complexion and Figure in the Human Species*, Winthrop Jordan (1965: vii) argues convincingly that the origin of human races is a 'scientific puzzle'. Race, he says, is a problem for the social as for the natural scientist. The scientific pronouncements in this regard are not trustworthy "because of their proven explosiveness" (Ibid). These scientific pronouncements have been shaped so frequently by the social considerations upon which they bear. Until recently, he adds (1965: vii), natural scientists seemed incapable of

discussing physical distinctions among human groups “without at once lapsing from self-proclaimed objectivity”. So, objectivity is again at stake in any discussion of race because there are so many contradictory considerations that are interlocked together in such discussion.

Theories of race in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries can be divided into two main theories: monogenesis and polygenesis. The former precedes the latter and argues for the unity of human races, rather than diversity. Samuel Stanhope Smith is one of the first monogenesisists who believe in the common origin of mankind. In his essay, which was first published in 1787, he attempts to show that the physical variety among the peoples of the world was due to natural causes. Some of the causes he talks about are climate, state of society, and habits of living. On the other hand, the first half of the nineteenth century witnessed the appearance of what is called the ‘American School’ of ethnology. This school is led by Samuel George Morton, George R. Giliddon, Josiah C. Nott, Louis Agassiz and other ethnologists who believe in the polygenesis of human races. Human diversity for these ethnologists has a biological basis and it could not be altered in any foreseeable time span. Also, they think that racial groups stood in a hierarchy of value, with black people on the lowest rank. In other words, race for them is a fixed entity and racial inferiority is a fact. The evidence provided by these ethnologists is mainly scientific; a simple measurement of the human skull. However, Bruce Dain (2002:198) argues that the evidence provided by these ethnologists is flawed evidence. He describes it as “unsophisticated, simplistically one-sided quasi-biology”. Such evidence is also untrustworthy, as mentioned earlier by Winthrop Jordan. These ethnologists try to prove their theory by coming up with a scientific evidence, which is not enough because human races cannot be reduced to be discussed from the point of view of science only.

Morton (1839), however, believes in the emancipation of the Negroes, but with reservation. In his *Jamaica Journal Crania American, or A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America* (1839), he was able to see blacks as individuals with worthwhile human histories. This does not alter his view about their inferiority to other races. Dain (2002:203) refers to him as someone who makes a distinction between science and sentiment; that is, between objectivity and sympathy. He regrets the inferiority of the Negroes, but this is a fact for him that cannot be denied.

As for Bartram, he belongs more to the monogenesis group, though such view comes much later in the 1840s. He incorporates in his narrative the idea that all life emanated from a common origin. For Peter L. Bayers (2003:39), Bartram “actively engages the natural world by alluding to the rudiments of the evolutionary hypothesis and the notion that all creatures and people have descended from a common origin”. This can be seen in his sympathy with the Indians. In the introduction to his travels, Bartram considers addressing the manners of the Indian nations as an important subject. He tries to investigate their ability to be civilized nations. He says that it is necessary to inquire whether they were inclined to adopt the European modes of civil society,



whether this is possible without using violent means. In other words, he tries to see if it is possible to have a peaceful encounter with the Indian culture. In his essay “Some Hints and Observations concerning the civilization of the Indians” (1995), he finds that this is possible. He decides that the Indians are capable of adopting European modes of civilization. He says in the introduction to his *Travels* that he was satisfied in discovering that *they* were desirous of becoming united with *us* in civil and religious society [emphasis mine]’ (1955: 26). He suggests a tentative plan for bringing the Indians into ‘civilization and union.’ He concludes (Ibid) that “it is suitable to send men of ability and virtue, under the authority of government, as friendly visitors into their towns....” So, one can also see here Bartram’s imperial eye. First, he uses the pronouns ‘they’ and ‘us’ that are usually used in colonial discourse to refer to the Europeans as ‘us’ and other nations as ‘they’ or ‘them’. Second, he tries to provide a rationale for his journey by claiming that he is trying to bring the Indians to civilization, while the main purpose, as he himself would not deny, is a commercial one.

Bartram finds much to admire in the Indians. However, he has some reservations about their manners. He is not blind to their vices, but other nations, he asserts, have the same vices:

The Indians make war against, kill, and destroy their own species, and their motives spring from the same erroneous source as they do in all other nations of mankind ... (1955: 183).

He admires their customs, especially music and dancing:

These people, like all other nations, are fond of music and dancing: their music is both vocal and instrumental; but of the latter they have scarcely any thing worth the name ... to accompany dances, they songs of different classes, material, bacchanalian and amorous; which last, I must confess, are extravagantly libidinous...(1955: 395-96).

