

A Puzzle Revisited:
Historiographic and Documentary Problems
in the Journals of
Anthony Henday

Submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for
Masters of Arts,
University of Winnipeg/
University of Manitoba

Scott P. Stephen
5374346
Prof. Jennifer S.H. Brown
July 1997



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-52736-0

Canada

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

**A PUZZLE REVISITED:
HISTORIOGRAPHIC AND DOCUMENTARY PROBLEMS
IN THE JOURNALS OF ANTHONY HENDAY**

BY

SCOTT P. STEPHEN

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of
MASTER OF ARTS**

Scott P. Stephen 1997 (c)

**Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell
copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis
and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to Dissertations Abstracts International to publish
an abstract of this thesis/practicum.**

**The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor
extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.**



Franklin Arbuckle, R.C.A.,
"Henday Enters the Blackfoot Camp, 1754"
(HBCA Documentary Art Collection, P-415 (1951))

A Puzzle Revisited:
Historiographic and Documentary Problems
in the Journals of
Anthony Henday

PREFACE and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
<u>CHAPTER 1: Historiography and Hagiography of Anthony Henday</u>	1
The First Generation: Henday as Explorer (1885-1930) 1 Miller Christy (1885, 1894), Lawrence J. Burpee (1907, 1908, 1935), Agnes C. Laut (1908)	
The Second Generation: Henday as Social Scientist (1930-present) 8 Douglas MacKay (1936), Arthur S. Morton (1939), Clifford P. Wilson (1955), E.E. Rich (1958, 1967)	
The Third Generation: Henday as Symbol (1954-present) 13 James G. MacGregor (1954, 1966), Grant MacEwan (1975), Peter C. Newman (1985)	
The Fourth Generation: Henday as Text (1969-present) 17 Glyndwr Williams (1969, 1978), Barbara Belyea (1996)	
<u>CHAPTER 2: The Historical Context</u>	24
Tracing Anthony Henday's Origins 25	
Reconstructing Henday's Fur Trade Career 29	
Interpretations 45	
<u>CHAPTER 3: The Four Journals</u>	47
Journal A 47	
Journal B 56	
Journal C 61	
Journal D 63	
<u>CHAPTER 4: Questions of Voice</u>	66
James Isham as Editor 67	
Andrew Graham as Editor 70	
The <u>Observations</u> 73	
Re-evaluation of B, C, and D 75	

Anthony Henday as Editor	77
Re-evaluation of A	82
CONCLUSION	84
<u>APPENDIX A:</u>	89
"A Copie of orders and Instructions to Anthy Hende, upon a Journey in Land, Dated att York Fort, June 26 1754"	
<u>APPENDIX B:</u>	92
Henday's Correspondence to James Isham, 1754	
<u>APPENDIX C:</u>	94
Henday's Trade Goods, 1754-55	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95

PREFACE and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In June 1754, Anthony Henday of the Hudson's Bay Company left York Fort on an expedition which became the prototype for a new Company policy. For the next forty years, the Company battled its French and Canadian competitors by sending servants inland to winter with potential native customers and encourage them to trade at the Bay. Unfortunately, modern understanding of this period of fur trade history has been marred by a misunderstanding of the first of these York inlanders. After lingering a century and a half in obscurity, Anthony Henday has been recognized yet consistently misinterpreted by scholars of the twentieth century.

The chief obstacle to understanding Anthony Henday is a problem of too many texts authored by his associates, compounded by the absence of his own original journal. His experiences and accomplishments on his inland journey cannot be understood until the inconsistencies and contradictions among the four surviving versions of his journal are sorted out and explained. These journals are best labelled as 'versions' and not 'copies', since no one journal is an exact copy of another.

Our understanding of Henday has been further hampered by the fact that most scholars prior to the 1960s were unaware of the existence of all four versions. Henday's only editor, Lawrence J. Burpee, knew about only one of the versions, and was therefore unaware of the documentary problems surrounding it. Most subsequent scholars have not closely re-examined the primary documents of the period. The results have been self-perpetuating misunderstandings of Henday's experiences and his context, characterized primarily by simplistic and unsatisfactory explanations for the myriad textual difficulties presented.

Henday's field notes¹ have not survived. The earliest surviving version of his journal is a fair copy made by his superior, Governor James Isham, and sent to London as part of the York packet for 1755. The three other versions all appear in various volumes of Andrew Graham's *Observations on Hudson's Bay*, now residing in the Hudson's Bay

¹In anthropological terms, field notes are, quite simply, notes made in the field: on the spot recordings of a person's experiences and reactions to those experiences, without the benefit of sober second thought or contemplation.

Company Archives (Provincial Archives of Manitoba) in Winnipeg. The volumes HBCA E. 2/4 (1768-69), E. 2/6 (1767-69), and E. 2/11 (c. 1780-91) all contain versions of the journal which contradict the earliest version and each other. For simplicity, Glyndwr Williams labelled these manuscripts in the order listed above as A, B, C, and D, following their approximate chronological order of composition.¹ For the sake of continuity, this study uses those same terms.

This study re-examines all four journal versions on their own merits, with an eye to discerning their textual origins and interrelationships. It then re-assesses Henday's journey and its results, and ultimately Henday himself. It combines an historical approach with a textual emphasis, for it is the texts more than the history which are the source of the problem. The primary goal is to rediscover Henday's voice, if possible, disentangling it from the voice(s) of his editor(s). Complete success may be unattainable given the gaps in the evidence, but even partial success should help to unravel some of the mysteries surrounding Henday.

Such an approach will necessitate passing over some other questions of historical interest, such as Henday's exact geographical route, and whether he saw the Rocky Mountains. The identity of the "Earchithinue" he was sent to find is another conundrum.

¹Glyndwr Williams, "The Puzzle of Anthony Henday's Journal, 1754-55" *The Beaver* (Winter 1978), 41. In a letter to Clifford P. Wilson, HBC Archivist Alice M. Johnson recounted the story of a London schoolgirl finding a copy of Philip Turnor's 1778-79 journal amongst her grandfather's books. Johnson wrote, "You see why I still have hope for Henday." (HBCA RG 20/4/107, Johnson to Wilson, 25 June 1954).

These people could have been the Blackfoot (Siksika),¹ Blood,² or Gros Ventre (Atsina)³: there is even a possibility they may have been a group from outside the Blackfoot Confederacy.⁴ Such issues, however, are outside the scope of this study.

Within this study, certain editorial procedures have been followed regarding quotations from Henday's journals and contemporary documents. To avoid the constant use of *sic*, extreme care has been taken to ensure that the eighteenth century word and sentence structures have been maintained: peculiarities of spelling and grammar, therefore, may be safely assumed to be accurate and authentic. The use of superscripts in abbreviations, however, has been abandoned in the interest of a less cluttered page. The motivation behind these editorial procedures has been to produce a readable document without compromising the integrity of the historical texts any more than is absolutely necessary.

This study owes a great deal to numerous scholars. Glyndwr Williams' work on Henday and Graham was very valuable to my discussion of Graham's role in the later versions of the journal, and on a personal level his encouragement was much appreciated. Germaine Warkentin's advice in the realm of textual scholarship has been crucial in helping me deal with the sometimes overwhelming documentary problems. Ian MacLaren's work on Paul Kane and Samuel Hearne has helped guide my approach to

¹Lawrence J. Burpee, "York Factory to the Blackfeet Country: The Journal of Anthony Hendry, 1754-5" *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 3rd series, vol. 1 (1907) section II: 307-64; Harold Adams Innis, *The Fur Trade in Canada* revised ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956), 139; Peter C. Newman, *Company of Adventurers* (Markham: Viking, 1985), 244; Germaine Warkentin, *Canadian Exploration Literature: An Anthology* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993), 67; Glyndwr Williams, "The Puzzle of Anthony Henday's Journal, 1754-5" *The Beaver* (Winter 1978), 45.

²A.S. Morton, *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71*, edited by Lewis G. Thomas (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1973), 19, 247n; James G. MacGregor, *Behold the Shining Mountains* (Edmonton: Applied Art Products, 1954), 147; Oscar Lewis, *The Effects of White Contact Upon Blackfoot Culture*, Monographs of the American Ethnological Society, no. 6 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1942), 16.

³W.P. Cumming et al. (eds.), *The Exploration of North America, 1630-1776* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1974), 190.

⁴See Lewis, 16.

Henday. Anne Morton of the HBCA has been a valuable person with whom to discuss Henday's life and times. Finally, Jennifer S.H. Brown has been an absolute gem in so many ways: moral support, academic orientation, editorial comment, constructive criticism, and seemingly endless patience. Without her, this study would probably never have gotten off the proverbial drawing board. There are, of course, many other people to thank for their support and encouragement: my family and friends, particularly Tim Marriott; my late mentor, John E. Foster; my fiancée, Susan Brown; and last but not least the kind and patient staff of the Hudson's Bay Company Archives and Provincial Archives of Manitoba. In the end, however, I must take full responsibility for this study and any flaws or errors herein.

CHAPTER 1
HISTORIOGRAPHY AND HAGIOGRAPHY
OF ANTHONY HENDAY

Scholars have only become aware of the Hudson's Bay Company inland traveller Anthony Henday within the last one hundred years. In 1886, George Bryce made no mention of Henday in his article, "Brief Outlines of the most famous Journeys in and about Rupert's Land."¹ Even historians such as Alexander Begg and Beckles Wilson, who were given the rare privilege of perusing the Hudson's Bay Company's records², either did not notice Henday, or thought him of little importance. Begg, for example, dated English penetration of the interior to Thomas Curry's 1767 expedition.³ When Henday did come to scholarly attention in the first decade of this century, he was at first quite prominent in fur trade histories. This prominence waned in the 1930s, but interest rekindled in the 1950s as the bicentennial of his inland journey approached. Each generation of scholars saw and studied Henday within a different context, and thus perceptions of Henday have changed through a century of Henday scholarship.

The First Generation: Henday as Explorer (1885-1930)

The study of Anthony Henday began within the context of the history of Canadian

¹George Bryce, "Brief Outlines of the most famous Journeys in and about Rupert's Land," *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the year 1886, vol. IV* (Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1887), 91-104.

²F.C. Ingrams of the HBC Archives Department, in a letter to a Mr. Brooks of South Croydon, stated that Miller Christy, Agnes Laut, Alexander Begg, and Beckles Wilson were all given "free access" to the Company's records during his time with the Company, although he did mention that Begg had focussed his research on British Columbia and Oregon: Hudson's Bay Company Archives (HBCA) RG 20/2/153, Archives Dept. Policy: Access to Archives Prior to 1937; Ingrams to Brooks, 17 February 1925.

³Alexander Begg, *History of the North-West* (Toronto: Hunter, Rose, & Co., 1894), 1: 86.

exploration. Once rediscovered by Miller Christy, Henday would figure prominently in the works of Lawrence Burpee and Agnes Laut. For them, Henday's importance lay in his physical journey, from Hudson Bay to the Rockies and back in one year; geography received much more attention than the social and economic aspects of his journal. During this period, fur trade scholars attempting to emphasize nation-building, economics, or native lifestyle made little or no mention of Henday.¹ Burpee and Laut, however, saw the importance of the fur trade as simple exploration: the expansion of the frontiers of geographical knowledge without regard to national or personal agendas. For them, Henday's experiences as the first Englishman alleged to see the Rocky Mountains fit that mould perfectly.

The story begins with the naturalist and historian Robert Miller Christy, whose history of the Company was never published.² Christy's research in the HBC records is difficult to trace, but he apparently came across Henday in 1894, while looking through Graham's *Observations*.³ Around this time, Christy transcribed the journals of Anthony Henday and Matthew Cocking from the final volume of the *Observations* (thus Henday

¹Outside of the works of Burpee and Laut, Henday was mentioned only in Harold Innis, *The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History*, revised edition (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956), first published in 1929. Innis referred to Henday's observations on the French trade (97) and on the Earchithinue's objections to visiting the Bay (139).

²The handwritten manuscript is in the Provincial Archives of Manitoba: Miller Christy, *The Last Great Monopoly: A History of the Hudson's Bay Company, From its Establishment in the Year 1670 to the Present Time...*, PAM MG9 A75-1, Box 1.

³Christy "probably saw" ten volumes of the *Observations* (i.e. HBCA E. 2/4-13): HBCA RG 20/2/153, Archives Dept. Policy - Access to Archives Prior to 1937, Shirlee A. Smith to P.R. Anstruther, 8 March 1974. Christy had previously consulted the Company's records on at least one occasion, in July 1885: see HBCA Search File - Miller Christy.

journal D), and in 1895 deposited them in the Public Archives of Canada.¹

Journal D remains the only version in print.² Lawrence J. Burpee edited Christy's transcription and presented it to the Royal Society of Canada in 1907, under the title, "York Factory to the Blackfeet Country: The Journal of Anthony Hendry, 1754-5."³ One peculiarity is Burpee's spelling of the name as Hendry rather than Henday. In a footnote, Burpee explained, "Miss Agnes C. Laut says...that the Minutes of the Hudson's Bay Company at Hudson's Bay House all spell the name 'Hendry'. Probably the latter is the correct form."⁴ In fact, the London Minute Books and the Servants Ledger spell the name Henday. James Isham and Humphrey Marten, who knew Henday quite well, referred to him as Hende and Henday respectively. More significantly, the name is spelled Henday in all but one of the surviving examples of the netmaker's signature. Laut must have misread some copies of York Factory correspondence, which occasionally spell the name Hendy.⁵

¹Clifford Wilson stated that Dominion Archivist W. Kaye Lamb told him that the transcript of Henday's journal in the PAC has a note on it saying it had been made in 1895 by Christy and had been deposited in the Archives at the same time as Christy's transcription of Cocking's journal, and that that was "all they have on it." Wilson to Alice M. Johnson, 29 January 1954, HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday. The similar documentary histories of Henday and Cocking's journals are interesting. It is to be hoped that this study of Henday may also add to the study of Matthew Cocking.

²In a letter, HBCA Archivist Alice M. Johnson referred to a planned Henday transcript (Johnson to C.P. Wilson, 15 March 1960, HBCA RG 20/4/107, Archives Dept. Research Correspondence, 1930-88: Hen-Hin), but an undated marginal note indicated that this was abandoned in 1961. Whether this transcription was intended for publication, or even which version of the journal was to be transcribed, is unknown.

³Lawrence J. Burpee, "York Factory to the Blackfeet Country: The Journal of Anthony Hendry, 1754-5" *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 3rd series, vol. 1 (1907) section II: 307-64. This was reprinted by Canadiana House of Toronto in 1973. For Burpee's source, see Burpee, 321n and Wilson, 29.

⁴Burpee, 321n. He made a similar statement in Lawrence J. Burpee, *The Search for the Western Sea: The Story of the Exploration of North-western America*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Musson Book Co., 1935), 114n.

⁵Isham's spelling can be seen throughout the York Factory journals and correspondence of the period; Marten's spellings can be seen in his Severn River journals and correspondence for 1760-61, HBCA B. 198/a/2. Henday consistently spelled his name Henday except in the York account books of 1752/53, where he

Burpee's role as editor is easy to assess, simply because it was so minimal. In dealing with the text, he made few changes. Burpee condensed Graham's opening sentence into a proper title:

[D] I shall give the Journal of a Journey to explore the Country inland, and to endeavour to encrease the Hudson's Bay Company's trade; Performed by a very able Young Man named Anthony Hendey Anno Domini 1754a5.

[Burpee] JOURNAL OF A JOURNEY PERFORMED BY ANTHONY HENDRY, TO EXPLORE THE COUNTRY INLAND, AND TO ENDEAVOUR TO INCREASE THE HUDSON'S BAY COMPANY'S TRADE, A.D. 1754-1755.¹

Perhaps the only flaw in Burpee's presentation of the journal is his habit of placing Graham's original footnotes within his own, thus removing Graham's comments from the document of which they are an integral part.²

In a few places, Burpee appears to have misread Graham's handwriting. On 14 October, Journal D recorded that the Archithinue "King" was seated on "a clean Buffalo skin." Burpee's transcription placed the "King" on "a clear (white) Buffalo skin," and added a footnote citing George Catlin's *North American Indians* concerning the religious significance of an albino buffalo skin.³

Burpee's footnotes were generally informative and helpful, but they focused on the

spelled it "Heanday" (B. 239/d/43, fo. 9). For spellings as Hendy, which may be misread Hendry, see the copy of Isham's instructions to Henday in February 1754, HBCA A. 11/114, fo. 166.

¹HBCA E. 2/11, fo.1; Burpee, 321.

²See, for example, the entry for 6 September 1754: HBCA E. 2/11, fo. 11d; Burpee, 331.

³E. 2/11, fo. 17d; Burpee, 337. A more entertaining example comes in the entries for late December 1754, where Burpee misread "Trap" as "Hap." The original document is far from illegible, and Burpee gave no footnote to explain what "Happing" is supposed to be. Paul Thistle made the same mistake, though his source was Journal B and not Burpee. See Paul Thistle, *Indian-European Trade Relations in the Lower Saskatchewan River Region to 1840* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1986), 22.

same issues as his introduction. Burpee was primarily interested in French expansion and Henday's exact geographical route. Henday as an individual was allowed one half page at the end of the introduction.¹ Since the original document itself received no attention, and neither did the issues of context, composition, and alternate versions, Burpee's edition is discussed here largely for the excess of authority granted to it by subsequent writers.

Burpee's interest in this period was long-lived. In 1908, he edited Matthew Cocking's journal, as a "companion document" to Henday's journal.² That same year, he published *The Search for the Western Sea: The Story of the Exploration of North-western America*, in which he referred to Henday as a "young officer" of the Company.³ Burpee's discussion of Henday in this work differed little from the discussion of the previous year. One noteworthy point is Burpee's dismissal of Henday's and Graham's estimates of distances: both men, he claimed, were "equally unreliable" in this respect.⁴

At some time between 1908 and 1935, Burpee became aware of one other version of Henday's journal. In the second edition of *The Search for the Western Sea*, Burpee added a footnote at the end of his discussion of Henday: "A more complete copy of Hendry's Journal has been found in Hudson [sic] Bay House since the above chapter was

¹Burpee, 307-320.

²Lawrence J. Burpee, "An Adventurer from Hudson Bay: Journal of Matthew Cocking, from York Factory to the Blackfoot Country, 1772-73" *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd series, vol. 2 (1908), section II: 89-121.

³Burpee, *Search*, 114.

⁴Burpee, *Search*, 121, 131.

written.”¹ This was probably Journal A, as a later book by Burpee quoted Journal A’s account of Henday’s first meeting with the French, citing it as “another copy of the same journal.”² Burpee probably learned of this other version from A.S. Morton, or perhaps Agnes Laut (although we have no evidence that she was aware of its existence). Burpee’s familiarity with Journal A must be questioned, however, as he was apparently unaware of any conflicts between the accounts in Journals A and D. His discovery of the earlier version did not prompt him to change a word of what he had written on the subject.

In the foreword to her 1908 work, *The Conquest of the Great Northwest*, Agnes C. Laut proudly described her research in the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives, then still closed to the public, and mentioned that she had “some thousands of pages of transcripts” of unpublished material from the Public Record Office in London.³ She devoted an entire chapter to Henday, with the heading:

1754-1755

MARCH ACROSS THE CONTINENT BEGINS - THE COMPANY SENDS A MAN TO THE BLACKFEET OF THE SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN - ANTHONY HENDRY IS THE FIRST ENGLISHMAN TO PENETRATE TO THE SASKATCHEWAN - THE FIRST ENGLISHMAN TO WINTER WEST OF LAKE WINNIPEG- HE MEETS THE SIOUX AND THE BLACKFEET AND INVITES THEM TO THE BAY⁴

¹Burpee, *Search* (1935), 135n.

²Lawrence J. Burpee, *The Discovery of Canada* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1944), 107.

³Agnes C. Laut, *The Conquest of the Great Northwest, vol. I* (New York: The Outing Publishing Co., 1908), xviii-xix. See also F.C. Ingrams to Brooks, 17 February 1925, HBCA RG 20/2/153, Archives Dept. Policy - Access to Archives Prior to 1937.

⁴Laut, 334.

Laut classified “Hendry” under the colourful category of “flotsam and jetsam.”¹ Much of her information on the man was inaccurate. She called him a “bookkeeper,” and gave the impression that his 1754-55 journey was on his own initiative, just as she later gave him credit for figuring out the Crees’ middleman position in the trade.² She identified Henday’s Cree companions as Assiniboine, and translated the name of his guide, Attickasish, as “Little Bear” rather than “Little Deer.”³

Laut’s quotations from Henday’s journal are confusing because her editorial rewriting of entries makes it difficult to ascertain which version she was using.⁴ Journal D seems to have been her source, judging from some of the names and numbers she quoted, and from her summary of Graham’s biographical comment on Henday from that journal. However, she added an embellishment on Graham’s story, detailing the precise circumstances of Henday’s final departure from the service, which cannot be substantiated by anything in the HBC records.⁵

Like Burpee in 1907, Laut apparently knew of only one version of Henday’s journal: Journal D. Unlike Burpee, she offered an explanation of why the Company did not act on what she believed it had been told in 1755. She blamed the Bayside factors for discrediting Henday. She accused them of “little-minded narrowness” and of objecting to

¹Laut, 334. She also mentioned “soft voiced English youths from the south counties, who had been outlawed for smuggling,” (335) which seems to have referred to Henday.

²Laut, 335, 347.

³Laut, 336.

⁴See, for example, Laut, 339-340.

⁵Laut, 352. This embellishment will be discussed in chapter 2.

being told what they did not know.¹ Their motive, she said, was a reluctance to undertake a campaign of inland settlement. “The factors on the Bay -- Norton and Isham -- were not brave enough men to undertake such a campaign. It was easier sitting snugly inside the forts with a multitude of slave Indians to wait on their least want.”² This explanation, expressed in different ways (and usually without her disparaging and accusatory tone), would be used to explain the documentary problems of Henday’s journals for the rest of the century.

In general, Laut’s discussion of Henday is based on incomplete research into the relevant documents, not all of which may have been accessible at that time (prior to any attempt at cataloguing). Perhaps the greatest value of her work, along with Burpee’s, lies in bringing Henday out of the archives and into academic discourse.

The Second Generation: Henday as Social Scientist (1930-present)

The gradual easing of restrictions on study of the Company’s records in the 1930s facilitated a major change in Henday scholarship. Christy’s transcription was no longer needed, and the earlier versions of the journal were being discovered. Questions of authorship were being raised for the first time, and a critical examination of Henday, his journal(s), and his experiences, had truly begun.

Moreover, the journals were being mined for a greater variety of information. Although Henday was now reduced to a few pages in the big books of fur trade history,

¹Laut, 352.

