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Abstract

This paper examines a particular social practice that attracted attention from visitors to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Caribbean: enslaved footmen accompanying white riders on horseback, often seeking to keep up by holding onto the horses’ tails. Referred to here as ‘master-horse-slave’, this is interpreted as a ‘hybrid co-mobility’ (or co-present mobility involving humans and animals). The paper argues that master-horse-slave was a manifestation of slavery as everyday social practice. More broadly, the paper argues for the importance of practices of mobility as significant features of Caribbean slave societies and the place of animals in these.
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Introduction

In the early nineteenth-century, William Holland (1757-1815) produced a series of prints satirising contemporary society in the British West Indies. ‘Taking a ride’ is one of two graphic vignettes from West India Fashionables (figure 1). The foreground shows five human subjects (two white riders and three black pedestrians, presumably intended to be enslaved) and two animal subjects (both horses) moving together. In the lead, a white West Indian gentleman rides a horse, ahead of an attendant. His wife sits side-saddle on a second horse, which a man leads by its bridle while another follows in her horse’s wake. The image is a satirical representation of elite West Indian society in particular, as evident in the ludicrously large hat worn by the planter, a motif that recurs in other Holland cartoons such as A West India Sportsman.\(^1\) Another feature that stands out is how two of the black men hold on to the horses’ tails. This is an unusual and comic action to which particular attention is drawn because each figure also carries a cut branch to swat flies, which the horses are unable to do in these circumstances.

This image is a satire based on the difference of West Indian creole society from metropolitan norms and thus part of a wider body of work that includes other Holland-published caricatures such as those featuring Johnny Newcome.\(^2\) Yet, it also illustrates a particular social practice that attracted the attention not only of caricaturists but of visitors to the Caribbean in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries – specifically, the sight of enslaved footmen accompanying whites on horseback, often seeking to keep up by holding onto the horses’ tails. This can be understood as a form of ‘co-mobility’ (or co-present mobility) involving free whites and enslaved blacks that accounts suggested was a common
sight in the Caribbean. In this paper, I employ the shorthand ‘master-horse-slave’ to describe this arrangement, a term designed to emphasise the conjunction of its three main human and non-human elements, the relations of power between them (specifically of master over mount and enslaved attendant) and to stress that it should be read as a unit. Writing of the ‘horse/man unit’, Elizabeth Atwood Lawrence notes that this is a ‘clear example of the power which resides in the structural arrangement of certain carefully chosen components and the force which can result when that image stands in a particular relation to society’. Similarly, this paper is concerned with the forms of domination articulated and expressed by master-horse-slave. While this may appear far removed from the brutalities of chattel slavery in the Caribbean, it is nevertheless an example of what Saidiya Hartman terms a ‘scene of subjection’, demonstrating how extreme forms of domination could reside in mundane and quotidian practices where ‘terror can hardly be discerned’ but is nonetheless present. Or, to put it another way, master-horse-slave is not just a practice that occurred in some slave societies, but a particular manifestation of slavery as an everyday social practice. I am also interested in considering how this practice became a focus for the expression of critical voices about West Indian society, although not necessarily antislavery sentiment. Beyond these substantive arguments, this paper seeks to make broader points about the importance of practices of mobility as significant features of Caribbean slave societies and the place of animals in these.

**Interpreting (Human-Animal) Mobilities**

In order to interpret master-horse-slave, it is viewed, firstly, as an example of mobility and, secondly and more specifically, as a ‘hybrid’ practice involving animals and humans. In recent years, ‘mobility’ has emerged as an important concept across the humanities and social sciences. It encompasses both the large-scale movements of people, objects, capital and
information, but also everyday micro-practices. Tim Cresswell uses ‘mobility’ not only to refer to the brute facts of physical movement – that is how and where things move – but, crucially, also how such movements are represented and how they are experienced. In practice, the elements of mobility are not easy separate out. Nevertheless, disentangling them serves a useful, analytical purpose and this three-fold conceptualisation will structure the body of this article. While much of the work on mobility has focused on late twentieth- and twenty-first-century mobilities, mobility (and immobility, of course) were integral to the Caribbean slave societies of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

This paper is concerned with how certain bodily mobilities were focal points for the imposition, demonstration and maintenance of racialized power, as well as its subversion and contestation. Master-horse-slave was one focal point, an example of a co-mobility that saw different forms of meaningful movement come together or rely on one another. Master-horse-slave is a particular type of co-mobility, however, in that it involves a non-human. Animals in general, and horses as a privileged type of animal, occupied an important place in Caribbean slave societies, but one that has been often overlooked. Juliet Clutton-Brock notes that horses have ‘nearly always been perceived as different from other livestock: they are treated as individual animals rather than as part of a herd or a flock’. In slave societies, this served to narrow their difference from enslaved people in the social and ideological hierarchy: often named, they appeared along with mules and cattle in estate inventories alongside human chattel as part of the ‘stock’. In more metaphorical terms too, comparisons been animals and enslaved humans were a common means of reflecting on relations of power and domination in the eighteenth century.

