Representations of landscape and gender in Lady Anne Barnard's "Journal of a month's tour into the interior of Africa"

by

Brenda Collins

Thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Art at the University of Stellenbosch

Supervisor: Ms Jeanne Ellis

December 2007

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

Signature: ____________

Date: 27/11/2007

Abstract

This thesis will focus on Barnard's representations of gender and landscape during her tour into the interior of the South of Africa. Barnard's conscious representation of herself as a woman with many different social roles gives the reader insight into the developing gender roles at the time of an emerging feminism. On their tour, Barnard reports on four aspects of the interior, namely the state of cultivation of the land, the type of food and accommodation available in the interior, the possibilities for hunting and whether the colony will be a valuable acquisition for Britain. Barnard's view of the landscape is representative of the eighteenth century's preoccupation with control over and classification of nature. She values order and cleanliness in her vision of a domesticated landscape. She appropriates the land in wanting to make it useful and beautiful to the colonisers. However, her representations of the landscape, as well as its inhabitants, remain ambivalent in terms of the discourse of imperialism because she is unable to adopt an unequivocal colonial voice. Her complex interaction with the world of colonialism is illustrated by, on the one hand, her adherence to the desire to classify the inhabitants of the colony according to the eighteenth century's fascination with classification and, on the other hand, her recognition of the humanity of the individuals with whom she interacts in a move away from the colonial stance.

Copyright ©2007 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

Abstrak

Hierdie tesis fokus op Barnard se voorstellings van gender en landskap gedurende haar toer in die binneland van die suide van Afrika. Barnard se bewuste voorstelling van haarself as ‘n vrou met vele sosiale rolle gee die leser insig in die ontwikkelende genderrolle gedurende ‘n tydperk van ontluikende feminisme. Gedurende haar toer doen Barnard verslag oor vier aspekte van die binneland, naamlik hoeveel van die grond reeds bewerk is, die tipe kos en akkommodasie wat beskikbaar is, die jagmoontlikhede, en of die kolonie ‘n waardevolle aanwins vir Brittanje sal wees. Barnard se beskouing van die landskap is verteenwoordigend van die agtiende-eeuse obsessie met beheer oor en klassifikasie van die natuur. Sy heg groot waarde aan orde en netheid in haar visie van ‘n getemde landskap. Sy lê beslag op die land deurdat sy dit bruikbaar en mooi wil maak vir die kolonialiste. Haar voorstellings van die landskap sowel as die inwoners weerspieël egter haar ambivalente posisie jeens die koloniale diskoers omdat sy sukkel om ‘n ondubbelsinnige koloniale stem te gebruik. Haar komplekse interaksie met die wêreld van kolonialisme word weerspieël deur, enersyds, haar navolging van die koloniale neiging om die inwoners van die land te kategoriseer in lyn met die agtiende-eeuse obsessie met klassifikasie en, andersyds, haar herkenning van die menslikheid van die individue met wie sy kontak maak in ‘n skuif weg van die koloniale standpunt.

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge with gratitude a postgraduate Merit Bursary from the University which made it possible for me to continue my studies. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Jeanne Ellis, for introducing me to feminist theory and for her guidance in the writing of this thesis. I am grateful to Greg Evans for his motivation and support, encouragement and discussion throughout this process. Finally, I would like to thank my parents and my brother for their continuous support and belief in me.

Contents

Chapter 1 Historical overview and theoretical framework 1

Chapter 2 Barnard as artist, writer and colonial agent 17

Chapter 3 Barnard’s perspectives on the landscape and inhabitants of the interior 49

Chapter 4 Conclusion 82

Bibliography 84

Chapter 1

Historical overview and theoretical framework

Introduction

Lady Anne Barnard's representations of the South African landscape and its inhabitants in her "Journal of a month's tour into the interior of Africa"[1] situate her in an ambivalent position in relation to the discourse of the colonial administration of the time. Her representations of herself in her journal give the reader an understanding of her experiences and circumstances as a British woman in the Cape in 1798. Barnard, in her roles as a member of the British colonial administration and wife of a colonial official, is implicated in the process of colonisation. Her position, however, is complicated by her social role as a woman. She is effectively placed on the fringe of colonial policymaking, although her noble birth and diplomatic skills give her some influence with the male establishment. As a result, she continuously negotiates her position through the different roles that she assumes, such as writer, artist, wife, adventurer and colonial agent, fluctuating between the positions of centre and margin within colonial discourse.

---

[1] Extracts of Barmard's "Journal of a month's tour into the interior of Africa" were first published in a family history, *The Lives of the Lindsays*, in 1849. The text referred to in this thesis was printed in 1994 as part of *The Cape Journals of Lady Anne Barnard 1797-1798*.

Her representations of the landscape of the interior firmly position her in the eighteenth century since her descriptions are indicative of the century's philosophy which viewed the world as measurable and controllable. This view opened up opportunities where the "landscape could be made and remade, new continents explored, and a 'New World' settled (Sobel, 1987: 17). Her representations encourage domestication of the land so that it can become useful and ordered. Similarly, her representations of the San and the Khoikhoi (or to use Barnard's terms "Bosches men" and "Hottentots") echo the eighteenth century preoccupation with classification. However, Barnard's ability, at times, to dissociate herself from the established ideas of colonial discourse, is revealed by her ambivalent perspectives regarding colonised people, which are reflected in her writings.

Historical context

Lady Anne Barnard (1750 – 1825) was the daughter of an impoverished Scottish nobleman and grew up at Balcarres in Fife. In her early twenties, she joined her sister, Lady Margaret Fordyce, who was widowed young, in London. They were well-known figures in British high society and had friends amongst royalty, and in political, literary and intellectual circles. They acted as hostesses for prominent politicians and "established themselves together … in modest comfort" after "some financial struggles" (Lenta, 1994: x). In London Barnard was thus well connected, but not prosperous.

In 1793, she married Andrew Barnard, the only son of a Bishop. After their marriage, Barnard persuaded her husband, a soldier who took half-pay because of ill health in 1783, to take his discharge from the army (Lenta, 1999: ix). He had no estate in England (Barnard, 1994: 19). By means of her influence with General Henry Dundas, the secretary of state for war and the colonies, she obtained a position for her husband in the first civil administration (Lenta, 1994: x) to be established at the Cape after the British occupation in the name of the Prince of Orange. In its strife with France, Britain wanted to protect its trading routes with India and the East and thus claimed this new colony. Barnard accompanied her husband to his post and they arrived at the Cape in May 1797.

Lord Macartney, the new governor, was not accompanied by his wife and Barnard became his official hostess. She entertained senior British officials on their way to and from India. She also regarded it as part of her responsibility to break down the social barriers between the English and the Dutch (Barnard, 1994: 20). She was probably Britain’s most valuable unofficial diplomat in South Africa, given her unique position in the colony combined with her personality, talents and wide range of interests. Leo Marquard comments in his book *The Story of South Africa* that the British government “[i]n making itself agreeable to the inhabitants ... had a great asset in Lady Anne Barnard, wife of the government secretary” (1963: 84). Barnard’s observations about life in the Cape would have been an invaluable source of information to both Lord Macartney and

General Henry Dundas, who was also a close friend of hers. She had a vast knowledge about the society and could therefore give an insider's account of events (Lenta, 1994: xvii).

Relevance of Barnard's texts

Barnard's writings are important as they were written during this critical period in Britain's colonial history and they provide us with historical information about the social and political life of the Cape during the first British occupation (Lenta, 2006: 303). We also learn more about the strained relations between the British, the Cape Dutch, the foreign slaves and the natives[2] of the Cape as she describes her visits and encounters with the local people. The many drawings that accompany her writings help to reify her narrative descriptions of daily life at the Cape for her reader.

Barnard's journals and letters "provide the earliest records we have of a British woman's life at the Cape" (Driver, 1995: 46) as well as of a British woman's opinions about and observations of the inhabitants and landscape. Texts about South Africa in the late 1700s are mostly written by male authors, for example John Barrow, Francois Le Vaillant, Anders Sparrman and Robert Jacob Gordon. Barnard is familiar with the work of Barrow and Le Vaillant and sees omissions in their work that she feels her writings might augment. However, she always suggests that as a mere woman she might not be as well educated or trained to offer as informed a report as the “Men of Science” (Barnard, 1994: 21). This point will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2, “Barnard’s roles as artist, writer and colonial agent”.

---

[2] I follow Elleke Boehmer's use of the term "native" as "a collective term referring to the indigenous inhabitants of colonized lands" (1995: 8).

Her journals are an important addition to South African colonial literature as they give a “new perspective on eighteenth-century constructions of gender, race and class” and they show an “interest in the notion of perspective itself” (Driver, 1994: 1). This is illustrated particularly well in her “Journal of a month’s tour into the interior of Africa” (1994) where Barnard often looks at herself looking at other people; there are instances in her narrative when she is uneasy with the discourse of imperialism and its tendency to stamp its values and perspectives on the colony and its inhabitants. All her texts are also important as “sources for feminist literary scholars” because of their “subject matter” and the “strategies which she used in the presentation of herself as the experiencing, reflecting consciousness” (Lenta, 1996: 180).

Theoretical framework

Driver’s concept of “self-othering”

Dorothy Driver’s concept of “self-othering” as discussed in her article “Lady Anne Barnard’s *Cape Journals* and the concept of self-othering” (1995: 46-65) is useful for my analysis of Barnard’s roles as writer, artist and colonial agent as well as for the analysis of her representations of the colonised people. The process Driver calls “self-othering” refers to the “intralocutory nature” (1995: 46) of Barnard’s Cape Journals. She uses this term to point out that Barnard’s writing presents different facets of the self and that her subjectivity is made up of different speaking positions; it seems as if these speaking positions “are engaged in negotiation (or contestation) with one another”, as if “the self [is] engaged in dialogue with an ‘otherness’ within” (Driver, 1995: 46).

Driver further argues that Barnard shifts her perspective on herself and the world and that she is conscious of “otherness” and seeing through “other” eyes (1995: 47). Barnard is thus able to represent herself as “the other” and view herself through the eyes of others (1995: 46). There are moments in Barnard’s narrative “where the ‘self’ is placed as ‘other’ and ‘other’ becomes seen as if from the place of ‘self’” (Driver, 1994: 11). It is when Barnard as writing subject takes up these “shifting perspectives on herself and the world” that “the self becomes other to itself” (Driver, 1995: 47). According to Driver, “self-othering” indicates a “fundamental disruption in the notion of ‘self’, a continual reorganisation of the relations between self and other” (Driver, 1994: 11). She argues that this process in Barnard’s *Cape Journals* disrupts colonial discourse which is usually seen as the “domination of ‘self’ over ‘other’” (Driver, 1994: 11).[3]

---

[3] Driver thus suggests that the basis of colonial discourse is mostly formed by the binary oppositions of “self” and “other”, and that these oppositions are disturbed in Barnard’s writing because gender, ‘race’ and class are not dealt with as separate categories (1995: 46). Instead, the categories of gender, ‘race’ and class “reveal themselves at their points of intersection” (Driver, 1995: 46).

Barnard's conscious use of her various voices or different "discursive positions" (Driver, 1995: 47) to represent her different roles produces these shifting perspectives in her writing. She illustrates her awareness of this process when she tells Thomas Pringle that "he [is] mistaken if he suppose[s that she is] *one* woman," and that she could be "one, two, or three different ones, and [was] capable of being *more*, exactly as the Circumstances [she] was placed in required" (Barnard, 1994: 164; emphasis in original). Her use of these different voices enables her to shift between different perspectives. Barnard's distinct voices, such as that of caring wife or official hostess, thus indicate that she does not see the self as a fixed identity, but rather as adaptable to different situations or circumstances.

Although Barnard's journals written during her stay in the Cape colony are often read as examples of Cape colonial discourse, Driver argues that Barnard's writing "show[s] ideology *in construction* in eighteenth-century South Africa as [she] self-consciously deals with the discourses at her disposal" (1995: 46; emphasis in original). Barnard's narrative does therefore not always conform to the characteristics of Cape colonial discourse and Driver's concept of "self-othering" is a useful tool for finding some of these moments in her narrative. Barnard's journals reveal a wrestling with the embedded conventions of colonial discourse (such as the binary oppositions of self and other) as it manifested itself in her context of the Cape. At times Barnard's writing reflects her awareness of the oppression of the other as seen, for example, in her sympathy with the oppressive conditions of the Khoikhoi in the colony. She has the ability to occasionally distance herself from the colonial stance and her perceptions of herself and the other are changed by this awareness. She recognises something of the inhabitants' humanity and not just their otherness.

Gender

At the time when Barnard was writing her *Cape Journals*, "women were being identified with the 'personal', the 'subjective' and the 'emotional'" (Driver, 1994: 7). However, during the 1790s women's political aims included "more cultural power and … economic and social parity in the public sphere" (Glover and Kaplan, 2000: 16). It was thus also a period when the social roles of women and "their sense of themselves" (Driver, 1995: 54) were being adjusted by the developing feminism. Barnard's awareness of her various roles in society and her ability to integrate these roles are indicative of this developing feminism. Nevertheless, this was not an easy endeavour for a woman caught up in the limitations imposed by gender during the eighteenth century and she was thus simultaneously "caught up by these stereotypes" and "anxious to escape them" (Driver, 1994: 7).

Driver argues that Barnard "continually fluctuates between the so-called 'masculine' and 'feminine' positions, and between other positions designated in terms of 'centre' and 'margin', 'culture' and 'nature', 'self' and 'other' (1994: 11).

These binary oppositions correspond to the underlying opposition of man/woman and are “heavily imbricated in the patriarchal value system: each opposition can be analysed as a hierarchy where the ‘feminine’ side is always seen as the negative, powerless instance” (Moi, 1989: 211). Barnard attempts to resist these binary associations. However, she cannot adopt the opposite pole of the dichotomy straight-forwardly and we find her in an ambiguous position. Her relationship with General Dundas, the secretary of state for war and the colonies at the time, closely allied her to the centre from which colonial discourse originated. At the same time, as a woman she is often situated on the margins of colonialism because of the “male dominance at many levels of colonial activity” (Boehmer, 1995: 9).

Driver suggests that Barnard’s writing “occup[ies] an ambivalent, contradictory and shifting relation to gender stereotypes, to feminism and to colonialism of the time” (1994: 10). She argues that Barnard “addresses the question of her own perspective in such a way as to negotiate and even withdraw from the colonising stances of the time rather than simply reproducing them” (Driver, 1994: 12). Barnard’s withdrawal indicates a conscious decision to reject the status quo and this implies an occasional resistance to the colonising stances of the discourse of imperialism.

