TRAVEL WRITING, HISTORY AND COLONIALISM: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

From remote antiquity, men and women have travelled due to diverse reasons. Curiosity may be one cause but diplomacy, political pursuit, military campaigns, trade, business contacts, exile, flight from persecution, migration, pilgrimage, missionary activities, and the search for economic or educational opportunities were and still are common inducements for foreign travel. That is perhaps the reason that travel has emerged as one of the most popular idiom in the academic discourse of the modern world. Literature, history, geography, cultural studies, anthropology, gender and postcolonial studies have engaged with the study and analysis of travel. In fact, in the past few decades, literature of and on travel has reached enormous scale. A number of reasons can be assigned for its popularity. Bill Buford attributes it to its “wonderful ambiguity” lying “between fact and fiction.”

It can be considered as “postmodern collage” encompassing and intersecting diverse pieces. Different academic disciplines have employed travel for different reasons. All those scholars who are working on colonialism, race, and cultural relations have “rediscovered those travel narratives that accompanied, described, extended, even made possible, the expansion of capital and colonialism.” Feminist scholars, working on women travellers, have focussed on their “texts’ relationship to male-authored accounts”. While literary critics and biographers have concentrated on the travel writings of those authors who are famous for their other works in order to get a glimpse of their lives and motives. In the similar vein, cultural geographers working on spatiality have found travel an interesting area of attention. And post-modern theorists have directed their attention to travel “for its expression of the themes and condition of exile, migration, nomadism, and boundary-crossings.”
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Thus as a multidisciplinary genre, travel has been subjected to varied uses and purposes. However, it has developed close relationship with history and colonialism. The paper explores the inter-relationship of three concepts: travel, history and colonialism. It points out that, though travelogues and travel writing have been used as sources of history in the earlier times, particularly for reconstructing the ancient and medieval past, more and more attention has been drawn in modern times towards their mutual relationship. Same is the case with colonial studies. As (post)colonial studies developed as an area of inquiry in the last decades of the twentieth century, the academics focussed on the nexus between travels in the early modern and later periods and emergence of colonialism. However, the connection of travel with history and colonialism, the paper argues, is quite complex and problematic and entails a detailed enquiry. The paper is divided into three parts. First part focuses on the concept of travel and its multifaceted aspects. The second part explores travel accounts as sources of history and third part discusses relationship of travel and colonialism.

Conceptualising Travel and Travel Writing
Travel writing is “enigmatic and influential” as well as “fluid and versatile” and its complexity has precluded its exact defining of contours and boundaries. According to one author, it is “a broad and ever-shifting genre.” One scholar has believes that travel writing, as a literary form, is a “notoriously raffish open house where different genres are likely to end up in the same bed. It accommodates the private diary, the essay, the short story, the prose poem, the rough note and polished table talk with indiscriminate hospitality. It freely mixes narrative and discursive writing.” A French author explains that it is “discontinuous” and thus “juxtaposes also segments of texts which differ in tone . . . The text is stratified: it consists of various layers of voices, vocabulary (the descriptions vary in kind: landscapes, habitats, clothing, works) and style . . . The travel book combines the heterogeneous (using all in one the form of memoir, diary and the letter) and disparity. It aims at the mosaic.” There are some who believe that its definition is an impossible task. However, many scholars have tried to put it in some framework.
One author traces its etymological origin and suggests that travel in modern English has come from the Middle English word, *travailen* (to toil or to make a toilsome journey), which is borrowed from the Old French *travaillier* (to labor or to work at strenuous physical or mental activities). Thus the author opines that this same root grew into the contemporary *travail* which connotes "gruelling labor and misadventure." In this way, travel in its very essence is not a vacation as we often conceive, but rather "a serious activity that is filled with adversity, difficulty, and discomfort: in short, travel is a sort of work."11