There is now a substantial and growing body of work on horses and other animals in history. Some of the most recent and challenging work in this field, undertaken under the sign of the ‘animal turn’, contests the anthropocentrism of most historical scholarship. For
example, Ann Norton Greene has considered horses as beings with ‘historical agency [that] lies in the substance of their existence, the physical power they produced, and the role of that power in shaping material and social arrangements’. Similarly, Sandra Swart asserts that what she playfully terms ‘horsetory’ is a project that parallels earlier efforts to write histories ‘from below’: the ‘history of horses can be to some extent compared to that of oppressed social groups/the subaltern’. At the same time, however, Swart acknowledges that ‘horses have been the adored animals of the colonising elite and certainly instrumental, if not critical, in the process of colonisation and oppression’. As Ann Norton Greene explains, the horse is ‘primarily an elite animal’ in human societies and ‘the utility and physical power of horses reinforced other kinds of power – aristocratic, military, political, sexual, religious’. This was certainly the case in Caribbean slave societies and master-horse-slave served to express and reinforce racialized domination over enslaved people. This was as well as the more utilitarian functions that horses played. While drawing on work on horses and equines more broadly, however, I do not intend to pursue the more radical implications of the animal turn for the study of slavery here, particularly for notions of agency and resistance. Instead, I will pursue a more limited agenda of considering how the conjunction of different forms of mobility, particularly riding and walking, could serve as a means of oppression in Caribbean slave societies, but also engender more critical responses.

Finally, a word on sources: most work on mobilities has focused on the present day and the methods employed are often ethnographic. With historical research, other approaches and sources are needed, crucially those that provide accounts of everyday practices. For this reason, key sources include accounts by visitors that are attentive to the peculiarities of West Indian societies and rich in detail, as well as a semi-fictional novel such as Marly, and various forms of visual imagery. The latter, as with figure 1, are interpreted here as discursive fabrications that make meaning, but also as illustrations – albeit idealised or satirical ones –
of everyday life in the Caribbean. Although the paper seeks to make a broader argument about master-horse-slave, the focus of this paper are the British West Indian colonies in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, particularly Jamaica and Barbados.

In the remainder of this paper I will examine master-horse-slave in the light of Cresswell’s three-fold approach to mobility – in terms of brute facts, representations and experiences. I will start with some descriptions of this co-mobility and situate it within a wider context of horses and horse riding in Caribbean slave societies. I will then linger on the cultural meanings associated with master-horse-slave. Finally, I examine how it was experienced by the human subjects involved. While there are no accounts from the perspective of the enslaved attendants, some insights can nevertheless be drawn.

**Brute Facts: Horse Riding in the West Indies**

Accounts of master-horse-slave in the Caribbean are not limited to caricature. Writing in the early nineteenth century, one anonymous visitor observed that ‘[w]hen a West India gentlemen rides out on horseback, he is usually followed by a negro, who runs after him with surprising swiftness; unwearied, he pursues, nor stops till he helps his master to alight’. Similarly, Daniel McKinnen, who visited Barbados in 1802, wrote:

You meet in the roads and avenues of the town riders in loose linen dresses and broad-brimmed umbrella hats, their horses gently ambling or pacing; a black running footman, perhaps with his hand twisted in the horse’s tail, following; and a distance of twelve or fourteen miles is a journey of no inconsiderable exertion for the day.

McKinnen drew particular attention to the sight of enslaved attendants holding on to horses’ tails, as did John Waller, who described this as ‘frequent all over the West Indies’. The interest in this practice may have partly stemmed from the concurrent trend in Britain to dock
the tails of horses. Indeed, the prevalence of accounts of master-horse-slave suggests both its widespread nature and the curiosity engendered by differences between British and West Indian equine cultures. As another British visitor, Frederic William Naylor Bayley, wrote:

no one ever thinks of riding in the West Indies, even on horseback, without taking a boy with him, to hold his horse when he alights. The unfortunate mortal chosen for this service, is obliged to keep up with his master, however fast he may go; and when the latter quickens his pace, he generally holds on by the horse’s tail. – The trio, on such occasions, that is to say, the master, the servant, and the horse, form a most ludicrous picture, and one that Cruikshank himself would not find unworthy of illustration.

