Livingstone, 1870, Central Africa, Bambarre

In July 1869, David Livingstone left the village of Ujiji on the eastern shore of Lake Tanganyika and set out to explore what he believed to be the western line of drainage of the Nile River. His course took him into the eastern part of the present day Democratic Republic of the Congo. To make the journey, Livingstone traveled with Mohammad Bogharib, an Arab trader, whom Livingstone considered a friend and with whom he had traveled previously.

The party reached Bambarre, a small Congolese village and base of Arab trading activity, on 21 September 1869. From here, Livingstone expected to carry on westward to the Lualaba and Lomami Rivers, which he hoped would prove to be two of the main branches of the Nile (1870h:XVIII, 1870i:XLI). Instead, despite two sustained attempts to leave the village over the next year, circumstances compelled Livingstone to stay in Bambarre until 16 February 1871.

The delay proved to be one of the longest and most frustrating of Livingstone's career as an explorer in Africa or, as he puts it in his 1870 Field Diary, "the sorest delay I ever had" (1870j:LXIX).The nadir came when Livingstone developed flesh-eating ulcers on his feet and was forced to remain in his hut in Bambarre for 80 days, the last 20 of which he suffered from acute fever, nausea, and vomiting (1870e:X).

In other words, the delay wholly upended Livingstone's ambitions as an Victorian explorer who had to keep moving, observing, and recording. His world narrowed to the village of Bambarre and its inhabitants. These included locally-based Africans, Arab traders from Ujiji and elsewhere in East Africa and Zanzibar, the Arabs' followers, and Livingstone's few attendants, among them Chumah, Susi, Gardener and a set of nine men from a government-run school for freed slaves in Nashik, India.

In his writings of the period, particularly the second half of 1870, Livingstone shifted from the impressionistic style that characterizes the majority of his final field diaries (1865-73) to something else. In part, this new narrative style – especially in the 1870 Field Diary – positioned Livingstone much like Samuel Taylor Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, condemned to retell his tale in order to account for how he, Livingstone, arrived at the present moment of stasis (e.g., 1870a:[1]-[13], 1870i:XLI).

His narrative framework in the 1870 Field Diary, in turn, took on a character akin to *A Thousand and One Arabian Nights*, with Livingstone layering a series of tales within the greater tale of his 1869-70 travels. Most importantly, the delay also compelled Livingstone to take a close look at his immediate surroundings and record his observations at a level of detail and depth that he hadn't since his famous first sojourn in Africa (1841-56).

What was Livingstone *really* up to in 1870 and, more broadly, on his final expedition (1865-73)?

Livingstone himself offers a variety of answers, even within the scope of the 1870 Field Diary. Tracing the western line of drainage of the Nile, he notes, continues his work in identifying the

source of the Nile and mapping the hydrography of Central Africa. It extends his efforts to correct the mistakes of rival explorers while reaffirming the geographical writings of ancient explorers – i.e., of confirming "the sacred oracles" and finding evidence that Moses visited Africa. Finally, he notes, it represents a key dimension of his desire to turn the benefits of this exploration towards stopping the Central and East African slave trades (1870h:XVIII, 1870d:{18}-{19}, 1870i:LVI-LXI, cf. Jeal 2011:15-17).

The question of Livingstone's objectives has also occasioned significant debate among scholars. In an essay written long ago (1973), Roy Bridges offers what remains the most succinct and perspicacious of such assessments. Livingstone, writes Bridges, sought to attack the African "slave trade by means of legitimate trade, treaties and missions," but he also hoped to return to the "halcyon days" of his first expedition to Africa, to "repeat the success" of his celebrated transcontinental journey of 1852-56, and to "crown it with the fulfillment of his ideas" (1973:166-67). Livingstone found motivation in "the solution of the Nile problem" being the "one task [he] thought he could succeed in tackling," from his "intense desire to stand well in the eyes of those influential men who had now become his friends," and, finally, from believing it his God-given duty to improve Africa through the Nile quest (1973:168-70).

These objectives and desires make the 1869-70 period seem like a disaster – a perspective that Livingstone's biographers have taken up in multiple guises. Some argue that nothing happens to Livingstone in 1870; others summarize the sequential series of events in his life, such as they are; yet others delve into Livingstone's geographical fantasies during the period and probe the darker corners of Livingstone's psychology.

Reginald Coupland, for instance, notes that "week after week, Livingstone sat idle at Bambarré [...] What could he do? [...] There was little to record in the journal. He could only read," etc. Livingstone, Coupland adds, was "depressed," plagued by "interminable delay," and subject to "utter loneliness, and longing for home" (1945:83, 90). Tim Jeal, conversely, enumerates the many impediments Livingstone faced at this time and underscores how Livingstone's decision to face these "demonstrates the almost superhuman determination of the greatest explorers never to surrender" (2011:253).

Elsewhere, Jeal also devotes a whole chapter of his biography to Livingstone's "Fantasy in Manyuema" (1973:322ff.) which elaborates in detail Livingstone's theories of the Central African watershed. Oliver Ransford takes this approach further by focusing on Livingstone's "cyclothymic personality" and discussing how in the final seven months in Bambarre (22 July 1870-16 February 1871), Livingstone "escaped from the reality of loneliness and discouragement into the realms of imagination and visionary transcendentalism" (1978:264, 262).

