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Abstract

Captain James Cook is one of the greatest mariners and explorers the world has ever known. The writing he did on his first voyage around the world both preserved the histories of the Pacific Ocean cultures he encountered and commenced their colonization by the British Empire. Despite his limited educational background, Cook was able to achieve such fame by learning maritime skills and writing skills through literacy sponsorship and cognitive apprenticeship. When he was selected by London’s Royal Society to lead an expedition to the Pacific Ocean and around the world, it gave him a complex set of instructions that required him to write in genres that were new to him. This thesis theorizes Cook as a basic writer faced with a new and unfamiliar writing assignment and analyzes the writing he produced during his voyage through the lens of social cognitive theory. In doing so, I examine the function of his discourse community in his writing process and growth as a writer. I employ the theory of rhetorical space to analyze Cook’s ship, his site of composition, and the role it played in helping him to construct his audience and complete his writing assignment. Also, I identify a significant rhetorical shift in Cook’s writing that is commiserate with his confidence in his ability to produce ethnographic writing. As a result, I argue that the ideologies present in Cook’s discourse community and in the objects housed in his rhetorical space mediated his composition process and helped him to produce writing that was acceptable to the Royal Society.
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Chapter 1:

James Cook’s Social Cognitive Education

Less than 10 years after Captain James Cook’s death in 1779, Andrew Kippis published *A Narrative of the Voyage round the World, Performed by Captain James Cook, with an Account of His Life*, and nearly every generation since has produced new biographies containing additional information about the seaman’s life and adventures. Additional volumes focusing on different aspects of his accomplishments and the effects of his voyages on the course of history appear in bookstores on an annual basis. These accounts emphasize that he was born to an itinerate Scottish farmhand and the daughter of an English commoner on November 7, 1728 and left the small English village of Marton in his teens to forge a career in the British Royal Navy. As a matter of course, Cook would distinguish himself among his contemporaries with his talents for navigation and mapmaking and would secure a place alongside Raleigh, Drake, and Nelson in the pantheon of British navigators for discovering Australia and Antarctica.

Cook’s discoveries in the Pacific Ocean would have been of little use to the British Empire were it not for his writing. He had little formal schooling and what he received was devoid of the elements of a classic eighteenth-century British education. But later in life, he was able to produce highly influential accounts of the people and places he visited. Of the journal Cook composed during his first circumnavigation of the globe, Augustus John Hervey, the third Earl of Bristol and a Lord of the Admiralty wrote that it was, “The best Naval Journal I ever read” (Cook, 1968, p. ccxxi). Cook’s biographers and historians tend to avoid addressing the gap between Cook’s education and his accomplishments by merely citing his genius. Yet, Deborah Brandt’s (1998) theory of
literacy sponsorship and Linda Flower's (1994) concept of cognitive apprenticeship demonstrate how Cook's social interactions helped him to develop as a learner and a mariner. This social cognitive education provided him with a strong foundation on which to build a career not only as a sailor, but also as a writer. Given the interplay of Cook's social interactions with his mental processes for producing writing, his studies set the groundwork for his compositions to be analyzed through social cognitive theory and for his ship *His Majesty's Bark Endeavour*—the floating society that would carry him around the world on his first circumnavigation—to be examined as a rhetorical space.

It is my contention that Cook's composition process was affected by the ideologies present in the Great Cabin of his ship, the place where his discourse community convened and he composed. With the help of his discourse community and his rhetorical space, he became a more confident writer who could produce effective writing in the scientific genre of ethnography, a literacy task that was new to him. Therefore, he satisfied the complex requirements of the writing assignment the Royal Society gave him to complete on his first voyage around the world.

**Cook's First Voyage around the World**

Despite his numerous biographies, little is known about the content of Cook's formal education other than that he attended two rural schools for the equivalent of five years before becoming a grocer's apprentice at the age of 13, in 1741 (Beaglehole, 1974). In 1755, with war looming between England and France, he left his position as merchant seaman on a coal ship to volunteer for British Naval Service. By 1762, Cook had become an accomplished cartographer, recognized by the British Admiralty for his maps of Quebec and Newfoundland. With war behind them, the British Navy renewed its interest
in charting the largely unexplored Pacific Ocean, and at the behest of scientists from the Royal Society, who wanted to observe the transit of Venus across the Sun’s disc in 1769, an expedition to the Pacific was slated for 1768. While Cook was not the Navy’s first choice to command the expedition, members of the Admiralty familiar with his skills in cartography strongly recommended him for the commission (Salmond, 2003).

On July 30, 1768, the Royal Society presented James Cook with two secret letters that set forth what he was to accomplish on what would be his first of three voyages to the Pacific Ocean. Their first directive was to cultivate a friendship with the natives of Tahiti, observe the Transit of Venus across the Sun’s disc and gather data that could help scientists determine the Earth’s distance from the Sun. The second, and more politically motivated task, was for Cook to verify the existence of the Southern Continent (Antarctica) and to carefully observe the natural resources and people of New Zealand, a land mapped by and forgotten to Europeans in the seventeenth-century. By the command of the Lord High Admiral of Great Britain, the experienced cartographer and astronomer was to engage in the new literacy task of keeping a “Journal of Remarkable Occurrences,”¹ which would be used, in part, to help determine if the British should extend their empire to the Australian continent. Having nominal direction and no experience with this type of composition, Cook set out to complete his assignment of cataloguing peoples and places no European had ever before seen. Among the expedition’s 143 passengers and crewmembers were two naturalists, two artists, an astronomer, and a botanist, who was also a representative of the Royal Society—all of

¹ Captain Cook and his contemporaries wrote during a moment in history predating the codification of the rules for English grammar, syntax, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. All quotations reflect the language found in the sources referenced.
whom kept journals of their own. For the duration of the journey, Cook would write on a
daily basis with these men and learn to produce the genres his sponsor, the Royal Society,
most valued.

Perceptions of Captain Cook’s Writing

Accounts of Captain Cook’s life often include anecdotes about his inability to
write conventionally and how he was tutored at sea by his better-educated subordinates.
By his own admission, he considered himself a weak writer, so much so he felt the need
to justify his lack of writing aptitude after his second voyage:

I have given the best account of things in my power. I have neither had an
education, nor have I acquired abilities for writing. I have been almost
constantly at sea from my youth and have dragged myself...through all the
Stations, from a Prentice Boy to a Commander. (Cook, 1968, p. vi)

When considering that his primary purpose on the expedition was to record information
that would inform the British Empire's decisions, Cook can be positioned as a novice
writer undertaking a new writing task. As he worked his way up the ranks of the Royal
Navy he had kept logs for the ships on which he sailed, but these nautical documents
required terse statements of chronology, location, and ship maintenance. Additionally,
Cook was an accomplished self-taught cartographer and astronomer, but these roles never
required him to do any expository writing. Even with his lacking composition skills,
Cook completed his task sufficiently to be commissioned for two more voyages, and the
British monarchy did take action based on what he had written.

As an unconfident and underdeveloped writer, the seaman faced the challenge of
writing for an audience that would never experience the events, peoples, and places he
was to write about. In fact, no one on the expedition knew much about what they were to encounter in the Pacific Ocean because the previous explorers’ accounts were lacking in detail and specificity. These circumstances forced him to have to making meaning of his writing task, as well as the unfamiliar terrain and people he would encounter. Since his only resources were his ship, the educated men aboard it, and the books he kept in his cabin, how did Cook handle his writing task? In what ways did his previous knowledge and his fellow explorers help him to complete it? Also, given the extreme circumstances under which his writing took place, how did his ship function as rhetorical space?

Researchers in rhetoric and Writing Studies have provided many insights into how people use written language and have created many theories based on studies of live human subjects in more or less controlled academic environments. Their aims typically revolve around understanding how people compose, with an eye toward creating theories and methodologies that can help writing teachers to better educate their students and make them more confident writers in school and in their professions. Ethnographers have made similar strides by immersing themselves in communities to better understand the literacy practices of particular groups of people. Since writing is a mental and social activity, I propose that Cook’s journals, as well as the other documents he prepared during his first voyage, can provide insights into his writing process when viewed in terms of cognitive and social theories of composition. Applying these theories to the end result of his writing process can demonstrate how his context and community affected his composition, and how he grew as a writer.

James Cook’s Malleable Educational Biography

An intertextual reading of the prefatory sections of The Life of Captain James Cook
reveals that Kippis (1788) intended to accomplish more with his multivolume biography than simply relating the widely known facts about the voyages of Britain's greatest explorer to a reading public hungry for travel literature. Cook's reputation as a man capable of further opening up the Pacific Ocean to British commerce and colonization suffered at the pen of John Hawkesworth, a prominent British author, translator, and editor who "was particularly fussy about grammatical violations" (Abbott, 1982, p. 21).

In preparing the manuscript of *An Account of the Voyages undertaken by the Order of His Present Majesty for Making Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere* (1773), the Royal Navy's sanctioned account of Cook's first voyage and the three voyages that preceded it, the prescriptive grammarian did more than translate Cook's "Journal of Remarkable Occurrences" into a formal register; he also expurgated all of Cook's nautical observations and augmented his text with journals from others aboard the *HMB Endeavour*, as well as his own observations and extrapolations (Beaglehole, 1974: Percy, 1996a). The resulting account was more a monument to his own linguistic prowess than to Cook's seamanship.

Fully aware that Hawkesworth (1773) produced an unreliable text that robbed Cook of his language and legacy, Kippis (1778) appealed to an authority higher than the British Admiralty by dedicating his biography to King George III, who, with the total loss of the American colonies in 1783 was undoubtedly encouraged by colonial prospects in Australia.

In both his dedication to the monarch and the preface to the first volume of the biography, Kippis (1778) boasts about the quality and reliability of the research that yielded his account. To the king he writes, "the course of my studies has enabled me to speak with some confidence on the subject [Cook's and other royally-funded
expeditions]; and to say, that Your Majesty’s reign is eminently distinguished by one of
the greatest glories that can belong to a monarch" (p. v). In the preface that follows, he
assures his readers that he has remained faithful to Cook’s "public transactions" (i.e., his
journals) because these documents "display his mind and character, and, therefore, they
are the grand objects to which the attention of his biographer must be directed" (Kippis,
1778, p. vii). Yet, in a move to ensure that his account is "a work not wholly
uninteresting or unentertaining" for lay readership, Kippis' (1778) narrative extends
beyond the boundaries of Cook's journals to communicate "fresh matter...of the most
authentic kind,” which he derived by interviewing, among others, Cook's wife, his former
Royal Navy commanders, and the president of the Royal Society, who accompanied him
on his first circumnavigation (pp. ix-xii). At the time of publication, Kippis' subject was
at sea on his third voyage to the Pacific Ocean. There is no indication that the author ever
consulted Cook while preparing his manuscript, nor would he have the opportunity to for
the second volume of the biography, as Cook would be murdered on a Hawaiian shore on
February 14, 1779. This left Kippis the opportunity to construct Cook’s early life in a
manner that befit both the biography’s narrative and England’s political aims.

Considering the intended audiences for the biography, Kippis' main motive was to
reinforce British supremacy and its Navy's primacy by mythologizing the life and deeds
of the empire's most famous sailor. In doing so, Kippis (1778) situates Cook's life in
terms of his limited educational opportunities, thus creating, the literacy equivalent of a
rags to riches story. Instead of whit and determination enriching the son of an
impoverished Scottish immigrant who worked on a rich lord's estate, Cook's keen
capacity for observation and capacity to apply what he gleaned to new situations
transformed him from Locke's proverbial *tabula rasa* into a scientist. The idea of a man with "no claim to distinction on account of the lustre of his birth, or the dignity of his ancestors" serving his country's mission to improve upon existing knowledge of the philosophical sciences and astronomy resounded with an English reading public hungry for entertaining literary plots and glorified the monarch who reigned over such clever subjects (Kippis, 1778, p. 1). But, in buoying the spirits of an empire that had only five years before suffered the loss of a continent it had possessed for centuries, Kippis (1778) invented a bildungsroman trope that would be adopted by nearly all of Cook's subsequent biographers, as well as scholars in the small, highly specialized field of Cook Studies. For instance, the nature and content of Cook's childhood education remain disputed today. Kippis (1778) claims, "The first rudiments of young Cook's education were received by him at Marton, where he was taught to read by Dame Walker, the school mistress of the village" (p. 2). He further reports that after the Cook family relocated to Airy Holme, an estate where his father was appointed head servant, Thomas Skottow, Airy Home's lord, funded young Cook's education at a day school in the neighboring village of Ayton, "where he was instructed in writing, and in a few of the first rules of arithmetic" (Kippis, 1788, p. 2). With the exception of the locales of his schooling, subsequent biographers and scholars have disputed over the identity of his first teacher and the curriculum he received at Ayton—or if, in fact, he did attend a day school or was tutored by Skottow's eldest daughter (Williamson, 1948). Within the scope of a life marked by as many achievements as Cook's, these minute details may not readily appear worthy of the scholarly toil they have commanded. However, in forging a hero and building a great Briton, these early educational details can be used to construct the three aspects of his
education that are foundational to Cook's success: his ability to read and teach himself
new content and concepts; the quality of his written performances; and his advanced
understanding of the mathematical sciences, especially navigation, cartography,
hydrography, and astronomy. Cook's education has evolved into a plot device, a
malleable set of unknowns that can either explain his genius or illustrate his fortitude for
surmounting challenges.