While neither Isaac nor George Cruikshank may have illustrated this co-mobility, it was deemed worthy by contemporary caricaturists – witness figure 1 – with accounts such as McKinnen’s *A tour through the British West Indies* possibly forming the basis for the illustration.

Scenes of white riding and black running recur in many descriptions of the region from the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries. From these, general comments can be made about master-horseslave. Notwithstanding figure 1, it appears that this was a male activity, riding in the saddle being ‘an uncommon circumstance for a Creole lady’ who tended instead to travel in carriages. Their attendants were also male, typically adolescents or ‘boys’. Representing the West Indian equivalent of the running footmen who accompanied the carriages of wealthy personages in Britain, their more common role was probably as grooms or stable boys. Master-horse-slave was not necessarily seen a specifically British phenomenon. For example, the anonymous author of *Sketches and recollections of the West Indies* travelled around Dominica by horse. He and a companion were ‘attended by two negro servants on foot, carrying supplies of linen and clothes’, which
he described as a French custom. Nor was this practice limited to the period of slavery. For example, writing of his mounted tour round Trinidad in the mid-1850s, Charles William Day had ‘as a guide a trustworthy, clever, coloured man, on foot’.

Master-horse-slave was a particular co-mobility that existed within a wider set of practices and relations involving horses, other animals and riding in Caribbean slave societies and the broader Atlantic world. Horses were an integral part of plantation societies. In the Jamaican case, they were either bred locally in the island’s pens or brought from elsewhere in the region, usually Cuba. The price of the former was £50-100 in the early nineteenth century, whereas Cuban horses were cheaper at £30-50. Horses were also imported from North America and Britain, though these were considered to be less ‘hardy’ than those bred in the region. Whereas horses were usually ridden, mules were employed to take off the crop from the fields, transport hogsheads to the wharf and so on, while cattle were mainly used in the mill. Horses were also part of the ‘carceral landscape’ of Caribbean slave societies. Managers and overseers would use them on the estate, enhancing their mobility and ability to survey the landscape and dominate standing figures (see figure 2; note also the two mules employed to take the cut cane to the mill). Horses were also used to catch runaways and employed by militia units to intimidate enslaved people and put down insurrections.

Horses were central to how white West Indians moved around, ridden ‘when occasion requires a white man’s attendance at a distance’ (though the use of carriages was more common in urban areas or in flatter terrain). Horse riding was a feature of everyday life for white West Indians. For example, Richard Robert Madden wrote that each day elite and
middling Jamaican whites would take ‘an hour’s exercise in the cool of the morning on horseback’. Riding was also part of white leisure activities, whether visiting neighbouring estates, taking rides to altitude to escape the stifling heat or undertaking more substantial trips such as ‘marooning parties’, which involved leaving the beaten track to visit local sites of interest.

The importance of horses in West Indian colonial life grew with the introduction of horse racing. Flat-racing became a national sport in Britain in the second half of the eighteenth century, while steeplechasing originated at the end of the century. Racing was closely associated with horse-breeding, particularly of the Thoroughbred, which had developed following the importation of Oriental stallions for crossing with English mares in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Horseracing spread to Britain’s West Indian colonies by the last quarter of the eighteenth century and was soon very popular, not least because of the opportunities it offered for gambling. The activity was also encouraged by the colonial authorities because it fostered the import of horses from Britain. For example, a 1794 Act passed by the Jamaican Assembly offered a prize for races in each county and by the early nineteenth century horse races were taking place across the island.

Visitors to the West Indies noted that racehorses were usually ridden by black, presumably enslaved, jockeys. That these enslaved ‘race boys’ attracted comment points to something deeper: enslaved people did not normally ride horses. Soon after he had arrived in Barbados, Pinckard asked two enslaved girls whether they rode when travelling from far their estate. Their response illustrates the general pattern:

They both smiled, and hung down their heads, looking to the ground. No reply could have been more expressive, nor better understood. – ‘Ride! a slave ride! you are strangers here indeed! No, we walked, bore our burden on our backs, and journied on our naked feet!’
Saddle horses were elite animals and enslaved people did not normally ride them. More generally, enslaved people were not permitted to keep horses, as the colonial authorities saw this as being ‘attended with many and great mischiefs’. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that free and enslaved people worked in quite distinct animal milieux. While white West Indians used horses for work (and leisure), the lives of enslaved people were more entwined with mules and cattle, although they were not permitted to own these either. Enslaved people were tasked with using these animals to power the mill, to move wood or cut cane around the estate and to transport provisions or cart hogsheads for shipping. When they did ride, it was on mules, not horses. Those enslaved people who did come into contact with saddle horses, did so as grooms or – as in master-horse-slave – running attendants.

