
In June 1754 Anthony Henday, a netmaker and labourer at York Fort on Hudson’s Bay, set out with a group of Indians to winter on the western plains of North America. Having volunteered for the task, Henday was given detailed instructions for the journey by James Isham, the chief factor at the fort. Foremost amongst these was the task of persuading Natives of the interior, strangers to the Bay area, to by-pass the French post, Basquila, now The Pas, and to trade their furs at the bayside forts. Because he was exploring unknown territory, Henday was admonished to keep a journal in which he was to “Remark Down Every thing that occurs to [his] View Daily,” especially the distances and directions travelled together with various particulars of the terrain through which he moved: the names of Native Nations, soil and minerals, vegetation, the depth of water in rivers and lakes, names of places. On 23 June 1755 Henday returned to York Fort accompanied by 46 canoes of Natives and having in hand the map and journal of his travels.

Apparently no holograph manuscript of Henday’s journal survives, but there are four copies. The earliest was made in 1755 by Andrew Graham, an accountant at York Fort, for dispatch in September of that year to the “London committee” of the Company. The three remaining copies are to be found in three volumes of Andrew Graham’s “Observations on Hudson’s Bay” compiled over a twenty-five year period during which he served at Severn House, York, and Prince of Wales Fort. According to Barbara Belyea, the earliest of these, done in 1767-8-9, is in Graham’s hand; another from the same period is in the hand of an unidentified copyist. The fourth copy, also by Graham, is dated 1782. This copy is the source of the only previously published version of Henday’s “Journal,” edited by Lawrence J. Burpee in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3d series I (1907) as “York Factory to the Blackfeet
Country – the Journal of Anthony Hendry, 1754-55.” But Belyea suggests that Burpee had not even seen the manuscript; he was working with a colleague’s transcription.

The characteristics of each of the copies and their places in the various states of Graham’s “Observations” is carefully described by Belyea in a section called “From Manuscript to Print.” There too she addresses the problems of reliability presented by the four texts, “rife with differences and contradictions,” and the challenges these features offer to the prospective editor. Belyea has taken up these challenges because, in spite of the ambiguities and uncertainties of the versions of the Journal, great claims have been made for Henday by historians and anthropologists with respect to the extent of his travels (it has been said that he was the first European to see the Rocky Mountains), the peoples he is said to have met, and his accomplishments as a trade negotiator. Belyea says that the journal is “doubtful evidence” for many of these claims to be made unequivocally. And yet, neither can they be dismissed. Furthermore, the copies are important pieces in the context of reference material that was used to develop Hudson’s Bay Company policy for the fur trade and the opening of the west and they have been adaptable to the biases of historians and anthropologists.

“Context” is the key word in A Year Inland. Having resolved upon the need for an edition of Henday’s journal, Belyea’s first task was to grapple with the problems presented by the existence of four versions and the customary selection of a copy text. She does so in the context of Canadian and American traditions of documentary editing, observing the tradition of “heavy emendation, interpolation and annotation” in the former in contrast to a more theoretically based and scrupulous endeavour to preserve original evidence in the latter. Given the difficulty of establishing priority for any one of the four Henday texts and having the luxury of a relatively short journal comprised of mostly brief daily entries, Belyea uses a hypertext format that presents the four texts simultaneously for each date of the year-long journey. This procedure minimises editorial intrusion and manipulation and allows the reader to move freely from one text to another, noting major and minor differences.

Additional contexts follow the unembellished presentation of the four texts of the “Journal.” A short section of “Notes and Remarks” appended to the 1855 version and seven maps of the western interior are followed by a hundred pages of “Notes to the Texts.” These in turn are followed by a section of Commentary consisting of an
introduction and three substantial critiques of Henday’s journal and related materials, each thoroughly annotated. A list of sources and an index conclude the volume. In keeping with the principle that governed the choice of the hypertext format, this variety of contexts allows the reader freedom to examine the texts according to particular interests.

“Notes to the Texts” is an impressive and thoroughly researched section of heavy annotation in which the editor reveals a complex web of eighteenth-century fur-trade materials and other writings that augment the Henday journal. They are drawn from six categories: the editor’s own textual notes, Hudson’s Bay company maps and plans, Company records and correspondence, winterers’ journals, Company memoirs, and the commentaries of historians. The section presents an extraordinarily rich assemblage of information concerning many areas of knowledge: geography, culture, anthropology, ethnography, flora and fauna, history, etc.

In her three wide-ranging and interesting essays, “Tracing Henday’s Route,” “Indians, Asinepoets and Archithinues,” and “Uses of Henday’s Journal,” the editor examines the claims and interpretations of historians and anthropologists that have been based on Henday’s journal and the related materials. These claims concern such matters as whether or not he saw the Rocky Mountains, what Indians he met, how these Indians interacted with one another and with him, and whether Henday affected trade relationships and practices. The thrust of the essays is to show that the vagueness and ambiguity of his journal as an empirical document have rendered it a text adaptable to the biases, interests, and simplifications of its users. Historians have used it to propagate romantic myths about the opening of the west, even in the face of contrary evidence. Anthropologists have bent it and collateral material to their need for classification and generalisation in the interpretation of plains Indian society and culture. Hudson’s Bay factors seem to have adapted it to their arguments for various fur trade policies. Through each of these critical essays, Henday’s journal is examined as a major piece in a “network of reiterative, mutually confirming ‘Letters, Books and Papers’” in the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives.
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