Sara Mills in *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women’s Travel Writing and Colonialism* also refers to the woman travel writer’s ambivalent and contradictory relation to colonialism and points out that women's travel writing during the colonial period was "more tentative than male writing, less able to assert the 'truths' of British rule without qualification" (1993: 3).[4] She argues that these works are theoretically challenging as they are

> a strange mixture of the stereotypically colonial in content, style and trope, presenting the colonised country as naturally a part of the British Empire, whilst at the same time being unable to adopt a straight-forwardly colonial voice (1993: 4).

Barnard's writing also illustrates this tentativeness when she describes the South African landscape and its inhabitants. Mills further points out that in contrast to male travel writers women travel writers emphasise "personal involvement and relationships with people of the other culture" and take "a less authoritarian stance … vis-à-vis narrative voice" because they were "caught between the conflicting demands of the discourse of femininity and that of imperialism" (1993: 21). She argues that the discourses of imperialism "demand action and intrepid, fearless behaviour from the narrator" while the discourses of femininity "demand passivity from the narrator and a concern with relationships" (Mills, 1993: 21-22).

Many women travel writers struggled to integrate the discourse of imperialism with that of femininity as women were situated in an ambivalent position in the colonial context. McClintock, in *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest,* argues that gender dynamics were “fundamental to the securing and maintenance of the imperial enterprise” (1995: 7). Although white women had no formal power and “made none of the direct economic or military decisions of empire”, they were often put “in positions of decided – if borrowed – power, not only over colonized women but also over colonized men” by the “rationed privileges of race” (McClintock, 1995: 6). Differences in power between the coloniser and the colonised are reformulated as gender differences in colonial discourse and “colonization is naturalized as the relation between the sexes” (Spurr, 1993: 172).

---

[4] However, in "Two versions of a journey into the Interior", Carli Coetzee argues that we cannot ascribe this difference to gender alone (1995: 66-67). In her discussion of the work of Lichtenstein and Augusta de Mist, she argues that instances of compromise, complicity and resistance can be found in both male and female authored colonial texts, but that the form of complicity or resistance is often determined by the gender of the author.

Barnard’s narrative illustrates her ambivalence towards the discourse of imperialism. Effie Yiannopoulou in “Autistic Adventures: Love, Auto-Portraiture and White Women’s Colonial Disease” argues that multivocity “questions the construction of white femininity within colonial literature and theory as either collaborative or oppositional vis-à-vis the dominant imperialist powers” (1998: 325). The same effect can be seen in Barnard’s narrative because the different voices she employs play off the tensions evident in the discourses that she uses (this point will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2).

In addition to these distinct voices, she also employs various strategies to enable her to use the discourse of imperialism. Mills suggests that by means of the use of elements such as “humour, self-deprecation, statements of affiliation, and descriptions of relationships, which stress the interpersonal nature of travel writing" the texts of women travel writers "constitute counter-hegemonic voices within colonial discourse" (1993: 22-23). She argues that the constraints on women's writing, for example that the discourse of femininity "restricts what can be written" and that women cannot "draw on colonial discourse in the same way as men", can actually be seen as "discursively productive" since these constraints or limitations "enable a form of writing whose contours both disclose the nature of the dominant discourses and constitute a critique from its margins" (Mills, 1993: 22-23).

Landscape

In *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*, David Spurr identifies twelve basic rhetorical strategies of colonial discourse. He defines colonial discourse as "the particular languages which belong to [the historical] process [of colonisation], enabling it while simultaneously being generated by it" (Spurr, 1993: 1). He argues that these rhetorical strategies or modes, for example "surveillance", "appropriation", "aestheticization", "classification" and "negation", to name a few, are the tropes that are used by the colonisers to create and sustain colonial authority or to record the loss thereof (1993: 3). He further argues that these rhetorical modes or "ways of writing about non-Western people" are not used consciously or intentionally, but that “they are part of the landscape in which relations of power manifest themselves” (Spurr, 1993: 3).

For the purpose of this thesis, I will focus on the rhetorical strategy of “appropriation”. Spurr argues that colonial discourse “implicitly claims the territory surveyed as the colonizer’s own” (1993: 28). The mere act of surveillance therefore leads to appropriation – by surveying the landscape it becomes the colonisers’ own. However, the claiming of the territory is made out to be in response to an appeal by the colonised land and its people (Spurr, 1993: 28). This appeal “may take the form of chaos that calls for restoration of order, of absence that calls for affirming presence, of natural abundance that awaits the creative hand of technology” (Spurr, 1993: 28). Thus, the colonisers can justify the appropriation by implying that it is an appeal by the colonised. Spurr suggests that colonial intervention positions itself as the response to “nature which calls for the wise use of its resources … humanity, which calls for universal betterment; and … the colonized, who call for protection from their own ignorance and violence” (1993: 34). According to Spurr, the doctrine of this appropriation is that the “natural resources of colonized lands … belong[ ] rightfully to ‘civilization’ and ‘mankind’ rather than to the indigenous peoples who inhabited those lands” (1993: 28). The land and its resources thus become the natural inheritance of the coloniser (Spurr, 1993: 29).

The rhetorical category or mode of “appropriation” is useful when looking at Barnard’s representation of the South African landscape as she “appropriates” the land in wanting to make it “useful” and “beautiful” (Barnard, 1994: 342). Furthermore, the “principles of inclusion and domestication [which are] inherent in the rhetoric of appropriation” (Spurr, 1993: 34) are found repeatedly in her narrative. However, her appropriation of the land is in no sense a straightforward “colonizing gesture” (Spurr, 1993: 2) and her representations of the landscape remain ambivalent in terms of the discourse of imperialism.

Thesis Overview

In this chapter, I have discussed the historical context and relevance of Barnard’s journal. I have also provided a theoretical framework for the analysis of the text in the following chapters.

In the next chapter, “Barnard’s roles as artist, writer and colonial agent”, I will consider how Barnard situates herself in relation to the mainstream of colonial ideology of the time. I will also examine the various roles she performed during her stay at the Cape. These representations of herself offer insight into how Barnard viewed herself as a woman and reveal the pressures she had to deal with in order to conform to society’s expectations of a woman during this period. Her negotiation of these roles is illustrated by the vacillation between her use of the discourse of imperialism and the discourse of femininity, as well as her ability to view herself as “the other”. I will specifically focus on her role as a woman writer and artist during a period when women were struggling to escape the social strictures of society and starting to seek “more rights and more freedom” (Glover and Kaplan, 2000: 16). Lastly, I will discuss her role and contributions as agent within the colonial context.

In Chapter 3, “Barnard’s perspectives on the landscape and inhabitants of the interior”, I will look at Barnard’s desire to turn the South African land to some account. Her descriptions and opinions of the landscape echo the eighteenth-century worldview in which nature had to be controlled. She wishes to domesticate the land in order to make it more useful and beautiful. I will explore the usefulness of David Spurr’s rhetorical strategies, in particular that of “appropriation”, which he argues are typical of colonial discourse in situating Barnard in relation to the discourse of the colonial administration of her time.

A further focus of the chapter will be Barnard’s perspectives on the San, Khoikhoi, Cape Dutch and the slave women. I will explore her awareness of paradoxes and contradictions she sees within herself and in her responses to others. Her ambivalence is illustrated by her complex interaction with the world around her. She acknowledges moments of ambiguity, strength and resistance in the other. I will look at these ambiguities in more detail by analysing passages in which she gives a “verbal presentation” (Driver, 1995: 49) of her artistic subjects when she endeavours to draw a slave woman and a Khoikhoi girl and capture the picturesqueness of the moment, as well as passages in which she falls back on the stereotypes of the period when she describes her intentions to “catch” one of the “Boshemen” to see “how far they could be improved” (Barnard, 1994: 420).

The last chapter will be a conclusion of the issues discussed in the previous chapters.

Chapter 2

Barnard’s roles as artist, writer and colonial agent

In her journal, Barnard represents the various roles she performed during her stay in the Cape as a series of distinct narrative voices. Barnard’s conscious performance of her different roles enables her to “enunciate a set of different perspectives on herself and the world” (Driver, 1995: 48). She represents herself in her journal as writer and as artist. In addition to these roles, she is the wife of the colonial secretary at the Cape of Good Hope and acts as official hostess for Lord Macartney. She also acts as colonial agent, in particular for General Henry Dundas. She further represents herself as a diligent housewife and caretaker, as well as an adventurer in a foreign country. Barnard as writing subject is creating herself for the reader and her roles are thus a representation of the self as opposed to some “real” self. As Edward Said suggests, “representations, because they *are* representations, are embedded first in the language and then in the culture, institutions, and political ambience of the representer” and representations are thus entwined with “a great many other things besides the ‘truth’ which is itself a representation” (1991: 273). Barnard’s representations of herself also operate in a specific historical setting and in this chapter I will focus on her roles as woman writer, artist and colonial agent during a period marked by a feminist emergence and attempts to define women’s role in society, especially in Britain.

Barnard introduces herself as an artist at the very beginning of their[5] tour into the interior:

> Behind him Lady Anne Barnard, on her knee an old drawing book stoutly bound, which had descended from mitre to mitre in the Barnard family, and which little thought in its old age as Sarah says, that it should be caught turning over a new leaf, and producing hasty Sketches in the wilds of Africa (Barnard, 1994: 299).

In the passage above, Barnard refers to their seating positions in the wagon: she sits behind their driver and next to her husband as they are setting out on their journey into the interior. She is consciously reflecting on her role as artist as she mentions that she is in possession of the drawing book that has descended from the elder bishops in her husband's family. The possession of this book lends her as a woman a certain authority as she aligns herself with a male force (Mills, 1993: 44) since the drawing book has always been in possession of men. The way in which she refers to the drawing book as having "descended from mitre to mitre" emphasises the significance she attaches to its origins. The book was originally used by her husband's forebears and these clergymen presumably used it to sketch the English countryside, which contrasts strongly with its present surroundings and her intentions to sketch the "wilds of Africa".

---

[5] Barnard and her husband were accompanied by Anne Elizabeth, Andrew's cousin, and Johnnie, Lady Anne's cousin.

She refers to the book as “stoutly bound”, emphasising that it is suitable to take along on the long journey since it is durable and will survive the rough journey in the wagon. She further comments that the drawing book is “turning over a new leaf” and this echoes her resolution at the beginning of her journey to the Cape to look with “new eyes” (Barnard, 1994: 21) at everything around her. In the same way as the drawing book’s position has changed, from being the drawing book of clergymen in the English countryside to being the drawing book of a woman in the “wilds of Africa”, her position in society has also changed from being a hostess in London to becoming a woman traveller in the south of Africa. She is thus also “turning over a new leaf”.

In *Women Travel Writers and the Language of Aesthetics*, *1716 – 1818*, Elizabeth Bohls comments that “[t]he genteel accomplishments that occupied ladies’ enforced leisure and enhanced their value on the marriage market included drawing and the appreciation of scenery, as well as music and needlework” (1995: 2). Although drawing was a typical pastime for a woman during this period, Barnard puts this expected and traditional medium to use for her own purpose, that is, to visually describe “the wilds of Africa”, a “Country [that] was not fit to be looked at” (Barnard, 1994: 299) by women.

Another aspect to consider is the way in which Barnard identifies herself in this passage: she uses a third-person narrative and refers to herself as “Lady”, a title which defines her as the daughter of an Earl, and she uses her surname of

Barnard, her surname by marriage, which defines her as a wife. During this period it was still difficult for women to define themselves in social positions other than in relation to male figures. Nevertheless, Barnard, throughout her journal, continues to define herself in many other roles, for example as writer and artist.

Barnard's drawings serve mainly two purposes. The first is to record information to send back to England. Her sketches of unknown or curious plants (Barnard, 1994: 344) and of the different ethnic groups found at the Cape (196) as well as of places of strategic importance for Britain (409) are good examples of this. The second is to visually record her sightseeing when she uses her drawings in the same way as we would use modern-day photographs. She comments that she "like[s] to retain some of [nature's] scenes in [her] reflection by taking sketches" (Barnard, 1994: 293) and it is in this sense, to preserve memories, that she uses her drawings as photographs. She subtitles her journal with the following description: "with sketches and figures taken on the spot" (Barnard, 1994: 291). This emphasises the immediacy and relevance of her drawings in illustrating her journal entries and her observations of the country, especially if we interpret their function as similar to that of modern-day photographs when travelling in a foreign country.

At the Genadendal Mission Station, Barnard uses her drawings to capture specific scenes or people that she finds interesting or fascinating. She makes various sketches to show her readers what her surroundings look like: "I sat me down by the door of the work Shop and took a view of the Church and House nearer, which I give you” (Barnard, 1994: 339). She also tries to draw the mission station from a distance so that she could “not only bring in the Church but have a view of a part of the Craals which surrounded it” (Barnard, 1994: 336). However, she regrets that “many of them reached far beyond what [her] drawing could take in” (Barnard, 1994: 336). She comments that her “sketch is just”, but states that she does “not understand drawing from a height” (Barnard, 1994: 336). It is significant that Barnard struggles with this aspect since it is closely connected to the colonial gaze. Spurr argues that the commanding view is "an originating gesture of colonization itself, making possible the exploration and mapping of territory which serves as the preliminary to a colonial order" (1993: 16). He writes about the importance of the gaze to the visual artist and refers to it as “the active instrument of construction, order, and arrangement” (1993: 15). He also refers to the importance of the commanding view or panoramic vista to among others, landscape painting. Here, Barnard’s inability to appropriate the landscape by means of the colonial gaze implies a distancing from the colonising stances.

Barnard does not view her art as a leisurely pastime, instead she sees it as her occupation and refers to her drawings as work when she comments on the approval of one of the missionaries on seeing her at “work” (Barnard, 1994: 336) while she is busy making a sketch of the mission station. In a similar vein, when at the magistrate’s house in Swellendam, she remains indoors because of the scorching heat of the wind and the sun and turns her attention to drawing the magistrate's daughter: "I therefore set to *work* again, with the little Girls (sic) figure and succeeded" (Barnard, 1994: 366; emphasis added).

Barnard also regards her journal writing as an occupation and sets her activities of writing and drawing against the inactivity of other women, for example Anne Elizabeth.[6] Barnard's reference to herself as a "Journalist" (Barnard, 1994: 19, 404) indicates her conscious taking up of her role as writer.[7] Lenta remarks that Barnard seems to have been a diarist for most of her life (1994: xiv). Her main reason for keeping a journal of her voyage to and residence at the Cape was to keep herself occupied since, as she says, "nothing in [my] opinion tends so much to happiness as occupation" (Barnard, 1994: 21). She is thus writing a journal for her own pleasure and amusement and to keep herself occupied (Barnard, 1994: 15). The serious tone in which Barnard refers to her writings indicates that she regards this as a vocation and not simply a female pastime. The dedication with which she writes these memorandums adds further value to them and reinforces her perception of her writing as her occupation. Her writings are valuable because they provide her readers with first-hand knowledge and a new perspective on their colony. In the following extract, she refers to the leisure time they will have at the Government baths, but makes it clear that she has “work” to do and will not be idle:

---

[6] Driver suggests that Barnard "carefully measures her distance from some of the more crippling 'feminine' norms of the time" (1994: 9). She argues that Barnard represents Anne Elizabeth in "the most 'feminine' of stances, whether it be with her half-finished embroidery, or making a statement about preferring dancing to climbing Table Mountain, or sulkily complaining about sanitary facilities, or with a jar of ginger spilled over her, as if she had transformed into a 'confection'" (Driver, 1994: 9).