²Laut, 353.

such as A.S. Morton's *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71* (1939) and E.E. Rich's two-volume *History of the Hudson's Bay Company* (1958-59), the scope of discussion was much broader than before. His observations on social life and native culture were examined, and Henday came to be viewed as a sort of amateur anthropologist and sociologist. This is not to say that Henday the Explorer had been forgotten: the first great scholar of this generation, A.S. Morton, sought a complete understanding of Henday as an historical figure, including ascertaining his actual route of travel.

Douglas MacKay's 1936 general work, *The Honourable Company*, merits discussion only as a precursor to the later work of Morton. MacKay was probably the first writer on Henday to realize the full magnitude of the documentary conundrums involved, and he clearly foundered in that stormy sea. Without providing documentation, MacKay quoted Journal A's account of the first meeting with the French, and then quoted D's account of the meeting with the Earchithinue. Discussing Henday's experiences with the French on the return trip, MacKay quoted entries from Journal A, but then added, "Henday was obliged to stand by while the Frenchmen debauched his Indians with brandy and took the choicest furs."¹ That situation, as will be seen, only presented itself in the later versions. MacKay must have been aware of the contradictions among the various versions, as he appears to have read at least Journals A and D, but he made no effort to deal with these contradictions.

In 1939, Arthur Silver Morton published his epic contribution to fur trade

¹Douglas MacKay, *The Honourable Company* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1936), 91-93.

scholarship, *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71*.¹ His discussion of Henday was based on research in the Company's archives during the summer and autumn of 1933², and some of his notes are still extant in various HBCA Search Files. These notes provide valuable insight into Morton's handling of the Henday story.³ In some cases, Morton's notes show a better understanding of the issues at hand than the book.

Morton was aware of three of the four versions of Henday's journal; he made no mention of Journal B. Journal A he described in his book as an expurgated version, edited by the "decorous" James Isham so as not to offend the Committee.⁴ In his notes, Morton described Journal C as a copy made by Graham with "Henday's original before him." Journal D, Morton speculated, "must be of a version of Henday's Journal, made by Isham with Henday at his elbow."⁵ Morton was apparently speculating on the existence of another stage in the generation of the later versions: an uncensored copy of Henday's original journal, contemporary with Journal A, upon which at least one of Graham's versions was based. However, Morton seemingly abandoned this line of thought, as his book made no mention of this speculation.

In his notes, Morton wrote, "For the purposes of history the three versions [of Henday's journal] are necessary for what is shortened to the point of obscurity in one may

¹Arthur S. Morton, *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71*, ed. by Lewis G. Thomas (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973).

²See HBCA RG 20/2/132, Archives Dept. Administrative Subject File: A.S. Morton, 1931-33.

³Valuable though it is in many other respects, Lewis G. Thomas' 1973 edition of Morton's work adds little or nothing to Morton's treatment of Henday.

⁴Morton, 244-46.

⁵HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday, A.S. Morton's notes, August 1933.

be perfectly clear in another.”¹ In his book, Morton presented the later versions as the truthful ones, and dismissed A as edited by James Isham for the consumption of the London Governor and Committee. He argued that Isham stripped the official copy of the journal of all references to Henday’s “bedfellow”, on the grounds that such relationships were strictly forbidden.

However, other discrepancies in descriptions are more difficult to explain. Regarding Henday’s return trip past Paskoyac and Fort la Corne, Morton had to admit, “The ways of censors are mysterious. At any rate, Isham judged it necessary not to pass on...in its entirety Henday’s description” of what he saw at Basquiaea.² Inconsistencies such as this must be considered serious flaws in Morton’s handling of the documentary problems. Unfortunately, despite these flaws, his evaluation has never been seriously challenged.

E.E. Rich’s monumental *History of the Hudson's Bay Company* suffered from similar problems. Rich’s logic was essentially the same as Morton’s.

[Henday’s] interest in the Indians and their families, and their acceptance of him, was undoubtedly facilitated by the fact that by this time [about December] he had settled down with what he described as his ‘bed-fellow’ from among the Indians with whom he was travelling. She performed all the normal functions of a squaw for him, and very greatly assisted his journey. But she does not appear in the official copy of Henday’s Journal which Isham sent home, for the Chief Factor had personal reason to know the Committee’s views about co-habitation with Indian women, and had only been confirmed in command at York in 1751 on condition that he neither kept Indian women in the post himself nor permitted others to do so. Henday’s ‘bedfellow’ therefore does not figure in the official copy of

¹HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday, A.S. Morton’s notes, August 1933.

²Morton, 244-46.

his Journal¹

Little of what Rich said about the ‘bedfellow’ can be substantiated by any of the journals. She was mentioned but seldom, and only briefly, giving a bit of information or advice and then disappearing into silence again.

On the documentary problems surrounding Henday, Rich was practically incomprehensible.

He was able to speak French, but the Committee had doubted his ability to measure his journey at all accurately, and he seems to have been such a man as was capable of doing and of feeling far more than he could commit to paper -- so much so that the Committee confidently assumed that it was Isham who drafted his Journal. Even so, Henday’s matter-of-fact narrative repays detailed study, for he was a shrewd observer and in his own cryptic way he got his thoughts on paper.²

How Rich developed this sense of Henday’s capabilities, or of his “cryptic” way of getting past his alleged censors, is not clear. Presumably, he did not acquire it from a “detailed study”, because he does not appear to have made one. His later work, *The Fur Trade and the Northwest to 1857*, advanced the analysis no further; he there simply claimed that the journal “was severely edited because his [Henday’s] method of travel was that of the woodrunners”, and thus a “bowdlerized” version (Journal A) was produced by Isham.³

In 1955, Clifford Wilson, editor of *The Beaver* magazine, offered a valuable

¹E.E. Rich, *The History of the Hudson’s Bay Company 1670-1870* (London: Hudson’s Bay Record Society, 1958-9), 1: 633.

²Rich, *History*, 1: 637.

³E.E. Rich, *The Fur Trade and the Northwest to 1857* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967), 123.

summation of a half-century of Henday scholarship.¹ He identified three journals: those later labelled by Glyndwr Williams as A, C, and D.² Journal A was “a fair copy” made by Isham, “toned down somewhat so that it would be fit to be read by them [the Governor and Committee].”³ All three journals, he said, were “heavily edited -- as is evident from the fact that they constantly disagree with each other,”⁴ but he did not discuss the editing of Journals C and D. As with those before him, and with several after him, the intellectual understanding that none of the versions is free from editorial interference seems to give way to a natural inclination to single out the ‘right’ version and to blame someone for the ‘wrong’ version.

The Third Generation: Henday as Symbol (1954-present)

The second generation of Henday scholars carries on up to the present day. Henday is seldom a focus of study, and historians writing a few pages in a larger work tend to rely on the work of previous writers. A few writers, however, have gone not deeper into the morass of documentary conundrums but deeper into the world of imagery,

¹Clifford P. Wilson, “Across the Prairies Two Centuries Ago” *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report, 1954-5*: 28-35. Wilson also wrote Henday’s entry in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* in 1974, but introduced no new material or insights in that article. See *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 3: 285-7.

²Wilson, “Across the Prairies,” 29.

³Wilson, “Across the Prairies,” 29. In an interview the previous year, Wilson made specific reference to the absence of the Rocky Mountains in Journal A: “It is quite possible...that the original journal contained some remarks on the scenery and that Isham or some other wretched editor deleted them as being too frivolous to be read by the August governor and committee.” (“Three Versions of Journey: Confusing Jumble of Journal,” *Prince Albert Herald*, 4 June 1954, clipping in HBCA Search File: Anthony Henday.)

⁴Wilson, “Across the Prairies,” 29.

myth and symbolism. In a very real sense, this is not a generation of scholars, but rather a constantly recurring tangent, an omnipresent fringe element, more concerned with Henday as a sort of icon than as an individual.

This is not meant to be a harsh criticism. Bruce Greenfield observed, “[I]t seems impossible to make a discovery without a myth of discovery to provide the context in which things can be recognized.”¹ Without doubt, Henday accomplished a very impressive journey, and there is an inescapable sense of the heroic surrounding his experiences. For some, this becomes the focus of their approach, and perhaps nothing focused them more than the bicentennial of Henday’s great journey in 1954-55. Books were written, paintings commissioned, memorials erected. Although this sense of Henday as Hero has not encouraged a very scholarly approach, it is well worth examining. The study of Canadian history does not take place in a vacuum or on an island, and the popular as well as the academic interpretations are all part of the ongoing and ever-expanding discourse on our past.

One example of the public recognition of Henday was the memorial erected in 1954 in Red Creek, Alberta. At the same time, the Sherritt Gordon nickel refinery in Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta was minting medallions in three sizes bearing a portrayal of Henday’s first meeting with the Earchithinue “on the spot where the factory was built.”² There is also Franklin Arbuckle’s 1950 HBC calendar painting, “Henday enters the

¹Bruce Greenfield, “The Idea of Discovery as a Source of Narrative Structure in Samuel Hearne’s *Journey to the Northern Ocean*,” *Early American Literature* 21/3 (Winter 1986/7), 190.

²“An Islander’s Notes,” *Isle of Wight County Press*, 25 February 1967, HBCA Search File: Anthony Henday.

Blackfoot camp.”¹ Arbuckle painted it from the point of view of one of the seated inhabitants of the camp and the result is that Henday is made the focus of attention: he strides confidently (but not arrogantly) into the camp, followed by two Indians, presumably Attickasish and Connawapa. Though Henday is portrayed with an inquisitive but ordinary face, the mood of the painting is quite different from that of the journal entries.

In the publishing world, Henday has found admirers among the great popular historians of western Canada. Grant MacEwan eulogized Henday as “a robust young Englishman who knew no fear.”² “That one venturing single-handed into the far west had only a small chance of returning, didn’t seem to worry Henday.”³ As so often happens with Canadian explorers, Henday was attributed with a power over his native guides and companions which the documents do not substantiate. MacEwan consistently referred to “his Indians,”⁴ just as Burpee had interpreted Journal D’s description of Attickasish -- “my leader that had the charge of me” -- as “his Indian guide.”⁵ Peter C. Newman spoke of Henday in less glowing terms, accepting Glyndwr Williams’ argument that Henday was responsible for falsifying journal A.⁶ For Newman, however, Henday remained a romantic

¹HBCA Calendar Series (1951). See frontispiece.

²Grant MacEwan, *Fifty Mighty Men* (Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1975), 74. Apparently, MacEwan did not read Henday’s correspondence: see Appendix B.

³MacEwan, 75.

⁴MacEwan, 73-78.

⁵Burpee, *Search*, 119.

⁶Peter C. Newman, *Company of Adventurers* (Markham, Ontario: Viking Penguin Inc., 1985), 244n.

figure, an ambitious man stifled by the Committee's complacency.¹

However, James G. MacGregor is the one writer who could truly be called Henday's hagiographer. His 1954 book, *Behold the Shining Mountains*² was a rollicking portrayal of Henday's experiences, often unencumbered by historical fact. MacGregor was no stranger to historical inquiry: he had collaborated to some extent with Clifford Wilson³ and was aware of all four versions of the journal.⁴ MacGregor blamed Isham for rewriting Journal A with the twin motives of attempting to hide Henday's liaison with a native woman and of freeing the journal of the "clutter" of "unnecessary descriptions of scenery [i.e., the Rocky Mountains]."⁵

Despite clear evidence of serious research, including an extensive attempt to retrace Henday's route by car, large sections of MacGregor's book are flawed by flights of literary fancy.⁶ The experiences presented seem primarily to be those of Journal D, fleshed

¹Newman, 242-246. Newman's discussion of Henday is marred by a clearly incomplete understanding of Henday's journey and career.

²James G. MacGregor, *Behold the Shining Mountains* (Edmonton: Applied Art Products, 1954). MacGregor was primarily concerned with the history of Alberta, and so Henday made an appearance in many of his works. See particularly *Blankets and Beads: A History of the Saskatchewan River* (Edmonton: Institute of Applied Art, 1949), 67-71; *The Battle River Valley* (Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1976), 5-16; and *A History of Alberta*, 2nd ed. (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1981), 25-30. MacGregor's discussions of Henday's experiences vary little from book to book. *Behold the Shining Mountains* represents his fullest treatment of the subject.

³C.P. Wilson to Alice M. Johnson, 16 September 1953, HBCA RG 20/2/107.

⁴J.G. MacGregor to HBCA, 28 February 1953, HBCA RG 20/4/107. This item of correspondence raises the question of why Wilson, with whom MacGregor had apparently collaborated and certainly corresponded, knew of only three versions. Furthermore, MacGregor made no obvious reference to any documentary problems in any of his writings on Henday.

⁵MacGregor, *Behold*, 45, 50-51, 167, 259.

⁶Probably the best example of MacGregor's literary licence getting the better of him is his discussion of Henday's 'bedfellow' (*Behold*, 50-51).

out by MacGregor's speculation on Henday's thoughts and feelings. The overall impression left with the reader is that of a great explorer who accomplished a magnificent feat which happened to meet none of the objectives for which he was sent inland.

Particularly intriguing is MacGregor's handling of Henday's relations with his Indian companions. The Hudson's Bay Company, MacGregor argued, was "great magic" and had great prestige among the natives. Henday, as the Company's representative, had to be treated with respect: "he was, in their estimation, a man of great mysticism and powerful medicine."¹ On the other hand, his inability to live off the land like an Indian must have pointed to his inferiority. "The Indians with whom he travelled concluded...that he was a likable fellow, a respectful pupil, and one quick to learn. With all these good qualities they must have felt that in time he might even make a passable Indian."²

The Fourth Generation: Henday as Text (1969-present)

This generation of scholarship is a small one, as few historians have seriously examined the documentary problems of Henday's journals. Indeed, few historians who have dealt with Henday have had much experience in documentary editing, and thus have not always grasped the difficulties presented by these multiple texts. What sets this latest generation of Henday scholarship apart from all previous generations, however, is a new appreciation of the journals as four separate though interrelated documents. The dominant figure in this group has been Glyndwr Williams, former General Editor of the

¹MacGregor, *Behold*, 18.

²MacGregor, *Behold*, 54.

Hudson's Bay Record Society.

At the Third North American Fur Trade Conference, Williams spoke on the "puzzle" of Henday's journal, and later that year an expanded version of that lecture appeared in *The Beaver*.¹ Finally, Henday was given more than just a few pages in a chapter on HBC inland exploration and expansion, and finally the documentary problems which form a significant but overlooked part of his legacy were examined in the detailed study they had long deserved. Unfortunately, Williams' new direction down an old path arrived at a familiar conclusion.

Williams was the first scholar to publicly recognize that there are in fact four extant versions.² However, Williams' characterization of the different journals was flawed. He focused on Henday's two encounters with the French and on his October meeting with the Earchithinue. Based on a comparison of the four different journal accounts of each of these events, Williams classified B, C, and D together as a group in opposition to A. The differences between the three later versions were overlooked in favour of the similarities.

Perhaps Williams' greatest shortcoming was a tendency to overinterpret. For example, after quoting journal A's telling of Henday's arrival at Paskoyac in July 1754, Williams characterized Henday's tone as "unmistakably contemptuous" and "derisory", in contrast to the entries in B, C, and D for that day (he cited C as "typical"), where he

¹Glyndwr Williams, "The Puzzle of Anthony Henday's Journal, 1754-5" *The Beaver*(Winter 1978), 41-56.

²As mentioned earlier, James G. MacGregor was apparently aware of four versions of the journal, but made no indication of such in his writings.

claimed Henday “appears uncertain, even frightened, and needing reassurance from his Indian companion.”¹ Journal A’s description of the French post as a “Hogstye” is certainly contemptuous. However, the other versions carry no clear evidence of fear: Williams is simply inferring uncertainty. When Henday told Attickasish of the French threats in C, the text may be read as simply his relating an anecdote, and that was evidently the way in which Attickasish received it.

Another instance is in Williams’ description of Henday’s fellow travellers in December 1754.

One of the women was his companion, his ‘bedfellow’, who now begins to emerge as a personality in her own right, advising and informing a puzzled Henday about the complex trade system which involved the Cree, Assiniboine and Archithinue. For some time Henday’s entries record his bewilderment and resentment that his Cree companions were not interested in trapping, even though for much of the winter they were in good beaver country.²

In fact, trapping is only mentioned as an issue in any of the journals on or around 23 October and again in late December, and the entries reflect a curious tone rather than one of resentment.³ The trading system described in the different versions was not particularly complex, and furthermore, the ‘bedfellow’ scarcely emerged as a “personality in her own right”; in B and C, she appeared only twice, and in D once as “an Indian” and once as “the

¹Williams, “Puzzle,” 44.

²Williams, “Puzzle,” 46.

³In A, see Isham’s note to the 23 October entry and Henday’s entry for 27 December (B. 239/a/40, fos. 19d, 24); in B, see entries for 21, 23 October, 24-27 December, and 28 December-4 January (E. 2/4, fos. 48d-49, 52); in C, see entry for 27 December (E. 2/6, fo. 27); in D, see entries for 21, 23 October, 26-27, 28 December (E. 2/11, fos. 20-20d, 27-27d); most of these entries are brief, consisting of Henday’s simple and direct question of why the Indians do not trap, and their response of either silence or laughter.

Woman.”¹

In emphasizing the differences between A and the later journals, Williams passed over the differences among the later journals themselves. For instance, journals A and C agree on the events of 31 July and 4 August, but differ from B and D. Williams, while admitting that C does not agree with B and D, made no attempt to explain that.²

Emphasizing the differences between journal A and the others, he saw differences among the three later versions as relatively insignificant.

An apparently imperfect reading of other parts of the journals led to imperfect characterization of the different versions. Williams described the journey in A as one in which

Henday cut a brave figure as he passed the French posts on his way inland, dominated the Cree band with whom he travelled, won solemn pledges from the Assiniboine and Blackfoot Indians encountered that they would come back down to Hudson Bay with their furs, and on the return journey passed the French posts without any untoward occurrence. The expedition was not only a striking personal achievement; it held out glowing promise of commercial opportunities for the Hudson’s Bay Company.³

Upon close study, this characterisation appears to be an exaggeration. Brave or not, Henday had little reason to fear the French traders, as even the later journals described them as few in number and living in a very humble abode indeed. Nowhere in journal A did Henday dominate his travelling companions. Certainly, he did impress them on several

¹See the entries for 28 December–4 January, and 15 May in journal B (E. 2/4, fos. 52, 57); see also journal C, 27 December, 2 February and 15 May (E. 2/6, fos. 27, 29d, 35d) and D, 28 December and 15 May (E. 2/11, fos. 27d, 36).

²On those days, Henday met and smoked with two separate groups of Assinipoets: see Williams, “Puzzle,” 44; also B. 239/a/40, fos. 7-7d; E. 2/4, fos. 38d-39; E. 2/6, fos. 14-14d; E. 2/11, fos. 6d-7.

³Williams, “Puzzle,” 48.

occasions, such as on 18 August when he dressed a lame man's foot and on 26 September when he killed a "fine Large Moose" singlehanded, but his disagreements with Shenap and Attickasish showed that he was by no means dominant.¹ As for the expedition being a "striking personal achievement", it was never painted as such in journal A.

Williams also oversimplified in lumping B, C, and D together as essentially the same.

The other three copies of the journal paint a completely different picture -- Henday passed the French posts in a mood of apprehension rather than bravado, and was allowed to proceed only because of the strength of his accompanying party of Cree Indians; the Assiniboine and Blackfoot refused to contemplate taking to canoes and making the arduous journey down to the Bay, a reluctance encouraged by Henday's Cree companions who were revealed as occupying a dominant middleman position in the fur trade; and on the return journey the Indians from Henday's large fleet of canoes traded the most valuable of their furs at the French posts.²

There is nothing in B, C, or D to prove or even strongly suggest that Henday only got past the French on his way inland because of his large group of companions, and if there were it would be odd, considering the "great influence" which the French were later described as having over the Indians.³ Williams overgeneralized when he said that the inland Indians refused to contemplate going to the Bay: in C, Henday's invitations received favourable responses from two different groups of Asinepoets, "the French Leader (named Wapenessew)", and five canoes of "Bloody Indians."⁴ As for his Cree companions, the

¹B. 239/a/40, fos. 9d, 14d, 15d, 31-31d.

²Williams, "Puzzle," 48.

³E. 2/4, fo. 58; E. 2/6, fo. 37; E. 2/11, fos. 37d-38.

⁴See entries for 31 July, 4 August, 2 and 6 February, 7 March, and 17 May (E. 2/6, fos. 14-14d, 29d-30, 31d, 36).

journals described them as middlemen, but not particularly dominant.

The main value of Williams' study does not lie in these details, however, but rather in his attempt at explaining the differences among the journals. Unfortunately, that attempt was coloured by an excess of dichotomy; he overstated the case by declaring that either journal A or the collective journal B-C-D was a "forgery."¹ Having thus invoked the likelihood of fraud or falsification, he fell in step with a century of scholarship and labelled journal A as a misrepresentation of Henday's experiences. Where he differed from his predecessors was in blaming Henday himself, rather than Isham, for falsifying journal A.

Some of Williams' arguments are convincing, but not entirely so. His declaration of Henday's culpability was based on a process of elimination. Unable to accept either Isham or Graham as having falsified journal A, Williams turned to the only other possible suspect. He noted that Graham had described Henday as an ambitious man, not content with the humble position of netmaker, a characterization borne out by Henday's ongoing struggles for higher salaries. Williams claimed that "there is no discredit to Henday" in this ambition,² but then went on to build his critique upon it.

Recalling Isham's words in his instructions (which Williams referred to as a letter) regarding potential rewards for services rendered, Williams observed that it was in Henday's own best interest to make his expedition a commercial success. Certainly the historical context in which Henday was operating was one of business rather than one of

¹Williams, "Puzzle," 48.

²Williams, "Puzzle," 53.

experimental science, and he would not have been the only explorer to encounter a conflict between what he was expected to find and what was actually there. By Williams' argument, Henday in journal A responded to this conflict by abandoning unassimilable facts in favour of the ideal account expected by his superiors.¹

It should be emphasized that Williams made a significant step forward by analyzing the documentary problems in their own right. His study has in many ways been the foundation of and stimulus to this one, and remains the most comprehensive examination published to date. If the opposing thesis presented here is to prove credible, it must both refute and offer plausible alternatives to Williams' arguments.

In 1996 there was a new addition to the list of Henday scholars. Barbara Belyea has written two very interesting but as yet unpublished papers on Anthony Henday and the documentary problems surrounding his experiences.² Belyea's background in English rather than history is apparent, and her approach is radical and revisionist compared to what has come before. Perhaps Belyea's most original contribution to the literature is her assertion that twentieth-century historians are just as responsible (if not more so) for distorting and misrepresenting Henday than any eighteenth-century fur trader. She accused Burpee, Morton and MacGregor of forcing the evidence to fit Henday's experiences into their imperialist agenda.³ She chastised Williams for dismissing journal A

¹Williams, "Puzzle," 54. See also Greenfield, 192-3.