Vigorous scholarly debate and additional research into the minute details of Cook's
early years may one day yield a more complete understanding of his life's trajectory.
Viewed in a larger context, the many competing theories on his schooling address the
question that Hawkesworth (1773) sought to avoid asking when he translated Cook's
account into an erudite form of English the sailor never learned to produce. That is, how
could a man of modest origins and a limited education be sponsored by two bastions of
English birthright and knowledge, namely the Royal Navy and the Royal Society, to
represent their interests in voyage that would shape the future of not only science but also
the British Empire itself? Social status and educational pedigree were class markers and
barriers to social elevation since the middle ages, and even after the Enlightenment, they
tended to remain so. In defending the narrative that ownership of the globe belongs to the
European educated elite, Hawkesworth (1773) faced the conundrum of a man born in a
mud hut shaping the future of a hereditary empire, a reality that no class-conscious
Englishman would consider feasible.

**Literacy Sponsorship and Cognitive Apprenticeship**

The assumption that a strong educational background in Georgian England would
have made James Cook a more likely candidate for achieving social prominence would
prove as false in the eighteenth century as it does in the twenty-first. Cook's formal
scholastic education ended in his thirteenth year when, with the help of his father, he was
apprenticed to William Sanderson, a grocer and haberdasher in the coastal village of
Staithes. Virtually nothing is known about Cook's motivations for becoming an
apprentice shopkeeper, but most accounts of his life credit the shop's proximity to the sea
as inspiration for his adulthood behind the mast. Biographers seeking to cord together
ostensibly irreconcilable events in the navigator's lived experience often return to the
mythos of his early education to assert that his proficiency in arithmetic qualified him for
an apprenticeship in commerce. Though, in the eighteen months he worked in
Sanderson's shop, it seems all the young Cook learned was that shopkeeping was not a
suitable career path for him for him to follow (Beaglehole, 1974). At the end of his
training in commerce, Sanderson arranged for Cook a three-year apprenticeship to John
Walker, a "Quaker ship-master, ship-owner, and coal-shipper" in Whitby, village south of
Straithes (Beaglehole, 1974, p. 6). From an educational standpoint, Walker would
become the first person to sponsor Cook's literacy in a way that would directly contribute
to the Royal Society selecting him to sail around the world for the purposes of science
and discovery.

Not necessarily agents of academic learning, literacy sponsors are "usually richer,
more knowledgeable, and more entrenched" individuals or institutions who "lend their
resources or credibility to the sponsored but also stand to gain benefits from their success,
whether by direct repayment or, indirectly, by credit of association" (Brandt, 1998, p.
167). Coal was the "grand commodity of the northern countries," and Walker's concern
in this industry situates him in the literacy sponsor paradigm in two distinct, yet
complimentary ways (Lipson, 1948, p. 113). As an apprentice, Cook learned the maritime literacies required of a sailor on the frequent trips Walker’s coal ships *Freelove* and *The Three Brothers* took across the tempestuous and unpredictable North Sea to the Thames, a river known for its treacherously shifting sandy bottom (Taylor, 1811). While spending three years in this “nursery of seamen,” Cook rose from deck hand to master and was then asked by Walker to helm the *Friendship* before he chose a career in the Royal Navy as an able seaman over the diurnal perils of navigating from Whitby to London. When Cook was not aboard one of Walker’s ships, he lived in his master’s house and was encouraged to study navigation, which included reading the texts of the day on using a compass and determining its variation; navigating with a quadrant; calculating latitude; reading sail plans and charts; as well as practicing arithmetic (Beaglehole, 1974). Cook’s reading corresponded with his duties aboard Walker’s ships, and after three year’s apprenticeship, his master hired him in 1750. For the next five years, Cook would hone his maritime skills on a succession of short voyages from England’s north country to London, in addition to developing new sailing literacies, such as fitting out and rigging ships.

By taking on Cook as an apprentice, Walker benefited in many of the same ways as the literacy sponsors of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries that Brandt (1998) theorizes. For three years, he was able to mold a future employee at very little cost, teaching him the rudiments of what he would need to know to be an effective crewmember on one of the colliers in his growing fleet. As Brandt (1998) observes, “Sponsors are a tangible reminder that literacy learning throughout history has always required permission, sanction, assistance, coercion … They also represent the causes into
which people’s literacy usually gets recruited” (p. 167). In this case, the master-apprentice relationship is marked by a great deal of reciprocity because Cook was able to gain entrance into a trade in way that allowed him to acquire the skills necessary to launch a career on the sea. Whether Cook took the apprenticeship with the intention of joining the Royal Navy is unknown, but the practical skills he learned and the texts he studied prepared him to make the transition into military service. As Cook moved from station to station during his apprenticeship and brief career in the coal trade, he progressed along the continuum of general knowledge—that which a neophyte to the discourse community of sailing possesses—to task-specific knowledge which allowed him fulfill various functions on a ship, to community-specific knowledge which would allow him to pilot a collier along a specific trade route (Smagorinsky & Smith, 1992). Each of these types of knowledge assisted Cook in negotiating with his shipmates to make meaning of the situations that arose at sea, so they could respond appropriately. When Walker chose Cook to captain the Friendship, an appointment he declined in favor of a career in the Royal Navy, he became a fully enfranchised member of the discourse community of Whitby colliers.

Flower (1994) lauds the educative potential of traditional apprenticeships as means for individuals (usually young people whom are new to a community of practice) to engage in organized activities that teach them the social and cognitive processes that are used to make meaning in a discourse community. Since the institution of apprenticeship significantly predates formal schooling, those being initiated into the discourse community “learn by participating, not in textbook exercises, but in complex events that have social and economic value” (Flower, 1994, p. 117). While successful, marketable
work is the master’s desired end result, the traditional apprenticeship is marked by long
periods of observation that allow the learner to develop a “conceptual model of a task or
process in its entirety” (Flower, 1994, p. 118). Apprenticeship also is a socially
immersive activity because the apprentice usually resides with the master, who teaches
him the culture and discourse of a trade or skill.

Given the nature of the maritime trade Cook apprenticed himself to, there were few
opportunities for him to develop conceptual models of seafaring by simply observing,
regardless of how actively he scrutinized the seemingly innumerable concomitant acts
that fall under the rubric of sailing. Walker structured Cook’s learning experience in a
way that more closely approximates a “cognitive apprenticeship” (Flower, 1994, p. 119)
because he learned a succession of tasks that taught him techniques that could be used in
various settings. Where a traditional apprenticeship teaches “knowledge in use, the goal
of cognitive apprenticeship is to then decontextualize that knowledge to make it
transferable by practicing these problem-solving techniques in a variety of contexts”
(Flower, 1994, p. 199). What Cook learned was situated within the context of a coal ship,
but each voyage provided different situations for him to practice what he learned. Each
situation requires its own negotiation of circumstances, thus giving multiple meanings to
single tasks. Furling sailings is the same activity (almost) each time a crew does it;
however, furling sails upon entering a port in fair weather is a much different task than in
the context of storm. In cognitive apprenticeship, the sailor learns not only the
mechanical task, but also the cognitive and metacognitive processes that accompany it.

Situating Cook’s apprenticeship and employment in terms of literacy, cognition,
and context is necessary to understand how he acquired and applied the skills that would
bring him fame later in his career. Though he produced no texts to speak of during his
time in Whitby, Walker sponsored his maritime literacy with ample opportunities to
construct meaning by negotiating with and within a discourse community of sailors.
Additionally, and also important later in his first voyage around the world, his master
taught him the connection between reading previous mariners’ and scientists’ works as a
means of enhancing his own practice, an advanced cognitive literacy skill that precedes
text-based research, comparing others’ experiences with his own, and, most importantly,
contributing to the discourse of his profession by sharing new knowledge in writing.

The literacies Cook developed under Walker’s sponsorship significantly benefited
him when he volunteered for the Royal Navy on June 17, 1755 because he was posted to
his first ship, *HMS Eagle*, as a master’s mate, an advanced pay grade for a new enlistee.
The Royal Navy became Cook’s next literacy sponsor, providing him new nautical
literacies, but also the responsibility of keeping logs, a practice he was mandated to
perform for each rank he held until his death.
Chapter 2:
Captain Cook's Writing Assignment

In each rank he held in the royal navy, from his enlistment to his commission as captain of the *HMB Endeavour*, James Cook was responsible for documenting his voyages in writing. And as his pay grades increased, so did the sophistication of the documents he had to produce. The writing he did as commander of the Royal Navy's and Royal Society's joint expedition to the South Seas required him to produce writing that was more thorough and nuanced than any he had done before. In preparation for this expedition, the Lord High Admiral of Great Britain commanded him to keep a "Journal of Remarkable Occurences," which would combine writing tasks familiar to Cook with natural science genres that compelled him to grow as a writer.

The first entry in Captain Cook's journal of "Remarkable Occurences on board His Majestys Bark Endeavour" is dated "Friday May 27th to Friday July 29th" [1768] and relates in less than one hundred words that the ship is being fitted out for the coming voyage (Cook, 1968, p. 1). Cook, keeping true to the literalness expected of Royal Navy logs, explains the brevity of his entry in the last and longest sentence: "The transactions of each day both while we lay here and at Deptford [a boat yard] are inserted in the Logg Book and as they contain nothing but common Occurrences it was thought not to insert them here" (Cook, 1968, p. 1). This first of the nearly thousand entries he logged provides initial insights into his cognitive rhetorical processes and shows the literalness with which Cook takes directions. It also is an early indication that his writing process is recursive because the entry is the obvious synthesis of other lesser daily entries compiled on July 29th. Both of his cognitive construction of his writing task and the process he
went about to compose for it illustrate that Cook, a first time commander of a Royal Navy vessel, put great effort into negotiating the literate acts his position required him to perform. Maintaining a log aboard a Royal Navy vessel is a complex operation that involves nearly all of the vessel’s officers as well as the Master’s Mate, who is the sailor actually recording information in the log. The process, as detailed in *Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty’s Service at Sea* (1808), requires captains “to see that every circumstance which has occurred is properly entered” (p. 194). In true military fashion, the list of circumstances, or as Cook puts it “common Occurences,” is rather exhaustive because it entails nearly every aspect of diurnal shipboard life. For instance, one entry may include information pertaining to eight specific types of data that can be gathered on the vessel, ranging from “state of the weather, directions of the winds” to “loss of masts, yards, boats,” as well as receipt and quality of provisions and stores, and “Every alteration made in the allowance of provisions” to the crew (p. 194).

Faigley, Cherry, Jolliffe, and Skinner (1985) identify adult writers as "basic" based on a heuristic of the extent to which they set goals, reflect upon their rhetorical choices, and compose error-free prose. These categories are useful when applied to contemporary writers whose task is to compose in response to well-defined and finite assignments. Given the sprawling and open-ended nature of the Royal Society's writing assignment, Cook is writing to an assignment that would last for years, and the content of his writing is based on nearly everything that he observes. Additionally, the concept of error does not easily transfer to the late eighteenth century because English had not yet been codified standardized. Whereas the concept of the basic writer, as first presented by Shaughnessy (1977), focuses on error in textual production, Flower (1994) provides a framework more
befitting Cook and his rhetorical situation. The "novice writer" is "any of us attempting to perform a new practice or enter a new community" (Flower, 1994, p. 34). Viewing Cook through this lens alleviates the potential for anachronisms when applying contemporary writing theory to an historic instance of composition. It also allows for Cook to be seen as a writer with some experience who is embarking on a difficult and unfamiliar new writing task.