[7] Barnard had a history of writing. She is acknowledged as a Scottish woman poet for her well known ballad "Auld Robin Gray", written in 1772, which became "universally popular" (Graham, 1908: 26). It was published anonymously in 1783 and Barnard acknowledged the authorship of the words only two years before her death, in 1823, in a letter to Sir Walter Scott. Graham argues that Scottish women were reluctant to be known as authors because it was not seen as respectable for a woman to write and mentions that Barnard said "she had not owned it because she dreaded being known as a writer, lest those who did not write feel shy of her" (Graham, 1908: 26). The ballad became famous and was the subject of, amongst others, a play, an opera and even a pantomime (Hamilton, 1892: 97).

> The evening after was a long one, but having a good many memorandums to put down, and to repair some of my flying Sketches which were nearly obliterated by the Jolting of the waggon which is far beyond what any person can conceive who has never travelled in one, I had enough to do (Barnard, 1994: 322).

Barnard’s writings and drawings become part of a work process. Since she regards these activities as her occupation, she spends many hours on recording her surroundings and experiences. She comments that her separation from her family and friends is what keeps her habit of writing both disciplined and regular and explains that the fact that her loved ones are so far away is what makes her industrious (Barnard, 1994: 404). As part of this work process, she transcribes her memorandums and sketches over her drawings (Barnard, 1994: 392) before sending them off to England for her intended audience. Besides writing for her own pleasure, she also writes in order to entertain and inform her sisters, family and friends (Barnard, 1994: 22). We can assume that, since she wrote a preface to her journals in her old age and seems to be speaking to a general reader, she recognised the value of the *Cape Journals* and wanted them to be available to readers outside the family circle. Barnard left a large body of autobiographical writing to her nephew (the heir of her eldest brother) (Lenta, 1994: xiii). Her journals “have been carefully preserved through the centuries by her family” (Lenta, 1994: viii). In her old age she revised, amongst others, her *Cape Journals*. Although she felt very strongly that her work should not be published (Barnard, 1994: 22), this seems to be the result of women’s position in society during that period. Driver argues “[t]o the extent that this prohibition issues from an insistence on ‘deficiencies’, it may be set aside as a conventionally ‘feminine’ mode of self-depreciation’” (Driver, 1994: 2).[8]

Barnard writes her journal with an audience in mind since she hopes to transmit “a little Experience” and to be “useful” (1994: 22). Her writing imitates the tone of the conduct book of the period. Lenta argues that Barnard wishes to advise “morally as well as practically” (1996: 174) throughout her narrative. Barnard’s intention is to “stock [her] Journal with as many small instructions” as possible in order that her experiences and advice may be useful to friends who might also accompany their husbands to distant places in future (Barnard, 1994: 22). She advises her readers on choosing the “right … way of doing a thing” (Barnard, 1994: 22). By way of explanation for her advice she says that “[i]t is surprising if there is a Right and a wrong way of doing a thing how naturally some people take the Wrong way, even where the matter appears self evident” (Barnard, 1994: 22). She thus believes herself to be in an ideal position to give such advice.

---

[8] For a detailed discussion of how the journals of Lady Anne Barnard were published and brought to public attention, please see Margaret Lenta’s “Introduction” and Dorothy Driver’s “Literary Appraisal” to *The Cape Journals of Lady Anne Barnard 1797 - 1798* (1994: x – xix; 1 - 13).

Barnard also offers advice on domestic matters and Lenta suggests that Barnard may have used the popular genre of the household manual as one of her models for her journal (1996: 173). She often provides lists of domestic necessities for her readers, in the style of the household manual. At the beginning of their sea journey, she provides detailed lists of what they are taking along to the Cape, and in the preface to their journey into the interior, she also gives details on the "resources" (Barnard, 1994: 297) she packs for their tour. In these descriptions, the focus is on Barnard's roles as housewife and caretaker. She performs the "narrative roles" of caring wife and mother (taking care of Anne, Johnnie and their company) (Mills, 1993: 22). Mills refers to the concern of women travel writers to present the narrator as feminine by amongst other things providing lengthy descriptions of the domestic (1993: 4). Barnard represents herself as the diligent housewife, but does this mockingly or tongue-in-cheek. Her irony is clear in the following quotation: "and now let us see what the *careful house vrow* Anne Barnard put up for resources upon the Journey" (Barnard, 1994: 297). She gently mocks and amuses herself with this role that she assigns herself or that society has assigned her as a result of being a married woman. Following the style of the household manual, she lists all the items that she takes along on their journey. This serves to illustrate her thoroughness and allows her to offer advice on what travellers ought to take along on such a journey. In this way, she advises her audience on domestic practicalities.

On their tour into the interior where she finds herself in a position which breaks away from the traditional place for a woman, she emphasises her duties as the caring wife and caretaker, for example cooking for their company as well as making sure they have all the resources they will need on their journey. As seen in the previous paragraph, Barnard thus emphasises her roles as caretaker and housewife. This is in strong contrast to her position when she is at her home in the Cape. There her class position frees her from the basic traditional caretaking functions since she has servants to take care of these functions. She laments the absence of her cook and her maid which forces her “to attend to many household matters when [she] would rather be employing [her] pen or pencil” (Barnard, 1994: 285). Her preference here is clearly to occupy herself with her writing or drawing during a time when the accepted norm for a woman was to be the caretaker in the house.

Another function of her role as housewife is cooking and Barnard often refers to her skill in this category. On their return from their expedition to the Drupkelder, at eleven o’ clock at night, she still manages to make a good meal: “I made a Fricassee in the conjurer much to my own satisfaction and that of the others” (Barnard, 1994: 319). Barnard had to carefully integrate her different roles in her text and although she “travel[led] outside the home [she still] display[d] all of the conventional characteristics of women within the home” (Mills, 1993: 34). Thus, although she defines herself as writer, she still manages to cook and take care of her husband, Elizabeth, Johnnie and their “people”. Mills remarks that by emphasising these conventional characteristics women travellers are often "reintegrated within the private sphere of the private/public domain" (1993: 34).

Nevertheless, in some instances, Barnard consciously distances herself from the traditional caretaking roles. Mills suggests that "women feature largely in the colonial enterprise as potent objects of purity and symbols of home" (1993: 58). This was as a result of the "patriarchal need to maintain women as domestic and private" in order to represent the "English cultural subject as adventurous, civilized, masculine, and white" (Driver, 1988: 17). However, when Barnard and her company are staying over at the Van Reenens, they are taken on a fishing party to the Breede River. On the shore, Van Reenen's wife "tuck[s] up her sleeves" (Barnard, 1994: 352) to prepare their dinner, but Barnard, instead of assisting with the preparation of their food, uses this opportunity to draw. Although Van Reenen's wife continues her role as caretaker and caring wife outside the private sphere of the home, Barnard chooses to occupy herself with her drawings. In this instance, she does not adhere to the traditional female role where women were regarded as "symbols of home" (Mills, 1993: 58) in the colonial enterprise.

In contrast to Barnard's self-confidence in the previous paragraph, she sometimes struggles to assert herself as artist. Often she has to beg for time to make her drawings. Earlier on their tour on their way to the farm of Mynheer Cloute, she has to "beg[ ] for *five minutes* to sketch" (Barnard, 1994: 311). Her husband does not grant her request as he reasons they have “far to go” and the day is “far advanced” (Barnard, 1994: 311). Another example of her difficulty to be able to assert herself as woman in this way is on their way to the afore-mentioned fishing party to the Breede River. Barnard wishes to collect a miniature Aloe, but “fe[els] shy of proposing it to others to stop for [her] fancy” (Barnard, 1994: 352). She refers to her wish to collect a plant as mere “fancy”; it is her perception that it is not important enough to expect the whole company to stop on her behalf. Barnard’s inability to assert herself as artist or naturalist in these cases results from, as Driver argues, the fact that she is caught up in “the ideology of femininity” (1994: 8).

As a writer, the process of observing something for the first time was very important to Barnard, especially in its aspect of looking with “new eyes … the only eyes fit to make observations” (Barnard, 1994: 21). She regards her position as ideal for writing a travel journal as everything she sees will be new and foreign to her and even “common circumstances of life, [would be] rendered *new*, by a new climate … new scenes [and] new people” (Barnard, 1994: 21). She did not read any other accounts before she started her journal because she did not want to be influenced by earlier writers and she wanted to be “free from prejudice or plagiarism, to follow [her] own style and express [her]self in [her] own way” (Barnard, 1994: 409). She was searching for her own voice as writer in a world where men had the upper hand since the “published records of voyages and of African exploration were male forms” (Lenta, 1996: 172). However, she also regretted that she had not read some accounts on Africa before she went to live there as she suggests that “the works of others are excellent finger posts to direct the curiosity to what is really worthy of attention and to give one the means of proving by occular testimony the truth of what has been told” (Barnard, 1994: 293).

On their outing to Saldanha Bay, Barnard again regrets that she had “not read any of the accounts of the Cape before [she] wrote this little Tour” (1994: 409). She reflects on her writing and continues to refer to her inadequacy and lack of the necessary skills and knowledge to give a proper account of their tour and what she finds in the interior:

> I have not the proper knowledge of many *simple points* necessary to set off from, and … my Journal is far less accurate, intelligent, or *specious* as to *wisdom* than it might have been had I copied from Journals already written, what in reality I *ought* to have *copied* (Barnard, 1994: 409; emphasis in original).

Although Barnard suggests that other writers were “better qualified to collect materials to enrich” (Barnard, 1994: 21) their journals, she nevertheless continues her writing. This contradicts her continuous underrating of her own writing when she comments on “her own incompetence, the frivolousness of her matter and the superior abilities of men” (Lenta, 1996: 173). Mills comments that women’s travel writing is often described “as if it were trivial because it contains descriptions of relationships and domestic details, as well as the more conventional descriptions of colonial relations" (1993: 118). I agree with Lenta who argues that it seems unlikely that Barnard was sincere when undervaluing her work (1996: 172). She rather does this to allay any accusations of being presumptuous.

Although Barnard had not read any accounts at first hand that had been written of the Cape, she had some knowledge of them. She mentions in her journal that she had been told that "in some accounts of the Cape there [was] much exaggeration[9] [and] that others have been given by Men of Science, but that their observations ha[d] been too much confined to Natural History"[10] (Barnard, 1994: 21). Her own perspective appears to favour an account which avoids either extreme; she wishes to avoid exaggeration but also wishes to offer a lively narrative description which will capture the life and social circumstances of her subjects.

Despite her criticisms of her own writing, she positions her work in opposition to the pruned accounts of male writers (Barnard, 1994: 257). She asserts that a more descriptive account is needed and criticises Barrow's work for the lack of detail and excessive pruning and sets out to include more of the interesting details that he omits. She comments on his work as follows:

---

[9] She is referring to the work of Le Vaillant, a French naturalist and traveller.

[10] Robert Jacob Gordon, for example, writes his journal in shorthand and goes about his daily entries in a very scientific way; he records the weather conditions by giving an exact thermometer reading as well as the speed and direction of the wind for every day (http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/age/people.Gordon/frameset.html). Barnard's journal is entertaining to read as she fills it with anecdotes and comical characterisations – she does not merely provide bland or scientific information.

> I longed to make him spare the pruning knife with which Men of Letters are apt to lop away all the tendrils, the interesting domestic particulars which create interest while giving information, but he probably found in Lord Macartney one whose judgment was equal to all his wishes (Barnard, 1994: 257).

As Lenta argues, Barnard includes the “descriptions of people and ‘interesting domestic details’ in her texts, not because she has no access to botany, biology or geology, but because she sees them as an omission from male-authored accounts” (1996: 173). John Barrow as personal secretary to the new colonial governor, Lord Macartney, was appointed as his representative to the interior (Pratt, 1992: 58) and as a result made many journeys there and produced many official reports on his experiences and opinions. In her accounts, Barnard enriches Barrow’s official reports by including narrative descriptions, as well as descriptions of the inhabitants. Driver comments that, in Barnard’s text, “the writing, seeing, representing self is not effaced in the manner of the official report, as it is in Barrow” (1994: 7).

Pratt criticises Barrow’s work because he “separates Africans from Africa (and Europeans from Africans) by relegating the latter to objectified ethnographic portraits set off from the narrative of the journey” (1992: 59) and because his narrative concentrates on landscape and nature description. However, Lenta argues that the reason for this lies in the fact that his *Travels* is based on official reports written for Macartney and that the inhabitants did not really play a part in the “commercial potential of the Cape hinterland” (1994: xviii). By contrast, Barnard writes about the inhabitants of the interior and even includes dialogues with them in her journal. Lenta argues that Barnard did not have the restrictions these officers had and that “[a]s a woman she held no official position which might constrain her in writing” (1994: xvii) about issues that interested her. She argues that male officials were constrained in the topics of discussion in their writing (Lenta, 1994: xvii). Using discourses of femininity, Barnard could thus be excused for writing about things that interested her or that might not have been proper for Barrow to write about.

In the same way as Barnard sets her writing apart from the pruned accounts of some male writers, she distinguishes her writing from the exaggerated travel accounts of others. When staying over at the “Slabers” (sic) (1994: 413), she enquires about Le Vaillant’s prowess as he recounts “having killed a tiger while at their house” (Barnard, 1994: 413) in an anecdote in his published travels. She records that they refer to him as the “’greatest Liar it was possible to imagine, tho’ very civil and well bred’” and that “the Tiger was killed by one of *their* Hottentots” (Barnard, 1994: 413; emphasis in original). Barnard further comments that she assumes his representations are “tolerably correct” on matters “where his own vanity was not concerned” (1994: 413). She is subtly mocking Le Vaillant’s claims of bravery and courage. These types of statements where “bravery, courage and not losing face are seen as paramount virtues” were often found in male travel writing (Mills, 1993: 164).