In other words, the emphasis of such work falls on Livingstone's thoughts and his activities, and the authorities (Bridges excepted; also see Ross 2002:216-17) don't explore the larger contexts for Livingstone's ideas about Africa or the contemporaneous global events that helped shape these ideas. More importantly, the authorities fail to conceptualize nineteenth-century Central

Africa as a complex place teeming with activities, cultures, individuals, motives, and forces that far exceed Livingstone's activities and that certainly do not center all on him.

The issue, particularly in thinking in terms of locally-based Central African actors, extends as well to important historical scholarship (e.g., Bennett 1986:113-14). Indeed, even some landmark studies on the role of African populations in exploration limit their scope, ultimately, to the porters, interpreters, and guides that assisted travelers like Livingstone (e.g., Simpson 1976) or to the most famous "intermediaries" that worked with Livingstone specifically: Chuma, Wekotani, Susi, and Wainwright (Kennedy 2013:170ff., see also 159-94; cf. Bridges 1987:191).

The foregoing approaches, especially those that target Livingstone's stasis, follow what is evident of Livingstone's own assessment of the period covered by the 1870 Field Diary (17 August 1870-22 March 1871). In revising this diary to create the corresponding segment of the Unyanyembe Journal (1866-72), as we detail elsewhere in this edition, Livingstone compressed the bulk of the diary – and all the rich local cultural detail contained therein – to a few longeurs and just over three pages in the journal. Concurrently, he massively expanded the diary's last segment to focus on his impressions as he traveled between Bambarre and Nyangwe, in eastern Congolese region of Manyema.

This narrative inversion gives a good indication of what Livingstone valued *and* thought was worth discarding in relation to his travels during this period. In other words, authorities predominantly assess 1870 as a year of failure and fantasy for Livingstone, and this assessment falls into line with what Livingstone himself seemed to think in retrospect.

Oddly, however, the line of critical thought between Livingstone and subsequent scholars is not necessarily direct. In creating the posthumously published *Last Journals* (1874), Livingstone's friend and editor Horace Waller relied on a combination of the 1870 Field Diary and Unyanyembe Journal to create a hybrid record of the period, one that would be most complete as it combined the longest parts of each text. From that starting point, the original text(s) underwent a massive process of revision and editing to become the published book (Helly 1987).

In discussing this period of Livingstone's life and, as relevant, the broader Central African history it encompasses, literary critics, biographers, historians, and others have for the most part worked with the *Last Journals* as their primary text, with the occasional reference to published versions of letters or other archival sources (e.g., Coupland 1945, Seaver 1957, Jeal 1973, Ross 2002, Bayly 2014). In other words, these scholars have not worked with the 1870 Field Diary or, for the most part, its siblings: Field Diary XIII (28 June 1869-25 Feb. 1871) and the Unyanyembe Journal (respectively, Livingstone 1869 and 1866-72).

This approach runs counter to an analytical trend that has been gaining in momentum since the 1970s and 80s, following on the pioneering work of historian Roy Bridges (1973, 1977, 1987, etc.). Put simply, the work of Bridges and others in his wake advocates for returning to the

original field notes and other such sources of explorers and travelers like Livingstone. Such scholarship argues that these unabridged sources need to be read alongside more revised and/or published materials in order to develop the most comprehensive critical understanding of encounters in the field.

This approach has gained traction not only in terms of more traditional "analogue" scholarship, such as the recent publication of the lavishly illustrated volume on Explorers' Sketchbooks (Lewis-Jones and Herbert 2016), but also in the digital humanities via such projects as Olive Schreiner Letters Online, Livingstone Online, and, of course, the Livingstone Spectral Imaging Project. Each of these latter projects focuses and indeed capitalizes on the fact that digital practices and international collaboration now make access to the relevant archival materials easier than ever before.

In some of his foundational pieces, Bridges outlines the variety of revisionary stages through which such archival materials passed and the complexities in differentiating among those stages (see, especially, 1977:3-4). He also highlights the heterogeneous nature of the contents of the earliest stage manuscripts and, most importantly, suggests that the earliest stages contain the most direct information from informants, "what the explorer *heard*" (1987:181, italics in original). Of such original records, Bridges indicates, "Livingstone's notebooks are the most important example" (1987:181).

In returning to the original, unabridged text of the 1870 Field Diary, the current edition thus extends the critical approach. Yet in so doing, the edition underscores that Livingstone's *personal* story of travel – what he and subsequent scholars have most valued – is in fact the least interesting of the many, many stories found in the diary.

From another perspective, the text unearthed by our edition highlights that a key dimension of the diary – especially from the vantage of 2017 – are the myriad direct observations Livingstone records about Central Africa and particularly Bambarre in 1870-71 (cf. Bridges 1977:4). Although even the best of Livingstone's biographers has called his writings from the period "intellectual rambling" (Ross 2002:218), reference to the 1870 Field Diary shows that Livingstone's extended sojourn in fact produced a unique historical document – one without parallel in some ways – even among Livingstone's own writings.