²Barbara Belyea, "West to the Shining Mountains: Henday Reconsidered" (paper submitted to *Terra Incognita*, n.d.) HBCA PP 5458; Barbara Belyea, "Henday's Journal: historical evidence/ problematic text/ political tool" (paper given at University of Edinburgh, May 1996) HBCA PP 7014.

³Belyea, "West," 2-3.

as a forgery, and thought it more likely that none of the extant versions is true.¹ Both papers are written with a nihilistic sense of futility, laced with a poorly concealed grudge against historians.² Having said that, her paper, “West to the Shining Mountains: Henday Reconsidered,” remains the best discussion of Henday’s route and the difficulties in retracing it. However, its discussions of the documentary problems are, on the whole, inadequate.

¹Belyea, “West,” 10; Belyea, “Journal,” 19.

²See, for example, “West,” 7, 12-13, 19, 20; “Journal,” 6, 7, 20.

CHAPTER 2 THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

It is worthwhile at this point to provide a comprehensive biography of Anthony Henday to offer a context for analysis. It will be brief, for Glyndwr Williams was correct in calling Henday “a curiously elusive figure.”¹ However, our understanding of Henday’s experiences would be incomplete without an understanding of the context in which they occurred.

There seem to be more personal comments and testimonials than hard facts on Anthony Henday. His superior officer, James Isham, spoke of him as “a Very Servicable Man” and “a Hearty Man.”² Andrew Graham called him “a very able Young man,” “a bold and good Servant,” and “an able man, and in every respect well qualified” for inland travel.³ The most extensive testimonial is a page-long commentary which Graham inserted in journal D, between the entries for 31 October and 1 November 1754. It deserves to be quoted in full.

N.B. This Anthony Hendey was born in the Island of Wight and was in the Year 1748 Outlawed for Smuggling, and in 1750 entered into the Company’s Service, the Directors not knowing that he was under Sentence of Outlawry. This person whom I knew well was Bold; Enterprizing and Voluntarily offered his Service to go inland with the Natives, and explore the Country, and to endeavour to draw down the different tribes to the Factory. Before this time None of the Servants at the Factories had

¹Williams, “Puzzle” 53.

²HBCA A. 11/114, fo. 141, Isham to Governor and Committee, 21 May 1750; B. 239/a/37, fo. 27, York Factory journal, 26 June 1754.

³The first comment is from the introduction to journal D, and the second comment is part of the accompanying marginalia (E. 2/11, fo. 1); the third comment is from the introduction to journal B (E. 2/4, fo. 35).

ventured to Winter with the Natives: The Account of Horsemen being Inland was not credited: He Hendey was misrepresented by those in the Bay who were not acting a just part to the Company, and He perceiving not likely to meet with promotion he had so deservedly merited quitted the Company's Service. Which made one of the Directors observe afterwards "That a valuable Servant oftentimes was not known until lost."¹

To this should be added a marginal note from earlier in that journal, to the effect that in 1762 Henday "was drove from the Company's Service by the Ships' Gentry because he would not buy Slops & Brandy from them."² Agnes Laut appears to have manipulated this into an extraordinary embellishment.

[the factors] objected to being told what they did not know. Hendry was 'frozen' out of the service. The occasion of his leaving was even more contemptible than the real cause. On one of his trading journeys, he was offered very badly mixed brandies, probably drugged. Being a fairly good judge of brandies from his smuggling days, Hendry refused to take what Andrew Graham calls "such slops from such gentry." He quit the service in disgust.³

Neither this story nor her direct quote are corroborated by evidence from Graham or elsewhere in the Company's archives.

Tracing Anthony Henday's Origins

Questions abound concerning Henday's origins and early life. His birthplace, at least, has been determined with reasonable certainty. The surname, in a variety of spellings, remains a common one on the Isle of Wight.⁴ Parish baptismal records include

¹E. 2/11, fo. 21d.

²E. 2/11, fo. 1.

³Laut, 352.

⁴"An Islander's Notes," *Isle of Wight County Press*, 25 February 1967; see also Frank E. Warren to HBCA, 24 October 1970 (RG 20/4/107).

only one individual who could have been the Anthony Henday of Hudson Bay: all others with that name (or variations of it) were too old or too young to have been our man.

Anthony Henday, then, was baptised on 24 December 1725 in the village of Shorwell, about two miles inland from the southwest shore of the Isle of Wight.¹ He was the second son and third of eight children of Anthony and Mary “Hendy.”² His parents received 1/6 per week from the parish poor relief fund, and further supplemented their income by taking in parish children and being paid for their upkeep.³

These scraps of information tell us some interesting things about Henday’s origins, but they do not speak volumes and should not be made to do so. References in the parish records to Henday’s mother as “Goody,” short for Goodwife, suggests that her husband was a husbandman or yeoman (Goodman). Henday’s classification as a labourer, then, may have been more than just a Company designation. Below the level of the gentry, the tendency seems to have been to associate children with the status level below that of their father: therefore, the son of a husbandman would call himself a labourer.⁴ To conclude that Henday’s father was a husbandman is not as great a leap of logic as it may seem. The term was an extremely common description of men in pre-industrial England, as it

¹See HBCA Correspondence File - Donald Kennett. Mr Kennett is a descendant of one of Anthony’s brothers and has done research into the family tree.

²Because all surviving examples of Anthony’s signature spell the name with a final “-ay”, that spelling will be maintained.

³The circumstances of these children varied: in some cases, the mother had died, for example, or the father had been transported. In 1745, the Hendays received £4.10.0 from the parish for the upkeep of Joseph Jolliff’s child. See HBCA Correspondence File - Donald Kennett.

⁴Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost: further explored*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Methuen, 1983), 38, 39, 44.

described what so many of them were engaged in: tending animals and tilling the soil.¹

The family's apparent poverty at the time was typical of many. Not all families receiving poor relief were permanently below the level of subsistence. Rather, they experienced some sort of poverty for varying periods of time. Indeed, a good half of the citizens of pre-industrial England were judged by their contemporaries to be poor.²

The extent of literacy in the eighteenth century is more difficult to assess, especially for a relatively rural area such as the Isle of Wight. Although Henday's journal style (if, indeed, we can be certain that any of the versions actually reflects his style) is stilted and laboured, it is more literate than might be expected of a labourer and netmaker. Peter Laslett, in his classic work of historical sociology, *The World We Have Lost*, made the point that full literacy was at that time largely a trademark of the ruling class, and that most of pre-industrial England was an oral society.³ It appears, however, that somewhere between thirty and forty per cent of labouring men in Henday's time were able to sign their name, although the extent of their literacy varied.⁴ A perusal of the York Factory account books of 1754/55 provides an interesting though not necessarily statistically accurate yardstick. Where the men were obliged to sign their names to verify the expenses to be deducted from their earnings, only 11 of the 36 men signed their names with apparent ease. Twelve men signed their marks, while the rest of the signatures were

¹Laslett, 38, 39, 44.

²Laslett, 45-46.

³Laslett, 229, 233.

⁴Laslett, 229-233, 236, 339n5.

clearly unsteady: in some cases, the man was probably just unaccustomed to using a pen, while in others the name seems more traced than actually signed.¹

One apparently indisputable fact is that Henday was a great deal more literate than most of the inland travellers who followed him from York. Andrew Graham remarked, "I have often reflected that the accounts given us by the men sent inland (Anthony Hendey and William Tomison excepted) were incoherent and unintelligible."² Henday was the only one of the York travellers who produced a map, though even Isham's fair copy of it failed to impress the Committee.³ The journals of Tomison and Matthew Cocking were preserved in Graham's *Observations*, but most of the originals have not survived. Joseph Smith kept journals on his expeditions with Joseph Waggoner, but they varied widely in their literary quality. Samuel Hearne was the only other winterer of the period who appears to have kept a journal. The rest, such as Isaac Batt, George Potts, John Taylor, and Henry Pressick, left no record. On the whole, Graham may not have been too harsh in calling them "ignorant poor labouring men of no abilities."⁴

Henday's smuggling career raises the interesting question of whether he spoke French. Jennifer S.H. Brown has suggested that his name could be of French origin, and

¹B. 239/d/45, York Factory account book, 1754/55.

²Glyndwr Williams (ed.), *Andrew Graham's Observations on Hudson's Bay 1767-91*, with intro. by Richard Glover (London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1969), 291.

³Richard I. Ruggles, *A Country So Interesting: The Hudson's Bay Company and Two Centuries of Mapping, 1670-1870* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 38, 242. For Isham's fair copy, see Ruggles, 242 and HBCA A. 11/114, fo. 197, Isham to Governor and Committee, 4 August 1756. For the Committee's comments, see A. 6/9, fos. 33d-34, Governor and Committee to Isham, 12 May 1756.

⁴Williams, *Graham*, 262. In 1765, the Committee suggested sending the sailor James Spence inland, in the hopes that he might keep a journal which would provide some real information, but there is no evidence that Spence ever did go inland: Rich, *History*, 2: 16.

has pointed out that there is a town called Hendaye on France's Biscay coast.¹ Presumably Henday's smuggling activities involved France at least partially, if not exclusively. Indeed, Henday told the Frenchman he met in 1754, "I knew France as well as he did, and was not afraid to go their more than himself."² In a letter to James Isham, written a few days before that encounter, Henday said, "I don't doubt but they [the French] will be very Inquisitive...I shal say nothing at all to them (if they cannot talk English) and then I will give them a Civill lye."³ The implication here is that he could speak French if he wanted to, but in the circumstances he did not.⁴

Reconstructing Henday's Fur Trade Career

Henday made his first appearance in the Company's records on 24 April 1750, when the Minute Book of the London Committee mentioned him as having been engaged as a labourer at ten pounds per annum, with a ten pound gratuity at the expiration of his five-year contract "in Consideration of his being a Net Maker."⁵ Accordingly, Henday was advanced the sum of £2.2.0 in cash and given 16 shillings "for [his] Beds & to Drink [the Committee's health]." Soon he was on his way to York Factory.⁶

¹Williams, "Puzzle," 54.

²B. 239/a/40, fo. 6, entry for 22 July 1754.

³A. 11/114, fo. 180d, Henday to Isham, 9 July 1754.

⁴Linguist David Pentland (personal communication) has suggested that Henday may have conversed with the French in Cree - the lingua franca of the fur trade.

⁵A. 1/38, p. 193, London Minute Book, 24 April 1750; see also A. 6/8, fo. 47, Governor and Committee to Isham, 21 May 1750.

⁶A. 15/10, Grand Journal, p. 279; A. 16/31, Officers' and Servants' Ledger, York Factory, fo. 77d; it should be noted that both of these payments were standard practice.

Henday's superior at York was James Isham. Isham had been in England during the 1749/50 season, and returned to York on the same ship as Henday.¹ Back at York, Isham listed the new recruits in his annual letter to the Committee: the only name to receive any comment was Henday, whom Isham called "a Very Servicable man."² The remark implies a previous acquaintance; or perhaps they simply became acquainted on the ship from London.

It is clear, however, that Isham and Henday developed a friendship at York. The marked familiarity in their correspondence stands in sharp contrast to the formal businesslike style of most Company correspondence.³ The relationship was probably one of patronage, or perhaps even of paternalism. The patronage of senior officers was the most effective way for young men to rise through the ranks of the Company at that time.⁴ For evidence that Isham may have been ready, willing and able to act as a patron within the Company, it is worth noting his earlier role in the career of Samuel Skrimsher.

Samuel Skrimsher was probably a cousin of Isham, whose mother's maiden name was Skrimsher.⁵ Young Samuel was apprenticed to the Company in 1733, a year after

¹No ship's logs have survived, but the *Prince Rupert* was the only ship visiting York that year.

²A. 11/114, fo. 141, Isham to Governor and Committee, 21 May 1750.

³See Appendix B.

⁴See Jennifer S.H. Brown, "Two Companies in Search of Traders: Personnel and Promotion Patterns in Canada's Early British Fur Trade" in Jim Freedman and Jerome H. Barkow (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second Congress, Canadian Ethnology Society* (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975), 2: 629, 638.

⁵E.E. Rich (ed.), *James Isham's Observations on Hudsons Bay, 1743* (Toronto: Champlain Society for the Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1949), 318. See also Joan Craig, "Samuel Skrimsher" in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography III, 1741 to 1770* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 593-4; and HBCA Search File - Samuel Skrimsher.

Isham had been hired as a writer and bookkeeper.¹ In 1740, Isham (by then in charge of York along with a Mr Bricker and the surgeon, Mr Mackduff) listed York's complement in that year's general letter to London. Samuel Skrimsher, "who is warehousekeeper" and "a sober lad", was third in the list, and received an additional comment which no other man did: "and I hope will merit your honours favours."² In the previous year, Skrimsher and an Indian companion had been sent to Churchill to fetch trade goods and stores. Though both the York and Churchill journals mention this fact, the Committee complained of a lack of information regarding the journey. Isham's response was that Skrimsher had not taken "a great deal of notice, being going in haste."³

In 1746, Thomas White, then in command at York, suggested Skrimsher as a possible successor to himself at that post.⁴ Though that never came to be, the young man did become Second at York and a member of the council.⁵ Skrimsher served as Second under Thomas White (1744-46), Isham (1746-48), and finally John Newton (1748-50), who complained of Skrimsher's "Lazy Habit."⁶ Skrimsher was recalled to London in May 1750, but Newton drowned before the order arrived and Skrimsher took temporary command. Upon Isham's arrival, Skrimsher sailed to London, where he evidently

¹K. G. Davies and A.M. Johnson (eds.), *Letters from Hudson Bay, 1703-1740* (London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1965), 308n; Rich, *Isham*, 318.

²Davies and Johnson, 312.

³Davies and Johnson, 317.

⁴Rich, *Isham*, lxxx; HBCA A. 11/114, fo. 121.

⁵Rich, *Isham*, 247n1; HBCA A. 6/7, fo. 93.

⁶HBCA Search File - Samuel Skrimsher.

convinced the Committee of his worth, for he returned the following spring with a five year contract and the charge of the newly completed Flamborough House near York. Skrimsher's biographer, Joan Craig, has speculated that he was retained on account of his knowledge of Cree or his having journeyed between York and Churchill.¹ Historian E.E. Rich was not so forgiving, describing Skrimsher as "an unsteady man, lazy and unfit for forwarding any business."² However, Rich made a revealing comment which further encourages comparisons between Skrimsher and Henday: "Skrimshire [sic] had certain merits; he enjoyed travelling and he was one of the very few servants...who were competent in the Cree tongue."³ In early 1750, Isham probably knew of his cousin's impending recall, and may have seen Henday as a replacement for his protégé.

Although Henday would not be sent inland until 1754, the concept of such a journey had been in Isham's mind for a number of years previous to that. In 1743, Isham had compiled his *Observations on Hudson's Bay*, and offered his opinions on a great many aspects of the fur trade. The French seemed a continual threat to him and to the Company: "But what is the most Concer'n is to see us sitt quiet & unconcern'd while the french as an old saying, not only Beats the Bush but run's away with the Hair also."⁴ Isham spoke optimistically of inland posts, especially "at the head of port Nelson River...being a branch almost all Indians seperates Either to go to York fort, or Churchill."

¹DCB III 593. See also HBCA Search File - Samuel Skrimsher.

²Rich, *History*, 1: 585.

³Rich, *History*, 1: 585.

⁴Rich, *Isham*, 69.

Isham predicted a possible doubling of returns in such circumstances, and “in a few years might with god’s will,--be able to roat [sic] the French out of that small Settlement they have at the great Lake.”¹ A few years later, in commenting on Henry Ellis’ published account of the voyage of the *Dobbs* galley (1746-47), Isham’s optimism seemed dimmed, perhaps by sober second thought or perhaps in reaction to the increasing attacks upon the Company and its policy. Where Ellis suggested a settlement about ninety miles up the Nelson, Isham responded with skepticism. Such a settlement would have to be farther inland than a mere ninety miles to do anything more than drain off the trade of York and Churchill. Perhaps some benefit would have arisen if the French were dislodged from Lake Winnipeg, but Isham felt that to be impossible while Canada was still in their possession.² “[C]ou’d a Set[t]lement be made, and be of any further Service then what it’s at presant, certainly the Company wou’d have Erected Such before now.”³

This is not to suggest that Isham’s interest in the interior had in any way abated by 1750. His hopes for inland trading posts may have been tempered by experience, but Isham had other plans as well. In discussing the Earchithinue, Isham put forth the idea on which Heday’s journey -- as well as the journeys of all the men who followed him over the next two decades -- would be based.

was the English to Per’u up the Country... as the french has Done

¹Keeping in mind that at this time Isham was relying solely on native reports of the interior, it is probable that by “the head of port Nelson River” he really meant somewhere on the North Saskatchewan; his “great Lake” was undoubtedly Lake Winnipeg, and the French post on it Fort Bourbon. Rich, *Isham*, 67-68, 68n.

²Rich, *Isham*, 207.

³Rich, *Isham*, 209.

otherway's, I can not think but itt wou'd turn to great advantage to our Merchants or of England, their has been and is Still men that wou'd undertake such a Land Voyage with good Encouragem't Either to bring them [the Earchithinue] to the English forts to trade; or to give such a Discription of the Country that a Settlement might be made their....2 men is Suffitient for such an undertaking that is to go with some trusty So[uthern]. Indian, in the fall or Summer, to the Earchithinue Country, taking with them some trifles to give to the Natives, when Done with the So. Indians to their Country tell the spring, Keeping as near as possible to the Earchethinue Country...tell the Spring, then proceed again to the Earchethinues, using them Civilly, with promise of many such fine Goods &c. If they will come with them to the fort to trade, with a Great many more of such Like Inducements that is requir'd in Such casses, by which I do not Doubt but the trade that might be gain'd by that Country wou'd be Equivolent with York fort trade in a Small time, = a Settlement near the fork up port Nelson River wou'd be of great Service in this undertaking &c.¹

Here, in 1743, was the blueprint for Henday's journey. E.E. Rich noted that these ideas "lacked flamboyance or even originality", but that they were based on "a ripe experience and sympathetic knowledge."² All that was needed was the Committee's permission and a willing traveller. Permission came in the Committee's General Letter of 1753.³ Isham was to find a willing traveller in Anthony Henday.

Henday's career had been unremarkable up until that point. His only appearance in the York records since his arrival had been in the account books, where he had signed for his expenses. On 19 February 1754, however, Isham "sent 3 Indians with Anthony Hendy who is Going with the [measuring] Wheel &ca to measure the distance from the Entrance of Steel River; up the said River till he comes to the Branch that opens into Steel River;

¹Rich, *Isham*, 113-5. It is a matter of pure speculation as to who Isham had in mind in 1743 for such an expedition.

²Rich, *Isham*, xcix.

³A. 6/8, fos. 118d-119, Governor and Committee to Isham, 24 May 1753.

and so home down the North River," a journey which Isham estimated would take thirty days.¹ Isham's instructions to Henday, dated the day of Henday's departure, referred also to the use of guides and a compass; instructions were given for keeping a journal in the "wast[e] Book"² he had been given for taking notes.³ One of Isham's most interesting directives is his encouragement to "converse with the guides as much as you can, that you attain the Language, that you may be Qualified the better to undertake a Journey hereafter."⁴ The implication that Isham viewed Henday as a protégé is strengthened by this and by his closing remark, "be Resolute in your proceedings and you need [not] Doubt of Encouragemt from/ Your Friend/ James Isham."⁵

Encouragement was indeed forthcoming. In June 1754, Henday was outfitted with a selection of trade goods to give as gifts during his upcoming great inland journey.⁶ Isham had procured the services of "a trusty home Indian" named Connawapa to be Henday's companion. They were to proceed inland with Attickasish, or Little Deer, a

¹B. 239/a/37, fo. 15d, York Factory journal, 19 February 1754; in a letter to John Potts at Richmond Fort, Isham described this journey as "up Hays's River, near 100 Miles from the fort and across to Nelson River just below the lower Fork about 140 Miles from the fort by water," and looked forward to a journey inland to the "Earchithinue Country" the following summer, but in neither case did he mention Henday: B. 239/b/11, fo. 7, Isham to Potts, 15 April 1754.

²This was a rough account book in which transactions were recorded as they occurred, to be recopied later into a more formal book. See *Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1955), 2390.

³A. 11/114, fos. 166-167, "Instructions to Anthy Hendy, Dated att York Fort, Feby:ye:19th:1754"; there is some doubt as to the correctness of Henday's distance on this journey, as the measuring wheel appears to have been returned to London because of some defect: A. 5/1, fo. 9d, Governor and Committee to Isham, 27 May 1755.

⁴A. 11/114, fo. 167.

⁵A. 11/114, fo. 167.

⁶See Appendix C for a complete list of those goods.

“Captn or Leading Indian.”¹ Attickasish and his people set out from the fort on 26 June, with Connawapa and Henday in tow, and they would not return for almost an entire year.²

Upon his return on 23 June 1755, Henday was sent inland again almost immediately, this time in company with the apprentice William Grover. Grover soon became “Jaded,” however, forcing them to return after only a couple of days’ travel.³ Isham was disappointed, for it was by then too late for Henday to catch up with the Cree on their way inland.⁴ Instead, Henday spent an apparently leisurely trading season hunting and fishing,⁵ sometimes in the company of Humphrey Marten, clerk, steward, and future Chief at York and Albany.⁶ For a mere labourer and netmaker, Henday moved in high circles.

Another intriguing aspect of Henday’s identity first appears around this time. On 23 June 1755, the York journal recorded the arrival of “Captn Anthony Hendei.”⁷ For the next year, the journals consistently referred to him as “Captn Hendei,” then abruptly

¹A. 11/114, fo. 172. Attickasish was a familiar face at York during this time period. Andrew Graham, in journal D, noted in the margin, “Attickashish[sic] was afterwards my Acquaintance, and a Valuable leading Indian”: E. 2/11, fo. 5. Also see Paul C. Thistle, *Indian-European Trade Relations in the Lower Saskatchewan River Region to 1840* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1986), 20-21, 25.

²For Henday’s departure, see HBCA B. 239/a/37, fo. 27; for his return, see B. 239/a/39, fo. 32.

³B. 239/a/39, fos. 32d-33, York Factory journal, 28 June and 2 July 1755. This would not be Grover’s last abortive attempt to winter inland: see Rich, *History*, 1: 645.

⁴B. 239/a/37, fo. 33, York Factory journal, 2 July 1755.