By referring her readers to Le Vaillant’s travels, Barnard reminds them of the quality of other travel accounts that are available about the Cape. Doubts were frequently cast on the truthfulness of women’s accounts, in particular on accounts given in women’s travel writing, in which case “their texts [were] subject to accusations of exaggeration and falsehood” (Mills, 1993: 12). It is perhaps for this reason that Barnard includes her anecdote about Le Vaillant, a male travel writer, in order to position herself and her writing in opposition to his writing. Although claims of falsehood and exaggeration had been made about travel writing in general, far more women’s texts were accused of this than men’s (Mills, 1993: 30).

These accusations of falsehood and exaggeration against women’s writing probably emphasised the importance to Barnard of having correct information about the area, the inhabitants and their culture in order to give a truthful account of her travels. She is interested in and curious to know more about the country and the people who live there and possibly feels that she needs a local inhabitant’s help to offer a complete and detailed account of the interior to General Dundas and her readers. It is for these reasons that she wishes to obtain an interpreter who can accompany them on their journey. Her requirements are “some Dutch man … who could talk a little French, or English [and] who would be patient in replying to all [her] questions, and intelligent in answering them” (Barnard, 1994: 296). Since the interpreter could not join their party from the outset, she decides to travel for the first 200 miles "ignorant of every thing but *appearances* and to return by *his means*, wise and good for something" (Barnard, 1994: 297; emphasis in original). At the Genadendal Mission Station, she especially regrets the absence of Mr Prince, the interpreter, as she wishes to ask the Moravian missionaries many questions (Barnard, 1994: 330). She again wishes for the arrival of Mr Prince at the magistrate's house in Swellendam:

> I really longed for his arrival. I felt myself such a *poor contemptible* '*Simple* Traveller' marking down things not worth repeating and leaving things unnoted which I could by no means get at the knowledge of many things too arise out of subjects being talked over; so new and unthought of that no questions can be put about them, till we know they *exist* (Barnard, 1994: 366; emphasis in original).

She refers to herself as a "[s]*imple* [t]raveller" because she believes she needs the knowledge and information of an interpreter to be an informed traveller. However, despite her feelings of uncertainty and doubt in her own abilities, she still continues to write her journal and does not allow these feelings to inhibit her writing. Unfortunately, Barnard is disappointed in Mr Prince's perceived lack of intelligence and wisdom. She comments that he

> had scarce any English, just enough to stand as *vocabulary* between us and the Farmers when things were wanted, but not enough to enter *into dialogue*, and if he had possessed language enough for it, he wanted the sense and observation to render it useful, for I saw he was

> one of those people who *observe* nothing, and knew nothing respecting the matters they *daily* see, because from seeing them *daily* they are too *familiar* to be considered. I asked him some questions of various sorts, he 'did not know *Sir*' … 'he could not tell *Sir*' (Barnard, 1994: 388; emphasis in original).

In this passage, Mr Prince addresses Barnard as "Sir". Although there are many feminine representations of her as the narrator throughout the text, she is in this instance seen as a member of the colonial administration by Mr Prince. He addresses her as "Sir", indicating that she is an authoritative figure. This "masculine stance" (Mills, 1993: 156) marks her alignment with the colonial powers. Although she regrets the incompetence of Mr Prince and that she had not become the "illuminated Traveller" (Barnard, 1994: 388) that she hoped she would become with his help, she has experienced, observed and recorded the interior of the country for herself. Now she too can speak with authority about the interior of the country.

Another strategy which Barnard as woman travel writer uses to give her writing authority is to align herself with General Dundas. Mills comments that women's writing "has a very problematic reaction with authoritative status, particularly within the colonial context" (1993: 47) because of the lack of authority within the colonial setting and since the truth of the accounts of especially women travel writers were often questioned. It is for these reasons that it was important for Barnard to emphasise Dundas's request in the preface to her "Journal of a month's tour into the Interior of Africa" since, as Mills argues: "to write with authority, women align themselves with colonial forces and thus potentially with a predominantly male and masculine force, but they are not in that move wearing a male disguise" (1993: 44). Barnard's statement of affiliation to Dundas also gives her the authority to write about topics that were not accessible to women of the time. By repeating his request in her journal, Barnard emphasises his approval of her writing about the state of affairs in the colony. In the following passage, she confirms both her and her husband's roles as agents within the colonial context in South Africa as they were gathering information and making assessments of the interior of the country for Dundas:

> In consequence of the request of Dundas … 'tell me' says he 'when you write how you found cultivation … what fare and accommodation you had in (sic) your tour into the interior … if there was good sport for your husband, and whether he and you think the Colony worth the keeping' … these interrogatories have brought many a dull particular on your head my poor Reader and Bills of fare without end which you would not otherwise have had (1994: 293).

Dundas's request places Barnard in a position of influence. Her emphasis of his request could be a deliberate act on her part to obtain authority in her writing or in the eyes of her readers since, as a woman in the colonial era, her gender would be an obstacle if she wanted her writing to be taken seriously. Dundas's confidence in Barnard places her in a position of influence as her writings would be of more importance than mere journal entries for personal use. Her writings have a specific purpose and are not merely a female occupation with which to pass the time. She self-consciously assumes her role as writer. Whereas journal writing was traditionally regarded a feminine occupation, in this instance her journal is almost assigned the value of an unofficial colonial report through Dundas's request. By means of his request and confidence in her opinion and judgement, Dundas assigns Barnard a role in the expansion of the British colony in Africa.

However, although Barnard writes about and comments on the requested topics in her journal, she simultaneously mocks Dundas's request and her ability to give an informed response as she suggests:

> I have no more sense respecting the benefit of a certain description of Colony can be to the mother country, than the cat … and yet I foresee that Lady Anne may be supposed to have been … a Skilful farmer, an accurate observer of natures charms … an intelligent politician … a prodigious great Gourmand! (1994: 293).

In the above quotation, she is sending herself up as colonial agent. She professes not to know much about politics or farming and as a result she is downplaying the contribution she is able to make. Barnard uses this self-deprecating humour because it is problematic for her as woman to use the discourses of colonialism straightforwardly and she thus uses various strategies such as "humour, self-deprecation, statements of affiliation, and descriptions of relationships" (Mills, 1993: 23) to enable her to be more comfortable in using these discourses as a woman within the colonial context. Her mocking tone subverts her position as the narrator figure. Lenta suggests that Barnard often offered “an ironic version of herself” (1992: 57) in her revised writings to avoid “undue intimacy [and] any sense of the confessional” (1992: 57). Barnard’s “will to please and to amuse” is evident in her *Cape Journals* and Lenta argues that this is what makes the Journals “distinctively the work of an eighteenth century woman” (1996: 176). She further argues that Barnard is not avoiding the painful or the unpleasant, but that she is using an ironic tone to transform matters of official policy into comedy (Lenta, 1996: 176). Thus, although she does not directly challenge official policy she undermines it in her own way.

Barnard negotiates gender constraints in her writing by her statements of affiliation to General Henry Dundas, the secretary of state for war and the colonies, Lord Macartney, the governor at the Cape and her husband, Andrew Barnard, the colonial secretary. Her central, official and very public position as a woman in the Cape is supported by, and based on, her connections with these three prominent and authoritative male figures. The well-known fact among the society of the Cape of her connections with important and influential persons in the colonial government, for example Dundas, would further have strengthened her social position. Lenta argues that Barnard “had access to political information which would have been unavailable to the ordinary resident at the Cape, Dutch or British” (1994: xvii) as she was friendly with Lord Macartney and the wife of an important official. These connections provided her with detailed and strategic knowledge of her society. Her social power and influence were thus enhanced by her political connections and the fact that she was very well informed on social and political matters. However, although her influential and prominent social position originates partly in her relationship with these men, her personality and talents as diplomat played an equally significant role in establishing this position of influence.

Barnard's role as wife of Andrew Barnard, who as colonial secretary was the second highest official at the Cape, gives her an important position socially and politically. Although it is by means of her political connections with Dundas, a close friend, that her husband obtains this position, his position now lends her a certain status and position of social power and influence. Barnard and her husband's social positions and status are thus dependent on each other. Lenta argues that although Barnard wanted to

> advance her husband's career and to maintain his and her own position of prestige and influence at the Cape she [was] aware that the overt exercise of political power on his behalf by his wife may discredit her husband (1998: 1).

She comments that Barnard therefore attempted to stay within the prescribed domestic and social limits "whilst retaining control of the situation at the Cape and of influence in London" (Lenta, 1998: 1). Lenta suggests that Barnard's personality and abilities gave her husband a prominence which together with their privileged position of living at the Castle provoked resentment and jealousy from the military men (1991: 58, 70). However, although Barnard was "deliberately writing to [Dundas] in order that her non-official and female experience … might influence his decisions and those of the Cabinet to which he belonged" (Lenta, 1996: 177), she was careful at all times not to infringe upon her husband's domain and to make sure that Dundas was aware of her husband's worth (Lenta, 1992: 61).

Barnard is conscious of the influence and social power she wields as the wife of the colonial secretary. On 6 May 1798, the wife of Jacob Joubert, a farmer at whose house they stay over during their tour, makes Barnard a small pie as a gift which she presents to her on their departure the next morning. Perhaps this is a mere gesture of goodwill towards Barnard who praised the pie at supper, but she interprets it differently as she writes about it as follows:

> there is good fishing too near in a River which Mynheer has a favour to ask from Government respecting, in the shape of a liberty to have a boat on it, perhaps my little pye might be a small bribe to the Secretary's Wife (Barnard, 1994: 310).

She is aware that her position as the wife of the colonial secretary will probably have an influence on people's interactions with her. To her the gift of the pie suggests that the perception of Joubert's wife is that Barnard will use her influence with her husband to sway his decision on Joubert's request to keep a boat on the river. Her awareness of her position of influence in the colonial administration influences her interactions with other women, especially the Dutch women. Barnard's perception is that the Dutch woman entreats her to sway her husband's decision on official business; a field that falls outside the domain of women during this period.

Barnard's role as official hostess for Lord Macartney during the first two years of their stay further strengthened her social position. Even when Macartney left the Cape, Barnard "continued … to entertain, though on a lesser scale, and to be a powerful social influence in Cape Town" (Lenta, xi: 1994). Barnard's move from London to Cape Town brings about a change in social status for her. In the Cape, she becomes the "first lady" and obtains an official position in the colonial administration. She is no longer merely a member of a group of women living under the same circumstances and limitations; she is now in a position unlike any other woman in the Cape. Her status as a member of the nobility (and hence her title of "lady") further enhances her social status at the Cape. In England, the title might have been quite common, but in the Cape it is a novelty.

As official hostess of the British administration she also plays an important diplomatic role in the Cape colony. As mentioned previously, she entertained senior British officials on their way to and from India and regarded it as part of her responsibility to break down the social barriers between the English and the Dutch (Barnard, 1994: 20). In addition to this, she also considered it important to provide “entertainment and proper social opportunities” for the lower-ranked officers whom she felt had been “socially ignored” (Lenta, 1991: 61).

From the outset, Barnard represents their move to the Cape as an opportunity to make a contribution to the greater good of England as she comments that they are taking leave of the frivolousness of London, “its repetition of amusements without interest”, “its [l]uxuries” and “its habits” to apply themselves to the seriousness of colonial business, “to find [and do] good, wherever they could … to fulfil every wish of their Sovereign to the best of their power, by conciliatory attentions to the Dutch, and to the Natives” (Barnard, 1994: 20). Here she is speaking as an agent of empire and clearly indicates her intention to act as diplomat for the British Empire. Barnard was a confident diplomat and, Lenta suggests, she “knew herself to be central and authoritative in the world of human exchanges” (1994: xviii).

As hostess and diplomat she entertained Cape Town society at the Castle, which was the official residence. She had political experience and was very well suited for this role as she had been a hostess in London for many years (Lenta, 1994: x). This role contributed to the influence she had at the Cape and to her social power. She organised balls at the castle – as entertainment, but also as opportunities for developing good relationships with the Dutch at the Cape. She played an important role in introducing Dutch citizens of Cape Town to British officers and officials by inviting them to the balls held at the Castle and thus created goodwill between them. Lenta suggests that Barnard’s “friendliness and social skills enabled her to secure the goodwill of many of the Cape Dutch” (1992: 55).

Even though Barnard was criticised by the fiscal at her first ball for inviting the Dutch as he referred to them as “foes” (Barnard, 1994: 289), she nevertheless continues her diplomacy by inviting a “hostile family” (Barnard, 1994: 289) at a later occasion. She comments that the old man to whom she sent the invitation was so “affected with the good nature of the card addressed to one disdained by those who were in power that he burst into tears” (Barnard, 1994: 289). Although he could not attend for fear of disapproval by the party he belonged to, he sent his two daughters to the ball and Barnard suggests that this was his way of showing that “the edge of hostility was blunted” (Barnard, 1994: 289). Lenta comments that both Barnard and her husband “actively sought out disaffected Dutch citizens” (1992: 59).

Shortly after their arrival at the Cape she is disappointed to hear the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief, Sir James Craig, that the new colony “would not be found of one tenth part the use to Great Britain that was expected” (Barnard, 1994: 163). She, in comparison, believes that they can work wonders in the new colony and comments,

> I was however sorry to hear any opinion which could lower the high Idea I was willing to have of a Country acquired by old England,

> cherished by some of our friends and highest Authorities, and a place to which we ourselves were come to effect as I hoped Wonders, under our judicious Master (Barnard, 1994: 163).

Barnard frequently naturalises the colonial process in South Africa (Mills, 1993: 156) as she accepts the imperial presence of Britain without questioning the validity of their claim to the colony. She has great respect for her country as well as its rulers and hopes to make a contribution in the new country for the good of England. She often refers to her wish that King George will be glorified through their presence in the colony (Barnard, 1994: 372) and believes that the "flourishing situation of [the] Country compared to what it was formerly and the increasing riches of the inhabitants … [are] a very flattering testimony in favour of [their] Governor's jurisdiction" (Barnard, 1994: 376).

Although Driver argues that Barnard "explicitly adopts the 'feminine' as a characteristic authorial stance" (1988: 10), I would argue that this is not always true as is indicated by the following statements by Barnard in which she resists adopting the discourses of femininity and instead struggles to adopt the discourses of colonialism. She does not shy away from giving her opinion on political matters, a domain which fell outside the prescribed domestic and social limits for women. She refers to herself as a member of the colonial administration when she comments on the British occupation of the Cape: "if *we* keep the Cape" (Barnard, 1994: 394; emphasis added) or on another occasion when she reflects on the advantages of the colony for Britain, she says, "if *we* had kept the Cape when it was first discovered, [I wonder] if *we* should have found it an advantage to us today" (Barnard, 1994: 408; emphasis added). She includes herself in the colonialist mission and speaks as a British subject loyal to her country and its monarch and this tendency is emphasised by her repeated deployment of the plural pronoun "we" in her journal.

