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, invididuals, 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, ultimatley, 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 segement to focus on his impressions as he traveled between Bambarre and Nyangw, 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.