One scholar defines travel book as "any narrative characterized by a non-fiction dominant that relates (almost always) in the first person a journey or journeys that the reader supposes to have taken place in reality while assuming or presupposing that author, narrator and principal character are but one or identical."12 Another academic focuses on travel literature and defines it as "those texts that recount the journey of a person from one place to a significantly different place and that have enduring qualities—be they formal or content-based—that resonate with readers from different eras with different interests and backgrounds."13 Some consider travel "as a broadly defined practice featuring human movement through culturally conceived space, normally undertaken with at least some expectation of an eventual return to the place of origin."14 According to another author, travel writing has unlimited forms and he mentions the examples such as guidebooks, itineraries and routes and even maps to accounts of journeys over land or by water, or just descriptions of experiences. He states that such writings can appear both in prose and poetry, and often include part of historical and (auto)biographical works. Travel writings can comprise of simple notes and observations and sometimes letters written during the journey itself, or composed long afterwards with literary skill. Thus travel writing is "unlimited in its forms of expression," and it is "generally understood what it contains."15

As one can see, scholars are employing wide range of terms for travel writing. These include travel book, travel narrative, travel memoir, journeywork, travel story, travelogue, meta-travelogue, travel journal,
traveller’s account, travel literature, the literature of travel, travel genre or simply travel. Despite the abundance of different labels, one is consigned to agree with Jan Borm that travel writing is “a collective term for a variety of texts both predominantly fictional and non-fictional whose main theme is travel.”

Despite the euphoria of travel writing in academia, one can still say that analytical works on travel are quite few and far between. There are, therefore, a number of issues which still “haunt” any discussion of travel writing. As Tim Youngs says, “in academic terms travel writing has travelled. As an object of study it has crossed disciplines.” Travel writing also corresponds to and overlaps with many other disciplines. That is the reason that according to Hulme, travel writing has “four near neighbours, in generic terms: the novel (literature), ethnography (anthropology), the document (history), and reportage (sociology) . . . Despite the variety of material under consideration, key themes emerge. Like autobiography, with which travel writing shares some features, travel narrative is always controlled by the first-person singular. Predictably, therefore, questions of identity are frequently to the fore, suggesting the degree to which physical travel often tends, in its writing, to become symbolic of interior journeys of the mind or soul: the first person in question. But travellers have also often been important witnesses, reporting on other cultures or distant places, and the first person is also therefore always under question: the matter of authority is rarely far from the surface in travel writing.”

Some scholars believe that travel writing is a multiple genre in itself which consists of other genres. “This is a genre [travel literature] composed of other genres, as well as one that importantly contributed to the genesis of the modern novel and the renaissance of autobiography. It is a genre that confronts, at their extreme limit, representational tasks proper to a number of literary kinds: the translation of experience into narrative and
description, of the strange into the visible, of observation into the verbal construct of fact; the deployment of personal voice in the service of transmitting information (or of creating devotional texts); the manipulation of rhetorical figures for ends other than ornaments. Some of these demands are familiar to the ‘participant-observers’ of ethnography, others to writers and critics of fictional realism or historiography. All of them are important to the analysis of travel writing.”19 Similarly, “insights from sociology and cultural studies into the experience and consequences of travel are relevant to colleagues across a range of subjects, including Literature. The textual detail of travel writing itself, however, has now become the focus of scholars in many fields besides literary criticism.”20 So one is bound to agree with Speake that travel writing over the years “has taken on a bewildering multiplicity of forms and functions” and it has “an extraordinary rich and varied landscape.”21

What are the effects of travel on the personality of traveller? There are a number of answers to this question. Roxanne Euben believes that “direct exposure to what is culturally unfamiliar is just as likely to engender alienation or antagonism as openness.” She thinks that “direct observation cannot guarantee depth of insight into one’s own nomoi (customs, laws) or that of others, and that vicarious or imaginative travel does not by definition prohibit it. The kinds of blindnesses that attend physical travel on the one hand and, on the other, the insights available to those who journey imaginatively, suggest that what is crucial to ‘travel’ is not bodily presence but the dislocating character of the encounter. . . . texts that reflect and enact such dislocating mediations between the familiar and unfamiliar can serve as an invaluable resource for those who do not or cannot travel, in part by enabling imagination of and reflection on modes of life other than their own.”22 Travel, in the words of Euben, “signals estrangement from the moorings that impart solidity and definition to human life; a loss, not just of a familiar place but of a world comprised of family, friends, customs, and institutions, which both nurture and sustain its inhabitants. Such loss is captured by Descartes when he cautions that
‘when one spends too much time travelling, one finally becomes a stranger in one’s own country.’”