Barnard also often mentions the economic benefits the British occupation has brought to the colony. When she sees a large herd of cattle being driven to the "*Cape for Sale*" (emphasis in original) she suggests that "they will fetch *three times the Sum* they would have done before the English were masters of it" (Barnard, 1994: 309; emphasis in original). She believes that "friends and foes at Cape Town were equally aware … that the place was enriched by the arrival of the English" (Barnard, 1994: 289) and mentions that traders who could previously not "keep up the price of their articles … now established monopolies of things much to their own benefit" (Barnard, 1994: 289). In all the above statements Barnard upholds the colonial rule.

As colonial agent, Barnard used her drawings to help expand the empire by recording information[11] to aid the British in bringing structure and order to the new colony. Since this was a new colony, any information about the interior was valuable to Britain, especially because the Dutch were forbidden from moving deeper into the interior by the Dutch East India Company (Lenta, 1991: 61) during the Dutch occupation, and they made sure that existing maps, for example those drawn by Robert Jacob Gordon, did not fall into the hands of the British. The interior was still relatively unknown. This added importance to Barnard's drawings. She makes specific reference to a drawing of the Hottentot Kloof that appeared in one of the British magazines and which she saw afterwards on their journey that it was "perfectly incorrect" (Barnard, 1994: 304). She realises that she has a unique opportunity to make drawings of the landscape that will contribute to the information gathering exercise for England, especially since not many British have journeyed so far into the interior. Although she writes in her preface that she doubts whether she will have "many opportunities of judging of the Interior of the Country [since] a Woman cannot travel far into it without danger, inconvenience to herself and every body with her" (Barnard, 1994: 21), she nevertheless manages to see more of the interior than most British men at the Cape during this period (Lenta, 1996: 176).

---

[11] Lord Macartney placed a high priority on the collection of information about the whole region of the colony (Lenta, 1991: 61). For example, Barnard mentions on their tour that he wishes them to inform him about the condition of the roads (Barnard, 1994: 305). Both Barnard and her husband record information on the infrastructure of the interior as well as the opportunities and possibilities the country has to offer to their homeland.

Barnard uses her drawings to convey strategic information regarding the colony and in this way acts as colonial agent. She draws Hoedjies Bay (north of Saldanha Bay), but regrets her "ignorance of the important points fit to be most attended to in drawing this Bay" as she feels that she took her drawing from the wrong angle and should have focused on "its entrance on [Hoedjies] Bay, the small Islands and adjacent country and to have finished that part a little, instead of going round impartially; however [she feels that she] put down most truly all

[she] saw” (Barnard, 1994: 409). She regards the bay as a potentially valuable habour for the British and this motivates her to sketch the scene. She mentions the advantages, but also points out the disadvantage that the water is of very poor quality and not fit to supply the ships. Here she speaks as a subject of empire when she refers to “our *fleets*” (Barnard, 1994: 410; emphasis in original).

When she is giving her opinion on the strategic importance of the bay, which she is observing at first hand, her writing deploys the discourses of colonialism. However, she undercuts the straightforward authority of the text by emphasising her “ignorance” (Barnard, 1994: 409). She reflects self-consciously on her own opinions and descriptions. The narrative voice is speculative, rather than declamatory and it does not claim sure knowledge over its subject matter. Her intentions are not to convince the reader that she has certain knowledge, yet she is still presenting us with information. She is apologising for assuming a position of authority about matters she is claiming to be ignorant of. Lenta comments that Barnard frequently apologises in her journal “for the fact that she is recording experience which would have been unavailable to women in Britain, or which, in terms of the conventions of the day, a woman would not have been expected to comment on” (1992: 56). In this instance, Barnard supports what Mills describes as the “colonialist venture” (1993: 159) as she does not question the presence of England in the colony and she tries to find opportunities for England to expand their presence.

Barnard affiliates herself with Dundas, Macartney and her husband, three prominent men in the colonial administration, to enable her to access the discourses of colonialism. Although she displays a certain sense of self-confidence in her opinions about the colony and its use for Britain, and she offers her opinions on the colonial situation to Dundas, she mostly does this with some reservation or undercutting her own opinion immediately after having offered it. Driver refers to Barnard’s “selfconscious attitudes to herself as writer and observer” (1994: 8) and suggests that “her continually splitting subject-position gives a different tenor to colonial discourse than one hears in its male proponents” (1994: 8). Barnard cannot write from one stable position since as writer she is always changing and shifting her perspective between her many different roles.

In the next chapter, I will look at Barnard’s attempt to appropriate the land in her role as colonial agent.

Chapter 3

Barnard's perspectives on the landscape and inhabitants of the interior

As travel writer and as informant for Dundas, Barnard wishes to give a comprehensive account of the landscape of the interior. She tries to be scientific in her observations and makes detailed lists of birds and animals that she encounters (Barnard, 1994: 321, 348, 363). She tries to assess the suitability of the area and the soil for agricultural cultivation, including the selection and allocation of crops, livestock and trees (Barnard, 1994: 313, 340, 344, 401). She also records the state of rural development that she observes, for example the quality and quantity of houses that have been built (Barnard, 1994: 299, 381). In addition to this, she gives detailed descriptions of the accommodation and food (Barnard, 1994: 320, 366) they are provided with by the Dutch as well as the type of preparation methods used (Barnard, 1994: 375), in compliance with Dundas's request for a detailed account of her experience of Dutch life. In the following passage, Barnard pointedly reminds her reader of Dundas's request and she confirms her intention to gather the requisite information:

> [w]hat I have endeavoured and shall endeavour to do is to give a topographical account of all I see cultivated for you mon cher ami Monsieur Dundas … Africa is your Masters Villa (George the 3rd) … You his trusty Major domo have sent us with the excellent Stewart[12] who at present keeps the House Book and with his eye

---

[12] She is referring to Macartney who has given them leave for their tour into the interior.

> over us to point out what the Vrow and the Maun should remark we are not likely to send you groundless representations (Barnard, 1994: 320).

By repeating her obligation to Dundas she affirms her authority to write about colonial matters. She flatters Dundas and addresses him theatrically as “my dear friend” in French and also refers to him in his official capacity as the “Major domo” or principal agent of the king in managing the British colonial territories. She is always careful in her correspondence with Dundas as he is moreover her sponsor and benefactor. Ironically, she refers to King George as “your Master” and not “our Master”, perhaps distancing herself from the imperialism represented by Dundas and the British government. This stance creates tension in the discourse since she does not unquestioningly accept Britain’s right to colonise Africa. By referring to Africa as the “villa” of King George the third, she implies that the king is the master of Africa and has complete command over it. When she uses the image of Africa as the villa of King George her discourse attempts to domesticate the untamed landscape of the colony.

Africa is further represented as the Garden of Eden and Barnard and her husband as the “Vrow and the Maun” who are sent by the “Master’s … trusty Major domo” to act as custodians of the garden of Africa. She has referred to herself and her husband as Adam and Eve in an earlier journal, titled “Residence at the Cape of Good Hope.” This occurs on her first visit to the aptly named house at Paradise (Barnard, 1994: 203). Africa is similarly regarded as a garden or farm which has to be cultivated for Britain to produce food for its sailors and travellers at the halfway stop of their long sea voyage from Britain to the East. This corner of Africa becomes an English farmland which has to be cultivated for the empire, and Barnard and her husband are sent to assess how the land can be put to use for Britain.

However, while speaking as an agent within the colonial context, Barnard is also sending herself up. She uses humour and irony to undercut the seriousness of the colonialist statement she is making (Mills, 1993: 164). Once again, her mocking tone subverts her position as narrator, and disrupts the stability of a straightforward colonialist statement (Mills, 1993: 164). Mills argues that “[h]umour is often evident in those moments of the text when there is the possibility of the most clearly colonialist statements being produced” (1993: 164) as is the case here when Barnard employs the discourse of domestication to refer to the appropriation of the country by the British. Furthermore, the humour that pervades this paragraph also subverts the discourse by turning the previously mentioned “wilds of Africa” (Barnard, 1994: 299) into an Africa depicted as the “Master’s villa”.

In her description, Barnard refers to making a “topographical” account of her tour. This marks her intention to make a comprehensive study of the land. The first British occupation of the Cape had taken place “at a time when, in Britain, there was a concerted drive, by both individuals and the state, to collect and systematise facts” (Penn, 1993: 26). Britain was compiling facts about its colonies and focused on topographical and statistical publications (q.v. Penn, 1993: 26).[13] Dundas was a keen supporter of such projects (Penn, 1993: 26). Barnard's emphasis on the topography of the landscape, including descriptions of such features as mountain ranges and rivers, is clear in the following paragraph in which she describes the land as a vast open space lacking proper cultivation. Her description of the surrounding land as seen from the summit of the Hottentots Holland Mountain offers a sense of this:

> at length we reached the Summit, and the new *canaan* opened on my view. 'The World was all before me where to choose my place of rest, and providence my guide' … Providence seemed to be certainly the *only* guide in this land to trust to, for far as the sight could reach and it was no where bounded, there was hillock on hillock … Mountain behind Mountain, a slight thread of rivulet here and there like a silver eel winding thro' the valleys, but scarcely perceptible [sic], and the only objects on which the eye found any thing to pause was sometimes a few pointed stones on the summit of rising grounds, under which fancy would fain have laid the bones of Hottentot Heroes slain in Battle had not observation pointed out that this was only the natural form of the Country (Barnard, 1994: 306; emphasis in original).

On their ascent, she records that "half way up the Mountain [there is] scarce a House to be seen, no cultivation and of course no population" (Barnard, 1994: 305). Her disappointment is clear when they reach the summit and she can only see wide open spaces as "far as the sight could reach". She had hoped, based on information that she had obtained from the Dutch, that once they reached the summit, she would see a fertile country with many houses and

---

[13] Penn argues that cartography was part of this same impulse: "to control through surveillance; to conquer through classification; to organize space within a total system" (Penn, 1993: 27).

"the face of nature so bespangled with flowers that [she] should be delighted with it" (Barnard, 1994: 305). She writes: "[they] assured me that round Cape Town it was *nothing*, but that when I got to the *other side* of the Hottentot Kloof, a new Country would open on me" (Barnard, 1994: 305; emphasis in original). According to Adler, the idea of the mountain range as barrier-frontier is characteristic of travel literature about difficult journeys (Adler, 1996: 87). In the above passage, it is clear that Barnard seems to expect that "beyond the barrier [of the mountain range], experience will be entirely different" (Adler, 1996: 87) and that she would see cultivation and other signs of settlement.

Her reference in the above quotation to Milton's *Paradise Lost* emphasises how overwhelmed she feels by the vastness of the landscape. She is tired after their difficult ascent and sees no place to stop or even to rest her eye as the landscape is a wide expanse. This bleak outlook heightens her disappointment. She is trying to search for signs of paradise, but can find none. She ironically contrasts the landscape in front of her to Canaan[14] since she had expected to see a fertile, cultivated and domesticated landscape from the summit, instead of a vast open expanse.

In the above passage, Barnard focusses on the austerity of the landscape in front of her, mentioning the thin stream of water running through the valleys like "a silver eel," as well as mountains and hills as far as the eye can see. She also attempts to "introduce movement into her pictorial description" (Driver, 1994: 4) as she imagines a narrative about the Khoikhoi. She imagines that the “few pointed stones” that her eyes fix upon are the burial places of “Hottentot Heroes slain in Battle”. Barnard’s attempts to imagine or piece together a history for the Khoikhoi contrast with typical colonial narratives which deny the people of Africa a history (Spurr, 1993: 99). She tries to find some sense of the “historical or cultural existence” of the natives (Spurr, 1993: 107).

---

[14] This biblical reference refers to Canaan, a country that was represented as the land of milk and honey, as it was rich in natural resources and very fertile. It was known as the Promised Land because God promised it to the Israelites who were regarded as His chosen people.

Despite Barnard’s disappointment upon reaching the summit of the Hottentots Holland Mountain, she still believes the country holds all the possibilities and opportunities of Canaan, the promised land. She is convinced that the colony has many benefits to offer and comments that “[t]he soil like the rest of the Country seemed good, waiting only to be tried to prove itself so” (Barnard, 1994: 348). Likewise, on her visit to Genadendal, she suggests that the country has plentiful resources and that a little industry will provide a wealthy prospect for the Moravian missionaries and Khoikhoi. She comments, “[i]ndeed I see no reason why those people may not be as rich as they please, having hands and soil” (Barnard, 1994: 335). Barnard’s perception is that the land is receptive and is waiting to be domesticated. She is critical of the lack of cultivation and comments that the “[f]ields [are] still innocent of the plough”, implying that there are good prospects for development.

Barnard reads the landscape through the eyes of a colonial agent with specific focus on how it can be useful to Britain. She concentrates on reporting on “that which has economic utility, or which may be regarded as a potential resource” (Penn, 1993: 31). She observes of the land that, “barren and uncultivated as it now is, it strikes me as having powers in itself to become one of the finest countries in the World" (Barnard, 1994: 256). The general expectation was that the colony would be useful to Britain to protect its route to India, as well as offering possibilities for settlers to people the country (Barnard, 1994: 365, 417).

She intends to find out how the colony can be useful to the British and plans to do experiments to see "what the soils are capable of" (Barnard, 1994: 22). In addition, she wants to leave behind a "little farm of Experiment" (Barnard, 1994: 22) when they leave the Cape. This will serve a dual purpose as she will have a place to conduct her experiments, but she will also in this way be able to leave behind an "[a]sylum" for a couple who "may have rashly married without money" (Barnard, 1994: 22) and who would be grateful to have a place to farm and be able to take care of themselves in this way. She wishes to ascertain what crops the soil is capable of producing and which methods of cultivation will be suitable.

Since the improvement and beautifying of the country is important to her, she is constantly on the lookout for any signs thereof. Recording the places where she sees signs of cultivation, her observations are also in the service of empire and will aid Dundas in forming opinions on the usefulness of the country for Britain. Throughout her journal of their tour into the interior there are entries such as "Baron Kilderness (sic) has a House here, a comfortable looking farm, the first appearance of ground in tillage since we left the Baths" (Barnard, 1994: 327); "I saw no tillage till we arrived near Mynheer

Meybourghs a wealthy Man" (Barnard, 1994: 301) and "[a]s we approached this place there begun to be the appearance of cultivation and wealth (Barnard, 1994: 322). In her journal, she carefully notes the occurrence of cultivation which to her signals improvement, progress and wealth. She is impressed by signs of industry, for example when she sees "charming fresh raisins drying on Matts" and "all sorts of business going on belonging to a prosperous farm" (1994: 308). Her main aim is to domesticate the land since she wants the landscape to be "useful" and "beautiful" (Barnard, 1994: 342). Spurr argues that the principle of domestication is inherent in the rhetoric of appropriation (1993: 34). However, Driver comments that Barnard "values the presence of 'tillage' and other signs of human industry" (Driver, 1994: 4). She also refers to the observation of A.E. Voss who comments that Barnard "envisages a 'beneficent process' [when she] speaks of planting the land, by which she means colonising" (Driver, 1994: 6).