To create this record, Livingstone invented a medial narrative style that doesn't quite map onto Bridges three stages of production (Bridges 1987:180-90), and that, as we note elsewhere, oscillates between a field diary and a journal – at least as Livingstone normally created such documents. The record does not focus on progression since not much "happens" to Livingstone and he does not leave Bambarre till the very end of the 1870 Field Diary.

Rather, the diary rather captures the circulation of local and regional information in Bambarre, the Congo, East Africa, and beyond by layering the ideas of historical and contemporary actors onto narratives of events and recorded stories. This immediate, kaleidoscopic, and unvarnished record reflects Livingstone's growing interest in African societies at the end of his life (Bridges

1977:6), and indeed a principal value of the 1870 Field Diary lies in the many, many details that it provides about nineteenth-century Africa (cf. Bridges 1973:165).

In short, the diary documents the encroachment of Arab traders into the Congo. It outlines step-by-step the impact of such encroachment on local populations and their social relations. It details complex regional dynamics and the circulation of geographical, medical, agricultural, and other such information among an array of African and Arab individuals.

Finally, it presents the African populations of Bambarre, of other neighboring villages, and from farther north in Legaland and elsewhere in the region not just as *passive* victims of violence, but as evolving individuals that shift from gullibility, to suspicion, and finally to resistance in their interactions with the Arab traders and followers. In other words, the diary represents a breakthrough – overlooked till now in part because it has been edited out of the historical record – in the representation of such local African populations by travelers and explorers like Livingstone.

*

This oversight has occurred, in part, because of the sustained and intense critical focus on Livingstone himself, a trend that stretches back to Henry M. Stanley's writings (1872, etc.) and even earlier. It's worth noting, however, that late nineteenth-century travel in East and Central Africa placed explorers like Livingstone squarely in the middle of Zanzibar's evolving African empire.

This empire, which reached its height during the tenure of Sultan Barghash (r.1870-1888), exerted direct or indirect influence over a vast portion of the continent and "was aggressively expansionist in its ambitions" (Kennedy 2013:120-21). The workings of this empire compelled European explorers who visited the region to subsume their ambitions with the broader ambitions of the empire and, indeed, often to "bend to the will" of the empire's objectives (Kennedy 2013:100, 126).

In the late nineteenth-century, one of the empire's principal expansionist tendencies the form of a fierce quest for ivory to satisfy global demand – particularly in the Congo – which, Livingstone notes in 1870, "at present is like gold digging" (1870a:[32], cf. [24]-[33]). The Congolese ivory collected by Arab traders and their followers served the needs of "an extraordinary range of industrial products and decorative arts" including "billiard balls, knife handles and piano keys" as well as "all manner of lesser uses." (Hyam 2002:217)

Much of the ivory passed through London to the rest of Europe, but there was also significant demand in the Middle East and in Asia. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 considerably facilitated trade from Zanzibar and the Indian Ocean (Hyam 2002:217-18; cf. Livingstone 1874:89-92). In eastern Congo, such world demand for ivory translated into the arrival of Arab traders in the mid to late 1860s including the most famous of such traders Tippu Tip, the

widescale introduction of firearms, and the advent of slavery, particularly to supply harems for the Arabs and porters for transporting the ivory (Northrup 1988:27-28).

Expansion into the Congo proceeded by the creation of depots and bases, which the Arab traders and their followers then used to launch forays farther afield. The trading parties, often financed by capital from Indian merchants settled on the ~~east coast of Africa~~, brought together a diverse ~~array of~~ individuals, including "Omani Arabs, coastal Swahili, inland Africans, and others" (Northrup 1988:23).

Despite European characterization, labor in these trading parties took highly differentiated forms ~~and did not depend wholly on slavery.~~

~~Indeed~~, in East Africa, the Nyamwezi ethnic group pioneered a sophisticated culture of "wage labor shaped by indigenous precapitalist labor norms but closely linked to merchant capital and the global economy" (Rockell 2006:6). The use of slaves as porters in the Congo ~~– which the Arabs were just beginning to pioneer in 1870 and~~ where other ethnic groups, such as the Bira (in the northeast) and Bisa (in the southeast), dominated trade – ~~thus~~ constituted a break with East African caravan norms (Livingstone 1870a:[69], Wilson 1972, Rockell 2006:17).

~~Circumstances in eastern Congo, however, necessitated more than just recourse to slaves as porters.~~ The rush for ivory compelled the traders "to build up their own infrastructure" and, as Tippu Tip eventually did, to organize a state ~~that, on the whole, acted independently, but still retained loose allegiance with Zanzibar and, of course, served as a key link between maritime and interior continental trades~~ (Sheriff 1987:190, Vansina 1968:238, Renault 1989:161-63).

Livingstone himself experienced the push and pull of these forces ~~in various ways~~. For instance, in the 1870 Field Diary he notes that "a letter obtained from the Sultan of Zanzibar [...] has been of immense service to me with most of his subjects" (1870i:LI). Yet elsewhere ~~it becomes clear~~ that some of ~~Livingstone's~~ troubles with his Nassicker attendants stem from the fact that in Bambarre – i.e., so far from the coast – the attendants have little regard for the Sultan's authority (1870a:[17]-[19]).