**Nobility, Mastery and Absurdity**

Having sketched out the brute facts of master-horse-slave, let me turn to some of the cultural meanings associated with this co-mobility. Routine practices such as riding to visit friends, as well as stabling the horses of visitors and lending them fresh mounts, were part of a culture of racially-circumscribed hospitality that bound white West Indians together and also served to incorporate European visitors. Simultaneously, the prescribed nature of horse ownership and riding, as well as the place of horses within the carceral landscape, indicates that the meaning of horse riding must be understood in the context of racially unequal colonial slavery. Indeed, what Swart says of colonial Southern Africa is also valid for the Caribbean:

> Horses offer a particularly potent symbol, linked with power and ethnic iconography. Narratives of breed were constructed in which conceptions of human difference (class, race, national character) were projected onto the
horses and they were then used as vehicles to promote a sense of self-respect (through wealth, class and ethnicity). The cultural meanings of horse riding were heightened when – as in the case of master-horse-slave – rider and non-rider were co-present, racially different and when the latter was the personal property of the former. The difference in height, the ability of the rider to look down on figures on the ground, and size and mass of the horse all served to physically signify a relation of dominance. The whip, a prime symbol of both slavery and dominion over animals, further reinforced this chain of associations. Hence, master-horse-slave was not just a reflection of white power and privilege, but a means through which these were articulated and reinforced. Moreover, the ownership and riding of horses were also associated with high status and political authority in many West African societies, while their care was left to enslaved people. In consequence, it is not unreasonable to presume that the meaning of master-horse-slave would have also been evident to some enslaved people brought from West Africa.

The cultural significance of riding in the West Indies was clearly evident in contrast with walking. White pedestrians were unusual in the West Indies and those who walked any distance attracted comment. Pinckard, for example, surprised local whites in Barbados with the extent of the walks that he and his British companions made:

Cleghorn and myself frequently make excursions on shore, and stroll about the town and the field, by way of exercise, and of gratifying the strong curiosity which we feel to see and know all that appertains to the change we have made. In these ramblings, we often surprize the West Indians, by, what they term, the dangerous extent of our walks; and they assure us that, a few months hence, we shall be little inclined to use such violent exercise. A walk
of five or six miles appears to them tremendous: but we suffer no inconvenience from it.  

As these comments suggest, the avoidance of outdoors walking by whites was usually attributed to the heat and fatigue associated with the Caribbean climate and thus part of wider ideas about the capacities of different ‘races’ to undertake strenuous efforts in region.  

There was also a social stigma associated with walking, as apparent from the novel *Marly*. The eponymous protagonist, newly arrived in Jamaica from Britain to work as a bookkeeper, is unable to acquire a horse initially and cannot accompany the other white men on his estate on their shooting trips. This is because…

…no disgrace being considered so great in the island, as that of a white man being seen walking on foot when away from his home. No person does it, but such have forfeited their character and situation, and who, in consequence, are styled walking buckras, a name, synonymous to beggar, coupled with that of vagabond.  

The term ‘walking buckra’ is similar to ‘walkandnyam’, which Madden described as ‘a very significant negroism for a white man who has the sin of poverty and pedestrianism to answer for in Jamaica’.  

Both terms were used by enslaved people to refer to individuals of European descent who had fallen from, or failed to live up to white standards, something that points to the cultural significance of horse riding not only for white West Indians but also across society as a whole. To resolve his physical immobility, unwilling as he is to be viewed as a ‘walking buckra’ by the enslaved people over whom he is supposed to have mastery, Marly buys a horse. For this fictionalised figure, as well as his real-life equivalents, the horse enables the bookkeeper to move around on business, visit other estates and share in the racially-circumscribed culture of hospitality in the Caribbean. It also, literally, alters his position with regard to the enslaved people he encounters. Moreover, Marly’s decision to
purchase an expensive horse on credit – he spends £70, which is more than his annual salary – allows him to join the cavalry militia.\textsuperscript{56} This further propels him up Jamaica’s social hierarchy and enables him, partly through feats of horsemanship, to become accepted as a gentleman.\textsuperscript{57}