Barnard's focus on the cultivation of the land is illustrated by the following conversation with Morkel's tutor whom she meets on their tour on 6 May 1798. The farmer is absent and Barnard learns that the tutor takes care of the farm. She discusses his position on the farm and as tutor, as well as the Dutch practices of cultivation of the land, and finds it difficult to understand that the Dutch do not put the land to more productive use. She perceives the land as a "waste World" just waiting to be put to good use:

> I expressed a surprise that with so much waste *World* round him, and so much time, he did not cultivate some ground for himself … he had not the Slaves, the Oxen, or the implements, and why

> cultivates Mynheer Morkel so *little* who has all these things (Barnard, 1994: 303; emphasis in original).

Barnard seems to search for an explanation for the lack of “improvement” or cultivation of the country. She mentions that a possible reason for “this carelessness of improvement and of beautifying the Country, may arise from the equal division of property which takes place amongst all the Children on the death of the father” (Barnard, 1994: 321). She argues that perhaps if the eldest son was to inherit the property, the country would be more improved. Her reasoning is that if one child inherits the farm that child will take on responsibility for the improvement and upkeep of the farm as it will be for his own gain. This will serve as motivation to make the land useful. She links the reluctance of the farmers to invest in their property and land in order to improve it for their children to what she perceives as their parsimony and she thinks that the Dutch farmers will not pay anything extra to improve the land even for their own children. She also blames it on the inability or refusal of the Dutch to think of the future (Barnard, 1994: 321).

Barnard wishes the Dutch farmers to make productive use of the land and produce enough food not only for themselves, but also for the people and the animals of the colony. She suggests that Morkel “might raise as much grain, wine &c (sic) to make his Cattle … his horses … his Slaves *live well* instead of ill” (1994: 303; emphasis in original). It is her belief that the land and soil are rich enough for everyone to prosper from provided that the land is managed efficiently. Almost a hundred years later, Lady Barker, another British aristocratic woman travel writer would echo Barnard’s sentiments about the “lack of industry that [she] sees as characteristic of Boers and natives alike” (Whitlock, 1996: 75).

Barnard often emphasises the “lack” of the landscape. She mentions the absence of trees and grass and cultivation of the land. She advocates the planting of trees at various points in her journal and suggests that it is effortless to change the landscape as one needs “only to throw the seed into the ground to be blessed with a young Oak or fir of good size in a very few years, vegetation is so rapid” (Barnard, 1994: 321). She values a landscape that is beautiful (Barnard, 1994: 365) and useful: “I learnt afterwards that there is a deep glen between the rising ground and the Mountains which is wooded all over, this may be very useful, but does not beautify the Country much” (Barnard, 1994: 342).

In, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation,* Mary Louise Pratt speaks of “the hegemonic European subject who scans landscapes and dreams of their transformation” (1992: 104). When Barnard looks at the landscape in front of her, she dreams of the cultivation and improvement of the “bare” (Barnard, 1994: 302) country.

Similarly, she is impressed by the improvement and beautifying of the houses and gardens. She values what McClintock refers to as the domestic values of “thrift, order, accumulation, classification, quantification and regulation” (1995: 168). McClintock argues that “domestic space was increasingly disciplined by the obsessive tidying and ordering of ornaments and furniture” (1995: 168). We can see this trend in Barnard’s view of the houses, gardens and landscapes that she observes as she transfers these values of domesticity from an interior to an exterior context.

When they approach farms or homes, she scans the landscape in search of “a trace of taste … neatness or improvement” (Barnard, 1994: 312). She continuously criticises the Dutch for what she calls their “carelessness of improvement” (Barnard, 1994: 321). In this respect Barnard’s observations are similar to those of Barrow who criticises the Afrikaner settler society for their “lack of taste, comfort, and the spirit of improvement” (Pratt, 1992: 61). Barnard’s distaste can clearly be seen in the following passage:

> At this place we found a Garden in no order … good offices falling out of repair … a house dirty and inconvenient … how these people have every thing but possess things so unneatly … so indiligently that there is the appearance of *misery* when there might be all the charms of *comfort* (Barnard, 1994: 356; emphasis in original).

Barnard’s text is saturated with what Pratt calls the “spirit of improvement” (1992: 61). In this respect Barnard’s text is similar to that of John Barrow’s official report on the interior of the Cape colony. Pratt refers to such authors as “advance scouts for capitalist ‘improvement’” who observe the landscape and report that it is “unimproved” and thus available for improvement by the Empire (1992: 61). The “European improving eye” thus needs to represent the inhabitants as undeveloped and the landscape as both empty and undeveloped (Pratt, 1992: 61). For Barrow, as well as for Barnard, this means that the Dutch are included in their category of the “unimproved African” (Pratt, 1992: 61). Pratt argues that the reason for this is that the Dutch claim to the land has to be denied so that the aspirations of the British can be represented as uncontested (1992: 61). She suggests that “prior Dutch claims and 150 years of Dutch colonialism must be discredited” (Pratt, 1992: 61).

Barnard also had an interest in collecting and recording new or unusual specimens of local plants and wildlife, which served as ‘trophies’ to be sent home to Britain. She represents the land as a rich repository from which to extract exotic specimens of fauna and flora. It became a trend during this period to collect new plant species to add to European collections in attempts to categorise the whole world. This trend followed from the publication of the Swedish naturalist, Carl Linne’s *Systema Naturae* (The System of Nature) in 1735 in which he “laid out a classificatory system designed to categorize all plant forms on the planet, known or unknown to Europeans” (Pratt, 1992: 15). McClintock comments that

> hosts of explorers, botanists, natural historians and geographers [who were inspired by Linne] set out with the vocation of ordering the world’s forms into a global science of the surface and an optics of truth [and] [i]n this way the Enlightenment project coincided with the imperial project (1995: 34).

Barnard collects specimens of all kinds of plants and flowers to send to her friends and family in Britain. On their descent from the Houw Hoek pass, she sees pink everlasting flowers and becomes “intoxicated with their beauty” (Barnard, 1994: 310). She wishes that she could send some to Dundas’s wife since she had never seen this sort of flower before and says, “how I wished Lady Susan had had a pot of them sent by my hand and growing luxuriantly in her green house!" (Barnard, 1994: 310). Barnard wants to send these flowers to Britain as a showpiece to show what type of plants can be found in Africa. As a result of this trend to collect and categorise plants, modern greenhouses[15] (Barnard, 1994: 379) and botanical gardens "began springing up in cities and private estates all over the continent" (Pratt, 1992: 26-27).

Furthermore, when she records information on the landscape to send back to her readers in Britain, she tries to do this in a scientific way. For example, on their way to the house of Swellendam's magistrate she sees a plant which she refers to as a milk plant, "[t]here is in great abundance the *milk plant*, a curious one, of which I must give a drawing, with its properties" (Barnard, 1992: 344). Barnard attempts to be scientific in her observation of this plant and gives a drawing of it with its properties. In doing this, she is imitating the professional botanists as well as adhering to the eighteenth-century preoccupation with the classification of plants. In the preface to her journals, she states her intention to record everything she sees when she writes "all I can promise is to draw, and describe every thing I see with my *own eyes*, in the best manner I can" (Barnard, 1994: 21) (emphasis in original).

Barnard regrets her lack of knowledge about plants when they travel through the interior as she comments, "[h]ow many curious plants might a Botanist have discovered here! … I have eyes, but I see not from Ignorance!" (Barnard, 1994: 317). Nevertheless, she is a curious observer and is sensitive to the wealth of plants and animals of the African landscape. Even though she regrets her ignorance and does not have suitable equipment to collect specimens, she nevertheless tries to collect samples when she finds something new: “I picked up a low everlasting flower here exactly resembling a Scarlet Strawberry, but had no means of getting at the roots” (Barnard, 1994: 321). Likewise, on their way to Saldanha Bay, she finds only stalks of the bright pink everlastings which she sends to Lady Douglas and she adds that she will “try to get the roots at the right time of the year” (Barnard, 1994: 321). Barnard’s collection of specimens is part of the trend to categorise and control nature.

---

[15] Greenhouses were built to control the temperature and climate so that live specimens brought from all over the world could be accommodated.

As an amateur botanist, she collects a wide variety of specimens that seems interesting to her. On their trip to the Breede River she picks some aromatic grass and “some curious bulbs of an odd plant the leaves of which spread like a fan, thin and flat” (Barnard, 1994: 352). She also sends a specimen of some “flat black rocks to which Square bits of iron are fixed” (Barnard, 1994: 352). She believes that the rock is significant since Van Reenen is of the opinion that there might be volcanic matter below the ground.

Pratt comments that travel and travel writing changed irrevocably so that from the second half of the eighteenth century natural history was a part of it “whether or not an expedition was primarily scientific, or the traveler a scientist” (1992: 27). She suggests that “[s]pecimen gathering, the building up of collections, the naming of new species, the recognition of known ones, became standard themes in travel and travel books” (Pratt, 1992: 27).

Barnard collected all kinds of unusual objects from the region and she even refers to herself as a “collector … of curiosities” (Barnard, 1994: 408). On their way to Jacob van Reenen, Johnnie shoots a wild peacock and he wishes to keep one of its legs as a “voucher”. Barnard wishes to keep the feathers to send home as “[*her*] vouchers” (Barnard, 1994: 345) (emphasis added). She collects curiosities to send as gifts to her friends and family in Britain. She sends all kinds of gifts home, for example flamingo feathers to her sisters and some other friends “who I think would value them” (Barnard, 1994: 371). One of the functions of sending these “gifts” to Britain as the imperial centre is to show her friends and family what “their” new colony has to offer. She even sent gifts to the Queen and princesses and the prince of Britain. She hoped that she would be able to add “many an oddity” to her collection of gifts during their tour (Barnard, 1994: 285). She collects specimens from Africa which she refers to as “my Cape trifles” (Barnard, 1994, 285); these include some live Louries, dead swallows and feathers of all kinds of birds, for example plumes of the Sugar bird’s tail and ostrich feathers. She even “begged” the skin of a snake which was “as fine as Cypruss gauze with a beautiful net all over it” (Barnard, 1994: 364) from the magistrate to send to Lord Hardwicke (her brother in law). She also sends him a swallow’s nest (Barnard, 1994: 371). Barnard sends these curiosities to Britain to show the fruits of Africa.

She refers to her pursuit of collecting as research (Barnard, 1994: 408). She does not mind laughing at herself and mentions her mistake when she requested to have a few “Oval pebbles of blackish Colour … so uniformly alike in shape and size” picked up. She comments:

> I suppose other collectors of curiosities are at moments of their researches not without their knowledge of *similar disgrace*, tho' perhaps they don't tell. I found my oval pebbles when cracked neither more nor less than Sheep or Goats dung, and was laugh'd at by my friends accordingly (Barnard, 1994: 408; emphasis in original).

Although Barnard thus calls herself a researcher, she draws attention to the problems of collecting material (Mills, 1993: 173). In this way, she undercuts the straightforward authority of the text.

Barnard also conceives of domestic uses for the plants she finds in the African landscape and in this way domesticates the unfamiliar (Whitlock, 1996: 74). As Whitlock suggests in her article "A 'white-souled state': Across the 'South' with Lady Barker" the colony is contained "within a framework of domesticity and utility" (1996: 74) and "[f]lora and fauna are foreign yet available". Barnard picks some of the prickles of the great thorn trees to send to Britain to show what they look like. She suggests that they are "excellent toothpicks" (Barnard, 1994: 345) and that they can also be used as pins "in case of necessity [since] the points are so sharp and the wood so tough" (345). She also comments that she has heard that "the plant has found its way to Kew Gardens and is there called the 'Cuckold Tree'" (Barnard, 1994: 345). Barnard was thus aware of the relevance and importance of her observations of the African landscape to her home country.

When visiting the Van Reenens, she entreats them to “give [her] a little of any thing they had that they supposed [she] had not seen *before*, and in particular Specimens of any things that could be manufactured” (Barnard, 1994: 351). She is interested in the usefulness of the fruits of the colony. Van Reenen gives her some wool of a Spanish and an English sheep as well as some “Bastard wool between these two personages” (Barnard, 1994: 351). His wife gives her some wild pepper that Barnard refers to as a “fine Stomatick” (Barnard, 1994: 351) if steeped in spirits, as well as aloes which are good for the same use. Apart from these specimens, she is given “some black seeds from a wild grass” (Barnard, 1994: 351) which can be used as beads as well as “grey Sea beans” (351) which she sends to Britain as she thinks “they would make curious earings” (351). She is also given some wild saffron as well as wine made from the “wild Hottentot grape” (Barnard, 1994: 351). Further along their tour, she picks some black round berries which she thinks might be converted to some use since “they made a beautiful purple dye which in an hour became a bright prussian ‘blue’” (Barnard, 1994: 380). She tries to find a domestic use for the fruits of nature.

Furthermore, Barnard represents the landscape as an excellent spot for practising hunting as a sport (Barnard, 1994: 346). One of the reasons for their tour is for her husband to have a chance to hunt as he is “equally fond of the sports of the field and of all the Scenery’s which a new Country affords” (Barnard, 1994: 294). Throughout their tour he and the young Johnnie are mostly interested in finding birds and wildlife to shoot at. Africa becomes a playing field for the entertainment of the colonialists and they view it as “an extensive sporting Country" (Barnard, 1994: 401). On their tour, she also meets Colonel King and his friends who "were shooting for their Amusement" and refer to their hunting as "excellent sport" (Barnard, 1994: 402). When they stay over at the Jouberts near Grabouw, she describes the country as a playing field and hunting ground where the riches of the land can be enjoyed: "This place has some beauty in it, excellent shooting, all round it, and a Sporting Colonel I should think might spend a pleasant month in the Summer; there is good fishing too near in a River" (Barnard, 1994: 309- 310).

However, I agree with Driver when she argues that Barnard makes a "subtle distinction between the men's shooting and her own drawing, which marks down the game as fast as it passes and does not rob the landscape of the little variety it possesses" (1995: 53). She adds that Barnard is often amused by the men's inaccurate shooting and makes "pointed references to the danger posed by guns jiggled about in the wagon" (1995: 53). While the men are busy hunting, Barnard records the variety and numbers of wildlife she sees (1994: 349).

Although Barnard's eye as "[t]he writer's eye is always in some sense colonizing the landscape, mastering and portioning, fixing zones and poles, arranging and deepening the scene as the object of desire" (Spurr, 1993: 27), her appropriation of the land is in no sense a straightforward "colonizing gesture" (Spurr, 1993: 2). Her representations of the inhabitants, like her representations of the landscape, remain ambivalent and, in some sense, contradictory to the discourse of imperialism as can be seen in the next section.