⁵B. 239/a/39, fos. 34d-35d, York Factory journal, 16-24 July 1755; B. 239/a/41, fos. 18d, 25, York Factory journal, 18 February and 16 April 1756.

⁶A. 11/114, fo. 141, Isham to Governor and Committee, 21 May 1750. During this time, Marten seems to have been acting Second at York: A. 5/1, fo. 15, Governor and Committee to Isham, 24 May 1756.

⁷B. 239/a/39, fo. 32.

stopped; the title reappears in June 1760, following his return from his second winter inland.¹ “Captn Hendey” also appeared in other Company documents, though not with such regularity.² The usage seems to be Isham’s for the most part, though Marten and Joseph Isbister used it occasionally. From the timing of its appearance, the usage is clearly the result of some aspect of his inland journeys. No other Company employee of the 1750s or 1760s was given this title, not even other inland winterers: indeed, where it did appear elsewhere in the Company’s records of this period, it was applied to leading native traders, such as Attickasish or the “Chieff Captn of York Fort,” who led Joseph Smith and Joseph Waggoner to the land of the Sturgeon Indians in 1756.³

The use of this title seems to have escaped comment by scholars. Yet it is suggestive in its implication that Henday had become, in the eyes of the Bayside factors at least, a trading captain. Arthur Ray described trade leaders or captains as men “who were good hunters, knew the trading routes, had a family, could make ‘long harangues,’ and could deliver the rewards they promised to their followers.”⁴ Though Henday would not have known the trade routes, all four versions of his journal depicted him as a good hunter

¹“Captn Hendey” made regular appearances in the journals from 23 June 1755 to 13 July 1756 (B. 239/a/39, fos. 32-35d; B. 239/a/41, fos. 1-35), but the 26 July 1756 entry referred only to “Hendey” (B. 239/a/41, fo. 36); the title is used only once in 1760, on 30 June (B. 239/a/47, fo. 31).

²A. 11/114, fo. 196, Isham to Governor and Committee, 4 August 1756; B. 239/b/14, fo. 6d, Joseph Isbister (Albany) to Isham, 6 June 1756; B. 239/b/14, fo. 8d, Isham to Isbister, 25 July 1756.

³B. 239/a/42, fo. 3d, York Factory journal, 18 August 1756.

⁴Arthur J. Ray and Donald B. Freeman, *‘Give Us Good Measure’: an economic analysis of relations between the Indians and the Hudson’s Bay Company before 1763* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 63. See also Arthur Ray, “The Factor and the Trading Captain in the Hudson’s Bay Company Fur Trade before 1763” in Freedman and Barkow, ii 590; Williams, *Graham*, 169-170; Edward Umfreville, *The Present State of Hudson’s Bay* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954), 23.

and he had at least some connection with a native family. Most impressive, however, would have been the collection of gifts he brought inland (360 MB in value¹), and his ability to guarantee even more upon their return to the Bay. Such a thing is not impossible: Jean Baptiste “de Larlee” served the French and the English in turn, and ended his fur trade career as a trading captain at Albany.² Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of Henday’s ‘captaincy’ is that he alone among the winterers can be shown to have received such recognition³.

Henday also received recognition from the Committee in London, although the reviews were mixed.⁴

We have perused Hendays Journal & Examined a Draft (which We judge to be of your [Isham’s] making) of his 12 Mos Travel up Inland...in which We think he has and (by Continuing the same) may be of Service to the Companys Interest, In Consideration of which, and the hardships he may have undergone: We have Allowed him a Gratuity of £20 over and above his Wages. And We will futher reward him for what future Services he shall do the Company by his Travels hereafter, in bringing down Indian strangers...to Trade, which We judge to be the only means of enlarging the York Fort Cargoes, for we cannot find by his said Journal or Draft that any Settlement (the thing you seemed so desirous of) can be made with the least Appearance of Advantage....We can not help observing the course of Hayes and Seal Rivers are in this draft laid down very differently from any we have heretofore seen...therefore as we apprehend Henday is not very expert in making Drafts with Accuracy or keeping a just Reckoning of

¹B. 239/d/44, fo. 13.

²Thistle, 26. See also Morton, 267; Rich, *History*, 2: 1; Williams, *Graham*, 291; Brown, *Strangers*, xii. Jennifer S.H. Brown has observed that the name “de Larlee” makes no sense in French, and suggests that it may be a mistranscription of Desjarlais.

³Joseph Smith may have also been called “Captain” but no contemporary references have yet been found.

⁴The Company’s records contain no direct reference to Henday’s journal being read by the Committee: the Minute Books simply mention the packet from York being opened and the letters therein being read. See A. 1/40, p. 76, London Minute Books, 29 October 1755.

Distances other than by Guess... We direct if there is any Person at the Factory skilled in the above particulars who is willing to accompany him in his future Travels that he be encouraged thereto... And let them also be Attended by one or two more (if such there are) who are willing.¹

Thus Henday's journey swung Company policy decidedly in favour of inland wintering over inland settlement.

Henday had returned to York in 1755 to find a new contract waiting for him. The Committee's annual General Letter offered him £15 per annum for three years, "if a good Netmaker."² The terms were not satisfactory, however, as Isham reported that Henday had accepted £15 for one year, but would leave the service if not given higher wages.³ As it turned out, Henday would have other reasons to retire.

On 22 June 1756, Isham dispatched Henday to "View well & to take a true and Exact acct of the place he intimates for a Settlement," which was "Outman Lake," some 500 miles inland by their reckoning.⁴ Henday was back at York on 28 June, unable to proceed due to illness.⁵ That summer, the General Letter brought with it the Committee's appraisal of Henday's 1754-55 journey, a £20 gratuity for his labours, and a three-year contract for £20 per annum.⁶ Isham reported, "I acquainted Anthy Henday of the Tennor

¹A. 6/9, fos. 33d-34, Governor and Committee to Isham, 12 May 1756.

²A. 6/9, fo. 11, Governor and Committee to Isham, 27 May 1755.

³A. 11/114, fo. 187d, Isham to Governor and Committee, 2 September 1755.

⁴A. 11/114, fo. 194, Isham to Governor and Committee, 4 August 1756; B. 239/a/41, fo. 32d, York Factory journal, 22 June 1756.

⁵A. 11/114, fo. 194, Isham to Governor and Committee, 4 August 1756; B. 239/a/41, fo. 33d, York Factory journal, 28 June 1756.

⁶A. 6/9, fos. 33d-34, Governor and Committee to Isham, 12 May 1756.

of this Paragraph who Doth not adhear to Your Honours Proposals, saying He hath not Been Wright well since His Last Expedition, and is Desirous of Returning to England, have Accordingly sent Him Home.”¹ Henday had accumulated £34.10.2 in expenses against £103.4.6 in total wages (including his gratuities and £8.18.5 he was paid for furs he had trapped on his inland journey), leaving him with a balance of £68.14.4, which was paid out to him in London in December of that year.²

Scholars have failed to notice this departure, perhaps because Henday’s absence from the Bay was so brief. On 12 January 1757, he was re-engaged as a labourer and netmaker for five years at £20 per annum plus a £20 gratuity at the expiration of his contract “if he Behaves to the Company’s satisfaction.”³ Health problems, however, continued to plague him. In early 1758, he and Humphrey Marten were away from the fort hunting partridge at Ship River, but failed to return on 11 March as expected. Isham became worried, and sent a note to Christopher Atkinson, York’s sloop captain, who was also out hunting. Two days later, Atkinson reported that Henday had been sick with a cold for almost a fortnight. On 25 March, Isham recorded, “Information Anthony Hende

¹A. 11/114, fos. 197-197d, Isham to Governor and Committee, 4 August 1756. In the letter, Isham also (fo. 196) referred to French trading goods, remarking, “[T]he Commodity’s the French Deal in are many, in Particular Powder, Cloth &ca, as Captn Hendy actualy [sic] Traded with them, and is returned Home, can Inform Your Honours of Their Standard.” There is, however, no record of Henday appearing before the Committee.

²A. 15/10, Grand Journal, pp. 279, 366, 503; A. 15/11, Grand Journal, pp. 73, 82, 84, 112, 130, 146. Henday’s full account for this period of service is in A. 16/31, fos. 77d-78, Officers’ and Servants’ Ledgers, York Factory. Also see the relevant York account books: B. 239/d/41, fo. 8 (1750/51); B. 239/d/42, fo. 9d (1751/52); B. 239/d/43, fo. 9 (1752/53); B. 239/d/44, fo. 9 (1753/54); B. 239/d/46, fo. 10 (1755/56).

³A. 1/40, London Minute Book, p. 220, 12 January 1757; see also A. 15/11, Grand Journal, p. 165; A. 16/31, Officers’ and Servants’ Ledger, York Factory, fo. 107d.

very bad, tomorrow Shall send 2 men to See him Safe home.”¹ Precisely how long Heday’s illness lasted is unknown, but by June he was away trout fishing at Ten Shilling Creek.²

On 28 June 1759, Marten (acting Chief at York during Isham’s furlough) sent Heday inland again, this time in the company of Joseph Smith and a French deserter, Jean Baptiste “de Larley” [Desjarlais?].³ This man had been master at Basquia (The Pas), according to Marten, and could very well have been one of the men encountered by Heday in 1754/55. Their intention was to return to the “Earchithinue” country, but if any map or journal was made it has not survived. All that can be said for certain is that they arrived back at York at noon on 22 June 1760.⁴ Within a week, Heday and Smith had left the fort again -- to go fishing.⁵

Joseph Smith was not the untested youth William Grover had been. Smith had been inland twice before with Joseph Waggoner, in 1756/57 and 1757/58. Both Isham and the Committee were happy with the results of the inland wintering policy, and the two

¹B. 239/a/44, fos. 22-23d, York Factory journal, 13-25 March 1758.

²B. 239/a/44, fo. 30d, York Factory journal, 6 June 1758.

³B. 198/b/1, fo. 3, Marten to Robert Temple, 26 October 1759; see also B. 239/z/46, fo. 37, York Factory journal, 28 June 1759; B. 239/b/18, fo. 3, Marten to Ferdinand Jacobs, 3 July 1759; A. 11/114, fo. 23d, Isham to Governor and Committee, 24 August 1759. For more information on De Larlee, see Rich, *History*, 2: 1-2.

⁴B. 239/a/47, fo. 30, York Factory journal, 22 June 1760.

⁵B. 239/a/47, fo. 31, York Factory journal, 30 June 1760.

Josephs were among several men to follow in Henday's footsteps.¹ Isham's journals and correspondence during this period are full of comments on the increased number of Indians trading at York, particularly the "Bloody" Indians, who had not come since 1733.² The Sturgeon Indians, who had been visited by Smith and Waggoner, were also coming in in greater numbers: Isham reported 13 canoes in 1755, 39 canoes in 1757, and 57 canoes in 1758.³ Even after the fall of New France and the resulting disruption of the Montreal trade, Isham (rightly or wrongly) credited the increase in trade not to "our Success of Arms at Quebec &ca, but by the Encouragement of the Master, & Servants which has been In Land, for Which good Services We Referr to your Honours."⁴

In the autumn of 1760, however, Henday was transferred away from the main base for inland winterers (York), to the new post on Severn River.⁵ At Severn, under the command of his erstwhile hunting partner, Humphrey Marten, Henday continued to spend much of his time away hunting and fishing. Unfortunately, this familiar pattern was interrupted by the equally familiar problem of illness. On 25 March 1761, the post journal recorded, "Anthony Henday, and Christopher Atkinson brought their things home & have

¹See Rich, *History*, 1: 644-52; 2: 15-16. Also see, for example, HBCA A. 5/1, fo. 7, Governor and Committee to John Potts (Richmond), 27 May 1755; A. 5/1, fo. 25d, Governor and Committee to Isham, 23 May 1758; A. 5/1, fo. 26, Governor and Committee to Ferdinand Jacobs, 23 May 1758; A. 6/9, fo. 128d-129, Governor and Committee to Isham, 15 May 1760.

²B. 239/b/16, fos. 3d-4, Isham to Jacobs, 17 July 1758; A. 11/114, fo. 16, Isham to Governor and Committee, 16 September 1758.

³B. 239/a/44, fo. 34, York Factory journal, 4 July 1758.

⁴A. 11/115, fo. 50d, Isham to Governor and Committee, 5 September 1760.

⁵This is another career move previously overlooked in published accounts. I am indebted to the notes of A.S. Morton (HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday), for otherwise I too would have missed it.

not been able to Stir out of the Tent these 20 Day[s] taken bad with Lameness in their Legs, have been 3 days crawling about 20 Miles both in a poor Condition.”¹ Not until 11 May could Marten report Henday’s full recovery.²

The record of Henday’s period of service at Severn contains a most interesting journal entry. On 22 July 1761, Marten realized that he had made an error in his keeping of the post journal, and he had to tear out a page. He carefully noted this for the Committee’s reference, and even called upon “the Man who Had the Keys of the Store Room” to witness it. This man’s name, in his own handwriting, appears in a very cramped space at the bottom right-hand corner of the page: “A Henday.”³ This implies that at that time Henday was Trader and Second at Severn.

This clue about Henday’s position seemed confirmed a week later, when Marten travelled to York and left Henday in command.⁴ Isham had passed away on 13 April, and Marten was on his way to take command at York, while Andrew Graham (acting Chief since Isham’s death) would assume command at Severn. Graham arrived on 3 September,

¹B. 198/a/2, fo. 14d, Severn River journal, 25 March 1761.

²Henday was “Very bad” on 31 March (B. 198/a/2, fo. 15d), “Still very bad” on 10 April (fo. 16), “on the mending hand” on 16 April (fo. 16d), “s[t]ill lame” on 6 May (fo. 18d), and “much better” on 11 May (fo. 19).

³B. 198/a/2, fo. 25, Severn River journal, 22 July 1761. It is a great shame that almost all of the surviving examples of Henday’s signature are written in rather cramped spaces.

⁴B. 198/a/2, fo. 26, Severn River journal, 29 July 1761. Marten begins, “Sir/ Mr Isham having given me Orders to leave you Master of this House at my Departure,” but Isham’s original instructions to Marten say only to “leave the 4 Men with the 2 Ladds” (B. 198/a/2, fo. 47d, Isham to Marten, 9 April 1761); it is worth noting that Marten closed with “I am Sir Your Friend/ and Servant/ Hy Marten” (fo. 26d).

relieving Henday of his command after 36 days.¹ Two months later, Henday was sent to York with John Garbut and an Indian man to fetch some trade goods and “other things Needful.”² Henday would not return to Severn River.

Marten wrote to Graham, “As you had no Person at Severn fit to be trusted with the care of the House at your departure, have kept Anthony Henday, and sent you Joseph Smith [Trader at York after Isham’s death], the former’s time being out at Shiptime, and the latter you know is a worthy Creature and much fitter for the Trust than Eny other Person that can be Spared.”³ Back at York, Henday waited for the Committee’s response to his contract demand: “3 years at £30 per Annum or home.”⁴

Meanwhile, Henday apparently served in a similar capacity at York as he had at Severn. In the spring of 1762, Humphrey Marten was experiencing some discipline problems with his men, most notably Hugh Jones. In a letter to the Governor and Committee, copied into the York journal, Marten complained of Jones’ behaviour, and then added, “this in Justice I must declare that Christopher Atkinson has behaved in the best manner, his whole study as well as Anthony Hendays being to keep peace below Stairs.”⁵ Jones’ disruptive behaviour continued, and in a letter dated 2 April he demanded that Marten send him inland to winter with the Indians. Upon receipt of this letter, Marten

¹B. 198/a/3, fo. 2, Severn River journal, 3 September 1761. It is odd that Henday did not appear to have kept a journal during those 36 days, although in the following winter at Severn Joseph Smith did.

²B. 198/a/3, fo. 9d, Severn River journal, 18 November 1761.

³B. 239/b/23, fo. 5d, Marten to Graham, 6 December 1761; also copied in B. 198/a/3, fo. 42d.

⁴A. 11/115, fo. 61d, Marten to Governor and Committee, 2 August 1761.

⁵B. 239/a/49, fo. 28d, York Factory journal, 2 March 1762.

recorded in the journal, "I called up Stairs, Christopher Atkinson, Anthony Henday and George Richardson, that they might hear his (Hugh Jones's) reasons for sending me the above Letter, they being the properest Men I could think of."¹ Marten interviewed Jones in their presence: Jones was less than cooperative, and Marten threatened to hold him in chains until the supply ship arrived if he did not sign a document agreeing not to leave the factory without Marten's permission. The agreement was copied into the post journal and witnessed by Henday and Richardson.² They also signed their names to a statement that Jones had signed the aforementioned agreement of his own will and had not been coerced in any way.³

Precisely what role Henday played in his final days at York is difficult to determine. Marten listed all of the servants at York that spring, but no occupations were listed. Beside Henday's name, fourth in the list, Marten only wrote, "Willing, & able to Work."⁴ Henday's only other appearance in the journal was on 14 April, when he was drying furs while another man was mending nets.⁵ That summer, the HBC ship *King George (II)* brought the Committee's rejection of Henday's salary demands: he was being

¹B. 239/a/49, fo. 34, York Factory journal, 2 April 1762.

²B. 239/a/49, fo. 34d, York Factory journal, 2 April 1762.

³B. 239/a/49, fo. 35, York Factory journal, 2 April 1762. The two Henday signatures in the York journal are very similar, except that the initial "A" in Anthony is completely different; the second signature in the York journal is almost identical to the one in the Severn River journal. However, both the Severn River signature and the first York signature were written at the bottom of a page in a rather cramped space.

⁴B. 239/a/49, fo. 31d, York Factory journal, 7 March 1762.

⁵The man mending nets was not named: B. 239/a/49, fo. 36d, York Factory journal, 14 April 1762.

called home.¹ On Monday, 6 September 1762, Anthony Henday's fur trade career came to an end, as the *King George (II)* sailed away from York Factory.² On 18 January 1763, he was paid the balance of his account,³ and that was his final appearance in the Company's records. At about 38 years old, he was still a relatively young man, but of the rest of his life we have no record.

Interpretations

In light of all this evidence, it is worth returning to Graham's commentary on Henday. It is possible that Henday had made an enemy of one or more of the captains of the supply ships. Henday's account recorded amounts owed George Spurrell, captain of the *Prince Rupert (I)*: £2.5.0 in October 1751, £2.13.0 in December 1753, and £3 in December 1755.⁴ Spurrell made his last recorded voyage to York in 1755, and no more bills to ships' captains appear in Henday's account after that date. For the remainder of Henday's career, York was visited by Captains Jonathon Fowler Sr and Joseph Spurrell,⁵ but Henday had no recorded dealings with either of them. The ships' captains could be

¹Henday's friend and superior, Marten, and the sailor and veteran winterer, Joseph Waggoner, were both recalled along with Henday: A. 6/10, fo. 29, Governor and Committee to Marten, 24 May 1762.

²HBCA C. 1/366, fo. 35, Ship's Log, *King George (II)*, 1762.

³A. 16/32, fo. 39d, Officers' and Servants' Ledger. See also A. 15/11, Grand Journal, p. 497. For details of Henday's expenses during the second half of his career, see B. 198/d/2, fo. 5d (1760/61); B. 198/d/3, fo. 9d (1761/62).

⁴A. 15/10, Grand Journal, pp. 366, 502; A. 15/11, Grand Journal, p. 82; A. 16/31, fo. 77d, Officers' and Servants' Ledger, York Factory.

⁵There is no record of a ship visiting York in 1756; Fowler commanded the *Prince Rupert (I)* (George Spurrell's old ship) from 1757-59 (C. 1/874-6); Joseph Spurrell commanded the *Prince Rupert (II)* in 1760 (C. 1/882) and the *King George (II)* in 1761 and 1762 (C. 1/365-6).

formidable personages, as they had regular opportunities to speak directly with the Governor and Committee regarding Bayside matters. George Spurrell was a “solid, respectable figure,” who demonstrated great loyalty and ability during his long career with the Company, and after his retirement in 1756 was elected to the London Committee.¹ Jonathon Fowler, on the other hand, was a less savoury character: at one point, he attempted to exploit Andrew Graham by offering a poor price for skins which he would sell for Graham in Holland.² Were they inclined to do so, both Fowler and Joseph Spurrell were in a perfect position to damage Henday’s reputation and destroy his career. There is, however, no evidence that they were so inclined.

There is evidence suggesting that Henday left the service because he was unhappy with being a netmaker. Certainly Henday’s demands for higher wages indicate that he felt his services and talents undervalued by the Committee. This examination of Henday’s career calls to mind E.E. Rich’s words on Isham: “[Isham] was not enamoured of conditions in the Bay and at the end of his first contracted period of service was anxious to come home. But he...was prepared to remain if promotion offered.”³ Those exact words could also be applied to Henday. The only difference was that, for Henday, promotion did not come quickly enough to convince him to remain in the service in the face of frequent if not chronic health problems. Otherwise, perhaps Henday could have

¹Glyndwr Williams, “George Spurrell” in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* 3: 598-99. As a matter of pure speculation, it may well have been Spurrell who in hindsight made the comment Graham reported in the middle of journal D.

²Williams, *Graham*, lx, 284, 284n.

³Rich, *Isham*, xxxiii.

stood beside his friend Humphrey Marten as a senior officer of the Company. Henday's time at Severn River gives a tantalizing hint of what might have been.

CHAPTER 3 THE JOURNALS

Journal A

The 1755 packet sent to London contained "a Journal of a Voyage or Journey in Land, from York Fort up Hayes River, By Captn Anth[on]y Hendey from June the 26th 1754 to June the 23d 1755."¹ Following the journal proper, Isham added some comments under the heading "This Finished Captn Hendey's Journey and beg Leave, & beg Leave to observe some Remarks on the foresaid Journal, and what he observes to Me of ye Country."² Journal A is clearly an edited copy of the original journal or collection of field notes in the waste book, of which no exact copy is known to exist. The journal entries are in Henday's voice, but the footnotes are Isham's, and the entire document is in Isham's handwriting.³ The footnotes and Isham's appended commentary all suggest that the body of the text was left unchanged.

The entries all begin with observations on wind direction and weather, and further comments are generally brief but informative. It would appear that Henday sat down every evening and recorded the day's events. Henday the journal-writer always had his

¹HBCA B. 239/a/40, fos. 1-38.

²B. 239/a/40, fos. 38-45.

³See, for example, B. 239/a/40, fos. 2d, 3, 4d, 5; footnotes are common only in the early part of the journal. I owe a debt to the late A.S. Morton, whose 1933 notes on Henday suggested that the handwriting was Isham's: notes, HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday. See also a communication with Clifford Wilson, where an anonymous archivist (possibly Alice Johnson) makes a similar suggestion: communication with C.P. Wilson, 19 May 1954, HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday. Williams (48, 49), however, was of the opinion the writing was Graham's.

nose to the ground: he described things and places as he came to them.¹ When he did speculate on future encounters, it concerned people, such as the French at Fort Paskoyac [The Pas, Manitoba], whom he knew he could expect.