The manner in which master-horse-slave articulated social norms about movement in slave societies is confirmed by the cultural charge evident in exceptions to this arrangement from the same period. Consider, for example, one of the earliest images of Toussaint Louverture, an anonymous engraving that depicts him on a rearing cavalry horse, sabre aloft (figure 3). Commanding and confident, this is the leader of the Haitian Revolution as a terrifying vision of mounted, vengeful Jacobinism. The same motif recurs in Denis Volozan’s equestrian portrait of Louverture.\textsuperscript{58} Those few contemporary instances where people of African descent are shown riding are striking because they contest the dominant association between whiteness and equestrianism.\textsuperscript{59} (A more recent example from popular culture that plays on the insurgent potential of this pairing would be Quentin Tarantino’s 2012 film \textit{Django Unchained}.)

\textbf{[Insert Figure 3 here]}

In general, master-horse-slave articulated dominant relations between power and mobility, with two representational logics simultaneously in play: the rider and his steed ahead of the enslaved attendant (‘nobility’), and the rider elevated above both horse and slave (‘mastery’). Nobility turned on the analogous status of (white) master and horse, an animal routinely described as noble.\textsuperscript{60} In many human societies, horses, which were costly to buy and keep, were ‘symbols of social status and ruling power…regarded as the natural aristocrats of the animal world that represented what the natural order of the human realm
should be’. For the equine painter George Stubbs (1724-1806), for instance, horses articulated social order. Emulating metropolitan norms, West Indian planters sought to acquire and maintain fine horses. John Stewart estimated that a wealthy Jamaican planter with a family of 10-12 members would have ‘a coach and one or two covered gigs or one horse chaises, and fifteen or twenty horses and mules, with their proper attendants, &c. The equipage and horses, &c. may be worth about two thousand pounds sterling’. In owning horses, along with a large number of enslaved domestics, and commissioning paintings of their estates that included horses, white planters articulated their social elevation. Hence, horse ownership and riding brought social prestige and served as markers of social distinction, as did service in the mounted colonial militia.

A second discourse expressed by master-horse-slave was that of mastery. Here, the analogous status of horse and enslaved person came to the fore. The relationship between master and horse served as a model for slavery, with the ‘natural’ and biblically-sanctioned dominion of man over beast mapped on to that between racially-defined groups. The whip served as a common accessory in these mutually-reinforcing hierarchies. Alternatively, the horse/man could represent an idealisation of slavery. The rider’s control over, and care for, a dumb but powerful beast mirrored the paternalistic command of the supposedly ideal planter. These two elements of mastery – dominion and paternalism – came together in notions of ‘improvement’, good husbandry and enlightened estate management that were articulated in the West Indies from the late eighteenth century.

Though related, the discourses of nobility and mastery had distinct emphases. For example, each was related to different notions of ‘breeding’. When applied to elite white figures as part of a discourse of nobility, this articulated ideas of heredity and lineage, as well as good manners and politeness. Horse breeds such as the Thoroughbred served as a symbol for white nobility. Yet breeding also evoked the dehumanisation and mastery of enslaved
Africans and their treatment as part of an estate’s stock. Here the link between ‘race’ and ‘species’ was to the fore. Another manifestation concerned the mule, the offspring of a male donkey and a female horse, which has been posited as the etymological origin of ‘mulatto’. While some scholars have posited this as a historical invention by Edward Long among others, who claimed that ‘mulattoes’ were sterile like mules, this nonetheless speaks to the place of equine discourses in slave societies.66

The articulation of nobility and mastery through horses is evident in the work of the British artist, James Hakewill (1778-1843), who was engaged by Jamaican planters to present ‘idyllic views of plantation slavery’ in the early nineteenth century.67 Horses were a common element in his work. Consider, for example, his painting of the mortuary monument to merchant Thomas Hibbert, which stood at the top of a hill near Agualta Vale Penn in St. Mary’s parish (figure 4).

[Insert Figure 4 here]

The image shows a white gentleman, perhaps Thomas Hibbert, nephew of the deceased, gesturing to the monument, while looking at a black attendant, presumably enslaved, who holds the reins of the his horse. Two small dogs are at the white man’s feet. In discussing the painting, Vincent Brown draws attention to the central place of the human figures:

The relationship between the master and the slave anchors the social meaning of the monument. The master, directing the slave’s attention to the monument, compels him to note the prominence of the dead slaveholder, while the intimacy of the figures in the image allows a viewer to believe that the black man might respect or even appreciate the dominance of such men.68
Yet, the horse too is integral to the meaning. The dark colours of the horse’s coat, mane and tail mirror the top hat and frockcoat of the white man. These noble and elegant figures dominate the diminutive white-clad attendant who stands in the centre. Yet, simultaneously, horse and servant stand apart from the gentleman, separated both by space and the horsewhip he carries. Meanwhile, his left hand points to monument, the visual counterpart to the pen in the valley below, which denotes his dominion over the land and its inhabitants, human and non-human alike.\textsuperscript{69} Thus, Hakewill’s painting depicts the elements of master-horse-slave – albeit in dismounted form – and the relations of power between them (and without the satire of figure 1).