It has long been conceived that travel and writing are inextricably connected. As one author has explained that the travellers “travel in order to write, they travel while writing, because, for them, travel is writing.” However, there is another subtle aspect which relates travel and writing. Every traveller to an unknown land wants to leave his traces behind and most of which are in the form of writing. As Michel Butor explains that “to leave a trace of our passing is to belong to a spot, to become ourselves a Roman, Athenian, Cairote; therefore, we do it not only to return home with the light of these place-ideograms within us, but also to make our very existence a hopefully indelible ‘stroke’ on a visited spot.”

However, this apparently innocent phenomenon of marking leads to the way where “crosses, monuments, tombs are erected and inscribed. . . . Where the textual fabric of the new land is already quite dense, the explorer will bring home the names taught him by native instructors, but even more often, he, the new Adam, will untiringly name each identifiable site; so, world maps will become covered with names. . . . Even before the conqueror, the explorer seizes with his language the land he crosses.”

Many scholars believe that any “good travel” which is “heroic, educational, scientific, adventurous, ennobling” as a “distinctively Western activity.” However, many scholars have contested this Eurocentric view and claim that travel is a universal phenomenon. Sanjay Subrahmanyam contests this viewpoint and believes that European era of exploration in the early modern period “witnesses the expansion in a number of cultures of travel, as well as the concomitant development of travel-literature as a literary genre, whether the routes explored are overland (trans-Saharan, trans-Central Asian) or maritime. The notion of ‘discovery’ thus applies as much to [Chinese] Zheng He’s Indian Ocean voyages in the early fifteenth century as those of Cabral or Magellan a century later.”

**Travel Writing and History**

History in itself is a sort of travel. As past is metaphorically a foreign country, historians travel to this
alien land to explore and understand it. It does not mean physical journey of the historian to that land but it does imply engaging with different interests and varied perspectives of the past people. In that sense, historian is a voyager and a traveller. However, beyond that metaphor, history and travel writing are interconnected in many ways.

Travel writing has traditionally been accepted as an important source of historiography. In a number of ways, travel accounts can be helpful to the historian. The travellers generally provide such information which the local writers ignore as being ordinary and commonplace. Some educated and refined travellers have at times been able to offer unusual insights into the political events and social customs of foreign lands. Travel accounts are important not simply because they are windows on distant places but they are also mirrors that reflect the values of the travellers and throw back light on their own societies. However, there are diverse issues concerned with the nexus between travel and history writing. Mary Campbell has raised the following questions:

“How, for instance, does one distinguish fact from fiction, either as writer or as reader, in the case of unverifiable records of private experience taking place in profoundly unfamiliar surroundings? How do the pressures of audience expectation and the writer’s predispositions transform the language and content of such records? Are they records at all, or only literary occasions for compensatory fantasies on the part of the disillusioned, the nostalgic, the bewildered?”

One is bound to accept the position that traveller is “a kind of witness” and he generally tries to speak the truth. Mary Campbell contends that “neither power nor talent gives a travel writer his or her authority, which comes only and crucially from experience.”

The traveller in foreign land is faced with a world for which his language is not prepared. The traveller, therefore, has to employ the means of cultural translation.

Travel and translation are also quite interrelated. According to Mary Campbell, travel writing is “a literary instrument of consciousness, a genre of cultural
translation.” Translation means “transposing something (words, ideas, images) from somewhere into somewhere else, not just moving sentences from one language into another, but also physical realities into verbal utterances, . . . . And travellers who return home become translators of some sort, mediators and exegetes of a distant, inexplicable world for their listeners.” The author then goes on to give the example of Christian mission in China. The Jesuit priest in China, Matteo Ricci, discovered that if he dressed as a priest no one would take him seriously, so he dressed like a Confucian scholar instead, “thus ‘translating’ his social position into Chinese.” He also gave permission to the converted Chinese to pay reverence to their ancestors in the traditional manner, on the plea that it was a social rather than a religious custom. When Ricci translated the word ‘God’ by the Tianzhu, which literally meant ‘Lord of Heaven’, and allowed Chinese Christians to refer to heaven as simply Tian, as Confucius had done. The overall effect of such a strategy was that in Rome, the Jesuits were accused of having been converted to the religion of the Chinese rather than converting them to Christianity. Thus according to Peter Burke, “what appeared in Beijing to be a good cultural translation looked more like a mistranslation in Rome.” Thus travellers often have to face the problems of both “interlingual and intercultural translation.” Peter Burke points out another dimension of travel as translation. He contends that it is a “double process of decontextualization and recontextualization, first reaching out to appropriate something alien and then domesticating it.” He believes that this process should be looked at “from a double viewpoint. From the receiver’s point of view it is a form of gain, enriching the host culture as a result of skilful adaptation. From the donor’s point of view, on the other hand, translation is a form of loss, leading to misunderstanding and doing violence to the original.”