So, Bartram admires the Indians, but he has some reservations about them; they kill their own “species,” they don’t have instrumental music, and some of their dances are libidinous. The important thing to mention here is that in all the instances mentioned above, Bartram emphasizes that the Indians are ‘like all other nations,’ which indicates his belief in the common origin of all mankind. He emphasizes more than once that the Indians are ‘both well-tutored and civil,’ just like all other nations. Their real problem for him is that they have ‘unfortunate offspring.’

In his description of the Indians, Bartram is mainly sentimental. He is totally engaged in moralizing and advocating for them. This can serve as another instance for sentimental mode of narrative that one can find in Bartram, in addition to the scientific one. For Pamela Regis (1992:14), Bartram resorts mainly to natural history in his description of the Indians which causes his narrative to fail “because it doesn’t provide a middle ground between the impersonal and the personal”. While Regis might be right, one can argue that Bartram is not totally inclined to advocate for the Indians. He finds many things

to admire in them, but at the same time there are other things that he condemns. He keeps switching between the personal and the impersonal, or between the sentimental and scientific all over his text, even in his discussion of the Indians, which is supposed to be an issue of sympathy more than anything else.

As for Mungo Park, on the other hand, the situation is exactly the opposite. He is considered as a sentimental hero by many critics like Pratt (1992) and Marsters (2000). For Pratt (1992: 75), Park did not write a narrative of “geographical discovery, observation, or collection, but one of personal experience and adventure”. She describes Park as a sentimental hero who made himself the protagonist of his own account. His narrative takes the form of an epic series of trials, challenges, and encounters with the unpredictable. The sentimental writing in Park, says Pratt (1992:76), “anchors what is being expressed in the sensory experience, judgment, agency, or desires of the human subject”. In this kind of narrative, authority lies in the “authenticity of somebody’s felt experience.” This makes her describe Park as a ‘responsive’ and ‘self-dramatizing’ speaker. She argues (1992:77) convincingly that Park’s own hopes and fears and his own bodily experience “constitute the events and register their significance”. What gives value to the events of the narrative is the language of emotions. Similarly, Kate Ferguson Marsters (2000: 2) agrees with Pratt when she says that Park is a sentimental traveler who recorded his personal and subjective response to Africa and its people. Park’s heroism is also emphasized by Tim Fulford and Debbie Lee (2002:129) who consider him a ‘Quixotic Knight’ who pursues his promised task with faithfulness that exposes him to heroic adventures. They liken him to a knight of medieval romance who reaches the object of his quest after many trials and adventures, some of them are comic. Park’s exploration, for them, is portrayed as a “quest romance.” Finally, Nicholas Howe (2001:232) considers Park more as a “serious amateur naturalist” than a “trained scientific observer”.

Park’s sentimentality, however, does not deny the presence of important scientific moments in his narrative. Right from the very beginning he says:

I had a passionate desire to *examine* into the productions of a country so little known; and to become *experimentally* acquainted with the modes of life, and character of the natives [emphasis mine] (2000: 67).

The words ‘examine’ and ‘experimentally’ carry scientific connotations and suggest an empirical approach to his project. He uses these scientific terms to establish the aim of his journey right from the beginning. Also, like Bartram, he is interested in plants:

I had collected and brought with me from Madling the leaves and flowers of this tree; but they were so greatly bruised on the road that I thought it best to gather another specimen at this place; and accordingly collected that from which the annexed engraving is taken (2000: 298).

Park proceeds to talk about this plant in more details, which indicates his good knowledge in botany. He, however, doesn't go so far in such descriptions compared to Bartram. At certain moments of disappointment, botany helps Park to restore his Christian faith and to resume his quest:

I was indeed a stranger in a strange land, yet I was still under the protecting eye of that province who has condescended to call himself the stranger's friend. At this moment, painful as my reflections were, the extra ordinary beauty of a small moss . . . irresistibly caught my eye . . . reflections like these, would not allow me to despair. I started up, and disregarding both hunger and fatigue, traveled forwards, assured that relief was at hand; and I was not disappointed (2000: 227).

The present paper argues that the sentimentality that one finds in Park can only be traced back to the events of the narrative, not to Park's own emotions apart from these events. Actually, the sentimental moments in his narrative are usually brief and do not last for a long time. For example, one of the most sentimental moments in the narrative is when his blacksmith companion meets his aged and blind mother after a long time. One can write pages and pages about this moment. Park, however, comments briefly on this by saying:

From this interview I was fully convinced, that whatever difference there is between the Negro and European in the conformation of the nose and the colour of the skin, there is none in the genuine sympathies and characteristic feelings of our common nature (2000: 120).

Instead of talking about the sentimental moment itself, Park talks about other broader issues related to the difference between the Europeans and the Negroes.