While the preceding discussion of the forms of cultural meaning associated with master-horse-slave has largely focused on the articulation of social status (nobility) and the projection of domination (mastery), this form of co-mobility could also attract criticism and even dissent, especially from non-Caribbean observers, not least because it was such a clear articulation of racialized power. As evident in a number of the descriptions of master-horse-slave cited earlier, remarks about its absurd nature were common. For example, J. A. Waller wrote that:

\begin{quote}
In the course of this ride, I noticed for the first time a custom very prevalent here, and which to a European appears ridiculous. The negro slaves that accompanied us, took hold of our horses’ tails, to keep up with us. This is frequent all over the West Indies; and I have been surprised to see how and how far they would travel, thus assisted.\textsuperscript{70}
\end{quote}

Significantly, Waller’s account focuses on the tail-holding, a feature that is also satirised in ‘Taking a ride’ (figure 1) and Bayley’s comments about this ‘most ludicrous picture’.\textsuperscript{71} A sketch in the journal of Major John B. Colthurst, a British Special Magistrate who served in Barbados in the mid-1830s, also fixes on the absurd nature of this triad to outsiders (figure 5).
In ‘Sergeant Redshanks moving to muster’, the gap between the self-importance of lower
class whites (‘red legs’ or ‘redshanks’ in Barbados) and the reality of their social condition –
as evident in the tattered uniform and the bare lower leg – is the focus of Colthurst’s satire. It
further confirms the social significance of riding, even if ‘Sergeant Redshanks’ can only
afford a nag to raise him above his follower and uses a bayonet instead of a horsewhip. Yet,
the comically absurd nature of this ensemble also stems from how the accompanying figure
(an apprentice?) holds the horse’s tail, transforming the three figures – especially in eyes of
an ex-soldier like Colthurst – into a ludicrous six-legged, three-headed unit of military
incompetence.

[Insert Figure 5 here]

**Comfort and Malaise**

While the turn to satire was a common response to master-horse-slave among most
metropolitan observers, it engendered stronger forms of criticism from others. For example,
of his visit to Antigua in early 1796, Francis Baily wrote that:

> scarcely any person goes to a place where he expects to stop without his slave
to take care of the horse; and this slave must not ride, but run behind, and keep
up as well as he can: sometimes he may be indulged by his master’s suffering
him to lay hold of the horse’s tail. In this manner I have several times seen
negroes following their master, not unusually with the whip in their hand to
save him the trouble of carrying it. I have often thought, when I have been
witness to this ludicrous scene, that the master deserved the whip much more
than the poor beast.\(^7\)
Baily’s comments are unusually forceful but also capture the power relations and ideological force at the heart of master-horse-slave, not least by highlighting the central place of the whip and the (intentional?) ambiguity of ‘poor beast’. Usually such critical comments accompanied the expression of sympathy towards the attendants’ physical exertions, especially in contrast with the ease of the rider. When the observer was also a rider, however, this could provoke intense feelings of discomfort and awkwardness. In this section, I turn to what is the most difficult aspect of master-horse-slave to capture: the experience for the human subjects involved. Considering this aspect of the co-mobility is an important supplement to examining its cultural meanings, not least because of possible tensions between the two. Most significantly for my purposes, the experience of master-horse-slave often formed the basis for the most critical comments, usually via sympathetic identification with the attendants, as in Baily’s account.