The eighteenth-century pre-occupation with classification, as discussed in the previous section, is apparent in Barnard's desire to classify the different 'races' she encounters at the Cape. She makes sketches to inform Dundas and her other readers in England about the little-known inhabitants of the territory. She writes about the Khoikhoi at the mission station as follows:

> I do not mention their being naked as any *peculiarity*. I suppose you all take it for granted *that* was the case, at Church they all wear their Sheep Skins, and some begin to prefer cloths, but these are not a large party … I shall give a drawing of the *dress* [and] *undress* soon" (Barnard, 1994: 339) (emphasis in original).

She takes up the role of amateur anthropologist in her endeavour to record the habits and culture of the Khoikhoi. She makes drawings to show what the Khoikhoi wear and records the influence of Western values on their culture, as well as drawings of what they look like in their natural state. This information is useful for us today as it provides insight into the culture and lifestyle of the Khoikhoi during this period. She intended to "catch a face of every different cast or nation [in the Cape]" and was of the opinion that this "[c]ollection [could not] be short of 20 [portraits]" (Barnard, 1994: 196). She expresses the wish to have a specimen depiction of every class of individual who was living at the Cape circa 1798. Her aim is to record the variety of appearances across the full range of ethnic groups of the Cape.

Barnard's colonizing desire to domesticate the unfamiliar or foreign (Whitlock, 1996: 74) can also be seen in her desire to "catch" one of the San. This is a further example of her pre-occupation with classification. Driver suggests that Barnard's writing, which to some extent reproduces the racial stereotypes of her times, was "caught up in the Linnaean urge to classify" (1994: 5). Penn describes this classification system as a "conceptual grid, which enabled order to appear out of chaos [and which] became a paradigm for sciences other than botany" (Penn, 1993: 27). Barnard's perception of the San, or "Boshemen", is that they are quite closely related to the animals:

> I should have liked to catch one of those geniuses to try how far they could be improved, but I hear they are perfectly wild, a people of the most extraordinary breed in *all* respects, low of Stature and their countenances rather more of the dog than of the Human creature … that is to say, the bones of the face are so formed (Barnard, 1994: 420; emphasis in original).

According to McClintock, the female Khoisan (derogatorily known as "Hottentots" or "Bushmen") were regarded to be at the lowest point of human degeneration, "just before the species left off its human form and turned bestial" (1995: 55). Barnard shares this belief. She wants to "catch" one of the San people to see if they can be "improved". She uses the expressions "wild" and "low of [s]tature" to classify them. She furthermore likens their faces to those of dogs. The traits of humans and non-humans become entwined in her description. Spurr discusses this type of "classification" as a rhetorical strategy that is superimposed by the colonising (white) nations from their "privileged" position in accordance with Western standards and values.

Classification is concerned with attributing certain characteristics to particular groups or ‘races’ and about placing inhabitants of countries into different categories on a continuum of advancement (Spurr, 1993: 65) of which the highest point is “represented by modern European civilization” (Spurr, 1993: 64). The two poles of this continuum are civilization and savagery. This strategy justifies the exercise of power.

By means of her descriptions of the San people as a “lower” ‘race’, Barnard also approves of the colonial order imposed on these peoples. Spurr labels this rhetorical strategy as “affirmation”. In colonial discourse the other is defined by emptiness, disorder, chaos and disintegration and this gives the colonisers the opportunity to reaffirm the value of the colonialist enterprise (Spurr, 1993: 109) as bringing values such as civilization, humanity, science and progress and the principles of unity and order to the colonised. The “repeated affirmation of such values becomes in itself a means of gaining power and mastery” (Spurr, 1993: 110). The colonising authority uses the techniques of repetition and self-idealisation to create a political and ethical order (Spurr, 1993: 110). The main affirmation of colonial discourse is one which justifies the authority of the colonisers (who are in control of the discourse) by showing their moral superiority (Spurr, 1993: 110). A recurring theme in colonial writing is thus the idea that the white man has the burden of “civilizing” the savages of the colonised world (Spurr, 1993: 111), hence Barnard’s remark that she would like to “catch one of those geniuses to try how far they could be improved”. Her opinions and thoughts on the Khoisan are deeply embedded in the colonial ideology.

However, although Barnard classifies the San in this way, she also refers to them as “geniuses” and speaks with appreciation about what she has heard of their artistic talents (Barnard, 1994: 419-420). She comments: “I have heard that there must be great natural genius to do the Animals so much justice” (Barnard, 1994: 419). She further comments on their “excellent caricatures” (420) of the Dutchmen. The implication that the San are able to make such paintings contradicts the idea that they are part of the lowest point of human degeneration.

Barnard’s narrative presents two very different discursive points of view. When she speaks in her official role, she adopts colonial stereotypes in an attempt to comply with colonial discourse. However, when she speaks in her personal capacity, she interacts socially with her environment, and recognises people as individuals without resorting to stereotypes. In the first instance she is trying to access the male world of knowledge regarding science and surveillance. As a woman she has not been educated in these fields and is unable to offer an independent point of view since she does not have the language tools to present it. In order to use this discursive point of view she has to imitate the stereotypes of colonial discourse because she has no access to the educated world of science. There is a conflict between her official and personal roles.

This conflict is clear in the paradox in Barnard’s perception of the inhabitants of the colony, which is illustrated by the following discussions in which she gives a “verbal presentation” (Driver, 1995: 49) of her artistic subjects. While Barnard sketches the magistrate’s daughter in Swellendam, she notices a slave woman:

> While drawing I had observed a pretty copper coloured Slave working away on the ground, in the slow indolent way the Slaves work here; … gently pulling out her thread as if she could no much [care] whether it came out or no … and throwing me a timid conscious look from a pair of fine black eyes. She was a picture as she sat. I bid her work on without changing her attitude and she should have a row of my remaining beads. She did, equally pleased with the beads and with having her picture done (Barnard, 1994: 366).

The atmosphere that Barnard creates in her description of the slave woman at work in this passage is very tranquil and peaceful. She uses the adjectives “slow”, “indolent” and the adverb “gently” to describe the attitude in which the woman works. Barnard employs the stereotypes of colonial thinking which view Africa as inherently inferior to the “industrious” countries of Europe. This is imposed on the image of the slave woman whom she describes as working indolently. However, in her description Barnard refers to the way in which the slaves work “here”, implying that they work differently in Britain, perhaps they are more industrious there. Through her commentary on the Dutch’s slaves she implies that the British could bring good order to the Cape because they are better masters than the Dutch.

Barnard wants the slave woman to remain in this attitude and entices her with a row of beads as one would entice a child. She needs her approval before she can take her sketch and comments on the willingness of the woman to have her picture drawn as she is “equally pleased with the beads and with having her picture done”.

When Barnard looks at the slave woman as an object to be drawn, she measures her body with her eyes to perfect the proportions for her sketch. Spurr argues that “[t]he [coloniser’s] eye treats the body as a landscape: it proceeds systematically from part to part, quantifying and spatializing, noting color and texture, and finally passing an aesthetic judgment which stresse[s] the body’s role as object to be viewed” (1993: 23). Barnard describes the woman’s skin as “copper coloured”, and in this way draws her close to the natural landscape as copper is a desirable resource to be found for the empire. She aesthetisises the woman by turning her into a copper statue. Her overall judgement is that the slave woman is “pretty”. She therefore “deserves” to be looked at and sketched. Barnard’s interest in this woman is based on the aesthetic value of her body as an object of artistic representation (Spurr, 1993: 22). She is fascinated by this moment and wishes to capture the slave woman in this one moment in time, hence her description of the woman as “a picture”.

Although Barnard needs the slave woman’s approval to draw her so that she will remain in the same position in which Barnard first noticed her, the slave woman as the artist's model has no agency in how she will be represented by the artist. The woman is captured by Barnard's gaze and becomes an object for her to look at and sketch. In this example, Barnard's gaze is powerful as she is the white, aristocratic, British woman who is one of the colonisers and the gaze, in this instance, implies imperial power. However, although Barnard observes the slave woman initially as an object and "subject[s] [her] to a controlling and curious gaze" (Mulvey, 1975: 8), the slave woman returns this gaze and Barnard acknowledges her self assertion or resistance against her subordinate position. Although it is not as bold as Barnard's gaze, the slave woman does look back at her. She does not avert her gaze and this moment of self assertion or resistance gives the slave woman some agency. The gaze is returned or turned back upon Barnard and she realises that she too is being observed in turn.

Barnard's acknowledgement of the returned gaze illustrates her ability as a writing subject to "take up a set of shifting perspectives on herself and the world [and] it is in this sense that the self becomes other to itself" (Driver, 1995: 47). Barnard becomes aware of herself as the observer of the slave woman when she acknowledges the returned gaze and realises that she too is being observed by the very person she is observing (Spurr, 1993: 26). In this extract, the status of the slave woman as Barnard's other is framed in a specific context and she is not "part of the 'timeless' and 'natural' of colonial discourse theory" (Driver, 1995: 48).

Another aspect of the passage that works against colonialist discourse is Barnard's description of the slave woman as an individual instead of as belonging to "an undifferentiated mass of 'savages'" (Mills, 1993: 166). When she records the "conscious look from a pair of fine black eyes" of the slave woman, she acknowledges her as an individual human being. This acknowledgement also contradicts Barnard's earlier description of her as "copper coloured" and the implied status of the woman as an object.

Barnard does not comment on the woman's position as a slave; neither does she question the use of slaves since she and her husband were slave owners themselves (Lenta, 1994: xviii). Adler suggests that "most female travellers shared dominant ruling-class views regarding race and empire" (1996: 92) and this is evident in Barnard's more moderate view of slavery. She disapproved of it and she "rejoice[d], perhaps mistakenly, in the relatively humane handling of slaves at the Cape" (Lenta, 1994: xviii). Barnard also sympathises with the plight of the Khoikhoi and, Lenta comments, that she is more moved by "the near-serfdom in which the Hottentots labour on farms than by actual slavery" (1991: 65). In the extract that will be discussed in the next section, we can see Barnard's attitude towards an individual Khoikhoi girl whom she encounters.

One of Barnard's wishes at the beginning of the tour is to find "the Hottentots [she] longed to see in wilder bands than [she] had yet done" (Barnard, 1994: 293). When they are nearing the end of their tour, she expresses her regret at not yet having seen any of the "Hottentot Ladies in their *natural* but also ornamented state" (Barnard, 1994: 380; emphasis in original). She blames it on the farmers who keep their servants to "too much drudgery to be vain" and on the Herrnhuters (Moravian missionaries) who "have the disposition checked in them as much as possible" (Barnard, 1994: 380). She comments on the missionaries at Genadendal who discourage the Khoikhoi from wearing their ornaments (as they see it as indulgence in vanity) and encourage them to wear Western clothes. As McClintock notes, "[i]n the colonies, the mission station became a threshold institution for transforming domesticity rooted in European gender and class roles into domesticity as controlling a colonized people" (1995: 35). She argues that "through the rituals of domesticity", animals, women and colonised peoples were "wrested from their putatively 'natural' yet, ironically, 'unreasonable' state of 'savagery' and inducted through the domestic progress narrative into a hierarchical relation to white men" (McClintock, 1995: 35). Although Barnard praised and supported the work of the missionaries amongst the Khoikhoi, commenting that "all barbarous customs hav[e] been civilized away by them [and that she] saw nothing of the sort [at the mission station]" (Barnard, 1994: 339), she nevertheless regrets the disappearance of the old customs of the Khoikhoi. She thus regrets the very essence of colonial influence, of which she is a part, on the lives of the Khoikhoi as she wishes to see them in their "natural" or "ornamented" state.

In the following passage, Barnard is fascinated by the beauty of the Khoikhoi girl and is drawn to this scene because of the "picturesque creature":

> I had hardly expressed the regret when my good genius who (as well as Mr. Barnard's) is often very gallant and obliging to my wishes, presented to me Pharoah's daughter in the very brook before me, washing her Royal robes, and perhaps one of the most picturesque creatures it was possible to see.
> From afar I saw my copper coloured Princess seated on a Stone and all over Ornaments and hinted to Gasper that his horses I was sure would be glad of a Sip of water but found him inflexible; to give any gratification to a horse to make him go on the better was greek and Hebrew to him. I was therefore obliged to tell the truth, that I wanted to draw the Vrow. He shook his head. Mr. Barnard said he would not witness such doings, and scampered off. I dropped two minutes of the five I had prayed for, and I trust no one will expect much from a sketch done in *that time*. I bid her stand up … she saw what I was about and was delighted with it … from whence can a Hottentot Girl have acquired the idea of having a picture done for her? She stood as if it was familiar to her, yet I dare say it never happened to her before.
> When I had marked the form a little and the dress … I offered her 4 Shillings or a dook – viz handkerchief. She preferred the last … [ ] She was the best made woman of her Sort that I had seen, extremely tall, her countenance tho' less sweet than that of many other Hottentots was frank and ingenuous to a great degree, and she had much the air as if she had been told that she was handsome and had nothing to reproach herself with in want of tenderness of heart. She was really a gallant looking girl of 18, and resembled a good deal my old and kind friend Mrs. Lawson when she was about that age (Barnard, 1994: 380-381; emphasis in original).

In this extract, Barnard attempts to compose a story from the scene she sees in front of her. Driver comments on Barnard's "narrative tendencies" and argues that Barnard "sometimes introduces movement into her pictorial descriptions, thus combining the picturesque with narrative art (1994: 4-5). Here, Barnard romanticises the girl and makes her a character in her narrative. Her description starts off like the beginning of a fable. She depicts the Khoikhoi girl as a member of royalty; she calls her "Pharoah's daughter" and "my copper-coloured [p]rincess" and refers to her "[r]oyal robes". The narrative gaze reshapes the mundane scene of a woman washing her clothes in a stream. Barnard invites the reader to join her in her creation of a fable of

African royalty. Her description of the scene comes close to the “eroticization” of Africa “insofar it conceives its object as both sexual and feminine” (Spurr, 1993: 181). In this instance, the “colonialist imagination [conjures up] the gorgeous apparition of the African queen” (Spurr, 1993: 181). She becomes a spectator in this extract as she sees the Khoikhoi girl “from afar” and watches her. Barnard is in awe of the scene and cannot take her eyes away.