Relating to history, the issue of authenticity of information provided by the traveller becomes important. Even the father of history, the Greek writer Herodotus has been accused of providing “a mélange of myth, history, and geography.” It is generally assumed that the travel writers often crisscross “the boundaries between eyewitness testimony, second-hand information, and
outright invention,” and the readers cannot say with surety whether what they were reading is truth or fiction. It is also a fact that sometimes the readers’ expectation of complete truth and their imagination about the place come into conflict and create a serious situation for the traveller. If the latter speaks the truth, he would disappoint his readers and endanger his own position. Sometimes the traveller has to embellish the truth to fulfil the expectations of his readers. But as one author comments, “for this, considerable skill is needed, and only with help of fictional elements—or ‘white lies’, if one prefers—can the writer attain the necessary verisimilitude for creating a bridge of understanding between his own wide knowledge of the subject and the narrower expectations of the reader.”

It is also an acknowledged fact that travellers borrow much material from their predecessors. Most travellers before or during their travels study and keep with them journals of other travellers and their works hardly seem original. Sometimes, travellers produce their travelogues many years after their return to their home country and these may be based solely on memory. The historian must be on guard against lapses of memory which can serious affect the turn of events. Sometimes, the traveller relying on his memory would confuse the names of places and persons.

The notion of travel lies is an old one and traditionally travellers were accepted as telling lies. Percy Adams has produced a study of ‘travel liars’ and has also traced the close relationship between the genres of the novel and of travel literature. However, one cannot always be sure whether a lie is the result of ignorance or intention. It is often difficult to say with authority why the traveller has lied. There can be a multiple of motives for telling lies. As Percy G. Adams states:

“Although the chief causes of travel fabrications, whether of complete books or short passages, were money and vanity, prejudice was also a widespread motive for distorting the truth, both for the voyager who reported the distortions and for the reader who accepted them. And since it was—and is—a more subtle motive, the effects of which are often very hard to determine.”
However, there are certain ways to find out the falsehood. A historian can ferret them out by his painstaking labour. The preceding travel literature, newspapers and journals of the time can give him clues and by comparing various accounts from the original text of the author, most of the travelling lies can fairly be identified. It also often happens that an innocent traveller may be the victim of a fireside editor or translator, either contemporary or of a later period. Such an editor or translator feeling that the original journal must be made “more attractive to the public or must be tailored to fit the needs of what is considered to be a more sophisticated or a more robust time” makes significant changes in the original draft of the author.\textsuperscript{44} Such contributions can also be identified by an acute observer by comparing the different parts of the same work and identifying changes in the syntax, diction and tone.

There is another aspect to it. There is the realization that “travel writing is always necessarily a product of a particular time and a particular culture” and “the world informed by the voyage reports is a world informed by their subjectivity as well.”\textsuperscript{45} According to Campbell, this point needs to be stressed because “the voyage report was to play in the development of an extremely interventionist ethnology, now justifiably under attack from many quarters.”\textsuperscript{46} This issue lands us to the relationship of travel with colonialism.