From the perspective of local whites, horse riding – even if it was a locus of social status and domination – could be unpleasant. As the long-time resident of Jamaica, John Stewart, put it:

TRAVELLING in Jamaica is infinitely less pleasant than in England, and other temperate climes, and finely embellished countries of Europe. Here the sun blazes so intensely, and the whole atmosphere is so heated with his sultry beams, that travelling on horse-back at mid-day, and at particular times of the year, is absolutely insufferable, even to a person seasoned and accustomed to the climate.\(^{73}\)

The unpleasant aspects of riding in the West Indies help to explain the practical reasons why enslaved footmen were used in the first place: by assisting with mounting and dismounting, attending the horse when the rider had got down, as well as guiding strangers, attendants helped to make riding a less trying experience.\(^{74}\)
In considering the experience of master-horse-slave from the perspective of the enslaved attendant, we are hampered by a lack of direct sources. Nevertheless, it is possible to surmise about some aspects, such as the experience of someone on foot being loomed over by a horseman (figure 2) or being required to walk or run for miles in the heat of the day. Similarly, standing or running behind a horse would not only have been a smelly and unpleasant experience, because horses can and do defecate while being ridden, but a dangerous one due to their potentially lethal back-kick. Beyond such suppositions, there are also accounts produced by white observers that claim to capture the experience of running footmen (itself an effect of power, of course). Some observers assumed that they were untroubled by the physical exertion involved. Stewart, for example, claimed that ‘a negro, who is hardier, more robust and better accustomed to this kind of exercise, will walk thirty miles in a day with ease’. Such comments were based on a racialized understanding of people of African descent chimed with the broader attitudes of West Indian slaveholders. Indeed, apologists often described the benefits of slavery in terms of the bodily ease enjoyed by enslaved people. In contrast, metropolitan visitors were more likely to find the experience of master-horse-slave troubling. The best source here is George Pinckard’s *Notes on the West Indies*. Describing journeys he made with white West Indian gentlemen in Barbados in the 1790s, Pinckard provides another account of master-horse-slave:

> We were attended by slaves as running footmen, whose duty it was to travel as fast as we did, and to be in readiness to hold the bridles, or stand at the horses’ heads, at any spot where we might chance to alight, or to pause. They were equal in number to our horses, but as we were unaccustomed both to running footmen, and to slaves, we had strong feelings of compunction respecting these pedestrian pages; and from seeing them run, and pant, and broil, exposed to the mid-day heat of a tropical sun, merely for our ease and
pleasure, it became so painfully annoying to us that we lost all sense of
comfort and enjoyment.\textsuperscript{79}

Pinckard was a British doctor who accompanied Abercromby’s military expedition to the
West Indies in the mid-1790s. His account of the region had much to say about the
(supposed) effects of the climate on different social and racial groups. Here it conveys a
sense of what it was like to be a running enslaved attendant, suffering in the heat of the sun as
they strove to keep up with the horse. Pinckard’s sympathy is clear, although his account
remains focused on their embodied experience – panting for breath, sweating in the heat – in
a way that leaves the footmen mute, much like the horse he rides. Moreover, any empathetic
feelings are replaced by Pinckard’s own feelings of guilt, an instance of how ‘European
accounts of slavery operate a stringently self-reflexive dynamics of suffering’ that usually
ends with the suffering of the observer rather than the enslaved.\textsuperscript{80}

Perhaps what makes the experience of master-horse-slave most troubling to
metropolitan visitors like Pinckard is not simply sympathy for the enslaved but the guilt that
arises from becoming part of master-horse-slave. In so doing, these visitors were
participating in what was a conspicuous act of slavery. This co-mobility was disturbing to
visitors because it brought together the slaveholders’ ease with enslaved effort, dramatizing
how the former relied on the latter. Moreover, unlike plantation labour, this enslaved effort
was not economically ‘productive’, but merely served to make the rider’s life a little more
comfortable and to demonstrate his power and status. Finally, this practice involved a non-
human ‘beast of burden’ and a human being who is treated in just this way, thus serving to
emphasise the inhumanity of slavery.

Visitors’ experiences of master-horse-slave were used to meditate on the difference in
the sensibilities of white Britons and white West Indians. Waller, for example, attributed
white creole indolence to more than the climate: ‘The climate, no doubt, contributes much to
their habits; but if there were no slaves...[white residents] would undoubtedly evince greater 
elasticity'.

Similarly, consider what Pinckard and his companions were told when they 
brought up their discomfort at this situation:

Upon our mentioning to the gentlemen of the island our uneasy feeling 
respecting these sable attendants, they smiled at our European tenderness, and 
assured us that so far from it being a fatigue or hardship to them, they always 
hailed such an excursion as a holiday, and preferred it to remaining quietly at 
home. We could not, for an instant, dispute the information; but from 
knowing that such violent exercise, under such excessive heat, must have been 
fatal to ourselves, and not being enough West Indians to know how very 
differently it affected the negroes, we could not regard them without suffering 
strong feelings of *mal-aise*.