The day after Cook recorded the first official entry in his journal, July 30, 1768, the Royal Society furnished him with another complex writing task in the form of two secret orders that required him to write in multiple genres about places, peoples, and events that few—and in some cases no—Europeans had ever seen.

"The Instructions"

The first set of directives, or "The Instructions," the Royal Society provided pertained exclusively to Captain Cook piloting the *Endeavour* to King Georges Island, the British moniker Captain Wallis gave Tahiti when he claimed it for the throne, "to observe the Passage of the Planet Venus over the Disk of the Sun on the 3rd of June 1769" (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxix). "The Instructions" contained several types of information and orders that governed nearly every aspect of the voyage, from his departure from Plymouth Sound through the process of observing the transit Venus. Interspersed throughout the document were procedural, navigational, scientific, and diplomatic orders that set forth Cook's multivalent role on the first part of the mission, as well as the writing he would have to produce.

**Procedural orders.** In addition to the declaring the chief aim of the first segment of the voyage, these orders include receiving the ship's astronomer, "Mr Charles Green
with his Servant Instruments and Baggage" as well as ensuring that the *Endeavour*’s crew are “paid two Months’ wages in Advance” and taking on board “such a Quantity of Wine as you can Conveniently stow for the use of the Barks company” at the Island of Madeira (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxix). Other important information they convey is that immediately following the expedition is to “put to Sea without Loss of Time, and carry into execution the Additional Instructions contained in the inclosed Sealed Packet” (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxxi). And, should Cook not be able to perform his duties, the officer of the next highest rank is to perform them.

**Navigational orders.** These orders take into consideration the navigational data gathered in previous British expeditions to the Pacific Ocean and chart what the Royal Society believes to be the safest course to the South Seas. They include the coordinates of Tahiti, “situated in 17 degrees and 30 minutes of South Longitude, and 150 degrees of Longitude West of the Meridian of the Royal Observatory in at Greenwich” as well as a table of alternative coordinates from which the transit of Venus could be observed should Cook not be able navigate to the original destination (Cook, 1968, pp. cclxxix-cclxxx).

**Scientific orders.** While these instructions do not explicitly delineate the procedures for observing the Transit of Venus, they do inform Cook that he is to collaborate with Charles Green to gather the astronomical data. The Commissioners also direct Cook to improve upon existing maps of the areas he traverses and to document new discoveries that are “useful to Navigation or necessary to give us a more Perfect Idea and description than we have hitherto received of it” (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxx).

**Diplomatic orders.** The Commissioners of the Admiralty and members of the Royal Society knew that the success of Cook’s expedition to Tahiti relied upon
cooperation of the native peoples he encountered there and elsewhere on his voyage. To this end, they instructed him “to endeavor by all proper means to cultivate a friendship with the Natives, presenting them Trifles ... exchanging with them for Provisions ... and shewing them every kind of Civility and regard” (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxx). Included with the diplomatic orders was the warning “to be Constantly on your guard against any accident” because the island is “very populous, and Natives ... [can] be rather treacherous” (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxx).

**Additional Instructions**

In comparison to “The Instructions” for the first segment of Cook’s expedition, the Commissioner’s “Additional Instructions” are markedly different in tone and rhetoric. The 1769 observation of the Transit of Venus was an international affair of greater proportions than the 1761 transit, which more than 120 astronomers witnessed in countries spanning the globe from India to Russia, Turkey to Sweden, and nearly all points in between, including the American colonies (Beaglehole, 1974). It was first observed by British astronomer Jeremiah Horrocks in 1639 and immediately deemed important to science because the phenomenon could provide astronomers a means of calculating the distance from the Earth to the Sun and therefore a means of measuring the universe.² Since the event would not occur again until 1874, the scientific community heeded Edmond Halley’s (1714) address to the Royal Society, “I could wish that many observations of this famous phenomenon might be taken by different persons at separate places, both that we might arrive at a greater degree of certainty by their agreement” (p.

² Today, this measurement, roughly 149.5 million kilometers, is called an Astronomical Unit and is the standard unit of measure “to indicate distances within the solar system” (NASA).
Cook’s orders to make the observation from the southern hemisphere were unique and can be construed as a British maneuver to claim scientific prominence, but they were most likely only casually secret, given the fervor for the event.

The “Additional Instructions” were distinctly more political than “The Instructions”:

Whereas the making discoverys of Countries hitherto unknown, and the Attaining a Knowledge of distant Parts which though formerly discover’d have yet been but imperfectly explored, will redound greatly to the Honour of this Nation as a Maritime Power, as well as to the Dignity of the Crown of great Britain, and may tend greatly to the advancement of the Trade and Navigation thereof; ... You are therefore in Pursuance of His Majesty’s Pleasure hereby requir’d and directed to put to Sea ... so soon as the Observation of the Transit of the Planet Venus shall be finished. (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxxii).

This second set of instructions made it clear to Cook that during the first half of the voyage, he was to collect scientific data, but for the remainder of his mission, he would gather intelligence the British could use to extend their faltering empire. In particular, he was to attempt to verify the existence of Antarctica and to determine, if he did find it, whether it was habitable. If he could not make the “Discovery of the Southern Continent,” then he was to “fall in with the Eastern side of the Land discover’d by Tasman and now called New Zeland” (Cook, 1968, pp. cclxxxii-cclxxxiii). The “Additional Instructions” contained many of the same orders as the “The Instructions,” but there were two significant additions that would dictate Cook’s actions and the writing.
he was to do.

**Naturalist writing.** In addition to charting new lands and waters, Cook was to “carefully observe the Nature of the Soil, and the Products thereof”, in addition to documenting “Beasts and Fowls” and marine life (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxxii). He was also to record “any Mines, Minerals or valuable stones” and “bring home Specimens of each” (Cook, 1968, p. cclxxxii). Likewise, he was to collect seeds from trees, fruit plants, and grains and “ Transmit them to our Secretary that We may cause proper Examination and Experiments to be made of them” (p. cclxxxiii).

**Ethnographic writing.** The Commissioners directed Cook to treat any indigenous peoples he encountered with the same alliance-building respect he was to show the Tahitians and to take similar precautions as well. However, he was “to observe [and document] the Genius, Temper, Disposition and Number of the Natives” and “with the Consent of the Natives to take possession of Convenient Situations in the Country in the Name of the King of Great Britain” (p. cclxxxiii).

**James Cook’s Publications**

Prior to the Royal Navy selecting him to helm the expedition to the Pacific Ocean, Cook had three publications in three different genres of writing credited to his name. His survey of the Bay of Gaspé was published by Mount and Page of Tower Hill in 1759, a year after the map had given the British a tactical advantage over the French military in Quebec during the Seven Year’s War. More famously, the Royal Navy permitted him to publish in book form his *Directions for Navigating on Part of the South Coast of Newfoundland*, in 1766. The large island had never been completely or accurately charted, and when the French ceded the territory to the British in the 1763 Treaty of
Paris, Cook's ceaseless surveying helped the British to control the North Atlantic cod fishery. The volume's maps were instrumental in settling present and future ownership disputes, and its hydrographic descriptions steered fishing boats and naval vessels around perilous shoals into the new territory's pristine bays. While charting Newfoundland, Cook observed a solar eclipse on August 5, 1766 and communicated his findings to John Bevis, a Fellow of the Royal Society who read a brief report of the astronomical data Cook gathered to the Royal Society in April of the following year.

Each of these publications brought Cook distinction in the Royal Navy, and his prowess for creating new knowledge earned him the notice of the exclusive Royal Society. They cemented his reputation as a keen observer, a diligent gatherer of raw data, and an accurate reporter of information, as well as a maker of meanings in the genres of cartography, hydrography, and astronomy. Yet his publications share another key feature that would work both in his favor and against it, when he wrote his scientific observations during his first voyage. When Cook gathered the data for each of these documents, he had no intention of publishing them as finished texts. In the case of his survey of Gaspè, his commanding officer most likely sent the manuscript of the chart to Mount and Page of Tower Hill, but if this in fact the case and whether Cook knew he had done so cannot be historically verified (Beaglehole, 1974). Similarly, Cook produced his Newfoundland charts as part of his naval duty and was permitted to publish them under his own name and to earn royalties from sales as a means of remuneration for a permanent injury he sustained on duty. Lastly, it is unclear why or how Cook related his astronomical calculations to Bevis because the two had no prior encounters. The paper that resulted was An Observation of an Eclipse of the Sun at the Island of New-found-land, August 5,
1766, by Mr. James Cook, with the Longitude of the Place of Observation Deduced from it: Communicated by J. Bevis, M. D. F. R. S.” (1767), a title which ultimately credits the communicator over the observer.

The Royal Society may have noticed this pattern in Cook’s publication record because before he sailed to Tahiti they twice offered him additional guidance on how to manage the different types of writing he was to do during his voyage. Whether they doubted his ability to write for them is unknown, as is whether Cook’s lack of an educational pedigree, or a formal higher education in general, caused them pause. But it can be inferred that they were secure in his ability to succeed if he were to rely upon the formally educated, scientific supernumeraries who would sail with him and comprise the discourse community of the HMB Endeavour.

Hints from the Royal Society: Collaboration, Corroboration, and Community

On June 13, 1768, nearly six weeks before the “The Instructions” were issued, Nevil Maskelyne offered Cook a set of minute particulars pertaining to the scientific procedures for observing the transit of Venus (Kaye, 1969). Cook had already made a similar solar observation in 1766, the results of which the Royal Society published, but he had done so without the benefit of a corroborator to lend immediate credibility to what he saw. To make Cook’s solar observation acceptable to the scientific community, Bevis situated his data in the context of other astronomers who observed the phenomenon by including one telling sentence near the end of An Observation of an Eclipse (1767): “There were three several observers, with good telescopes, who all agreed as to moments of beginning and ending [of the solar eclipse]” (p. 216). On its own, Cook’s data was inadmissible to science, despite its accuracy and that he was “a good mathematician, and
very expert in his business” (Cook & Bevis, 1767, p. 217). The corroborating calculations were performed by parties of astronomers (“several observers”), thus making them immediately acceptable to science because they were corroborated and verified at the time of observation. Since Cook’s results closely resembled those of the other astronomers, they were added to the official record and became a verified piece of scientific discourse.

Maskelyne’s communiqué offered more than procedures that he, the foremost British astronomer, deemed to be acceptable and adherent to the extant bounds of astronomic observation. His fifteen directions were “to be observed by Capt. James Cook and Mr. Charles Green, with respect to their making Astronomical observations in the Pacific Ocean, and in the voyage and home again” (Kaye, 1969, p. 11). Each man was to be responsible for conducting his own observations, but they were to be together when they made them. The final directive illustrates the proximity with which Cook and Green were to expected to work: “Write down all you [sic] observations in a regular order, and as fair as possible, in a book or books common to both observers; and let each mark his observations with the initial letters of his name” (Kaye, 1969, p. 13). Maskelyne’s directions place two important constraints on the rhetorical situation Cook entered when he took on the exigence of the Royal Society’s “The Instructions” and “Additional Instructions.” Namely, they dictate to him that he is to work with and within the HMB Endeavour’s discourse community of civilian scientists, and summarily, they limit his potential discourse to statements of scientific observation based on the raw data he gathered. Although the Royal Society admired his potential for astronomic observation, Cook was mostly self-educated and there were many gaps in his knowledge. Aware of
Cook’s deficits of knowledge, Maskelyne appointed Charles Green, a member of the Royal Society and noted astronomer, to the expedition for both his acute observations and his ability to teach. On the voyage to Tahiti, he would school the captain and officers in new methods for calculating longitude and making surveys.