As in the previous extract of the slave woman, Barnard looks at the Khoikhoi girl as an object of beauty; she describes her as “perhaps one of the most picturesque creatures it was possible to see”. Her immediate response to witnessing such beauty is again to sketch the girl, to record this beauty. Lenta also comments that Barnard can see “beauty as well as strangeness in the indigenous peoples of Southern Africa in a way which is very unusual in her period” (1991: 71). Barnard does not describe the native women in a “conventional sexualised way” (Mills, 1993: 157). However, she creates sensual images when she describes both the slave woman and Khoikhoi girl as “copper coloured” and by means of this description she makes them a part of the natural landscape. In this description of the Khoikhoi girl, the focus is also on her as a free being. She is less clothed and is not restricted in the same way as Barnard and Anne Elizabeth.

Barnard is fascinated by the beauty of both women and does not impose the Western norms of beauty on them as was commonly deployed in colonial discourse. This is illustrated when Barnard likens the Khoikhoi girl to her “old and kind friend, Mrs. Lawson when she was about that age”, thus not differentiating on the grounds of ‘race’ or class. She is not “reproducing the view that Africans are deficient in relation to a western norm of beauty” (Mills, 1993: 160) since she is likening the Khoikhoi girl to a Western woman, albeit in looks and perhaps character.

Barnard’s admiration for the beauty of the native women is in stark contrast to her comments on the unattractiveness, size and lack of intellect of most of the Dutch women she meets. She hardly ever mentions the minds of the natives, perhaps because she does not expect them to be able to talk to her. Barnard differentiates between the Dutch women and the native women since she defines the latter by their bodies and not their minds, but she defines the Dutch women by their bodies and their minds (Bohls, 1995: 13). Barnard’s acknowledgement of beauty in the Dutch women is undercut by her negative opinion of them as lacking in intellect and social graces. Mostly, she describes the Dutch women in unflattering terms referring to the following characteristics: their size, the number of their children and their intellect (or lack thereof, according to her).

When, for example, Barnard describes the wife of Jacob Joubert, she evaluates her according to a checklist of unflattering characteristics which typify her prejudiced view of the Dutch: “not out of size, about 35, plain, stupid, but civil … I expected to have seen a dozen of Children” (Barnard, 1994: 307). Her overall impression of the married Dutch women compares to her description of the wife of Jacob van Reenen:

> [t]he Vrow was of the same size and age with *all the rest* of the married women in the Colony … the moment half a dozen Children are born, five and thirty, and 15 stone seem to be acquired of course … They have no idea I see of continuing to look handsome to please their Husbands (Barnard, 1994: 346; emphasis in original).

She continues to describe their dress and their lack of front teeth after the age of 30 and creates a stereotype of a typical Dutch woman. Barnard criticises the Dutch women for not adhering to the ideology of femininity in which it is important for women to “please their husbands”. She also criticises the morality of the young Dutch women as “so uncouth! … flippant, yet haughty and vulgar … it would ungoddess Venus herself” (Barnard, 1994: 365). Her commentary upon the morality of the Cape Dutch implies the superiority of the British colonisers and their focus on “the ideals of a civilizing mission bent on improving the moral condition of the colonized” (Spurr, 1993: 66), albeit the colonised settler nation in this instance. However, although she is very critical of the Dutch in general, she does occasionally find some redeeming factors, for example, she comments on Jacob van Reenen’s wife: “the Vrow here had one perfection which to me is a great one, an open and sweet countenance, no solicitude about any thing and tolerable good teeth [!]” (Barnard, 1994: 346).

Another aspect to consider in the above passage is that, at first, when Barnard sees the Khoikhoi girl in the stream, she does not want to ask her companions to stop the wagon for her so that she can sketch the girl. She then does this in a roundabout way, suggesting to Gasper that his horses might want a drink of water. When he does not comply with her suggestion, she has to state explicitly what she wants to do. Barnard again appears to be too shy to ask her husband and the other travellers to keep on stopping the wagon so that she can sketch. Both males protest to her decision to sketch the girl as Gasper "sh[akes] his head" and her husband says that he will "not witness such doings, and scamper[s] off". With this resistance and disapproval from both her husband and their driver, she then takes less time to sketch than she intended to as she "drop[s] two minutes of the five [she] had prayed for" as not to inconvenience the others.

A further example of Barnard's recognition of one of the natives of the colony as an individual can be seen in her interaction with a woman of mixed blood. Barnard does not allow her acts of diplomacy to be influenced by the opinions of others. She is not discouraged by the snobbery of some of the Dutch when she decides to invite a "blue Woman" (Barnard, 1994: 309) to one of her balls at the Castle. On their tour into the interior, at the house of Jacob Joubert, she meets the woman of mixed blood whom she refers to as "my blue Woman" (Barnard, 1994: 309) and invites her to the Castle:

> I asked her to one of my great Balls if she should happen to be at the Cape. Mr. Barnard gave me a look to say no more … [he] tells me I should get into terrible disgrace with the *Quality* of the Cape if a woman so decidedly half cast or more, had been seen in the same room with them, no degree of beauty, manners or even *fortune* being sufficient to spunge off the Stigma of Slave born … What ridicule! … when the one half of the Settlers here are of the lowest class of European Dutch (Barnard, 1994: 309).

Although Adler (1996: 92) suggests that “[m]ost female travellers shared dominant ruling-class views regarding race and empire”, Barnard occasionally withdraws from these colonising stances and her writing occupies an ambivalent and contradictory relation to the colonialism of this period (Driver, 1994: 10). In this passage, Barnard is not influenced by ‘race’ or class and sees the woman as an individual. However, this passage also illustrates Barnard’s complex attitude towards the inhabitants of the colony. On the one hand, she has a welcoming attitude towards the “woman so decidedly half cast or more”, but on the other hand she deplores the “one half of the Settlers [at the Cape who are] … of the lowest class of European Dutch”. Her emphasis of the word “*Quality*” in reference to the Dutch at the Cape highlights the paradoxes in society since they represent a lower class than the European Dutch. She deplores the fact that they have the audacity to be condescending to other groups of people, classifying them according to ‘race’ and class. However, by means of her criticisms of the Dutch, her prejudices against them are also revealed. Her opinion of the Dutch is that they are of a lower social status than their European counterparts.

The extracts discussed in this section are illustrative of Barnard’s complex interaction with the world of colonialism. On the one hand, she adheres to the desire to classify the inhabitants of the colony according to the eighteenth century’s fascination with classification. On the other hand, she recognises the humanity of the individuals with whom she interacts in a move away from the colonial stance.

Chapter 4

Conclusion

Barnard's perspective of the South African landscape and its inhabitants is influenced by various factors such as the "cultural ideology" of colonialism and her close alliance to the "institutional authority" (Spurr, 1993: 11) of the British Empire. Apart from these factors, she is also heavily influenced by the eighteenth-century worldview of nature as a space to be categorised and ordered, as well as by her struggle to carefully integrate her various roles, ranging from woman writer to colonial agent, in a male dominated society.

Throughout the period covered In Barnard's journal, she is travelling under the protection of her husband. In this sense Barnard's text differs from many other texts by women travel writers since many of them represent the female narrator as travelling alone and without protection, reinforcing the idea that the colony is safe for the colonisers to travel in, even for women travellers (Mills, 1993: 22). Unlike many other women travel writers, her motive for travel is not portrayed as being merely for personal reasons (Mills, 1993: 22). She gives various reasons for her tour into the interior, amongst which her "assignment" for General Dundas. She is thus straightforward and open about her role as colonial agent.

Barnard justifies the domestication of the land by finding common points between the colonial project and the needs of the inhabitants. She masks the difficulties and problematic nature of colonisation by implying that it is an appeal by the colonised land and its people (Spurr, 1993: 28). She often refers to the land in terms of what Spurr calls the “natural abundance that awaits the creative hand of technology” (Spurr, 1993: 28). She can thus justify the appropriation of the land by implying that it is an appeal by the colonised. Barnard is always practical and this is evident in her wish to make the land useful to the colonialists, as well as the inhabitants, for example in her wish to have the farmers produce enough food for everyone, including their slaves (1994: 303). Similarly, Barnard offers ingenious suggestions for putting the things that she encounters on her travels to some practical use.

Throughout this text, Barnard’s narrative presents two very different discursive points of view. When she speaks in her official role, she adopts colonial stereotypes in an attempt to comply with colonial discourse. It is then when her view is tainted with images of colonial stereotypes and when she reproduces the racism of the period. However, when she speaks in her personal capacity, she interacts socially with her environment, and recognises people as individuals without resorting to stereotypes.

Bibliography

Adler, M. 1996. “Skirting the Edges of Civilization: Two Victorian women travellers and ‘colonial spaces’ in South Africa.” In *Text, Theory, Space: Land, Literature and History in South Africa and Australia*. Darian-Smith, K. Gunner, L. and Nuttall, S. (Eds). London and New York: Routledge. 83 – 95.

Barnard, A. 1994. *The Cape Journals of Lady Anne Barnard 1797 – 1798*. Robinson, A.M. Lewin (Ed). Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.

Barnard, A. 1973. *South Africa a Century Ago*. Anderson, H.J. (Ed). Cape Town: Maskew Miller Ltd.

Barnard, A. 1973. *The Letters of Lady Anne Barnard to Henry Dundas: from the Cape and Elsewhere 1793 – 1803 together with her Journal of a Tour into the Interior and Certain Other Letters*. Lewin Robinson, A.M. (Ed). Cape Town: AA Balkema.

Barnard, A. 1999. *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard 1799 – 1800*. Lenta, M. and Le Cordeur, B. (Eds). Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.

Blanton, C. 2002. *Travel Writing: The Self and the World*. New York: Routledge.

Boehmer, E. 1995. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bohls, E. A. 1995. *Women Travel Writers and the Language of Aesthetics, 1716 – 1818*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bradford, H. 1996. “Women, Gender and Colonialism: Rethinking the History of the British Cape Colony and its Frontier Zones, c. 1806 - 70.” In *Journal of African History*. Vol. 37. 351 - 370.

Coetzee, C. 1995. “Two versions of a journey into the interior.” In *Pretexts: Studies in Writing and Culture.* Vol. 5 (1 - 2). 66 - 83.

Cullinam, P. 2003. *Robert Jacob Gordon 1743 – 1795: The Man and his Travels at the Cape*. [Online]. Available: http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/age/people/Gordon/frameset.html. (2006, Nov. 06).

Driver, D. 1988. “’Woman’ as Sign in the South African Colonial Enterprise.” In *Journal of Literary Studies*. Vol. 4 (1). 3 – 20.

Driver, D. 1994. “A Literary Appraisal.” In *The Cape Journals of Lady Anne Barnard 1797 – 1798*. Robinson, A.M. Lewin (Ed). Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.

Driver, D. 1995. “Lady Anne Barnard’s Cape Journals and the Concept of Self-othering.” In *Pretexts: Studies in Writing and Culture*. Vol. 5 (1 - 2). 46 - 65.

Glover, D. and Kaplan, C. 2000. *Genders*. London and New York: Routledge.

Graham, H. G. 1908. *Scottish Men of Letters in the Eighteenth Century.* London: Adam and Charles Black.

Hamilton, C. J. 1892. *Women writers: their works and ways*. London: Ward, Lock, Bowden and Co.

Kerridge, R. 1999. “Ecologies of Desire: Travel Writing and Nature Writing as Travelogue.” In *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Clark, S. (Ed). London and New York: Zed Books. 164 - 182.

Lenta, M. 1991. “All the Lighter Parts: Lady Anne Barnard’s Letters from Cape Town.” In *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*. Vol. 22 (2). 57 – 71.

Lenta, M. 1992. “Degrees of Freedom: Lady Anne Barnard’s Cape Diaries.” In *English in Africa*. Vol. 19 (2). 55 – 68.

Lenta, M. 1994. “Introduction.” In *The Cape Journals of Lady Anne Barnard 1797 – 1798*. Robinson, A.M. Lewin (Ed). Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.

Lenta, M. 1996. “The Art of the Possible: Lady Anne Barnard’s ‘Cape’ Writings and their Survival.” In *South African Feminisms: Writing, Theory and Criticism 1990 – 1994*. Daymond, M.J. (Ed). New York and London: Garland Publishing. 169 – 183.

Lenta, M. 1999. “Introductory Note.” In *The Cape Diaries of Lady Anne Barnard 1799 – 1800*. Le Cordeur, B. and Lenta, M. (Eds). Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society.

Lenta, M. 2006. “Introduction.” In *Paradise, the Castle and the Vineyard: Lady Anne Barnard’s Cape Diaries.* Lenta, M. (Ed). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Marquard, L. 1963. *The Story of South Africa*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

McClintock, A. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. London: Routledge.

Mercer, W.S. 1999. “Gender and Genre in Nineteenth-century Travel Writing: Leonie d’Aunet and Xavier Marmier”. In *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Clark, S. (Ed). London and New York: Zed Books. 147 - 163.

Mills, S. 1993. *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women’s Travel Writing and Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Moi, T. 1989. “Feminist Literary Criticism.” In *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*. Jefferson, A. and Robey, D. (Eds.) London: B.T. Batsford. 204 - 221.

Mulvey, L. 1975. “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema.” In *Screen.* Vol 16 (3). 6 – 18.

Orr, Bridget. 1999. “’Stifling Pity in a Parent’s Breast’: Infanticide and Savagery in Late Eighteenth-century Travel Writing”. In *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. Clark, S. (Ed). London and New York: Zed Books. 131 - 146.

Penn, N. 1993. “Mapping the Cape: John Barrow and the First British Occupation of the Colony, 1795 – 1803.” In *Pretexts: Studies in Writing and Culture.* Vol 4 (2). 20 - 43.

Pratt, M. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Said, E.W. 1983. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Singh, J.G. 1996. *Colonial Narratives/Cultural Dialogues: “Discoveries” of India in the Language of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sobel, M. 1987. *The World They Made Together: Black and White Values in Eighteenth-century Virginia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Spurr, D. 1993. *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Van der Merwe, P.P. “A Poet’s Commitment: Antjie Krog’s Lady Anne.” In *South African Feminisms: Writing, Theory and Criticism 1990 – 1994*. Daymond, M.J. (Ed). New York and London: Garland Publishing. 259 – 279.

Walker, E. 1964. *A History of Southern Africa*. London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd.

Whitlock, G. 1996. “A ‘white-souled state’: across the ‘South’ with Lady Barker.” In *Text, Theory, Space: Land, Literature and History in South Africa and Australia*. Darian-Smith, K. Gunner, L. and Nuttall, S. (Eds). London and New York: Routledge. 65 – 77.

Woodward, W. “Metonymies of Colonialism in *Four Handsome Negresses* by Ethelreda Lewis.” In *South African Feminisms: Writing, Theory and Criticism*

1990 – 1994. Daymond, M.J. (Ed). New York and London: Garland Publishing. 169 – 183.

Yiannopoulou, E. 1998. “Autistic Adventures: Love, Auto-Portraiture and White Women’s Colonial Dis-ease.” In *European Journal of English Studies*. Vol. 2 (3). 324 - 342.