Whilst the local white were comfortable with the situation, partly because of their racialized 
understanding of black endurance, the metropolitan visitors felt ‘*mal-aise*’ – literally bodily 
uneasiness and discomfort – at the unequal co-mobilities associated with Caribbean slavery. 
Such experiences and the more critical attitudes they might engender contrast with the self-
satisfied nobility and confident mastery provided by mounted elevation.

The discomfort that Pinckard and his companions felt can be related to a broader 
discourse about what marked white West Indian creoles out as *different* from metropolitan 
whites. This discourse became increasingly articulated with the rise of antislavery sentiment 
and the treatment of enslaved people worse than animals was seen by some to indicate a need 
for amelioration. However, it is also important to recognise that Pinckard’s account also 
suggested the possibilities for change in this experience. The white planters sought to 
reassure him and his companions that even if they were not ‘enough West Indians’ yet, they 
would be in time. Becoming a ‘creole’, being ‘creolised’, as Pinckard puts it elsewhere, was
a matter of both getting to ‘know…the negroes’ better and of becoming habituated to and comfortable with West Indian practices of mobility, including master-horse-slave. The comments of his hosts also indicate how local whites were habituated to this practice, giving no more thought to their enslaved attendants than they would to their equine mounts – and perhaps even far less.

Master-horse-slave was not simply a common form of mobility in the West Indies that carried and engendered certain cultural meanings, but a practice that was experienced in different ways by those involved. While local whites were accustomed to travelling in this way, even if riding could still be unpleasant, they certainly found more comfort than the running attendants who accompanied them. No records convey the experience of these enslaved footmen themselves, though the descriptions of panting and sweating figures give some sense of the associated fatigue, even if they also render these figures silent. Perhaps the most charged experiential element of master-horse-slave came when outsiders were asked to join in. In Pinckard’s account, the register shifted from the absurd sight of this co-mobility to the feelings of malaise it engendered.

Conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to examine master-horse-slave as a common feature of the British West Indies in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and to consider what this practice reveals about the everyday articulation of racial domination in Caribbean slave societies. In considering this triad, the paper has focused on a sight often remarked upon by visitors as something characteristically different about West Indian society. That it attracted comments points both to the oddness of this practice to metropolitan eyes and how it made visible the social inequalities associated with colonial slavery. This related both to the respective roles of rider and attendant, but also to the co-presence of the horse. Horses and
other animals were an integral part of British and West Indian life at the time, of course, but in slave societies where some human beings performed roles that animals would elsewhere, where some human beings were treated in ways similar to animals and where animalistic discourse was common, the place of animals was especially significant. The horse was a form of social capital in West Indian societies and a symbol of (white) mastery, as well as a means of transportation. Likewise, master-horse-slave was a social arrangement where the relations of power were clearly manifest in bodily interrelations and the cultural meanings associated with these.

In examining master-horse-slave, this paper has sought to take a different approach to the history of slavery, focusing not on social groups, institutions or laws, but on quotidian practices of movement, reading these as both expressing and – in this case – serving to reinforce dominant relations of racialized power. Inspired by work on mobility, the paper has examined this particular co-mobility in three ways: in terms of the brute facts of master-horse-slave, including how it was linked to wider patterns of horse ownership and other relations with animals; its representation in contrast to other forms of mobility and the wider discourses around it; and how master-horse-slave was experienced by the human subjects involved. In so doing, this paper has sought to throw a critical light on a common historical practice, but also to make an argument for the significance of mobility as a focus for future work on slave societies.

A particular challenge in examining such everyday practices and mobilities is to get at the perspectives of enslaved people. This is a far from unfamiliar challenge for historians of slavery, of course. Moreover, it should be noted that the use of denigrating terms such as ‘walking buckra’ demonstrates the cultural meanings associated with mobility among enslaved people. Their experiences are far harder to get at, though we might make some presumptions about what it might have meant for the attendants to have participated in this
tiring, unpleasant and even dangerous practice. The absence of these perspectives also makes it difficult to uncover resistance to master-horse-slave, something that has not been addressed here. Verene Shepherd notes that the ‘abuse and stealing of animals was a common means of sabotage used by those enslaved who worked closely with animals’ and perhaps some enslaved people sought to avoid a turn spent as part of a master-horse-slave arrangement by laming a horse, though the risks of punishment, especially if they were responsible for the horse’s care, would have been considerable. While clandestine acts of mistreatment and resistance could be identified, the more overtly threatening figure of the black rider – a direct challenge to master-horse-slave – should not be overlooked either. Ultimately, though, master-horse-slave is a scene of subjection, not merely a reflection of Caribbean slavery but one of its many instantiations. Master-horse-slave is slavery.
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