Bazerman (1988) provides a plausible explanation for Maskelyne’s prescriptive procedures on documenting the Transit of Venus that is rooted in the Royal Society’s evolving view of what constitutes evidence scientific writing. In an analysis of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, Bazerman (1988) observes four stages of the experimental report in the volumes spanning from 1665 to 1800. In the third stage of development, encompassing volumes 50 through 70 (c. 1760-1780), the period corresponding to Cook’s first voyage, “articles explored the meaning of unusual events through discovery accounts” (Bazerman, 1988, p. 78). Previous reports, he notes, focused on uncontested reports of events (c. 1665-1700) and arguments over results (c. 1700-1760). The aegis of Cook’s epoch was the shift in venue for scientific experimentation. During the first stage, experiments were performed in front of the Royal Society, but more controlled laboratory environments became necessary to witness phenomena, which ushered in the second stage. During this time, scientists conducted experiments—sometimes in front of corroborators—and then read their results to the society. Cook’s moment in scientific history, though, was marked by “the regular appearance of natural phenomena, [which] seemed best pursued by increasing detail and precision, re-creating events increasingly designed to display particular features of nature” (Bazerman, 1988, p. 79). The *HMB Endeavour*’s scientific supernumeraries, a future president of the Royal Society among them, subscribed to this method of logging
their observations at each shore they touched upon. Their method of compiling daily observations on shore and then composing lengthy narratives after embarking reflects this paradigm shift in scientific writing. Their influence shaped how Cook went about his own ethnographic writing (as I will demonstrate in Chapter 4). When situated within the Royal Society’s expectations for scientific documents during that period, Maskelyne’s instructions for astronomic observations gave Cook a regiment for achieving precise results and guidance on how to write them. However, the directions he received on how to obtain and communicate naturalistic and ethnographic data would prove to be a lacuna for his writing.

James Douglas, the 14th Earl of Morton and President of the Royal Society, presented Cook with a consternating concatenation of additional “hints” on conducting and documenting the expedition (Cook, 1968, p. 514). Nearly two months after he received “The Instructions,” on August 26, 1768, the remainder of the ship’s complement boarded in Plymouth, bring the total number aboard to “94 persons including Officers Seamen Gentlemen and their servants” (Cook, 1968, p. 4). That day, Joseph Banks, a botanist of note and fellow of the Royal Society, and Dr. Daniel Carl Solander, a Swedish naturalist and student of binomial nomenclature inventor Carl Linnaeus, presented Cook with Douglas’ missive. The “hastily put together; and probably very incorrect” letter (Cook, 1968, pp. 516-519) affirmed the naturalist and ethnographic assignments of the “Additional Instructions.” Douglas’ letter can best be understood as a treatise on conflicted humanism. It admonishes British cruelty against native peoples: “From the reports handed about concerning some of the late expeditions, it should seem that upon one or two occasions, some of Natives had been wantonly killed without any just
provocation" (Cook, 1968, p. 515). And it is a call for Cook, as a representative of the British Empire, to chasten future contact because natives “are human creatures, the work of the same omnipotent Author, equally under his care with the most polished Europeans; perhaps being less offensive, more entitled to his favor” (Cook, 1968, p. 514). He continues, “No European Nation has a right to occupy any part of their country, or settle among them without their voluntary consent” (Cook, 1968, p. 514). And, at the same time, he urges Cook to impose “voluntary consent” and to catalogue them as if they were natural phenomena, or features of the land the British flag would cast its shadow upon: “If the Ship should fortunately discover any part of a well inhabited Continent, many new subjects in Natural History might be imported, and useful branches of Commerce set on foot, which in process of time might prove highly beneficial to Britain” (Cook, 1968, p. 516). Upon making contact with the “inhabitants,” Cook’s “principal objects of attention” were to be their “Dispositions,” “progress in Arts of Science”, physical features, religion, and systems of self-governance (Cook, 1986, pp. 516-517). Douglas’ exhaustive list of items to document communicated, with a degree of detached scientific dispassion, the Royal Society’s expectation of voluminous, detailed data—the raw material they needed to make the decision to colonize the Pacific.

Douglas’ hints also indirectly instruct Cook to make use of the scientific community aboard the ship. In a section of the letter on vegetation, he writes, “to bring home live plants in Pots, it might be useful to mark upon the Stem ...” (Cook, 1968, p. 517). Then, after quoting a stanza from Virgil in Latin (Cook did not speak the language), he corrects himself, “Upon glancing over this article, the same appears to be superfluous, because it is scarce to be imagined that Mr Bankes and Dr Solander will attempt bringing
home plants in pots” (Cook, 1968, p. 518). As commander of the expedition, Cook was expected to oversee all that occurred at sea and on shore, but Douglas sends a conflicting message as to what role Cook is to play in the naturalist and ethnographic aspects of the voyage. Certainly, he was to survey and chart the lands because that was how he earned his reputation. Whether Douglas’ hints are instructing Cook to leave the ethnographic observations to the naturalists or are encouraging him to actively gather his own data, as Maskelyne told him to, is unclear—especially in light of his order to “form a Vocabulary of the names given by the Natives” which seems directed at someone who could speak Virgil’s Latin. There is no record of whether Cook struggled to interpret Douglas’ hints, but the writing he did at sea from 1768 -1771 remains and is an artifact the cognitive processes he used to construct his assignment and how he used his shipboard discourse community to complete it.

**Cook as Basic Writer**

The Royal Society’s “Instructions” required Cook to negotiate a complex set of writing tasks aboard the *HMB Endeavour*. Moreover, they situated him in between the two societies that sailed aboard the small converted coal ship, making him at once expert and novice, master and pupil, commander and colleague. As the captain of a Royal Navy vessel, his power was absolute. To ensure the success of his mission, he could flog men who were derelict in their duties and mandate scurvy-preventing rations that were insipid even to sailors who had grown accustomed to eating dog, seal, and shark. As a member of the expedition’s scientific party, Cook was an astute novice. Early in the voyage, the astronomer with whom he was to observe Venus’ transit, Charles Green, remonstrated in his own journal Cook and his officers because they could not provide “Proper
Assistance" with determining longitude (Green as referenced in Cook, 1968, p. 9). And when they did, he continues, "their Obs\(n\) (observations) cannot be depended upon, when made a fatigue instead of Pleasure" (Green as cited in Cook, 1968, p. 9).

In "Inventing the University," David Bartholomae (1985) reviews the challenges novice writers face when attempting to enter an academic discourse community. "The student," he writes, "has to appropriate (or be appropriated by) a specialized discourse, and he has to do this as though he were a member of the academy or an historian or an anthropologist" (Bartholomae, 1985, p. 135). Since discourse communities are conglomerates of individuals who communicate in specialized ways about a limited universe of topics or interests, a writer (whether she be a student or not) must learn to produce discourse according to the conventions dictated by experts in the field. The metaphor that is most commonly used to explain this initiation or initial hearing by the expert community is entrance. The novice stands on the outside of the gated discourse community, writing and then passes her texts between the bars to those on the inside. Should she be able to manipulate language in a way that pleases those on the inside, the gate swings wide with acceptance, and the ritual of initiation is complete. This take on discourse communities does not best describe Cook's situation, though. Firstly, it implies that acceptance is the end of the journey into the discourse community because once inside the gate, the writer is enfranchised and her membership permanent. Secondly, Cook did not seek to enter the Royal Society's scientific discourse community; the community was literally formed around him.

Much like Bartholomae's (1985) undergraduate writers who must invent the university each time they write, Cook had to invent the Royal Society for himself, in
order to compose successful ethnographic accounts over the course of his voyage. As Bizzell (1982) observes, "Producing text cannot take place unless the writer can define her goals in terms of the community's interpretative conventions" (p. 232). While entering a discourse community accounts for the social aspects of writing, it does not fully explain the individual's role in interpreting and composing in accordance with a community's standards. Writing is both a social and a cognitive activity that requires a writer to engage in a number of mental tasks before she can begin the act of composing. While there are analogs between Cook's rhetorical situation and those of students in the more controlled environment of the classroom, viewing the forty year-old captain as an adult basic writer applies a heuristic to his situation that does not comfortably translate from the twenty-first-century U. S. college context to the late eighteenth-century British Navy.
Chapter 3:

*His Majesty's Bark Endeavour* as a Rhetorical Space

The exigence for Cook’s rhetorical situation was the Royal Society’s instructions, and their supplemental hints provided him with the constraints of discourse community, collaboration, and corroboration. To successfully complete his writing assignment, Cook had to gather the empirical data about the places and peoples he encountered and record it in a manner that was acceptable to the Royal Society. Additionally, his mission required him to verify previous explorers' accounts and add new information that would inform the Admiralty, the Royal Society, and British government so they could make the decision as to how Britain should extend its influence into the South Pacific. Bazerman (1988) addresses the issues writers face when transforming empirical observations into language and finds that it is a “complex matrix of social and individual practice” shaped by scientific communication’s “purposes, processes, and norms of statement production” (p. 188). In turn, these norms, in the form of genres, “make empirical experience a topic-, resource-, and constraint-shaping individual behavior” (Bazerman, 1988, p. 188).

Flower’s (1994) social cognitive theory explains how an individual undertaking a writing task is affected by the contextual constraints of her society. Therefore the writer must mediate the constraints of her society during her composition process to produce written meanings that reflect her own cognition and are acceptable to the readers for whom she is conveying her meanings. That is, a written genre is a social construct as well as a writer’s way of making meaning. So at once, writers like Cook who had to produce meaning as ethnography, are helped and hindered by the genres in which they write and the readers who read them.
At Cook’s moment in history, the scientific community, as lead by the Royal Society, distrusted singular empirical observations. Moreover, the residue of John Locke’s plain-language approach to empirical knowledge, as delineated in his Essay on Human Understanding (1979) prompted them to distrust an individual’s capacity to accurately relate in language what he witnessed. Collaboration and corroboration, though, could bring scientific discourse “into increasingly close and precise exchange with the phenomena being examined” (Bazerman, 1988, p. 188). The Royal Society’s “Instructions” placed Cook in a communicative context that demanded he use empirical observations to advance new scientific claims that would either reinforce previous claims or cast doubt upon them. By placing representatives of the Royal Society aboard the HMB Endeavour, his sponsors sought to create a complex social-cognitive matrix at each observation site, thus ensuring Cook and his supernumeraries would return with the most reliable account of what they saw.

Another powerful factor that would influence how Cook learned to write ethnographic accounts within the constraints imposed by the Royal Society was the HMB Endeavour itself because it was the site of all composition that took place on the voyage. The small bark was the place where the discourse community convened, collaborated, and committed its observations to paper. It was also the place in which Cook would learn to construct his audience and to write according to the conventions they deemed acceptable for scientific discourse. Over the course of three years, the Endeavour would circumnavigate the globe—its physical location changing with each gust of wind. However, the ship itself was constant and provided Cook a static context for composing.
HMB Endeavour

On August 25, 1769, Captain Cook and the scientific party brought out a piece of Cheshire cheese and tapped a cask of porter in the Endeavour's Great Cabin. It had been one year since they sailed from Plymouth and as the ship's botanist, Joseph Banks, notes in his journal, they toasted the king's health and "livd like English men" (Banks, 1896, p. 179). The small commemoration and thanksgiving with English delicacies may have reminded the men in the Great Cabin of their native land, but the HMB Endeavour was a thoroughly English ship with a discourse community comprised of Britain's scientific elite. Over the course of the voyage, it would afford Cook an ideologically English context in which to write and to learn to write.

By Royal Navy standards, His Majesty's Bark Endeavour was an unconventional ship christened with the catchall appellation Bark because its dimensions and mission did not conform to any of the standard categories of Royal Navy vessels, such as cruiser, schooner, or man of war (Cook 1968; Villiers 1967). Much like Cook's early education, the details of how the cat-built coal ship Earl of Pembroke became the HMB Endeavour remained open to scholarly debate for nearly two centuries. Historians inclined to adulate Cook as a superior seaman claim that he selected the 106-foot collier (a coal transport ship) for the Royal Navy. After all, as Walker's apprentice and employee, he began his seafaring career in the coal trade and knew the limits to which these dromedary vessels could be pushed (Beaglehole, 1974; Gasciogne, 2007). However, when J. C. Beaglehole culled all of the extant documents pertaining to Cook's voyages to create the largest, most comprehensive archive of Cook artifacts, he uncovered communiqués between the Navy Board and Admiralty Secretary that decisively put the controversy to rest: "The Board
suggests a cat-built vessel, which would be roomy enough for the purpose [of a voyage of
discovery]. One of about 350 tons can be purchased in the River Thames" (Cook, 1968,
p. 605). The *Earl of Pembroke* was purchased on March 31, 1768 and was already in the
Deptford shipyard being fitted out when Cook was invited to lead the mission, nearly two
weeks later.