On 20 July 1754, Heday sent a letter to York, informing Isham that "we should see a French Factory in 2 Days more, and that We must go by it, before We can go their [Cree] Country. I dont very well like it, having nothing to Satisfy them on what account I am giving [going?] up the Country, and Very possibly they may suspect Me to be a Spy."²

Heday evidently overestimated the French, as his journal entry for 22 July 1754 gave his first impressions of Fort Paskoyac: "we Entered their fort (or more properly a Hogstye) for in short it is no Better, they are very Lazey, not one stick of wood anigh their house." Isham, in his comments, recorded Heday's opinion that "he and 2 more could have took Either of their [French] hutts, and [it] startled them to see one Man, much more if severall were sent."³ As he had expected, Heday was informed by one of the two men there "that he would detain me there, and send me home to france, I told him I knew france as well as he did, and was not afraid to go their more than himself, which Made Monsieure a Little

¹When he arrived at a place and camped, he would describe the place (e.g. 1 July 1754 (B. 239/a/40, fo. 2d): "very high Rocky Land, & shrube woods, nothing but falls and heaps of Large Stones") but would not name it until he left the next day (e.g. 2 July 1754 (B. 239/a/40, fo. 2d): "took my departure from stoney Banks"), unless the place already had a Cree name (e.g. 15 July 1754 (B. 239/a/40, fo. 4d): "this day Entered Mono ko tuskey ["Shade falls": fn]).

²Williams, "Puzzle," 54; A. 11/114, fo. 180d. Heday's expectations were probably coloured by Isham's unflattering opinion of the French: "Slie [sic] Su[b]tle and artfull to perfaction...Enemyes to the Company peace or warr" (Rich, *Isham*, ci). Also see Davies and Johnson, 264.

³ Isham was also referring to Fort la Corne, which Heday visited on his return trip the following spring; B. 239/a/40, fos. 5d-6, 41.

Cooler."¹

Once past the French, Henday and his companions pressed inland, meeting several groups of "Esinepoet"[Assiniboine] and "Mirtho" Indians, most of whom were receptive to the idea of trading at the Bay.² Early in October, Henday finally met the "Earchithinue" and on 14 October arrived at the main camp of some 200 tents.

we mett the Earchithinue men on horse back 40 in number they were out on a Scout from the main body, to see if we were Enemies, when they found us friends, Attickasish, Connawappa, and 2 more of our Leaders marched att the front about 4 Mile where upon the top of a Hill I seed 200 tents, where they were pitched in 2 Rows, and an opening Right through the middle, and att ye farther End of the Street, their was a Large tent pitcht in front, where all the old Men were seated and their King in the middle, and in the middle of the tent was full of fatt Buffaloes flesh, and after that we had all smoakt round, Every flag had a Side of meat, and ye rest Served all round amongst ye Indn men, and I had satt before me 20 Broild tongues, then we Returned to our tent³

There followed a day of feasting, during which Henday found that "they have plenty of tobacco, as they of [have] their own and paint of severall Colours, they think Little of our tobacco & paint", but when exchanging gifts on the 16th, he observed that "they are mad for guns, Knives, Hatchets &ca."⁴ The Earchithinues promised to accompany Henday down to York in the spring, and the two groups then parted ways to prepare for the

¹B. 239/a/40, fo. 6.

²On 31 July, "came to us ten tents of Senipoets, I went and Smoakt with them, they all promised to go with me to the fort next Spring" (B. 239/a/40, fo. 7), and likewise on 4 August, "there Came to us seven tents more of Esinepoets, I went to their tents & Smoakt with them, they all in Gen^l promised, to go to the fort in y^e Spring of y^e year" (fo. 7d); on 5 September, he commented, "the Esinepoets are very Numerous, and the Mirtho Ind^s as they call them, but their is no odds in y^e Esinepoets and them." (fo. 12d).

³B. 239/a/40, fos. 18-18d.

⁴B. 239/a/40, fo. 18d.

winter.¹

Through the winter and into the spring of 1755, personal details seemed to dominate the journal. Henday's group was reduced to about a dozen people, mostly women and children. Henday told of encounters with bears, of his illness, and of the group's shortage of powder and shot. On 16 March, for instance, there "came one Indian for more powder, and Shott, I gave him none, for in Short have not above one Measure and one half for my Self, and that when I grow better [he was ill at this point], intend to take care to kill provisions for myself and family."² Henday first spoke of a "family" in August, but the concept of "family" became more tangible through the winter.³ One man in particular came to the forefront: he was not given a name, but was variously referred to as "my Man", "my Indian", "the Man that I tent with", and, most commonly, "my partner".⁴ Of this man, Isham said, "the Man proved to be an honest Man & a good friend" to Henday.⁵

¹On 16 October, "the Earchithinues Say they will go with me to y^e fort and see y^e Gov^r" (B. 239/a/40, fo. 18d), and again on 18 October, "severall of y^e Earchithinues promised to go with me to y^e fort att the spring of the year, and they would get all kinds of ffurs, that their Country affords" (fo. 19).

²B. 239/a/40, fo. 30; for encounters with bears, see entries for 22 November 1754 (fos. 21d-22) and 10 January 1755 (fo. 25).

³B. 239/a/40, fo. 8d. In an eighteenth century context, family should not necessarily be interpreted as the nuclear household of modern thinking: Henday could very easily be referring to household of pre-industrial conception, containing a master and his servants. See Laslett for a complete discussion of family in a pre-industrial context.

⁴This man made regular appearances between 7 March and 17 April 1755: B. 239/a/40, fos. 29-32d.

⁵B. 239/a/40 fo. 42; on 1 April 1755 Henday, being ill, gave this man his gun, and some powder and shot, to go and hunt for them: up until then, Henday had not trusted his small supply of powder to anyone (B. 239/a/40, fo. 31). Another friend of Henday's seems to have been Connawappa, one of his guides: when the two met again in the spring, Henday commented that it was "the first time I have seen him Since the fall of y^e year, he when went away, he Left his wife, Bob[?], and an Earchithinue Girl for me to keep, he has Made an Exceeding Good use of his time...he said he had Eat nothing for 2 days, I told him I had nothing for to Eat myself, when he

Not all of the Englishman's companions were as agreeable as this fellow, however.

On 30 March 1755, Henday wrote,

I went to Shenap for a hatchet I Lent him when he went up the River a hunting, he said he would not give it me, I said but Little to him, for he is Like a child, and would not be Long considering for to knock me on the Head, for I know not what.¹

The next day the tension increased as Henday and Shenap argued over their tent cloth and Henday's gun (which Henday also appears to have lent him). Several days later, the conflict remained unresolved, as Henday commented, "as for Shenap and his Lame Lye, they are all angry, but I Cannot help it, and the Inds all told Me, if I saw him or his Son, not to say anything to them (the old Man is Like a Child, and the son a proud fool[])."²

There was also disagreement over beaver trapping and issues of trespassing.

Henday's companions showed no inclination to trap beavers in any numbers despite a great abundance of that valuable animal. Isham's footnote to the 23 October 1754 entry read: "here Captn Hendeay observes Beaver are plenty, asking the Reason why they did not Lye by and kill more he says that Beaver alone is not sufficient to Maintain their familys, therefore are obliged to pitch from place to place for Larger Beasts, such as Moose and Buffaloe, he also Says notwithstanding they find Sever[a]ll houses in a day they will only

went to his own tent I gave him some dried Meat, and 4 Loads of Shott" (21 April, B. 239/a/40, fo. 32d). Nine days later Henday's reunion with his other guide was described much more briefly: "here we came to where Attickasish and y' Ind' were making their canoes, all in a Starving condition" (30 April, B. 239/a/40, fo. 33s).

¹B. 239/a/40, fo. 31, 30 March 1755.

²B. 239/a/40, fos. 31-31d. Also see Paul C. Thistle, "Dependence and Control: Indian-European Trade Relations in the Post-Kelsey Era" in Henry Epp (ed.), *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's 'Inland Country of Good Report'* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1993), 125.

Break open one or two and pitch away."¹

At Christmastime, Henday pressed his companions on this subject, and "they told me it was not their country, for if the Earchithinues should see us they would kill us all, I told them I would not believe anything of it unless I see it, att which they were very Angry and Ask'd me if I would shoot one of them if I saw him, and I told them not unless they presented for to shoot at me first."²

Rather than argue this point, Henday tried to consolidate the successes he had already gained. Earlier in December, he had "talked with the old Capt[ai]n ab[ou]t Every Canoe taking one Earchithinue but he would give no hearing to such a proposal I told him Every Ind[ia]n that would take one Earchithinue you [presumably Isham] would give them 1 G[allo]n Brandy, and 2 Measures of Tobacco, and other goods, he att Last Consented to take 2 or 3, if they come According to promise, which I do really believe they will."³ His optimism in this respect is significant in light of his comments of 24 March 1755: "the Esinepoets are farther down the River, there are a great many of them promised to [go] to the fortt, for many Years (has not been)."⁴ However, Henday's optimism seems to have been misplaced. When he met the Earchithinue again in mid-May 1755, they again promised to go down to the Bay, but only a week later, on 21 May, he reported, "they

¹B. 239/a/40, fo. 19d. At this time Isham reported that the Indians "all In General say Beaver is Scarce, and what they att present Gett are obliged to Go into the Earchithinue Country, and Stone Inds Country": A. 11/114, fo. 162, Isham to Governor and Committee, 8 September 1754.

²B. 239/a/40, fo. 24.

³B. 239/a/40, fo. 23.

⁴B. 239/a/40, fo. 30d.

have neither victuals nor goods, and cannot padle, so we shall proceed tomorrow for the fort, as fast as we can here is 60 canoes designed for the fort if ye french does not stop them."¹

Whether this unfortunate turn of events was due to bad planning on the Earchithinue's part, or to the "old Capt[ai]n" breaking his promise, Henday must have been disappointed. The journal entries after this point are short and relatively uninformative, although this may simply have been due to the fact that he was now travelling through territory he had visited the previous summer. On 23 May 1755, the fleet of canoes came to a French trading house, where Henday was kindly received and where the group rested until the 26th. The only reason Henday gave for this delay was weather, as on the 25th when it rained all day. This was not the first time that weather prevented the company from travelling, but it may be noted that a few days after leaving this French house Henday and his group paddled 24 miles in a thunderstorm.² This pattern repeated itself when Henday reached Paskoyac on 29 May, where he remained until 2 June. On one day, the Indians were "talking &ca" and the next day they were mending their canoes; at both posts, though, Henday claimed that the French "got but very Little trade."³

After Henday returned to York on 23 June, Isham evidently questioned him on various details of the journey, and then added some of his own remarks at the end of the

¹B. 239/a/40, fo. 35d.

²B. 239/a/40, fos. 35d-36.

³B. 239/a/40, fos. 35-36d.

journal. He cast no doubt on the veracity of Henday's report, observing that the inland natives "were very civil to Capt[ai]n Hendey, mightily pleased at his coming to See them, and did promise to go to the fort with him in ye Spring of ye Year." But he could not ignore the fact that the Earchithinue (as well as many other Indians who had made similar promises) had failed to come to the Bay. On this topic, Isham commented, "the misfortune is the English Earchithinues has not ye knowledge of padling in cannues, nor Even knows not how to make such, they Rideing Chiefly; two of them was 2 or 3 days Sitting in a cannue, other Ind[ian]s padling, but being afraid turned back."¹ Perhaps Henday's "old Capt[ai]n" did keep his promise after all, but the Earchithinue backed out of the deal; or perhaps the Earchithinue had simply told Henday what he wanted to hear.² Isham's further comments add to our picture of what happened in those ten days in May:

Notwithstanding all this Captn Hendey told the King, and all the Earchithinues to gett goods, and he would go see the governor, and Return again with more presents, and Conduct them to the fort where they might trade themselves, being great plenty of sundry Goods, they as well as the Esinepoets and Bloody Ind[ian]s promised so to do, told Captn Hendey to be as good as his word, and to bring two More of his country Men (they said their Country Men, for they Looked upon Capt[ai]n Hendey as their Country man) for in truth they had a great deal more Love & Respect for him, then our Ind[ian]s had³

Isham also emphasized that "there is upwards of 250 tents of English Earchithinues, and

¹B. 239/a/40, fo. 40; elsewhere he said that "if the Indians could have come on horse back they would not have hesitated upon it, but that is unpracticable." (fo. 42d).

²Isham himself had commented on a native propensity to give agreeable information: "if you put a Question to them, as I have Done oft'n, they will answer to what I Desir'd, at the same time neither her'd see, or [k]new any thing of the matter" (Rich, *Isham*, 92). Andrew Graham also commented on this in E. 2/4, fo. 20. Also see Williams, *Graham*, xxvii.

³B. 239/a/40, fo. 40.

Esinepoets, besides the Bloody Ind[ian]s which are numerous, and differrs Little from ye Esinepoets, that might be brought to trade."¹

Isham recognized two chief obstacles to his ongoing efforts to get the inland Indians down to trade: the Cree middlemen and the French traders. The French were a problem of which Isham was already aware, and his only real amendment to Henday's account concerned the time spent at Forts la Corne and Paskoyac on the return trip: "Here he hints of ye Inds trading with ye French, which they cannot deny, this is no More then what I always Understood, therefore No wonder they bring so Little goods to us."² Neither was the middleman position of various groups of Cree news to Isham: Ferdinand Jacobs had warned him of just such a situation the previous year.³

There can be no doubt that Henday's journal and Isham's commentary were from the beginning meant to go together. The journal itself gives the impression of having been copied from daily field notes, and the resulting narrative is uneven and occasionally confusing. As an example, the entry for 7 September 1754 states that "this day [we] went with the french Inds who took Care to Load [lead?] me all of ye way."⁴ It is difficult to figure out to which Indians he is referring. Isham filled in most of the noticeable gaps in

¹B. 239/a/40, fo. 39d. Most scholars have assumed these "Bloody" Indians to be the Blood, but such an identification seems overly simplistic in light of comments suggesting a connection between the "Bloody" Indians and the "Esinepoets" (see, for example, B. 239/a/40, fo. 39d).

²B. 239/a/40, fo. 42.

³See B. 239/a/40, fo. 40. Jacobs wrote to Isham, "the Indians which trades Yearly with Us get great Quantity's of Furrs (Catt in particular) from the above said Earchithinues, and Trade from them for Our Goods, and may probably be the reason for their not encourageing them to come Down to Trade, by which means the Indians keep the Benefit of that Trade amongst them Selves." HBCA B. 239/b/11, fo. 13-13d, Jacobs to Isham, 23 August 1754.

⁴B. 239/a/40, fo. 12d.

information with his footnotes and the commentary, apparently based on Henday's "head notes" -- his oral reports and memories. This may be why the journal itself was allowed to remain so lacking in explanations.

Together, Henday's journal and Isham's commentary paint a picture of a bright and eager young man venturing inland with a group of Cree Indians, with whom he seems to have felt quite comfortable. His initial fears concerning the French traders were allayed by the sight of their small and poorly-kept establishment -- shabby compared to York. Once past Paskoyac, Henday took every opportunity to meet with Indians and try to convince them to return with him to the Bay in the spring. In general, they promised to do so but, as Henday himself observed, not all those who promised to come actually came. The Earchithinue, when he finally found them, expressed their interest in visiting York as well.

No doubt convinced that his mission was a success, Henday then began to prepare for the oncoming winter, which he spent with his "family". Life with this small group of Cree was relatively comfortable, and a period of illness was made easier by the aid of a good friend. There was conflict, with Shenap over some property and with the other Indians over trapping, but nothing much appears to have arisen out of these quarrels. The only hint of pessimism came in the spring, as Henday began to realize that his flotilla of canoes would be much smaller than he had been led to hope. Success faded further from view when he was unable to get past the French posts quickly or without loss of goods to the French. However, even in these gloomy final days of the journey, the journal refrains from employing powerful adjectives: the mood is at best implied rather than directly stated. Though generally positive, the document as a whole maintains an even keel and

sticks to the people and places, without emotion.

Journal B

A rather different picture is presented by three other surviving versions of the journal, all of them found in volumes of Andrew Graham's *Observations on Hudson's Bay*. Of these, the earliest version, here referred to as B after Williams' usage, is in the first book of Graham's earliest compilation of his *Observations*, dating to 1768-9 (HBCA E. 2/4, fos. 35-60). The volume contains sections on natural history, Indians, and Eskimos; descriptions of life at HBC posts; discussions of inland policy; lists giving the standard of trade at York; some meteorological and astronomical observations (not Graham's own); and an abstract of William Tomison's journal of his 1767-8 expedition to Lake Winnipeg.¹ Under the heading "A small account of the Archithinue Indians", Graham included "A Journal of a journey from York Fort to the Archithinue country in the years 1755 and 1756, by Anthony Hendey, being the first of the Company's Servants who went in land to endeavour to promote the fur trade."

Journal B is written in a copperplate clerical hand very different from Graham's.² This version is clearly an edited copy, as several days or even weeks are often condensed into one entry, whereas A has a separate entry for every day. Not only have the years been copied wrongly, but many incidents have been misplaced by a day or two. Other differences also stand out: as will be seen, some details have been removed, many more

¹Williams, *Graham*, 352.

²For a discussion of eighteenth century handwriting styles, see D.C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York: Garland, 1992), 207-13.

have been added, and some have been changed entirely.

The description of Henday's first encounter with the French in B differs only slightly from that in A: "he told me the master and men were gone down with the furs, and that they must stop me till they returned, however, they were very kind and at night I went to my tent and told my leader that had the charge of me, who only laughed and said they dar'd not."¹ It is unclear whether Henday was looking for reassurance from his fellow traveller (probably, but not necessarily, Attickasish), or if he was simply sharing what he thought was a funny story. Whatever the case, Henday's comparison of the post to a "Hogstye" has been dropped, as has his accusation of laziness.

Much more significant changes are found on 31 July 1754, when Henday met ten tents of Esinepoets. In A, these Indians agreed to visit York in the spring, but here their answer was much different.

being now entered their country, I went and smoaked and talked with them to go with me to the fort in the summer, but they answered, we are more conveniently supplied from the french houses, I said that the french gave them little for their furs, but all I said signified nothing, I found them strongly attached to the french Interest.²

Henday met with similar resistance on 4 August, when he smoked with seven more tents of Esinepoets, but "have no hopes of geting them to the fort, as what cloth &c they have is french,"³ and again on 20 September, when he complained, "have done all in my power to get them [seven tents of Esinepoets] to visit our forts, but I am afraid to little purpose,

¹E. 2/4, fo. 38.

²E. 2/4, fo. 38d.

³E. 2/4, fo. 39.

they living in this plentyfull country, and can well do without any European support, but their chief objection is the long distance."¹

Henday's exhortations fell on deaf ears among the Earchithinue as well. Where journal A recorded discussions of an economic nature only on 16 October, B placed them on 14-15 October (days which were spent feasting in A). On both days, he received a familiar answer: "that it was far off, and they could not paddle in canoes....and they could not live without buffaloes flesh, and that they never would leave their horses, and many other obstacles which I think very just, the chief of which was, they never wanted provisions."² The Earchithinue were far from unkind, however. Their leader in journal B told Henday "that he loved the great leader who sent me, that I or my countrymen might come again with safety, and said that he would perhaps see me again at waskesew [red deer] river in the spring of the year if the buffaloe should take the rout downwards."³

Winter in journal B descended on a much gloomier Henday than in A. Furthermore, winter in B was spent without a "partner" or a "family", although a female "bedfellow" did make two appearances.⁴ Even the disagreements over trapping progressed differently. On 23 October, Henday commented that his companions "Killed 2 moose, one buffaloe and only 10 beaver, when I am certain they might have killed 200, whereas they only kill a few for cloathing, the creeks and ponds are full of beaver houses."

¹E. 2/4, fo. 44.

²E. 2/4, fos. 46d-47.

³E. 2/4, fos. 48-48d.

⁴She is mentioned in the entry for 28 December-4 January (E. 2/4, fo. 52), and again on 15 May (fo. 57).

¹ At Christmastime, what had been a heated argument about trespassing in A became a lighter matter in B. Observing that wolves were very numerous where they were, Henday asked his companions "why they would not kill them, to which they answered the Archithinues will kill us if we trap in their country; I then asked them when and where they were to get the wolves &c to carry to the forts in the spring = to this they made no answer but laughed one to another." One thing that did not change between the journals is Henday's stubborn character, as evidenced in A by his dealings with Shenap, and in B by his defiant comment at the end of this entry: "myself trapping wolves."² The whole matter seems to have been cleared up a few days later, when Journal B recorded:

Indians killing moose and waskesews [red deer], but very few beaver altho' they are very numerous, as are also wolves and foxes, but not one trap have they put up yet; my bedfellow informs me that they were angry with me for speaking so much about trapping, and advised me to say no more to them about it, for they would get more wolves and beaver &c from the Archithinues and Aseenepoets than they could carry; I asked her when we would see them again, and if they bought the goods every year from them, she said that the Indians that traded at York Fort were supplied by them, and that we should see them in the spring, but she begged of me to take no notice, otherwise they would kill her, so for ye woman's sake shall take no notice but be quiet.³

Journal A has no mention of such advice or of such an advisor.

When the group did indeed meet the Earchithinue and Esinepoets in May, Journal B commented, "127 tents of Archithinues came to us, I bought 30 wolves skins from them, and the trading Indians bought a great many skins of sorts, which proves what my

¹E. 2/4, fo. 49.

²E. 2/4, fo. 52; note the change from "Earchithinue" to "Archithinue".

³E. 2/4, fo. 52.

bedfellow formerly told me...we have neither hatchet nor knife left, having sold all for furs."¹ Many of these furs never made it to York, however.

Where A only hinted that the Indians traded with the French on the return trip, B declared it openly and in very gloomy terms.

[24-25 May, Fort la Corne] the master gave the natives 10 gallons of adulterated brandy, and has traded from them above 1000 of the finest skins, refusing wolves, bears & dressed beaver skins in coat, as also skins that are in any manner damaged or are not in season; I cannot get them to proceed, it's surprizing to observe what great influence the French hath over the natives.

[30 May, Fort Paskoyac] obliged to lye by, could not get the natives away, they have traded the most valuable furs; I breakfasted &c with the master, and he showed me his stock of furs, a brave parcel of cased cats, martens, and parchment beaver...the Frenchmen are masters of all the Indian languages & have greatly the advantage of us, and if they had brazile tobacco which they have not, would entirely cut our trade off

[31 May, Paskoyac] the Indians would not paddle, they have kept a continual trading, and I believe many would trade all the furs and pelts they have if they could persuade them to take their heavy goods²

It was on this pessimistic note that the Henday of journal B arrived back at York on 23 June 1755.