**Travel Writing and Colonialism**

During the past few decades, as colonialism\textsuperscript{47} emerged as the focus of many disciplines, and postcolonial studies\textsuperscript{48} developed as a multidisciplinary field, interest in the role of travel and exploration literature in contributing to and reflecting the colonial past has increased steadily. It is now generally recognized that travel writing is directly or indirectly linked with the European project of colonialism. As the traveller makes cultural comparisons, there emerges a judgmental hierarchy. Such apparently innocent comments as ‘We do it this way, they do it that way’ may sound neutral but may also contain a “subtext” of superiority and inferiority. And thus travel writing has been accepted as “one of the ideological apparatuses of empire.”\textsuperscript{49}
European travellers, as they recorded their observations of other lands and peoples, contributed to the “growth of a new, empirically informed discourse about both man and nature.” It is apparent that the travellers and travel writing was instrumental in the institutionalisation of new science through books and reviews, learned academics and journals, and at the universities. The Royal Society of London was interested in travel accounts in order to promote natural knowledge. The travellers, though, generally undertook to travel mainly to satisfy intellectual urge and curiosity, often also took abroad “precise intellectual aims backed by systematic readings and carefully drawn instructions.”

May Louis Pratt’s Imperial Eyes is particularly important as it shows how travel writing has produced ‘the rest of the world’ for European readerships. It investigates into how the European people got engaged with expansionist enterprises of colonial powers. For that purpose, she studied particular corpus of travel writing related to the period and then established connections from travel writing to forms of knowledge and expressions that were produced at that time. She uses the concept of transculturation to introduce questions about the ways in which modes of representation from the metropolis are received and appropriated by groups on the periphery— and how transculturation from the colonies to the metropolis takes place. She also uses the concept of ‘contact zones’ to refer to the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, racial inequality, and intractable conflict. Thus Bill Ashcroft explains:

“European societies, at least, have combined the urge to travel with the urge to possess. This has not always meant physical possession. Long before the rush to build empires, a strange link between discovery and knowing characterized the urge for possession. This urge has, in turn, been actualized in acts of description—in writing—, the material record of which gives both permanence and availability to the object described.”
Pramod K. Nayar believes that the European encounter with India often occurred as a three part process. First, the traveller was prepared in his imagination for India through the cultural imaginary of already circulating fables and narratives such as travel reports of wealth, excessive eroticism, pleasure, danger and profit. Second, as he travelled through India he recorded his experience of the actual ‘discovery’ of the East and compiled it into a readable personal account. Third, he proceeded to inquire about, explain and document what he observed. Thus the “‘proto-colonial’ discourse of discovery moves from imagining of what could be discovered in the East to the ordering of what was discovered. These writings therefore mark a narrative possession—we could think of it as “colonization”—of India.”

One has to accept that travel writing is also inextricably linked with the issue of identity formation. According to Indira Ghose, travel “serves as an ideal paradigm to study the intersection of different axes that construct identity.” One fundamental question in any travel account is how the traveller has constituted the other. Ghose has indicated two contradictory forms of constructing the identity of the other: “the construction of the other as negation of the self, as completely other” which was mainly the case in the travel accounts pertaining to the Americas; and “the assimilation of the other as same (but lacking)” which was the case in the travel writing concerning the East, including India. However, the common element in both these constructions is that “they are moulded in the image of the self and serve the function of self-definition.”

Thus, one of the significant elements in the encounter between the West and the non-West in the early modern period was the creation of the binaries of self and other. The travel accounts at that time, though not yet directly implicated in colonial imperatives, established a base of knowledge in which Europe performed the normative function. As pointed out by Bernard S. Cohn, these accounts “established an enduring structural relationship” between the East and the West which considered Europe as “progressive and changing”, while the East as “static.” For Europeans, East was “a kind of
living fossil bed of the European past, a museum which was to provide Europeans for the next two hundred years a vast field on which to impose their own visions of history.” It was a “land of oriental despotism, with its cycles of strong but lawless rules,” which created political order only by “unbridled power” and “led inevitably to its own destruction in a war of all against all, leading to anarchy and chaos.”

This does not mean to suggest that these European travel accounts in the early modern period in any direct way brought about Imperialism or colonisation. However, this encounter between the East and the West did establish some of the Oriental stereotypes and clichés which became important during the colonial period. That is the reason why colonial writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries resonate some of the same images which were in the beginning provided by the pre-colonial European travellers. William Dalrymple calls them “unwitting contributors to later colonialism.” It is, no doubt, conceded that these accounts are far more complex and resist a straightforward label of Orientalist writings. The textual representations are “not monolithic or univocal” and these “create a network of intersecting and contending discourses about India.” However, it cannot be denied that these “competing discourses” lead to a “discursive framework that is particularly amenable to later colonial use.”
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