The Great Cabin of the *HMB Endeavour*—the Royal Navy issued a warrant for the
new name on April 7—received the most significant modifications of any part of the
capacious coal ship. Typically, this area of a Royal Navy vessel was the reserve of the
ship's captain and senior officers. As the Royal Society added greater and greater
numbers of scientific representatives to the mission, the officers were moved below decks
and the Cabin was partitioned and then partitioned again so that all fourteen members of
the scientific party had access both to Cook and his personal workspace in the Great
Cabin (Beaglehole, 1974; Cook, 1968; Villiers, 1967). Cook historian and Australian
Navy Captain Alan Villiers (1974) offers a unique perspective on the claustrophobic
redesign,

The great cabin of the little *Endeavour* made room for the most fantastic band
of circumnavigating young university men ... It was also quite an imposition
on the generosity of Captain Cook. One begins to understand, perhaps, at
least one reason why he was appointed. It is improbable that any other naval
captain would have had his traditional quarters so crowded at the outset of so
long a voyage. (Villiers, 1967, p. 92)

As Villiers (1974) implies, the *Endeavour* was the first vessel over which Cook would
have sole command. Whether such generosity was in his nature or whether he accepted
the compromised space to attain a higher post, the Royal Society's "Instructions" clearly
indicated that Cook was to collaborate with their representatives for the duration of the
expedition. In this regard, proximity could only ensure that they communicated regularly
and corroborated each other's observations.

Yet, the cramped quarters worked to Cook's advantage, and the Great Cabin was to
became a learning space for Cook. American historian and English professor Percy
Adams (1971) candidly observes, "As a writer, Cook was untrained and artless, but he
learned fast and had good teachers" (p. viii).

Captain Cook's Discourse Community

By the time the Endeavour was fitted out to sail, the Royal Society had expanded its
seagoing party to fourteen men, bringing the ship's compliment to eighty-five. (A typical
cat-built collier usually carried two-dozen seamen.) Of the fourteen, only five served
scientific functions, the remainder was servants and assistants. The scientific party was
lead by botanist Joseph Banks, a wealthy Oxford educated "gentleman commoner" who
would later become president of the Royal Society and scientific advisor to George III.
With him came his friend, Swedish naturalist, Daniel Carl Solander and two natural
history artists, Sydney Parkinson and Alexander Buchen. The astronomer, Charles Green,
who was selected by the Astronomer Royal to observe the Transit of Venus with Cook,
rounded out the group.

Cook sent for Banks and Solander on August 14, 1768, and they would set sail
eleven days later. As he notes in his journal, "their Servants and baggage being already
onboard" caused Cook to hire "Several Ship wrights and Joiners for the Yard Employ'd
on board refiting the Gentlemens Cabbins and making a Platform over the Tiller" (Cook,
1968, p. 2). The quantity of books and materials required to perform their duties must have astonished Cook, who brought his own sizable library of charts and sea journals in addition to the surveying equipment he needed to navigate the ship and make celestial observations (Cook, 1968). On August 19, natural historian John Ellis wrote to Carl Linnaeus, Solander's tutor, to gossip about the investment Banks made in preparing for the voyage. He writes,

No people ever went to sea better fitted out for the purpose of Natural History, nor more elegantly. They have a fine library of Natural History; they have all sorts of machines for catching and preserving insects ... they have even a curious contrivance of a telescope, by which, put into the water, you can see the bottom to a great depth, where it is clear ... (Smith, 1821, pp. 230-232)

Ellis's letter covetously delineates the astonishing number and variety of objects Banks brought aboard and concludes his concatenation, "in short Solander assured me this expedition would cost Mr. Banks ten thousand pounds" (Smith, 1821, p. 232).

Despite refitting, the "Gentlemens Cabbins" remained too cramped for them to accomplish more than sleeping. Cook's Great Cabin, which doubled as a dining room for the scientific party, became the primary workspace for Banks, Solander, Green, and Cook as well as a storehouse for their books and instruments. In bout of nostalgia brought on by weeks away from land and years away from his London social circle committed a scene from the Great Cabin to his journal on October 30, 1770. He writes,

Now do I wish that our friends in England could by the assistance of some magical spying glass take a peep at our situation; Dr Solander setts at the
Cabbin table describing, myself at my Bureau Journalizing, between us hangs a large bunch of sea weed, upon the table lays the wood and barnacles; they would see that notwithstanding our different occupations our lips move very often, and without being conjurors might guess that we were talking about what we should see upon the land which there is now no doubt we shall see very soon. (Banks, 1962, p. 396)

Space was a luxury the *Endeavour* afforded no man, regardless of his wealth on land or status on the ship. The close quarters Cook kept with Banks would benefit both men, especially when they had to make meaning of places and peoples no European had before seen.

**Theories of Space**

In his discussion of the differing characteristics of utopias and heterotopias, Michele Foucault (1986) writes, "the boat is a floating piece of space, a place without place that exists by itself, that is closed in on itself and at the same time given over to the infinity of the sea" (p. 27). The boat, he concludes, is "the great instrument of economic development ... but has been the greatest reserve of imagination" (Foucault, 1986, p. 27). Here at once, Foucault captures the romance associated with navigation while acknowledging that the ship is a vessel of commerce and imperialism. However, cognition is more constrained aboard the *Endeavour* than Foucault's reference to "reserves of imagination" would allow. Rather than offering those aboard passage to limitless creativity, the ship itself regulates the social and cognitive processes of those aboard it because it is a floating microcosm of England. It is made of English timbers and carries material vestiges of British scientific and political ideologies that exhort its
passengers to think, interact, and write according to the values of its homeport.

Marxist philosopher, Henri Lefebvre (1994) asserts that "physical space has no 'reality' without the energy that is deployed within it" (p. 13). Following his logic, activities that occur with a certain space shape it and make it real. Space does not become real in a concrete way, he notes, but real in the way "abstractions such as commodities and money are real" (Lefebvre, 1994, p. 27). Therefore, he claims "(Social) space is a (social) product" (Lefebvre, 1994, p. 26). Space produced by social interaction serves as a "tool of thought and of action; that in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power" (Lefebvre, 1994, p. 26). Space mediates mental and social actions; therefore the creation of meaning in language is moderated by the space in which the meaning is produced. As Lefebvre constructs it, space is not the neutral territory Western science and mathematics portrays it to be. A given space, as context for composition, can manipulate a writer's previous meaning making strategies and regulate them into congruence with the dominant ideology present in the given space. Or, in other words, where the writer composes affects the product of her composition because space affects the writer's invention process.

Building on Lefebvre's (1994) theory in "On Gender and Rhetorical Space" (2001), Roxanne Mountford explores how hierarchies of gender and status are worked out in the sacred geographies of Christian churches by applying the concept of rhetorical space to narrowly focus on the effect physical spaces have on communication. Specifically, she examines the pulpit, the physical place designated for preaching, as an embodiment of clerical authority. In her analysis, Mountford (2001) finds that the pulpit itself limits the rhetorical performances of preachers because it "carries with it the sediment of cultural
tradition, of the social imaginary" (p. 63). Further, the pulpit's history as an ideologically
male space inhibits the rhetorical performances of other genders and gender ideologies.

Mountford's (2001) notion of rhetorical space provides a framework for examining
the interaction of cognition, community, location, and ideology aboard the *HMB Endeavour* as well as a means of understanding how Cook's site of composition helped
him learn to compose for his audience during his first voyage around the world. She sets
forth this concept as, "Rhetorical space is the geography of a communicative event, and,
like all landscapes, may include both the cultural and material arrangement, whether
intended or fortuitous, of space" (Mountford, 2001, p. 42). The *Endeavour* was a small
vessel, the locus of Cook's discourse community and the discourse they produced was the
Great Cabin, which through this lens becomes a repository of British imperial and
scientific ideologies that influence the writing that took place within it. Because the
objects housed in the Great Cabin literally surrounded the discourse community that
congregated there, Mountford's (2001) theory posits that they would directly affect and
influence the ideologies of the persons who composed within that space because
"rhetorical spaces carry the residue of history upon them, but also, perhaps something
else: a physical representation of relationships and ideas" (p. 42). For a novice writer, this
residue can meaningfully influence both the writer and what is written because "Spaces
have heuristic power over their inhabitants and spectators by forcing them to change both
their behavior ... and, sometimes, their view of themselves" (Mountford, 2001, p. 50). In
Cook's case, space would help him to construct his audience and to write for them
because objects and persons embodying their ideology abounded in his small, crowded
cabin. Much like the cheese and porter that made the ship's gentry feel like *true*
Englishmen on the voyage's anniversary, the Englishness of the Great Cabin was forged and preserved by the scientists' libraries and the Royal Society's imperializing instructions.

**Social Cognitive Theory**

Rhetorical space, as Mountford (2001) constructs it, affects all communicative events that take place in a particular location. To ground this concept in the context of written composition, this analysis views space as an additional factor to be included in Linda Flower's (1989) social cognitive theory because this view of writing affords "more balanced, multi-perspective descriptions and more rigorous grounded theoretical explanations of various aspects of the writing process: of the process of meaning-making, of constructing knowledge, of working collaboratively, of planning and revising" (p. 289). To achieve this balance amidst a broad array of mental and communal factors, she offers a view of the writing process in which "cognition and context may in a sense construct one another" (Flower, 1989, p. 287). She grounds her framework in three principles. The first principle is "cultural and social context can provide direct cues to cognition" (Flower, 1989, p. 287). Secondly, "that context is also and always mediated by the cognition of the individual writer" (Flower, 1989, p. 287). And lastly, "that the bounded purposes that emerge from this process are highly constrained but at the same time meaningful, rhetorical acts" (Flower, 1989, p. 287).

There are numerous contexts (or social factors) for Cook's writing, and rhetorical space is certainly included among them. Delimiting his contexts to accord within the bounds of Flower's (1989) heuristic reveals three aspects as most important to his growth as a writer. The first context Cook must mediate in his composition process is his prior
knowledge of composing. Over the course of his naval career, he developed strategies to successfully communicate in the genres of the ship's log, cartography and navigational instructions, and astronomy. While none of these genres directly transfers to his new literacy task of compiling and composing ethnographic accounts, it would be unfair to Cook to assume that he had never previously composed in a scientific genre successfully. According to Flower (1994), "novices are not blank slates, but learners who bring a great deal of cultural capital and literate experience with them" (p. 19). As such, Cook brings to his writing task the skills and literacies he developed during his career; however, he must learn to engage in a "discourse practice" that will allow him to transact with the Royal Society (Flower, 1994, p. 20).

Another significant context for Cook's composition is the writing assignment he received from the Royal Society. "The Instructions" and their accompanying documents are not only the exigence for his "meaningful, rhetorical act," but also the determiner of his cognitive processes, such as the goals he set for his writing, as well as the criteria by which he would decide what observations were pertinent and important for his audience to know. In addition to the categorical information the documents present, the most useful aspect of these documents is that they direct Cook, both tacitly in "The Instructions" and explicitly in Douglas's "Hints" to collaborate with the scientific party aboard the vessel. The Royal Society knew Cook's background was limited, but at the same time, they must have seen potential in his three works. Both the maps and the astronomical observation were the product of a man with limited education demonstrating proficiency in highly specialized genres. As Flower (1994) notes, "Success in carrying out a literate act appears to depend on two things: knowing enough of the
conventions and expectations built into the practice to at least enter the conversation and having a repertoire of problem-solving strategies for comprehending and composing that can deal with the task itself and with difficulties" (p. 22). Cook did not have to invent the Royal Society on his own or guess at the discourse practices his audience expected of him because two members of his shipboard discourse community were prominent members of the Royal Society and both had published papers its Philosophical Transactions. Joseph Banks, the naturalist, and Charles Green, the astronomer, would both help Cook to develop the problem-solving strategies he needed to successfully respond to his rhetorical situation.