Journal C

The second of Graham's versions, referred to as journal C, is not a copy of either A or B, but rather an amalgamation of the two. This version is found in the second book of a volume of the *Observations* compiled between 1767 and 1769, and it spent most of its existence in the library of Samuel Wegg, Deputy Governor (1774-82) and then Governor

¹E. 2/4, fo. 57.

²E. 2/4, fos. 58-59.

(1782-99) of the Hudson's Bay Company. It was purchased by the HBC from Maggs Bros. of London in 1926, and now rests in the Company's archives as E. 2/6; journal C is on folios 10d-38d. Book one of this volume has been lost, but the second book contains some very brief natural history notes, a discussion of Company policy in the Bay, and lists relating to York in the 1760s; the largest section, however, is "a Journal of a Journey inland from York Fort up Hay's River &c by Anthony Hendey from June the 26th 1754 to June the 23d 1755."¹

The description of Henday's first encounter with the French is almost exactly the same as that in B, but the Esinepoets which he met on 31 July and 4 August gave him the same positive response which they did in A.² From that point, C follows B until the end of the year, with the exception that journal C contains no discussion of trapping on or around 23 October (as there was in both A and B). On 23 December, journal C recorded that "the old Man is afraid the Archithinues will come and kill us." This was probably the "old Capt[ai]n" from A, and he was mentioned again on the 27th.

made a wolf trap...the Indians were angry, and said the Archithinues would kill us if we trapped in their Country; I asked the old Man how they were to get wolves skins to Carry to the Fort; He made me little answer; but am informed by My bedfellow that we shall Trade them from the Archithinues in the spring of the year: for the sake of the Woman, shall take no notice at present.³

Again, the account has changed. In journal C, only one man spoke to Henday about this subject, and he did not seem to find the discussion at all humorous; also, Henday's

¹Williams, *Graham*, 353.

²E. 2/6, fos. 13-14d.

³E. 2/6, fo. 27.

bedfellow did not necessarily fear for her life here, though some potential ill consequences are implied.¹

Something of the mood of A returned in the March entries, where Heday again spoke of his "Family", a term completely absent from B. His "partner" did not return, but there is a comment to the effect that "we go on very well, my two Companions are good Men."² Furthermore, trade prospects also improved. Although the Earchithinue refused Heday's invitations, his group met Wapennesew, "a French leader, who promises to go with me to the Fort, He is a jolly, stout, good natured Man, and carrys a great command amongst the Natives; my Bedfellow (who slyly gives me information) informs me He Commands 20 Canoes, and is much taken notice of by the French."³ On 7 March, journal C reported:

all the Natives unpitched, and went different ways in search of food; myself, and Family, Vizt. 3 Men and 9 Women and Children, are resolved to stay here if we can get any food; before the Natives went away, I was plagued with them begging my powder and shot; I gave to the French Leader and other Leaders what I could spare, and they all promised to come and build Canoes, and go with me to York Fort.⁴

[13 March] two young Indian Men in the French interest, brought me 12 Beaver skins to trade for powder and shot; I told them they trade with the French, who gives them little or nothing for their furs, they said that was truth, I gave them 3 Charges of powder and ball, and told them to take care of their furs and go with me to the Fort where they would get powder &c

¹Journal C recorded, "am informed by My bedfellow that we shall Trade them from the Archithinues in the spring of the year: for the sake of the Woman, shall take no notice at present." HBCA E. 2/6, fo. 27.

²See entries for 7 and 11 March: E. 2/6, fos. 31d-32.

³E. 2/6, fo. 29d.

⁴E. 2/6, fo. 31d.

and be kindly used, they promised that they would.¹

Although only the 13 March entry appears in A, both entries are in the mood of that journal rather than B.² The optimism was not long lasting, however, for Henday in C had the same problems at Paskoyac and Fort la Corne as he had in B. This time, there is an estimate of the damage: "I am certain He hath got 1000 of the richest skins."³ Henday's expedition in C, then, was in the end no more of a success than it had been in B.

Journal D

The final version of the journal, D, is not only the latest but also the only one in print. The original D is found in a volume of the *Observations* with no title page, and its spine reads simply "Observations on Hudson's Bay". The HBC Archives (E. 2/11) dates the volume to 1792, and it does include references to events as late as 1791, but internal evidence suggests that most of the volume was written, if not actually compiled, sometime shortly before 1782.⁴ It contains little original material, but mostly copies of journals, lists, and letters, as may be expected in view of the fact that Graham had by that time left Hudson Bay. They include an abbreviated version of Matthew Cocking's journal of his 1772-3 inland journey, several sets of scientific observations by Thomas Hutchins, and a copy of Professor Joseph Black's letter of October 1779 to Graham regarding Hutchins'

¹E. 2/6, fo. 32.

²Journal B makes no mention of either of these incidents: the period from 6 March to 22 April 1755, which takes up several pages in A (B. 239/a/40, fos. 29-33), is condensed into one small entry in B (E.2/4, fo. 55d).

³Fort la Corne, 25 May 1755: E. 2/6, fo. 36d.

⁴Williams, "Puzzle," 41. An anonymous HBC archivist (probably Alice M. Johnson) suggested to Clifford Wilson that Journal D was written in 1790, and quoted Leveson Gower as dating it to 1792: communication with C.P. Wilson, 19 May 1954, HBCA Search File - Anthony Henday.

experiments. However, the volume begins with this heading: "I shall give the Journal of a Journey to explore the Country inland, and to endeavour to encrease the Hudson's Bay Company's trade; Performed by a very able Young Man named Anthony Hendey Anno Domini 1754a5."¹

In general, D is similar in mood and content to B. The Esinepoets who met Henday in late July and early August declared themselves to be "conveniently supplied from the Pagua Mistgushewuck Whiskeheginish", the French house of Paskoyac.² The Earchithinue were unwilling to abandon their horses for canoes, or their buffalo for fish.³ During the winter, Henday's companions at first laughed at his constant talk of trapping, but when their amusement turned to annoyance, Henday was informed of it by "An Indian", not his bedfellow as in journal B.⁴ Henday had no "Family" but rather "Tent mates" and "Companions", and in general he kept the same distance from his fellow travellers as he did in B.⁵ The French took the Indians' best furs, and journal D expressed a sense of failure when Henday arrived at York on 20 June 1755 -- three days earlier than in journals A, B, and C.⁶

¹Williams, *Graham*, 358; Williams, "Puzzle," 41; journal D is found on folios 1-40d in E. 2/11.

²E. 2/11, fo. 6d.

³E. 2/11, fo. 18.

⁴28 December 1754: E. 2/11, fo. 27d.

⁵See 7, 17, 18 March 1755: E. 2/11, fos. 32-32d.

⁶E. 2/11, fos. 37d-39d.

The contradictions and inconsistencies among the four surviving versions have created a complicated network of documentary problems. The argument that the later versions are a coherent and cohesive alternative to the falsifications of journal A is overly simplistic. The failure of any two versions to agree on important aspects of Henday's experiences suggests that these documents were generated by a process more complex than heretofore thought. The black and white of Henday scholarship must give way to myriad shades of grey. The quest for the absolute truth regarding Anthony Henday has led to misinterpretation and misunderstanding; the documentary threads must be carefully untangled before we dare speculate on their meaning.

CHAPTER 4 QUESTIONS OF VOICE

Of all the questions raised by a comparison of the four versions of Henday's journal, the question of authorship must take first priority. Whose voice is being heard in any given version? Previous scholars have offered incomplete or overly simplistic answers to this question: the early scholars had at best limited access to all the relevant documents, and later scholars seldom had time to do anything more than propagate the accepted wisdom on Henday. Only Glyndwr Williams has made a concerted effort to reconstruct the world of Anthony Henday -- and that laudable effort fell short. Perhaps what Henday needs is not another historian but an editor.

Textual scholar D.C. Greetham observed, "Being a critic means being sensitive to another person's quirks and peculiarities; it means that the critic must by an almost phenomenal leap, 'become' that other person....And this is true whether the other person is the author or one of the text's transmitters."¹ The reconstruction of Henday's career has demonstrated that we have not known and cannot know everything we would like to know about the man. Furthermore, Greetham urged a critical mistrust of all texts and evidence, "not believing that anybody is completely free from error."² Traditionally, scholars have tried to identify one of the versions as a 'true account', and in the process overlooked inconsistencies and contradictions.

¹Greetham, 296.

²Greetham, 296.

Barbara Belyea has questioned the assumption that a text can be true or false, and has seen the lack of evidence regarding Henday's "pretextual experiences" as an insurmountable obstacle in untangling the apparent mixture of voices in the journals.³ While such gaps do seriously inhibit the search for Henday's true voice, such an exercise is far from futile. Julian P. Boyd, an editor of the American statesman Alexander Hamilton, has clearly outlined the duties of the historical editor:

[He] must employ all discoverable texts and to each of these he must address questions that the historian or the biographer usually does not have the need or the time to ask. What, for instance, called this particular text into being? What purpose did it serve? In what other respects and why does it vary from other texts? What is the significance of these variations...? It goes without saying that the editor like the historian must ask first of all: Is this document authentic? But even on this primary obligation there is a vital difference. The editor asks the question invariably, habitually, and searchingly of every document that he encounters and his ears must be attuned to the ring of a false note or he fails in the first test that justifies his existence, that of presenting a dependable body of authenticated documents....His method is no more guaranteed to produce truth automatically than any other, but his systematic effort to meet this overriding obligation seems more likely to result in the isolation of unreliable texts than is the case with other means of historical investigation.⁴

By examining the journals textually and contextually, some progress at least may be made in untangling Henday from his editors.

Isham as Editor

As observed earlier, James Isham has been almost universally blamed for the documentary problems surrounding Henday's journal. The precise verbs used by scholars

³Belyea, "Journal," 19.

⁴Quoted in Charles T. Cullen, "Principles of Annotation in Editing Historical Documents; or, How to Avoid Breaking the Butterfly on the Wheel of Scholarship" in George L. Vogt and John Bush Jones (eds.), *Literary and Historical Editing* (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Libraries, 1981), 95n9.

vary: Wilson believed Journal A was "toned down somewhat"¹ while Rich called it "severely edited."² A.S. Morton went so far as to call Isham "decorous."³ Glyndwr Williams is the only scholar who has come to the defence of the "honourable if crotchety" Isham.⁴

The general argument against Isham is based entirely upon the assumption that journals B, C, and D truly represent Henday's experiences, and that journal A must therefore be a purposefully falsified document. The blame for falsifying the journal naturally falls on Isham, who as Chief at York would have had the greatest opportunity. As for motive, most scholars have looked to the "bedfellow" of the later versions. The London Committee was well known to disapprove of liaisons between Company men and Indian women, and Isham himself had been censured for keeping a native wife. Journal A, then, was the result of Isham's attempt to keep both himself and Henday out of trouble. This might have proven an acceptable theory, if Isham himself had not added in his comments, "[I]f I had been in Captn Hendeys place, when the King of the Earchithinues offered him his Daughter in Marriage (and I a single Man as he was) would have Embraced ye proposal, which would have created a firm friendship, and would have been agreat help in Engageing them to trade."⁵ If Isham was indeed attempting to stay out of

¹Wilson, "Across the Prairies," 29.

²Rich, *History*, 1: 633.

³Morton, 246.

⁴Williams, "Puzzle," 53.

⁵HBCA B. 239/a/40, fo. 41d.

trouble, then this comment could not have aided him in that. Interestingly, the Committee evidently did not reprove Isham for this remark.¹

Williams argued against Isham's censorship on the grounds that Journal A also omitted vital commercial information on inland trading patterns and "Earchithinue" attitudes: "Isham could not conceivably have deleted information of such importance simply to avoid drawing attention to the fact that Henday was accompanied by an Indian woman."² Had Isham truly been uneasy about revealing Henday's domestic arrangements, he could simply have done what Journal D did for the entry of 28 December 1754, where "my bedfellow" of B and C became merely "An Indian."³ Considering that the woman only appears a few times in each version, such neutering would not have posed much of an inconvenience.

Furthermore, Williams argued, the commercial information lacking in Journal A would have been of great value to Isham in the ongoing debate over inland expansion. Upon perusing Journal A, the London Committee wrote to Isham to encourage further expeditions by Henday, "which We judge to be the only means of enlarging the York Fort Cargoes, for we cannot find by his said Journal or Draft that any Settlement (the thing you seemed so desirous of) can be made with the least Appearance of Advantage."⁴ It is the

¹Other examples of the Committee's leniency regarding liaisons with native women during this period can be seen in Isham's discussion of half-breed children (Rich, *Isham*, 78-79), the mistresses of Richard Norton (A. 6/6, fo. 100, Governor and Committee to Norton, 1739) and Humphrey Marten (Davies and Johnson, xxvi), and Andrew Graham's discussions of half-breed children (E. 2/7, fo. 24d).

²Williams, "Puzzle," 53.

³E. 2/4, fo. 52; E. 2/6, fo. 27; E. 2/11, fo. 27d.

⁴HBCA A. 6/9, fos. 33d-34, Governor and Committee to Isham, 12 May 1756.

later versions that support Isham's arguments in favour of inland posts. If Heday's experiences were indeed misrepresented in Journal A, then Isham could have had no possible motive for falsifying the document.

This is not to say that Isham took no active part in the generation of Journal A. Clearly, his footnotes and commentary are an integral part of that document. That Isham should add such glosses to the journal is not surprising, for the journal proper would have piqued rather than sated his curiosity. What is surprising is that Joseph Smith's journals were not accompanied by any sort of commentary. Indeed, it seems odd that the man who wrote *Observations on Hudsons Bay* should not comment on any other inland journey than this one.

In the case of Heday's initial expedition, however, Isham was determined to get as much information as he could. Having read the field notes, he then attempted to delve into Heday's head notes: his memories and impressions which had not made it onto paper. This probably helped Heday digest his experiences as much as it helped Isham find out about them. It is significant that Isham's debriefing brought the journal section of A more into line with the accounts of the later versions (something generally overlooked by scholars), but it is not unexpected. Although Journal A retained a content, tone, and style markedly different from B, C, and D, the later versions offer some clues to the source from which they may have gotten their information.

Graham as Editor

Williams called Henday a "curiously elusive figure,"¹ but much more elusive is Andrew Graham, and particularly his role in the documentary history of Henday's journals. Two of the four versions exist in Graham's handwriting, and another was copied by a clerk into Graham's *Observations*. Henday's journal was included in both of the first two versions of the *Observations*: only William Tomison's 1767-8 journey to Lake Winnipeg (which Graham himself had organized) received similar treatment. Years later, the journal again appeared in what was probably the last version of the *Observations*. Clearly, Graham felt Henday's experiences to be important, particularly for their information on the Earchithinue and the interior.

Graham's comments, particularly in Journal D, suggest that Graham and Henday knew each other well. Graham certainly thought highly of Henday, and of Isham also, suggesting that perhaps Graham was part of Isham's patronage circle. Unfortunately, the documentary problems under examination here would be slightly less complicated if Henday and Graham had never met.

The problem lies in the fact that Graham spoke highly of Henday at the same time as he was completely rewriting him. Given the contradictions among the various versions, one of two situations must exist. Journal A may be essentially true, in which case Graham was misinterpreting and misrepresenting a man he claimed to have known quite well. Alternatively, Journal A may be fundamentally false, in which case Graham's high opinion of Henday (who is the only reasonable suspect of such falsification) can only be justified

¹Williams, "Puzzle," 53.

by accepting Graham's complete ignorance of Journal A. However, if Graham was ignorant of Journal A, then where did he get his information?

Graham was too junior a clerk in 1755 to have had any opportunity or desire to falsify Henday's journal. A more difficult question is whether or not he was familiar with or in possession of Journal A or a copy thereof. Williams claimed that the number of versions of the journal generated by Graham was evidence that "he clearly had in his possession (both in Hudson Bay and later in Scotland) substantial notes on Henday's travels."¹ Certainly Graham would have had "ample opportunity and every official reason" to discuss Henday's expeditions with him, regardless of the nature of their personal relationship, and Williams presumes quite strongly that Graham acquired "either Henday's original journal notes, or a copy of them."² This, of course, assumes that these notes survived. The fact that Henday's journal was copied while Joseph Smith's journals of 1756-7 and 1757-8 were not suggests the possibility that Henday's field journal may not have been in very good condition by the end of his year inland.³

Williams himself cast doubt on his own theory. In his 1969 edition of Graham's *Observations*, Williams commented, "Graham had made a curious statement when he

¹Williams, *Graham*, 335. Recall that Williams also thought Journal A was in Graham's hand: this would have made the dilemma discussed above even more confusing.

²Williams, "Puzzle," 51.

³For Smith's journals, see HBCA B. 239/a/43 and B. 239/a/45. The latter journal, in particular, is nearly incoherent: it is one long sentence (fos. 1-8d) in sloppy handwriting, giving daily accounts of direction and not much else, and ending very abruptly without any mention of arriving back at York. There is one mention (fo. 4d, no date) of the "Sineapoites" hunting buffalo in pounds and not knowing "how to padeal," but otherwise Smith and Waggoner paused only to give "backer" [tobacco] to groups of unidentified Indians. This journal may be a hidden treasure for linguists, however, for it appears to have been written phonetically: that is to say, Joseph Smith wrote the same way as he spoke.

declared that the journey from York to the Saskatchewan would take four months, even if he meant the round trip; and one cannot suppose Henday's journal to have been beside him when he wrote that."¹ Another discrepancy can be found in the 1791 version of the *Observations*, in a discussion of native warfare. Graham mentioned the "Archithinue," "who do not wander about" and "live in small wooden houses." Richard Glover observed that neither Henday nor Cocking (Graham's two main sources on the "Archithinue") mentioned this.² Likewise, a map (c. 1772) of which Graham is the likely author shows Cocking as having discovered the Hayes River-Cross Lake water route to the Saskatchewan, even though it was well-known to wintering servants long before Cocking went inland.³

Comparison of all four versions suggests that Graham was working from loose notes rather than a bound journal (and Henday's original field notes would have been a collection of two or more quires⁴). The occasional reversal of daily entries and discrepancies in such things as dates indicate some jumbling of the original information. Williams found it probable that Henday had handed his original notes over to Graham before leaving the service, because "this would explain why information appears in some versions

¹Williams, *Graham*, lxx.

²Williams, *Graham*, 173. In his footnote, Williams speculated that this may be a garbled reference to the Mandans and/or other tribes to the southwest, who were also called "Archithinues."

³Ruggles, 38, 40.

⁴Isham's instructions only refer to "hand Line paper" (HBCA A. 11/114, 172d), but he sent "a Quire of Paper" to Henday inland (HBCA A. 11/114, fos. 181-181d, Isham to Henday, 4 September 1754). Presumably loose leaf paper would be quite impractical for an extended wilderness journey.

and not in others."¹ Unfortunately, Williams failed to explain this logic. It is much more likely that Graham was working from notes or memories of conversations with Henday. To these were possibly added notes or memories of conversations with Attickasish, other Indians, and/or any number of the inland winterers who followed Henday. There is also the intriguing possibility of Graham inserting information or experiences from Henday's 1759-60 expedition -- of which, alas, no written account survives. Yet another possible source were Isham's notes from 1755, which may still have been in Isham's possession when he died and Graham took temporary command in 1761.

The Observations

It is no great disservice to accuse Graham of using his notes on Henday in a rather free and easy manner: that is very much the way in which he treated all of his notes. The *Observations* reveal an intelligent man with a sharp and perceptive mind, though lacking in mental discipline. "Having once started to write a book," Williams wrote, "Graham found it hard to stop doing so."²

Graham's propensity for repeating himself can clearly be seen in the fact that Henday's journal appeared in three volumes of the *Observations*. In general, each new volume contained some new material and some new phrasing, but often Graham merely copied sections from previous volumes.³ Whether working with old or new material, Graham often found it uncontrollable. His descriptions of birds, for instance, were so

¹Williams, "Puzzle," 54-5.

²Williams, *Graham*, xxv.

³E. 2/9 and E. 2/12, for instance, are nearly identical in content. For a more complete discussion of the interrelationship of Graham's works, see Williams, *Graham*, 352-361.

jumbled together under the two categories "Migratory" and "Local", that the order in which they appear in the books may have been the order in which they reached Graham's desk.¹ Furthermore, a great deal of Graham's information (particularly concerning eggs and nests) is simply wrong, or true of a different species. Glyndwr Williams has suggested that these mistakes indicate difficulties with the Cree language, which would account for certain other errors as well. Some of his descriptions are actually composites, in which the characteristics of related species are blended.²

When dealing with Henday's experiences, then, Graham was following a familiar pattern. Journal C included personal comments by Henday not found elsewhere; the verb "steered" was changed to the less nautical "travelled"; and distances were changed.³ Names were changed as well, causing confusion among scholars and wreaking havoc on any attempt to retrace Henday's route. Most notably, journal A/B/C's "Monokau sokahigan" or "nelson pond" became "Christianaux Lake" or Lake Winnipeg in D, and A's "another Large River" became "Keiskatchewan River" in the later versions.⁴ Williams admitted that Henday's narrative was subject to "editorial modification" in Graham's

¹Williams suggested this in *Graham*, xxvii. Germaine Warkentin made a similar, though more general, remark in *Anthology*, xvii.

²Williams, *Graham*, xxvii-xxviii.

³Williams, "Puzzle," 55. In general, journal D reduced distances by half for most of August, mid-September through mid-October, and from late October through the end of April..

⁴Henday reached the former on 8 July (B. 239/a/40, fo. 3d; E. 2/4, fo. 35d; E. 2/6, fo. 11d; E. 2/11, fo. 3) and the latter on 21 July (B. 239/a/40, fo. 5d; E. 2/4, fo. 37d; E. 2/6, fo. 13; E. 2/11, fo. 4d). He returned to the lake in question on 3 June in A, B, and C (B. 239/a/40, fo. 36d; E. 2/4, fo. 59d; E. 2/6, fo. 37d) and on 4 June in D (E. 2/11, fo. 39d).

hands.¹ "What we have in the later versions of the journal, then, is an amalgam of information provided by Henday, and comments or explanations offered by Graham; and where the one begins and the other ends is not always easy to determine."² However, Williams did not believe that Graham's modifications misrepresented Henday's experiences in any significant way.