~~The rise of the village of~~ Ujiji, on the eastern shore of Lake Tanganyika, ~~preceded the development of trade in the interior of Central Africa. However,~~ the settlement soon became an important gateway to the Congo and, indeed, was Livingstone's departure point in 1869 (Bennett 1974:226-28).

West of ~~Lake~~ Tanganyika, where ~~prior~~ trade had ~~predominantly~~ taken a regional form, Arab expansion followed two principal directions. Initially, efforts focused on the regions of Kazembe and Katanga in the south and south east, then once the ivory in those regions dwindled, Arab traders moved north, into Manyema where Livingstone composed both the 1870 and 1871 Field Diaries (Sheriff 1987:187-90). Arab settlement in Manyema focused on a few ~~key centers~~, among them Nyangwe, Kasongo, and to a lesser degree Bambarre (Wisnicki 2013:211, Sheriff

1987:190), hence the reason why in 1869-71 Livingstone found himself in the latter village in the first place.

In this region, ivory abounded. Livingstone, for instance, complained of the "Californian gold fever at Ujiji" that prevented him from getting reliable carriers for the Congo, and later, just before he reached Bambarre, he "met a band of Ujijian traders carrying 18000 lbs weight of ivory bought in this new field" (1870i:L, XLII). Moreover, in 1870, Livingstone observed the traders making a vigorous push towards new frontiers, both west of the Lualaba River in the direction of the Lomami River and further north along the Lualaba, towards the rainforests of Legaland (e.g., 1870h:XVII-XVIII).

The arrival of the traders in these regions, not unexpectedly, led to tensions with the local populations and to significant, long-term hardships for those populations. As one historian notes, "[i]n the three decades between 1865 and 1895, the peoples of eastern [Congo] lost their autonomy, first to Afro-Arab traders in the service of the Sultan of Zanzibar and then to the Congo Free State in the service of King Leopold II of Belgium" (Northrup 1988:13).

Before the arrival of the traders, global trade had reached Manyema only indirectly with cultural and economic forces from such ethnic groups as the Tetela to the southwest and Lega to the north exerting the greatest regional influence. As a result, the peoples of this region evolved complex relationships between themselves and the local geography, including the practices of mixed agriculture and cattle-keeping, and among themselves and the hunter-gatherer populations of the forests to the north, with whom they engaged in vibrant exchange.

Ethnic identity was, to a degree, quite fluid, more so towards the Lega populations of the north. Indeed, this circumstance persists to the present day and results in, what one authority calls, the "bewildering diversity of ethnic units" that serve as "cultural buffer groups" between the Lega and their more distant neighbors, including those in the south (Biebuyck 1973:5, 17; also Northrop 1988:13-18 and Wisnicki 2013:218ff.).

Livingstone characterized this ethnic diversity, which did not correlate with Victorian expectations of how African populations should be organized, in different terms. He usually grouped the different regional populations under the single term "Manyema" yet simultaneously faulted their lack of cohesion, especially at a broader political level: "The great want of the Manyema is national life. Of this they have none. Each headman is independent of every other" (1870g:{29}, cf. 1870i:XXIII).

This situation, suggested Livingstone, resulted in a "permanent halt" in technological development in the region. It positioned perpetual war as the only solution for regional conflicts – even lesser inter-village disputes – and made local social dynamics particularly susceptible to interference by the newly arrived Arab traders (1870h:XVII, XIX; 1870i:XXIII).

Today, the Bangubangu constitute the principal ethnic group residing at Bambarre (Maes and Boone 1935, Raucq 1952:35-36, Boone 1961, Maho 2009:34; cf. Vansina 1968: Map D and

Butcher 2008:143-49). Authorities, however, suggest that this collective name originated as an Arab or European appellation (Boone 1961:5; cf. Biebuyck 1973:19n.).

The authorities trace the genealogy of this population in two ways, with some foregrounding the links of the Bangubangu to the Lega to the north (Biebuyck 1973:xix, 10, 18), and others counting the Bangubangu among the people of Congo's Kasai-Katanga region to the south, with ties between the Bangubangu and the Luba originating in the early nineteenth century (Raucq 1952: 42, 44; Vansina 1965:161-73, especially 162; cf. Wisnicki 2013:218-19). Bambarre's own population thus defies facile ethnic description, in part because of limited critical literature (Boone 1961:11).

The historical record provides limited illumination. In the 1870 Field Diary, Livingstone himself makes only the occasional reference to the "Bambarre people" (1870i:XXXVI, XXXVII, 1870k:LXXIII), whom he distinguishes from the Lega (1870i:XXXVII). He traces the origin of the Bambarre people to the Luba on the south and southwest, However, he does so in a potentially confused way that also links the Bambarre people to the Lega in the rainforests to the north: "All they can say of [the]ir forefathers is that they came from Lualaba up Luamo then to Luelo and thence here – The name seems to mean forest people – Manyuema" (Livingstone 1870h:XVII; cf. Cameron 1877,2:66-69, who makes the links with the Luba more explicit).

Underlying complexities of origin and identity aside, Livingstone's act in the 1870 Field Diary of naming the local population and fixing it in at Bambarre or more regionally has an important discursive implication. The act enables Livingstone to introduce a key set of protagonists into his narrative, to characterize them, and, as Livingstone and many others after him do, to point to "the isolation in which they live" (1870a:[1], cf., e.g., Northrup 1988:19-20).