It could also be argued here that Park's sentimentality is used as a means to an end. On the one hand, he uses it as an appeal to the reader to gain his/her approval for what he is doing. On the other, he uses it to hide his imperial eye. For Marsters (2000:22), Park's work "went beyond being an especially good example of a sentimental traveler". Park for her did see with an imperial eye, he views the land and its people in terms of their potential for European methods of production. After all, the background of Park's travel is his relationship with the African Association which has commercial interests in Africa. He has to be faithful to the general aim of this association. He himself doesn't deny that this faithfulness is his main concern all throughout his narrative:

If I should perish in my journey, I was willing that my hopes and expectations should perish with me; and if I should succeed in rendering the geography of Africa more familiar to my countrymen, and in opening to their ambition and industry new sources of wealth, and new channels of commerce, I knew that I was in the hands of men of honor ... (2000: 68).

He emphasizes the same point in another instance:

I have now ... explained with sufficient minuteness, the nature and extent of the commercial connection... between the Negro natives of these parts of Africa which I visited, and the nations of Europe (2000: 272).

So, commerce is the main aim for Park's travel. To avoid the pitfalls of other exploration writers, Marsters (2000:22) argues, Park "stumbled into the heroic mold that fit the expectations of the public". Pratt (1992:70) emphasizes the same point when she says that the image of human knowledge in Park is that of a 'fund,' which reflects the predominantly commercial aims of Park's journey to Africa. She maintains that sentimental travel literature in general has an anti-conquest dimension - the overtly dominating goals of imperialism are obscured by promoting "a utopian, innocent vision of European global authority." Fulford and Lee (2002:117) give more importance to Park's *Travels* in particular. They emphasize that central Africa is a region brought sensationally to western eyes in 1799 by the words of Mungo Park. Many other travelers follow his footsteps, fascinated by his descriptions of the land and its people. There are so many examples from the text that illustrate Park's imperial eye. Like Bartram, he frequently uses the pronouns 'us' and 'them' when he talks about the Europeans and the Negro natives. Also, as mentioned earlier, the passages in which we find his faithfulness to the African Association are much more elaborate and detailed compared to the others in which he shows his brief sentimentality.

Even in the moments when Park switches to his scientific narrative, he immediately links it to his 'imperial eye.' To give only one example, when he and his companions were leaving a village called Marina on February 14, they saw some natives of a neighbour-hood village called Toorda, trying to gather a kind of berries called *tomberonges*. Park (2000: 131) affirms his knowledge of botany once more when he says that he knew it to be the fruit of *rhamnus lotus* of Linnaeus. He adds that he 'observed' this shrub at other places. The natives use it to make bread which he (2000: 132-33) describes as "sweet and agreeable". The important thing in this account is that Park may not be totally conscious of his imperial interests. "An *army* may very well have been fed with the bread I have tasted ... it is not likely that the *soldiers* would complain of it [emphasis mine]" (Ibid: 132-33). So, Park's sentimentality and scientific knowledge are joined together in this instance. Both modes of narrative are used to reinforce his 'imperial eye.'

The other important thing that links Park to Bartram is his belief in the common origin of human beings. He shares with Bartram feelings of antipathy towards slavery. Chapter twenty-two in his *Travels* is devoted to a whole essay on the origins of slavery in Africa. In this chapter, Park provides a general outline of the system of slavery in Africa. He is appalled by the suffering he saw in slavery. He (2000: 263) concludes that slavery in Africa constitutes a system of no modern date. He disapproves of slave trading, something that he tracks throughout his book. Also, the passage quoted earlier in this paper from Park's

reaction to the interview between the blacksmith and his mother (120) emphasizes his belief in the common origin of mankind. Compared to Bartram, it is much easier to feel this belief in Park's part because his narrative is mainly sentimental. Once again, this proves the main argument of the present paper; that is, the complementarity between the scientific and sentimental modes of narrative in both Bartram and Park. In addition to being a sentimental hero, Pratt (1992:78) argues that Park is also "the non-hero of anti-conquest ... [he] writes himself as a receptor, not an initiator, as devoid of desire as his scientific counterpart". Switching from one mode of narrative to the other, Park observes a lot of similarities between the different tribes of people he encountered:

I have observed that the Moors, in their complexion, resemble the Mulattoes of the West Indians; but they have something unpleasant in their aspect, which the Mullattoes have not. I *fancied* that I *discovered* in the features of most of them, a disposition toward cruelty, and low cunning ... The treachery and malevolence of their character, are manifested in their plundering excursions against the Negro villages ... The Negroes very seldom retaliate...[emphasis mine] (2000: 171).