The ultimate context for Cook's composition was the Great Cabin in which he and his discourse community composed. It is in this space that he collaborates with the scientific party and writes in his "Journal of Remarkable Occurences." There is evidence, in the form of field notes made on shore and astronomic observations made on deck, indicating that Cook wrote in other locations, but these documents serve as prewriting for the official accounts he would commit to the journal, which was housed in the Great Cabin.

In terms of the other half of social-cognitive paradigm, cognition functions to help writers negotiate the various contexts of their rhetorical situation so that they can produce discourse that responds to and summarily alters an exigence (Bitzer, 1968; Flower, 1989; Flower, 1994). Examining the cognitive dimensions of an historic instance of composition, such as the "Journal of Remarkable Occurrences," poses a unique challenge because Cook died in Hawaii on St. Valentine's Day, 1779. Typically, cognitive rhetoricians of the 1970s and 1980s conducted their research into writers' thought
processes with speak-aloud protocols, process journals, or in-person interviews. While none of these methodologies are viable in Cook's case, his first voyage rendered three manuscripts of his journals, each slightly different from the other because of Cook's proclivity to revise and expand his accounts with each successive copy. These journals and the journal of Joseph Banks, the person with whom he most frequently collaborated and learned from the Great Cabin, provide significant insight into Cook's metacognitive processes.

Sanders and Schilperood (2006) argue that it is possible to gain insights into a writer's cognitive processes by conducting a close analysis of a text's structure. To prove their thesis, they applied psycholinguistics and rhetorical structure analysis to the compositions of 10 child writers. Their study resulted in detailed hierarchies of the individual writer's content structures, which, they assert, provide insights into how the children represented the writing task to which they were responding. This methodology, while potentially fruitful, is not altogether appropriate in the case of Captain Cook because *in toto*, Cook's "Journal of Remarkable Occurrences" is nearly a million words, a veritable avalanche of data for a thorough and complete textual analysis. Yet, Sanders and Schilperood (2006) reinforce a basic notion that justifies empirical textual research into a writer's cognitive processes. Namely, the text a writer produces is the sum total of the social cognitive mediations made during the writer's writing process. To this end, there are several moments in Cook's tome that provide insights and opportunities for an analysis of how he learned to write ethnographic observations, especially when his writing is considered side by side with other texts housed in the Great Cabin.

How Cook interpreted the Royal Society's "Instructions" is evident in his revisions,
expansions, and overall text structure. From the million words in his journal, it is evident that he took it upon himself to respond to each request the Royal Society included in its two sets of instructions and supplementary materials. But at times, Cook did not have the strategies he needed to supply his audience with the information they desired in the genre that they accepted. So he leveraged the rhetorical space of the Great Cabin to confer with his scientific party to learn the conventions of writing for the scientific community, which were certainly a context that abounded in his instructions as well as in the texts that they brought with them aboard the *Endeavour* and housed in the Great Cabin. By looking at the lengths Cook went to provide a full account of his voyage—replete with the minutia his assignment demanded—it is obvious that his bounded purpose, or the meaning behind his rhetorical act, was to provide such an account in his own words.

There is only one instance in his journal when Cook, for very good reason, falls short of his goal. It comes near the end of the expedition, on the day after Christmas 1770, after Cook, excruciatingly ill himself, lost nearly twenty men to dysentery. By this time, he had learned to write thorough ethnographic accounts of the places where he landed. Under the given circumstances, though, he defers and directs his audience to others' written observations: "Batavia is a place that hath been so often Viseted by Europeans and so many Accounts of it extant, that any description I could give would seem unnecessary: besides I have neither abilities nor Materials Sufficient for such an undertaking" (Cook, 1968, p. 442).

**Space and Learning**

Over the course of the voyage, the Great Cabin, as the locus of the discourse community and a rhetorical space, helped Cook to write for his imperial audience
because he would adopt their ideologies and learn to write according to their conventions. Though not every writing task the circumnavigation required of him was new because he had developed meaning-making strategies for composing astronomical and cartographic work, as well as the experience of log keeping from his previous naval appointments. These maritime strategies would prove useful both for observing the Transit of Venus and charting unrecorded or incorrectly recorded landmasses.

As a sailor, Cook had a limited understanding of the rhetorical power of the British empire, but a potentially incendiary incident in Rio de Janeiro would help him to grow into his role as diplomat and plenipotentiary for the British Empire. Early in the expedition, November, 13, 1768, when the *Endeavour* touched at the Portuguese colony to take on food and fresh water, the Viceroy Count Rolim embargoed the ship and forbade its crew from coming ashore (Cook, 1968). Since the converted coal ship resembled no other vessel in the British fleet and none of its sailors wore traditional military uniforms, Count Rolim suspected Cook and the crew to be pirates attempting to conduct illegal trade. When Cook presented the Viceroy with his official papers, "he certainly did not believe a word about our being bound to the Southward to Observe the transit of Venus but looked upon it as an invented story to cover some other design we must be upon, for he could form no other Idea of that Phenomenon ... then the North Star passing thro the South Pole (these were his own words)" (Cook, 1968, p. 23). Banks was particularly outraged and inveighed against "these illiterate, impolite gentry" who prevented him from going ashore to collect botanical specimens (Banks, 1896, p. 31).

After Cook's initial meeting with the Viceroy on shore, he remanded himself to the Great Cabin, and a volley of correspondence ensued. His letters began as polite requests
for provisions, but they quickly grew in bravado. On November 19, Cook submitted a letter different in tone and content from its predecessors. The memorial restates Cook's displeasure with the treatment he and his crew received and his bewilderment with the nature of the insult. To build his case, the captain relayed an account of two Royal Navy vessels that were "received (by you Excellencys Predecessor) with all the respect that was their due" and cites his source, "a Journal of those Ships now in my possession" (Cook, 1968, p. 490). For even greater effect, Cook then references the peace treaty between Britain and Portugal and hints at political sanctions being levied against the Viceroy in a terse and archly political one-sentence paragraph:

It appear very Extraordinary to me & doubtless will do so to my Court that notwithstanding the same treaty of Peace & Amity still subsists between their Britannick & Most Faithful Majesty's, orders of so different a nature from those formerly Practis'd, should now have been issued out of this Port. (Cook, 1968, p. 490)

This is high rhetoric for a seaman who had never before sailed outside the icy waters of the North Atlantic and a bold political move to thrust upon the colonial governor of a well fortified port. Its reasonable to believe that Cook read the journals of the *HMS Dolphin* and *HMS Tamer* and that he was well within his duties to anchor in Rio de Janeiro because the first of "The Instructions" states, "You are at Liberty to touch upon the Coast of Brazil ... if you find it necessary for completing your water and procuring refreshments for the Bark's Company" (Cook, 1968, cclxxx). However, Cook's political references seem entirely outside the scope of his knowledge and experience, although he may have had copies aboard. The Great Cabin housed a myriad of texts, including the
Articles of War and Abstracts of Acts of Parliament, both of which he requested in a memorial to the Navy Board on June 24 of that year (Cook, 1968).

Cook's and Banks's journal entries for November 19, 1768 are significantly different. Cook had mentioned the previous letters he composed on November 17 and 18 in his "Journal of Remarkable Occurences," but his entry for the November 19 reads, "Close Clowdy weather Emp'd geting on board Rum, Water, and other necessarys. Caulking and fiting the Ship. Punished John Thurman Seaman with 12 lashes for refusing to assist the sailmaker in repairing the sails" (Cook, 1968, p. 25). But Banks begins that day's entry with, "We sent answers to his Excellency's [the Viceroy's] memorial" (Banks, 1896, p. 27). The answer to the discrepancy in their journal entries can be found in Joseph Banks's papers at the National Library of Australia where there is an unsigned draft of the letter Cook submitted to Viceroy Count Rolim written in Banks's handwriting. The four-page missive shows omissions, revised passages, interlineations, and large doodles made out of frustration or boredom, or a combination of the two. In Cook's official incident report to the British Admiralty, which he composed after the Endeavour sailed from Brazil, he encloses "true" and "attested" copies of the thirteen letters that passed between him and the Viceroy, never mentioning that any of the enclosures were coauthored pieces (Cook, 1968, pp. 481-495).

Neither Cook nor Banks mentions coauthoring the letter, but the Banksian draft provides the first evidence of collaborative writing taking place in the Great Cabin. Given the highly political rhetoric it contained and the confidence with which it was produced, is safe to infer that Banks, whose wealth brought with it political influence, took the lead in its composition. But the references to the other Royal Navy ships' logs was a decision
most likely made by Cook, who would have been familiar with the previous voyages and would have known that they were documented in texts he had. As a result of their cooperation, Cook learned to invoke his Empire's privilege and did so in subsequent memorials to the Viceroy, proving that he became confident with the genre. He also learned to work within the rhetorical space of his discourse community and to write according to their conventions by virtue of following Banks's model.

For the duration of the voyage, Cook and Banks would collaborate on written documents in the Great Cabin, working together as ordered, and in turn producing corroborated accounts—especially the ethnographic accounts they would include in their respective journals. As members of the same shipboard discourse community working to produce valuable new knowledge for both the British Empire and the European scientific community, their relationship evolved from that of a mentor advising a mentee to two peers working collaboratively on a set of complex documents.
Chapter 4:

Growth and Ideology in Captain Cook's Ethnographic Writing

After collaborating with Joseph Banks on the November 17, 1768 memorial to the Viceroy of Rio de Janeiro, James Cook shows a surprising and immediate interest in discussing writing in his "Journal of Remarkable Occurences." On November 18, Cook notes that he received an answer to the previous day's letter, then commits to his journal this anachronistic critique of Count Rolim's writing, "I must own that this Memorial of the Viceroy's was well drawn up and very much to the purpose which is more than I can say of any of the Subsequent ones" (Cook, 1968, pp. 24-25). While neither the captain nor the botanist reference their coauthoring, Cook's use of the terms "well drawn up" and "purpose" indicate that the substance of their discussion extended to the qualities of effective and persuasive writing. Cook may here be applying new knowledge from his writing lesson with Banks and committing it to the memory of his journal. His newfound focus on effective writing would help him to learn to compose ethnographic accounts that would provide the Royal Society and the British monarch with the information they needed to begin the British colonial project in the Pacific in earnest.

This entry also illustrates the recursive nature of Cook's writing process on a small scale. That is, Cook received the Viceroy's letter, wrote the day's journal entry, then was disappointed with the quality of Count Rolim's "Subsequent" letters to the extent that he felt the need to document his dissatisfaction. This late addition may be Cook attempting to give a full account of the voyage, but it is more likely that he is documenting every aspect of the Rio de Janeiro incident in his journal because these entries would serve as his prewriting for the full account he composed for the Admiralty Secretary on November
30, as per his "Instructions" (see Cook, 1968, pp. 481-486). Recursion is a defining quality of Cook's writing throughout the voyage, and he employs several strategies for revision, expansion, and clarification in all the genres he produces. Over the course of the voyage, the ideological influence of his rhetorical space would also inform his writing process and lead him to revise his opinions of the indigenous cultures he encountered.

Following his collaboration with Banks, Cook describes his own letter writing with greater confidence, thus indicating his growing confidence to successfully compose in the genre. Cook's accounts of his letter writing become more forceful and suggest that the letters he produces are more effective diplomatic compositions that harness the rhetorical power of the British Empire. For instance, when Cook learns that the party he sent ashore for provisions was jailed on November 20, he writes, "emmediately upon hearing this I wrote to the Viceroy demanding my Boat and Crew and his Excellencys reason for detaining her" (Cook, 1968, p. 25). Nearly everyday until Cook is permitted to embark from Brazil on November 30, he describes his writing in near heroic terms, as if his letters were defending the very dignity of the King of England. When accused of being a pirate on the 21st, Cook writes, "he doubts that she [HMB Endeavour] is the Kings, this I thought proper to answer in writing" (Cook, 1968, p. 25). When he receives a letter accusing his men of smuggling rum on the 23rd, again he takes up his pen as if it were a sword, "I thought it incumbent on me to answer this Memorial" (Cook, 1968, p. 25). On the 28th, the day before Count Rolim releases the Endeavour, Cook combines his newfound zeal for rhetorical critique with his growing confidence as a writer: "This Day I unexpectedly received an Answer to my last Memorial wherein were only a few week [weak] arguments to support his Excellencys suspicions that the Ship did not belong to
the King and that my people smugled: the Memorial I answerd" (Cook, 1968, p. 26).