Against these protagonists, Livingstone's diary pits the Arab traders and their followers. Livingstone distinguishes this group as the "Ujijians" or "Ujijian traders" (1870a:[69]; 1870e:XIII; 1870i:XXXV, XLII; 1871e:CI), thereby associating them with what would soon become the East African gateway to and easternmost edge of Tippu Tip's Central African trading empire (see above).

In other words, Livingstone composes the 1870 Field Diary from a place that he categorizes as isolated, that lacks overarching local political mechanisms to regulate affairs, and that, as noted earlier, effectively lies at the edge of the Sultan of Zanzibar's sphere of influence. In such a distant and lawless place, the 1870 Field Diary suggests by turns, someone who refrains from violence can be a friend of the local population (1870a:[49]), a coward (1870e:XIII), or a dependent of the Arab traders and so no friend at all.

No one underscores this last point better than Livingstone himself. The 1870 Field Diary contains numerous instances of Livingstone turning to the Arab trader Mohamad Bogharib for aid (e.g., 1870i:XLII) and especially memorable references to the kindness of Katomba, another Arab trader, (1871e:LXXXIX-XCIV, cf. 1866-72:[649]). Most striking of all, Livingstone himself

gifts his "double barrelled gun" (1871e:XCI) to Katomba in return for this kindness – an odd decision indeed given 1870 Field Diary's endless descriptions of Arab and Arab-led violence.

From one perspective, Livingstone's 1870 Field Diary embodies a first-hand chronicle of the arrival of Arab traders in Manyema and the forays of these traders into new regions to the west and north. The chronicle includes Livingstone's eye-witness testimony of the damage done by the traders, as when he reports having "passed through nine villages destroyed by the worthies who did not wish me to see more of their work" (1870a:[26]). There are also multiple, often detailed narratives collected from the traders themselves of violence committed locally in, for instance, villages such as Mamohela and Kasongo as well as further afield in Legaland (1870i:XXIX-XXXI, 1870k:LXXIV, 1870d:{23}-{24}).

The violence described in the 1870 Field Diary bears an eerie ring of familiarity in the context of marketplace massacre Livingstone himself would experience in July 1871 in Nyangwe: "these three then fired into a mass of men who collected [-] one killed two another three & so on" (1870k:LXXIV; cf. 1871f:CXLVI ff.). In fact, in the last sentence of the diary, Livingstone makes reference to Dugumbe, whose followers were the main instigator of the Nyangwe marked massacre, and looks forward to his imminent arrival in Nyangwe, little suspecting what will soon happen: "I hope to go tomorrow towards the sokoni or great market of this region" (1871e:CI).

As might be expected, the violence that continuously surrounds Livingstone makes a significant impact on his mental well-being and, as a result, on his representations in the diary. At times, he attempts to separate the Arab traders and their followers and places the blame squarely on the pettiness of the latter: "The nine villages and a 100 men killed by Katomba's slaves at Nasangwa were all about a string of beads fastened to a powder horn which a [M]anyema man tried in vain to steal" (1870e:X).

At other times, Livingstone lumps the different traders together, differentiating only by degree: "The traders from Ujiji are simply marauders, and their people worse than themselves thirst for blood more than for ivory - Each longs to be able to tell a tale of blood, and Manyema are an easy prey" (1871e:XCVII). He also underscores his inability to reconcile the kindness of the Arabs towards him and their conduct in nonetheless taking "their share of the spoil[s]" collected by their followers (1866-72:[653]).

The complexity of the events on the ground thus puts Livingstone in a complicated situation. Throughout the span of the 1870 Field Diary, he gains repeat, first-hand experience of the impact of the Arab traders on the local populations in Manyema. He also observes how the local populations play into this violence, by attempting to use the Arab traders for local conflicts (e.g., 1870g:{29}) or by themselves beginning to imitate the violence of the traders (e.g., 1870k:LXXIV, 1870i:XXVII).

Finally, Livingstone, a devout Christian, finds that he simply cannot make sense of the contrast between his own work as a missionary – however nominal at this stage in his career – and the

failure of the Arabs and their followers to harbor any similar ~~such~~ ambitions ~~in terms of~~ spreading Islam (1870k:LXXIV, 1871e:C-CI). Rather, ~~on the last page of the 1870 Field Diary~~ he writes that in East Africa the traders have "propagated nothing but syphilis and the domestic bug" (1871e:CI).

These circumstances ~~engender~~ some of the most vituperative language in the 1870 Field Diary. In reflecting on the conduct of the ~~Arab~~ traders ~~in Central Africa~~, Livingstone in turn assails the falsehood of ~~the traders~~ with whom he is personally acquainted, some of the foundational ideas of Islam, its holiest city ~~to which he ascribes the spread of cholera across East Africa and into Central Africa~~, and, finally, the founder of the religion himself (1871e:LXXIX, LXXXI-LXXXIII, XCVIII).