Re-evaluation of B, C and D

It cannot be doubted that Henday's experiences underwent editorial modification at Graham's hand. The journals of other inland travellers suffered a similar fate, and this should come as no surprise. Field notes from such frontier experiences almost invariably undergo some sort of metamorphosis, perhaps only of style and syntax, perhaps of structure, or perhaps of characterization. Nor is it *uncommon* for them to be put through these changes by other people than the initial writer, people who have either *no* experience of the wilderness, or a different set of experiences with it.³ In Henday's case, his journal was the victim of what Germaine Warkentin has called Graham's struggles to give his voluminous writings "the severe order of a treatise." Unfortunately, his texts proved almost uncontrollable: "amended and re-written with each new piece of information, they told and retold the uncovering of the secrets of the immense spaces through which his men were travelling."⁴

¹Williams, "Puzzle," 55.

²Williams, "Puzzle," 56.

³I. S. MacLaren, "Wanderings Among Fur Traders, Reliability Among Documents: Paul Kane and Others" (unpublished paper, presented to Rupert's Land Research Centre Colloquium, February 1992), 2.

⁴Warkentin, xvii.

Graham's tampering resulted in a palpable difference in tone and style in the later versions. Most notably, journals B, C, and D contain an undercurrent of anthropological investigation completely lacking in A. On 22 November 1754, for example, Henday and an Indian man encountered a bear in A; the later versions deleted Henday's presence but introduced a new element:

A:
 this day a Large Bear had like to have killed me and ye Indn man and I went to ye Hutt (ie) and Laid some great Sticks before, so that he should not get out in a hurry but he came outt (Just as I was Going to Lay down my Sticks) in a great fury, the Indn Ran of Like a Lusty fellow, and Left me with my Bow & arrows, to get of as well as I cowl....(ie) he means ye Bears den or hole where he Lyes.

B:
 one young man narrowly escaped losing his life by a grizzle bear that he had wounded, but by throwing from him his beaver coat which the bear tore to pieces, he got clear off, *this they always do* when closs [sic] pursued by it or any other enraged animal; the men went afterwards and killed him.

C:
 one young Man narrowly escaped being tore to pieces by a black Bear, that he had wounded but by throwing from him his Beaver Coat which the Bear tore to pieces he got Clear off, *this is often done*: the Men went immediately and killed him.

D:
 One Man narrowly escaped from a Grizzle Bear that he had wounded, by throwing his Beaver coat from him; which the Bear tore to pieces, and *which the Natives always do* when forced to retreat. The Men & Dogs went out & killed the Bear.¹

The placing of a particular incident in the context of custom to emphasize a general tendency or cultural trait is, as H. David Brumble has observed, an editorial practice to

¹HBCA B. 239/a/40, fos. 21d-22; E. 2/4, fo. 59d; E. 2/6, fo. 25; E. 2/11, fo. 24d. The emphasis has been added.

which many anthropologists resort in native biographies and autobiographies.¹ When the reader knows what to look for, Graham's editorial hand can appear heavy indeed.

This is not to say that editorial modification robbed the later versions of all validity. Anthropological information not found in journal A is not necessarily false, although it should be handled with caution, as we cannot be certain of its source. Personal comments not found in journal A are quite possibly Henday's voice, though they may just as easily be someone else's. In the end, journals B, C, and D must be accepted as flawed but useful documents, for even if they may not accurately reflect reality, they do reflect contemporary perceptions of that reality -- ones which have left an indelible mark on our perception of that reality.

Henday as Editor

Although Williams vindicated Isham and implicated Graham in the crime of misrepresentation, when actually assigning blame for that crime he turned instead to Henday himself. "Frequently the wide gulf between the desired goal and the actual experiences of the journey must have made the process of composition an ongoing conflict between the desired story of discovery and the unassimilable facts."² Williams argued that Henday's response to that conflict was to falsify his journal. There is far too little personal information available on Henday to speculate on whether he would have done such a

¹See H. David Brumble, "Editors, Ghosts, and Amanuenses," chapter 3 in Brumble, *American Indian Autobiography* (University of California Press, 1988). In particular, see Brumble, 77-79.

²Greenfield, 192-3.

thing. It is possible, however, to examine the meat of Williams' argument, which may rest on an imperfect understanding of the Company and the fur trade in the 1750s.

Specifically, Williams may have misinterpreted the expectations which Henday was trying to meet. The real enthusiasm for the inland wintering expeditions came from Henday's patron, Isham. Isham would have been disappointed but not surprised by Earchithinue's reluctance to take to canoes, for he was already in possession of information to that effect.¹ More important for Isham was the issue of the viability of inland posts.² The Committee was certainly happy with Henday's expedition as described in Journal A, but Isham must have been disappointed at the apparent obstacles to inland settlement. Had Henday really been willing to falsify his journal to suit the expectations of his audience, he would presumably have done so to meet Isham's expectations.

The evidence which Williams brought forth to support his argument is limited and largely circumstantial. He cited examples in Journal A where Henday elaborated on his personal bravery and dominance when later versions present the episodes in a more mundane light. On 26 September 1754, Henday wrote in Journal A, "I went a hunting and killed a fine Large Moose, and when ye Inds Came to Me they were overjoyed, that I should kill a Moose, and no body with me, for they do not go far without 2 together."³ In Journals B and C, this was related much more plainly: "I killed a moose and the Indians

¹A. 11/114, fos. 173d-174. Governor John Nixon had recognized this situation as early as 1682, when he reported that the Cree "would be the only brokers between all strange Indians and us, and by all means ke[e]p both them and us in ignorance." See Thistle, 25.

²A. 11/114, fos. 173, 173d, 174.

³HBCA B. 239/a/40, fo. 15d.

a great many."¹ In the aforementioned hunting story of 22 November, Henday was also more prominent in A than in the others, though the "personal bravery and dominance" are hidden behind images of the intrepid explorer running away from a bear.

To be fair to Williams, there is another example which he did not mention. On 18 August 1754, Journal A recorded, "one of the the Inds Came to Me said he was very Lame, I drest his foot, and he brought me a Moose Nose and some tongs, and seemed overjoyed that they had got a doctor Come to them." In the later versions, on the other hand, Henday received no such adulation.

All of these incidents are relatively minor, and the aspersions which they allegedly cast upon Henday's character can be dismissed with two arguments. To argue from within the text of A, it can be pointed out that if Henday had really been concerned with bolstering his image, he would not have included such entries as the Shenap dispute in the spring or the bear story of 10 January 1755: "I went a hunting, Saw a Large black Bear, but I did not Like him, he made a strong Roaring, and Lookt hard att me, he made off and I was not Sorry for it, for their were no Indians nigh me by 6 or 7 M."² It should also be noted that the later versions are not entirely free of the "tinge of self-glorification" which

¹HBCA E. 2/4, fo. 44d; E. 2/6, fo. 20. Journal D (E. 2/11, fo. 14d) mentioned no such hunting trip on 26 September, but two days earlier recorded, "I killed a large moose, took the heart, & gave the remains to the Indians."

²HBCA B. 239/a/40, fo. 25; for the dispute with Shenap, see fos. 31-31d, entries for 30 and 31 March, and 4 April 1755. Maurice Hodgson claimed that overt heroism is rare in the journals of Canadian explorers: "if anything, they are only too aware of their own physical and psychological weaknesses. Their heroism, then, is of the kind with which identification is possible; the essentially weak or very ordinary man forced by circumstances to endure and to exceed his own expectations. Heroism, in such conditions, becomes admirable, personal, and, ultimately, real." Maurice Hodgson, "Initiation and Quest: Early Canadian Journals" *Canadian Literature* 38 (Autumn 1968), 40. Though Henday should be considered more English than Canadian, it is perhaps not too outrageous to suggest that his extended contact with the northern wilderness had seriously affected his character and identity.

Williams found in A. Journal C, for instance, recorded, "I am looked on as a Leader I have Ladies of different ranks to attend me, please to observe the Men does nothing but hunt, and we Leaders hath a Lady to hold the thogin with water to our heads when we drink."¹

To argue from outside the text, it is reasonable to suggest that the situation was not one where Henday glorified himself but rather where Graham generally downplayed Henday's role. Graham copied the journal because of its commercial and geographical importance: he had no reason to include full descriptions of hunting stories which were interesting (and immediate) to Henday but not to anyone who would be reading the *Observations*.

Williams also brought up the "rather more important incident" where Henday in A was offered the Earchithinue king's daughter in marriage.² Williams admitted that there was nothing impossible or indeed even improbable in this, but nevertheless added it to the evidence against Henday. The later journals do give a slightly different picture of what happened when Henday parted ways with the Earchithinue in the fall of 1754. Journal B remarked that "he offered me two slave girls which I declined accepting, by telling him that perhaps provisions might turn scarce and I would not be able to maintain them, however he gave them to one of my leaders." Journals C and D did not even mention that

¹HBCA E. 2/6, fo. 14d, entry for 8 August 1754. "Thogin" is a Woods Cree (th-dialect) word, meaning a birchbark container (personal communication: David Pentland).

²HBCA B. 239/a/40, fo.41d. See also Williams, "Puzzle," 54.

the girls were first offered to Henday.¹ What Williams gave as evidence of the truth of the account in B is unsatisfactory. Graham's footnote, adding that one of the girls was killed in an incident at York in 1765, only appeared in C and D: in journal B, the same footnote referred to one of four "Archithinue slave girls" whom Henday encountered with two tents of unidentified Indians on 22 February 1755.²

Williams' final piece of evidence against Henday dealt with his initial encounter with the French. Citing Henday's last letter to Isham (included here in Appendix C), Williams observed that it was more in keeping with the tentative entries of the later versions than with the "truculent" tone of A.³ Henday wrote of his upcoming encounter, "I dont very well like it, having nothing to Satisfye Them on what account I am going up the Country, and Very possibly [sic] they may suspect Me to be a Spy." However, Williams failed to quote Henday's stoic declaration of resolve: "I will Face them with a good Countenance let it be how it will, for as I am gone thus Farr, if it please God, Will see the Farthest end of all Their Country...I wish Your Hons Health, and if the French should shoot me, I have nothing to lay to Your Hons Charge."⁴ At this time he was writing about the unknown, and he probably expected to find a fairly large establishment, perhaps manned by at least some military personnel. No doubt his description in journal A

¹HBCA E. 2/4, fo. 48d. C and D simply recorded that the girls were a gift to one of Henday's leaders, while Henday himself only got forty buffalo tongues. E. 2/6, fo. 22d; E. 2/11, fo. 19d.

²HBCA E. 2/4, fo. 54d.

³Williams, "Puzzle," 54.

⁴HBCA A. 11/114, fo. 180d, Henday to Isham, 9 July 1754.

of the French house as a "Hogstye" and his truculent response to the Frenchmen's opening remarks were a product of the wide gulf between his expectations and reality.¹

Williams ended his study of the journals with a rather scathing attack on Henday.

Henday's journey was a venturesome and remarkable exploit; but one flawed by the explorer's sketchy and inaccurate first account of it. Lack of facility with the pen can explain his failure, irritating though it may be to modern scholars, to describe adequately the vastness of the prairies, or the distant splendour of the Rockies, but it is less easy to accept the deliberate suppression and distortion of some of the most significant commercial aspects of his discoveries.

Unfortunately, Williams was unable to present solid evidence of Henday's guilt. Indeed, there exists little or no real evidence to discredit or invalidate Journal A. As discussed earlier, there is no indication of A having been tampered with. On the basis of the evidence presented in this study, the collective and self-contradictory account presented by Journals B, C, and D have no claim over Journal A regarding the truth about Anthony Henday's experiences in 1754-55. Henday, then, cannot be blamed for falsifying anything.

Re-evaluation of A

The validity of journal A must be considered relative rather than absolute. Williams was quite correct in remarking on Henday's lack of facility with the written word², and the London Committee was equally correct in suspecting Henday to be "not very expert in making Drafts with

¹Both the English and the French on the frontier of the Northwest fur trade were paranoid about each other. This paranoia was based partly on fear, partly on a simple lack of information, and partly on Indian attempts to build up that paranoia and profit from it. See Eccles, 103; Thistle, 27. The suggestion that Henday may have been expecting to meet soldiers as well as fur traders stems partly from the imminent outbreak of the Seven Years War, partly from his comment in the letter about the possibility of being shot, and partly from his comment to Isham (mentioned in Isham's remarks: B. 239/a/40, fo. 41) that "he and 2 more could have took Either of their huts."

²Williams, "Puzzle," 56.

Accuracy or keeping a just Reckoning of Distances other than by Guess.”¹ Journal A clearly shows the Hayes River flowing in the wrong direction, and other geographical ambiguities prompted Graham to reinterpret Henday’s route. Likewise, Henday’s distances in A would have placed the Earchithinue camp somewhere in south-central British Columbia.² The substance of the journal, however, cannot be shown to be anything but a reasonably accurate representation of Henday’s inland experiences.

Journal A is written in a very straightforward manner, conforming quite closely to the form of a ship's log. It is a useful record, but tedious, only occasionally embellished with anything more than mere factual observations. Exploration tends to be less exciting than most people would like to believe, and the fourth or fifth encounter with a bear becomes boring, at least in the telling. This repetitive detail displays itself to particularly poor advantage in field notes and first drafts of journals. It is only when the adventurer has time to reflect upon his experiences that any sort of narrative can emerge.³

¹HBCA A. 6/9, fos. 33d-34, Governor and Committee to Isham, 12 May 1756.

²HBC Archivist Alice M. Johnson, in a letter to Clifford Wilson, recalled great discrepancies in the distances given by Peter Skene Ogden and Norman Kittson on their Snake Country expeditions: “I can only think the estimate depended on how tired one felt at the end of the day.” (HBCA RG 20/4/107) An excellent discussion of the problems of distance in the Henday journals can be found in Belyea, “West,” 10, 15-17.

³See Victor G. Hopwood, “Explorers by Land to 1860” in Carl F. Klinck (gen. ed.), *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 25. In 1994, this author canoed from Rocky Mountain House to Edmonton on the North Saskatchewan River, and attempted to keep a daily journal according to Isham’s instructions. It was unexpectedly difficult to sit down at the end of the day, squinting in the light of burning driftwood (which does not burn very brightly), surrounded by campmates finishing supper or preparing to bed down for the night, listening to owls or crickets or coyotes in the distance, trying to remember let alone write down even half of what happened that day; to go even further and try to digest it all and put it into context is next to impossible.

CONCLUSION

Ian MacLaren, English professor and weekend adventurer, has reflected that field notes are "an apt name for what anyone can muster in the wilderness," because the very nature of the wilderness experience imposes contingencies on both the mind and the body, and thus conditions narration in very important ways. MacLaren spoke of the "sheer exhilaration of living out of doors and out of civilization," and there is no reason to expect that a product of early industrial Britain (like Henday) would not have experienced quite a similar exhilaration.¹ Mundane matters such as spelling, sentence structure, style, and even the logical progression of ideas become not only insignificant but inadequate. On a canoe trip north of Great Bear Lake, MacLaren was attacked by a bear, an experience to which Henday would have related all too easily. MacLaren's field note, however, "splutters with details, and alarms me now as not at all a full rendering of the events and emotions of the moment." The luxury of recollection in tranquility permitted the story to become recognizable as a tale, but "writing did not seem capable of registering the event."²

Henday probably had little previous literary experience to assist him in registering the events of his journey. It should come as no surprise that so many details appear in Isham's commentary which are absent in the journal itself. A de-briefing must have been necessary to help Henday express the nature and extent of his experiences, and even then it must have been a struggle. Wilderness and language, MacLaren wrote, often have little to do with one another.

the one...ceaselessly in a flux of infinite variety, the other making possible naming, categorizing, and the ascription of identity and status, in short, the comprehension

¹MacLaren, 2.

²MacLaren, 3. A personal parallel comes to mind concerning a close call on a set of rapids at a particularly dangerous S-curve on the North Saskatchewan River: the tale remained incoherent to one who had not been there until weeks after the event, but even then words seemed pointless, inappropriate, almost ridiculous.

and control of that flux. Wilderness certainly does not need language, and, while immersed in the flux of the wilderness, individuals...don't need/can't use/have no use for written or even spoken language. Once outside it, we resort to language to normalize our experience of it, to communicate it to a world of readers who know what wilderness is, recognize it as a linguistic and visual construct, and expect to fit another version of it into what they already know by means they already recognize.¹

It is in this process of normalization that the essentially dichotomous nature of exploration journals is revealed. The exploration narrative, simple though it may be, is at once purposeful, direct and immediate, yet moving into the realm of archetypes: the quest, self-preservation, alienation, and the search for identification.² In Heday's case, there is the quest for the Earchithinue, to see "the Farthest end of all Their Country,"³ and to return to York in the spring with a flotilla of canoes; there is the struggle for survival, against food shortage, illness, and the implacable subarctic winter; there is the alienation of being separated from the familiar relative safety of York Factory and thrust into a strange new world; and there is the establishment of a new home in the wilderness, the formation of a family or winter hunting group, in which Heday can find security and friendship. Herein lies the real nature of exploration.

It is not just that there could be no real discovery of North America until there was a written record of that discovery.⁴ It is that exploration consists of so much more than merely

¹MacLaren, 4.

²Hodgson, "Initiation and Quest," 40.

³HBCA A. 11/114, fo. 180d, Heday to Isham, 9 July 1754.

⁴Greenfield, 189-90.

walking across a continent. As Australian historian Paul Carter observed, it is entirely possible to explore without discovering anything.¹

For, while discovery rests on the assumption of a world of facts waiting to be found, collected and classified, a world in which the neutral observer is not implicated, exploration lays stress on the observer's active engagement with his environment....Despite the tendency of most historians to regard the terms as virtually interchangeable, the pleasures of discovery and exploration rest on utterly opposed theoretical assumptions. The delight...in discovery was summational, a matter of adding up discrete experiences....To be an explorer was to inhabit a world of potential objects with which one carried on an imaginary dialogue.²

Author and playwright A.A. Milne put it another way. One day, Winnie-the-Pooh was singing a song when his friend Rabbit happened along.

“Did you make that song up?”

“Well, I sort of made it up,” said Pooh. “It isn't Brain,” he went on humbly, “because You Know Why, Rabbit; but it comes to me sometimes.”

“Ah!” said Rabbit, who never let things come to him, but always went and fetched them.³

Anthony Henday, then, was an explorer and not a discoverer, a Pooh and not a Rabbit. Explorers opened themselves to a whole range of experiences which could not be rendered into a simple narrative of discovery. They allowed themselves to be subtly naturalized, entering into what Maurice Hodgson called a “psychological captivity”⁴: in this respect, all great exploration narratives are in essence captivity narratives.

¹Paul Carter, *The Road to Botany Bay: An Exploration of Landscape and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 26.

²Carter, 25.

³A.A. Milne, *The House at Pooh Corner* (New York: Dell, 1956), 83.

⁴Maurice Hodgson, “The Exploration Journal as Literature” *The Beaver* 298 (Winter 1967), 9, 10, 12; Hodgson, “Initiation and Quest,” 36.

In this respect also, Henday's humble background may have been his greatest asset. His only trepidation which found its way onto paper concerned another group of Europeans, the French: once past them, he entered fully into his experience, describing native life without condescension, and speaking of the Earchithinue with genuine awe and respect.¹ Henday spoke of a family, and was spoken of as a kind of trading captain. He quietly followed his guide, Attickasish, naively refusing to conform to the conventional image of the explorer as aggressive and independent. Rather than mastering the untamed lands through which he passed, he became in a sense part of the landscape itself, part of the natural cycle of the seasons, of night and day, of feast and famine.² One suspects that only his daily journal entries enabled Henday to keep track of time in the European sense.

Henday probably did not see himself as an explorer, or as any kind of agent of European imperialism, certainly not in the same way as men like Alexander Mackenzie. Whereas even less conquering heroes performed some kind of imperialistic act, such as Henry Kelsey naming Derings Point or Samuel Hearne taking possession of the Arctic coast for Britain, the most Henday did was raise the flag on St. George's Day, and that is not even mentioned in Journal A. By and large, he used Cree place names, and where he does seem to have applied his own place names, they are not very imperialistic: St Catherine's Hill (after a hill on the Isle of Wight), Shenap Plain, Connawapa Creek.³

¹Warkentin, 67.

²See Greenfield, 197, 199.

³B. 239/a/40, fos. 12, 10d, 13. For an excellent discussion of the significance of the act of naming, see Paul Carter, particularly the introduction and first chapter.

Journal A, then, represents Henday's first look at the wilderness. Still weighted down by the cultural baggage of his metropolitan upbringing, and further hampered by an unliterary nature, it was Henday's misfortune to have had an experience, or rather to have developed an inventory of experience, which he was largely incapable of communicating. That he was able, at least to some extent, to process or digest his experiences, seems clear from the amount of information appearing in Isham's commentary. What Isham got out of Henday, though, has been distilled through Isham, just as the later versions of the journal have been distilled through Andrew Graham. Somewhere beneath all of this is the "real" Anthony Henday, lost to posterity not because posterity was uninterested, but because Henday did not know what to say -- if, indeed, there was anything that could be said. Perhaps, like MacLaren and like this author on their travels, he found words inadequate even more than he found them difficult.

Pages misnumbered -- there is no page 94.

APPENDIX A

A Copie of orders and Instructions to Anthy: Hendey,
upon a Journey in Land,
Dated att York Fort, June 26 1754
[HBCA A. 11/114, fos. 172-174d]

Having intimated to the Hudsons Bay company 1752: that in my opinion it was Requesit, and wou'd be to their Interest, if a proper person was sent up the Country, by wch Such a person might Enlarge and Encrease the Said company's trade &: with unknown Inds:-- It is therefore the company's will and pleasure answerable to their general Letter 1753. that that [sic] I do forward the same. and as I chuse you as a proper person for such an untetaking: and besides being willing your self, I therefore order that you be very punctuall in observing the following Instructions.

- [1]st Having procured a trusty home Indian, Connawapa by Name, for your Companion; you are to proceed with him with the Captn or Leading Indian who is now at the fort, Attickasish by name, and is to sett out tomorrow the 26 Day of June¹ having given him Encouragemt and Promisd him further Encouragement, provisor he faithfully Discharges the trust imposd on him; that is to See you Safe to his Country; that is to say,— the Keiskachewan, Missinneepce, Earchithinue, Esinepoet, or any other country Indians, that we have not as yet any traffick with; and that by your presence, and with your Assistance, he Exhorts the Natives to come to you, that you may converse with them, making them presents, perswading them as much as in you Lyes, to be at peace, and not to Warr, one against another; but to hunt and gette goods, and bring them to the fort, when their is a Suffitient of Sundry goods, and that your govr² will use them Civilly, who is beloved by all Indians that as yet Knows him by his Civil treatment to them; tell them I send you to acquaint them I want to See them, I love the Indians, and that if they will all come the following year, you will then go along with them and Lead them down the Ensuing year, with many more Such promises that occur to your memorie &ca Espitally if you can gett a Sight of the Earchithinues, and persuade two or three to come with you, by fair means but by no means use force, but use all you may See of Different Nations Civilly, giving Each Leader a small Presant, you having such with you for that purpose and above all be upon your Guard.
- 2d You having a compass, hand Line paper &ca:&ca: along with you, therefore be Very Exact in Keeping a Journal of your travels and Observations Daily, observing the Course, trying the Depth of water in the River or Lakes, when in you cannoe; and as you Know the Distance already a considerable way up the River, you may know

¹The slight discrepancy in dates is presumably an error in copying.