So, Park observes similarities in complexion, but differences in character, between these people. He appears to sympathize with the Negroes. It is also interesting to notice the language that Park uses in this regards, I 'fancied' that I 'discovered,' which is an attempt in his part to appear as objective as possible, especially with regard to the crucial issue of the similarity or difference between the different tribes he meets.

In spite of all the hardships that Park meets during his travel, he was able to survive at the end of his *Travels*. He knows well that opening new commercial channels is a task that carries a lot of appalling risks. He was imprisoned by some of the local chiefs; he was at the mercy of brigands who stripped him of his clothes; and sometimes he was robbed and left for dead. He didn't perish, though, but restored his resolution towards the end when he has undergone an epiphany brought on, once again, by a moss. It could be argued here that his epiphany is not only brought on by the fact that he survived, though this is a great achievement for him, but also by the fact that he has lost all his European commodities that he had with him at the beginning. For the natives and for the readers as well, he is no longer defined by these commodities. He is now in a situation that makes it easier for the natives, and the readers, to believe everything he has done. However, he is still the powerful white man. He is still alive to the possibilities of more and more commercial business to be carried out in Africa.

As a whole, one can say that the real problem for Bartram, Park, and the other travel literature writers at the end of the eighteenth century is whether to see science, nature and moral perception as diversities that formulate a unity or not. From their writings, it is evident that they believe in the unity of these different approaches. Science and sentiment were not considered as two

contradictory things for these writers. They could co-exist together in one text. Also, this vision helps them to consider all human beings as coming from one common origin. They even were able to sympathize with the native Indians. For these writers, the Indians have the ability to be 'civilized' people. By the late 1830s, however, no such vision existed. Morton and the other members of the 'American School' of ethnology think that there is no unity between nature and morality. In order to argue for the emancipation of the slaves, these two should be divorced. This conflict of opinion among scholars might be the main reason for the different perceptions of race that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century.

To conclude, one can say that finding Bartram and Park as scientific and sentimental at the same time is a touchstone for European travel writers for decades to follow. In their *Travels*, these two approaches seem to complement each other. As a result, both Bartram and Park seem to have similar beliefs. On the one hand, they are imperialists who try to open new lands for European commerce. On the other, they believe in the common origin of all human beings. The real problem for Bartram and Park is how to reconcile their sentimental emotions with their colonial interests. In other words, the real problem is how to represent themselves as anti-conquest writers. They try hard to appear as objective and disinterested as possible. In order to achieve this goal, they try to suggest a link between the outside world of nature and the inside world of mankind. They combine sentimentality with science to avoid being too subjective and to be as 'authentic' as possible. However, looking closely at their *Travels*, one can say that their race, being white Europeans, shapes their observations, even the scientific ones. Both of them try to obscure their colonial interests, but in different ways.

## References:

- Anderson, Douglas.** (1990). 'Bartram's *Travels* and the Politics of Nature'. *Early American Literature*, 25.1: 3-17.
- Bartram, William.** (1955). *Travels of William Bartram*. In Mark Van Doren (ed). New York: Dover.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1995). 'Some Hints and Observations Concerning the Civilization of the Indians or Aborigines of America'. In Gregory A. Waskelkov & Kathryn E. Holland Braund (eds.), *William Bartram on the Southeastern Indians*, 187-199. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Bayers, Peter L.** (2003). 'Evolution and the Politics of the Early United States in William Bartram's *Travels* (1791)'. *English Language Notes*, 40.2: 38-49.
- Dian, Bruce.** (2002) *A Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Fulford, Tim and Debbie Lee.** (2002). 'Mental Travelers: Joseph Banks, Mungo Park, and the Romantic Imagination'. *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 24.2:117-38.
- Howe, Nicholas.** (2001). 'Looking for a River, or, Travelers in Africa'. *Research in African Literature*, 32.3:229-42.
- Irmscher, Christoph.** (1999). *The Poetics of Natural History, from John Bartram to William James*. New Jersey: Rutgers.
- Jordan, Winthrop D.** Introduction. (1965). *An Essay on the Causes of the Variety of Complexion and Figure in the Human Species*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1968) *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro: 1550- 1812*. Tennessee: University of North Carolina Press.
- Marsters, Kate Ferguson.** (2000). Introduction. *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa*. London: Duka UP, 1-28.
- Morton, Samuel George.** (1839). *Crania American, or A Comparative View of the Skulls of Various Aboriginal Nations of North and South America*. London: Simpkin, Marshall.
- Park, Mungo.** (2000). *Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa*. London: Duke University Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise.** (1992). *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Regis, Pamela.** (1992). *Describing Early America, Bartram, Jefferson, Crevecoeur, and the Influence of Natural History*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P.
- Smith, Samuel Stanhope.** (1965). *An Essay on the Causes of the Variety of Complexion and Figure in the Human Species*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