One example of Livingstone's language suffices to convey the whole: "[The cholera at Zanzibar] we get from Mecca filth - nothing was done to prevent the place being made a perfect cesspool of animals guts & ordure of men" (1871e:LXXIX; cf. 1874,2:96-98, where Waller has preserved only some of the relevant passages). ~~Further examples can be consulted via the images and transcriptions of the original manuscripts available through our critical edition.~~ We have chosen to publish the passages in keeping with our commitment to dealing with our historical materials honestly, including in those instances when they do not conform to our own ideas or to positions we would want the materials to take.

In the present case, from the vantage of 2017, the passages in question make for painful reading. It's tempting to take the stance that such representations "invariably reflected the ideas of difference prevalent in [explorers'] own society at the time they wrote their travel narratives" (Kennedy 2013:202) or to read the passages against the Central African historical contexts set out throughout this essay. However, it's also not easy to dismiss the passages so summarily given Livingstone's his ability – in other cases – to think beyond the racial ideas of his times in terms of many of the African populations he encountered.

As a result, rather than apologize for or condemn Livingstone, we believe that a more productive approach lies in confronting these materials head on, acknowledging their problematic nature, and then reading them within the unvarnished context of the original 1870 Field Diary.

Put more simply, 1870 Field Diary embodies a process narrative – particularly because of its reflective, fairly unrevised nature. In the diary, Livingstone cycles through the complexities of the Central African situation and does not always succeed in making sense of them. Such an encounter with unresolved complexities ~~represents~~ the experience of the field in Central Africa in 1870.

To engage ~~these~~ complexities, Livingstone develops a new kind of narrative style. ~~The narrative~~ style juxtaposes a broad and heterogeneous set of ideas and observations.

The style, particularly its rapid transitions between themes and events, enables Livingstone to alternate theories of the Nile River system, with:

- first-hand observations on local African cultural practices and social dynamics,
- reflections on his own travels and delays,
- complaints about his attendants,
- narratives of local events gathered from his informants,
- notes on the evolving state of his health,
- discussion of personal grudges against individual back home and in East Africa,
- and much, much more.

In other words, the entries cumulatively take on an elaborate stream-of-consciousness form where local priorities and concerns become layered upon Livingstone's own experiences and motivations.

The overall narrative of the diary, including the scale and scope of the information that Livingstone records, grows out of his unique situation and circumstances in 1870. On one hand, Livingstone bashes contemporary armchair explorers, i.e., "theoretical discoverers," like W.D. Cooley and James Macqueen, who developed elaborate geographical theories by integrating the observations of others rather than engaging in first-hand exploration (1870c:II).

On the other, Livingstone fails to acknowledge that he himself is operating like an armchair explorer, albeit one based in Central Africa. He dreams of traveling and exploring like the Arab traders that surround him, but a variety of circumstances have immobilized him and, as noted earlier, he devotes portions of the 1870 Field Diary to accounting for his impediments (e.g., 1870i:LIV-LV).

Yet despite such immobility, the 1870 Field Diary shows Livingstone to be very well informed about regional events and events farther afield in East Africa and elsewhere. Additionally, the diary makes clear that each group of traders that arrives in Bambarre, from whatever direction, further enlarges Livingstone's story of knowledge.

As a result, when Livingstone composes the Letter from Bambarre – the drafting of which coincides with the end of the 1870 Field Diary and marks the point from which Livingstone resumes his travels – he shows that the principal information gained from Waller relates to events in Britain or across the Atlantic, not Africa (Livingstone 1871c:[1]).

The scale of Livingstone's knowledge best emerges through an enumeration of the locations from which Livingstone shares news in the 1870 Field Diary. These locations include:

1) Nearby villages such as Mamohela and Kasongo (1870a:[24]-[33], 1870i:XXIX);

2) North along the Lualaba River to Nyangwe and beyond (1870a:[24]-[33], [41]-[45]; 1870e:X; 1870h:XIX; 1870i:XXI, LIV-LV; also see the map on 1871a: [LXXVI v.2]);

3) Legaland and beyond to Lake Albert (1870a:[33]-[40]; 1870h:XVII; 1870i:XXIX-XXXI, LV [v.1]; also see the map on 1870f:[XIV v.2]);

4) Lubaland and Lunda to the south and southwest to Katanga (1870c:[I], 1870f: XIV [v.1], 1870i:XXI);

5) Ujiji and the central East African trading routes to Zanzibar (1870d:{21}-{22}; 1870e:XI; 1871b:LXXIX, LXXXI;

6) The areas north and northeast of Unyanyembe all the way to Buganda and Masaailand (1870f:[XIV v.2]; 1871b:LXXIX, LXXXI); and

7) Mecca and the Arabian Peninsula (1870i:XL, 1871b:LXXXIII).

In other words, despite being apparently stranded and isolated in Bambarre, Livingstone works with his informants to record information about vast swaths of Central and Eastern Africa and beyond.

From another perspective, the extraordinary geographical breadth of the information – which derives from Arab and African informants – positions Livingstone's diary as a unique record of non-Western knowledge circulation in Central Africa in 1870. However, this knowledge comes at a cost, as historians note: "the British exploration of Africa often occurred in collusion with gateway states" – such as Zanzibar – "that were themselves expansionist in intent" (Kennedy 2013:112, cf. 124). In Livingstone's case, this dynamic took the form of his close relationships with some of the Arab traders, as already described.