Pajares and Valiante's (2006) research on the role of writers' self-perceptions, as a component of social cognitive theory, provides insights into Cook's meteoric increase in self-confidence as a diplomat. Although their research focuses on students in writing classrooms, their findings support the captain's shipboard compositions. As with Cook's collaborative writing with Banks in their rhetorical space, Pajares and Valiante (2006) find that students create and develop self-efficacy beliefs "as a result of the social persuasions they receive from others" (p. 160). Writers' self-efficacy beliefs are shaped by their previous performances with writing, with positive experiences bolstering their confidence to successfully perform genres. However, writers can also form self-efficacy beliefs "through the vicarious experience of observing others perform tasks" because "[a] significant model in a student's life can help instill self-beliefs that will influence the course and direction that life will take" (Pajares & Valiante, 2006, p. 160). These self-perceptions of their abilities to compose then influence the rhetorical choices and actions that writers pursue, ultimately guiding them to select tasks "in which they feel competent and confident and to avoid those in which they do not" (Pajares & Valiante, 2006, p. 159). This research reinforces the role of Cook's rhetorical space and the discourse community that composed and conferred within it. The example Banks set for Cook's letter writing created a scenario in which his confidence grew with each letter he wrote. The Viceroy's relenting to Cook's will by liberating his ship affirmed that confidence.

But Cook did not transfer the self-confidence he developed to his "A De[s]cription of the Bay or River of Rio de Janeiro," his first post-embarkation account of a location his ship visited and a precursor of the ethnographic descriptions he would have to compose
according to the Royal Society's writing assignment. On December 7, several days after the *Endeavour* sailed from the troubled port, Cook begins his "De[s]cription" with a hydrological account intended to help future British navigators to avoid foundering while seeking safe anchorage in the bay. When he shifts his narrative to describe the ethnographic features of the land itself, his writing assumes a markedly less confident tone: "I shall now give the best description I can of the different Forts that are erected for the defence of this Bay [...]" (Cook, 1968, p. 31). During the time his was relegated to his ship, Cook had thoroughly surveyed the bay and had made numerous sketches of the shoreline (Beaglehole, 1974; Cook, 1968; MacLean, 1972). He had ample empirical information from which to compose his account; however, the account itself reflects his lack of self-confidence to accurately portray what he had seen into written words. His previous cartographic publications gave him reason to be confident in his ability to produce this genre (Flower, 1994). Under Banks's tutelage, he had also grown confident in his ability to compose diplomatic letters. Therefore, it was the ethnographic genre itself—the new, important writing task—that was deleterious to his self-efficacy. Having developed a working relationship with a member of his discourse community, Cook's "Journal of Remarkable Occurences" demonstrates that he sought Banks' assistance to learn to successfully compose ethnographic accounts. After this consultation, he would become sufficiently confident in his ability to write ethnographies that he would produce one independently near the end of his voyage.

**Ethnographic Accounts**

After successfully learning to compose diplomatic memorials and struggling to make meaning in his first attempt at an ethnographic account, Cook's journal provides
ample evidence that he collaborated with Joseph Banks to gain the self-confidence and proficiency he needed to write the comprehensive, data-rich ethnographies the Royal Society's "Instructions" required him to produce. Cook's most prominent historian and archival steward, J. C. Beaglehole, was the first to notice similarities in Cook's and Banks's journals, on account that Banks' papers were not fully compiled and published until the mid-twentieth century. Those studying Cook (too) often cite Beaglehole's introduction to his 1968 edition of Cook's journals to substantiate their claims that the captain was a plagiarist: "[i]t is possible that as an unlearned sailor and unpractised writer he [Cook] needed a model ... The two men were on good enough terms not to object to plagiarism, however grand its scale" (Cook, 1968, p. cciv). Batten (1978) notes that it was common practice in eighteenth century nonfiction travel literature for authors to reprint others accounts in part or in whole within their own and without consent because there were no laws prohibiting the practice. Warner (1958) indicts Robinson Crusoe's author, Daniel Defoe, of the same offense, "Defoe ... had read extensively and incessantly in out of the way material, published and unpublished, and in days when plagiarism was more acceptable than it is now, he had no hesitation in lifting, almost bodily, passages from other writers" (p. 19). More recently, Percy (1996b) addresses the "curious habits of Cook the copyist" by suggesting that Cook altered Banks's journal to reflect a "professional astronomer's desire to record only and exactly what he had observed" (pp. 6-7). In the age of intellectual property, Percy (1996b) introduces a more palatable spin on Cook's writing habits, but the crime remains the same. And more tragically, she, like many who write about Cook, perpetuates the view that he was an astronomer trying to play naturalist observer and not a writer learning to make meaning in a new genre.
Cook indeed learned to write ethnographic accounts according to the Royal Society's conventions for scientific papers, which according to Bazerman (1988) were detailed reports of empirical observations of unusual events that were corroborated by other observers. Banks was a good model for Cook the novice writer because his naturalistic observations frequently appeared in *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, and as a member of that scientific community he was present when other researchers presented their findings during the society's meetings (Gasciogne, 1994). His influence within the organization lead him to hold its presidency for forty-one years, until declining health prompted his resignation on March 16, 1820. As Beaglehole (1968), and the historians and biographers who benefited from his scholarship, noted, there are numerous instances in Cook's Tahitian ethnography that demonstrate him learning to write in the genre by modeling his own text after Banks' journal, much like he did when he learned to write diplomatic letters.

Yet, Cook's Tahitian ethnography is not verbatim plagiarism. There are three long passages of over 500 words that mimic Banks's in structure and content, but there are only a few instances where Cook uses Banks' exact wording. This distinction is noteworthy for two reasons. The first is that Cook is not using the content of Banks's journal to compensate for deficiencies in his own. Rather, he is copying or closely paraphrasing the opening lines of each section Banks writes then endeavoring to compose his own account independent of Banks's journal. For instance, Banks begins the food section of his Tahitian ethnography with the (run on) sentence, "In the article of food these happy people may almost be said to be exempt from the curse of our forefather scarcely can it be said that they earn their bread with the sweat of their brow when their
chiefest sustenance Bread fruit is procurd with no more trouble than that of climbing a tree ..." (Banks, 1896, p. 138). Cook commences his food account similarly, "All these articles the earth almost spontaneously produces or at least they are raised with very little labour, in the article of food these people may almost be said to be exempt from the curse of our forefathers scarcely can it be said that they earn their bread with the sweet of their brow" (Cook, 1968, p. 119). Cook's first sentence closely resembles Banks's but his account thereafter is almost wholly his own words and resembles Banks's only in structure and content. Cook repeats this procedure in sections of his Tahitian ethnography on the practice of tattooing, as well as his descriptions of the natives' dwellings.

The second reason this distinction is noteworthy is that it raises the possibility that Cook may not have copied Banks' finished journal entry, but that the two actually composed their accounts together and conferred while doing so. For instance, in the tattooing section, Banks writes, "Islanders I have seen (except those of Ohiteroa) agree in having all their buttocks covered with a deep black over most have arches drawn one over the other as high as their short ribs ..." (Banks, 1896, p. 129). The captain writes in his journal, "yet all agree in having their buttocks cover'd with a deep black over this most have arches drawn one over a otheras high as their short ribs" (Cook, 1968, p. 125). Despite the similarity of these two entries, Cook does not adopt Banks's spelling and commits spelling errors of his own. Also, he omits the proviso that excludes the natives of Ohiteroa from this tattoo design. Instead of plagiarism, these similarities indicate collaborative writing. Since the two men both composed in the Great Cabin, it is likely that they compared their field notes and spoke about how to best explain the intricate tattoo design before committing these observations to paper. As a novice in this genre,
Cook neglects to include the crucial detail that differentiates the two populations. In later entries, when Cook was more confident and competent with the genre, his use of specifics surpasses Banks's.

Collaborative writing seems a more plausible explanation than blatant plagiarism because Cook adopted Banks's process of taking field notes on shore and then composing his ethnographic account after the *Endeavour* sailed. Only six pages of Cook's original field notes have survived, but they provide insight into his composition process and suggest that he would have to confer with Banks to provide specific details for his account. On October 27, 1769, Cook took the following field notes in New Zealand:

Monday PM Pass'd a remarkable Cape
The Cape to be named and described
The 1\textsuperscript{d} off it
A Bay to the westward of it
Saw some Towns & Cultivated ground
Abundance of the natives came off—not less than 4 or 500 in the Course of this day a sign that the Country must be very populous—

AM The behavior of the people who came alongside[.] (Cook, 1968, p. 541)

In his study of exploration and travel literature, I. S. MacLaren (1992) observes that field notes are both the first step in a traveler's writing process and the first attempt to mediate experience in words. As with all writers, those documenting their observations have idiosyncratic writing processes, but "single words, phrases, or names from field notes might be built into sentences and paragraphs, as the traveler (or someone else) begins to shape the experience of the discrete portion or the entire trip, informing it with
continuity and purpose" (MacLaren, 1992, p. 41). Given the lack of details in Cook's field notes, he certainly would have to confer with Banks for the two to compose corroborating accounts for the Royal Society. For example, Cook's note, "The behavior of the people who came alongside" was expanded into: "As soon as they came within about a stones throw of the Ship they would there lay and call out Haromai hareuta a patoo age, that is come here, come a shore with us and we will kill you" (Cook, 1968, p. 281). Banks's New Zealand account has a similar observation, replete with the natives' threat, although he phrases it more poetically: "Come to us, come to us, come but ashore with us, and we will kill you" (Banks, 1968, p. 246).

With such sparse fields taken on shore, Cook and Banks would have to rely on each other to compose their accounts at sea. Winsor (1994) witnessed a similar phenomenon when she studied the invention and composition processes of three engineering students coauthoring a lab report. The students were instructed to find novel uses for small ceramic spheres, then to coauthor a report of their results. In Winsor's (1994) case study, "students wrote about the spheres and then used those texts rather than the spheres themselves to create new knowledge ... [and] used writing to achieve group agreement about which ideas were valid" (p. 846). Like the students, Banks and Cook used writing to convert empirical experiences into ideas, which they would then discuss and commit to their journals. This practice makes determining original authorship and plagiarism practically impossible. Therefore, what they produced was two accounts that resulted from the same communally held beliefs about what they saw; using similar wording could only enhance their observations' veracity. Their reports of their beliefs then became legitimate data that could be reliably acted upon by the Royal Society. Additionally, the
time and distance from the actual moments and places of observation would allow the ideological influence of the discourse community's rhetorical space to mediate the accounts they produced side by side in the Great Cabin.

**Compassionate Colonizer Ideology**

By virtue of "The Instructions," Cook was writing for two specific audiences, the Royal Society and the Royal Navy. The account of the people and places he encountered on his voyage around the world would provide data that would influence the decisions of these two powerful groups. Inarguably, the most prominent member of the Royal Society was its president, the 14th Earl of Morton, James Douglas. The several pages of "Hints" he offered Cook not only instructed him on how to go about successfully writing for this assignment, but also imparted the ideology that would pervade Cook's rhetorical space, the Great Cabin. After reading Lord Anson's journal from his exploration of the South Seas and Captain Wallis's account of his discovery of Tahiti, Morton was alarmed by the unjustified violence that British officers and sailors perpetuated against the indigenous peoples Britain sought to colonize (Cook, 1968): "From the reports handed about concerning some of the late Expeditions," he writes, "it should seem that upon one or two occasions, some of the Natives had been wantonly killed without any just provocation ... A naked man in the water could never be dangerous to a Boats Crew" (Cook, 1968, p. 515). The "one or two occasions" seems a polite understatement when compared to the gravity of Morton's concern about the egregious account of "a single man, who was killed in attempting to Swim toward one of the Boats" (Cook, 1968, p. 515). Too much for England was at stake for the Royal Society or the Admiralty to tolerate unjustified violence, especially with French explorers, like Bougainville, seeking
to expand France’s sphere of influence into the Pacific Ocean.