²Isham, of course.

therefore by a Day or two at first Setting out Know how many miles you go in a Day hereafter, by which you may Compute the miles by padling or travelling by Land all the way, mind to Remark Down Everything that occurs to your View Daily, mentioning when you come to any River, or Lake, the name, when you meet with any Natives what Nation &ca.

- 3d Observe the Soil as you proceed, what trees, Herbs, &c: mentioning in your Journal, when and where, also take particular notice if there is any sort of mineral if you find any Reserve some and mention the Day and month &c: and particular Remark the place and Situation where you may find Such.
- 4th Observe when you pass the missinnipee Country, and Draw near to the Earchithinue Country, whether the great Lake is a Lake or not, or whether it is an open Sea, as I have been Inform'd by Several it is a Sea where Ships are seen to Pass by; be particular in coming at the truth of this, which is a material Point.
- 5th When you have convers'd and Seen all the Natives you Can, then Return taking care to be back by the 10th of Augt at furthest if possible Sooner, as you will have Sufficient time to travel as far as the borders of the Earchithinue Country by the 20th of July.
- 6ly This will be Suffitient for the first time, first to Know the Situation of the country and Indians, then please god, we may better be able to Send the following year for to winter and bring Such for[e]ign Indians Down to trade, also by this Journey we shall Know partly whether there is any possibility of making a Setlemt a Considerable Distance up Nelson River, whether or no, the Indians cou'd bring Double the Quantity of goods to the said Setlement in one Year, to what they do at presant bring to the fort in one Year.
- 7ly It's not unlikely but the french or wood Runners, in hearing of your being amongst the Indians, may way Lay you, to prevent which, take particular Care to make the Indians your freinds, that in case they shou'd attempt Such a thing, you may be able to head the Indians against the said wood Runners, for your own Preservation, but otherwise do not offer, or Let the Indians molest the Said wood runners, unless they are the first transgressors as already observ'd.
- 8th I have been Severall times inform'd that the Earchithinues, who are perdigious Numerous, and which is my View in Sending you to bring them to trade, has no Knowledge, or at Least can not padle in cannoes, if this be true and you have the oppirtunity of seeing some of them, Let your Guides Show and Learn them, also Exhort them to practice it that they may be able to padle down to the fort &ca.
- 9th As you travel up Nelson River observe the track or branch the Indians parts

out of Nelson River for to go to Churchill, or to come to York fort, and what Distance up Nelson River as near as you can guess what Sort of a place whether plenty of woods or Likely for a house their &ca.

- 10th Upon the contrary Side the french Knowing of your Comg as mentiond in the 7th Instruction, I say they may come to See you as a freind make much and Invite you to their Settlement, if so, use them Kindly but upon no acct go with them, but Keep at a Distance for you Can not be too Carefull in Regard to their fondling, artfull and Skeeming Disposition.
- 11th As you proceed inland if you meet with any Indians who is Comming for the fort, besure [sic] to Send a note by all Such Different Indians you shall meet comming down, as I may Know is how you proceed &c:.
- 12th I Desire you take particular notice of all these Instructions, peruse them often; that you may not fail in the Performance thereof,-- besure [sic] to Converse with the guides as much as possable, that you may attain their Language, and by so Doing you will be better Capable to Exhort and Encourage the Natives to trade.
- 13th And Lastly besides these Instructions, take all the observations and Remarks that occurs to your View, be it Ever so trifling as you may imagine, yet all Such when I come to Examine it will be a Suffitient Satisfaction mentioning such in Your Journal, and by so doing and Encouraging and Exhorting the Natives to trade you may Depend upon it the Company will Suffitiently Reward you for any Service you may do the Company by such a Journey, Besides which you may Depend upon Encouragement from

Your Sincere freind and Well wisher
James Isham

APPENDIX B:
Anthony Henday's Correspondence,
1754
 [HBCA A. 11/114, fos. 179-181d]

To Mr James Isham Governour in Chief of York Fort

Dated at Desolation fall July
 The 2 1754.

Hon: Sir

Having an Oppertunity of Sending a line or two by these Indians, this is to acqu[aint]: You the River we are now in is Nothing but Falls, Rocks, and Islands, We are Obligated to Carry the Cannoes and things over most of them, and have been obliged so to do ever since we left the River that goes into the North River which is about 60 Miles above where we crost the Island, We are all in good health at present, for We made a good Dinner on the Roots of Rushes such as the Cooper use about his Casks, having nothing else to eat for two Days but two Jack, but we are to see a place to morrow Where we shall take them up with Our hands, Sir I hope Your Honour will excuse my Ashurance, Sir I remain Your Obedient Servant, and will endeavour to Discharge the trust laid on me

Anthony Henday

* * * * *

York Fort Sunday July 14: 1754

Anthony

I Received Yours and am glad to hear You are all well, as we are at present, and hope by the Receipt of this will be got into a plentifuler Country then when You last Wrote, there was a French man coming to the Fort, but light of a Misfortune to break his Cannoe therefore did not Come, but sent me a letter; Monsiure wants a Correspondance I sent him an Answure by the Young Captains Tribe who says he'll be down with You and the Indians next Summer.

By eny Indians that You see Coming for the Fort send Me a line of Your Welfare and a Small Account of your Country.

I have had very few Indians down, 60 Cannoes less then last Year, they tell me there is but few, and them gone to Warr, this You will know if Truth, and if you see any going upon such and Errand, perswade them from it.

I hope by Your means a good Success in promoteing the Companys Trade, by Exorting the Indians to live peaceably, and encouraging them to get goods, Espetially Beaver, and above all be sure to bring as many Cannoes of Earchithinues You can to Trade, of their Own Furrs, and for their Own Use.

I Conclude wishing You Health and Success, and am,

Your Faithful Friend
And welwisher
James Isham

All Friends give their Love to You.

* * * * *

To the Hon[oura]ble James Isham, Governer in Chief at York Fort:
Theise [?]
Hon[oure]d Sir

Having an Oppertunity to let Your Hon know that We are got near 300 Miles up the Country, and the Indians last Night inform'd Me that we should see a French Factory in 3 Days more, and that We must go by it, before We can go their Country I dont very well like it, having nothing to Satisfye Them on what account I am going up the Country, and Very possably they may suspect Me to be a Spy, but I will Face them with a good Countenance let it be how it will, for as I am gone thus Farr, if it please God, Will see the Farthest end of all Their Country, as I can if the French do not stop Me, as I dont doubt but they will be very Inquisitive about it I shall say nothing at all to them (if they cannot talk English) and then I will give them a Civill lye. We are all in good health, and Feed on good Moose and Swans for two Days past it having Rain'd and blow'd hard all the Time I wish Your Hons Health, and if the French should shoot me, I have nothing to lay to Your Hons Charge

Sir I remain Your
Dutiful Servant
Anthony

Dated July the 9th 1754
in Minishco River
Apetty Tuskey

* * * * *

York Fort Sepr 4th
1754

Anthony Henday

I rec'd Yours of July the 9th: and hope these will come safe, and find You in good health, as we all are at present Captain Spurrel of the Prince Rupert is now with us, which I doubt not but will be pleasing to the Indians to hear. You seem fearful of passing the French Follow Your Instructions in such a Case, I do not Imagine they will Intercept You I am tould Bob: has seen the French who Used Him well, I hope health and success will attend You, be sure to Keep in Friendship with Attickoshiss I have sent You a Roll of Tobacco, and a Quire of Paper by the Bearer, You say You live on Moose and Swans, an Earchithinue that is Hear, tells me there is Wild Goat[,] Nutts[,] Apples &c in their Country, I desire You will be particular in Your Journal, I wish You health, and hope

to see You at the head of many Earchithinues, and foreign Indians, next Summer, from
Your loving

Friend and Servt:
James Isham

APPENDIX C:

"Gave for Journeys att Times and Sent by Anthy Hende
to present to foreign Indians, &c."

[B. 239/d/44, fo. 13]

Files	3
Guns, Long	3
Powder	24 lb.
Shot, Bristol	48 lb.
Low East India	48 lb.
Tobacco, Brazil	26 ½ lb.
Roll	16 lb.
Steels	24
Awles	64
Needles, Quilting	100
Paint [vermillion]	1½ lb.
Beads, China, Red & White	2 lb.
Black barley corn	2 lb.
White	2 lb.
Large round white	6 lb.
Small do.	3 lb.
Blew do.	3 lb.
Feathers	3 lb.
Knives, Jack	48
Large Roach	48
Brandy	7 gallons
Blankets	2
Cloth, red	8 yds.
Hatchets, Middling	4
Ice Chisels, Narrow	2
Hatts, Laced	3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Hudson's Bay Company Archives (HBCA):

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| A. 1/38-42 | London Minute Book, 1748-66 |
| A. 4/1-2 | London Agenda Book, 1737-71 |
| A. 5/1-2 | London Correspondence Book Outwards,
General Series, 1753-88 |
| A. 6/7-10 | London Correspondence Book Outwards,
HBC Official, 1742-67 |
| A. 9/4 | Memorial Book, 1688-1778 |
| A. 9/8 | Copies & Drafts of Memorials, 1750-1878 |
| A. 10/1 | London Inward Correspondence,
General, 1712-1816 |
| A. 11/114-115 | London Inward Correspondence from Posts,
Churchill, 1723-63 |
| A. 11/114-115 | London Inward Correspondence from Posts,
York Factory, 1716-75 |
| A. 14/11 | Grand Ledger, 1745-69 |
| A. 15/10-11 | Grand Journal, 1745-63 |
| A. 16/31-32 | Officers' & Servants' Ledger,
York Factory, 1738-81 |
| A. 18/1 | Balance of HBC Books, 1746-84 |
| A. 24/7-9 | Invoice Book of Shipments to Hudson Bay,
1749-64 |
| A. 26/2-3 | Indent Book, 1751-65 |
| A. 44/1 | Register Book of Wills & Administration of
Proprietors, etc., 1717-1819 |
| A. 64/45 | Inventory of Archives |
| A. 67/1 | Miscellaneous Papers, 1719-1870 |
| A. 67/15 | Extracts from Minutes, 1693-1891 |
| B. 198/a/2-4 | Severn River - Post Journal, 1760-63 |
| B. 198/b/1 | Severn River Correspondence, 1759-60 |
| B. 198/d/2-3 | Severn River Account Books, 1760-62 |
| B. 239/a/33-39 | York Factory - Post Journal, 1749-55 |
| B. 239/a/40 | York Factory - Post Journal, 1754-5
(Anthony Henday's journal) |
| B. 239/a/41-42 | York Factory - Post Journal, 1755-7 |
| B. 239/a/43 | York Factory - Post Journal, 1756-7
(Joseph Smith's journal) |
| B. 239/a/44 | York Factory - Post Journal, 1757-8 |
| B. 239/a/45 | York Factory - Post Journal, 1757-8 |

	(Joseph Smith's journal)
B. 239/a/46-49	York Factory - Post Journal, 1758-62
B. 239/b/6-36	York Factory Correspondence, 1750-75
B. 239/d/41-49	York Factory Account Books, 1750-60
C. 1/365-366	Ship's Logs, <i>King George (II)</i> , 1761-2
C. 1/869-876	Ship's Logs, <i>Prince Rupert (I)</i> , 1751-5, 1757-9
C. 1/882	Ship's Logs, <i>Prince Rupert (II)</i> , 1760
E. 2/4	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1768-9
E. 2/5	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1768-9
E. 2/6	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1767-9
E. 2/7	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1771
E. 2/9	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1775
E. 2/10	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1775
E. 2/11	Andrew Graham's <i>Observations</i> , 1792
RG 20/2/132	Archives Dept. Administrative Subject File: A.S. Morton, 1931-33
RG 20/2/153	Archives Dept. Policy: Access to Archives prior to 1937
RG 20/4/99	Archives Dept. Research Correspondence: A. Graham
RG 20/4/107	Archives Dept. Research Correspondence, 1930-88: Hen-Hin
RG 20/4/170	Archives Dept. Research Correspondence, 1930-88: Maps
Search File	Miller Christy
Search File	Anthony Henday
Search File	Samuel Skrimsher
Search File	Joseph Smith
Search File	Inland Traders
Correspondence File	Donald Kennett

Provincial Archives of Manitoba (PAM):

MG9 A75-1, Box 1 Miller Christy, *The Last Great Monopoly:
A History of the Hudson's Bay Company
From its Establishment in the Year
1670 to the Present Time...*(ms.)

Burpee, Lawrence J. "York Factory to the Blackfeet Country: The Journal of Anthony Hendry, 1754-5." *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 3rd series, vol. 1 (1907) section II: 307-64.

- . "An Adventurer from Hudson Bay: Journal of Matthew Cocking, from York Factory to the Blackfeet Country, 1772-73." *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, third series, vol. 2 (1908), section II: 89-121.
- Dobbs, Arthur. *An Account of the Countries Adjoining to Hudson's Bay in the North-west Part of America*. New York: S.R. Publishers Ltd. and Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1967.
- Davies, K.G. and Alice M. Johnson, eds. *Letters from Hudson Bay, 1703-40*. Introduction by Richard Glover. London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1965.
- Kelsey, Henry. *The Kelsey Papers*. Introduction by John Warkentin. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1994.
- Rich, E.E. and Alice M. Johnson, eds. *James Isham's Observations on Hudson's Bay, 1743*. Toronto: Champlain Society for the Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1949.
- , eds. *Cumberland House Journals and Inland Journal 1775-82: First Series, 1775-79*. Introduction by Richard Glover. London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1951.
- Umfreville, Edward. *The Present State of Hudson's Bay*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954.
- Williams, Glyndwr, ed. *Andrew Graham's Observations on Hudson's Bay 1767-91*. Introduction by Richard Glover. London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1969.

Published Secondary Sources

- Bailey, Alfred G. "Overture to Nationhood." In *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, edited by Carl F. Klinck, 55-67. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Begg, Alexander. *History of the North-West*. Toronto: Hunter, Rose, and Co., 1894.
- Brown, Jennifer S.H. "Two Companies in Search of Traders: Personnel and Promotion Patterns in Canada's Early British Fur Trade." In *Proceedings of the Second Congress, Canadian Ethnology Society*, edited by Jim Freedman and Jerome H. Barkow, 2: 622-645. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975.
- Brumble, H. David. *American Indian Autobiography*. University of California Press, 1988.
- Bryce, George. "Brief Outlines of the most famous Journeys in and about Rupert's Land." *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for the year 1886*. Montreal: Dawson Bros., 1887: 91-104
- Burpee, Lawrence J. *The Search for the Western Sea: The Story of the Exploration of North-western America*. Toronto: Musson Book Co., 1908.
- . *The Search for the Western Sea: The Story of the Exploration of North-western America*, 2nd edition. Toronto: Musson Book Co., 1935.
- . *The Discovery of Canada*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1944.
- Carter, Paul. *The Road to Botany Bay: An Exploration of Landscape and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Craig, Joan. "Samuel Skrimsher (Skrimshire)." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, III: 593-4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Cruikshank, E. A. "The Study of History and the Interpretation of Documents." *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, third series, vol. xv, 1921, section ii: 1-13.

- Cullen, Charles T. "Principles of Annotation in Editing Historical Documents; or, How to Avoid Breaking the Butterfly on the Wheel of Scholarship." In *Literary and Historical Editing*, edited by George L. Vogt and John Bush Jones, 81-95. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Libraries, 1981.
- Cumming, W.P. *et al*, eds. *The Exploration of North America, 1630-1776*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1974.
- Dempsey, James. "Effects on Aboriginal Cultures Due to Contact with Henry Kelsey." In *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's 'Inland Country of Good Report'*, edited by Henry Epp, 6-10. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1993.
- Eccles, W.J. *Essays on New France*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Francis, R. Douglas. *Images of the West: Responses to the Canadian Prairies*. Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1989.
- Greenfield, Bruce. "The Idea of Discovery as a Source of Narrative Structure in Samuel Hearne's *Journey to the Northern Ocean*." *Early American Literature* 21/3 (Winter 1986/7): 189-209.
- Greetham, D.C. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York: Garland, 1992.
- Hodgson, Maurice. "The Exploration Journal as Literature." *The Beaver* 298 (Winter 1967): 4-12.
- "Initiation and Quest: Early Canadian Journals." *Canadian Literature* 38 (Autumn 1968): 29-40.
- Hopwood, Victor G. "Explorers by Land to 1860." In *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, edited by Carl F. Klinck, 19-40. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Innis, Harold Adams. *The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History*, revised edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1956.
- Jenness, Diamond. *The Indians of Canada*, fifth edition. Bulletin 65, Anthropological Series no. 15. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, 1960.
- Laslett, Peter. *The World We Have Lost: further explored*, 3rd edition. Cambridge: Methuen, 1983.
- Laut, Agnes C. *The Conquest of the Great Northwest*. New York: The Outing Publishing Company, 1908.
- *The "Adventurers of England" on Hudson Bay: A Chronicle of the Fur Trade in the North*. Toronto: Glasgow, Brook, and Co., 1914.
- Lewis, Oscar. *The Effects of White Contact Upon Blackfoot Culture*. Monographs of the American Ethnological Society, no. 6. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1942.
- Litalien, Raymonde. *Les Explorateurs de l'Amerique du Nord 1492-1795*. Sillery, Quebec: Septentrion, 1993.
- Lytwyn, Victor P. *The Fur Trade of the Little North: Indians, Pedlars, and Englishmen East of Lake Winnipeg, 1760-1821*. Winnipeg: Rupert's Land Research Centre, 1986.
- MacEwan, Grant. *Fifty Mighty Men*. Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1975.

- MacGregor, J. G. *Blankets and Beads: A History of the Saskatchewan River*. Edmonton: Institute of Applied Art, 1949.
- *Behold the Shining Mountains*. Edmonton: Applied Art Products, 1954.
- *Peter Fidler: Canada's Forgotten Surveyor, 1769-1822*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1966.
- *The Battle River Valley*. Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1976.
- *A History of Alberta*, 2nd edition. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1981.
- MacKay, Douglas. *The Honourable Company: A History of the Hudson's Bay Company*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1936.
- MacLaren, I.S. "Samuel Hearne and the Landscapes of Discovery." *Canadian Literature* 103(1984): 27-40.
- "Samuel Hearne's Accounts of the Massacre at Bloody Fall, 17 July 1771." *Ariel* 22/1 (January 1991): 25-51.
- "Exploring Canadian Literature: Samuel Hearne and the Inuit Girl." In *Probing Canadian Culture*, edited by Peter Easingwood *et. al.*, 87-106. Augsburg: AV-Verlag, 1991.
- Milloy, John S. *The Plains Cree: Trade, Diplomacy, and War, 1790 to 1870*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1988.
- Milne, A.A. *The House at Pooh Corner*. New York: Dell, 1956.
- Morton, Arthur Silver. *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1939.
- Newman, Peter C. *Company of Adventurers*. Markham: Viking, 1985.
- Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles* (1955)
- Ray, Arthur J. "Indian Exploitation of the Forest-Grassland Transition Zone in Western Canada, 1650-1860: A Geographical View of Two Centuries of Change." PhD thesis, Dept. of Geography, University of Wisconsin, 1971.
- *Indians in the Fur Trade: their role as trappers, hunters, and middlemen in the lands southwest of Hudson Bay, 1660-1870*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- "The Factor and the Trading Captain in the Hudson's Bay Company Fur Trade before 1763." In *Proceedings of the Second Congress, Canadian Ethnology Society*, edited by Jim Freedman and Jerome H. Barkow, 2: 586-602. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975.
- Ray, Arthur J., and Donald B. Freeman. *'Give Us Good Measure': an economic analysis of relations between the Indians and the Hudson's Bay Company before 1763*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Rich, Edwin E. *The History of the Hudson's Bay Company 1670-1870*, 2 volumes. London: Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1958-59.
- *The Fur Trade and the Northwest to 1857*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967.
- Rogers, George C., Jr. "The Sacred Text: An Improbable Dream." In *Literary and Historical Editing*, edited by George L. Vogt and John Bush Jones, 23-30. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Libraries, 1981.

- Ruggles, Richard I. *A Country So Interesting: The Hudson's Bay Company and Two Centuries of Mapping, 1670-1870*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.
- Russell, Dale. "The Puzzle of Henry Kelsey and His Journey to the West." In *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's 'Inland Country of Good Report'*, edited by Henry Epp, 74-88. (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1993).
- Thistle, Paul C. *Indian-European Relations in the Lower Saskatchewan River Region to 1840*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1986.
- . "Dependence and Control: Indian-European Trade Relations in the Post-Kelsey Era." In *Three Hundred Prairie Years: Henry Kelsey's 'Inland Country of Good Report'*, edited by Henry Epp, 124-130. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1993.
- Van Kirk, Sylvia. *"Many Tender Ties": Women in Fur Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670-1870*. Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer, 1980.
- Warkentin, Germaine. *Canadian Exploration Literature: An Anthology*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Warkentin, John, ed. *The Western Interior of Canada: A Record of Geographical Discovery 1612-1917*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1964.
- Williams, Glyndwr. "The Puzzle of Anthony Henday's Journal, 1754-5." *The Beaver* (Winter 1978): 41-56.
- Wilson, Clifford. "Across the Prairies Two Centuries Ago." *Canadian Historical Association, Annual Report, 1954-5*:28-35.
- . "Anthony Henday (Hendey, Hendry)." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. III: 285-7. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- . "George Spurrell." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. III: 598-9. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Unpublished Secondary Sources

- Belyea, Barbara. "Henday's Journal: historical evidence/ problematic text/ political tool." Paper given at University of Edinburgh, May 1996.
- . "West to the Shining Mountains: Henday Reconsidered." Paper submitted to *Terra Incognita*, n.d.
- Maclaren, Ian. "Wanderings Among Fur Traders, Reliability Among Documents: Paul Kane and Others." Paper presented at the Rupert's Land Research Centre Colloquium, Winnipeg, February 1992.
- Rollason, Heather Ann. "Studying Under the Influence: The Impact of Samuel Hearne's Journal on the Scholarly Literature about Chipewyan Women." M.A. thesis, Canadian Heritage and Development Studies, Trent University, 1994.