As a result, although Livingstone casts himself as a champion of African rights in the face of the Arab slave trade (cf. Kennedy 2013:201), the text of the 1870 Field Diary likewise complicates this positioning. Repeat references in the diary indicate that sometimes the local African populations respond favorably to Livingstone and recognize his intentions, but that at other times they refuse to make distinctions and are "outspoken in asserting [the] identity [of Livingstone and his attendants] with the cruel strangers" (Livingstone 1870e:XIII, 1870i:XLIII, cf. 1866-72:[652], Stanley 1878,2:79-80).

Moreover, this is not just a case of mistaken identity. Early on, Livingstone cites the role of his Nassicker attendants in taking slaves and in killing local inhabitants in imitation of the Arab traders (1870a:[55]-[62], 1870i:LIII), then later documents how the freed Banian slaves sent to Livingstone by John Kirk, the British political agent at Zanzibar, extend the Nassicker model of violence against locals (1871b:LXXXIV, 1871e:XCI-XCIV, CI). In each case, Livingstone candidly admits his guilt and complicity in helping to bring such violence to Central Africa, but either

justifies the decision (1870i:LII-LIV) or, as he does on the last page of the diary, attempts to assert his own innocence: "I am clear of blood guiltiness" (1871e:CI).

Yet Livingstone's decision to visit Central Africa – the first European to do so – and his extended sojourn in Bambarre also engender a unique transformation in his composition practices as a diarist. He beings to capture his observations about the local cultures at a level of depth and detail that distinguishes the 1870 Field Diary from the majority of the 20-odd other field diaries and notebooks that Livingstone kept on this final expedition to Africa.

In the nineteenth century, the presence of such information would have had a complex resonance with Livingstone's contemporaries. Its content would have satisfied professional expectations for ethnographic observations in the field, but Livingstone's heavy reliance on informants would have undermined the credibility of his geographical pronouncements (Kennedy 2013:132, 199, cf. 158).

Roughly speaking, the diary's presentation of such information bifurcates. Most predictably, the diary includes a variety of ad hoc observations. Livingstone, for instance, makes generalizations about the appearance of the population (1870a:[44]-[45]); he describes funeral rites (1870a:[1]-[6]); he discusses various religious beliefs in Manyema (1870i:XXVI); and he outlines agricultural practices (1870e:XII). Thanks to his medical background, Livingstone also includes notes on the presence of ailments, the use of local medicines, and the role of the traders in spreading STDs (e.g., 1870d:{19}-{21}, 1870e:X, 1870i:LXIII-LV).

At the same time, Livingstone makes a sustained effort to address bigger questions of society and history in Bambarre and Manyema more generally. The diary opens with a series of anecdotes about regional chiefs and elsewhere includes stories about the death of the oldest son of Moenekuss (the headman of Bambarre), and describes the habits of another regional headman, Merere, and his father (1870a:[7]-[12], 1870g:{29}-{30}, 1870i:XXVIII-XXIX).

Livingstone also devotes a fair amount of attention to the structure of Manyema villages and habitations, regional trading dynamics (a topic to which he will return at length in the 1871 Field Diary), and local systems of justice (1870a:{43}-{45}, {63}-{70}; 1870j:LXVII-LXVIII). Most interestingly, at one point Livingstone develops an annotated genealogy of the house of Charura, a deceased African headman, to which genealogy he, Livingstone, later returns to provide additional detail (1870k:LXXII, 1871b:LXXXII).

Such diverse narrative gestures, collectively, serve to portray Bambarre and the surrounding area as a vibrant regional location, one filled with diverse and clearly differentiated individuals, linked by a complex set of social dynamics and relationships, driven by motivations that Livingstone may not understand fully but that – the 1870 Field Diary shows – he gradually begins to recognize and delineate. In other words, the 1870 Field Diary captures a complicated local universe in Central Africa that – whether Livingstone intends it or not – stands alongside (and whose nuances exceed) the more ideologically-driven pronouncements of victimization that the diary elsewhere projects upon it.

Indeed, close critical attention to this universe shows forces at play that undermine any narrative of victimization that Livingstone might try to impose. These forces take the form of active and sustained resistance by the local African populations to the Arab traders, their followers, and, ultimately, Livingstone himself.

Most obviously, this occurs at the level of interpersonal and intercultural interaction. It is no secret that the local populations in Manyema resent the arrival of the Arabs, as in the case of the Bira ethnic group who, notes Livingstone, "are now enraged at seeing Ujijians pass into their ivory field" (1870a:[69]).

This anger translates into multiple skirmishes with the Arab traders. One example gives a sense of the whole: "Moenemokia killed 2 Arab agents & took their guns [...] Elsewhere they made regular preparation to have a fight with Dugumbe's people just to see who was strongest. They with their spears & wooden shields or the Arabs with what in derision they called tobacco pipes (guns)[.] They killed eight or nine Arabs" (1870a:[59], [61]-[62]; cf. 1870i:XXXVIII). The local populations not only resist the Arab traders, but kill them and their followers, and, notably, capture their firearms. Elsewhere the locals also apply more subtle warfare tactics, such as setting Arab camps on fire at night (1870i:XXXI).