To prevent further hostilities that would almost certainly damage the British Empire’s efforts to possess the South Pacific, Douglas included his philosophy of compassionate colonization in his "Hints" to instill the mission with the humanitarian aspect that previous discovery efforts woefully lacked. Since he believed that following his philosophy and incorporating the compassionate colonizer ideology into all British-native encounters would ensure the mission’s success (especially with his representatives in such close proximity to the captain), the Royal Society’s president prominently sets out this ideology at the beginning of his "Hints":

To exercise the utmost patience and forbearance with respect to the Natives of the several Lands where the Ship may touch ... To have it still in view that shedding the blood of those people is a crime of the highest nature ... No European Nation has a right to occupy any part of their country or settle among them without their voluntary consent ... There are many ways to convince them of the Superiority of Europeans, without slaying any of those poor people ... Upon the whole there can be no doubt that the most savage and brutal Nations are more easily gained by mild, than by rough treatment.


The logic promoted within Morton’s ideology is deceptively simple: if Britons are hospitable to the indigenous peoples, the indigenous peoples will acknowledge their own inferiority and forfeit their rights to their lands. Morton's patriarchal advice proved fruitful and prescient because the natives permitted Cook to plant the Union Jack in Tahiti, New Zealand, and Australia. Though, the Tahitians struck the colors as soon as
Cook's claiming party rowed away and made the flag into a vestment for one of their chiefs (Salmond, 2003). However confused the natives were with the ceremonies of colonization, Douglas's ideology, as an additional context for the discourse community to negotiate in their rhetorical space, found its way into Cook's ethnographic accounts. Yet the ideology only appears after Cook writes his ethnographic accounts independently of Banks.

By the time the *Endeavour* sets sail from New Zealand, in March 1770, Cook's ethnographic accounts are wholly his own compositions. The structures of these accounts, and to a significant degree their content, were sufficiently different from Banks's that there is no evidence the two collaborated or that Cook paraphrased passages from Banks's journal (Beaglehole, 1974; Percy, 1996b). Though they would collaborate on their accounts of the mysterious creature that came to be known as the kangaroo in June 1770 (Banks, 1896; Cook, 1968; Percy, 1996a). It is also at this point in the voyage that the ideologies that pervade Cook's rhetorical space appear in his ethnographic writing.

The ideological shift in Cook's "Journal of Remarkable Occurences" has confounded historians, who in turn have advanced equally curious claims about Cook's writing. In 1933, Frederick Watson, an Australian archivist, wrote a small book titled *Lieutenant James Cook* in which he questions whether portions of Cook's "Journal of Remarkable Occurences" were written in England, and presumably, although he never states it outright, by another author. No other Cook historian, even those critical of him, has ever advanced a similar claim, but Watson's (1933) thesis reinforces the plausibility of the ideological contexts present in the Great Cabin directly affecting Cook's
compositions. That is, when Cook composed without the assistance of his discourse community, the imperializing contexts latent in the texts housed in the Great Cabin inculcated Cook and thus led him to reproduce their colonial and paternalistic values in his own texts.

A close examination of Cook's descriptions of indigenous peoples reveals that his attitude towards them changes significantly over the course of the voyage. On January 16, 1769, only five months into the voyage and before the *Endeavour* touches at Tahiti, Cook writes critically of the native peoples of Tierra del Fuego,

> [T]heir cloathing consists wholly of a Guanacoes skin or that of a Seal, in the same form as it came from the Animals back, the Women wear a piece of skin over their privy parts but the men observe no such decency ... We could not discover that they had any head or chief, or form of Government, neither have they any usefull or necessary Utentials except it be a Bagg or Basket to gather their Muscles [mussels] into: in a Word they are perhaps as miserable a set of People as are this day upon Earth. (Cook, 1968, p. 45)

Then over a year and a half later, Cook concludes his account of the New Holland (Australian) aborigines with a philosophic rumination on materiality and happiness that negates his previous observation:

> From what I have said of the Natives of New-Holland they may appear to some to be the most wretched people upon Earth, but in reality they are far more happier than we Europeans; being wholly unacquainted not only with the superfluous but the necessary Conveniences so much sought after in Europe, they are happy in not knowing them ... [T]hey live in a warm and fine Climate
and enjoy a very wholesome Air, so that they have very little need of

Clothing and this they seem to be fully sensible of... (Cook, 1968, p. 399)

Cook's ideological shift is so encompassing and abrupt that his biographers and historians have indicted him for writing "nonsense on stilts" (Cook, 1955, p. 399) or merely coming to an "unexpected climax" (Williams, 1981, p. 499). After several failed attempts to find evidence that could reconcile the New Holland passage with the remainder of Cook's corpus, J. C. Beaglehole (1974) relents in his final major work and quizzically offers this unlikely explanation the passage: "Cook bursts into a panegyric that almost persuades one that he had spent the voyage reading Rousseau... Has he been listening to some oration of Banks, while the ship lay at anchor in the night; or read through some piece of paper adorned with the Banks version of the fashionable intellectual indiscretions?" (pp. 251-252).

Watson's (1933) thesis, although unfounded, is more plausible than Beaglehole's guess at whether Cook was reading Rousseau. Percy (1996a) notes that Cook was a voracious reader since his apprenticeship with Walker, but there is no evidence to support whether he encountered Rousseau's works or an oration of them. (But the cosmopolitan Banks may have.) When writing in his rhetorical space, Cook was composing in a floating microcosm of England, replete with the humanistic (albeit self-serving) ideologies of the Royal Society. Cook, as would most Europeans of his time, besmirches the Tierra del Fuegans for their lack of technology ("usefull or necessary Utentials"), nakedness, and ostensible lawlessness. After prolonged exposure to the ideological contexts present in the Great Cabin, Cook views the New Hollanders, whose society is even more primitive than the Tierra del Fuegans', as being "far more happier than we
Europeans" because "they think themselves provided with all the necessaries of Life and that they have no superfluities" (Cook, 1968, p. 399). Clothing and government, which goes unmentioned in the latter account, are those "superfluities" that caused him to deem the Tierra del Fuegans wretched.

Considering the numerous sources of the ideologies present in the Great Cabin, Cook's New Holland passage espouses the patriarchal beneficence that Douglas promotes in his compassionate colonizer philosophy. In his "Hints," the president of the Royal Society explains why murdering indigenous peoples is reprehensible, "They are human creatures, the work of the same omnipotent Author, equally under his care with the most polished European; perhaps being less offensive, more entitled to his favor" (Cook, 1968, p. 514). Cook makes no mention in his "Journal of Remarkable Occurences" regarding whether or how frequently he returned to "The Instructions" and "Hints." After composing in his Great Cabin for a year and a half, the ideologies that saturated his rhetorical space influenced his writing process and appeared in his writing. The data Cook gathered for his audience helped him to construct his audience because it was perfumed with the rhetoric of the original assignment itself.

**Conclusion**

In the eighteenth-century, any circumnavigation of the globe was deemed a successful voyage by the Royal Navy because even the most experienced of British captains was at the mercy of the winds and weather, not to mention the vicissitudes of the new peoples he encountered or the dreaded toredo worm, a tropical ocean parasite that could eat a sailor's ship out from underneath him. By this metric, Cook's voyage was an unmitigated success, but by the Royal Society's writing assignment, he resoundingly
failed to observe accurately the Transit of Venus and to discover Antarctica, two of the objectives most vital to his expedition. Cook and astronomer Charles Green had fair skies and an unimpeded view of Venus's transit, but their data, like the data of the nearly 150 other skyward gazing astronomers around the world, was fundamentally flawed, thus leaving the distance from the Earth to the Sun in the realm of the scientific unknown. Not until 1922 would astronomers learn of the Black Drop Effect, the conundrum of light playing in the turbulent upper atmosphere that causes Venus to appear to elongate before it ingresses into the Sun's disc (Maor, 2004). Yet, the Royal Society would not discover the flaw in Cook's data until after his death, and, even then, no one would begrudge him the fact that scientific ambition was more advanced than the scientific instruments he had at his disposal.

Cook also failed to find the Southern Continent, but comforted himself in his shortcoming by writing in his journal: "[A]s to a Southern Continent I do not believe any such thing exists unless in a high latitude" (Cook, 1968, p. 288). However, the diplomacy evidenced in his Rio de Janeiro letters reappears in a section of the "Journal of Remarkable Occurrences" he titled "Discoveries to Come." Here, with his naval career obviously in the forefront of his mind, he writes,

Thus I have given my Opinion freely and without prejudice not with any view to discourage any future attempts being made towards discovering the Southern Continent, on the Contrary, as this Voyage will evidently make it appear that there is left but a small space to the Northward of 40° where the grand Object can lay, I think it would be a great pity that this thing which at times has been the object of many ages and Nations should
not now be whole clear'd up, which might very easily be done in one
Voyage without much trouble or danger or fear as the Navigator would
where to go to look for it. (Cook, 1968, pp. 290-291)

In other words, Cook tells the Royal Society that he can be persuaded to overcome his
doubts about Antarctica's existence if he were to be given another chance to find it.
Certainly, the fearless and untroubled "Navigator" he mentions in this passage is no one
other than himself. In less than three years, the humble surveyor who was most at home
in the North Atlantic developed the self-efficacy of an intrepid explorer who was most
comfortable in the longitudes of the unknown.

Cook's hopeful proposal for a second voyage contains evidence that his rhetorical
space, the Great Cabin, mediated the composition process of one of the HMB
Endeavour's non-European passengers. When the Endeavour set sail from Tahiti, two
Tahitian passengers, Tupaia, a priest and tribal leader, and his servant, Taiata, were
onboard and bound for England at Joseph Banks behest because "what makes [Tupaia]
more than anything desirable is his experience in the navigation of these people and
knowledge of the islands in these seas" (Banks, 1896, p. 108). Tupaia was a willing
passenger as Banks notes (his young servant's opinions are never recorded), but "the
captain refuses to take him on his own account ... I therefore have resolved to take him,
thank Heaven, I have a sufficiency, and do not know why I may not keep him as a
curiosity as well as my neighbours do lions and tigers" (Banks, 1896, p. 108). Although a
"curiosity," Tupaia was given full access to the Great Cabin, whereby he gave Cook an
account of over 130 islands surrounding Tahiti and drew a map of 74 of them (Cook,
1968). The ambitious captain is quick to include these "Discoveries to Come" as reasons
for a second voyage because they could be readily added to the empire after he verifies Antarctica's existence. Although he could not read the texts or use the instruments housed in the Great Cabin, Tupaia, too, was influenced by the compassionate colonizer ideology that permeated the rhetorical space and mediated his meaning making process. The map he drew for Cook was an invaluable contribution to the British colonial project, and his ability to convince the New Zealanders of the English's beneficence helped Cook to add both those islands and nearby Australia to the empire.

The data Cook gathered in his "Journal of Remarkable Occurences" proved to the Royal Society that the South Pacific was suitable for British colonization. They would grant him two more voyages to those western longitudes: one to find the elusive Southern Continent and another to look for the mythical Northwest Passage. He had grown considerably as a writer during the first voyage, and would refine his writing on the subsequent voyages so that he could publish his journals himself to profit from Britain's fascination with its new colonies. To this day, the ethnographic accounts he and Banks collaborated on provide the foundation of Polynesian anthropology and history. The Royal Society's interest in the Pacific Ocean ushered in a new era of European influence and subjugation, which only now, thanks to scholarly interest in indigenous rhetorics, is being understood through the natives' accounts of these remarkable occurrences. Despite this troubled legacy, the Tahitians, whose ancestry he preserved in his journal, still sing, "Hail, all hail, Cook, Chief of Air, Earth and Water, we acknowledge you Chief from Beach to the Mountains, over man, trees and cattle, over the Birds of the Air and Fishes of the Sea" (Dening, 1992, p. 212).
While the indigenous peoples of the South Pacific experienced Cook’s influence firsthand, the Royal Society and British Empire relied on the ethnographic accounts he composed to learn about their cultures. Cook’s reliance on his discourse community helped him not only to construct his writing assignment, but also to make meaning of the places and peoples be encountered. From the Royal Society’s perspective, Cook’s greatest achievement was his ability to convincingly incorporate their ideology of compassionate colonization into his ethnographic accounts. As he learned to compose in this scientific genre from Joseph Banks, it is evident that the HMB Endeavour played a greater role in Cook’s voyage than merely transporting him around the world. This floating microcosm of England mediated his composition process and helped him to produce the data his sponsors needed to make a decision that would change the course of human history.
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