Later history would show such tactics to be ineffective in the face of the growing and ever more aggressive Arab trade plus the organizational skills of Tippu Tip. However, the 1870 Field Diary captures the effects of the resistance strategies at a moment when the future remains undecided. On one hand, the local populations succeeds in evoking fear and drawing respect from the traders: "The Mamohela horde is becoming terrified [-] Every party going to trade has lost three or four men and the last foray lost ten and saw that the Manyema can fight" (1870i:XXXIV, cf. XXXI).

On the other, Livingstone's diary tracks the increasing skill of the local populations in engaging in a different kind of warfare, as in the case of the Merere, a local headman and descendant of Charura. In a brief narrative included near the end of the 1870 Field Diary, Merere first turns against the Arabs, killing one and robbing several others "of all they had," but then apparently repents of his behavior and indicates that he will "repay all loses" (1871b:LXXX).

More interesting, however, is Livingstone's representation of Merere's personal disposition in these proceedings: "He looks as if insane & probably is so" (1871b:LXXX). Livingstone describes Merere as a cipher, an individual whose actions exceed Livingstone's abilities to assess and definitively characterize them from a putatively rational perspective.

In other words, the local populations in the vicinity of Bambarre begin to cultivate indeterminate, unpredictable behavior as a strategy of war alongside more open physical

violence. The 1870 Field Diary's running commentary on the cannibalism ~~of the population~~ at Bambarre best ~~instantiates this dynamic.~~

In the diary and, ~~indeed,~~ in other documents from this period, Livingstone makes repeat references to his fear that the people of Bambarre are cannibals. For example, the diary opens with a discussion of ~~local~~ cannibalism in relation to funeral practices (1870a:[1]-[6]), and, later, Livingstone offers a genealogy of the practice by linking it to the ~~local~~ practice of eating sokos (i.e., gorillas) (1870c:IV).

Yet such definitive statements ~~also~~ stands alongside more tentative assertions. ~~In one case,~~ Livingstone opens his letter to Lord Stanley by describing Manyema as the country of "the *reputed* cannibals" (1870i:XLI, emphasis added). ~~In another, he~~ notes that the population now engages in the practice in secret because of the manifest disgust of the traders (1870k:LXXV).

~~In other words~~, Livingstone indicates that his characterizations may be based more on hearsay than the direct observation requisite for the professional practice of Victorian-era exploration. Such references ~~thus undercut the apparently more definitive assertions made elsewhere~~ and, collectively, introduce an irreducible strand of ambiguity into the narrative of the 1870 Field Diary. ~~Ultimately, it is an ambiguity that~~ Livingstone himself foregrounds.

When discussing the population of Bambarre just prior to ~~his departure~~ – i.e., ~~at the moment where~~ his information ~~would be expected to be~~ most accurate due to his long sojourn in village – he ~~on one page~~ states that "their cannibalism is doubtful" only to reverse himself ~~four pages~~ later by indicating that he locals are "undoubtedly cannibals" (1871b:LXXXIII, LXXXVII). ~~In the~~ 1870 Field Diary, ~~Livingstone~~ never resolves such contradictions. Rather, he leaves the people of Bambarre and heads for Nyangwe, where he ~~turns~~ his remaining iron gall ink and one of the last sets of writing paper available to him – a copy of *The Standard* – to compose the 1871 Field Diary ~~(1871f)~~.

*

When Livingstone ~~turned to revising his experiences for the Unyanyembe Journal~~, he collected the many reference to cannibalism ~~in the 1870 Field Diary~~ into a single longer passage and conflated them with ~~the general violence in the region~~ (1866-72:[646]-[648]). Horace Waller, in turn, ~~in~~ producing the text of the *Last Journals* (1874) kept most of the 1870 Field Diary references intact.

~~However~~, Waller considerably dampened the immediacy, fragmentary nature, and unresolved tensions of the ~~original~~ diary by tampering with the text, by combining it with that of the journal, and by introducing a series of extra-textual digressions (1874,2:52, 55, 61, 62, 63-64, 65, 86-87, 88, 89-92, 94-95, 108). In doing so, Waller undermined a key dimension of the 1870 Field Diary by dismantling, at the discursive level, one of the diary's most radical innovations.

~~Waller, in short,~~ – as ~~did~~ Livingstone ~~in the Unyanyembe Journal~~ – chose to prioritize a narrative of victimization over the representation of an intricate Central African universe whose differentiated actors could not only evolve as individuals, but also develop nuanced methods of resistance that combined brute force with sophisticated psychological strategies:

[M]y long detention in Manyema leads me to believe that they are truly a bloody people - cold blooded murders are frightfully common and they say that but for our presence they would ^ be still more frequent - They have no fear of spears and shields - guns alone frighten them – they tell us frankly and quite truly that but for our firearms not one of us should ever return to his country (1871b:LXXXIII).

Such passages, omitted from both the Unyanyembe Journal and *Last Journals* and silenced till now, show unflinchingly rebellious local populations ~~starkly at odds~~ with more common Victorian representations and underscore that editions such as this one embody only an initial step in a full-scale historical reassessment of the manuscript record of exploration.

First Author's Note

This essay is dedicated to Justin Livingstone, for whom I have made the paragraphs a little longer.

Works Cited